

Submitter		SH6 Blenheim to Nelson Speed Review Submissions
1	Individual submitter	<p>1) Will lead to more traffic along old Renwick Road from Blenheim to Renwick which is more suburban and also not as well designed for large amounts of traffic as the very wide straight road between Blenheim and Woodbourne.</p> <p>4) Installation of a slow car bays must be considered. It's extremely dangerous to pass at 80km/h and there are already very few spots to safely pass here. Being forced to travel behind cars that are driving 40km below the speed limit or suddenly slow down from 120km/h to 20km/h (because of turns they're scared of or misunderstandings of turn speed suggestions) leads to people unsafely overtaking in a bid to get as far ahead of these reckless and frustrating drivers as they can, as quickly as they can, regardless if they can clearly see far enough ahead. This is relevant for most of the stretch of road between Atawhai and Blenheim.</p> <p>5) Better merge lanes from SH6 and Mahakipawa Rd. Notice of the wide shoulder coming up (north bound) allowing for slow traffic to move over.</p> <p>7) Reminders to pull over if causing traffic. Slow car bay.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Slow car bays, rumble strips.</p> <p>10) Pull over for queue behind you signs.</p> <p>11) Rumble strips, median and edge barriers where applicable.</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) Better notice of shoulders and slow car bays since people will continue to go the speed they're comfortable at regardless of the limits set. Good luck enforcing speed limits on a stretch of road with almost nowhere for police to catch them.</p> <p>15) Merge lanes for exits on and off SH6 as applicable.</p> <p>16) Overhead bridge or tunnel if possible for children crossing the river to the school. Reminder signs for passing school busses.</p> <p>17) Rumble strips along median and edge.</p> <p>18) The 80km/h is fine. Increasing the median strip along the entirety of the 80km/h section of Atawhai Dr will reduce the need for people to turn across two lanes or following traffic to drive into the shoulder behind stopped turning traffic. Other option would be yellow lines which are actually regularly enforced. Safety measures for Alisdair Rd exit must go beyond reducing speed and actually improve upon the reduced visibility.</p> <p>19) People are morons who like the pretty view and don't pay attention. Maybe build a wall. Improved merge lanes for Atawhai cres, Tui Glen Rd, Bay View Road and Malvern Road to reflect the increase in housing i.e road users in this area.</p>
2	Individual submitter	<p>We are very supportive of a reduction in speed to 80kmh on SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim. This is a dangerous road for many obvious reasons. It seems as if whatever the speed limit is, some drivers strive to reach it as often as possible, and drivers trying to reach 100kmh on that winding, hilly road make driving there a very unpleasant experience. Consequently, we avoid going to Marlborough.</p> <p>On the other hand, since the speed limit was lowered to 80kmh on SH60 between Richmond and Maisey Road, driving there is a more pleasant experience with people driving to the conditions rather than setting the goal of reaching the speed limit.</p> <p>So, go for 80!</p>
3	Individual submitter	<p>1) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>4) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>5) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>7) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>8) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>9) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>10) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p>

		<p>11) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>13) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>14) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>15) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>16) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>17) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>18) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p> <p>19) Please consider not restricting everybody (speed limits) for a few people's lack of skill or judgement. Reducing speed zones is not the most practical approach to stopping these road incidents, consider more passing lanes or widening the current risk zone's boundaries. I am highly against any speed limiting as it costs us safe drivers time and money when travelling.</p>
4	Central Express LTD	<p>1) When the limit in this section was 80km after the earthquake it caused more congestion coming into Blenheim from a hpmv perspective</p> <p>4) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>5) I agree</p> <p>7) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>8) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>9) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>10) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>11) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>13) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>14) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>15) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>16) I agree</p> <p>17) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>18) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p> <p>19) From perspective of hpmv it will cause congestion. As light vehicles will only be able to travel at the same speed as heavy vehicles but when there is a rise/hill the heavy vehicle naturally slows which in turn will cause the light vehicles to dangerously overtake due to the reduced momentum of heave vehicles.</p>
5	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>4) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>5) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>7) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>8) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>9) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>10) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p>

		<p>11) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>13) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>14) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>15) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>18) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p> <p>19) I agree with the proposed changes because they will make road travel safer and lessen the risks to local communities.</p>
6	Individual submitter	<p>1) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education is!!</p> <p>4) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>5) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>7) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>8) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>9) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>10) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>11) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>13) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>14) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>15) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>16) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>17) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>18) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p> <p>19) Reducing speed is not the answer, better driver education &amp; passing lanes</p>
7	Individual submitter	Hi I just completed this survey and there appears to be double ups and sections missing, i think around the Pelorus Bridge and Rai Valley sections.
8	Individual submitter	<p>1) i commute along this stretch of road, and a lot of the time drivers are travelling at 80 km/h, which is very frustrating in a 100 km/h zone, but I don't see a need to adjust the speed to 80 km/h permanently.</p> <p>4) This stretch of road is open and flowing, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p> <p>5) I agree, the turn off to Queen Charlotte Drive has a lot of tourist traffic who often seem uncertain of their next action. Also turning out on to SH6 is up hill, which can catch tourists out.</p> <p>7) This stretch of road is open and flowing, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p> <p>8) I agree, but with the 80 km/h zone starting east of Wakamarina road as this road is dangerous to turn out of in a 100 km/h zone.</p> <p>9) This stretch of road is open and flowing, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p> <p>10) I agree. I volunteer here once a month, and walk the roadside, it is very scary at times.</p> <p>11) This stretch of road is open and flowing, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p> <p>13) This stretch of road is open and flowing, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) This stretch of road is open and flowing, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p> <p>16) I agree.</p> <p>17) This stretch of road is open and flowing, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p> <p>18) This stretch of road is already safe at 80 km/h, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p> <p>19) This stretch of road is open and flowing, so why would you lower the speed limit. Try educating drivers to actually drive. Lowering speed limits seems to be a backward step.</p>
9	Individual submitter	<p>1) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>4) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>5) Existing speed limit (km/h): 70</p> <p>7) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>8) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>9) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>10) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100/50 in Dec/Jan</p> <p>11) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>13) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p>

		<p>14) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>15) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>16) Existing speed limit (km/h): 80</p> <p>17) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>18) Existing speed limit (km/h): 80</p> <p>19) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p>
10	Automotive Adrenaline	<p>1) No this is not unreasonable</p> <p>4) This is not logical.or reasonable. These are good roads and the speed limit should not be changed on this section of road. Based on findings from Europe and Australia a speed reduction on this section of road is more likely to increase the road toll than reduce it. This is due to drivers losing focus.</p> <p>5) This is fine</p> <p>7) This is not logical.or reasonable. These are good roads and the speed limit should not be changed on this section of road. Based on findings from Europe and Australia a speed reduction on this section of road is more likely to increase the road toll than reduce it. This is due to drivers losing focus</p> <p>8) This is not logical.or reasonable. These are good roads and the speed limit should not be changed on this section of road. Based on findings from Europe and Australia a speed reduction on this section of road is more likely to increase the road toll than reduce it. This is due to drivers losing focus</p> <p>9) This is not logical.or reasonable. These are good roads and the speed limit should not be changed on this section of road. Based on findings from Europe and Australia a speed reduction on this section of road is more likely to increase the road toll than reduce it. This is due to drivers losing focus</p> <p>10) No this is ok</p> <p>11) This is not logical.or reasonable. These are good roads and the speed limit should not be changed on this section of road. Based on findings from Europe and Australia a speed reduction on this section of road is more likely to increase the road toll than reduce it. This is due to drivers losing focus</p> <p>13) This is not logical.or reasonable. These are good roads and the speed limit should not be changed on this section of road. Based on findings from Europe and Australia a speed reduction on this section of road is more likely to increase the road toll than reduce it. This is due to drivers losing focus</p> <p>14) This is not logical.or reasonable. These are good roads and the speed limit should not be changed on this section of road. Based on findings from Europe and Australia a speed reduction on this section of road is more likely to increase the road toll than reduce it. This is due to drivers losing focus</p> <p>15) This is logical</p> <p>16) This is also ok</p> <p>17) This is ok</p> <p>18) This is ok</p> <p>19) This is ok</p>
11	Individual submitter	<p>I thoroughly approve of the plans expressed on your website (although I could not get it to work for me - I could not get it to register past two of the sections of the road).</p> <p>In every way it is more sensible than the current speed limits.</p> <p>I use the read several times a year, and in any event I never exceed 80km/hour. It rarely seems to cause a problem for others, and I make regular efforts to allow them to pass.</p> <p>Not only would the drive be safer, but it would be less stressful. The extra ten minutes needed for the drive would be compensated by that intangible gain of freshness given by lower stress.</p>
12	Individual submitter	<p>1) Objection: This is a straight stretch of road with well controlled intersections.</p> <p>4) Objection. This is a well formed section of road with gentle curves and good visibility.</p> <p>5) Agree.</p> <p>7) Objection. This is a well formed section of road with gentle curves and good visibility.</p> <p>8) Agree.</p> <p>9) Objection. This is a well formed section of road with gentle curves and good visibility.</p> <p>10) Agree. A busy stretch particularly near the bridge.</p> <p>11) Objection. This is a well formed section of road with gentle curves and good visibility.</p> <p>13) Objection. This is a well formed section of road with gentle curves and good visibility.</p> <p>14) Agree. Icy in the winter, slow bends, bad consequences for off road excursions. Cyclists, caravans, camper vans.</p> <p>15) Agree.</p> <p>16) Agree.</p> <p>17) Objection. This is a well formed section of road with gentle curves and good visibility.</p> <p>18) Agree. A lot of non-motor traffic.</p> <p>19) Objection. This is a well formed section of road with gentle curves and good visibility.</p>
13	Individual submitter	<p>1) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>4) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>5) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p>

		<p>7) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>8) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>9) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>10) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>11) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>13) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>14) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>15) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>16) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>17) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>18) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p> <p>19) Fast drivers concentrate, slow drivers day dream</p>
14	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a wise decision given that agricultural traffic (tractors, harvesters, grape trucks, etc. and cyclists are permanently encountered on this stretch of hwy. In these conditions 80 km/h is the most fluid speed over a longer period.</p> <p>4) On this part of the road, there are many intersections with agricultural traffic, cyclists and also horses and school buses. As a school bus driver over a period of 8 years I only had 2 occasions where the passing vehicles slowed to the mandatory 20 km/h. Virtually all roads in Marlborough are school bus routes but none is signposted as school bus route as they are in other part of the country. The locals don't want to slow down even when it's their own children in the bus.</p> <p>5) The built up area of Havelock is expanding, which justifies the proposed new speed limit.</p> <p>7) This part is winding with limited visibility in places and fog in winter. A 100 km/h sign incites drivers of HT vehicles, towing vehicles and others with a speed limit of 90 or even 80 to exceed their lower limits. The proposed new speed limit of 80 km/h is justified.</p> <p>8) A variable school zone speed limit of 40 km/h with a proposed new speed limit of 70 km/h would be more adequate, so as to have consistency with other parts of the district.</p> <p>9) Yes, given that fog can occur in this area in Autumn / Winter. In Summer cyclists and tourists are present.</p> <p>10) The bridge is only one way and there are lots of pedestrians about, given the proximity of the camping ground and people (mainly children) swimming in the river and walking back and forth to the road. 50 km/h all year round would be adequate.</p> <p>11) 80 km/h is justified but Rai Valley is a settlement and should have 50 km/h limit.</p> <p>13) Part of this stretch is new and wider. This causes drivers to speed. An 80 km/h will help them to hold their horses.</p> <p>14) This part is steep and winding and vehicles have been falling off the road. A 60 km/h limit is realistic.</p> <p>15) Tourists are respectful of the 'recommended speeds' signposted in this area but commuters and locals are not. May-be the 'recommended speeds' signs could be replaced by mandatory speed limit signs but 80 will help them stay on the road.</p> <p>16) The variable school zone should be the same as in the other parts of Tasman District.</p> <p>17) In this area many vehicles stop to pick up hitch-hiker backpackers heading for Picton while others may get distracted by the changing scenery. Reducing the limit to 80 is wise and will help.</p> <p>18) Same as above. Existing 80 is excessive and 60 more adequate, given the increased traffic in this area.</p> <p>19) 100 km/h in new roundabouts area is excessive. Because the road has been widened with a new seal does not mean that it is safer, even if locals and commuters tend to think so. They seem to think that they want to show us that 'they know their stuff'.</p>
15	Individual submitter	<p>I do not agree with changing any of the existing 100km/h areas to 80 km/h between Nelson &amp; Blenheim. Its a good road, just drive to the conditions.</p>
16	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>4) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>5) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>7) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>8) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>9) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>10) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>11) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>13) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>14) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>15) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>16) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>17) Don't reduce speed</p>

		<p>18) Don't reduce speed</p> <p>19) Don't reduce speed</p>
17	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Open road that is very safe to drive at 100km/h. Reject the proposed speed of 80km/h. On cruise control I can drive at 100km/h all the way from 250m north of Gee St to 240m south of Queen Charlotte Dr without needing to apply the breaks when no other cars are present.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Open road that is very safe to drive at 100km/h. Reject the proposed speed of 80km/h. On cruise control I can drive at 100km/h all the way from 300m north-west of Clive St, Havelock to 100m west of Wakamarina Rd, Canvastown without needing to apply the breaks when no other cars are present.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Open road that is very safe to drive at 100km/h. Reject the proposed speed of 80km/h. On cruise control I can drive at 100km/h all the way from 260m west of Tapps Rd to 320m south of Pelorus Bridge without needing to apply the breaks when no other cars are present.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Open road that is very safe to drive at 100km/h. Reject the proposed speed of 80km/h. On cruise control I can drive at 100km/h all the way from 320m north-east of Pelorus Bridge to 210m north of Hills Rd, Rai Valley without needing to apply the breaks when no other cars are present.</p> <p>13) Open road. Reject proposed new speed limit. Safe to drive upto 100km/h depending upon the conditions.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) Open road. Reject proposed new speed limit. Safe to drive upto 100km/h depending upon the conditions.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Open road. Reject proposed new speed limit. Safe to drive upto 100km/h depending upon the conditions.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
18	Individual submitter	<p>1) Drivers frustration when conditions are suitable to travel at 100km/h</p> <p>4) The road is quite suitable for 100 km/h most of the time. A blanket 80 km/h is ridiculous for this stretch of road</p> <p>5) Driver frustration especially on the straight stretches of road. Allow the majority of drivers the to use their intelligence to drive to the conditions. A sledgehammer to crack a nut is ridiculous.</p> <p>7) As above</p> <p>8) As above</p> <p>9) Same arguments as above</p> <p>10) Same as above. 99percent of drivers are very responsible when driving this road</p> <p>11) Driver frustration needs to be seriously considered</p> <p>13) Same as above</p> <p>14) That is a stupid idea to reduce it go 60km/ h some of it is ok at 60 but give drivers a brain for goodness sake they will drive to the road conditions</p> <p>15) Leave it as is</p> <p>16) Ok with that</p> <p>17) Leave it as is not necessary to change it</p> <p>18) Ok with that</p> <p>19) Road is safe for the current speed limit there</p>
19	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight road. Why does the speed need to change!</p> <p>4) Again this is a lot of straight roads. Why does the limit need to change. Maybe sort out the corners to make them safer!</p> <p>5) Are there accidents on this stretch? Then why alter the limits.</p> <p>7) The corners are low grade and the speed is currently OK. What has caused any accidents on this stretch? Driver inattention maybe and lowering the speed limit will alleviate this?</p> <p>8) There is a need to slow traffic at school arrival and departure times but the rest of the time the current speed limit is adequate.</p> <p>9) These are basically straight roads. Upgrade the one tight corner!</p> <p>10) Upgrade these corners as lower speed limit will not stop accidents</p> <p>11) Again predominantly straight road! Upgrade the road and corners</p> <p>13) The posted limit is fine. Maybe upgrading the corners would help.</p> <p>14) Again straight Rd. Current limits are acceptable</p> <p>15) Tidy up the road and the corners</p> <p>16) Sort out cable bay intersection, in the middle of a corner, come on sort it out!</p> <p>17) No Comment</p>

		18) No Comment 19) Straight Rd. Really!
20	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree with the reduction. I have both driven and cycled this stretch of road. The mix of activities non driver related would be safer with the lower limit.</p> <p>4) Again, I've driven this stretch many times, cycled it a few. I think it is a "mental " thing, when someone can say, after 20 people dying" , what's the problem. I've cycled and driven in many countries. Currently I'm cycling Chicago to Santa Monica following Route 66. In all States so far, drivers have slowed 50 meters behind me , if on coming traffic was visible; and only then past safely giving at least e metres width. Perhaps it's the liability laws in the States, but I feel safer cycling here than I have ever done in N Z. As to factors you should consider. Start by telling your Minister EDUCATION AND ADVERTISEMENTS are not working. YOU need the up the standards of driver competency, re educate the population, that speed from A to B is not the primary responsibility of the driver, it is the safe passage of him or her to their destination safely.</p> <p>5) This again is a busy area. Slower speeds reduce risk, reduce fatalities, yet have LIMITED effect on overall journey time. I support the reduction.</p> <p>7) Again, have driven and cycled 4 times. It was along this piece of Highway I just about got wiped out by a caravan driver who didnt realise his carav8was wider than his car. I still can relive that moment, thankfully I use a mirror when cycling. As a driver, I really dont think an 80 km speed limit would have affected my efficiency when I worked in Nelson with responsibilities in Blenheim and Kaikoura. I drove the highway often, usually under pressure and stressed lower speed limits would " notmalise" over time.</p> <p>8) Cant picture this stretch so wont comment.</p> <p>9) The number of caravans, trucks and the straights then bends. All suggest lower speeds would be safer.</p> <p>10) So much is going on in this area, both in the high season and beyo8. I'd support the reduction. Weather, summer, winter also plays a part in driver ratings here.</p> <p>11) As per previous comment.</p> <p>13) Ths Whangamoas need to be respected. Lower speeds will save lives. The road is going through a scenic reserve and the technical demands of driving it need to be respected</p> <p>14) Previous comment refrts.</p> <p>15) The Hirs community has user pulses. Z lower speed limit would enhance safety.</p> <p>16) Increasing urbanization and transitioning from rural to urban all would support lowering the limit.</p> <p>17) Previous comment spies.</p> <p>18) Previous comm9with greater emphasis apies. Increasing numbers of children come into the mix in this section.</p> <p>19) Same again. This close to Nelson, promoted as a very livable community environment, should be allowed to speed.</p>
21	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think this is okay due to the side roads and the slow up thru Woodbourne then onto Renwick</p> <p>4) I don't agree with this at all. As a regular driver of this section of road this is not necessary. I would suggest center barriers for high crash areas and better signage on corners that need to approached with a bit more caution.</p> <p>5) Nope all good</p> <p>7) 100kms is fine the road is a lovely flowing road other than a couple of corners that could do with center barriers and better signage as to appropriate speed.</p> <p>8) same answer as question 5 but agree with variable speed scool zone</p> <p>9) Same answer as question 5</p> <p>10) Agree</p> <p>11) As per Question 5</p> <p>13) Agree</p> <p>14) Agree, you can't really go much faster without it becoming unsafe unless you are in a rally car!</p> <p>15) Agree</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) Agree</p> <p>18) 80km is perfectly fine the road is clear and the link roads onto it have good vision</p> <p>19) Okay</p>
22	Individual submitter	<p>Submission: Lowering the speed limit on SH6 at Atawhai Nelson: Improvements to the safety and resilience of the Nelson to Blenheim route.</p> <p>I wish to submit a request that the speed limit on state highway 6 when entering Nelson City limits is reduced from 100kmph to a uniform 80 kmph. This would include the stretch of SH6 passing through Atawhai and up to the Glen Rd turn off.</p> <p>I believe that there is an overwhelmingly clear direction of intent from consultation feedback that the speed limit coming into Nelson from Blenheim is currently unsafe in all residential and mixed amenity zones.</p> <p>Reducing the speed limit from 100 to 80 kmph would have a number of immediate benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Lower speed limit allows more time to react to unsafe conditions or hazards which will reduce probability of accidents and fatalities</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Lower speeds allows safer merging and stopping from vehicles turning into and off SH6 as well as school and commercial buses operating on route</li> <li>· Lower speeds allows safer use of adjacent cycleway which has no separation barrier from the highway in many areas, for pedestrians, cyclists and children</li> <li>· Lower speeds creates safer conditions for pedestrians and motorists crossing SH6 or parking alongside to access Haven and foreshore recreational areas</li> <li>· Consistent speed limit from Nelson all the way to outside the residential areas means safer driving conditions with a negligible reduction in travel time.</li> </ul>
23	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment</p> <p>19) I wish to submit a request that the speed limit on state highway 6 when entering Nelson City limits is reduced from 100kmph to a uniform 80 kmph. This would include the stretch of SH6 passing through Atawhai and up to the Glen Rd turn off. I believe that there is an overwhelmingly clear direction of intent from consultation feedback that the speed limit coming into Nelson from Blenheim is currently unsafe in all residential and mixed amenity zones. Reducing the speed limit from 100 to 80 kmph would have a number of immediate benefits: • Lower speed limit allows more time to react to unsafe conditions or hazards which will reduce probability of accidents and fatalities • Lower speeds allows safer merging and stopping from vehicles turning into and off SH6 as well as school and commercial buses operating on route • Lower speeds allows safer use of adjacent cycleway which has no separation barrier from the highway in many areas, for pedestrians, cyclists and children • Lower speeds creates safer conditions for pedestrians and motorists crossing SH6 or parking alongside to access Haven and foreshore recreational areas • Consistent speed limit from Nelson all the way to outside the residential areas means safer driving conditions with a negligible reduction in travel time. • Lower speed limit will cause a general noise reduction for residences along SH6, pedestrians, cyclists and fauna resulting in a general increase in amenity. Lowering the speed limit supports the goals in the Nelson Regional Land Transport Plan. For example: • Communities have access to a safe transport system (reducing fatalities) • Communities having access to a range of transport choices such as walking and cycling and bus transport. • Appendix 5 project descriptions SH6 Nelson to Blenheim improvements : improved safety along this corridor I wish to highlight how this part of Nelson has changed over the last decade with higher traffic flows, increased residential density and a larger number of families residing in this general location. The current stretch of SH6 from Nelson past Atawhai is a significant hazard to motorists, pedestrians and children. A reasonable, cost effective and immediate mitigation measure is to lower the speed limit.</p>
24	Individual submitter	<p>1) These are open roads on flat terrain with few risks to normal drivers. Don't lower the limit.  4) These are open, flowing roads on flat terrain with few risks to normal drivers. Don't lower the limit. You are punishing the vast majority who drive sensibly and creating greater stress on drivers who will lose their patience on roads that do not need a lower limit.  5) Understandable. Havelock is growing in this direction and there is some slow moving traffic here, including boat trailers and tractors.  7) These are open, flowing roads on flat terrain with few risks to normal drivers. Don't lower the limit. You are punishing the vast majority who drive sensibly and creating greater stress on drivers who will lose their patience on roads that do not need a lower limit.  8) Understandable to have a variable limit around the school.  9) These are open, flowing roads on flat terrain with few risks to normal drivers. Don't lower the limit. You are punishing the vast majority who drive sensibly and creating greater stress on drivers who will lose their patience on roads that do not need a lower limit.  10) Understandable given the tourists and their greatly varying speeds as they leave/arrive.  11) These are open, flowing roads on flat terrain with few risks to normal drivers. Don't lower the limit. You are punishing the vast majority who drive sensibly and creating greater stress on drivers who will lose their patience on roads that do not need a lower limit.  13) Roads here are self-regulating anyway. The lower limit will punish/delay sensible drivers while the hoons will ignore the change anyway.  14) Roads here are self-regulating anyway. The lower limit will punish/delay sensible drivers while the hoons will ignore the change anyway. 60kph is ridiculously slow for some sections.  15) Roads here are self-regulating anyway. The lower limit will punish/delay sensible drivers while the hoons will ignore the change anyway.  16) Understandable, given the school zone.</p>

		<p>17) These are open, flowing roads on flat terrain with few risks to normal drivers. Don't lower the limit. You are punishing the vast majority who drive sensibly and creating greater stress on drivers who will lose their patience on roads that do not need a lower limit.</p> <p>18) There is a parallel suburban road that caters to the local traffic and a clear Tee intersection at the highway. Leave it as it is.</p> <p>19) People are already travelling at 80k here. Why change?</p>
25	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) Yes... 100km/h is not dangerous on this stretch of road.. how is lowering the speed to 80km/h, going to stop people choosing to exceed the speed limit??</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) Yes...</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) Yes...this is an open country road</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) Yes</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) Yes, 80km/h would be adequit</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) Yes, the cost of removing the passing lane on both sides of the gentleannie</p> <p>18) Yes, what difference will it make</p> <p>19) No</p>
26	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep speed limit as it is please</p> <p>4) Same as above</p> <p>5) Agree with this one</p> <p>7) Leave as is</p> <p>8) Leave as is</p> <p>9) Same as above</p> <p>10) Agree with this one</p> <p>11) Leave as is</p> <p>13) Leave as is</p> <p>14) 80 k for this one</p> <p>15) Leave as is</p> <p>16) Leave as is</p> <p>17) Same as above</p> <p>18) Leave as is</p> <p>19) Agree with this one</p>
27	Individual submitter	<p>1) Complete overkill. Excellent road and your proposed change is obviously being done in a missguided attempt to show you are doing something.</p> <p>4) Completely unnecessary it is possible to safely negotiate every corner on this road at 100 Kilometres and hour. I set my cruise at this speed and don't change it until Havelock.</p> <p>5) I have no problem with 50 K's in all built up areas as well as lower speed limits around Schools.</p> <p>7) Safe road does not need to be changed. There are speed signs on all corners indicating safe speeds.</p> <p>8) Completely safe to travel at 100 k's and obey speed restrictions indicated by the various speed signs. School zone should be controlled as proposed.</p> <p>9) Absolute bollocks. Excellent piece of road. Speed restriction totally unnecessary.</p> <p>10) Leave as is works well.</p> <p>11) Current speed signs indicating safe speeds work perfectly</p> <p>13) Drivers are currently restricted on this section by the current layout of the road. I travel this road many times a year and have not witnessed any problems here. There are a few (very) passing lanes which allow cars to pass trucks if necessary.</p> <p>14) No drivers can make 100 K's on much of this section of road. It is totally unnecessary to impost an arbitrary speed restriction which is totally unnecessary. All it does is make the people in power feel satisfied that they have done something. Doesn't matter what. Instead of spending some funds and improving the road you just want to slow us down. The end result of this if we allow you to continue would be a 10 k speed limit.</p> <p>15) Not necessary. 99% of drivers drive to the conditions and navigate this are safely.</p> <p>16) Of coarse</p> <p>17) Unnecessary as per my other comments</p>

		<p>18) I have no problem with this</p> <p>19) Likewise. Sensible, not like the rest of your crazy proposal.</p>
28	Nelson City Council	<p>NCC supports NZTA's goal of improving safety on the Nelson to Blenheim corridor and thanks NZTA for the opportunity to comment on the speed limit reduction proposal. NCC applauded leadership from central government to approve road safety and the increased budget being invested on improvements such as new barriers, passing lanes and wider shoulders. As part of the road safety improvements Council understands speed reviews are an area where great safety gains can be made. Council is grateful that Nelson/Marlborough speed review was bought forward to be carried out alongside those in Auckland, Waikato and Canterbury which were identified as high risk areas. Council acknowledges national and international research that shows speed affects the likelihood and impact of all crashes. Small reductions in impacts speed greatly increase the chances of surviving a crash. A report from the International Transport Forum last year looked at speed limit case studies from around the world. The pattern was the same in all cases: where speed limits were lowered, the number and severity of crashes decreased; where speeds were increased, so did the number and severity of crashes. Safe speed limits, that match the condition of the road, save lives. NCC is currently progressing a review of its own Speed Limits Bylaw and intends to consult on this mid 2020. We note that the timing of the NZTA consultation and possible implementation before Christmas risks speed limits on NCC local side roads being out of step with revised NZTA speed limits. Through the media Council is aware of some push back from the Community on the NZTA proposals and we are aware that a petition to keep existing limits is circulating. Council believes safety must take priority over convenience and encourages NZTA to continue with educational campaigns to advise road users of the risks of travelling at high speed and the benefits of speed reduction. Council requests consideration is given to planning and resourcing for future stopping bays and/or passing lanes to mitigate driver frustrations when stuck behind slow moving trucks. NCC response to the proposed changes as attached and in summary demonstrate partial support for the proposed changes to speed limits between Nelson and Blenheim. 400m west of Severne St, Blenheim to 335m west of Jacksons Rd, Woodbourne. NCC Feedback .</p> <p>NCC has limited knowledge of the SH6 local road environment in Blenheim and does not feel well positioned to comment. 335m west of Jacksons Rd, Woodbourne to 130m east of SH6/SH63 intersection, Renwick. No comment. 130m east of SH6/SH63 intersection to 250m north of Gee St, Renwick. NCC supports lowered speeds around schools and has a strong track record of installation of variable school speed zones on own road network. Council questions why a 40kmph variable speed zone is not proposed at this location. 250m north of Gee St, Renwick to 240m south of Queen Charlotte Dr, Havelock. Council has limited knowledge of the SH6 local road environment in Marlborough and does not feel well positioned to comment. 240m south of Queen Charlotte Dr to 60m south of Kavenagh Pl, Havelock. Council supports lowered speeds around schools has a strong track record of installation of variable school speed zones these on our own network. Council questions why a 40 kmph variable speed zone is not proposed for this location. 300m north-west of Clive St, Havelock to 100m west of Waka marina Rd, Canvastown. Council has limited knowledge of the SH6 local road environment in Marlborough and does not feel well positioned to comment. 100m west of Wakamarina Rd to 260m west of Tapps Rd, Canvastown. Council has limited knowledge of the SH6 local road environment in Marlborough and does not feel well positioned to comment. 320m south to 320m north-east of Pelorus Bridge. Council supports a lowered speed limit through this area which is known to have high volumes of turning movements, and pedestrian movements across the highway during the summer season. 320m north-east of Pelorus Bridge to 210m north of Hills Rd, Rai Valley. Council has limited knowledge of the SH6 local road environment in Marlborough and does not feel well positioned to comment. 210m north of Hills Rd to 180m north of Bryants Rd, Rai Valley. Council supports lowered speeds around schools has a strong track record of installation of variable school speed zones these on our own network. Council questions why a 40kmph variable speed zone is not proposed for this location. 180m north of Bryants Rd, Rai Valley to 770m north-east of Whangamoia Saddle Summit. Council has limited knowledge of the SH6 local road environment in Marlborough and does not feel well positioned to comment. 770m north-east of Whangamoia Saddle Summit to 280m north of Teal Valley Rd. Council supports the lowering of the limit on the Nelson side of the Whangamoia saddle. The existing 100kmph signage sets a "target" and can be misinterpreted by drivers unfamiliar with the challenging terrain and high truck volumes on this stretch of road. 280m north of Teal Valley Rd to 90m south of Lud Valley Rd, Hira. Consideration of a passing lane in this location is requested giving drivers the opportunity to safely pass trucks before the hill climb. 90m south of Lud Valley Rd to 45m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira of variable school speed zones on our own network. Council is aware that the Hira School and community have requested lowered speed past the school for some time and support the proposed 60kmh variable speed zone at this location. 45m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira to 440m north-east of Allisdair St, Atawhai. Council supports the lowering of the limit to 80 from Hira toward the city. Council has frequently heard of near misses reported to Council at Cable Bay Road, Rayners Road and the Glenduan intersection, and are sadly aware of a recent fatal crash involving a cyclist at the Glenduan intersection. 440m north-east of Allisdair St to 150m south-west of Atawhai Cres north, Atawhai. Council supports the lowering of the limit from 80 to 60 in this section. A School Travel Plan completed for Clifton Terrace school in 2008 highlighted the safety concerns of shared pathway users in this stretch due to the close proximity the path to the SH6 vehicle lanes, and the narrowness of the shared path at this location due to topographical constraints. In addition Council has received many concerns and complaints from users of Marybank Road who are uncomfortable when pulling into and out of this side road due to speed of SH6 approaching traffic. Council is aware that if the subdivision continues on this hill side that traffic volumes using this intersection are likely to increase. 150m south-west of Atawhai Cres north, Atawhai to 250m north-east of Trafalgar St, Nelson. Council has called for a lowering of this limit to 80 for sometime and fully supports this.</p>
29	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit on this section of road to 80kmh. I travel this section of road at least once per week, often more. I believe consideration needs to be given to constructing a dedicated cycle lane along this stretch, as a lot of cyclists use this road.</p> <p>4) I use this section of road every day, Mon-Fri, as I commute to my workplace at Woodbourne. I strongly believe that the speed limit needs to remain at 100kmh for this section of road. However, to make this section of road safer, there needs to be more passing lanes and more places for slower traffic to pull over. I have lost count of the times when I've been held up by vehicles travelling at 80kmh or slower, when there's no reason to, and also been overtaken numerous times by vehicles travelling over 100kmh when I am doing the legal limit. I believe that driver attitude is a HUGE factor in the number of crashes on this section of road. I see examples of dangerous driver behaviour almost on a daily basis. I believe reducing the speed to 80kmh on this section of road will only encourage drivers to take more risks. There are those who travel on this section of road at 20kmh below the speed limit already. So it follows that if the speed limit is reduced to 80kmh, they will be doing 60-70kmh!! I believe this will happen, and impatient drivers will become more impatient, take more risks, with disastrous results. Keep the speed limit at 100kmh for this section please, but make the road safer by having at least one passing lane, and more slow vehicle bays.</p> <p>5) I agree with this proposal.</p> <p>7) I disagree with this proposal. I travel this section of road at least once every 5 weeks. I believe it is a good road with no challenges for drivers. Reducing the speed limit on this section of road will</p>

		<p>only encourage impatient drivers to take more risks.</p> <p>8) Same as response for question 4 above.</p> <p>9) Same as response for question 4 above</p> <p>10) I agree with this proposal.</p> <p>11) I disagree with this proposal for the reasons outlined in question 4.</p> <p>13) I believe the speed limit should remain at 100kmh for this section of road. There has recently been an upgrade of the road around the summit area, which is an absolute eyesore, no replanting of the road sides, rain just washes silt everywhere. When travelling towards Nelson the gradient is quite steep when descending. For the amount of money spent on this upgrade, I don't think the NZ taxpayer has received value for money.</p> <p>14) There are lots of twists and turns on this section, which forces drivers to reduce their speed anyway. There are also a few straight stretches of road where 60kmh would be a ridiculously slow speed and I believe would frustrate motorists even further.</p> <p>15) I agree with this proposal.</p> <p>16) I agree with this proposal.</p> <p>17) I agree with this proposal.</p> <p>18) I agree with this proposal.</p> <p>19) I agree with this proposal.</p>
30	Individual submitter	<p>1) Allow for cycle lanes</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) I think 80 would be fine.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
31	Individual submitter	<p>1) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane</p> <p>4) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane</p> <p>5) fully support area heavily built up</p> <p>7) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane</p> <p>8) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane</p> <p>9) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane</p> <p>10) Fully support lots of pedestrians</p> <p>11) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane</p> <p>13) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane</p> <p>14) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane very windy road</p> <p>15) Fully support lots of heavy traffic no seperate bike lane</p> <p>16) support</p> <p>17) support heavy traffic</p> <p>18) fully support heavy traffic</p> <p>19) fully support heavy traffic</p>
32	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>4) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training. Also the effect on buisness that travel this road every day time is money.</p> <p>5) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>7) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>8) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p>

		<p>9) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>10) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>11) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>13) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>14) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>15) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>16) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>17) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>18) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p> <p>19) Yes stop lower speed limit because of poor driver skill look into driver training</p>
33	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a stretch of road that, given the high standard of the current vehicle fleet and the well planned roadway that exists, requires no change from the current speed limit of 100kmh. If driven with care to one's own abilities and to the weather and traffic conditions, there is no pressing need to lower the speed limit through this section of road.</p> <p>4) This is a stretch of road that, given the high standard of the current vehicle fleet and the well planned roadway that exists, requires no change from the current speed limit of 100kmh. It can comfortably be driven at or near the limit, depending on weather and traffic conditions, with no concerns for safety or emergency reaction time if required. There is generally very good visibility and sight lines over this entire stretch of road. There is definitely potential for the creation of a couple of passing bays to help smooth the flow of traffic in both directions.</p> <p>5) This is probably a sensible reduction given the presence of the QC Drive turnoff, suburban streets and local traffic volumes.</p> <p>7) This is a stretch of road that, given the high standard of the current vehicle fleet and the well planned roadway that exists, requires no change from the current speed limit of 100kmh. If driven with care and to one's abilities and to the weather and traffic conditions, there is no pressing need to lower the speed limit through this section of road. If anything, perhaps better recommended corner speed signage could be helpful, but otherwise this is not a risk prone area.</p> <p>8) The school zone reduction is sensible, during school hours only. Otherwise there is no real need to reduce speed here at all. Visibility is very good for vehicle entering SH6 from Canvastown and other side roads. Making these compulsory Stop signs, if not already, would be advisable.</p> <p>9) Other than one or two corners, this is a stretch of road that, given the high standard of the current vehicle fleet and the well planned roadway that exists, requires no change from the current speed limit of 100kmh. So better reduced corner speed warnings may be helpful here. Otherwise this road is not unsafe to travel on at 100kmh.</p> <p>10) This seems a reasonable speed reduction given the build up of traffic in this area especially over Summer.</p> <p>11) There are two very distinct sections to this portion of SH 6. The first is the windy section from Pelorus Bridge which most people drive at between 80-90kmh now anyway, as most people drive to their ability so reducing it would seem unnecessary. The second section comprises cornering and more straights where 100kmh can be maintained safely. The current reduction of speed from Rai Valley School to to the Nelson side of Rai Valley is sensible.</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) This is an area with a combination of very safe straights, wide open corners together with some more challenging windy sections. To designate the entire section as a 60kmh zone is a dramatic step to address only some areas where this speed would be safest. In fact the majority of the windy sections would be driven at around 60kmh currently by most drivers while the rest can safely be negotiated at the current 100kmh. A more practical approach would be to post more obvious reduced corner speed signage and warnings, enforcing left hand lane if not passing courtesy at Collins Valley and otherwise maintaining the status quo for the balance of the carriageway.</p> <p>15) This section is safely travelled at the current speed limit. If there are concerns for vehicles entering or exiting Teal Valley Road then perhaps consideration should be given to the physical design and current stopping protocol of the existing intersection.</p> <p>16) This is a sensible current speed given the Hira dairy and presence of the school.</p> <p>17) This is a stretch of road that, given the high standard of the current vehicle fleet and the well planned roadway that exists, requires no change from the current speed limit of 100kmh. If driven with care to one's own abilities and to the weather and traffic conditions, there is no pressing need to lower the speed limit through this section of road.</p> <p>18) There seems to be no benefit in reducing an already manageable max speed of 80kmh to a very pedestrian 60kmh on a section of road with comfortable corners, excellent line of sight and not obvious danger spots.</p> <p>19) This is a stretch of road that, given the high standard of the current vehicle fleet and the well planned roadway that exists, requires no change from the current speed limit of 100kmh. If driven with care to one's abilities and to the weather and traffic conditions, there is no pressing need to lower the speed limit through this section of road. The current sections of reduced speed that apply already in portions allow for safe entry and exit to SH6 from adjoining roads.</p>
34	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it the same</p> <p>4) Keep it the same</p> <p>5) No just no</p> <p>7) Just no</p> <p>8) Do the school zone but keep.others the same , change to 80 in a township</p> <p>9) Keep at a 100 thanks</p> <p>10) Yeah na we good xxx</p> <p>11) We good</p>

		<p>13) Yeah na  14) Keep the same  15) Nooooooo  16) Yeah that's good ,  17) Nooope keep 100  18) 80s perfect x  19) 100 good</p>
35	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) As someone who drives the road from Nelson to Blenheim regularly, this change is extremely unnecessary and pointless. The road from Blenheim to havelock is extremely easy to navigate at 100kms and there is no need to change this. The issue is inexperienced drivers not the road. All that needs changing is more passing lanes or slow vehicle bays.  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) Many places to pull over and no dangerous roading. Do not see why this should be any less than 100km.  9) Again another easy to navigate road. Not many corners that require less than 100km speed limit.  10) More passing lanes and pulling over spaces. I started driving this road on my learner license and I pulled over for people when I couldn't do 100kms which needs to be a encouraged rather than reducing speed. Even in winter this road is safe at 100kms.  11) To blame speed limit as the causes of accidents is silly. Widen the roads, have more passing lanes and stopping bays.  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
36	Individual submitter	<p>I have completed the online feed back form for submissions on the speed review however there are a number of other comments I would like to make. There was no space provided for general comments. This is something I found very strange and inconsistent with many other feed back reviews I have been involved in. My general comments are as follow:.</p> <p>The whole proposed speed limit review appears “airy fairy” and someone’s idea for saving money. It is going through a consultation process without providing the real information necessary to seek and provide informed feedback. The Q and A section is full of generalisations and unsubstantiated claims. The information I would have expected to see in this type of consultation are:</p> <p>A map showing the location of all of the fatal crashes  A map showing the location of all of the serious injury crashes.  Comment on the cause of the crashes. That is what percentage were caused by excessive speed, alcohol, drug impairment, inattention, careless driving etc</p> <p>The times given for additional time taken for travelling each section of the road are false. I have driven the road and measured the time and distance for each section. I drove each section at between 90 – 100kph and never exceeded the speed limit. To achieve the time difference listed you would have to exceed 80kph to achieve the small time calculated.</p> <p>The comment that the comments and review will be completed by the end of the year and new speed limits will be in place by the end of the years smacks of a predetermined outcome with the public feedback nothing more than a farce to “tick the consultation box”</p> <p>Even internationally recognised methods of assessing the speed of a road confirm many section of the road are suitable for 100kph speed limits.</p> <p>This whole process gives the impression of a desire to reduce speeds and therefore reduce the need for further maintenance and road improvements. It is a hidden money saving exercise so more money can be sent to other pet projects.</p> <p>A proposal to reduce speeds in some areas to 90 kph could have been more readily accepted but 80 is a step too far. It would be better for more time and effort to be spent on enforcing current speed limits than merely cutting speeds back to the 1970s.</p> <p>I expect a thorough review and publishing of a fair and detailed summary of all submissions and comments. I have to say the whole proposal and way the feedback has been requested plus lack of information doesn't pass the “smell test”.</p>

37	Individual submitter	<p>1) Unnecessary. The road is straight and has wide shoulders. Completely unnecessary to reduce the speed on this section of the road.</p> <p>4) Unnecessary. This is a good section of road that even road modelling confirms meets the 100kph standard. The road is safe to drive at this speed.</p> <p>5) Unnecessary. The 70 speed reduction is on an uphill section of road and is easy to reduce speed. Nothing has changed in many years on this part of the road and there is no need to reduce the speed limit.</p> <p>7) Unnecessary. The road has wide sweeping corners with straights in between. It is safe to drive at 100 kph.</p> <p>8) Support this speed reduction near the school.</p> <p>9) Unnecessary. This part of the road has long straights with sweeping corners. It is safe to drive currently and no need to reduce the speed.</p> <p>10) Support this speed reduction. It is currently confusing to introduce a speed reduction for a short time of the year.</p> <p>11) Unnecessary. The road is good to drive at 100 kph.</p> <p>13) Most of this section of road is comfortable to drive at 100kph. The hill sections will always be driven at a comfortable speed. Making it all 80kph is overkill and unnecessary.</p> <p>14) Unnecessary. If the purpose of the speed reduction is to get motorcyclists to slow down it won't work. 70 kph may work but 60 is just far to slow and unnecessary.</p> <p>15) No. Unnecessary. Parts of the road are very wide with good visibility and good run off.</p> <p>16) Support the proposed change.</p> <p>17) Unnecessary. Most of this section of road has very good visibility and sweeping roads.</p> <p>18) Unnecessary. It is only a few years ago this section of road was reduced from 100 to 80. Unnecessary to reduce it further.</p> <p>19) Support the proposed reduction.</p>
38	Individual submitter	<p>1) Why? What's it's going to solve except the increase in road rage..</p> <p>4) Stupid idea!! It takes long enough getting to town without the added time for slowing down. The people 'making' the rule changes LIVE in town..try living out in the country for 5mins and see how you like these speed limit changes. Stupid!!</p> <p>5) Why change something that doesn't need to be changed?</p> <p>7) This effects me a lot because I live here. The people making these suggested changes do not live here and nor have any idea how the speed limit is NOT the issue!! None of the accidents are from locals but all from outsiders who clearly do not know how to drive outside of traffic lights!! Stupid proposal!!</p> <p>8) This definitely needs to happen!!! Children are our priority and the fact that people go 100kms past a school is absurd!!</p> <p>9) No need for this change. Utterly pointless!</p> <p>10) Great idea!!! Especially with the amount of tourists over summer time!</p> <p>11) You try driving it 1 time and see how you like driving it at that lower speed!! This issue isn't the speed limit...it's the drivers!!! Stupid change!!</p> <p>13) Why??? You try living out in the country and see how you like it adding all that extra time on when it already takes so long to get to town now as it is.</p> <p>14) Idiots!!! The people making these suggested changes need to get off their computers and actually go drive the road themselves first!!</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) Leave it as is.</p> <p>17) What about all the mothers in the country who go into labour....speed limits reduced to the limits that all the above are suggesting are only putting these mothers in great risk</p> <p>18) Why????????????</p> <p>19) This has no point other than to make people get road rage which will end up resulting in more accidents than what their is now</p>
39	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Excellent idea, maybe wherever possible adding a cycle lane.</p> <p>5) Good idea, lots of uncertain tourists here, needs clear signage and lower speeds will help clarify navigation</p> <p>7) Horrible piece of road especially for cyclists. Reduced speed will help. Putting a shoulder/cycle safe area would be best.</p> <p>8) As before</p> <p>9) Same answer as before. This Havelock to Pelorus stretch of road is the most scary bit of SH6 until you get to the Glenhope area. Cyclists have no where to go so lower speed can only help.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) Generally I think 100km would be ok. But on the hills and windy bits of road, reduce speed limit so idiots dont expect to be able to do 100.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) worth it, you still have the horrible intersection from Atawai Drive onto SH6 80kph plenty for this bit of road.</p>
40	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree.</p> <p>4) This section is perfectly safe at 100 kph. The vast majority of users drive in a responsible manner.</p>

		<p>5) Agree. Signpost well in advance that urban area is ahead.</p> <p>7) Retain existing 100 kph limit.</p> <p>8) Retain existing 100 kph limit but install signage well in advance to warn of variable school zone.</p> <p>9) Retain existing 100 kph limit.</p> <p>10) Agree. Road narrows for bridge. 60 kph is sensible. Signpost well in advance.</p> <p>11) Retain existing 100 kph limit.</p> <p>13) Retain existing 100 kph limit.</p> <p>14) Retain existing 100 kph limit.</p> <p>15) Retain existing 100 kph limit.</p> <p>16) Agree.</p> <p>17) Retain existing 100 kph limit.</p> <p>18) Retain existing 80 kph limit.</p> <p>19) Agree.</p>
41	Individual submitter	<p>Reducing the speed limit to 80 is ludicrous. The roads are not dangerous, people are, and still will be, whatever the speed limit. A reduction will just lead to frustration and possibly more accidents</p> <p>.</p>
42	Individual submitter	[no comment]
43	Individual submitter	It's not the speed limit. Lowering the speed will not reduce crashes hasn't worked in other countries ie Europe. Please leave as is
44	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a short stretch of road where it's likely drivers will respect a lowered speed limit without becoming frustrated. I support this.</p> <p>4) I oppose this. There are very few areas of this road that drivers can't safely travel at 95-100 km/hr, and none of those areas are the sort that would catch drivers unaware due to deceptive bends. The biggest issue with this stretch of road is that there are few places to safely pass - and some drivers aren't satisfied with 95-100km/hr, become impatient and overtake dangerously. It seems fair to assume that as this small subset of drivers doesn't respect the current speed limit, they're likely to exhibit the same behaviour with a slower speed limit, and with a slower speed limit there might be a larger group of impatient drivers. Overtaking lanes or pull off strips seem a safer solution.</p> <p>5) This seems reasonable given that it's a residential area.</p> <p>7) I oppose this. As per question 2, the majority of this road feels safe to drive at the current speed limit and lowering it seems like it would just further aggravate the drivers who become impatient and overtake in risky areas. Again, overtaking lanes or pull off strips seem a safer solution.</p> <p>8) I support this; it seems sensible in a school zone. It seems likely that drivers would respect this change.</p> <p>9) I oppose this. It seems unlikely to decrease risky driving, particularly given most of this stretch is reasonably straight or has sweeping bends that aren't sharp. Overtaking lanes or pull off strips seem a safer solution.</p> <p>10) I support this. It seems sensible; it seems like the majority of drivers would be likely to be driving within this speed limit already given the sharp bends and give way signs on the bridge.</p> <p>11) I oppose this. Better warning signs on the bends may be more effective a some of those bends would be driven at slower than 80 km/hr. It doesn't seem necessary to curb the 100km speed limit on the straighter stretches.</p> <p>13) I oppose this. There are stretches of this road that seem unnecessary to cut down to 80km/hr, and there are stretches of road where the curves and contours naturally slow people down.</p> <p>14) I oppose this. There are ares of this road where 60km/hr seems too slow. The more windy stretches of road prevent people travelling faster anyway, but it seems likely to encourage impatient driver behaviour to slow this whole stretch down. Reducing the speed limit to 60km/hr could also reduce incidents of courteous behaviour where slower drivers pull off to allow faster drivers to pass safely.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) I support this. This seems sensible and drivers are likely to respect a reduced speed limit for a school zone</p> <p>17) I oppose this. This area doesn't have sharp bends - reducing the speed limit could frustrate more impatient drivers and encourage risky overtaking.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
45	Individual submitter	<p>1) The speed limit is safe leave it at 100 -driver education.</p> <p>4) The speed limit is safe drive to the conditions of the road- driver education leave it at 100</p> <p>5) The current speed limit has been more than reasonable for this stretch of road- leave it at 100</p> <p>7) The speed limit is safe leave it at 100</p> <p>8) When considering school drop speed limits at school arrival and leaving times. Other than that leave the current limits in place.</p> <p>9) The 100k speed limit is safe- driver education- no need for Reduction</p> <p>10) The current pelorus bridge lowered limit takes into account foot traffic around the bridge. You also stop for the one way bridge and severely reduce your speed around it already. All other limits outside of the current reduced zone are safe leave them at 100</p>

		<p>11) The current speed limit through Rai valley is already reduced there is no need to extend lower speed limits further.</p> <p>13) The limit is safe. Slow drivers create impatience and accidents...Create more passing lanes and lay-bys if there are issues. Leave the limit at 100</p> <p>14) The current limit is safe. Slow drivers create impatience and accidents create more passing lanes and lay-bys if needed. Leave at 100</p> <p>15) The current limit is safe. Slow drivers create more accidents. Fix the roads and create more lay-bys if needed. Leave at 100</p> <p>16) Unnecessary 80 is fine leave it at 80</p> <p>17) Unnecessary. The 80k limit around the service station is more than sufficient. You also spent a large amount of money upgrading this passing lane north recently. Stop wasting our time</p> <p>18) 80 is a safe limit</p> <p>19) 80 is a safe limit</p>
46	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree this speed limit should be reduced.</p> <p>4) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>5) Agree this speed limit could be reduced for safety's sake.</p> <p>7) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates may relate to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>8) Agree this speed limit could be reduced for safety's sake.</p> <p>9) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>10) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>11) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>13) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>14) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>15) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>16) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>17) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>18) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p> <p>19) I have observed erratic driving / high speeds in those attempting to pass slow moving traffic in this area. The increased speed relates to sheer frustration when other drivers travel at 70km to 80km and will not let other traffic pass.</p>
47	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) As there is a school in this area and the road can be busy at these times I am happy with the proposed change</p> <p>19) As this is a busy road and houses run along this area, I am happy with proposed change to speed to stop any accidents occurring on this stretch of road.</p>

48	Individual submitter	<p>1) LEAVE IT AT 100KM/H Reducing it to 80 will ONLY cause more trouble and potential accidents. The problem is not the speed. The problem is the dumb drivers! Lights off when it's dark, peoe not indicating, or driving at 50 on a 100 road. It is blatantly stupid. The areas that are of low speed are already signaled at 30 or 60 depending on the location. If someone goes faster than that then obviously the problem is the driver. Reducing the speed limit is STUPID</p> <p>4) LEAVE IT AT 100KM The problem are DUMB DRIVERS including tourists. Or people driving while looking at their cellphones.</p> <p>5) No ways! LEAVE IT AT 70KM. INSTEAD, EDUCATE PEOPLE TO DRIVE BETTER.</p> <p>7) LEAVE IT AT 100 KM</p> <p>8) LEAVE IT AT 100</p> <p>9) LEAVE IT AT 100 KM/H</p> <p>10) LEAVE IT AT 100 KM/H</p> <p>11) LEAVE IT AT 100 KM/H</p> <p>13) LEAVE IT AT 100 KM/H. The drive is fine, the problem are dumb drivers. They are the hazard.</p> <p>14) LEAVE IT AT 100 KM/H You guys are going to cause more stress, frustrations, deads and heart attacks if that speed limit is reduced.</p> <p>15) LEAVE IT AT 100 KM/H</p> <p>16) Variable school zone is ok</p> <p>17) OMG, LEAVE IT AT 100 KM/H!</p> <p>18) LEAVE IT AT 80</p> <p>19) LEAVE IT AT 100 KM/H</p>
49	Individual submitter	<p>1) No need, do not agree</p> <p>4) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>5) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>7) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>8) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>9) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>10) Ridiculously slow. Will cause more frustration and accidents</p> <p>11) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>13) Peoples frustration at slow speeds</p> <p>14) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>15) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>16) No need. Do not agree</p> <p>17) No need, do not agree</p> <p>18) Road is wide with good vision. No need. Do not agree</p> <p>19) It's is a motorway. Wide, good vision. No need. Do not agree</p>
50	Individual submitter	<p>1) That speed is fine, passing lanes could be installed, or the road widened, no need for a speed decrease</p> <p>4) I oppose this, the road is fine at 100km, there is no passing lanes when there should be, especially on the straights, the road could be widened on the bends. That would significantly increase drive time when it isn't needed to be</p> <p>5) 70km is fine</p> <p>7) I oppose a speed decrease, more road drainage needs to be installed below the hillside, and again passing lanes. The road is fine at 100km</p> <p>8) I agree it should be slower pass the school during school hours, outside of them 100km is fine</p> <p>9) You could widen and staighthen the road out, and install slow vehicle bays, it's fine at 100km</p> <p>10) It's fine at100km</p> <p>11) This is fine to do 100km in, more slow vehicle bays and a passing lane would improve it</p> <p>13) It's fine at 100km</p> <p>14) No need to reduce speed</p> <p>15) It's fine at 100km</p> <p>16) Seems suitable</p> <p>17) No need to reduce speed</p> <p>18) It's fine at 80km</p> <p>19) It's fine at 100km</p>
51	Individual submitter	<p>1) Absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p>

		<p>4) This is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. Add some passing areas. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>5) Fine</p> <p>7) This is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>8) Keep the variable school speed zone. Otherwise this is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with and you are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>9) This is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>10) Keep the reduced speed limit seasonal. There is literally nobody here in winter.</p> <p>11) This is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>13) Didn't you just spend millions of dollars "fixing" this section of road? Did you get it so wrong that now you have to reduce the speed limit too? Where will the insanity end? Again, this is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. Add some passing areas. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>14) This is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. Add some passing areas. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>15) OK to reduce speed limit to 80 -- you can't safely drive it any faster than that anyway.</p> <p>16) Fine</p> <p>17) This is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. Add a passing area somewhere around the mid-point. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>18) Absurd. Again, This is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p> <p>19) This is a very easily negotiated section of road that competent drivers have no issues with. You are proposing an absolutely pointless reduction in speed that will have a significant social and economic cost of slowing down traffic with no proven benefit. If you really just cannot help yourselves and decide to raise the speed limit anyway, at least make it 100 kph between 7pm and 7am when there is literally nobody on the road, ever!</p>
52	Individual submitter	<p>1) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>4) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>5) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>7) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>8) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here, and feel it is really important to slow down traffic near schools to enable students to walk or cycle to school and feel safe</p> <p>9) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>10) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>11) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>13) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>14) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here, as resident numbers have increased in these valleys this makes sense and increases safety</p> <p>15) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here, as resident numbers have increased in these valleys this makes sense and increases safety</p> <p>16) I'm in support of the proposed speed reduction here, as resident numbers have increased in these valleys this makes sense and increases safety</p> <p>17) I am in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p> <p>18) This is great news, when I visited clifton terrace school I was told that it was impossible to visit the estuary given the fast road, and it felt like a real barrier to the ocean. This way residents,</p>

		<p>school children and visitors can connect better with the ocean and it may also have a positive impact on less shorebirds being hit by cars.</p> <p>19) I am in support of the proposed speed reduction here</p>
53	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is such a joke, its straight flat roads and totally unnecessary. Put a passing lane in instead would be more thoughtful</p> <p>4) Why? This is unnecessary, look at a passing lane before Havelock would be better value for money and travel. How many crashes are here? And those that happen are from unsafe passing</p> <p>5) This is not a heavily built up area so again unnecessary. Areas like this in Canterbury and West Coast are only limited to 70 or 80</p> <p>7) Totally uncalled for, just require safe driving practices and passing</p> <p>8) I accept this as a school area</p> <p>9) Not needed again best think could be a passing area/slow vehicle bay along the big straights</p> <p>10) Leave as it is, this area has little people after summer so no need to be driving so slow as proposed</p> <p>11) Why? A passing lane on the big straight or decent pull off area for slower traffic be better</p> <p>13) This is good safe road so doesn't need to be limited. Again better use in pull off bays</p> <p>14) No way totally unnecessary. Better driving, safe passing required</p> <p>15) Unnecessary again safe passing and driving to the conditions</p> <p>16) Yes leave this as is as is school and populated place on corners</p> <p>17) Not needed at all, better safer driving instead</p> <p>18) Leave at 80, no need to be as slow as 60</p> <p>19) Leave as is</p>
54	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it as is</p> <p>4) Leave it as it is</p> <p>5) Leave it as is</p> <p>7) Leave it as is</p> <p>8) Leave it as is</p> <p>9) Leave it as is</p> <p>10) Leave it as is</p> <p>11) Leave it as is</p> <p>13) Leave it as is</p> <p>14) Leave it as is</p> <p>15) Leave it as is</p> <p>16) Leave it as is</p> <p>17) Leave it as is</p> <p>18) Leave it as is</p> <p>19) Leave it as is</p>
55	Individual submitter	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the proposed Speed Limit changes on State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson.</p> <p>We are recent arrivals in Nelson, having moved here 4 years ago from other parts of New Zealand. We reside in Marybank, and travel this road regularly, particularly the section from Nelson to Hira, which we travel both ways twice a day on most days.</p> <p>We are astounded by the huge disparity between confidence and competence we regularly witness on this, and other regional highways in the Nelson Area.</p> <p>We fully support all of the proposed speed limit changes in zones 1-3 ,5-6 inclusive, zone 8 and zone 10 respectively.</p> <p>We fully support all of the proposed speed limit changes in zones 12-19 inclusive.</p> <p>Reductions from 100km/h to 80km/h in Zones 4,7, 9 and 11 appear to us ,on the surface, to be an over-reaction, as these sections are well-formed, relatively straight-forward sections of road. However, we are not in possession of the accident statistics for these sections of road in particular, to make a more informed submission.</p> <p>Other factors which need to be considered include:</p> <p>Zone 14: Intersection of Teal Valley Road and State Highway 6: Vehicles turning onto or off Teal Valley road, or pedestrians crossing between Teal Valley Road and Ross Road, take their life in their hands each time they do so because of the lack of visibility of vehicles travelling north on State Highway 6 from the South. Reducing the speed limit to 60 in this zone as proposed will be a significant improvement.</p> <p>Zone 16: The section immediately outside Hira School needs either (a) a turning bay for traffic turning right off State Highway 6 into the School, or, failing that, (b) a pull-off area on the eastern side of the highway for school-bound vehicles to wait to safely turn right into the school. There is insufficient space and visibility (to other vehicles approaching from the north) for cars to safely</p>

		<p>wait within the current narrow median strip to turn right into the school, even with the proposed variable school zone in place.</p> <p>Zone 17: The intersection of Cable Bay Road and State Highway 6. This intersection needs a turning lane for traffic turning left from State Highway 6 onto Cable Bay Road. Because there is no view of the intersection for vehicles travelling east from Nelson until the last moments, it is unsafe for turning vehicles to slow down to turn, as they risk getting tailgated by another vehicle travelling in the same direction.</p> <p>Zone 17: The Intersection of Glen Road and State Highway 6. This is a blind bend for vehicles travelling east from Nelson, and there isn't sufficient time at 100km/h for vehicles travelling east from Nelson to see and respond to vehicles turning right off Glen Road across their path, and more particularly, vehicles turning right from Glen Road onto State Highway 6 cannot see vehicles travelling east on the state Highway until it is too late. This is even worse for cyclists. This intersection needs more than a speed limit change; it needs to be moved to a site with better visibility, but at least a speed limit reduction would "lessen the mess".</p> <p>Zone 18: This is a built-up residential area, housing the only school in Atawhai and a lot of children walking or cycling to and from school. Apart from immediately outside the school, the foot/cycle path is in immediate proximity to the State highway, with no physical barrier between. at 80km/h, we do not feel safe with our child walking or cycling this path. The proposed reduction to 60km/h is in keeping with the residential and school status of this zone; however, there also needs to be a protective barrier between the footpath/cycleway and the highway, particularly the section between Sybil Way and Marybank Road.</p>
56	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support this change in the interest of road safety</p> <p>4) A good move for road safety</p> <p>5) Much of this would be difficult to travel faster. Reduction in speed limit makes good sense.</p> <p>7) No.</p> <p>8) No. Very appropriate given the accident rate on this road.</p> <p>9) No.</p> <p>10) Often pedestrians there. Speed reduction is sensible.</p> <p>11) Makes sense given the accident rate.</p> <p>13) Proposal is sensible.</p> <p>14) Do the proposed change</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
57	Individual submitter	<p>1) In general: The numbers here do not line up with the numbers on the map here:<a href="https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/sh6-blenheim-to-nelson-speed-consultation/SH6-Blenhheim-to-Nelson-speed-review-consultation-v2.pdf">https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/sh6-blenheim-to-nelson-speed-consultation/SH6-Blenhheim-to-Nelson-speed-review-consultation-v2.pdf</a> This makes it hard to cross-reference between the legal definitions given and the map. Also generally, this highway is one of the first on the west coast tourist route and is one of the hashest introduction to travellers that the speed limit in NZ is not a recommendation. Given that we as a country can't change the mindset that the speed limit is a target, particularly for visitors, we should instead set speed limits within the safe speeds for the road.</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) This makes a lot of sense. The two-stage drop-down is not needed with the lower speed out of town and this aligns with the idea of 'town == 50km/h (or less)'</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) Crossing the road here to get from the carpark to the walks on the other side is a hazard. Perahaps it would be 50km/h all year round, consistent with Havelock? Otherwise I strongly agree.</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) This is a very good idea. The safe speed for much of the traffic on this road is far less than 100km/h and this avoids traffic behind backing up behind a campervan or truck getting the impression that they 'should' go much faster down these bends. As an external reference, many years ago Brown Mountain, on the Snowy mountains highway, NSW, Australia was similarly restricted and this is now well accepted.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
58	Individual submitter	<p>1) I am not opposed to this change given the existing 80 km/hr limit past the airport and onto Renwick.</p> <p>4) I travel this section of road regularly. It is totally safe at 100 km/hr with long straights or gently curving bends. One or two passing lanes would not go amiss but passing can be safely done at several locations. There are good views and it is easy to see ahead. It's simply nonsensical to reduce the speed to 80 km/hr through this entire stretch. The proposal is way over the top and a</p>

		<p>complete over reaction.</p> <p>5) Having a single 50 km/hr zone through Havelock makes sense.</p> <p>7) Like the road from Blenheim to Havelock above, this section of road is absolutely fine at 100 km/hr. The proposed change is totally unnecessary. Such an over reaction.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) This is another long stretch of road which is totally safe at a 100 km/hr speed limit. Yes there are some bits that require slower speeds at times/places, but for goodness sake the speed limit is simply that, a limit, not a target.</p> <p>10) Dropping the speed limit makes sense through this area due to walkers, visibility etc, but 70 km/hr would suffice</p> <p>11) Another section of road with long straights and good corners. Yes there are some bits where you need to slow down, but that's the case for most NZ highways. This section should remain at 100 km/hr. Totally unnecessary to drop the speed limit.</p> <p>13) This section of road includes various bits where 100 km/hr is not safe, but other parts where it is totally safe. As I said above, the speed limit is a limit not a target and drivers are very capable of slowing down to suit the conditions. In fact there are bits along here where you need to go slower than 80 km/hr. Does that mean you will contemplate dropping the speed to 50 km/hr to match the worst parts? That would be just as logical as the proposed drop to 80km/hr.</p> <p>14) Dropping the speed through much of this section is probably ok given the winding hilly nature of the road. But to 60 km/hr over the whole section?? Way too slow for the approach to the top of the Whangamoia saddle. And parts of the Whangamoia road is safe above 60 km/hr. Leaving it at 100 km/hr would be totally fine as frankly you cannot do any where near that sort of speed. Dropping the speed limit will change little.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) This section of road includes passing lanes and long straight or gently curving sections of road. Totally safe at 100 km/hr. Yes, you need to slow down a bit for the sweeping corner past the Glenduan turnoff, but that's not a drama.</p> <p>18) The existing 80 km/hr is absolutely fine here. If you are going to have 80 km/hr limits either side, then this 60 km/hr slot will add unnecessary complexity. (Not that I agree with the drop to 80 km/hr to the north.)</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
59	Individual submitter	Please do not reduce the speed anywhere you are proposing. I don't support any changes. It is the drivers that are the problem, not the speed! Increase cops to fine the dangerous drivers and slow drivers. All the current speed limits are comfortable and fine.
60	Individual submitter	<p>1) OK with this - makes sense</p> <p>4) A reduction is unnecessary as the road is generally wide and with easy curves. A reduction would simply impede traffic flow and in my view tend to bunch up cars / trucks etc. There are a couple of corners which could have safety improved</p> <p>5) In my view this reduction is unnecessary as the traffic already slows to 70 in this area. It is not heavily built up so unsure why a 50k limit would be required? At time it appears traffic has difficulty turning right out of QC Drive to head towards Nelson, but that could be improved with larger turning / merging bay very easily.</p> <p>7) No reduction required, as per above this is an easy flowing drive that does not require a reduced speed limit, which in my view would cause frustration and be counterproductive.</p> <p>8) Agree with this proposed reduction - would improve safety around the school</p> <p>9) Reduction is not required, the road is easy and flowing; a reduction would cause frustration and be counterproductive in my view.</p> <p>10) Agree with this proposed reduction</p> <p>11) No reduction in speed limit required. As per above, the road is easy and flowing. Cannot believe you are proposing to reduce basically the whole distance between Nelson and Blenheim!!!!????? What are you thinking?</p> <p>13) Reduction here also not required. Will cause frustration and be counterproductive. Common sense is required!!! There are some corners that could have safety improved by widening, or wire centre barriers - that would improve safety more than an arbitrary ridiculous speed limit reduction.</p> <p>14) No reduction required. Whilst there have been many crashes on this hill, I have not seen any evidence that speed between 61 and 100kmh is the key factor??? In my view an arbitrary reduction like this will not improve safety significantly, but will definitely cause a lot of frustration and potentially prompt car drivers to overtake unsafely. DO NOT DO THIS!!!!</p> <p>15) No reduction required. See above</p> <p>16) Yes agree this change is a good idea. This one is sensible, unlike most of the others!</p> <p>17) Reduction really not required, but if you have to have some to feel good then this one is only a relatively short distance so maybe.....</p> <p>18) Don't think a reduction is required - 80ks feels appropriate here, 60 would feel very slow.</p> <p>19) Again, if you must make some reductions then maybe this one could be done, it's only a short distance.</p>
61	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p>

		<p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) Clifton terrace school - I am sure you are aware is along this stretch of road. During the school rush we constantly witness near misses - yesterday a child was very nearly hit after mistakenly falling onto the carriageway. The truck driver thankfully avoided a serious incident, so any reduction in speed limit is welcomed but during school rush hours the limit should be further reduced to 50.</p> <p>19) With the amount of current and proposed housing development, vehicles trying to negotiate turns onto and off the highway presents a danger to vehicles even at 80 kmh - please consider reducing this to 70kmh.</p>
62	Individual submitter	<p>I am writing to provide a submission and feedback on the proposed speed limit changes to State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson.</p> <p>In its current form, the proposal is to reduce the existing open road limit from 100kmh to 80kmh along virtually the entire stretch of this highway.</p> <p>Whilst I support a reduction of the speed limit outside of the schools along this route, I am strongly opposed to the entire stretch of highway being reduced to an 80kmh speed limit.</p> <p>This is both completely unnecessary and a totally over the top approach. NZTA has a responsibility to ALL motorists who use this road, not just the local communities along which this highway passes through.</p> <p>Reducing the speed limit on the open highway is most certainly not “the most effective way of improving the safety of the road”, and is rather a knee jerk reaction and wanting to be seen to be doing something, rather than making actual real roading improvements to the Highway.</p> <p>Motorists should quite reasonably be able to expect to traverse a State Highway in a timely and efficient manner, without unnecessary speed limit changes adversely impacting on journey times.</p> <p>Apart from slower speed limits around schools and townships where it is appropriate, the rest of the highway should be left at the status quo of 100kmh.</p> <p>NZTA should also seriously investigate building new passing lanes where possible, to alleviate motorist frustration when stuck behind slow moving vehicle’s. This will facilitate improved journey times, and provide for a much better travel experience when using this stretch of State Highway.</p>
63	Individual submitter	<p>1) The general public are against this.</p> <p>4) The general public are against this.</p> <p>5) The general public are against this.</p> <p>7) The general public are against this.</p> <p>8) The general public are against this.</p> <p>9) The general public are against this.</p> <p>10) The general public are against this.</p> <p>11) The general public are against this.</p> <p>13) The general public are against this.</p> <p>14) The general public are against this.</p> <p>15) The general public are against this.</p> <p>16) The general public are against this.</p> <p>17) The general public are against this.</p> <p>18) The general public are against this.</p> <p>19) The general public are against this.</p>
64	Individual submitter	<p>1) This section of road is straight, in good condition with little housing. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>4) This section of road is in good condition with little housing and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>5) This section of road is in good condition with little housing and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p>

		<p>7) This section of road is in good condition with little housing and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>8) I am supportive of a reduced speed limit in the school zone. For other areas This section of road is in good condition with little housing and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>9) This section of road is in good condition with little housing and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>10) I am supportive of this reduced speed as the area has multiple hazards.</p> <p>11) This section of road is in good condition with little housing and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>13) This road does have complex driving, particularly in Winter however I am not supportive of the change in speed limit as many parts are completely drivable in the 80-100km range. Almost all roads have areas where it is not safe to travel over 80km such as tight corners. I am not supportive of enforcing 80km speed limits on entire sections of roads as this is precedent setting for a change in policy of moving to 80km for all open roads because of safety concerns.</p> <p>14) This road does have complex driving, particularly in Winter however I am not supportive of the change in speed limit as many parts are completely drivable in the 80-100km range. Almost all roads have areas where it is not safe to travel over 80km such as tight corners. I am not supportive of enforcing 80km speed limits on entire sections of roads as this is precedent setting for a change in policy of moving to 80km for all open roads because of safety concerns.</p> <p>15) This road does have complex driving, particularly in Winter however I am not supportive of the change in speed limit as many parts are completely drivable in the 80-100km range. Almost all roads have areas where it is not safe to travel over 80km such as tight corners. I am not supportive of enforcing 80km speed limits on entire sections of roads as this is precedent setting for a change in policy of moving to 80km for all open roads because of safety concerns.</p> <p>16) This section of road is in good condition with little housing and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>17) This section of road is in good condition with little housing and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>18) This section of road is in good condition and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p> <p>19) This section of road is in good condition and relatively straight-forward driving. This would seem to set a precedent of 80km roading on perfectly acceptable roading. I am opposed to this.</p>
65	Individual submitter	<p>1) Protect the most vulnerable road users ( cyclists) a much as possible</p> <p>4) See above box</p> <p>5) The slower the better</p> <p>7) Definitely 80kph</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) The whole Wangamoas needs to be 80 or less</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Consider the popularity of this whole stretch of road with cyclists and touring cyclists</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) The slower the better</p>
66	Individual submitter	<p>1) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>4) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>5) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>7) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>8) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>9) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>10) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>11) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>13) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>14) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>15) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p>

		<p>16) OK</p> <p>17) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>18) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p> <p>19) Not required - leave speeds as they are and focus on reductions areas near schools, shops or other built up areas.</p>
67	Individual submitter	<p>I am writing in opposition to the introduction of reduced speed limits for SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson, for the last 20 Years the road between Blenheim and Nelson has been my workplace, during this time I have travelled this stretch of road over 20,000 times all which has been done safely and without harm under the current speed limits, I strongly oppose the introduction of reduced speed limits believing them to be completely unnecessary and a slight on the overwhelming majority of drivers who regularly use that road in an appropriate and safe manor under the current speed limits.</p> <p>Over the past week I have been observing vehicles travelling on SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson, although most of those vehicles have been travelling at speeds close to the 100km limit all have been doing so in a safe and appropriate way, it is wrong to impose speed restrictions on the thousands of vehicles that safely use this road. Apparently we live in a democracy where the majority are able to make the decisions that affect our way of life yet these changes would mean imposing unnecessary restrictions on the majority of responsible safe travelers because of the actions of a very small minority.</p> <p>I am well aware of the consequences when driving incidents occur, my wife's sister was killed on this road by a distracted driver who crossed the center line, I was only minutes behind the young man who died when his vehicle hit a rock, I personally could not understand how this had happened until later I was told it was suicide. I have vehicle camera footage of numerous incidents and accidents that have happened on this road, none of which would have been avoided with the propose speed restrictions.</p> <p>It would also be negligent to dismiss that amount of frustration this will create for drivers who have to travel this route. I hope that you can respect the views of the thousands of road users that oppose the reduction in speed limits and that you can focus your time and resources on areas that can make a real difference such as driver distraction and vehicle safety.</p> <p>As a person who has spent an enormous amount of time 25,000 hours driving on this road I find the proposal of speed reductions for SH6 Blenheim to Nelson to be Ludacris and feel the change could even increase the amount of road incidents. If you were focused solely on a zero toll policy then the increase in incidents would become irrelevant and as a society if "zero toll" policy was the path we were taking then all planes should be grounded, there is risk all around and I believe where possible this should be minimized with effective and appropriate measures, reducing the speed limits on SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson is not one of those.</p>
68	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) From experience driving this route many times, a 90 kph average speed suits the nature of the road, and appears to be a safe limit</p> <p>5) The current 70 kph slow-down zone works well and seems safe.</p> <p>7) From experience driving this route many times, a 90 kph average speed suits the nature of the road, and appears to be a safe limit</p> <p>8) From experience driving this route many times, a 90 kph average speed suits the nature of the road, and appears to be a safe limit</p> <p>9) From experience driving this route many times, a 90 kph average speed suits the nature of the road, and appears to be a safe limit</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) From experience driving this route many times, a 90 kph average speed suits the nature of the road, and appears to be a safe limit</p> <p>13) From experience driving this route many times, a 90 kph average speed suits the nature of the road, and appears to be a safe limit</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) From experience driving this route many times, a 90 kph average speed suits the nature of the road, and appears to be a safe limit</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Start the 80kph zone just prior to Glen Rd, rather than Cable Bay Rd. Otherwise 90 kph limit. Glen Rd turn-off is hazardous and may require particular attention?</p> <p>18) Strongly support the change to a 60kph limit in this stretch. Turn offs to residential streets are on curves and are dangerous and difficult to execute when cars are approaching at 80kph. The residential area has grown significantly in size in recent years, which merits review of the safety of access. Clifton Tce School is in this zone and it services all of Atawhai and Marybank. The road access to this school is currently hazardous.</p> <p>19) Support the change to 80 kph limit. There are turn-offs to residential streets in this stretch which are hazardous to execute with traffic travelling at 100kph.</p>
69	Individual submitter	<p>1) This best left for someone in Blenheim to advise</p> <p>4) Is probably the best bit of road, why change it? Just silly</p> <p>5) Can you detail the level of accidents as a result of the 70 and how many would be reduced as a result of the reduction?</p> <p>7) Again a perfectly good piece of road - 80 sounds like perfect solution to a problem that does not exist</p> <p>8) Sounds ok around a school</p> <p>9) Again a perfectly good piece of road - 80 sounds like perfect solution to a problem that does not exist</p> <p>10) Yep, it is high use with intersection</p> <p>11) Should be only 80km on the neslon side for a couple of Kms - it is a bit windy and has some blind broughs</p>

		<p>13) Could reduce parts to 80, but most of the road is ok at 100</p> <p>14) Sure - like you could actually do a 100 anyway !</p> <p>15) No - its a straight piece of road</p> <p>16) no change - ok as is</p> <p>17) There are a few cyclists there - 80 would be tolerable</p> <p>18) 80 is ok</p> <p>19) Again straight flat bit of road with seperate cycle way - keep at 100</p>
70	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support this.</p> <p>4) I support this</p> <p>5) I support this</p> <p>7) I support this</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) I support all 17 proposed changes</p>
71	Individual submitter	That was the speed 50mph 30 years ago. Now we have better roads - better tyres - better brakes and why go backwards? Stupid.
72	Individual submitter	<p>1) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>4) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>5) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>7) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>8) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>9) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>10) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>11) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>13) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>14) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>15) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>16) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>17) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p>

		<p>18) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p> <p>19) What a joke of a survey....This basically says you are going to change this regardless of what people think as you do not provide a yes / no agreeance part to this survey. If you want a true indication of what people think then this is how you would of structured this survey....</p>
<b>73</b>	Individual submitter	Could you please advise me on the process involved in applying for a speed limit to be lowered in a specific area?
<b>74</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) Build better roads</p> <p>4) Build better roads</p> <p>5) Build better roads</p> <p>7) Build better roads</p> <p>8) Build better roads</p> <p>9) Build better roads</p> <p>10) Build better roads</p> <p>11) Build better roads</p> <p>13) Build better roads</p> <p>14) Build better roads</p> <p>15) Build better roads</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Build better roads</p> <p>18) Build better roads</p> <p>19) Build better roads</p>
<b>75</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) No</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) No</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) No</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
<b>76</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) Driver frustration at the lower speed</p> <p>4) Driver frustration at the lower speed</p> <p>5) Driver frustration at the lower speed</p> <p>7) Driver frustration at the lower speed. Surely you drive to the conditions</p> <p>8) Drive to the conditions not the arbitrary speed limit</p> <p>9) Driver frustration at the lower speed limit</p> <p>10) Just drive to the conditions</p> <p>11) Driver frustration is going to cause moire accidents</p> <p>13) Driver frustration</p> <p>14) Definitely driver frustration</p> <p>15) Driver frustration</p> <p>16) Driver frustration</p> <p>17) Driver frustration</p>

		18) Ridiculous 19) Driver frustration
77	Individual submitter	I don't travel from Nelson to Blenheim so can't comment on the suggested speed reduction. However, I agree with the NZTA that a reduced speed limit on SH6 from Nelson until at least past Atawhai is necessary in order to make joining and exiting the highway much safer. If the NZTA has concluded that a speed reduction will lead to less injuries and deaths, surely that is the answer, despite a petition from drivers?
78	Individual submitter	1) No 4) Should stay 100, strait east road. 5) Remain 100. 7) Remain 100 8) No Comment 9) Remain 100. It's a limit not a target. Many locals drive this road daily and this will slow commutes significantly. 10) Remain 100. It's a limit not a target. Many locals drive this road daily and this will slow commutes significantly. 11) Remain 100. It's a limit not a target. Many locals drive this road daily and this will slow commutes significantly. 13) Remain 100. It's a limit not a target. Many locals drive this road daily and this will slow commutes significantly. 14) Remain 100. It's a limit not a target. Many locals drive this road daily and this will slow commutes significantly. 15) Remain 100. It's a limit not a target. Many locals drive this road daily and this will slow commutes significantly. 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment
79	APM Workcare	1) No Comment 4) This section of the road is strait and simple to drive. Driving at 80 is unnecessary. 5) Good idea. 7) Totally unnecessary. I drove this stretch of road today and do not have to take my car off 100kmph cruise control the whole way. There are no major turns and many long straight stretches. Lowering the speed so drastically in this area is almost guaranteed to cause dangerous overtaking and tailgating due to people driving below 80kmph. 8) Totally unnecessary. I drove this stretch of road today and do not have to take my car off 100kmph cruise control the whole way. There are no major turns and many long straight stretches. Lowering the speed so drastically in this area is almost guaranteed to cause dangerous overtaking and tailgating due to people driving below 80kmph. I do however totally agree with the 60kmph variable school zone and already slow down past the school. 9) Totally unnecessary. I drove this stretch of road today and do not have to take my car off 100kmph cruise control the most of the way. There are no major turns and many long straight stretches. Lowering the speed so drastically in this area is almost guaranteed to cause dangerous overtaking and tailgating due to people driving below 80kmph. 10) Agree with this. There are frequently people on the road and people fulling out of the cafe. Good idea. 11) Totally unnecessary. I drove this stretch of road today and do not have to take my car off 100kmph cruise control the whole way. There are no major turns and many long straight stretches. Lowering the speed so drastically in this area is almost guaranteed to cause dangerous overtaking and tailgating due to people driving below 80kmph. 13) Totally unnecessary. I drive this stretch of road frequently and often do not go any slower than 90kmph. There are no major turns and many long straight stretches. Lowering the speed so drastically in this area is almost guaranteed to cause dangerous overtaking and tailgating due to people driving below 80kmph. 14) I believe that this could be lowered to 80kmph. It is no doubt a challenging road however there are sections which allow for easy travel (e.g. long strait stretches) which do not warrant driving the crawling speed of 60kmph. As someone who drives this road frequently I feel that the speed of 80kmph is entirely appropriate for this road, bearing in mind that it is a limit, not a target. People who do not drive this road often drive much slower (which is fine) however they have the opportunity to let more confident local drivers pass on overtaking lanes or stopping bays. 15) Totally unnecessary. Long strait stretches and easy corners. It should remain as it is. 16) I agree with this. 17) Unnecessary. Long strait stretches of road with minimal corners. Totally fine as it is. 18) Fine as it is. Easy strait road with great cycle path which means pedestrians are well away from the road. 19) Fine as it is. Easy strait road with great cycle path which means pedestrians are well away from the road.
80	APM Workcare	1) No Comment 4) No Comment 5) No Comment

		<p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) Have you taken into consideration the numerous locals (who keep these rural communities alive) frequently commute this road? Moving the limit from 100 to 60 is absolutely nonsensical. By doing this you are likely to cause MORE issues with logging trucks and camper vans driving SLOWER than that speed, causing huge frustrations to drivers and pushing them to make risky overtaking moves. Please seriously consider this proposed change and the impact it will have on the people it will most effect. Everyone who is driving in NZ on open roads should be aware 100 is the LIMIT, not the TARGET. Its the drivers that are the issue, not the speed limit.</p> <p>11) Have you taken into consideration the numerous locals (who keep these rural communities alive) frequently commute this road? Moving the limit from 100 to 60 is absolutely nonsensical. By doing this you are likely to cause MORE issues with logging trucks and camper vans driving SLOWER than that speed, causing huge frustrations to drivers and pushing them to make risky overtaking moves. Please seriously consider this proposed change and the impact it will have on the people it will most effect. Everyone who is driving in NZ on open roads should be aware 100 is the LIMIT, not the TARGET. Its the drivers that are the issue, not the speed limit.</p> <p>13) Have you taken into consideration the numerous locals (who keep these rural communities alive) frequently commute this road? Moving the limit from 100 to 60 is absolutely nonsensical. By doing this you are likely to cause MORE issues with logging trucks and camper vans driving SLOWER than that speed, causing huge frustrations to drivers and pushing them to make risky overtaking moves. Please seriously consider this proposed change and the impact it will have on the people it will most effect. Everyone who is driving in NZ on open roads should be aware 100 is the LIMIT, not the TARGET. Its the drivers that are the issue, not the speed limit.</p> <p>14) Have you taken into consideration the numerous locals (who keep these rural communities alive) frequently commute this road? Moving the limit from 100 to 60 is absolutely nonsensical. By doing this you are likely to cause MORE issues with logging trucks and camper vans driving SLOWER than that speed, causing huge frustrations to drivers and pushing them to make risky overtaking moves. Please seriously consider this proposed change and the impact it will have on the people it will most effect. Everyone who is driving in NZ on open roads should be aware 100 is the LIMIT, not the TARGET. Its the drivers that are the issue, not the speed limit.</p> <p>15) Have you taken into consideration the numerous locals (who keep these rural communities alive) frequently commute this road? Moving the limit from 100 to 60 is absolutely nonsensical. By doing this you are likely to cause MORE issues with logging trucks and camper vans driving SLOWER than that speed, causing huge frustrations to drivers and pushing them to make risky overtaking moves. Please seriously consider this proposed change and the impact it will have on the people it will most effect. Everyone who is driving in NZ on open roads should be aware 100 is the LIMIT, not the TARGET. Its the drivers that are the issue, not the speed limit.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Have you taken into consideration the numerous locals (who keep these rural communities alive) frequently commute this road? Moving the limit from 100 to 60 is absolutely nonsensical. By doing this you are likely to cause MORE issues with logging trucks and camper vans driving SLOWER than that speed, causing huge frustrations to drivers and pushing them to make risky overtaking moves. Please seriously consider this proposed change and the impact it will have on the people it will most effect. Everyone who is driving in NZ on open roads should be aware 100 is the LIMIT, not the TARGET. Its the drivers that are the issue, not the speed limit.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
81	Individual submitter	<p>1) no</p> <p>4) no</p> <p>5) no</p> <p>7) no</p> <p>8) no</p> <p>9) no</p> <p>10) this is a very short distance over which to have a reduced speed, would make sense to extend it. At the moment you come across the bridge rapidly and there is little time to slow down or stop</p> <p>11) no</p> <p>13) no</p> <p>14) no</p> <p>15) no</p> <p>16) no</p> <p>17) no</p> <p>18) no</p> <p>19) It makes no sense to have the previous section of road 60 and this section 80, it is just as populated and there are significant housing developments going in which will increase the traffic turning in and out of SH6 in this section of road, more school children using the shared pathway between town or Clifton Terrace school. Recommend that this also be 60</p>
82	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p>

		<p>8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
83	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave at 100km  4) Leave at 100km  5) Leave at 70km  7) Leave at 100km  8) Leave at 100km with a variable school zone of 60km  9) Leave at 100km  10) Leave at 100km-50km  11) Leave at 100km  13) Leave at 100km  14) Leave at 100km  15) Leave at 100km  16) No  17) Leave at 100km  18) Leave at 80km  19) Leave at 100km</p>
84	Individual submitter	Remain as the limits are or NO CHANGE
85	Individual submitter	<p>1) No, I think 80 km/h is a wise decision.  4) No, I think 80 km/h is a wise decision.  5) No, I think 50 km/h is a wise decision. I have been cycling here and 70 km/h still feels very fast when a car passes you at that speed.  7) No, I think 80 km/h is a wise decision.  8) No, I think 80 km/h is a wise decision. I would like to see all school zones to 30 km/hr. Children just use their brains differently to adults. We should act like the mature ones here.  9) No, I think 80 km/h is a wise decision.  10) I would like to see it down to 50 km/hr at all times. We have too much variety in speed limits. Keep it simple, especially for tourists.  11) Wise decision. I totally agree.  13) Wise decision. I totally agree.  14) It should be down to 50 km/hr to keep things simple to all road users.  15) I support this proposal.  16) School zone should be 30 km/hr. Just treat it like a busy shopping street as that's how it looks like at school hours.  17) I support this.  18) Should be down to 50 km/hr to be in line with what most tourists experience at home. This 60 km/hr makes things confusing.  19) I support this.</p>
86	Individual submitter	<p>1) no change  4) No change  5) No change  7) No change  8) No change  9) No change  10) No change</p>

		<p>11) No change</p> <p>13) No change</p> <p>14) No change</p> <p>15) No change</p> <p>16) No change</p> <p>17) No change</p> <p>18) No change</p> <p>19) No change</p>
87	Wine Works Marlborough	<p>The proposed speed reductions are a terrible, ill thought out idea. This arbitrary broad brush approach ignores the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the community and will only create logistics bottlenecks, negative economic impacts on businesses and inhabitants of the region, and likely result in no improvement to road safety.</p> <p>Poor drivers will still drive poorly, the reduction in speed limit will only serve to cause more frustration when the “I’m slow so I’m safe” hold up traffic with their dawdling, and modern vehicles which are tuned to give lowest emissions at normal open road speeds are operating at inefficient speed range will see decreased fuel efficiency and increased emissions.</p> <p>Investment should instead be targeted at improved driver understanding of how to operate a vehicle safely, and improving the road’s driveability. More passing lanes will allow the smoother, better and safer flow of traffic, with decreased environmental impact from vehicle emissions.</p> <p>Where traffic around schools is a concern, relatively low investment in underpasses can help children cross the road safely.</p> <p>It is time to listen to the community and create real, value enhancing improvements, not just use a blanket approach which will benefit no one and make matters worse.</p>
88	Individual submitter	<p>1) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety</p> <p>4) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety</p> <p>5) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety. Also this is a scenic area and popular with tourists.</p> <p>7) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety, particularly this stretch of road is not very wide.</p> <p>8) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety, particularly this stretch of road is not very wide, with logging trucks too.</p> <p>9) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety, particularly this stretch of road is not very wide, with logging trucks too.</p> <p>10) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety, tthe road is so busy at times, it is particularly popular with tourists, and there is a lot of traffic coming / going to ferry on this narrow winding road.</p> <p>11) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety, tthe road is so busy at times, it is particularly popular with tourists, and there is a lot of traffic coming / going to ferry on this narrow road, and logging trucks.</p> <p>13) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety.</p> <p>14) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety, tthe road is so busy at times, and huge logging trucks.</p> <p>15) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety.</p> <p>16) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety.</p> <p>17) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety.</p> <p>18) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety.</p> <p>19) As a cyclist, I support this for everyone's safety.</p>
89	The Sounds Retreat Luxury Lodge	<p>1) There is absolutely no reason to change the limit to 80 as there have not been any accidents even at 100.</p> <p>4) There is absolutely no reason to change the limit to 80 as there have not been any accidents even at 100.</p> <p>5) There is absolutely no reason to change the limit to 80 as there have not been any accidents even at 100.</p> <p>7) There is absolutely no reason to change the limit to 80 as there have not been any accidents even at 100.</p> <p>8) There is absolutely no reason to change the limit to 80 as there have not been any accidents even at 100.</p> <p>9) There is absolutely no reason to change the limit to 80 as there have not been any accidents even at 100.</p> <p>10) There is absolutely no reason to change the limit to 80 as there have not been any accidents even at 100.</p> <p>11) There is absolutely no reason to change the limit to 80 as there have not been any accidents even at 100.</p> <p>13) Speeding has not been the cause of any of the recent traffic incidents here. One was suicide and the others have been poor driving.</p> <p>14) Speeding has not been the cause of any of the recent traffic incidents here. One was suicide and the others have been poor driving.</p> <p>15) Speeding has not been the cause of any of the recent traffic incidents here. One was suicide and the others have been poor driving.</p>

		<p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) There is not reason to change the limit</p> <p>18) There is not reason. There have been no accidents even at 80.</p> <p>19) There is not reason. There have been no accidents even at 100.</p>
90	Individual submitter	<p>1) This was 80KMH when the alternatove road to Ch Ch was in place due to the Kaikoura earthquake. there was no lives saved and it is not neccessary to reduce this part of the highway.</p> <p>4) This is a 100KMH road - Not an 80KMH road. perhaps you should consider 2 or 3 pull off bays each way between Renwick and Havelock for the slower drivers.</p> <p>5) I suggest this should be 60KMH. it is not total urban - also, make the road a little wider at the intersection of SH6 &amp; Queen Charlotte Drive</p> <p>7) This is a 100KMH road also. maybe put a 85KMH sign for the corner at the end of the first straight for the first cnr out of Havelock towards Canvastown. or maybe consider some extra road widening and realignment.....</p> <p>8) Make this 80KMH</p> <p>9) Completely unnecessary to reduce the speed on this nice straight part of the road. It will be Ludicrous and frustrating and cars will naturally travel at 100KMH, therefore enabling good revenue for the government coffers</p> <p>10) if you want to go for it. whatever.....</p> <p>11) Once agin no need for the road to be 80KMH. this is a 100KMH piece of highway. we are living in the 21st century - not the dark ages.....</p> <p>13) If you need to reduce this part of the speed limit start the 80kmh 200M from the end of the first straight before you start climbing the Rai Saddle through to the other side of Hira. You cant do much more than 80KMH through there anyway.</p> <p>14) same as above</p> <p>15) 80KMH is fine for this</p> <p>16) happy with this</p> <p>17) Should be retained at 100KMH</p> <p>18) 80KMH is fine</p> <p>19) 100KMh is fine</p>
91	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) I believe you are taking away people ability to make their own judgement the speed limit is fine at 100 maybe you should either 1. Make more passing lanes or 2. Nation wide increase the speed limit of trucks and cars with trailers to 100 that no build up of traffic to create frustrated drivers and police the 100km more closely.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Same as before. Modern cars and trucks are capable of handling correctly with a non frastrated driver.</p> <p>8) Maybe the other consideration would be 90. The 60 is fine</p> <p>9) I still maintain 100 is fine. Me, myself I am driver that drives to the conditions and I will sit happily in behind a truck at 90 until the time is correct. Still I think trucks could be up to 100</p> <p>10) Fine</p> <p>11) I still think 100 is ok</p> <p>13) still I think you are taking away people's ability to think 100 in places is fine let them make the judgment.</p> <p>14) 60 is about what the whangamos can be done comfortably but still you are telling people what to do ???</p> <p>15) I think it's on the way it is</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) It fine the way it is</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
92	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave at 100km/h</p> <p>4) Leave at 100klm/h</p> <p>5) Leave at 70klm/h</p> <p>7) Leave at 100klm/h</p> <p>8) Ok with variable speed outside school</p> <p>9) Leave at 100klm/h</p> <p>10) leave as is</p> <p>11) Leave at 100klm/h</p> <p>13) Leace at 100klm/h</p> <p>14) Leave at 100klm/h</p> <p>15) Leave at 100klm/h</p> <p>16) OK with variable speed zone</p>

		<p>17) Leave at 100km/h  18) Leave at 80km/h  19) OK with change to 80km/h</p>
93	Individual submitter	<p>1) Terrible idea  4) More passing lanes??!  5) Yep fair enough  7) Again no, put in more passing lanes  8) Yep good idea around school zone. But this is the only place to currently get pass slow traffic  9) Passing lanes  10) Yep totally agree  11) No  13) Passing lanes  14) No  15) Nope  16) Yep fair enough with school zone  17) Nope  18) No!  19) No</p>
94	Individual submitter	<p>Firstly I want to acknowledge that I do not know the exact circumstances of every one of the 20 fatal accidents across this stretch of road over the last 10 years, therefore my position is based on my own experience.</p> <p>My position  I travel this route frequently and am concerned that the proposal seeks to reduce the speed across all of it, bar a few populated areas which are already limited to 50 or 60KM with school zones set at 40km (sections 2, 3, 6, 12 which I agree with the current speed restrictions).</p> <p>What I would state early on is that I agree that:  section 14 of the proposal, between 770m north-east of Whangamoia saddle and 280m north of Teal Valley Road cannot in my opinion be safely driven at 100km and therefore some reduction is common sense.  section 10 of the proposal, 320m either side of the Pelorus Bridge is congested with vehicles and pedestrians, has relatively blind corners in both directions and therefore some reduction in speed makes sense.</p> <p>In all other sections, I am opposed to lowering the existing speed limits. As the NZTA information states, there are many factors that contribute to accidents. I appreciate the argument that lower speeds offer more reaction time and also decrease the degree of lethality of impact. However this SH6 proposal does not encompass these other contributing factors which I believe are more significant not only on this stretch of road, but for New Zealand drivers in general.</p> <p>The issue as I see it  I think I can accurately say that each time I take this route (and any other route in NZ for that matter):  I see drivers for whom indicating is sporadic at best, even when overtaking on the open road.  I see drivers distracted by being on their telephones.  I see chronic tail-gating by overly aggressive drivers.  I see slow vehicles gathering long lines of traffic behind them when opportunities to stop and let said traffic past are many.</p> <p>In general, I see complacency in the attitude many drivers in NZ place on their responsibility to drive safely. Unfortunately, this complacency frequently extends to people making very poor decisions such as:  passing late into blind corners.  not coming to a complete stop at stop signs.  driving through give-way signs without slowing enough to safely look left and right (especially to look for motorcycles)</p> <p>Addressing the attitude of many New Zealand drivers is no simple task but I don't think that lowering the speed limit is the answer. I fear that for many it will add to the likelihood of distraction and for others, increase frustration and therefore poor judgement behind the wheel.</p>

		<p>Recommendations for SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson</p> <p>I do think that many parts of the route are not adequately marked with solid yellow lines or centre line rumble strips where it is unsafe to pass. Some corners are not marked at all, others not early enough before a bend or rise.</p> <p>I think that many of the contributing roads have poorly maintained give-away and stop markings on the road (many have not been painted in a long time or are covered over by gravel or dirt).</p> <p>I also think that some give-ways should be made compulsory stops because they do not offer clear enough views of on-coming traffic.</p> <p>I realise that this will not stop a driver from using their cellphone or failing to indicate but I think they are strong recommendations none the less.</p>
95	Vanishing Point Studio	<p>1) Keep the existing.  4) Keep the existing.  5) Keep the existing.  7) Keep the existing.  8) Keep the existing.  9) Keep the existing.  10) Keep the existing.  11) Keep the existing.  13) Keep the existing.  14) Keep the existing.  15) Keep the existing.  16) Whats changing?  17) Keep the existing.  18) Keep the existing.  19) Keep the existing.</p>
96	Individual submitter	I have submitted on line and overlooked mentioning removal of the existing passing lane in the current 100km area adjacent to Atawhai drive
97	Individual submitter	<p>1) no  4) no  5) no  7) no  8) no  9) no  10) no  11) no  13) no  14) no  15) no  16) no  17) no  18) no  19) yes being resident in this area 70km limit for this section please and bring 50km to 500mtrs north east of trafalgar st</p>
98	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support this speed reduction  4) I support this speed reduction  5) I support this speed reduction  7) I support this speed reduction  8) I support this speed reduction  9) I support this speed reduction  10) I support this speed reduction</p>

		<p>11) I support this speed reduction  13) I support this speed reduction  14) I support this speed reduction  15) I support this speed reduction  16) I support this speed reduction  17) I support this speed reduction  18) I support this speed reduction  19) I support this speed reduction</p>
99	Individual submitter	<p>Hi I object to road speed changes for the entire Nelson to Marlborough highway but I do support areas of concern to have speed reductions. Most accidents are caused by drivers who don't respect any speed signs, limits, etc at any time or place. Dropping speed limits for these people is a waste of time as if it's 80 km they will still travel at excess speeds and are the cause of accidents whatever you do. The Whangamoas can't be taken at 100km all the way unless you want to fall off the road in any condition it's not the roads or speed it's the nut behind the wheel that's at fault. You only have to look at the way people have been injured and killed on our roads from very stupid manoeuvres or just dumb decisions not speed limits. Please don't drop speed limits because of the driving of a very few nut cases on our roads. Kind regards Ash ps (never had an accident in 50 years of driving)</p>
100	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree with this  4) I believe this can stay at 100km as the road is good and is easily driven up to 100km/hour  5) I agree with this  7) I believe this can stay at 100km as the road is good and is easily driven up to 100km/hour  8) I believe this can stay at 100km as the road is good and is easily driven up to 100km/hour  9) I believe this can stay at 100km as the road is good and is easily driven up to 100km/hour  10) I agree with this as approaching the bridge can be dangerous  11) I believe this can stay at 100km as the road is good and is easily driven up to 100km/hour  13) I agree with this  14) I believe this could be 70 or 80. A lot of the corners on the Whangamoas are tight and generally you are only going slow but there are also areas where a speed limit of 70-80 would still be fine  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
101	Individual submitter	<p>The only speed limit lowering I support is in towns and around schools.  Leave the open road limit alone, I do not support lowering the open road limit.  Fix the roads properly no patches, wider safety verges and passing bays - thank you.</p>
102	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yep slow the movement of traffic down. Good one. I don't agree  4) Don't be muppets spend some money widen the verges for safety, add passing bays for slow traffic. Use North Island road upgrade techniques ie mill units stop with the cheap overlays  5) That's ok  7) You got to be kidding where do you come from. I have driven these roads every day for 15 years. Leave it alone  8) Yes good why has it taken you so long. Civil servants you must be  9) You are being silly again  10) Fine  11) How do you justify your job  13) No leave it alone  14) 70km  15) Fine if you feel better  16) You're going to do it anyway  17) Leave it alone  18) 80 is fine good road wide  19) It makes you feel better</p>
103	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) I find it difficult if the speed limit is changing all the time as on the Abel Tasman Drive in Golden Bay where one needs to look out for speed signs all the time which distracts from keeping the eyes on road and avoiding hitting cyclists or pedestrians. Keep it at 80 and 60 (where schools and busy villages), don't add 50 into the equation.</p>

		<p>7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) I would like to see the speed limit lowered to 60km/h from the Athawai Drive turnoff (Founders Park turnoff) to north east trafalgar street due to the skate ramp that is right next door to the road and attract young kids and the freedom camping spot at Queen Elisabeth II Garden spot. Kids might play along the roadside there and vehicles go in and out on that busy road.</p>
104	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  4) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) Keep it at 100km/h, with a variable speed limit outside Canvastown School only. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  9) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  10) Change it back to 100km/h all year round. The speed drop in Dec/Jan is laughable for an area with so little traffic.  11) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  13) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  14) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  15) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  16) This change is sensible  17) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  18) Keep it at 80km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is  19) Keep it at 100km/h. There is nothing wrong with this section of road as it is</p>
105	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) Too slow - 100km fine  5) Too slow - 70km fine  7) Too slow - 100km fine  8) No Comment  9) Too slow - 100km fine  10) Too slow - 80km better  11) Too slow - 100km fine  13) 100km on the flat.  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
106	Individual submitter	<p>1) Speed does not need to be reduced. It is a straight piece of road, in the country.  4) Speed does not need to be reduced. There are only a couple of places to pass in this area and lowering the speed makes it impossible.  5) 70 kph is fine as a lead in to the 50kph zone. There is a safe turning zone off SH6 into Queen Charlotte Dr.  7) Speed does not need to be reduced. even at night in rain 100kph is safe for normal licenced drivers  8) Speed does not need to be reduced. Nobody can keep up with multiple changes to the speed limit on a short highway. Variable school zone is acceptable.  9) Speed does not need to be reduced. interferes with the limited straights for passing.  10) Agree with this</p>

		<p>11) Extend the 60 kph zone through to the top of the rise. Too many changes of speed</p> <p>13) Just limit it on the hill</p> <p>14) too many changes. Just make it 80 on the hill</p> <p>15) From the top of the saddle down to Hira would be better at 60 kph</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Keep it at 100kph, its a highway</p> <p>18) its slow enough as it is at 80, don't make it slower</p> <p>19) Speed does not need to be reduced</p>
107	Individual submitter	<p>I don't agree with a blanket 80kph change to the Blenheim to Nelson highway. That won't fix the problems like people ignoring the limit or driving while impaired.</p> <p>I do support more restricted zones past schools and in accident black spots, plus more passing lanes to stop the dick moves by important idiots. I've seen a few incident where people have made poor passing.</p>
108	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) The lower the speed limit the more frustrated drivers will be especially those who travel that road often</p> <p>5) That's through Havelock township so needs to be 50</p> <p>7) Another block to frustrate drivers. It's not the drivers driving at 100 km it's the too slow drivers that are the trouble. Also tourists in rentals who are trying to find there way. Even Dr Google gets it wrong we had an encounter with some Japanese tourists looking for Waikato and they ended up north of Collingwood cause that is where the south island Google is.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Stupid</p> <p>10) Are these speed limits being made by people who don't know the area or perhaps they are qualified by having a University Degree Crazy</p> <p>11) Oh dear oh dear</p> <p>13) Where does the rule drive to the conditions come in</p> <p>14) Drive to the conditions</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) That's more sensible</p> <p>17) Leave it at 100</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) Agree</p>
109	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) A blanket speed reduction is not the answer. It is trying to crack a nut with a sledge hammer. Instead any spots such as intersections with restricted visibility or windy sections that do need a speed reduction should be fitted with signposted fixed speed cameras. That way all the traffic is slowed to the appropriate speed 24/7 in the places it needs to be slowed. Unless there is a much increased police presence a lot of drivers will ignore the new speed limit and take their chances at being fined. Getting a fine and demerit points for doing 92 on this section of road is ridiculous.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Leave it at 100 and put in a signposted fixed speed camera</p> <p>8) This is sensible. Install a signposted fixed speed camera.</p> <p>9) Ridiculous. If you make this stretch 80 then you may as well do every straight road in the country.</p> <p>10) 60 is sensible through Pelorous</p> <p>11) Leave it at 100. Install a signposted fixed speed camera at an appropriate location.</p> <p>13) 80 only through the twisty section. Signposted fixed speed camera at a suitable location.</p> <p>14) Not letting the surface deteriorate to the extent it has historically before repairs are made. A second lower rail needs to be installed on the crash barriers. The present danger from these barriers to motorcyclists is obvious. 60 is too low. 70 - 80 more realistic for all road users not just under powered vehicles.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) 80 is a safe speed here. Don't change it to 60.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
110	Individual submitter	<p>Atawhai Dr should be 80 Kph for the full length with a 60kph zone plus School reduced to 40 kph during drop off &amp; pickup times.</p> <p>With the same applying for Hira School.</p>

		<p>Rai Valley Reduced to 50 Kph the School restriction to apply there also.</p> <p>Peloris 60 Kph all year round</p> <p>Canvas town School restriction same as above.</p> <p>The rest of the open Hi way to remain at the open road 100 Kph limit as all corners of concern are already speed posted &amp; the Yellow lines are in overabundance already, it is impossible to fix STUPID AT ANY SPEED</p> <p>As a Commercial Coach Driver using this road at regular intervals; the number of times I have been in a Que behind a slow Inconsiderate, Incompetent Driver is too regular.</p> <p>But on a positive note there are the drivers Both Commercial &amp; Domestic who show great skills &amp; consideration to other traffic by allowing traffic to safely pass ( there are the few Nutters who will pass at any cost )</p> <p>There is a NEED to Educate drivers!!!! How to use Turn Signals, Merge lanes &amp; Flush medians etc</p> <p>Mapua is a Classic example when travelling North towards Motueka ! Traffic wanting to turn onto Mapua drive; instead of turning on indicators at the start of the flush median/ merge section coming up to the intersection they stay in the northbound lane Under braking until arriving at the small section with the Turn arrows; then indicate right at approx 30kph &amp; finally turning out of the North bound lane having made the following traffic to slow to a crawl !!</p> <p>This practice is of a plague proportion in this region, along with drivers not stopping at STOP Signs</p> <p>The Road Code says to Signal your intentions a MINIMUM of 3 seconds before your maneuver ?? That also means signaling before Braking !!</p> <p>Regular domestic Driver reassessments as to Road code knowledge &amp; driving skills i.e. slowing on Passing lanes to let traffic pass instead of speeding up &amp; immediately slowing again at the end!!</p> <p>Graded licensing i.e. Restricted to Urban Roads until a skill level to master open road Travelling /speed, judgement, perception &amp; awareness.</p> <p>We have too many Parents teaching their children their own bad Driving habits!!</p> <p>A classic example of this was a youth (nice polite young man) came to look at &amp; test drive a car I had for sale ( he had obtained his restricted a week earlier) I was in the passenger front seat &amp; as we exited the left turn merge lane leaving Mapua I commented had he looked in his mirror &amp; checked over his right shoulder to check his surroundings were clear ??</p> <p>The Mother said don't worry about what's behind you it's their job to avoid you !!! OMG, I asked the lad to pull over where it was safe &amp; I drove back to my property</p> <p>I advised the lad to get some professional lessons before Buying a car !!</p> <p>I would be very happy to speak on my submission should the opportunity be available.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my Submission</p>
111	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) this is a straight piece of well formed road,counterproductive!!!</li> <li>4) I consider this proposal to be unwarranted and counterproductive</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) very limited overtaking opportunities,leave it alone,otherwise you will be causing frustration and rash behavior!!!</li> <li>8) school zone ok , leave rest alone not a difficult road</li> <li>9) leave as is ,good road,don't encourage impatience and frustration</li> <li>10) leave as is!!!</li> <li>11) leave alone,good road!!</li> <li>13) leave as is ,good road surface</li> <li>14) just leave it,drivers will find their own comfortable speed</li> </ol>

		<p>15) good road surface,leave it for drivers to travel at their comfortable speed</p> <p>16) excellent road,school zone ok ,leave it</p> <p>17) good road, easy curves easily support existing limit</p> <p>18) good road easily support 100kph, leave it</p> <p>19) great wide road ,why frustrate people?</p>
112	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This should not be changed along here</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) This doesn't need changing</p> <p>10) Should be 80</p> <p>11) Does not need changing</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) Should be 80</p> <p>15) Does not need changing</p> <p>16) Good idea</p> <p>17) Does not need changing.</p> <p>18) I drive along here twice a day and have a daughter at Clifton terrace school, so we also walk along the cycleway. I see no need for it to change, however, adding a small barrier between the road and cycleway would be great</p> <p>19) There is no need for this to change. I drive along here every day; it's a mostly straight stretch of road and 100 is a reasonable speed</p>
113	Individual submitter	<p>1) Lifting it to 110</p> <p>4) Increase it to 110</p> <p>5) Lift it to 100</p> <p>7) Increase to 110</p> <p>8) Increase to 110</p> <p>9) Increase to 110</p> <p>10) Increase to 110</p> <p>11) Increase to 110</p> <p>13) Increase to 110</p> <p>14) Increase to 110</p> <p>15) Increase to 110</p> <p>16) Increase to 110</p> <p>17) Increase to 110</p> <p>18) Increase to 110</p> <p>19) Increase to 110</p>
114	Johnston Associates South	<p>1) I have been driving on this road for 12 years, it is very straight and speed does not seem to be an issue. If anything a speed reduction will increase traffic congestion.</p> <p>4) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont see the need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont se ethe need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>8) This road is very straight and wide I have not had any issues in the 12 years I have been driving on this stretch of road</p> <p>9) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont se ethe need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>10) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont se ethe need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce</p>

		<p>productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>11) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont se ethe need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>13) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont se ethe need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont se ethe need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>16) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont se ethe need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>17) I have been travelling on this road for 12 years at least once per week. The dangers of this stretch of road relate to passing maneuvers and people well exceeding the speed limit that currently exists. I dont se ethe need for a speed reduction. This will add 1hr 20min driving to my average week. I run a chartered accountancy business with offices in Nelson &amp; Blenheim. This will reduce productivity and impact on businesses in both regions.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
115	Individual submitter	<p>1) Improve the road to allow those who wish to travel at 100kph to do so while allowing those who wish to travel slower to do so without holding up traffic. If people aren't happy driving at 100kph then they should pull over instead of withholding traffic. People need to allow extra time at intersections and unsafe intersections need to be made safer.</p> <p>4) It's a state highway. If you don't want to drive at 100kph that's fine but pull over. Why should the rest of us slow down because one person is incompetent. If your not happy driving at speeds deemed reasonable and safe by normal people you should be on the road in the first place</p> <p>5) Your decision? How about letting people who use the roads decide? How can you tell what speed the road should have from your office in Auckland? Why when technology has improved have road conditions worsened. Why should our taxes increase and pay for Aucklands roads when our roads suffer and to fix the problem you chose to slow people down rather than fix the roads and educate drivers. What are we paying you for?</p> <p>7) The fact that you don't know our roads. We do and you aren't listening to us.</p> <p>8) What's the need to drop the speed when the school zone isn't active? Schools empty but we still have to dribble past at 80? Ridiculous!</p> <p>9) There is no need for a lower speed limit. Listen to people who know the road. The odd person who actually wants it dropped only want it dropped because they are not confident driving at the limit. Probably shouldn't be on the road or need further training.</p> <p>10) Why a slower limit for the winter when It's safe to drive at 100kph. Traffic slows itself down over the summer in the area due to the extra traffic. No need for lower limits.</p> <p>11) The road would be safe at 120kph don't drop it further than 100kph. It was never about road safety. It was always about the revenue from people by slowing them down so much that even the most law abiding will break the law.</p> <p>13) Nothing dangerous about the road. Don't reduce the speed. Improve dangerous areas if you think there's a problem</p> <p>14) Motorbikes and other vehicles can easily get around that road without issue. Morons will still crash no matter the speed limit. People will most likely see it as an opportunity to pass slow people on blind corners with the speed reduced so far. It is the drivers responsibility to drive to the road.</p> <p>15) Straight piece of road that is safe at 100kph. No change needed</p> <p>16) No problem with 80kph. Easy to cross the road for the few people that need to Cross the road.</p> <p>17) State highway. No need for lower speed.</p> <p>18) The school is way set back from the highway and there is no need to cross the road as there are no roads on the seaward side. Small driveways and side roads can be fixed by installing a median strip</p> <p>19) Median strip and turning bays are already in place. The road is safe. There is no need to reduce the speed. There is an off street cycle way and no risk to pedestrians</p>
116	Individual submitter	<p>1) No speed change needed</p> <p>4) Not needed No speed change needed</p> <p>5) Not needed No speed change needed</p> <p>7) Not needed No speed change needed</p> <p>8) 60 school zone is good but 80 is not needed</p> <p>9) Not needed No speed change needed</p> <p>10) No speed change needed</p> <p>11) Not needed No speed change needed</p>

		<p>13) No speed change needed</p> <p>14) No speed change needed</p> <p>15) No speed change needed</p> <p>16) No speed change needed</p> <p>17) No speed change needed</p> <p>18) No speed change needed</p> <p>19) No speed change needed</p>
117	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's a flat straight road and suitable for travelling at 100km/h. Heading west there needs to be a left turning bay into Bells Road.</p> <p>4) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>5) Agree, especially when foggy</p> <p>7) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>8) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>9) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>10) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>11) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>13) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>14) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>15) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>18) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 80km/h. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p> <p>19) I travel from Blenheim to Nelson return, three times per week. This road is suitable for travelling at 100km/h. There does need to be a passing lane (in both directions) and some slow vehicle bays. As a country we need to bring in random drug testing to lower the road toll.</p>
118	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>4) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>5) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>7) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>8) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>9) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>10) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>11) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>13) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>14) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>15) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>16) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>17) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>18) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p> <p>19) Don't lower speed limits. It's not the speed that's causing crashes, it's the driving. Lowering speed limits will frustrate people and make it worse.</p>
119	Okaramio Residents Association	<p>1) This is a straight section of road with very good visibility.</p> <p>4) Priority one is to construct pull off areas at intersections which allow drivers to pull over and let the traffic pass before turning right. Priority two is passing lanes. Reducing the speed will not fix the problem and will lead to even more frustrated drivers. Fix the road and stop spending money on consultation.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) No Comment</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> <li>9) No comment</li> <li>10) No Comment</li> <li>11) No Comment</li> <li>13) No Comment</li> <li>14) No Comment</li> <li>15) No Comment</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) No Comment</li> <li>18) No Comment</li> <li>19) No Comment</li> </ul>
120	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) No Comment</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) No Comment</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> <li>9) No comment</li> <li>10) No Comment</li> <li>11) No Comment</li> <li>13) No Comment</li> <li>14) No Comment</li> <li>15) No Comment</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) No Comment</li> <li>18) No Comment</li> <li>19) No Comment</li> </ul>
121	Abel drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Productivity. If roads need upgrades to make them safer at 100k then this should happen</li> <li>4) Productivity</li> <li>5) Productivity</li> <li>7) Productivity</li> <li>8) Productivity</li> <li>9) Productivity</li> <li>10) Productivity</li> <li>11) Productivity</li> <li>13) Productivity</li> <li>14) Productivity</li> <li>15) Productivity</li> <li>16) Productivity</li> <li>17) Productivity</li> <li>18) Productivity</li> <li>19) Productivity</li> </ul>
122	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the existing speed limit is fine keep it, instead make side roads left turn only, and prohibit right turns into side roads also work instead on megerging lanes for side roads.</li> <li>4) Keep the existing speed limit of 100 km/h that stretch of road is fine, work instead on passing pays and places and signs for camper vans to let traffic pass</li> <li>5) Do it!</li> <li>7) Keep the existing speed limit of 100 km/h that stretch of road is fine, work instead on passing pays and places and signs for camper vans to let traffic pass</li> <li>8) Keep the existing speed limit of 100 km/h that stretch of road is fine</li> <li>9) Keep the existing speed limit of 100 km/h that stretch of road is fine, erect a speed activated electronic warning sign telling vehicles to "Slow Down" on the big left hand corner at the end of the straight</li> </ul>

		<p>10) do a new limit (km/h): 100/60 in Dec/Jan, uses electronic signs speed to avoid confusion, as in I'm sure this was a 50 the last time I drove the road but now there's no signs...</p> <p>11) Keep the existing speed limit (km/h): 100 it's fine</p> <p>13) Keep the existing speed limit (km/h): 100 it's fine</p> <p>14) Use electronic signage to lower the speed limit when hazards such as Ice Grit or bad weather exist drivers are much more likely to respect a lower limit they can see the reason for. A mandatory lower limit all the time will appear arbitrary when conditions are good, for instance nice summer days.</p> <p>15) Keep the existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>16) yeppo</p> <p>17) Keep the existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p> <p>18) Do it</p> <p>19) Do it Nelson people used to only drive at 80km/h anyway when going into town, it's only going to affect the post quake Christchurch people that like to race everywhere in their Holdens</p>
123	Individual submitter	<p>Please do not put safety barriers down the entire road. It will cause more havoc than you realise. Otherwise introduce atleast 10-15 passing bays so vehicles trying to travel at a space speed can pass the boats, caravans and rental vans ahead. It would be a total shame to see heavy vehicles held up trying to do a normal business day.</p> <p>Otherwise, guarantee to us that there will be Police Officers on this section of road daily, pulling over the slower drivers and ticketing the same. Officers will need to be on the road everyday from 5am to 7pm to control this situation. If you want proof of slow drivers, just come and look at State Highway 60 between Richmond and Mapue, I travel this road frequently and find it very frustrating having to travel behind a vehicle or vehicles travelling at 70kphs, sometime 60. On Tuesday this week I was number 10 in the queue behind a vehicle with one driver in it. A police vehicle passed going the other way and did nothing about it. Shortly after that I observed drivers, go across double yellow lines to pass the car out.</p> <p>I find it hard to understand why a lot of the speed limits around the country are being reduced to 80 as their max speed. It driver behaviour that is the problem, alcohol etc.</p>
124	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree</p> <p>4) Disagree, this road is safe to drive at 100km, however there need to be more slow vehicle bays and passing lanes. There is no where for caravans , trucks etc to pull over and let people past.</p> <p>5) Agree</p> <p>7) Disagree, this road is safe to drive at 100km, however there needs to be areas for slow traffic to pull over</p> <p>8) Agree</p> <p>9) Disagree, this road is safe to drive at 100km, however there needs to be places for slow vehicles to pull over to allow traffic past.</p> <p>10) Disagree, should be 50km all year around.</p> <p>11) Disagree, thus road us safe to drive at 100km, however there needs to be places for slow traffic to pull over</p> <p>13) Disagree, this road is safe to drive at 100km but needs pill over areas and passing lanes</p> <p>14) Agree</p> <p>15) Agree</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) Disagree</p> <p>18) Agree</p> <p>19) Agree</p>
125	Individual submitter	<p>1) Most drivers in my experience already drive this road at 80km.</p> <p>4) This is unnecessary. Yes it is a winding road and NZTA have done nothing to improve this road it the 50 years I have been traveling it. More passing lanes are required. There are not enough passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. Pullover bays do not work as most drivers refuse to use them</p> <p>5) Happy for this to be reduced. Cars travel too fast through Havelock</p> <p>7) This is unnecessary. Yes it is a winding road and NZTA have done nothing to improve this road it the 50 years I have been traveling it. More passing lanes are required. There are not enough passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. Pullover bays do not work as most drivers refuse to use them</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) This is unnecessary. Yes it is a winding road and NZTA have done nothing to improve this road it the 50 years I have been traveling it. More passing lanes are required. There are not enough passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. Pullover bays do not work as most drivers refuse to use them</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This is unnecessary. Yes it is a winding road and NZTA have done nothing to improve this road it the 50 years I have been traveling it. More passing lanes are required. There are not enough passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. Pullover bays do not work as most drivers refuse to use them</p> <p>13) This is unnecessary. Yes it is a winding road and NZTA have done nothing to improve this road it the 50 years I have been traveling it. More passing lanes are required. There are not enough passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. Pullover bays do not work as most drivers refuse to use them</p> <p>14) This is unnecessary. Yes it is a winding road and NZTA have done nothing to improve this road it the 50 years I have been traveling it. More passing lanes are required. There are not enough passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. Pullover bays do not work as most drivers refuse to use them</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p>

		<p>17) This is unnecessary. Yes it is a winding road and NZTA have done nothing to improve this road it the 50 years I have been traveling it. More passing lanes are required. There are not enough passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. Pullover bays do not work as most drivers refuse to use them</p> <p>18) Leave it at 80km</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
126	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's ridiculous changing the speed limit to 100 I have been traveling this road for 30 years It's simply bad driving</p> <p>4) More passing lines and giving warnings to the SLOW drivers</p> <p>5) Rubbish</p> <p>7) Rubbish</p> <p>8) Ridiculous</p> <p>9) Ridiculous</p> <p>10) Seriously</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
127	Individual submitter	<p>Your figures of 10,000 vehicles a day with 20 people killed and 92 seriously injured is low compared to 9 years and 328,500.00 vehicles. No one likes death or injuries but the speed limit should stay the same I have been driving on that road for 64 years, it is fine as it is. Realign Nelson side of the Whangamoas.</p>
128	Individual submitter	<p>At the age of nearly 65, I have been driving the Whangarnoas from Nelson to Blenheim, for many years. I have worked extensively as a truck driver both in NZ and overseas and also worked in the field of road construction and maintenance. I have an accident free driving record and have also assisted roadside at many accident sites and have been trained to work in both volunteer fire brigade and forest industry standards for emergency situations.</p> <p>Other Factors you should consider are:</p> <p>Unanticipated effects of road barriers</p> <p>From teenage years onwards, I have realised that where you were once able to pull off the road completely to give other motorists a clear overtaking opportunity, you can no longer do this because of roadside barriers.</p> <p>With a loaded trailer and a flat tyre, where safety should be a priority, I now often find myself in the middle of a lane changing a tyre. People who are now performing basic repairs or comfort stopping for various reasons or wanting to take photos; now have very limited options to do so because of safety barriers that have been erected close to the lane edge in the name of progress. It is to such an extent that if there are cyclists on your side of the road, allowing them a 1.5m margin often puts you onto the wrong side of the road and necessitates crossing a solid white line which you can be ticketed for doing.</p> <p>State of Road Repair</p> <p>The state of road edges has deteriorated to such an extent in some places due to lack of maintenance or poor quality maintenance workmanship. On the Nelson side of the Whangarnoas, I cannot recall any major roadwork being undertaken for most of my life beyond an occasional passing lane or slip clearance. Current safety requirements for roadworks add ridiculous cost and unnecessary confusion with more road cones than cars on the road.</p> <p>Poor Road Design for Cyclists</p> <p>Concave water tables along the roadside edge of the bank create issues for cyclists pedalling with saddle bags who end up overbalancing and falling into the gutter or are endangered entering the flow of traffic or falling in front of it. Cyclist numbers are likely to increase in future and they have every right to be using our roads in safety. If a cyclist is pedalling uphill, followed by a log truck or 40 foot container trucks, it brings the speed of all traffic to that of the pushbike which cars following from behind are not expecting when they round comers. This results in heavy braking which can make them hit the bank or cross the centre line.</p> <p>Road User Courtesy</p> <p>Most truck drivers are extremely considerate of other road users and pull over where-ever possible to enhance traffic flow. It is noticeable however, that rental cars and campervans do not often follow the same policy and create big long lines of backed up traffic. Driver frustration will increase significantly if you proposed policy of reducing speed limits that facilitate passing in safe areas is implemented. I recommend more passing bays. Compulsory Overseas Driver Testing. I frequently follow traffic that use their brakes unnecessarily; stop in the middle of the road without warning if vehicles in front of them are turning rather than passing on the left; turn without indicating and drive erratically all over their traffic lane and do not pull over to let faster traffic pass. Overseas driver have often never experienced roads like ours before, and are used to freeways or autobahns instead. If tourism continues to increase at similar rates to previous years, then additional driver testing should be required to cope with our unique road conditions.</p> <p>Accident causes</p> <p>Younger people with high powered cars and roads that are not designed for fast travel seem problematic. I have witnessed accidents involving trailers, horsefloats and campervans. These I would</p>

		<p>put down to driver error and road conditions and would not have been prevented by slowing down all traffic which is already travelling slowing in those places.</p> <p>The last accident I assisted with on the Nelson side of the Whangamoas, unfolded in front of me when a young girl drove onto spilt diesel and spun across the road hitting both bank and then road edge barrier and blocking both lanes. Attending police were slow to respond because four other accidents had just happened. When accidents occur it is difficult to get help quickly because of poor or non-existent cell phone coverage.</p> <p>My suggested solution to fixing the problem is more traffic patrols pulling over slow vehicles and dangerous drivers and enhancing driver awareness and skill levels without ticketing .</p>
129	BetterWorld NZ	<p>I commend NZTA's proposal to adopt the safe and appropriate speed limit between Nelson and Blenheim.</p> <p>I note that a significant part of this 100km/h route is used by cyclists on Tour Aotearoa length of NZ journeys. From personal experience I can advise that this is an intimidating road to cycle.</p> <p>I note that some local residents claim that lowering the speed limit will encourage reckless driving and therefore more road trauma. I attach the research from the International Transport Forum on speed limit reductions from 10 nations providing evidence that this does not happen in practice:</p> <p>All the cases indicated a strong relationship between speed and the number of crashes, i.e , an increase in mean speed was accompanied by an increase in the number of crashes and/or injured road users. Conversely, a decrease in mean speed was associated with a decrease in the number of crashes and injured road users. [Page 5]</p>
130	Individual submitter	<p>Travelling over this road regularly, I feel the traffic is travelling sensibly the way the rules are set down now. It will be difficult for trucks to travel at the lower speeds and still be able to pull in on passing bays and let cars pass. I feel that if this speed review has to take place, it would be more sensible to lower it only 10km to 90km. Lowering the speed will not stop the odd idiot or the drunk or drug affected driver that are on the road, may even make things worse. Modern cars are not made to travel at these lower speeds. I am against any change.</p>
131	Individual submitter	<p>proposal 1 keep it 100; proposal 2 keep it 100; proposal 3 keep it 70; proposal 4 keep it 100; proposal 5 keep it 100 with a variable speed of 60 for the school zone; proposal 6 keep it 100; proposal 7 reduce limit to 60; proposal 8 keep it at 100 and build pullover areas; proposal 9 keep it 100 an build pullover bay; proposal 10 keep it 100 and build pullover bay; proposal 11 keep it 100; proposal 12 keep it 80 with a variable speed zone of 60 at the school; proposal 13 keep it 100; proposal 14 keep it 100; proposal 15 keep it 100.</p>
132	Individual submitter	<p>I strongly disagree with your proposal as outlined in your Consultation document and submit that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The argument you proffer seems predicated on the fact that “some people have told us that current speed limits are not safe”. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yet there is no attempt at quantifying or qualifying this statement. What properly conducted survey was completed that would avoid any bias or prejudice of any vocal minority or even attempt to put that minority into a percentage of stakeholders with potentially conflicting interests (ie all users/those affected in any way)?</li> <li>b. Without such a professional approach to understanding the issue or if there is an issue of any realistic proportions your approach could be seen as sincere but naïve and or disingenuous.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Your suggestion that the changes would add no more than 9 minutes to a road trip from Blenheim to Nelson is based on what algorithmic model? Surely not a simplistic desktop calculation of distance over speed without any calculation of the exponential slow-down from build-up of “frustrated drivers” (again, an approach that could be seen as sincere but naïve and or disingenuous). Possible outcomes from your proposed changes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Your own officers become more vigilant in order to protect the dignity of the official strategy: an understandable human reaction by the officers.</li> <li>b. No driver dares pass a vehicle travelling slower that the new speed limit which will surely happen” : the consequential traffic snail-trail will add significantly to the journey in time and frustration. And before you ask me to quantify “significantly” I can’t: but you could, using your staff and algorithms to collate and interpret such scenarios. But I will wager you don’t.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Emotive pre-decision arguments: I have read how this section of the motorway is a death road and how it is one of NZ’s most fatal sections of highway. Really? Short of an 1800’s approach to road safety with a flag-waving person walking in front of the ‘iron monster’ there is an inevitable percentage of tragedy and misery and cost from transport methods: probably even if flag-wavers were the new norm. It’s about reasonable care and cost: and that is the reality. BUT we can both trust the media to take any such emotional “factoid-seeds” suggested by you and use them for head-line click-bait. BUT you should not allow this to happen unless it is part of your strategy to achieve an objective not supported by facts.</li> <li>4. So what should happen: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. I totally support appropriate speed reduction in school and community areas and the vigilant policing of those.</li> <li>b. I totally support the NZTA demanding that all companies supplying tourists with rental cars/mobile homes provide plain-speak information on how to drive on NZ roads and how to be good drivers within our society: the NZTA should supply the printed multi-language material for this. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. All rental vehicles should also have mandatory dashboard stickers with key bullet points re allowing passing/moving over and slowing down and not speeding up on passing lanes/stopping to admire the view and not going slower to admire the view.</li> <li>ii. Your officers should do sport-checks to ensure rental companies provide these.</li> <li>iii. Your officers should be charged with stopping tourist-offenders and explaining the realities of NZ driving and road values to them. Why not include some quantitative assessment in the officers’</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>

		own reporting systems: with photos of the tourist vehicle registration taken so that such constructive work can be part of their personal (and then departmental) KPI's.
		5. I support the policing of freight trucks by your officers to ensure that trucks do not use passing lanes and flat terrain to speed up (to 100km plus when they should be travelling at 90km/h) just to immediately slow down again on the first incline.
133	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) no issues with the proposed new speed limit of 80 kmh</li> <li>4) existing 100 km/h is ok ,would except 90km/h to maintain the flow with heavy transport .</li> <li>5) go to 50km/h ,</li> <li>7) existing 100km/h is ok , 90km/h would be ok and would maintain good flow with heavy transport .</li> <li>8) proposed new speed limit km/h 80 to 60 is ok</li> <li>9) 90km/h to maintain traffic flow with heavy transport , no to 80km.</li> <li>10) .proposed new speed limited 60 km/h ok</li> <li>11) 90 km/h to maintain traffic flow with heavy transport . or leave at 100km/h.</li> <li>13) 90 km/h to maintain traffic flow with heavy transport . no need to pass.</li> <li>14) proposed speed of 60 km/h a bit low 70 km/h would be more appropriate .</li> <li>15) proposed speed limit good</li> <li>16) proposed speed limit ok</li> <li>17) proposed speed limit ok</li> <li>18) existing 80km/h ok</li> <li>19) proposed 80 km/h ok</li> </ul>
134	Individual submitter	Please DO NOT change the speed limit from 100 down to 80km/hr between Nelson and Blenheim except past schools. There is nothing wrong with the roads - unless you ban cars - accidents will happen. Most accidents are caused by driver impatience, suicide, medical events, drugs, alcohol, cell phone use. A lower speed limit will not change these events from happening. Don't send us back to the stone age
135	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> <li>4) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> <li>5) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 70kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> <li>7) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> <li>8) Agree</li> <li>9) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> <li>10) Agree</li> <li>11) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> <li>13) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> <li>14) Its about driving to the conditions. No need to change anything</li> <li>15) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> <li>16) Current limits make sense</li> <li>17) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.No need to change</li> <li>18) 80 kmph is perfectly ok</li> <li>19) Good road perfectly safe to drive at 100kmph. Reducing speed won't help idiots on the road.</li> </ul>
136	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Leave at 100km</li> <li>4) Leave at 100km</li> <li>5) Leave at 70km</li> <li>7) Leave at 100km</li> <li>8) Leave at 100km</li> <li>9) Leave at 100km</li> <li>10) All Good</li> <li>11) Leave at 100km</li> <li>13) Leave at 100km</li> <li>14) Leave at 100km</li> <li>15) Leave at 100km</li> <li>16) All Good</li> <li>17) Leave at 100km</li> </ul>

		18) Leave at 80km 19) Leave at 100km
137	Individual submitter	1) Straight bit of road, pointless in lowering the speed. Speed reduction will allow no passing of slower vehicles and just cause more of a bottle neck. 4) As with number 1. Same reasons. 5) OK, but is lowering the speed to 50km really required ? 7) Same as answer 1, pointless speed reduction, leading to slower traffic bottle necks. Create passing lanes is all that is required. 8) No Comment 9) Same as answer 4, this will just lead to slower traffic creating bottlenecks. Install passing lanes. 10) No Comment 11) Same as answer 4 13) Same as answer 4 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment
138	Individual submitter	1) Shouldn't be changed 4) Shouldn't be changed 5) No Comment 7) Shouldn't be changed 8) Shouldn't be changed apart from school zones 9) Shouldn't be changed 10) Shouldn't be changed 11) Shouldn't be changed 13) Shouldn't be changed 14) Shouldn't be changed 15) Shouldn't be changed 16) Should be changed 17) Shouldn't be changed 18) Shouldn't be changed 19) Should be changed
139	Individual submitter	I am not a regular traveller between Nelson and Blenheim. But I have been stuck on the road because of the low speed traffic. I agree with number 19 because there are lots of people live between Nelson and Atawai. But I cannot understand the speed limit reducing in rural areas for example number 11. Overall I can not agree with this speed limit change, because this proposal changed speed limit in all areas between Nelson and Blenheim. Personally, I believe regular commuter between Nelson and Blenheim will spend much more time on the road.
140	Individual submitter	1) No problem with 80kmh 4) This is a long open relatively straight road, but with limited opportunities for safe over taking. As one who frequently drives motor vehicles there, frustration constantly prevails. There are plenty of stretches suitable for over taking lanes as has been suggested many times before. There's not even safe places to pull over to allow safe passing. Why does nobody listen? 5) No problem with 50kmh over 240m 7) 100kmh should stay absolutely 8) 60kmh always appropriate through school zone 9) Again there is a definite need for safe passing lanes and there's plenty of room to do so. Reducing the 100kmh speed limit on this section is ridiculous and will only add tto driver frustration 10) No objection to 60kmh on this section 11) Again this is a relatively straight forward section of open road. Reducing the 100kmh is a sure recipe for annoyance and frustration. Always welcome some more safe passing provisions. 13) Again passing lanes are needed on several sections of this road. If these are indicated motorists will usually wait for a safe passing opportunity. As a frequent HVM driver nothing suggests that reducing from 100kmh is justified. 14) Some impatient drivers often encountered on this section. No objection to an 80 kmh speed limit ( not 60 kmh) on this section. A demand for extra care is a constant requirement for all. 15) Definite need for safe passing lanes for both directions. Especially for traffic entering the Whangamoas, wishing to clear slower vehicles. 80 kmh ok here 16) No problem with 80 kmh here 17) Not necessary to reduce from 100 kmh. Again passing is hazardous so some provision for this here too would assist the safety aspect.

		<p>18) This is a busy area for traffic entering and exiting the highway. No problem with 60kmh.</p> <p>19) No problem at all with 80 kmh on this section.</p>
141	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) I do not support the change on this section. I believe that this road is suitable for travelling at 100km/hr and the reduced speed is unnecessary.</p> <p>5) This sounds reasonable.</p> <p>7) I do not support the change on this section. I believe that this road is suitable for travelling at 100km/hr and the reduced speed is unnecessary.</p> <p>8) This sounds reasonable, especially near the school.</p> <p>9) I do not support the change on this section. I believe that this road is suitable for travelling at 100km/hr and the reduced speed is unnecessary.</p> <p>10) This sounds reasonable.</p> <p>11) I do not support the change on this section. I believe that this road is suitable for travelling at 100km/hr and the reduced speed is unnecessary.</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) Why don't we make this 80km/hr and then keep the same speed limit from Rai Valley to Allisdair St? It's confusing to try to keep switching speeds to stay legal.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) I agree with the variable school zone change.</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) I agree with this one. The kids having to walk and cycle along the footpath here are uncomfortably close to fast moving traffic.</p> <p>19) I agree with this one.</p>
142	Individual submitter	<p>1) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>4) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers. There are plenty of safe stretches of road along this highway which are capable of holding 100km speed limit.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>8) Proposed school zone I agree with but when the two straight strips of road are the really only safe passing areas until you get to Rai Valley, reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>9) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>10) I think this is fair.</p> <p>11) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>13) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>14) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>15) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>16) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>17) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>18) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p> <p>19) Implementing passing lanes would assist with the flow of traffic. Reducing the speed limit will only aggravate drivers who are stuck behind others going well below the speed limit and encourage dangerous passing maneuvers</p>
143	Individual submitter	<p>1) The road conditions are fine so it should stay the same</p> <p>4) Does not need reducing</p> <p>5) Does not need reducing</p> <p>7) Does not need reducing</p> <p>8) Does not need reducing</p>

		<p>9) Does not need reducing</p> <p>10) Does not need reducing</p> <p>11) Does not need reducing</p> <p>13) Does not need reducing</p> <p>14) Does not need reducing. This is ridiculous for daily commuters.</p> <p>15) Does not need reducing. This is ridiculous for daily commuters.</p> <p>16) Does not need reducing. This is ridiculous for daily commuters.</p> <p>17) Does not need reducing. This is ridiculous for daily commuters.</p> <p>18) Does not need reducing. This is ridiculous for daily commuters.</p> <p>19) Does not need reducing. This is ridiculous for daily commuters.</p>
144	Wash rite	<p>1) How about no, I feel that the road is safe. It's the slow drivers and tourist that need to be removed from the road. I will not take notice of the speed reduction. Also 20 percent reducing pd speed is greater than 9 mins added to the trip. Who did the math the time will be 20 to 25 mins longer</p> <p>4) This road is straight are you silly maybe slow vehicle bays</p> <p>5) This is ok.</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) No</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) No</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
145	Individual submitter	<p>1) Instead of m changing speed limit focus on distracted drivers</p> <p>4) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>5) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>7) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>8) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>9) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>10) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>11) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>13) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>14) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>15) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>16) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>17) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>18) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p> <p>19) Instead of changing speed limits focus on distracted drivers and fixing the roads</p>
146	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree</p> <p>4) Agree</p> <p>5) Agree</p> <p>7) Agree</p> <p>8) Agree</p> <p>9) Agree</p> <p>10) Agree</p> <p>11) Agree</p> <p>13) Agree</p>

		<p>14) Agree  15) Agree  16) Agree  17) Agree  18) Agree  19) Agree</p>
147	Individual submitter	<p>1) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  4) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  5) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  7) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  8) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  9) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  10) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  11) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  13) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  14) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  15) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  16) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  17) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  18) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads  19) spend some of the money that goes up to Auckland to fix our roads</p>
148	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) This section of road is not unsafe or needing a speed reduction . I have traveled this section for nearly 30 years and not had any form of issues on this stretch of road  8) I agree with this reduction  9) Absolutely silly idea to drop this speed limit through this easy flowing section of highway  10) Yes I agree with this reduction  11) There is no section of this stretch of road that needs the speed to be lowered it is a safe easily driven section of highway  13) This is a safe section of road that only has crashes due to idiot unable drivers leave it at 100  14) No reduction needed here  15) Leave it at 100 kmph  16) I agree with this strongly  17) No reduction needed  18) If you lower every limit there will be more frustration and silly accidents  19) Leave it at 100</p>
149	Individual submitter	<p>1) The general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  4) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  5) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  7) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  8) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  9) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  10) No  11) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  13) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  14) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  15) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  16) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?  17) general public getting around. Cars have become a lot safer and road getting better why should speed limits be dropping?</p>

		18) No Comment 19) No Comment
150	Individual submitter	1) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 4) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 5) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 7) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 8) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 9) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 10) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 11) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 13) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 14) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 15) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 16) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 17) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 18) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc 19) Do not change it, Lowering the current speed limit is only going to cause more issues including a increase of traffic causing people to attempt dangerous overtaking etc
151	Auckland Transport	"I commend NZTA's proposal to adopt the safe and appropriate speed limit between Nelson and Blenheim. I note that a significant part of this 100km/h route is used by cyclists on Tour Aotearoa length of NZ journeys. From personal experience I can advise that this is an intimidating road to cycle.  I also live in a rural area with narrow widely road with no footpaths. It makes it harder to walk/ride a bike and for my personal fitness I would like to have a safe journey regardless of what mode of transport I use.
152	Individual submitter	4. Should be retained at 100km. This is a perfectly good stretch of road that flows well at 100kmh. 7. Once again should be retained at 100kmh. Flows well. 9. As per above. 10. Good option. 11. As above (no's 4-9). 13. Retain at 100kmh. This is ridiculous why did NZTA spend so much funding on the Rai Saddle to end up reducing the road speed. Also goes for eastern side of Whangamoia Saddle. 14. Agree you could not travel at the existing speed of 100kmh. 18. Retain at 80kmh no need for change. General: I note it was stated that cycle use has increased along the highway. I have travelled this road at least 2x per week for the last 15 years and am at a loss to see the supposed increase in cycle use. This is a red herring. There are cycleways provided from NN to Atawhai and pretty much out to Renwick and the Rapara Road intersection. If anything a cycleway extension out to Hira from Atawhai would be helpful. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
153	Individual submitter	Thanks, rural contractors roading issues are principally about moving machinery from one farm to the other - speed not really the issue! Am personally aware of proposed changes on SH6 and think its over the top - support speed zones around schools but as someone who drives the route about six times a year , don't want an 80km limit all the way. Do support one speed zone from Atiwhai to Nelson as have been pinged for doing 100km in an 80km area - bloody confusing to go in and out of speed zones in an urban area
154	Individual submitter	Thanks, rural contractors roading issues are principally about moving machinery from one farm to the other - speed not really the issue!  Am personally aware of proposed changes on SH6 and think its over the top - support speed zones around schools but as someone who drives the route about six times a year , don't want an 80km limit all the way. Do support one speed zone from Atiwhai to Nelson as have been pinged for doing 100km in an 80km area - bloody confusing to go in and out of speed zones in an urban area  Cheers
155	Individual submitter	1) This reduction seems unnecessary. At 100km/h there seems to be low crash risk, whilst lowering the speed limit lowers the impact of a crash there seems a very low risk of crashing in the first place. 4) This reduction seems unnecessary. Most of this road is in good condition and is open with decent straights and stretches where 100km/h is entirely appropriate. Lowering the speed limit would unnecessarily inconvenience road users. If there are any high risk areas could they be more appropriately signposted? 5) Due to the houses this does not seem unreasonable but is it really necessary? The width pf the road lends itself to higher speeds if a lower limit was put into place some islands or a narrowing of the road would be useful to control the anticipated speed limit vs the regulated speed limit. 7) This seems unreasonable. The road is quite safe to travel at a maxium of 100kph. Drivers can travel slower if condotions dictate. 8) The school zone already has a lower limit and the rest it is appropriate to travel at speeds f up to 100kph, this change seems unnecessary.

		<p>9) Drivers are capable of making thier own decisions regarding speed. Most of this section of road speeds of up to 100kph are not unreasonable and can be driven safely.</p> <p>10) I wholeheartedly support the reduced speed limit in summer. Better signage that informs people that this is a summer speed limit would be good and a prewarning sign before the 50 zone is reached would also be useful. The rest of the year a reduction to 80kph should be sufficient.</p> <p>11) 80kph until you are past the rai falls gravel storage and then 100kph from there. Drivers can make their own speed choices based on conditions but the road is suitable to drive at speeds of up to 100kph.</p> <p>13) Although there are many corners that do not allow speeds of 100kph these tend to be obvious when approaching. There are few driveways and side roads it seems that the open road limit is appropriate. Reducing the speed limit would also hinder overtaking of slower commercial vehicles.</p> <p>14) Much of this could be serviced with the 80kph spped limit you have proposed for the adjacent areas. Dropping it to 60 is problematic as too many speed zones gets confusing for drivers.</p> <p>15) This seems like a good change.</p> <p>16) It is sometimes useful to pass commercial vehicles on the weigh station straight at speeds in excess of the current limit. A passing lane here would be great.</p> <p>17) This seems unreasonable. It is open road and can be traversed at speeds of up to 100kph quite safely.</p> <p>18) This is unreasonable. The road suits travel at speeds of up to 80kph quite safely. There is little to no pedestrians crossing and good separation from pedestrians on tge sidewalk. Keep it at 80kph</p> <p>19) This is a seperate road from the residential roads for tge most part. The cycleway is also off this section of road. Keep the speed limit as it stands. The median strips allow for a safe merging as it is.</p>
156	Individual submitter	<p>1) Nothing wrong with this speed limit on this stretch of road it's open with clear vision.</p> <p>4) Open road with lots of passing opportunities 100 k/m is a safe speed</p> <p>5) Built up area I agree with 50km/h</p> <p>7) Once again road is a open road with plenty of passing opportunities</p> <p>8) School area with reduction at school times only.</p> <p>9) Lovely piece of open road with clear vision safe at 100 km/h</p> <p>10) Agree with the tourist season but be all year round.</p> <p>11) Again nice piece of road 100km/h is ok</p> <p>13) Plenty of slow speed corners which are well posted no change need.</p> <p>14) Again well posted corners</p> <p>15) No change here 100km/h is ok through this area</p> <p>16) School zone though here no change 80km/h</p> <p>17) No change open road driving with passing lane here</p> <p>18) Coming to built up area so yes to change</p> <p>19) Same as last question</p>
157	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) I do not support this decrease in speed. This section of road is built to a good standard and improvements have been made at known black spots. The road width and geometry support the design speed of 100 kph.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) I do not support 60 kph for this zone. It does not work in the Hundalees on SH1 with many vehicles travelling up to 80 kph. This should be 80 kph with the balance of the adjoining mountainous section.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
158	Individual submitter	<p>Has any research been done on whether speed, within the current speed limit, was a factor in these deaths?</p> <p>If people were going over the speed limit and there was an accident then nothing will</p>

		<p>change, people will still drive at the same speed and those deaths are not determined by any speed limit.</p> <p>Then there are factors like the young man committing suicide by crashing his car the other day. Once again, the speed limit not a factor.</p> <p>Ice on the Nelson side of the Whangamoā? Speed limit not a factor unless you drop it down 50 or less.</p> <p>This feels like a blanket change without the cause of the deaths broken down to the particular causes.</p> <p>I think the speed in areas 4, 7, 9, 11 and 13 to the top of the saddle should be left at 100km/h. The majority of this road is quite straight and safe.</p>
159	Individual submitter	<p>I find this to be most disturbing. As a frequent road user, I don't have any problem with the 100kph. Limit and adhere to signs and take care. Additional passing bays would be an excellent idea. I believe it is not the road but the drivers who are at fault. Not concentrating and other such things. I have crashed, but it had nothing to do with the speed limit but the driver in the other vehicle, who fell asleep. Please leave the speed limits as they are.</p>
160	Individual submitter	<p>I am opposed to this proposal. Having travelled this road for many years I consider them to be safe as they are. I have also travelled to Christchurch lately and found the 60km through the Hundalees to be absolutely ridiculous and an over kill. I think this proposal would make a joke of the trip to Nelson as well. Modern cars handle most conditions very well and safely.</p>
161	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight section of road with one cross intersection and one T intersection along the route. There are wide verges and turning bays at Bells Road. The 100 Km.h speed limit should not be reduced. Further the section between the western end of the road from the Argosy to Renwick 50 Km.h zone should be returned to 100 Km.h</p> <p>4) The current speed limit is suitable and should remain at 100 km.h. The road is winding by nature, however most bends can be easily negotiated to 100 km.h. These slower sections (ie; just north of Dangerous Creek) could simply have speed advisory signs erected recommending a lower speed until the winding section has been negotiated. Of interest there are no speed advisory signs or reflectorised chevron boards between Renwick and Havelock recommending that a lower speed be considered or advising of a bend ahead. This has been the situation for years and should have been addressed if the number of accidents was considered an issue. Because of the lack of suitable long straights there is insufficient road available for safe passing. Two passing lanes in each direction between Okaramio and Havelock should be built. Truck and camper vans travelling at lower speed cause more impatience and create dangerous passing manoeuvres on this section of road than speed does.</p> <p>5) Again the present speed limit is sufficient. The road is wide and the intersections have excellent visibility.</p> <p>7) The 100 Km,h speed limit should remain. The addition of a passing lane / slow vehicle lane in each direction on this section would allow for more free flowing traffic in both directions. Sufficient warning signs on the approach to bends requiring lower speeds should be installed.</p> <p>8) The speed limit should remain at 100 km.h with the addition of a 60 km.h variable speed zone</p> <p>9) The speed limit of 100 km.h should remain. Minimal intersections and easy sweeping bends make this section of road safe at 100 km.h</p> <p>10) Makes sense Include a slow vehicle lane for trucks and slower vehicles to utilise to prevent congestion.</p> <p>11) This section of road should remain at 100 km.h. Minimal intersections. Include a warning road sign for the short section of road near Hebbards Creek and passing Rai Falls</p> <p>13) 100 Km.h speed limit to remain from Rai Valley village to the end of the passing lanes on the Nelson side on the Blenheim side of the Whangamoā Saddle 80 Km.h from this point to Teal Valley Road</p> <p>14) Reduce speed limit to 80 Km.h. include slow vehicle pull off areas where the geography allows</p> <p>15) Agree</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) 100 Km.h speed limit to remain to allow safe and quick passing at the passing lanes either side of the hill. 100 Km.h to remain until reaching the present restriction at Atawhai</p> <p>18) To remain at 80. Consider variable speed signs passing the school</p> <p>19) 100 Km,h to remain. My overall thoughts on reducing the speed between Blenheim and Nelson comes from my 42 years service in the MOT and Police where I spent the last 10 years of my service as a highway patrol officer based in Marlborough. I now drive light and heavy commercial passenger vehicles on this road on a regular basis. During my time in the Police I patrolled this road several times a week as part of my patrol plan. I never found the speed limit to be unsuitable, however always came across drivers complaining about trucks and other slow travelling vehicles causing long lines of traffic and impatience leading to issues about unsafe passing. The simple cure is the installation of passing lanes and slow vehicle lanes at regular intervals along the entire length of the highway Any reduction in the speed limit will not slow a high percentage of vehicles down on the straight and easy winding sections of the road. Most drivers will travel at a speed (that while illegal) they consider appropriate for them at the time. Vehicles passing at high speeds will become an issue as long queues build and they attempt to pass as many vehicles as they can on the length of road available. This will cause confrontation when these people are stopped by the Police and it is the Police that will be on the receiving end of the abuse. Most people I dealt with were travelling at speeds around the 115 km,h and higher I don't believe that lowering the speed limit will change this. There was a high frequency of vehicles crossing the centre line (lazy cornering) but this was not generally speed related. It is no secret that the Police have reduced their road safety footprint over several years to the point where they are almost non existent on this road. This has caused speeds to increase during that time. As a commercial driver I see it daily on all roads. A Police presence is the best tool available to make the road safer. There will always be fatal accidents involving idiots and a change of speed limit will not change their behaviours. I also believe that your estimate of the extra time taken to drive the route is a simplistic estimate based on an uninterrupted journey with no hold ups behind slower vehicles. The long queues will increase with this reduced speed limit and will extend the travel time to well beyond your estimate.</p>

162	Individual submitter	Please could you consider a giveway sign for traffic heading south into Malvern Ave to Atawhai Drive. Suggest removal of the grassy patch between the cycle lane and the highway. This is where all the near misses occur. We see this from our living room every day. 80kmh please both for getting on to the highway and the noise level.
163	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists.</p> <p>4) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists.</p> <p>5) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists.</p> <p>7) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists.</p> <p>8) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly school children and cyclists.</p> <p>9) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is along key cycling route between Picton and Nelson. The amount of vehicle traffic through here makes this section terrifying for people on bikes. A lower speed limit will SAVE LIVES.</p> <p>10) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p> <p>11) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p> <p>13) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p> <p>14) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p> <p>15) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p> <p>16) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p> <p>17) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p> <p>18) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p> <p>19) Agree with the change due to increased safety for all road users, particularly cyclists who are sharing the road with motorists. This is a high volume cycling and motoring route between Picton and Nelson.</p>
164	Individual submitter	<p>1) NO</p> <p>4) This stretch of road I travel every day and 100km is fine. It does not have a high crash rate from Renwick to Havelock</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) This section of road I believe is fine for 100km,</p> <p>8) Absolutely agree, speed restrictions need to be put in place in from of Canvastown School</p> <p>9) 100km is fine</p> <p>10) 80km</p> <p>11) 80km</p> <p>13) 80km</p> <p>14) 80km</p> <p>15) 80km</p> <p>16) 80</p> <p>17) 100km</p> <p>18) 80km</p> <p>19) 80km</p>
165	Individual submitter	<p>1) I do not know this stretch of road, but I think a blanket reduction of 80 is poor decision, it will frustrate cars, but would be better to install lorry recognition cameras to make sure they did keep to the 80 limit and cars to get past them.</p> <p>4) repeat answer to Q.1</p> <p>5) repeat answer to Q.1</p> <p>7) repeat answer to Q.1</p> <p>8) repeat answer to Q.1</p> <p>9) repeat answer to Q.1</p> <p>10) repeat answer to Q.1</p>

		<p>11) repeat answer to Q.1  13) repeat answer to Q.1  14) repeat answer to Q.1  15) repeat answer to Q.1  16) Does the variable school zone mean only at school open/closing times? this isn't clear  17) Yes definitely AND a bike section on this busy road for increasing numbers of housing at Todd's Valley with children going to Clifton Terrace School should be created.  18) Yes, this section includes the turn off for Clifton Terrace school and a lot of other roads coming down the hill to these junctions.  19) This speed limit change should not start until the junction of Tui Glen Road</p>
166	Individual submitter	<p>1) Provides consistency between Woodbourne and Blenheim - currently variable  4) Support  5) Support  7) Support  8) Support  9) Support  10) Support  11) Support  13) Support  14) Absolutely support - drive this route often. Feel unsafe because of OTHERS speed - I have slowed down to safe speed voluntarily, and regularly pull over when cars build up behind.  15) Support  16) Support  17) Support  18) Support - getting more residential - kids, bikes, streets entering the road.  19) Support - lots happening, people about, bikes, cars turning off...</p>
167	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) Driver education on U turns is needed. This is causing a lot of unnecessary accidents in this area  13) No Comment  14) Keep to 80km for the entire road. If that much of a speed reduction is needed fix the road. Accidents happen by vehicles crossing the centre line not speeding on this stretch of road.  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) This is a very safe stretch of road with few corners. Look at driver education first. This is the easy and cheap option that won't work as well as keeping drivers on their side of the road.  18) Keep the limit the same as this is not a dangerous stretch of road. The school is off the main road and will align with the proposed 80km limit for all of the State highway  19) No Comment</p>
168	Individual submitter	<p>1) I do not support this  4) I do not support this  5) I do not support this  7) I do not support this  8) I support this  9) I do not support this  10) I do not support this  11) I do not support this  13) I do not support this  14) I support a speed decrease to 80km over the Whangamoia saddle  15) I do not support this  16) I do not support this</p>

		<p>17) I do not support this</p> <p>18) I do not support this</p> <p>19) I support this</p>
169	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Improve the Glen intersection, to include a turning lane from traffic coming from Hira direction, and a better one for traffic coming from Nelson. This intersection where there has been multiple deaths needs to be made safer. Widen the verge for cyclists. Improve directional road marking after rest stops or parking areas such as the sand flats to assist tourists with staying left. Speed has rarely been the cause of the serious accidents along this stretch of road, and while lowering the speed may lessen the impact of the accidents that will continue to happen, its just a bandaid for the fundamental issues on this stretch of road.</p> <p>18) This reduction should be in line with the school zone, and only be in play during the school zone hours.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
170	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it 100k</p> <p>4) Keep 100k</p> <p>5) Keep 100k</p> <p>7) Keep 100k</p> <p>8) Keep 100k</p> <p>9) Keep 100k</p> <p>10) Keep 100k</p> <p>11) Keep 100k</p> <p>13) Keep 100k</p> <p>14) Keep 100k</p> <p>15) Keep 100k</p> <p>16) Keep</p> <p>17) Keep 100k</p> <p>18) Keep 80k</p> <p>19) Keep 100k</p>
171	Individual submitter	<p>The proposal to reduce the open road speed limit on this road to 80 Kph is outrageous.</p> <p>If you want to improve road safety on NZ roads try:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improving driver training, consider retesting drivers when licences expire.</li> <li>2. Make third party insurance compulsory as per all Northern European countries, all of them with better road safety records. This will eliminate the ability for young men to buy and race souped up Jap imports.</li> <li>3. Getting police to intervene when they observe poor driving and provide constructive advice, rather than just issuing speeding tickets and fines for crossing the centre line when it is perfectly safe to do so.</li> </ol>
172	Individual submitter	<p>1) The existing speed limit is safe and drivers should be able to drive at a safe speed to suit the conditions</p> <p>4) Leave the speed limit as is as that is safe as long as drivers drive to the conditions. Remember at different periods of the day traffic can be very light</p> <p>5) Built up area so could be reduced but maybe 60kph would be better</p> <p>7) Existing speed limit is safe so no reduction is required, the 100kph is the maximum and common sense tells you to slow down in certain areas</p> <p>8) Maybe a reduction because of the school</p> <p>9) Existing speed limit is safe as long as drivers drive to the conditions</p> <p>10) Busy area reduction would be a good idea</p>

		<p>11) Existing speed limit is safe.</p> <p>13) There are sections of this part of the road that could have 80kph as the Rai and Whangamoia hill cannot be driven at even 80kph and maybe a Limited speed zone sign would be a better option on the flat sections of road</p> <p>14) Keep the speed the same as you propose for 11 above</p> <p>15) This will remove the only overtaking area</p> <p>16) As it is safe maybe 60kph during school hours would be better or when children are about.</p> <p>17) The existing speed limit is safe</p> <p>18) The present 80kph zone is safe</p> <p>19) The existing 100kph zone is safe with the passing lane</p>
173	Individual submitter	<p>1) nothing to submit</p> <p>4) I oppose this proposal, and support the existing 100 km/h limit over the majority of this section. It may be that there are localised short sections where 80 km/h are appropriate near Okaramio.</p> <p>5) No fixed opinion. I support speed limit reduction where road conditions, traffic volumes or adjacent population/activities make this appropriate</p> <p>7) I oppose this proposal, and support the existing 100 km/h limit over this section.</p> <p>8) I support the proposed 80 - 60km/h variable school zone proposal at Canvastown.</p> <p>9) I oppose this proposal, and support the existing 100 km/h limit over this section.</p> <p>10) I support the proposed 60km/h limit at Pelorus Bridge</p> <p>11) I oppose this proposal, and support the existing 100 km/h limit over this section.</p> <p>13) I oppose this proposal, and support the existing 100 km/h limit over the majority of this section. There are parts of Collin's Valley Road (in the valley) where 80 km/h may be appropriate. I am thinking of the approach taken between Kawatiri and Murchison, where a 80 km/h limit has been in my opinion appropriately applied - 80km/h on the windy bits, near Kawatiri, then 100 km/h to Murchison.</p> <p>14) I support a reduction of the 100 km/h limit over this section. 60 seems a bit low, but concede it may be appropriate. I am thinking of the approach taken between Kawatiri and Murchison, where a 80 km/h limit has been in my opinion appropriately applied - 80km/h on the windy bits, near Kawatiri, then 100 km/h to Murchison.</p> <p>15) I oppose this proposal, and support the existing 100 km/h limit over this section.</p> <p>16) I support the proposed 60km/h variable school zone proposal at Hira school.</p> <p>17) I oppose this proposal, and support the existing 100 km/h limit over the majority of this section. There are parts where 80 km/h may be appropriate. Cable Bay Road intersection, Wakapuaka Hall to Glen Road intersection, Tods Valley Road west to Atawhai</p> <p>18) Not sure about this - seems a bit harsh. What about a variable 80 - 60 school zone type arrangement?</p> <p>19) No fixed opinion. I support speed limit reduction where road conditions, traffic volumes or adjacent population/activities make this appropriate.</p>
174	Big Chill Distributions	<p>1) That might be a good idea with cyclists going to Woodbourne</p> <p>4) No : Not a good idea as the road is okay to travel at 100 kmh or 90 kmh for trucks</p> <p>5) Good idea as its residential area and pedestrians walking into Havelock central The foot path is narrow and unprotected</p> <p>7) No Keep it to 100 kmh Just even out the road surface and straighten some corners a little</p> <p>8) No keep it to 100 kmh</p> <p>9) No keep it at 100 kmh but fix the bumpy road and straighten out the bends</p> <p>10) Good idea as some vehicles go too quick into that corner</p> <p>11) Keep it at 100 kmh</p> <p>13) Keep it at 100 kmh but fix up the road and corners</p> <p>14) No keep it at 100 kmh Its very hard to do that speed anyway</p> <p>15) Keep it at 100 kmh</p> <p>16) Keep it at 100 kmh theres passing lanes there</p> <p>17) Not a problem Keep it at 100 kmh</p> <p>18) Keep it at 80 kmh : as a lower speed is too slow</p> <p>19) Good idea as there are tricky intersections to navigate : 80 kmh is worthwhile</p>
175	Individual submitter	<p>1) Most drivers obey the rules and they drive safely, however some ignore the rules and are reckless, these drivers still will ignore the rules but even more so and put others at risk. Lowering the speeds will just create more frustration and more bad driving. Speed limits should stay the same.</p> <p>4) As above. Fuel consumption will be higher at your proposed speed change and will add to the risk taking of careless drivers. The proposals Will also add 20 minutes to the journey that I make on a regular basis. Creating compulsory pull over shoulders for slow vehicles and enforcing that would create better safety. Not good for commercial efficiency.</p> <p>5) If this has accidents and/or pedestrians then reducing to 50km makes sense.</p> <p>7) As in 1 and 2, no leave as is.</p> <p>8) School zone lights and speed limits at the appropriate times should be all that is needed.</p>

		<p>9) Please leave as is! This would be hugely frustrating.</p> <p>10) Maybe or create a pedestrian underpass under the bridge.</p> <p>11) This road seems safe to me, except for the drivers that will want to pass the vehicle in front despite the speed they are going, so again this change will only add to the problem.</p> <p>13) Leave, can you imagine the amount of dangerous overtaking that drivers determined to go faster than the cars in front will do. Please do not make this any more unsafe for us good drivers.</p> <p>14) As above</p> <p>15) As above, leave as is</p> <p>16) With good lighted speed sign for school zone</p> <p>17) No leave as is. Perhaps creating better joining traffic lanes may help.</p> <p>18) Is this really a problem?</p> <p>19) Again improve the access for joining traffic onto this stretch of road.</p>
176	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes, What's magical about 80? Why not 90? Otherwise agree.</p> <p>4) Yes, this is stupid! Parts of this road are suitable for 100k, others 90. 80 apart from a few spots is silly. It makes no sense to reduce an entire length of highways' speed. If you are going to do this then why not SH1 Christchurch to Timaru, or Auckland motorways where there are far more crashes. Better driver education and skills are the answer. Drive to the conditions!</p> <p>5) Agree</p> <p>7) See previous comments. Parts of this section yes PLUS more extensive use of Double yellows.</p> <p>8) Stupid</p> <p>9) Again largely unwarranted. Approaches and bends to Pelorous yes to 80 or 90 with more Double Yellows.</p> <p>10) Yes</p> <p>11) 90</p> <p>13) 90</p> <p>14) 80</p> <p>15) 90</p> <p>16) 90</p> <p>17) 90</p> <p>18) 80</p> <p>19) 90</p>
177	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>4) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>5) 70km/h is good</p> <p>7) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>8) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>9) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>10) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>11) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>13) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>14) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>15) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>16) Even that could be 100km/h and 80km/h past Hira school.</p> <p>17) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>18) 80km/h is ok</p> <p>19) Keep it 100km/h</p>
178	Individual submitter	<p>1) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p> <p>4) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p> <p>5) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p> <p>7) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p> <p>8) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p> <p>9) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p> <p>10) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p> <p>11) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p> <p>13) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p>

		<p>14) keep speed limit at 100kmh  15) keep speed limit at 100kmh  16) keep speed limit at 100kmh  17) keep speed limit at 100kmh  18) keep speed limit at 100kmh  19) keep speed limit at 100kmh</p>
179	Individual submitter	<p>1) There were no accident due to going 100 km/h. You say that the faster you go the bigger the chance to have a bad accident. This week a young man died in Nelson in a 50 km/h zone on his motorcycle. So why don't you do 20 or 10 km/h in the whole country?  4) You are planning to put barriers in the middle of the road. This is so dangerous. Imagine the road is blocked due to an accident or landslide, you are trapped. You can't pass to get out of the danger zone or to get help. What a dangerous plan.  5) No Comment  7) You have to build passing lanes. Drivers get frustrated being stuck behind camper vans not pulling over.  8) Who died on SH6? And older man getting a heart attack and driving off the road. Tourist driving on the wrong side of the road. A lady walking her dog because you didn't built a footpath /bicycle track over Gentle Annie Saddle. An other lady on her bicycle had to die because you didn't build a bicycle track / footpath. No accident was speed related.  9) You wasted so much money with your planing so far and haven't done anything. You could have built a few passing lanes with this money already.  10) 200m south to 20m north-east would be sufficient.  11) No Comment  13) What was the point of building such a wide road over Rai Saddle and not marking a passing lane. Waste of money.  14) No need for speed limit over the Whangamoia. Everyone is driving to the conditions of the road.  15) We need a footpath to get to Hira School not a speed limit.  16) Footpath / bicycle track!!! Please listen.  17) Footpath / bicycle track to connect Hira with Nelson. 2 people died already! How many more do you need to build a footpath?  18) 80 km/h is sufficient  19) Wide and straight road. No problem with 100 km/h.</p>
180	Individual submitter	<p>1) 100 km/h is not too fast for modern vehicles. It is not the road, it is the bad driver. Being stuck behind a camper van going 65 km/h and not pulling over makes you frustrated and you overtake where you normally wouldn't. You should force the rental car/camper van companies to get the message to their customers that it is in the NZ road code to pull over and let traffic pass. We need passing lanes on this road. You say that you don't have the money for this. You consulted us before, had public information stalls, brochures printed and so on. You wasted all this money, no wonder you are running out. Why do you consult the public if you do your own thing anyway. Having a speed limit of 80 and 60 km/h is too easy. We don't need specialists and well paid manager for such a decision. I am so frustrated.  4) 100 km/h is not too fast for modern vehicles. It is not the road, it is the bad driver. Being stuck behind a camper van going 65 km/h and not pulling over makes you frustrated and you overtake where you normally wouldn't. You should force the rental car/camper van companies to get the message to their customers that it is in the NZ road code to pull over and let traffic pass. We need passing lanes on this road. You say that you don't have the money for this. You consulted us before, had public information stalls, brochures printed and so on. You wasted all this money, no wonder you are running out. Why do you consult the public if you do your own thing anyway. Having a speed limit of 80 and 60 km/h is too easy. We don't need specialists and well paid manager for such a decision. I am so frustrated.  5) 100 km/h is not too fast for modern vehicles. It is not the road, it is the bad driver. Being stuck behind a camper van going 65 km/h and not pulling over makes you frustrated and you overtake where you normally wouldn't. You should force the rental car/camper van companies to get the message to their customers that it is in the NZ road code to pull over and let traffic pass. We need passing lanes on this road. You say that you don't have the money for this. You consulted us before, had public information stalls, brochures printed and so on. You wasted all this money, no wonder you are running out. Why do you consult the public if you do your own thing anyway. Having a speed limit of 80 and 60 km/h is too easy. We don't need specialists and well paid manager for such a decision. I am so frustrated.  7) 100 km/h is not too fast for modern vehicles. It is not the road, it is the bad driver. Being stuck behind a camper van going 65 km/h and not pulling over makes you frustrated and you overtake where you normally wouldn't. You should force the rental car/camper van companies to get the message to their customers that it is in the NZ road code to pull over and let traffic pass. We need passing lanes on this road. You say that you don't have the money for this. You consulted us before, had public information stalls, brochures printed and so on. You wasted all this money, no wonder you are running out. Why do you consult the public if you do your own thing anyway. Having a speed limit of 80 and 60 km/h is too easy. We don't need specialists and well paid manager for such a decision. I am so frustrated.  8) 100 km/h is not too fast for modern vehicles. It is not the road, it is the bad driver. Being stuck behind a camper van going 65 km/h and not pulling over makes you frustrated and you overtake where you normally wouldn't. You should force the rental car/camper van companies to get the message to their customers that it is in the NZ road code to pull over and let traffic pass. We need passing lanes on this road. You say that you don't have the money for this. You consulted us before, had public information stalls, brochures printed and so on. You wasted all this money, no wonder you are running out. Why do you consult the public if you do your own thing anyway. Having a speed limit of 80 and 60 km/h is too easy. We don't need specialists and well paid manager for such a decision. I am so frustrated.  9) 100 km/h is not too fast for modern vehicles. It is not the road, it is the bad driver. Being stuck behind a camper van going 65 km/h and not pulling over makes you frustrated and you overtake</p>



		wonder you are running out. Why do you consult the public if you do your own thing anyway. Having a speed limit of 80 and 60 km/h is too easy. We don't need specialists and well paid manager for such a decision. I am so frustrated.
181	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>4) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>5) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>7) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>8) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>9) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>10) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>11) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>13) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>14) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>15) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>16) Satisfied with this.</p> <p>17) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>18) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p> <p>19) Yes. Put more overtaking lanes in and pull off zones instead of reducing the speed zone. Accidents happen with frustrated drivers. Do NOT reduce the speed zone.</p>
182	Individual submitter	<p>1) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>4) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>5) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>7) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>8) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>9) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>10) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>11) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>13) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>14) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>15) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>16) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>17) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>18) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p> <p>19) Going to cause more people backed up getting frustrated and passing in dangerous areas. Truckies have already said they won't be letting traffic pass them so I'm looking forward to hearing about more crashes</p>
183	Individual submitter	<p>1) Straight road, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>4) Open road with few dangerous sections, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>5) Semi-residential area, 70 is an appropriate speed limit.</p>

		<p>7) Open road with few dangerous sections, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>8) Open road with few dangerous sections, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>9) Open road with few dangerous sections, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Open road with few dangerous sections, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>13) Open road, dangerous sections are well signed and road has been improved, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>14) Open road, dangerous sections are well signed, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>15) Open road, dangerous sections are well signed, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>16) Open road with few dangerous sections, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>17) Open road with few dangerous sections, no need for speed reduction.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) The area between Atawhai Cresc north and Trafalgar St is as built up as the rest of Atawhai. Therefore, the speed limit should be 70 km/hr.</p>
184	Individual submitter	<p>1) Straight piece of road. No change required. Impractical idea. Reduction in speed will cause more frustration and make drivers agitated. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 100kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>4) Absolutely ridiculous proposal. Very impractical. Main highway with long sweeping corners and straights. No need for reduction. lower limit will cause more frustration and agitation in drivers. Area does not include passing lanes to get by trucks/camper vans and other slower traffic which also adds to driver frustration that can cause bad decisions to be made. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 100kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>5) Acceptable</p> <p>7) Absolutely ridiculous proposal. Very impractical. Main highway with long sweeping corners and straights. No need for reduction. lower limit will cause more frustration and agitation in drivers. Area does not include passing lanes to get by trucks/camper vans and other slower traffic which also adds to driver frustration that can cause bad decisions to be made. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 100kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>8) Acceptable</p> <p>9) Absolutely ridiculous proposal. Very impractical. Main highway with long sweeping corners and straights. No need for reduction. lower limit will cause more frustration and agitation in drivers. Area does not include passing lanes to get by trucks/camper vans and other slower traffic which also adds to driver frustration that can cause bad decisions to be made. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 100kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>10) Acceptable</p> <p>11) Absolutely ridiculous proposal. Very impractical. Main highway with long sweeping corners and straights. No need for reduction. lower limit will cause more frustration and agitation in drivers. Area does not include passing lanes to get by trucks/camper vans and other slower traffic which also adds to driver frustration that can cause bad decisions to be made. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 100kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>13) Acceptable speed reduction proposal for the majority of this section of road. 80kmph zone should begin at start of hill incline though, not on flat sweeping section from Rai Valley to the incline. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>14) Acceptable &amp; practical to reduce speed limit through this section of road. Limit should be 80kmph or 70kmph though. 60kmph is too low for parts of this road that can be travelled safely above that.</p> <p>15) Mainly straight piece of road with several sweeping bends. No change required. Impractical idea. Reduction in speed will cause more frustration and make drivers agitated. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 100kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>16) Acceptable</p> <p>17) Absolutely ridiculous proposal. Very impractical. Main highway with long sweeping corners and straights. No need for reduction. lower limit will cause more frustration and agitation in drivers. Area does not include passing lanes to get by trucks/camper vans and other slower traffic which also adds to driver frustration that can cause bad decisions to be made. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 100kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>18) Absolutely ridiculous proposal. Very impractical. Main highway with long sweeping corners and straights. No need for reduction. lower limit will cause more frustration and agitation in drivers. Area does not include passing lanes to get by trucks/camper vans and other slower traffic which also adds to driver frustration that can cause bad decisions to be made. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 80kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p> <p>19) Absolutely ridiculous proposal. Very impractical. Main highway with long sweeping corners and straights. No need for reduction. lower limit will cause more frustration and agitation in drivers. Area does not include passing lanes to get by trucks/camper vans and other slower traffic which also adds to driver frustration that can cause bad decisions to be made. Road can be driven safely in both directions at 100kmph. Anyone who cannot safely drive this section of road at the current speed limit is not a competent driver.</p>
185	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p>

		<p>9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) This is good, however, there needs to be clear signage for school zone as it is not easy to slow down for with not enough notice  17) Yes, very good given this stretch of road and school bus drop off zone  18) This will only lead to frustration and unnecessary for this stretch of road.  19) This is a straight stretch of road, there is a cycle way and good car lanes. Reducing the speed limit here seems unnecessary and will lead to a lot of frustration</p>
186	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it at 100  4) Leave it at 100  5) Leave it at 100  7) Leave it at 100  8) Leave it at 100  9) Leave it at 100  10) Leave it at 100  11) Leave it at 100  13) Leave it at 100  14) Leave it at 100  15) Leave it at 100  16) Leave it at 100  17) Leave it at 100  18) Leave it at 100  19) Leave it at 100</p>
187	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) This is a very remote area with recent alignment work done - 100km/h in this section feels appropriate  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
188	Individual submitter	<p>1) Safer for all  4) Sound safety choice  5) A busy street with school children and old folk  7) High crash area. Positive move  8) Safety for all  9) No comment  10) Tourist area. High foot traffic  11) Number of farms.  13) No Comment  14) No Comment</p>

		<p>15) High use area  16) Tricky turn onto main rd from cable bay.  17) The turnoff to the Glen is dangerous. Little visibility turning in or out. Needs to be 60  18) High crash area  19) Close to built up areas</p>
189	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) The issue here is the lack of passing lanes, which means car drivers are forced to follow heavy trucks and slow campers leading to frustration and unwise passing.  5) I don't believe there are issues with the current 70km zone  7) Again the problem would be solved with a passing lane.  8) This is one of the few stretches of road where cars can safely pass slower vehicles - the school zone should be kept tightly contained so once traffic is past the school there is the option to pass at 100km.  9) This stretch should be left at 100km, there are opportunities for careful passing.  10) The natural shape of this stretch keeps speeds down so no need for any change.  11) No reason to change from 100kms, but a passing lane for Blenheim-bound traffic would be useful.  13) There is a good opportunity to pass slow-moving traffic here with good visibility so it would be detrimental to lower the speed zone.  14) The shape of the road serves to slow cars when necessary, and lowering the speed limit would take away opportunities for safe passing when heavy vehicles pull over.  15) There's a good safe passing opportunity here for cars wanting to move past heavy vehicles before the hill so it would be detrimental to reduce the speed limit  16) No issues here  17) The road is very wide and safe through here, no reason to lower speeds  18) No issues  19) Again a good safe road with clear visibility, no reason to lower speeds</p>
190	Individual submitter	<p>1) 100 is fine for that stretch of road  4) Leave it the way it is  5) Compromise, take it to 60  7) 100 is not to dangerous for that stretch of road  8) The school zone yes at 60 but the open road should remain at 100  9) Should stay the same  10) 100/60  11) Remain the same as before  13) Existing speed limit  14) Existing speed limit  15) Existing speed limit  16) 80/60 for school zone  17) Existing speed limit  18) Existing speed limit  19) Existing speed limit</p>
191	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's straight road so leave it at 100!  4) Mostly good road no need to reduce speed limit. Maybe look at more passing lanes.  5) Agree with this as there is housing.  7) No need, road relatively good.  8) This seems reasonable and agree with this.  9) Definitely NO. This is just going to lead to driver frustration. This is a good road.  10) Agree as Bridge is bottleneck and as camp site there so increased risk of accidents with pedestrians and vehicles turning for cafe and camp site  11) Leave it at 100.  13) Leave it alone. 100kms. Some good road. Maybe make advisory limits on acute bends mandatory may make drivers less impatient for cautious drivers.  14) Just make advisory limits on acute bends mandatory!  15) Agree traveling through village and since new development being proposed thus would be pro active for new traffic  16) Agree  17) Agree. More housing development has taken place so more traffic exiting onto highway.  18) 80 is ok. Multiple changes in speed limits only adds to confusion.</p>

		19) 100 is perfectly ok. Good straight road with turning bays. People already cause frustration by doing 80 along this stretch since no passing lanes. I can see these same people would then do 60 if reduced to 80. Its a perfectly good road but a passing lane would be good.
192	Individual submitter	<p>1) Use the road daily and it is straight with reservations in the middle of the road for drivers turning right. Few road junctions and they are safe. Perhaps add a central reservation for drivers waiting to turn right into Jackson's Road. Speed should stay at 100.</p> <p>4) Another straight piece of road. Not residential so current speed limit is safe. There is a cycle lane off road. So no risk to cyclists</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Reducing to 80 will frustrate drivers and cause them to take dangerous overtaking moves.</p> <p>8) Agree with reduced speed at school start finish time but this is a straight road with no side roads and no pedestrians whenever I have driven it. Speed should stay at 100</p> <p>9) This will be so frustrating for safe and careful drivers. They will end up tempted to make potentially dangerous overtaking moves. This stretch has straights with good visibility. Have no idea why you would think it needs to be only 80km. Only a foreign driver with a camper van would be happy at that speed</p> <p>10) This is 10km an hour more than in a busy town centre! On an open road, seriously. How about lots of signs to warn the tourists that there is a one way bridge coming up? Much better idea</p> <p>11) Yes, there a couple of bends but a sensible driver with a safe driving record will slow down for them. This does not mean they should be forced to travel 80km on the straight sections which have clear visibility.</p> <p>13) More passing lanes or more places for slow vehicles to pull over and signage to tell the uneducated that they should pull over if there is a big queue behind them . Slow speeds will only make drivers frustrated and they will make bad calls about overtaking</p> <p>14) 60 is ridiculous. There are so few cyclists that it out of proportion to claim reducing the speed for their benefit. The only time I had a near miss on this stretch was a bloody camper van cutting the corner on a bend. Dropping the speed limit would not prevent this. More passing lanes, slow vehicle lanes and signage to tell slow vehicles they should pull over will avoid driver frustrations</p> <p>15) 100 is safe. 99.9% of drivers do not have accidents at this speed unless they have been drinking, taking drugs or are on their phone. Why weren't we focusing on getting these drivers off the road rather than reducing speed limits for safe drivers?</p> <p>16) Yes. Agree with school zone reduced speed limit</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) 80 is fine. Never seen any bad driving due to speed or risks caused by driving at 80. There is a footpath for pedestrians and cycle track so no worries for them if we continue to drive at 80</p> <p>19) Cycle lane and footpath so 100 is fine. Very few side roads and safe place to wait whist turning right. Keep at 100</p>
193	Individual submitter	I would much prefer passing lanes on the steep, twisty sections of the highway over the Whagamoas, than reduce all speeds. I'm happy with reduced speeds in school zones. I would like to see much more drunk and drug testing and better quality driver education than blanket speed reduction. Poor and drunk/drugged drivers will continue to drive badly and ignore the rules regardless of the limits.
194	Individual submitter	<p>1) That lowering the speed limit will just annoy people and will have people doing more risky over taking. Leave it how it is.</p> <p>4) As stated above. Lots of people do not want this speed limit to change. Leave it how it is.</p> <p>5) Just leave the speed limit alone. It's fine the way it is. Leave it how it is.</p> <p>7) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>8) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>9) Leave it how it is</p> <p>10) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>11) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>13) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>14) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>15) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>16) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>17) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>18) Leave it how it is.</p> <p>19) Leave it how it is.</p>
195	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p>

		<p>14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) Driver education more important than lowering limits. Revenue making for police. High statistics at moment comes down to bad luck and random numbers of people in vehicles at time. Am sure lots of accidents in those areas are not on 100k stretches anyway. People need to be educated about how to overtake safely, pull over appropriately, merge correctly etc rather than penalising everyone with a nanny state approach.</p>
196	Individual submitter	<p>1) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  4) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  5) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  7) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  8) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  9) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  10) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  11) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  13) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  14) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  15) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  16) This is ok.  17) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  18) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.  19) Driving habits need to be looked at firstly. The driving age should be raised to 18years and a full licence not issued until the age of 20 years.</p>
197	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree to the reduction to 80km per hour. No other factors should be considered.  4) I agree to the new proposed speed limit of 80km ph. No other factors to be considered.  5) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 50km. No other factors need to be considered.  7) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 80km. No other factors need to be considered.  8) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 80km ph, with a 60 variable school zone. No other factors need to be considered.  9) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 80km ph. No other factors need to be considered.  10) I agreed with the proposed new speed limit of 60km per hour. No other factors need to be considered.  11) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 80km. No other factors need to be taken into consideration.  13) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 80km. No other factors should be considered.  14) I agree with the new proposed speed of 60km. No other factors need to be taken into consideration.  15) I agree with the new proposed speed limit of 80km. No other factors need to be taken into consideration.  16) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 80km with a variable school zone. No other factors need to be taken into consideration.  17) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 80km. No other factors need to be taken into consideration.  18) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 60km. No other factors need to be taken into consideration.  19) I agree with the new proposed speed limit of 80km. No other factors need to be taken into consideration.</p>
198	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) Yes. I travel this fairly frequently and cars that travel down this road get very frustrated at a slower speed. People who drive 80 already are causing more dangerous driving by driving slow, as other drivers who know the long fairly easy driving roads are getti no so frustrated they make poor decisions. By lowering the speed this would more likely increase car accidents from more overtaking and frustrated drivers. I strongly don't believe it would benefit anyone to reduce this but that it would in actuality cause more collisions and dangerous driving.  5) No Comment  7) Again this would frustrate drivers who frequent this road and cause many poor decisions and increase incidence of accidents rather than reduce it. It has too many long straights that are more than safe to drive at 100kph  8) No Comment  9) This stretch of road is another area we see a lot of dangerous driving on with people getting frustrated with slow drivers. Reducing the limit to 80 would fuel the fire rather than reduce poor decisions and I would expect more people would speed, overtake in unsafe places and put other motorists at risk! This is a poor idea in my opinion and would concern me for my safety more driving this road if the speed was reduced.  10) I would think 60-70 would be ok</p>

		<p>11) No this stretch of road can be driven safely at 100. I believe again from witnessing many times people will overtake in poor places and get frustrated if it was slowed. There would most likely be more speeding and more accidents.</p> <p>13) This is a major road where car accidents are waiting to happen from frustrated drivers overtaking on corners after being stuck behind slower (around 80) cars. The 100 limit should definitely stay or I would expect a large increase in crashes with drivers wanting to pass slow vehicles and speed. This would be a dangerous piece of road to reduce the speed on as I have personally witnessed dozens of cars - at least 1 per day and up to 3 some days performing a dangerous overtake due to being held up. The crashes seem to lately have been more to do with sleepy drivers, excessive speed over the limit and poor driving. I don't believe it is due to the stretch of road being too high a speed limit.</p> <p>14) God no! The driving here is horrific. Reducing to 60 in my opinion is asking for trouble. It is a road that some prefer to take slower and some take at the 100k but there are many pull over spots for cars wanting to drive slow and let others pass. A better solution would be signs telling slow drivers to let others past. The slow drivers that do not use the pull over bays are the single most dangerous thing on the hill and I have witnessed many many near misses due to someone not pulling over to let drivers past and drivers getting fed up and overtaking on blind corners and getting angry. This impairs their driving massively. If it was to be reduced at all maximum would be to 80k. Biggest suggestion I have is signs instructing slow cars to let others pass.</p> <p>15) No reason to change this speed limit</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Again a stretch of road with long straights and easy driving. 100 is how it should stay. 80 would aggravate drivers I believe.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
199	Individual submitter	<p>1) Driver education, boredom while driving more likely to check phones fiddle with the radio if not concentrating on the road.</p> <p>4) As above in question 1</p> <p>5) Seems reasonable as it is a built up area.</p> <p>7) Too many differing speeds causes confusion. No reason why a competent driver can not drive at 100 km on this stretch of road. Passing bays help stop frustration and poor passing decisions.</p> <p>8) As with my previous comment. Too many differing speeds just confuses motorists</p> <p>9) Again a competent driver can drive this section at 100 km. Look at educating drivers. Stop blaming the road or speed. It's driver decisions that are causing crashes.</p> <p>10) During the summer and daylight hours this would be reasonable. As more traffic and people on foot in this area.</p> <p>11) Again a competent driver can manage 100 km/ hr without endangering the self or others.</p> <p>13) Apart from the very dangerous new corner created with a few million dollars in last couple of years on the Rai saddle, this piece of road has areas where 100 km/ hr is quiet reasonable. Passing lane would help past all the windy areas.</p> <p>14) The Whangamoia hill restricts your speed naturally, stop drivers cutting corners. Even done slowly this is dangerous</p> <p>15) As comments above, give drivers some credit and let them use their own initiative. Stop treating us as idiots.</p> <p>16) Leave as is, stop trying to control people</p> <p>17) Leave this as is. No real need for this to be changed</p> <p>18) As above</p> <p>19) As above</p>
200	CAWTHRON INSTITUTE	<p>Re: SH6 Blenheim to Nelson – Proposal 17</p> <p>Cawthron Institute, New Zealand's largest independent science organisation, based in Nelson, operates the Cawthron Aquaculture Park (CAP) at Glen Road, Glenduan, just north of Nelson. We operate this in partnership with Sanford Ltd, Moana NZ, and the Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology. Cawthron, along with our partners, holds serious concerns about the safety of the intersection at SH6 and the Glen Road. The CAP facility routinely has over 100 people working on site with many visitors also coming and going during the day. Cawthron has previously raised concerns about the intersection of SH6 and Glen Road and sought to make representations to address what we believe are serious road engineering issues with the SH6 corner, which makes turning right out of Glen Road towards Nelson exceptionally dangerous. The recent death of a cyclist on that corner (April 2019) highlights some of the issues we believe exist.</p> <p>We understand from engagement with NZTA that the proposed speed reductions for Proposal 17 (45m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira to 440m north east of Allisdair St, Atawhai) from 100 to 80km/h should assist in addressing the safety concerns we have raised.</p> <p>On the basis of this understanding, Cawthron Institute strongly supports the proposed speed reduction for this section of road and seeks immediate implementation.</p> <p>Additionally, Cawthron Institute will be writing to the NZTA Safety Manager to raise our concerns around the intersection. We will also be offering to help fund "SLOW DOWN" signage, which we understand costs approximately \$30,000, if this can assist in improving safety at this intersection immediately.</p> <p>Copies of previous correspondence with NZTA on this issue are attached.</p>
201	Individual submitter	<p>1) no</p> <p>4) no</p> <p>5) no</p> <p>7) no</p> <p>8) no</p> <p>9) no</p>

		<p>10) AS a frequent road user in this area I support this change</p> <p>11) As a frequent user of this road I believe that 100kmh should be retained on long straights.</p> <p>13) As a frequent user of this road I believe that 100kmh should be retained on long straights.</p> <p>14) As a frequent user of this road I believe that 100kmh should be retained on long straights.</p> <p>15) As a frequent user of this road I believe that 100kmh should be retained on long straights.</p> <p>16) AS a frequent user of this road I agree with this proposed change</p> <p>17) As a frequent user of this road I believe that 100kmh should be retained on long straights.</p> <p>18) AS a frequent user of this road I agree with this proposed change</p> <p>19) AS a frequent user of this road I agree with this proposed change</p>
202	Individual submitter	<p>1) I feel this stretch of road is safe having only one intersection along it, as long as there is enough turning bay room, i cant see why this stretch needs to be reduced to 80km/hr</p> <p>4) Through this whole section of road there is no piece that cannot be navigated safely at 100km/hr and I have done so over 400 times in the last 10years, if the time and money that this review has cost was put into more pull over bays and passing lanes there would be less frustration with drivers not being able to get past slow vehicles on this stretch of road</p> <p>5) This is probably realistic since the development of areas around this section of havelock. why not make the whole stretch 60km/hr</p> <p>7) Through this whole section of road there is no piece that cannot be navigated safely at 100km/hr and I have done so over 400 times in the last 10years, if the time and money that this review has cost was put into more pull over bays and passing lanes there would be less frustration with drivers not being able to get past slow vehicles on this stretch of road</p> <p>8) I understand the need for increased safety around the schools however, through this whole section of road there is no piece that cannot be navigated safely at 100km/hr and I have done so over 400 times in the last 10years, if the time and money that this review has cost was put into more pull over bays and passing lanes there would be less frustration with drivers not being able to get past slow vehicles on this stretch of road</p> <p>9) Through this whole section of road there is no piece that cannot be navigated safely at 100km/hr and I have done so over 400 times in the last 10years, if the time and money that this review has cost was put into more pull over bays and passing lanes there would be less frustration with drivers not being able to get past slow vehicles on this stretch of road</p> <p>10) I think this is a wise idea basically cant go much faster anyway and during summer season is quite busy</p> <p>11) Through this whole section of road there is not many places that cannot be navigated safely at 100km/hr and I have done so over 400 times in the last 10years, if the time and money that this review has cost was put into more pull over bays and passing lanes there would be less frustration with drivers not being able to get past slow vehicles on this stretch of road</p> <p>13) This section of road is appalling and shows the lack of planning by NZTA, having shortened the two of the three passing lanes that there are, and putting no more in, and not enough decent length pull over bays which all need ample warning prior. I think from 1km north of Opori road to 800m east of Kokorua road should be 80km, however from that point to 770m north east of the saddle summit should be left at 100km. A pull over bay each way on serpentine straight would be a vast improvement as well</p> <p>14) This section of road you basically cant go any faster than 60km anyway so basically all you are doing is putting signs up for the people without common sense! a few more sign posted slow bays or pull over bays would be great - seems only drivers that know the road know where to pull over - others need telling.</p> <p>15) No real reason that this needs to be 80km/hr, hardly any driveways or side roads to be worried about?</p> <p>16) agree the school zone could be added</p> <p>17) Through this whole section of road there is not much that cannot be navigated safely at 100km/hr and I have done so over 400 times in the last 10years, if the time and money that this review has cost was put into more realignment of a couple of corners nearer to Atawhai, this would be a fine piece of road</p> <p>18) why the change? Is this to increase the revenue from the speed camera that sits there? apart from the area of the school which has pull off bays anyway, i cant see this being a safety requirement.</p> <p>19) This is probably a reality as development has increased, however need to re-instate the passing lane/slow bay heading to Nelson that was removed</p>
203	Individual submitter	<p>1) why</p> <p>4) there is nothing wrong with the road. get rid of freedom campers would be better</p> <p>5) nothing wrong with how it is</p> <p>7) there is nothing wrong with the road. passing lanes would improve it</p> <p>8) nothing wrong with how it is</p> <p>9) nothing wrong with how it is put in more passing lanes</p> <p>10) works well how it is</p> <p>11) works well as is. getting rid of over seas tourist from driving on our roads they are the biggest hazard</p> <p>13) keep as is works very well. more passing lanes and less foreign drivers would make it better</p> <p>14) leave as is it works</p> <p>15) works well as is</p> <p>16) works as is</p> <p>17) nothing wrong with how it is</p> <p>18) nothing wrong with how it is</p> <p>19) works well how it is</p>

204	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) should stay at 100km</li> <li>4) should stay at 100km</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) should stay at 100km</li> <li>8) should stay at 100km with a variable school zone</li> <li>9) should stay at 100km</li> <li>10) No Comment</li> <li>11) should stay at 100km</li> <li>13) should stay at 100km</li> <li>14) should stay at 100km</li> <li>15) should stay at 100km</li> <li>16) should stay at 100km</li> <li>17) should stay at 100km</li> <li>18) should stay at 80km</li> <li>19) No Comment</li> </ul>
205	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>4) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>5) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>7) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>8) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>9) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>10) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>11) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>13) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>14) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>15) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>16) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>17) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>18) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> <li>19) Agree with slowing speed in built up area or town but not in the large sections of road between towns. I travel for work and some days you don't see any other traffic on the road.</li> </ul>
206	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) Overall, this stretch of road is probably the straightest part of the journey between Nelson and Blenheim. Does it need changing? Not in my opinion!! 100km is adequate.</li> <li>5) Not against the change of speed through Havelock.</li> <li>7) Another stretch of road that I dont believe needs changing, however, the condition of road worries me. Have travelled this road alot over the past 10 years and when there is alot of rain and flooding there has been terrible patches where aqua planning occurs dues to uneven roading and lack of drainage.</li> <li>8) Not opposed to changing speeds near schools or communities.</li> <li>9) Road is fine as is.</li> <li>10) Pelorus can be a busy tourist spot, not against speed reduction through the small area nearing the bridge.</li> <li>11) Keep as is. 100 is adequate.</li> <li>13) No need to change! Yes, in the winter it can be icy etc but competent and aware drivers drive to the conditions. Incompetent drivers need more more passing bays if they cant manage the 100kms. Holding up lines of traffic is causing stress and radical passing that cause accidents.</li> <li>14) NO BLOODY WAY ARE YOU CHANGING TO 60KM PER HOUR!!!! WHAT DIP SHIT IN THEIR RIGHT MIND WOULD CHANGE TO 60KM???</li> <li>15) Again, just stupid.</li> <li>16) Not opposed to change round townships/communities especially with the Cable Bay intersection.</li> <li>17) 100 is fine.</li> <li>18) 80 is fine.</li> <li>19) Not opposed to this change.</li> </ul>
207	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) No Comment</li> <li>5) Logging trucks, campervans, cyclists, motorbikes, cars towing boats in high numbers, next to pedestrians on the footpath makes walking alongside the road safer if the speed is reduced.</li> </ul>

		<p>7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) Summer time traffic is increased over many months, not just Dec/Jan  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) For inexperienced drivers and visitors sharp bends of this road require caution  15) No Comment  16) Traffic from nearby properties leaving and entering the main traffic flow  17) The traffic in this area often includes cyclists, cars with trailers, motorcycles etc. Drivers take wide sweeping bends at hugely different speeds.  18) There are several streets which intersect with the main highway in this area. For visitors especially there is very little time to slow down and prepare to make a turn.  19) a lower speed when preparing to enter the roundabout gives the driver more time to adjust</p>
208	Individual submitter	How ridiculous. Keep them as they are plz
209	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) Although not completely familiar with this stretch of road we would suggest that where there is a passing lane 100km be allowed. Campervans and trucks will cause traffic congestion if passing is not enabled.  8) No Comment  9) Although not completely familiar with this stretch of road we would suggest that where there is a passing lane 100km be allowed. Campervans and trucks will cause traffic congestion if passing is not enabled.  10) No Comment  11) Although not completely familiar with this stretch of road we would suggest that where there is a passing lane 100km be allowed. Campervans and trucks will cause traffic congestion if passing is not enabled.  13) Although not completely familiar with this stretch of road we would suggest that where there is a passing lane 100km be allowed. Campervans and trucks will cause traffic congestion if passing is not enabled.  14) Fully in support of this.  15) Fully in support of this.  16) Fully in support of this.  17) Fully in support of this  18) Fully in support of this  19) Fully in support of this. In fact have made formal submissions to this end at least twice in the past with the NZTA. Would also suggest a quieter seal on the road.</p>
210	Individual submitter	<p>Assumably NZTA just spent many millions on the Rai Saddle realignment for seemingly, little benefit , as the road is not substantially changed or improved. Now, a few short months later you advise you wish to lower the speed limit to make it safer because 19 people lost their lives over the the previous 9 years. Approximately 2 deaths per year which is always sad, but please, what about the tens of thousands that travel that stretch of road daily, weekly, yearly and arrive safely at the end of their journey. Spending millions to make a road safer, to then suggest it isn't safe at the current limit, defies all logic.  Reducing the speed limit will cause frustration, needless risky overtaking and sadly, more accidents.  I personally do not travel this road often but when I do, I have never experienced bad driving other than slow inconsiderate drivers who cannot see in their rear vision mirror.  Why can we not have more signage advising pulling over if holding up traffic or the likes. Between Picton, Blenheim to Christchurch and Blenheim to Nelson, nothing other than drink driving messages.  Lastly I agree with speed limits for Canvastown, Rai Valley and the likes but please consider that some drivers are just not competent to drive, let alone on winding, hilly sections of our highways. You cannot legislate for the small minority of incompetent drivers against the majority of safe law abiding everyday drivers.  Please give my submission some serious consideration as I believe, in talking with others, that these thoughts are those of the majority of Marlborough people.  Thank you for your time</p>
211	Individual submitter	[no comment]
212	Individual submitter	<p>1) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  4) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p>

		<p>5) Existing speed limit (km/h): 70  7) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  8) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  9) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  10) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100/50 in Dec/Jan  11) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  13) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  14) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  15) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  16) Proposed new speed limit (km/h): 80 with a variable school zone  17) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100  18) Existing speed limit (km/h): 80  19) Existing speed limit (km/h): 100</p>
213	Individual submitter	<p>1) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  4) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  5) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  7) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  8) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  9) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  10) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  11) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  13) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  14) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  15) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  16) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  17) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  18) dropping speed limit won't make it safer  19) dropping speed limit won't make it safer</p>
214	Individual submitter	<p>I wish to submit on the proposal to reduce the speed limit from Blenheim to Nelson to 80 kmh. While it may be reasonable to reduce the speed from Rai to Hira, the rest of the road has long straights and there are very few places where it is not possible to drive safely at 100 kmh.  A speed limit of 80 kmh would result in drivers becoming frustrated and so more likely to cause an accident. We have just been to Central Australia, and there we were told how the speed on the road from Adelaide to Darwin had been reduced to 100 kmh but it was found that this resulted in more accidents due to frustration, and so the speed limit was increased to 120 kmh.  I notice in the report in the Nelson Mail that Mr Harland noted that in the last week there had been two fatalities on the road. This comment does not support the argument for reducing the speed limit. The Whangamoia Saddle fatality was a suicide, and the Rai Valley one was not even on State Highway 6. Therefore, neither of these fatalities would have been avoided if the speed limit was 80 kmh.  Finally, I submit that the current speed limit of 100 kmh should not be reduced.</p>
215	Individual submitter	<p>1) leave at 100k. It is not the speed limit which is the problem is is drivers, an altered speed limit will not change that. This answer applies to subsequent questions  4) leave at 100k  5) leave at 100k  7) leave at 100k  8) leave at 100k  9) leave at 100k  10) leave at 100k  11) leave at 100k  13) leave at 100k  14) leave at 100k  15) leave at 100k  16) leave at 100k  17) leave at 100k</p>

		18) leave at 100k 19) leave at 100k
216	Individual submitter	<p>Re the above, I want to put in a BIG TOTAL AGAINST THE REDUCTION IN SPEED LIMIT FOR THE TOTAL LENGTH OF THIS ROAD.</p> <p>When are people going to STOP MAKING CHANGES TO ALL FACETS OF SOCIETY BASED ON THE MINORITY which is exactly you people are proposing to do.</p> <p>The numbers of deaths on this road in my opinion does not warrant the total over reaction to change the total speed limit.</p> <p>I don't recall seeing the detail of what caused these accidents which would be interesting because I am thinking a number were not totally speed related.</p> <p>The theory, speeding reduces deaths is fine but what is not said is these accidents at a lower speed MAY and only may save lives.</p> <p>As regards this road like most if driven to the speed limits and to road condition there is no major problems, and both of those issues are something only the driver can control, no law change will make any difference, other than a death verses a partial disabled person.</p> <p>I question who ever is in charge to make changes do they really drive the road themselves and regularly, I guess not.</p> <p>YES I agree some Speed reductions would be helpful, (look at the speed reduction in Rai Valley positive move also this applies at Hira) CANVASTOWN from school to after township turn off maybe 60ks, take confusion out of speed limits around Atawai too many changes maybe 60ks either side of Clifton Tce school then 80ks for the rest. The speeds through Havelock, Renwick and Woodbourne seem to be correct. There could be some changes coming into Blenheim.</p> <p>ROAD ALIGNMENT, I personally think the millions \$\$\$\$ spent in Nelson of Rai Saddle was poorly spent still left a sharpish curve in the middle then passing lanes only go so far and there is plenty of room over the top to have passing lanes each way.</p> <p>So what you have now is vehicles not sure whether to pull over and other vehicles not sure if they are allowed to pass lots of confusing painted lines, all it needs a reworking of this area to make it a safe passing area.</p> <p>PASSING LANES this has been issue with this road for years and nothing has ever been done in stead of wasting money on changing speed limits put the money into passing lanes and achieve something POSITIVE.</p>
217	Individual submitter	<p>1) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>4) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>5) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users. That section of road sees plenty of cyclists entering from Queen Charlotte Dr.</p> <p>7) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>8) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>9) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>10) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>11) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>13) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>14) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>15) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>16) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>17) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>18) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p> <p>19) I fully agree with a speed reduction in this area. The slight reduction in travel time is worth its weight in reducing the rate of fatalities and serious injuries to road users.</p>
218	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight and wide piece of road. 100km is OK</p> <p>4) 80km is too slow around here. Better to put double yellow lines on most corners so that vehicles cannot overtake</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) 80km is too slow. Please put double yellow lines where cars should not overtake and keep the speed at 100km/h</p> <p>8) 80km is too slow. Please put double yellow lines where cars should not overtake and keep the speed at 100km/h</p> <p>9) Leave the speed at 100 and paint more double yellow lines.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This part of the road is OK for 100km/h. Leave the speed at 100 and paint more double yellow lines.</p> <p>13) Some of the straight parts are OK at 100km/h. Just be sensible and PAINT MORE DOUBLE YELLOW NO PASSING LINES</p> <p>14) PAINT DOUBLE YELLOW NO PASSING LINES SO THAT VEHICLES TRAVELLING TO BLENHEIM CAN'T USE THE PASSING LANES THAT BELONG TO THOSE TRAVELLING TO NELSON. Its absolutely crazy that there are safe passing lanes for cars in one direction but certainly not safe for the other direction. Many times I am driving to Blenheim that cars will overtake downhill on those Whangamoia passing lanes.</p> <p>15) OK</p> <p>16) OK</p> <p>17) The Cable Bay turnoff is an accident waiting to happen. Slow the cars down, put the road cones out, get a few 20 Ton diggers and start digging!</p>

		<p>18) 80 is OK, 60 too slow</p> <p>19) Please leave it at 100</p>
<b>219</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>4) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>5) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>7) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>8) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>9) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>10) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>11) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>13) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>14) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>15) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>16) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>17) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>18) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p> <p>19) Just leave it alone. You are creating more issues than solving them. Slower and stubborn drivers dont pull over and create frustrated, aggressive and bad decisions that cause these accidents you speak of.</p>
<b>220</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>4) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>5) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>7) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>8) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>9) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>10) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>11) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>13) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>14) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>15) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>16) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>17) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>18) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p> <p>19) Driver education not speed reduction. People will drive 60 to 70 not 80 and cause frustration and more accidents leave it 100</p>
<b>221</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>4) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous</p>

		<p>passing and fatigue.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>8) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>9) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>10) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>11) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>13) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>14) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>15) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) This is a totally unreasonable and unnecessary hassle for drivers. People should drive to road conditions and not be patronized by overly cautious speed reductions that encourage dangerous passing and fatigue.</p>
222	Individual submitter	<p>I disagree with some of your proposals because it is not necessary for you to keep trending towards a bigger NANNY state than we already have. I am a fully licenced driver that should have the legal right to operate my vehicle in a responsible manner - which I do, and not be penalised by other idiots on the road who do not know how to drive to the conditions.</p> <p>Examples of where the road is not to blame for the accidents that are happening: 1. A teenager that drives down the Whangamoia Saddle Summit at 170kph and smashes in to a boulder is not an accident THAT IS SUICIDE. That has nothing to do with the road.</p> <p>2. A tourist who crosses the Centre line between Pelorus Bridge and Rai Valley and kills them self and does DETRIMENTAL DAMAGE to a lovely local person is not an accident. They should not have been driving in New Zealand AT ALL They should have been on a bus and until drivers who are not used to driving on the left hand side of the road are stopped from driving this will continue. Tis has noting to do with the road - this is purely driver error.</p> <p>- this is purely driver error.</p> <p>3. A drunk and drugged driver returning home from a three day wake, falling asleep and driving into the path of a delivery truck at Okaramio is not an accident. That is pure ignorance and complete disrespect for all road users at the time that they chose to drive under the influence. This has nothing to do with the road. Other suggestions/comments for changes: The Electronic School Zone Signs are a good idea, but, they need to be programmed correctly. Only have them programmed during the school terms when children are present and not during the school holidays. This should not be a difficult task given today's modern technology.</p> <p>Where are all the signs for "slow traffic to pull over and let traffic pass them", between Blenheim and Nelson like the road is full of them between Murchison and Christchurch?</p> <p>ALL rental car and motorhome companies should have to tell their customers to pull over and let traffic past whenever they have any traffic behind them. I have paid taxes all my life for the right to use the roads in my country for what they have been designed for, not sit behind people who have paid no taxes and don't know how to drive in our country.</p> <p>Tourists who only drive on the right hand side of the road in their home country should not be allowed to drive in New Zealand. They should be on buses. They are so unsafe and slow and cause too many accidents. Many of them do not know how to drive on rural or country roads.</p> <p>Reducing Speed limits may or may not prevent accidents. It could cause more accidents and then what will you change next? What will be left to change? Here is my feedback on your 19 proposals: 1. Disagree - why can 90kmh not be trialed first. 2. Agree 3. Agree 4. Strongly Disagree -There is no need for this length of road to be 80kph. Any modern vehicle can be put on Cruise Control for this whole piece of highway and never have to slow down or brake. This means that a competent licensed driver should be able to do the same. 80kph is just ridiculous. 5. Agree 6. Agree. 7. Strongly Disagree -There is no need for this length of road to be 80kph. Again, any modern vehicle can be put on Cruise Control for this whole piece of highway and never have to slow down or brake. 80kph is ridiculous. 8. Agree -Also the Police could enforce the Double Yellow no overtaking Lines to make this very short stretch of road safer. They would get six months quota of tickets in five days. 9. Strongly Disagree -There is no need for this length of road to be 80kph. There are ample straight pieces of road for doing 100kph and for overtaking. 80kph is ridiculous. 10. Agree</p> <p>11 Disagree - 100kph is safe but would agree with a trial of 90kph because of the other unsafe drivers on this road.</p>

		<p>12 Agree</p> <p>13 Disagree - 100kph is safe but would agree with a trial of 90kph because of the other unsafe drivers on this road from the beginning of the Rai Saddle.</p> <p>14 Disagree -70kph should be trailed first.</p> <p>15 Disagree -90kph should be trialed first.</p> <p>16 Agree 17 Disagree -90kph should be trialed first. 18 Disagree -70kph should be trialed first. 19 Disagree -90kph should be trialed first.</p>
223	Ct equine training	<p>1) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>4) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>5) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>7) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>8) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>9) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>10) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>11) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>13) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>14) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>15) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>16) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>17) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>18) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p> <p>19) It's tourists an people who think they know the road an speeding an doing dangerous man maneuvers that are the problem. I tow a loaded horse float often to nelson an back an on 1 occasion I just about took out 3 motorbikes in 1 day doing stupid things.</p>
224	Individual submitter	<p>1) n</p> <p>4) n</p> <p>5) n</p> <p>7) This is a good road leave as 100km</p> <p>8) This is a good proposal</p> <p>9) Should stay at 100km untill Totara flat is a good road</p> <p>10) Good idea</p> <p>11) This is a good road stay at 100km</p> <p>13) Good road stay as is</p> <p>14) 80km an hour would be fine</p> <p>15) this road is good stay at 100km</p> <p>16) Good idea</p> <p>17) Good road stay 100km</p>

		18) keep at 80 19) keep same good safe road
225	Individual submitter	I agree with proposed change from Saveane St to Jacksons Road. I disagree with all the other proposals. Given that heavy trucks use this route, safe passing is essential and reduced speed will adversely affect this. Inability to pass slow, laden trucks will increase frustration which in itself will lead to accidents. More policing of current speed restrictions would help.
226	Individual submitter	1) Not to change it because it will anger people for no reason 4) Yes just improve the road don't slow down the movement of people in Nz any slower 5) No need to change it 7) No need to change it 8) No need to change it it's fine 9) No need to change it 10) No need to change it 11) No need to change it 13) No need to change it 14) No need to change it 15) No need to change it 16) No need to change it 17) No need to change it 18) No need to change it 19) No need to change it
227	Individual submitter	Firstly your checkbox "submit your feedback online " does not work. It takes you to a survey page which is nonexistent. Secondly a blanket reduction to 80kmh between Nelson and Blenheim is complete overkill. I travel the road frequently and it is perfectly safe with a 100km limit and people who drive to the conditions. The road has been built with very few passing lanes which is a cheap way out. This is a cheapskate way of trying to reduce the road toll and will only lead to more frustration on the road. I have been in a queue of 13 cars behind a slow driving truck who refused to pull over which is bad driving and creates annoyance. If slow drivers pulled over to let people pass and there were more overtaking lanes as per CHCH and Ashburton there would be very little problem.
228	Individual submitter	1) leave at current speed (100kph) 4) leave at current speed (100) 5) leave at current speed (70) 7) leave at current speed (100) 8) leave at current speed (100) 9) leave at current speed (100) 10) leave at current speed(100/50) 11) leave at current speed (100) 13) leave at current speed (100) 14) leave at current speed (100) 15) leave at current speed (100) 16) leave at current speed (80) 17) leave at current speed (100) 18) leave at current speed (80) 19) leave at current speed (100)
229	Hira School Bus Driver	Electronic variable school zone signs are not turned on reliably e.g Hira School. 18 Allisdair Street to Atawhai Cres north should remain 80kph.
230	Individual submitter	I have just come back from the long weekend during which I biked on the Blenheim to Havelock section of this route. I'd just like to put my voice behind that of other cyclists who have no doubt also noted that reducing speed from 100 to 80 is a great idea and helps make us feel safer on the road. It can be quite nerve wracking biking around a corner on a State Highway where there is little verge and hearing a car approaching from behind that you know won't see you until they reach the corner. If they are going slower, they have more time to react to your presence and (hopefully) pass you safely. A slower speed just generally gives car drivers more time to react to their mistakes, and those of others, or general unexpected road conditions.  I also think it's great to reduce the speed limit prior to reaching Queen Charlotte drive as there are now a significant number of cars and bikes who use that route, so it's a fairly major intersection, at which slow speeds will reduce accidents.

		<p>Next year I will also be biking on the route from Havelock to Pelorus Bridge as part of Tour Aotearoa, along with approximately 1000 other cyclists between February and April. It would be great if these reduced speed limits were already in place by then.</p> <p>I appreciate that car drivers may be frustrated by the lower speed limits, however this seems to me to be something that people will quickly get used to, as they do in other countries, and when speed limits are dropped within suburbs of cities. I'd like to think that car drivers don't really think that their 10 minute shorter trip to Nelson is worth risking my life, or that of any other road user (whether they be in cars, on bikes or any other mode of transport) for...</p> <p>As a general question for NZTA (or MOT) outside of this consultation... when are you going to bring in safe passing laws? 1.5 metre minimum passing distance for people on bikes is the law in many other countries and I know those of us who bike on the roads regularly would like to see this introduced in NZ</p>
231	Individual submitter	<p>1) It also needs a roundabout at the airport. Sunstrike is a major issue in winter and I have to head towards Renwick and then make a u turn as it's too dangerous to turn towards Blenheim in the mornings with the sun.</p> <p>4) Just do it. The road is dangerous</p> <p>5) Just do it. The road is dangerous</p> <p>7) Just do it. The road is dangerous</p> <p>8) Just do it. The road is dangerous</p> <p>9) Just do it. The road is dangerous</p> <p>10) Just do it. The road is dangerous</p> <p>11) Should be 60 kms or less near any of the schools on route</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) This is pretty residential. Are you sure that 8kms is slow enough? Lots of bikes use this stretch.</p> <p>19) Lots of bikes use this. Is 60kms better? I find it interesting that a lot of people have so much confidence in their abilities and blame everyone else for accidents. The road is really bad all the way with big trucks, tourists and bikes. Stick to your guns and do the right thing and slow things down. Nine extra minutes is worth it to save one life let alone the huge number that are dying on that road.</p>
232	Individual submitter	<p>1) Improvement Safety, smoother traffic flow, reduced fuel consumption, reduced noise print This is a no brainer , please reduce speed as proposed Switzerland has adopted an 80 km/ speed limit nationwide some years ago, except Motorway It's blessing</p> <p>4) My comments apply to all the proposed speed limits I support all the proposals</p> <p>5) See above</p> <p>7) See above</p> <p>8) See above</p> <p>9) See above</p> <p>10) See above</p> <p>11) See above, In support of all proposals</p> <p>13) Yes please see above</p> <p>14) In support</p> <p>15) In support</p> <p>16) Yes please See above</p> <p>17) Yes please As commented first</p> <p>18) Yes please</p> <p>19) Yes please Can't wait for that, using it everyday See first comments</p>
233	Individual submitter	<p>1) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road.</p> <p>4) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road.</p> <p>5) I would be ok with this change.</p> <p>7) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road.</p> <p>8) I think for safety, this change would be a good thing.</p> <p>9) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road.</p>

		<p>10) I think 60kph is a fair speed limit for this stretch of road.</p> <p>11) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road.</p> <p>13) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road.</p> <p>14) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road. Most people also know when to slow down for corners and weather condition etc.</p> <p>15) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road. Most people also know when to slow down for corners and weather conditions etc when needed.</p> <p>16) No problem with this section changing to above.</p> <p>17) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road.</p> <p>18) 80 kph seems to work fine here...</p> <p>19) This road is fine at 100kph. Normal drivers that have passed their drivers licence should be comfortable at 100kph on this stretch of road.</p>
234	Individual submitter	<p>1) no</p> <p>4) no</p> <p>5) no</p> <p>7) no</p> <p>8) no</p> <p>9) no</p> <p>10) no</p> <p>11) no</p> <p>13) no</p> <p>14) no</p> <p>15) no</p> <p>16) no</p> <p>17) no</p> <p>18) no</p> <p>19) no</p>
235	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave as is</p> <p>4) Leave as is</p> <p>5) Leave as is</p> <p>7) Leave as is</p> <p>8) Leave as is</p> <p>9) Leave as is</p> <p>10) Leave as is</p> <p>11) Leave as is</p> <p>13) Leave as is</p> <p>14) Leave as is</p> <p>15) Leave as is</p> <p>16) Leave as is</p> <p>17) Leave as is</p> <p>18) Leave as it is</p> <p>19) Leaves is</p>
236	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p>

		<p>14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) Over the years I have made and supported many submissions regarding the stretch of SH6 between Allisdair Street, Marybank and Trafalgar Street. It was some satisfaction when the Marybank area was reduced to 80km/hr. but I'm overwhelmed with the idea that this stretch might be further reduced to 60km/hr. and the remainder to 80 - fantastic if it happens. In reality, 100km/hr from Allisdair to Trafalgar Street saves less than one minute in travel times compared with 80km/hr. Having noticed a number of traffic measuring strips in the recent past, I imagine statistics will show a marked increase in traffic flows emanating from the suburban distributor roads in the district. Having lived in the area for 35 years I am aware of the increase in population, and inevitably traffic volumes. In my particular case, exiting from Marybank Road is a nightmare - limited visibility to the right and a converging acceleration lane, with double central road markings, plus numerous private driveways are a recipe for serious accidents - amazing there are in fact so few. It was not so long ago that a huge public support for reducing the speed limit of this section was voiced but this seems to have been ignored - why? I sincerely hope this time around it will not be and we can once again not be harassed by impatient drivers eager to save a few seconds in their current journey at the risk of adding significantly to their hospital or mortuary stay.  19) (please refer to Item 16 above)</p>
237	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
238	Individual submitter	<p>1) Disagree  4) Disagree  5) Disagree  7) Disagree  8) Disagree  9) Disagree  10) Disagree  11) Disagree  13) Disagree  14) Disagree  15) Disagree  16) Disagree  17) Disagree  18) Disagree  19) Disagree</p>
239	Individual submitter	<p>1) seems very little reason to slow a good straight piece of road, fair enough in and around the built up areas, but the whole way?  4) Why - nothing wrong with this stretch of road, it has great sweeping corners and heaps of visibility. I believe its just an excuse to do something for the sake of it. I do not believe dropping the limit here will make any difference, except to the revenue hungry authorities who will make a fortune.  5) No problem with this, stick with the standard equation, 100 on State highways and 50 in suburbia. Avoid a million different speeds just complicates life  7) Pointless, open State highway, you'd be better asking if people should be on the road if they cannot keep a vehicle on this stretch of road  8) Makes sense to have this zone in place, there are some awkward turn offs and the school. I have never witnessed the school at pick up and drop off time, but I can see the virtue in this limit  9) Great road, leave it alone 100 is almost too slow through the green field of the surrounding farms</p>

		<p>10) Make sense to pull traffic up on the approach and departure of this area. there are always cars and truck parked up, let alone people on the road around the bridge and Cafe. Maybe a nice progressive 100 - 80 and down to 60 some 250 meters out.</p> <p>11) 100 is good here, again a nice flowing road. possibly maintain 80 till your are clear of the twists just South of Peloris bridge, but there after let it be</p> <p>13) open state highway, there are suggested speed limits on the road, to advise people to slow, if they are not responding to these what make you think they'll respond to a different color sign. Interesting the new Rai saddle road works have created a great new road, yet on the Blenheim bound side they have painted a burn onto the left side of the road, why would you do that? This is no doubt designed to allow trucks to pull over, but I have never seen anyone use this, if this was a lane, with signs warning of the pending merge everyone would pull left, clear the backed up traffic and let the road flow at 100. I just cannot get my head into this and it drive me mad every time I drive over the hill, just make it into a passing lane.</p> <p>14) This is insane. You will cause more issues with people falling asleep. This speed limit on the hill will be such an irritation it wont be worth even going this way, I'd rather go round the long way via St Arnaud and stick to a speed such that the car will not be hunting for a gear continuously and not even being able to gather enough speed to run at hills and corners.</p> <p>15) if you leave the hill at 100, then I wouldn't bother changing this</p> <p>16) As is where is, work now, adding a school zone is a great idea</p> <p>17) again a nice road with overtaking lanes, who would even consider such a change</p> <p>18) 80 is good enough here, I get the feeling we are just lowering speed so we can say "well we tried" 80 on this stretch of road is as low as you need to go. If you feel the need you could add a school zone sign and pull speed down during school drop off and pick up time, but seriously I cannot see the point in making it any slower then it already is</p> <p>19) Leave it alone. I get the feeling the limit on this road will be made as low as authorities can get away with. I believe this is the wrong approach, I have followed drivers on this stretch of road that have scared me, there are horrific drivers on our NZ roads, Modern cars offer way too much stimulation for people and there are just too many buzzers and beeps, buttons to push and calls to answer.</p>
240	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight piece of road with great visibility and does not require a reduction of speed limit from 100km/h to 80km/h.</p> <p>4) There is no requirement for a reduction in the speed limit for this road but what is required is passing lanes or slow traffic bays to lessen the frustration of long ,slow lines of traffic with nowhere to pass. Reducing the speed limit will only increase the frustration and result in even more stupid risky overtaking.</p> <p>5) No problem with this proposed speed reduction.</p> <p>7) Again this is a good stretch of road with absolutely no need for a speed reduction. Lowering the speed limit will only increase the number of frustrated drivers taking stupid risks to overtake.</p> <p>8) Agree with this proposed speed reduction.</p> <p>9) Improve the road with addition of passing lanes and/or slow traffic lanes and leave the speed limit at 100km/h.</p> <p>10) 60km/h for this stretch of road would be a good solution.</p> <p>11) Again there is no need for a reduction in the speed limits for this piece of road. Leave the existing limit of 100km/h.</p> <p>13) No need for a lessening of the speed limit over this stretch of road. Again, increase passing lanes and/or slow traffic bays.</p> <p>14) As above in question (11).</p> <p>15) As above in questions (15) and (12).</p> <p>16) Agree with this proposal.</p> <p>17) As above in questions (11), (12), and (17).</p> <p>18) No requirement to lessen the existing speed limit on this stretch of road as there is good visibility and clear road.</p> <p>19) Agree with this proposal to reduce the speed limit here.</p>
241	Tuffnell plumbing and Drainage	<p>I am writing this submission to strongly oppose your proposed speed limit reductions to most sections of State Highway 6 between Nelson &amp; Blenheim.</p> <p>Whilst I do agree with some speed reductions around built up townships and schools only, I find the proposition of reducing the open road speed limit to 80kph and in some places 60kph to be a ridiculous proposition.</p> <p>This stretch of highway is in dire need of more overtaking bays, (1 on the causeway on Nelson side of Canvastown, 1 on the strait on Nelson side of Rai Valley township, 1 near Okaramio) along wide straitening of the road in places , and removing sharp bends and corners etc, whilst installing median barriers, rumble strips etc is of some help, it in no way addresses the real reason this highway is being reviewed, and I am sure that this is a cost cutting measure, NZTA are effectively placing a band aid over a gaping wound.....spend the real money needed to fix this road to a standard New Zealanders can be proud of, if it's such a problem.</p> <p>I am sure there are thousands of traffic movements calculated every day for this stretch of highway, by comparison a mere 112 people have either been killed or injured in 10 years, unfortunate yes, avoidable possibly, but I am sure that a number of those killed or injured people can't be directly related to the road layout itself.</p> <p>NZ Transport agency is using this number to scaremonger the public, There are other contributing factors in crashes, What about the weather conditions? What about driver inattention? What about poor driving ability (Tourists)? What about driver frustration caused by other negative road users? What about pedestrians crossing the road without checking to see if the path is clear before walking onto SH6?, these are all valid points that in no way are a direct result of the road layout itself that NZTA has provided the public.</p>

		So in summary, I oppose all 100kph speed reductions proposed, unless in a built up area or outside schools, I really hope NZTA listen to the anti-submitters, as this effects both communities, industry, family's alike
242	Individual submitter	<p>I would like to put my support in keeping the speed limit at 100ks.</p> <p>I drive the road often and feel there is not the need to lower the speed to 80.</p> <p>Trucks driving pull over when there is space to do so, most other drivers are also as courteous, everyone I've seen over many years slow down when needed and also with the road conditions everyone slows down where needed.</p> <p>It seems to me that the government is going over the top with controls and managing when for many years most people have managed the road without the 'micro - managing'.</p>
243	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight piece of road. Traffic naturally travels at a lower speed if busy, but when quiet it is safe to travel at 100km/hr. I do not agree with lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>4) This stretch is too long to reduce speed to 80km/hr. near Havelock yes reduce speed from Queen Charlotte Drive but retain 100km/hr south of Queen Charlotte Drive and let driving conditions determine speed to avoid frustration of drivers.</p> <p>5) Agree with speed reduction</p> <p>7) Keep at 100km/hr</p> <p>8) Lower speed near school only</p> <p>9) Road conditions limit speed there is no need to reduce this to 80km/hr</p> <p>10) Agree with limiting speed in Dec/ Jan but otherwise road conditions limit speed there is no need to reduce this to 60km/hr</p> <p>11) Road conditions limit speed there is no need to reduce this to 80km/hr</p> <p>13) Road conditions limit speed there is no need to reduce this to 80km/hr</p> <p>14) Road conditions limit speed there is no need to reduce this to 60km/hr</p> <p>15) Road conditions limit speed there is no need to reduce this to 80km/hr</p> <p>16) Agree with variable speed within school zone</p> <p>17) Road conditions limit speed there is no need to reduce this to 80km/hr</p> <p>18) Road conditions limit speed there is no need to reduce this to 60km/hr</p> <p>19) There is no need to reduce this to 80km/hr</p>
244	Individual submitter	I am a frequent user of the road. I would rate it as one of the better travelling roads in New Zealand. It has good quality surfaces and the roads are well signposted. I see no advantage of lowering the speed limit. Will only create bottleneck traffic.
245	Individual submitter	<p>1) Slower speed limits will only frustrate drivers who will then make irrational dangerous decisions increasing the risk, not decreasing as proposed. If any speed limit reduction it should only be to 90kph which is the legal speed limit for trailer towing vehicles</p> <p>4) as above</p> <p>5) as above</p> <p>7) as above</p> <p>8) as above</p> <p>9) as above</p> <p>10) agreed</p> <p>11) Slower speed limits will only frustrate drivers who will then make irrational dangerous decisions increasing the risk, not decreasing as proposed. If any speed limit reduction it should only be to 90kph which is the legal speed limit for trailer towing vehicles</p> <p>13) as above</p> <p>14) as above</p> <p>15) as above</p> <p>16) agreed</p> <p>17) Slower speed limits will only frustrate drivers who will then make irrational dangerous decisions increasing the risk, not decreasing as proposed. If any speed limit reduction it should only be to 90kph which is the legal speed limit for trailer towing vehicles</p> <p>18) Keep status quo</p> <p>19) Slower speed limits will only frustrate drivers who will then make irrational dangerous decisions increasing the risk, not decreasing as proposed. If any speed limit reduction it should only be to 90kph which is the legal speed limit for trailer towing vehicles</p>
246	BMW M/C club	<p>1) No, even though I don't get why, it's a perfectly straight section of road with massive visibility</p> <p>4) I drive that road all the time &amp; it's an easy flowing road for you average car driver</p> <p>5) I actually have no objection to this, lots of pedestrian &amp; tourist traffic</p>

		<p>7) Why ?</p> <p>8) Obviously yes to school hours new limits</p> <p>9) Again, nothing wrong for your average driver</p> <p>10) I agree with this one, so much foot traffic etc</p> <p>11) Perfectly good road</p> <p>13) It's a winding section of road that will be made more dangerous by restricting speeds will force people into overtaking the cars that will now go much lower than 80</p> <p>14) 60 is ridiculous, why not make that 80, traffic will be at a crawl now</p> <p>15) No problem except to does currently provide an opportunity to overtake the campervans etc</p> <p>16) Nope</p> <p>17) Again, a perfectly good section of road with good visibility</p> <p>18) It's a main road, keep it that way but maybe more signage for the people that think it's a sleepy little suburban st</p> <p>19) Don't do it</p>
247	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>4) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>5) Lower to 50km/h due to the Queen Charlotte turn off</p> <p>7) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>8) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>9) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>10) Keep it as is</p> <p>11) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>13) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>14) Better mark slow vehicle bays</p> <p>15) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>16) Ok</p> <p>17) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>18) Keep it 100km/h</p> <p>19) Keep it 100km/h</p>
248	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight stretch of road with good visibility in an area that is not densely populated. there is no reason why this area should not be 100km</p> <p>4) This is an open stretch of road in a country area where it 100km is a reasonable speed limit. This road is not overly complicated or very windy. It is used daily by commuters between Blenheim and Havelock, and slower limits would impact on commute time.</p> <p>5) Agree with this change.</p> <p>7) This area is an open area with a reasonable road so could be left at 100km</p> <p>8) Agree with this change as it goes through a populated area and school zone.</p> <p>9) Agree with this change</p> <p>10) Agree with this change</p> <p>11) Agree with this change, windy roads</p> <p>13) Agree with this change</p> <p>14) Agree with reduced speed here, but perhaps 70km might be more appropriate.</p> <p>15) this is a reasonable stretch of road so 100km seems appropriate</p> <p>16) agree with reduced speed around the school area</p> <p>17) This is a reasonable stretch of road, doesn't warrant a reduction to 80km</p> <p>18) 80km is an appropriate speed in this area.</p> <p>19) 100km is a reasonable speed in this area, its a good straight road</p>
249	Ultraquip Ltd	<p>1) no problems - think this is a great idea.</p> <p>4) stupid idea - this is the best part of the road between Blenheim and Nelson and is just plain stupid to reduce this to 80kph. this NEEDS to remain at 100KPH. drivers will become very drowsy on this stretch of road and cause accidents</p> <p>5) no problems with this- makes sense.</p> <p>7) this needs to remain at 100kph drivers will get drowsy and will be unsafe.</p> <p>8) this needs to be 80kph to include Wakamarina road turn off.</p> <p>9) stupid idea, this is a safe bit of road and 100kph is not at all unsafe.</p>

		<p>10) no problem with this.</p> <p>11) stupid idea- needs to remain at 100kph</p> <p>13) 80 kph through this stretch of road is no problem, there are some straights that 100kph is safe but more often than not you dont drive at 100kph through here so not sure what the point is in reducing speed limit through here.</p> <p>14) this is the same point as number 11, you cant drive at 100kph and no one tries to maybe drop it to 80kph.</p> <p>15) no problem with this.</p> <p>16) no problem with this.</p> <p>17) no problem with this. this has become quite built up with homes and 100kph is too fast for this</p> <p>18) no problem with this- it is a busy bit of road with a lot happening there.</p> <p>19) no problem with this. makes sense.</p>
250	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>8) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>9) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>13) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>14) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>15) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 100km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>18) Yes, this speed limit is too low for a road that can safely take 80km/h. Ensuring the signage for corners is increased.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
251	Individual submitter	<p>1) I don't think that a reduction in speed limit is needed here.</p> <p>4) Yes plenty. As a driver who travels this road regularly, this will be incredibly frustrating. The fact is that a lot of vehicles travel below the speed limit along here as it is (probably because their speedos are inaccurate, then they do another 10Km/h less for good measure). I think that this will result in driver frustration (therefore overtaking where they shouldn't be) and also loss of concentration &amp; potentially drowsiness due to the low speed on a road that is actually suitable for 100Km/h. The point you make about more risk of injury/death at 100km/h versus 80km/h even though accidents may not be caused by speed is ridiculous, because where do you stop? The same can be said about 80Km/h versus 50Km/h. Maybe it would be safer still if we all go back to using horse and cart ...</p> <p>5) Agree that this is probably fair enough, as there are some houses along here.</p> <p>7) Totally reject the notion that this is needed. 100Km/h is perfectly safe along here. Again I think that this will result in driver frustration (therefore overtaking where they shouldn't be) and also loss of concentration &amp; potentially drowsiness due to the low speed on a road that is actually suitable for 100Km/h. If you are concerned about this part of the road, I suggest you spend some money on it to make it safer.</p> <p>8) I don't think the permanent reduction to 80km/h is needed, although i do think that enforceable variable school signs at 60km/h 150m either side of the school are needed.</p> <p>9) There certainly are some factors you should be considering - the fact that this piece of road is could hardly be more suitable for a 100Km/h limit and to reduce the speed limit along here would be mind blowingly over the top. Many parts of this road are straight or almost straight, and for many motorists, sitting behind a car doing 80Km/h on these parts of the road would just not happen even if that was the limit. To proceed with a speed limit reduction on this part of the road would amount to revenue gathering in my opinion.</p> <p>10) Agree with 60Km/h for 320m on the Blenheim side of the bridge (due to the rest areas there), but think there is no need for this limit to go beyond 150m on the Nelson side.</p> <p>11) This is not needed - please exercise some common sense instead of political correctness. Again much of this road is straight or nearly straight, and the bits that are not, are well able to be safely traveled at 100Km/h (they have for decades remember). Also 210m north of Hills Rd is too far away from the town - the speed limit should only reduce from 100Km/h at 400m north of Hills rd.</p> <p>13) Couldn't disagree more with this - the area is sparsely populated and there is absolutely no need for this at all. Obviously there are some areas where it is not suitable to travel at 100Km/h, but this is where driver training/experience comes in. Not keen on the nanny state having undue influence on this. Again, spending a bit of money on advisory signs before corners where speed needs to be reduced would be a far better investment than dropping the whole stretch of road to 80Km/hr</p> <p>14) 60Km/h is too low. Fair enough to reduce it to 80km/h though.</p> <p>15) What is the point of this? it is not needed.</p> <p>16) Agree with this.</p> <p>17) Agree that there are parts of this road that are hazardous for cyclists due to minimal verge, but can't see how an 80Km/h limit is going to improve this much. Again spend some money on the</p>

		<p>road to give cyclists more separation from the traffic, and leave the speed limit as it is.</p> <p>18) Agree with this.</p> <p>19) Probably fair enough, but most people only do 80Km/h along here anyway.</p>
252	Individual submitter	<p>1) Unnecessarily travelling at 80 km/h on rural roads is infuriating. Slowing the whole road for a few trouble spots is just a waste of time and is likely to be disregarded.</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
253	Recycling for Charity	<p>1) I drive this road all the time, its a section of straight road that does NOT need the speed limit reduced and should stay at 100KM.</p> <p>4) Perfectly good section of highway that can be travelled at 100KM, if anything you need to put in some passing lanes. I driven this road thousands of times. All it needs is some passing lanes and some minor road straightening perhaps. The road needs to stay at 100KM</p> <p>5) Yes reducing the speed limit to 50 when driving into Havelock makes cents so i agree with that speed limit drop from 70KM to 50KM.</p> <p>7) This is 100KM Road, again if any changes need making here put in some passing lanes instead. NOT reducing the speed limit. This is a State Highway and NOT a suburban road. Widening and passing lanes are the answer to solve the problem here.</p> <p>8) Slow vehicle bays need to be built in some of the up hill areas of this section of road. Again unnecessary to lower the speed limit. More passing lanes and widening. Agree with the 60KM variable speed limit during school finishing times. Otherwise the road is fine and should stay at the 100KM speed limit</p> <p>9) Perfectly good straight road, no change 100KM, again consider widening or passing lanes.</p> <p>10) Yes a speed restriction to 50KM through this area makes sense as many tourists stop here and people would be driving abit slower.</p> <p>11) This section is fine at 100KM, however further investment in slow vehicle bays and passing lanes will help ease the congestion during peak times.</p> <p>13) Going up the Saddle Hill at 80KM is fine, there needs to be an increase in either passing lanes or slow vehicle bays.</p> <p>14) Further earthworks needs to be done on this area to cut out the sharp corners etc. Id support a 80KM speed limit only on the sharp corners, Hilly parts of the road. But these areas need to be worked on. A number of things need to be implemented here, slow vehicle bays to passing lanes. Trucks dont have space to allow cars to pass safely so there needs to be more passing lanes or slow vehicle bay to allow people to pass safely. Driving the Hilly terrain id support a 80KM speed limit. I dont think it needs dropping further you guys at NZTA just need to get on with these projects.</p> <p>15) Further earthworks needs to be done on this area to cut out the sharp corners etc. Id support a 80KM speed limit only on the sharp corners, Hilly parts of the road. But these areas need to be worked on. A number of things need to be implemented here, slow vehicle bays to passing lanes. Trucks dont have space to allow cars to pass safely so there needs to be more passing lanes or slow vehicle bay to allow people to pass safely. Driving the Hilly terrain id support a 80KM speed limit. I dont think it needs dropping further you guys at NZTA just need to get on with these projects.</p> <p>16) The road is fine here, once you come off the mountain, there is no need for a speed reduction 100KM, Yes accept the variable speed limit reduction during school pickup times.</p> <p>17) 100KM no need to change the limit</p> <p>18) 100KM no need to change the speed limit</p> <p>19) 100KM, no need to change the current speed limit.</p>
254	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p>

		<p>13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) The entire proposed change is a joke, it is not the speed limit that's the issue. Decreasing the limit will only increase accidents as drivers will become impatient and pass in dangerous spots etc etc. They are still going to speed. This isn't a safety issue it's a revenue gathering scheme. Keep the limit in all open roads to 100kph and the other areas with their current speeds.</p>
255	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) The current speed limit is sufficient and that the concerns are around people that use their cell phones as they come into cell range. This is not going to change with a lower speed limit  5) no issues with this  7) Once again changing the speed limit will not change the culture of using a cell phone or the people that can't face sitting behind others  8) current speed limit sufficient  9) This stretch of road is the one where I notice many drivers speeding well over the current speed limit. This will not change with a lower speed limit as it is the mentality of the drivers  10) agree with the new speed limit  11) given that it is a windy road maybe changing to 90km which works in with trucks and vehicles towing  13) Make this 90km  14) Reduced this to 80km. Most of the drivers are just doing stupidly overtaking due to trucks being slow. Reduce the speed limit to 80 then most people won't pass unless they are idiots and there are still a few out there. Changing the speed limit will not stop the idiots  15) Agree  16) agree  17) reduce to 90  18) 80km appears to be working well in this area  19) most people only drive at 80km thru here anyway</p>
256	Individual submitter	<p>1) Please leave it at 100. It is a straight piece of road.  4) Please leave it at 100km/hr.  5) n/a  7) Please leave it 100km/hr.  8) Please leave it at 100km/hr.  9) Please leave it at 100km/hr.  10) Please leave it as it is.  11) Please leave it at 100km/hr.  13) Please leave it at 100km/hr.  14) Please leave it at 100km/hr. I drive this road many times, to and from Nelson. Put in more passing lanes along the straights to enable the slower drivers to let the others pass.  15) Please leave it as it is.  16) Yes. Please leave it as it is.  17) This would be appropriate.  18) This would be appropriate.  19) This would be appropriate.</p>
257	Individual submitter	<p>1) Why change it if it's not a high crash rate area? Driver training should be our main focus here crashes will never be eliminated while human error is a factor  4) Once again human error will never be eliminated it's a good stretch of road that's not at all difficult or dangerous at current speed limit  5) Fair enough section of road has higher number of residence so not at all stupid unlike the others  7) Once again perfectly drivable section of road that's no worse than elsewhere in NZ lowering the limit will create frustrated dangerous drivers  8) The road is fine driver training and awareness should be improved  9) Ridiculous as with most of previous  10) Reasonable as high foot traffic area  11) Once again the opinion of the public won't be counted and it'll be changed anyway.  13) May as well walk  14) Listen to the public and fix roading correctly no just patch and slap a slower speed limit on  15) Ridiculous</p>

		<p>16) Acceptable  17) Ridiculous  18) Why?  19) Fair</p>
258	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes, make more passing lanes and improve the road. Reducing the speed limit is NOT the answer here.  4) Yes, make more passing lanes and improve the road. Reducing the speed limit is NOT the answer here.  5) 70 is fine on this stretch of road, leave it alone.  7) Yes, make more passing lanes and improve the road. Reducing the speed limit is NOT the answer here.  8) Yes, make more passing lanes and improve the road. Reducing the speed limit is NOT the answer here.  9) Yes, make more passing lanes and improve the road. Reducing the speed limit is NOT the answer here.  10) 50kmh should be in place here as their are sharp bends on the approach/exit, parked cars and traffic.  11) Leave as it is now or add passing lanes.  13) Leave as it is now or add passing lanes.  14) Leave as it is now or add passing lanes.  15) Leave as it is now or add passing lanes.  16) Agreed  17) Leave alone, 100 is fine.  18) 80 is fine here, it was also fine at 100. Keep at 80, have more rigorous policing of the current speed limit.  19) Agreed, 80 is fine here. I live on this stretch, have done for 12 years. I think 100 is fine but no objections to it being 80.</p>
259	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  4) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  5) Don't change leave it how it is 70 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  7) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  8) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  9) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  10) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  11) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  13) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  14) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  15) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  16) Don't change leave it how it is 80 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  17) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  18) Don't change leave it how it is 80 . Country will be going backwards if this happens  19) Don't change leave it how it is 100 . Country will be going backwards if this happens</p>
260	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) The current speed limit on this piece of road is entirely adequate...it is a flowing section of highway and stressing public by lengthening their travel times is adding more work for the police and more revenue to your coffers.  5) This may be appropriate.  7) Current speed limit is appropriate.  8) School zone change is appropriate for safety reasons..  9) Current speed limit is adequate  10) May be an appropriate change..  11) Current limit is adequate  13) Current limit is adequate  14) A change in limit may be appropriate but only to 80km/hr not the proposed 60km/hr  15) Current limit is adequate  16) This change is appropriate for safety reasons  17) Current speed limit is more than adequate.  18) Current limit is adequate  19) Current limit is adequate</p>

261	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it at 100, its a straight road, put in some passing lanes if needed</p> <p>4) Keep it at 100, put in more passing lanes</p> <p>5) Again why lower it to 50? There hasnt been any crashes there, keep it at 70</p> <p>7) Keep it at 100, put more passing lanes in</p> <p>8) Keep it at 100, put more passing lanes in</p> <p>9) Keep it at 100, put more passing lanes in</p> <p>10) Keep it at 100/50</p> <p>11) Keep it at 100, straighten the road rather than drop the speed limit because of your poor road design</p> <p>13) Keep it at 100, better passing lanes on the Rai Saddle</p> <p>14) Keep it at 100</p> <p>15) Keep it at 100</p> <p>16) Thats fine</p> <p>17) Keep it at 100, more passing lanes</p> <p>18) Keep it at 80, have you even driven this road????</p> <p>19) 100 is fine, run a barrier along the edge of the sea to stop muppets driving in, reducing the speed limit wont change that</p>
262	Individual submitter	<p>Please do not lower the speed limit from Blenheim to Nelson. Crashes are mostly caused by things, but not so much to speed. Please note my concerns for crashes as follows: 1. Inattention. 2. Incompetency. 3. Laziness 4. Road conditions. 5. Drivers not keeping to the correct speed displayed. I drive from Woodbourne to Blenheim town daily. Too often do I see drivers at 80km or below between Woodbourne and Blenheim, this causes angst for drivers wishing to drive at the recommended speed. On open roads, there are too many drivers that can not drive to the posted speeds, slowing down on corners excessively and speeding up on straights and passing lanes. Better fix: Better roads, more passing lanes, better driver training would be a start.</p>
263	Crave Hire Company	<p>[no comment]</p>
264	Individual submitter	<p>Having reviewed the proposed changes in detail and completed the online submission I am sending this email to cover the points the online submission does not allow.</p> <p>Overall my concern is NOT about trying to save 9 minutes travel time between Blenheim and Nelson but is about being allowed to drive safely to the conditions when making this and all other journeys. I suggest that most accidents and the resulting injuries on this and other journeys are due to poor driving, poor judgement, drug and alcohol impairment, poorly maintained vehicles and frustration at being delayed unnecessarily. The proposed speed limit reductions will do virtually nothing to change those reasons. Whilst I accept that reduced speed of impact tends to lessen injuries in some cases that is not a reason to reduce maximum speed limits.</p> <p>Speed limits are suppose to provide a maximum speed that a reasonable driver, driving to the conditions may reach on some, but not all, sections of the road the limit applies to. As the signs say "it's a limit , not a target". Driver training and education is something that needs to be reinforced on this and all other roads in New Zealand. That, together with severe consequences such as loss of licence, very high fines and crushing of cars involved would help manage the issue much more that simply putting different numbers of Speed Limit signs.</p> <p>On this particular journey the appropriate speed changes daily due to traffic loading and weather, however it is sometimes possible to travel at the posted speed limits in some sections. This is particularly so when passing much slower moving traffic on relatively straight sections when having the ability to drive to 100km/h means I can pass safely and within the Law. Many drivers drive well below the limits, which is fine by me as I usually have the ability to pass vehicles safely as stated above.</p> <p>Some drivers drive consistently up to 10km.h slower than the posted limit due to their vehicle speedo being inaccurate so if you drop the limit to 80km/h they will travel at say 70km/h which is not your intended outcome; or is it?</p> <p>We all hope that the frequency of accidents can be reduced but it is highly likely that the proposal will simply result in much longer queues of vehicles travelling at slower speed resulting in an increase of accidents caused by frustration due to the inability to overtake safely within the design of the roads and the Law.</p>
265	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a perfectly straight section of road well signposted and with good visibility. No speed limit change is needed. What is needed is better driver training and more enforcement of existing limits.</p> <p>4) This is a well maintained section of road with multiple sections that are suitable for passing of slow vehicles that often cause long tailbacks. The proposed speed limit reduction will severely</p>

		<p>reduce the options for passing of slower vehicles thus increasing the tail backs resulting in even slower travel as the tailbacks will only be able to travel at the speed of the slowest vehicle. The alternative is that some drivers will become more agitated and try overtaking where it is unsafe and so probably increase the number of accidents.</p> <p>5) The gradual decrease in the speed limit works very well in this section. Leave it as it is.</p> <p>7) This section of road is perfectly safe with the existing limit if drivers drive to the conditions existing at the time. For those who don't a reduced speed limit will make no difference.</p> <p>8) I agree with the proposed school zone but leave the existing speed limit as is.</p> <p>9) This section of road is perfectly safe with the existing limit if drivers drive to the conditions existing at the time. For those who don't a reduced speed limit will make no difference.</p> <p>10) This section of road is perfectly safe with the existing limit if drivers drive to the conditions existing at the time. For those who don't a reduced speed limit will make no difference.</p> <p>11) This section of road is perfectly safe with the existing limit if drivers drive to the conditions existing at the time. For those who don't a reduced speed limit will make no difference.</p> <p>13) This section of road is perfectly safe with the existing limit if drivers drive to the conditions existing at the time. For those who don't a reduced speed limit will make no difference.</p> <p>14) Why create traffic tailbacks worse than exist now? If people drive to the conditions there is no reason to change the limits</p> <p>15) Did you miss the fact that there is a long relatively straight passing lane section on this road? Leave the limits as now exists.</p> <p>16) I agree.</p> <p>17) The road is perfectly suitable to the existing speed limits.</p> <p>18) The road is perfectly suitable to the existing speed limits.</p> <p>19) The road is perfectly suitable to the existing speed limits.</p>
266	Individual submitter	<p>1) Living in Renwick, commuting to Blenheim and back, most traffic flows at 80kph now. Reducing the limit from 100 to 80, will slow the flow even more</p> <p>4) You should take into account driver frustration caused by slow traffic, and nowhere to pass, ie. lack of passing lanes!</p> <p>5) Try putting speed cameras in position, that will slow traffic every time.</p> <p>7) Once again, lack of passing lanes, causing driver frustration</p> <p>8) Good move.</p> <p>9) Lack of passing lanes.</p> <p>10) 60 kph means that pushbikes that don't have speedo's are going to be overtaking motor vehicles, how bizarre!</p> <p>11) Lack of passing lanes</p> <p>13) Leave as 100kph</p> <p>14) 100 kph is unrealistic as it is, but 60 is laughable</p> <p>15) 80 is fine in this section</p> <p>16) as above</p> <p>17) as above</p> <p>18) 60 is laughable</p> <p>19) Traffic volume now makes it fairly difficult to attain 100, so 80 is o.k.</p>
267	Individual submitter	<p>1) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>4) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>8) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>9) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>13) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>14) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is. This is a ridiculous proposal.</p> <p>15) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>18) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p> <p>19) There is no requirement to reduce this limit. It is perfectly safe as it is.</p>
268	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Keep it the way it is</p> <p>8) Keep it the way it is</p>

		<p>9) Keep it the way it is  10) This is fair enough popular area  11) Keep it the way it is  13) Keep it the way it is  14) Probably 80 ks reasonable.  15) Keep it the way it is  16) Sounds good  17) Keep it the way it is.  18) Keep it the way it is  19) Keep it the way it is</p>
269	Individual submitter	<p>1) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  4) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  5) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  7) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  8) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  9) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  10) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  11) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  13) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  14) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  15) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  16) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  17) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  18) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit  19) nothing wrong with the road so don't need to change the limit</p>
270	Individual submitter	<p>My submission relates to those sections of the road with the speed limit currently set at 100km/hr.  The blanket speed limit reduction for all sections with a limit of 100km/hr to 80km/hr is unnecessary and inappropriate for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of 100km/hr sections can be safely driven at 100km/hr, except when weather conditions are poor, when people naturally slow down anyway</li> <li>• Responsible drivers adjust their speed to the road conditions, and we shouldn't be setting our laws to cater for the lowest common denominator, who will likely ignore the speed limit whatever it is set at</li> <li>• Advisory speed signs are in place where needed and are effective at signalling the need to reduce speed. In many cases these signal a safe speed of much less than 100km and I have no problem with this. After all, the speed limit is just that, a limit – not a target.</li> <li>• There may be localised sections of road where a lower speed limit is appropriate, although my understanding is that there are no particularly bad black spots on the 100km/hr sections of this road and that accidents in the past have been distributed along the length of SH6</li> <li>• A blanket reduction from 100km/hr to 80km/hr will result in many careful and competent drivers, driving to the conditions at a safe speed, but collecting speeding fines</li> <li>• This could be seen as a revenue gathering exercise by some, in the guise of a road safety initiative</li> <li>• While nobody can argue a reduction in our road toll is a bad thing, there are other things that need to be taken into consideration when setting our open road speed limit. Productivity, the improved safety features on much of our national car fleet, improvements in our roads and road signage and the ability to get from A to B in a reasonable time at a reasonable speed.</li> <li>• Taking the philosophy of reducing our road toll at all costs to its logical conclusion would result in a ridiculous situation where our open road speed limit might be 40km/hr or less. Clearly this would be unpalatable and so we have always set a limit that is “reasonable” and accept there will be some deaths on our roads. Currently that speed limit on open roads is 100km/hr, adopted to take into account many factors and studies. For many of New Zealand's roads, including SH6, this limit is still appropriate (aside for some localised tweaking).</li> <li>• The approach of reducing the speed limit from 100km/hr to 80km/hr on all (or many) open roads in NZ is a very blunt instrument if the objective is to reduce our road toll and we should be considering other measures such as: driver education and training, improved vehicle standards (wof's, minimum safety standards etc), road improvements, improved signage etc</li> <li>• I would urge you not take this rather lazy approach of taking down all the 100km/hr signs and replacing them with 80km/hr signs on the basis that this will reduce the road toll on SH6</li> <li>• If speed limits are set at an unrealistically low level, the main outcome will be an increase in drivers inadvertently exceeding the speed limit, whilst still driving safely, rather than an improvement in the road toll</li> </ul>
271	Individual submitter	<p>The proposal to put an 80 kph speed limit on SH 6 Blenheim - Nelson is ridiculous. We have lived in Westport since 1995 and so have not travelled that road very often in the ensuing years. Before we came to Westport we lived in Picton and travelled the SH6 Picton - Blenheim many times so were very familiar with the traffic problems on road peculiarities.</p> <p>This year we had reason to travel from Nelson to Blenheim and were amazed at the huge road works and improvements done in various spots which we recall as being restrictive. Overall I would</p>

		<p>rate the SH6 now as being hugely easier to negotiate with far better overtaking lanes and certainly very much safer.</p> <p>To reduce the speed limit from 100 down to 80 as being ridiculous in the extreme with the reasons not being reasons at all, merely excuses to fit in with Government policy of the more extreme left wing idealologies.</p> <p>The SH6 Westport to Greymouth is far more restrictive and geologically dangerous yet you show no signs of restricting the limits on that.</p> <p>Having sat on Buller District Council as a councillor and the representative on the WCRC NZTA meetings I have yet to see some of the recommendations we put on the table carried out as yet such as passing bays after single lane bridges to allow slow moving trucks to let vehicles pass after crossing the bridge.</p> <p>The reduction to speed limits on the Nelson - Blenheim route is definitely a waste of time and money which could well be spent elsewhere to good effect. I definitely oppose the proposal.</p>
272	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is probably not unreasonable, given the level of development and traffic volumes.</p> <p>4) This is a completely unrealistic expectation - there are no features of the road and its alignment that suggest it should be 80km/hr, and drivers will not adhere to it. For speed limits to work, the road must provide the appropriate clues - this road section doesn't.</p> <p>5) Possibly acceptable, but I believe a transition zone is still appropriate, given the sporadic ribbon development here.</p> <p>7) Again, the road provides no clues that this is an 80km/hr speed zone, and it is unlikely to be willingly adhered to by road users. Alignments are good throughout. Not an acceptable action.</p> <p>8) See above. Variable speed zone at the school is probably appropriate.</p> <p>9) See above. Absolutely no justification for lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>10) Given that there is a one-lane bridge here which sometimes produces significant queues, together with picnic areas, 60km/hr does not seem unreasonable.</p> <p>11) Apart from the first km or so, this again is open country with good alignments, and provides no clues as to why it should be 80km/hr. As with other sections inappropriately proposed as 80km/hr, I am of the view that the crashes are almost certainly due to driver ability, and these drivers are likely to still be a hazard, even if they do drive at 80km/hr. Every one else with just be frustrated.</p> <p>13) See previous comments - provides few clues as to why 80km/hr is reasonable, and therefore is likely to have low compliance. However, more truck crawler lanes on both the Rai and Whangamoia Saddles is a very worthwhile improvement that would be welcomed by all road users.</p> <p>14) See comments in Question 15 about truck crawler lanes - even more important here. Physically, this is a tight and winding section which does provide the clues about why a lower speed limit is appropriate. People will drive at whatever speed is comfortable for them. 60km/hr is probably OK, but 50 or 70 would be equally applicable. It won't make any difference to the crash rate.</p> <p>15) Again, no clues as to why it should be 80km/hr and therefore the proposal is unreasonable.</p> <p>16) Acceptable</p> <p>17) Same response as Question 13</p> <p>18) The width of carriageway, and provision of turning lanes suggests that 60km/hr is unnecessarily conservative, but I might be persuaded if the science is sound.</p> <p>19) Acceptable</p>
273	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes this makes no sense. Dont do it.</p> <p>4) Even crazier thing to do.</p> <p>5) Leave as is</p> <p>7) Once again makes no sense.</p> <p>8) There is no basis for doing this.</p> <p>9) Once a silly proposal.</p> <p>10) No need to do this. Just creating a speed trap.</p> <p>11) Yes no safety issue here. Leave as is.</p> <p>13) No safety basis for this change.</p> <p>14) No need to change.</p> <p>15) No change required.</p> <p>16) No.</p> <p>17) No safety reason to change.</p> <p>18) Leave as is.</p> <p>19) No safety reason to change.</p>
274	Individual submitter	<p>I have just returned from a short trip to the USA. Part of the trip involved driving around the state of Maine where I was particularly impressed by the road signage for speed limits. The signs appeared to specify a speed that was appropriate to the roadway and the nature of the built up areas it passed through. For example a 50 (mile per hour) section would drop back to 45 if the road got windy and then drop to 40 as a town was approached and then further drop to 30 or 25 depending upon the nature of the road through the built up area.</p>

		<p>For rural areas it appears that the speed signage in Maine specifies a suitable upper limit for the speed that can be travelled on each section of road rather than just prescribing an open speed limit. For urban areas and the approach to urban areas the speed signage gave a clear message of what a suitable upper limit should be over different sections of the road. And all this without signage stating that that the road had a variable speed limit. Parts of Australia have similar variable speed limits. Some years ago I raised the idea of variable speed limits with the NZ roading authority but the response was that motorists would find it confusing. Well if the Americans and Australians can cope with the supposed complexity Kiwis shouldn't really have any trouble with it. I understand that the NZ Transport Agency and Local Authorities are currently looking at reviewing the speed limits for rural roads. Rather than reducing a road from open speed limit to 80kph say over its full length I would urge that they look to what is done elsewhere and introduce speed limits that vary over the length of the road appropriate to the speed that can be safely travelled over each section of the road.</p> <p>The hire car I had in Maine had an indicator on the dashboard, next to the speedometer, of the allowable road speed. As each new speed sign was passed the indicator on the dashboard changed. I'm not sure how it worked but it was a bit of new technology I found very interesting.</p>
275	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't make the decision. 100km is fine.  4) Simply ridiculous.  5) That is fine  7) Dumb  8) Close down NZTA?  9) Stupidity  10) Ok  11) Absolute Stupidity  13) 90km  14) Agreed  15) Agreed  16) Agreed  17) Dumb  18) Dumb  19) Agreed</p>
276	Individual submitter	<p>I make this submission having had approximately 27 years as a tanker and trailer driver. Having a drivers license is a privilege not a right to ignore the law. More education is needed for new drivers. I do not support the changing of speed limit locations 4 and 5, 7 and 8 with the exception of school zone; 9 and 11. Impatient drivers pass at inappropriate places, thus causing accidents.</p> <p>I support number 13 and believe 80km/h for number 14 keeping the speed consistent though 15 and 16 with 13 and 14.</p> <p>I do not support 80 for 17. Would support 18 and 19.</p> <p>I do not support the variables outside of the school zones. Consideration needs to be given to the heavy duty truck drivers in relation to their driver hours. Inappropriate signage appears at times, with regards to road works.</p>
277	Individual submitter	<p>1) The issue is not speed it is poor driving behaviour  4) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  5) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  7) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  8) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  9) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  10) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  11) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  13) Happy with current speed  14) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  15) Happy with current speed  16) Happy with current speed  17) The issue is not speed rather poor driving behaviour  18) No to lowering speed  19) No to lowering the speed limit</p>

278	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>5) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>7) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>8) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>9) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>10) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>11) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>13) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>14) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). A 40% reduction is far too dramatic. More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>15) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>16) I support the proposed change.</p> <p>17) I do not support the proposed change. This road has a mix of classes of traffic and both limited passing options and options for slower traffic to pull over, creating tailbacks. Poor decision making due to frustrated drivers will result in more, not less incidents, as potentially similar speeds (i.e. over the posted limit). More opportunities for slow traffic to move over and improvements to the road are by far the best options.</p> <p>18) I do not support the proposed change. I have lived in this area for 15 years and have a child attending the local school. The current 80 kmh limit is appropriate and works well. I would support variable school zone limit but note the school traffic is well separated from the highway.</p> <p>19) I do not support the proposal. I have lived in the area under consideration for 15 years and drive or cycle daily on the route. I do not see any need to change the limit and instead, options for North-bound traffic on SH6 to turn into Malvern Ave, Bayview Rd and Atawhai Drive without having to use the north-bound passing lane for several hundred metres</p>
279	Individual submitter	<p>1) you have not made your findings available for public scrutiny and you need to.</p> <p>4) NZTA must guarantee that the road toll will come down if speed reductions are implemented</p> <p>5) NZTA needs to upgrade roads to comply with larger traffic volumes and have slow drivers targeted by traffic enforcement.</p> <p>7) show the public the factors that have been noted to cause a speed reduction</p> <p>8) NZTA findings should be made public.</p> <p>9) The public need to know factors collected by NZTA before it is possible to add "other factors"</p> <p>10) "other factors" to what factors? Transparency of the factor process by NZTA to be made public.</p> <p>11) NZTA's poor performance over the last 10 years to meet rising traffic flows is a factor that can't be ignored.</p> <p>13) NZTA has admitted it's failure to keep the motoring public safe over the years by choosing to lower the speed limit, a near sighted option.</p> <p>14) NZTA's failure to implement stage 2 of the Whangamoia realignment which is 20 plus years overdue is a major factor as to why this speed reduction is a farce.</p> <p>15) Public viewing of NZTA's findings that have instigated this speed lowering must be actioned.</p>

		<p>16) All information NZTA has used to base its findings on must be made public for a fair poll to be made.</p> <p>17) The facts for NZTA triggering speed lowering in all areas must be made public.</p> <p>18) NZTA must present all facts used to decide speed lowering in all areas for public consultation.</p> <p>19) NZTA must follow due process and make all facts governing speed reduction in all areas available for public scrutiny.</p>
280	Individual submitter	<p>1) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>4) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>5) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>7) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>8) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>9) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>10) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>11) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>13) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>14) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>15) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>16) no</p> <p>17) It will make the trip very slow</p> <p>18) no</p> <p>19) no</p>
281	Individual submitter	<p>1) Perfectly straight bit of road and can comfortably be driven at 100</p> <p>4) This piece of road can be comfortably be driven at 90 to 100 km. Drive to the conditions. I drive this road Nelson to Blenheim at least once a week and sometimes more and have done for the past 24 years and not encountered any problems other than the odd driver who should not be on the road.</p> <p>5) This area is mainly bush so why the need to make it 50. No other word for it sorry. Dumb!!</p> <p>7) Again driving to the conditions it can be comfortably driven at 90 to 100. One of the biggest problems with all our roads is the inconsistent line markings. There are yellow no passing lines mostly in place that I would agree with. Then not far away dotted lines going around bends with totally no visibility. Is this just a cost cutting measure. It does nothing for road safety. Then in areas there are solid white lines. I have brought this up in conversation and everyone's view is different as to whether one can pass here or not. I would love someone to accompany me so I can point these out as it is difficult to put down on paper and expect the reader to get the same picture.</p> <p>8) No problem here except the sign must be clear as to the speed limit and the time of day it is in place. Not one of the stupid signs like in Rai Valley that say when children are present. Again we have had some interesting discussions as to what this actually mean. Too open the interpretation. The person who designed that one should not be on the payroll.</p> <p>9) Again there is no problem here and can be comfortably driven at 90 to 100. It is ironic that you want to reduce the speed now when vehicles are getting safer. We know what the main issues are. Your own stats have shown that more people killed in accidents have drugs in their system and distractions such as phones. For a start someone under the influence of drugs or alcohol would not pay any attention to speed signs anyway.</p> <p>10) No real problem here.</p> <p>11) Again this is perfectly safe to drive at 90 to 100 as per conditions. There are a few places I know about where I can overtake a slow vehicle. 80 would mean I would be on the wrong side of the road longer and I do not like being on the wrong side longer than necessary also in some place 80 would mean running out of safe road before completing the move.</p> <p>13) Again there is no reason driving to conditions most of this route can't be driven at between 90 and 100 there are also the 2 passing lanes at the base of the Whangamoia and as my vehicle carries a bit of weight I like to be able to get a bit of speed up before climbing the hill as it makes it a lot easier. The youngster that killed himself recently certainly did not pay attention to speed limits 170kph so regardless of what you post it would not have saved him. Why penalise us that know how to drive for the odd idiot</p> <p>14) There are places where it is safe to do 80 going down the South side of the Whangamoia. 80 would be more sensible it is again driving to the conditions</p> <p>15) Again nothing wrong here</p> <p>16) Again as long as the sign by the school is clear speed and time of day</p> <p>17) Nothing wrong here 100 is safely achievable all the way. The only exception I would agree with was either side of the Glenduan intersection due to the bend on the NW side vehicles suddenly appear from the right making it dangerous for vehicles from Glenduan entering SH6</p> <p>18) 80 is fine here the school is off the main road and I have not encountered many vehicles turning off or onto the road here.</p> <p>19) Straight road safe to do at 100 except for people distracted by phones landing in the water. That will still happen at 80 km</p>
282	Individual submitter	<p>1) leave the open road alone.</p> <p>4) leave the open road alone</p> <p>5) why not make it a 60kmh.</p> <p>7) leave the open road alone</p> <p>8) leave the 100 limit alone, just add the school zone</p>

		<p>9) leave the open road alone</p> <p>10) leave the open road alone</p> <p>11) leave the open road alone</p> <p>13) leave the open road alone</p> <p>14) leave the open road alone</p> <p>15) leave the open road alone</p> <p>16) nothing wrong with a school zone</p> <p>17) leave the open road alone</p> <p>18) leave the current speed alone</p> <p>19) leave the open road alone</p>
283	BMW Motorcycle Club - Aotearoa New Zealand	<p>1) Leave at 100 kp/h</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Leave at 100 kp/h</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) Leave at 100 kp/h</p> <p>11) Leave at 100 kp/h</p> <p>13) Leave at 100 kp/h</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) Leave at 100 kp/h</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Leave at 100 kp/h</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) Leave at 100 kp/h</p>
284	Individual submitter	<p>1) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.</p> <p>4) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.</p> <p>8) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, especially the variable school zone, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think</p>

there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.

9) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.

10) No Comment

11) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.

13) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.

14) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.

15) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.

16) No Comment

17) While I support the idea of selective areas with reduced speed limits, I think a blanket reduction to 80 kph is unnecessary and will not actually reduce the number of accidents in the long term. Reasons are: With the national 100kph limit the majority of people will drive accordingly, and smoothly. There will be opportunities to overtake at passing lanes and other places. Introduce a 80 kph limit and there will be drivers who are being very careful to avoid going over this limit, and will consequently drive at 70-75kph. Especially if they think there are going to be Police speed traps. They will be spending more time checking the speedo, so be less observant of the road and other drivers. Other cars will back up behind these, and end up with long convoys, with people braking and accelerating, which costs more fuel. Some drivers behind the slower moving car (usually the third or fourth car) will see a clear stretch of road and decide to overtake, but because of the extra cars in front and the speed limit in place will try not to go too fast, so will be more dangerous in the overtaking manoeuvre. Where there is a passing lane everyone will be jostling at 80kph, and the risk of an accident will be higher.

18) No Comment

19) No Comment

285	FIPENZ	<p>As a former leader of three NZ transportation consultancies and with in excess of 50 years of experience, I trust that the comments given below are treated with an air of respect.</p> <p>I am generally in agreement with NZTA policy to reduce speed limits, where appropriate, to reduce overall crash levels and especially crash severity. I frequently travel SH1 between Blenheim and Christchurch and also SH7 over Lewis Pass and welcome the recent introduction of differential speed zones largely introduced to reflect speed environment and more demanding alignment. I have resided in Blenheim for the past 5 years and use SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson on a reasonably frequently basis. I am largely in support of your proposals to reduce speed limits especially in built up areas, adjacent to schools, and in areas where vertical and horizontal alignment is challenging. The latter is certainly true of the Rai Valley Saddle and Whangamoas despite recent upgrades to the infrastructure.</p> <p>The one area where I feel there is room for reconsideration is the length of SH6 between north of Renwick to south of Havelock. This length of SH6 largely follows the valley floor and as such, has a good standard of both vertical and horizontal alignment with little impairment of overtaking sight distance. The speed environment is definitely more like 100km/h than 80km/h and I can envisage that the imposition of a reduced speed limit would lead to significant driver frustration and encourage unsafe driving procedures.</p> <p>The Media would suggest that there is a considerable groundswell within both public and business circles against the introduction of 80km/h over the entire length. Maintaining 100km/h between Renwick and Havelock as well as being sensible may go some way to easing acceptance of the proposed strategy.</p>
286	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The existing speed limit (100 km/hr) be retained.</li> <li>4) The existing speed limit of 100 km/hr be retained.</li> <li>5) Agree.</li> <li>7) Agree.</li> <li>8) Generally agree, with reduction to 40 km/hr in school zone at start and end of school day.</li> <li>9) Agree.</li> <li>10) Agree.</li> <li>11) Agree.</li> <li>13) Agree.</li> <li>14) Agree.</li> <li>15) Agree.</li> <li>16) Agree.</li> <li>17) Agree.</li> <li>18) Agree.</li> <li>19) Agree.</li> </ol>
287	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provide more passing lanes</li> <li>4) This is open road with plenty of visibility, again more passing lanes will be more effective</li> <li>5) I don't oppose this one</li> <li>7) This is country road with no need for a reduction</li> <li>8) Again this is a clear visibility area, keep the variable school zone but don't reduce permanently to 80</li> <li>9) There are very few parts of this road with extended periods of limited visibility, however one or two more passing lanes would help</li> <li>10) The December and January reductions are great for summer swimmers, however 60 here is unnecessary during the rest of the year when it's almost always empty</li> <li>11) There are a number of stretches here with straight country driving, and absolutely no need for anything less than 100</li> <li>13) Again this is open road, with only dairy farms there</li> <li>14) This is winding roads but has periods with long straights suitable for overtaking. If you remove these it will cause frustration and eventually more accidents when people take unnecessary chances</li> <li>15) Again this has a lot of corners, but the inability to exceed 80kph will cause frustration and lead to more accidents</li> <li>16) I don't oppose this</li> <li>17) This is wide open road with a need to overtake after the slow Whangamoas saddle. Without a 100kph limit there will be frustrated drivers taking risks and causing more crashes</li> <li>18) There is no need to change this as it works fine at present with a reduction altering drivers to be more aware</li> <li>19) This is a clear visibility stretch of road with very few potential hazards</li> </ol>
288	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Leave at 100, 80 will make people overtake and increase danger</li> <li>4) Leave at 100, 80 will promote dangerous manoeuvres and add duress to truck drivers</li> <li>5) This is a reasonable change as there are children walking in this area,</li> <li>7) Should be 60 km as school is directly on the main road and danger of vehicles pulling out of wakamarina</li> <li>8) 60 km because of school</li> <li>9) Leave at 100 because of previous reasons</li> <li>10) 50 right through, very busy area</li> <li>11) Leave at 100</li> </ol>

		<p>13) Leave at 100  14) Leave at 100, 60 is ridiculous  15) 100 through here  16) 50 because of school  17) Leave at 100  18) 50 due to school  19) Leave at 100</p>
289	Individual submitter	<p>1) There is nothing wrong with this section of road. I have cycled and driven it a lot over 20 years. I have never seen an accident let alone a fatal one. The corner of Middle Renwick and Belss roads has been improved to allow turning bays for traffic. There is no logical reason to lower the limit along this stretch of road.  4) Not required. This is a road comprising of short to long straights with no tight corners. I have driven my wifes Suzuki the entire length of this stretch at 100/km'h on cruise control without having to brake. Where is there any section that is any more dangerous than any other stretch of NZ road.  5) 70 is adequate. Gives time for traffic to transition from 100 to 70 to 50. Until this are is heavily populated, not required.  7) There are multiple long stretches along this portion which are totally suitable for 100 km/h. There are no tight corners. Keep at 100  8) no  9) There are multiple long stretches along this portion which are totally suitable for 100 km/h. There are no tight corners.  10) no  11) 80 km/h for the few corners north of Pelorus, but after that 100.  13) No need to reduce speed on entire section of road.  14) 60 km/h an absolute insult. 80 at the least  15) no reason for lowering. On reduces ability for traffic to pass on one of the few straights before getting to the saddle which has no true passing bays and nobody pulls over.  16) no  17) Fully suitable for 100 km/h. No problematic corners plus passing bays which are totally suitable for 100 km/h  18) 60 is stupid. 80 has always been suitable along this stretch  19) yes to 80. This means consistency from the previous section</p>
290	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  4) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  5) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  7) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  8) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  9) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  10) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  11) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  13) roads are great, Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  14) plenty of areas to put slow lanes in, educate people. As a commuter daily these roads are fine but need more education for people that a tourists or drugged and drunk to pull over and be considerate to others. Everyone should have the right to drive at a comfortable speed to them.  15) again no issues.. people drive to the conditions now  16) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions for daily road users  17) Don't sit at a desk and make crucial decisions on speed , nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are, people tourists need education or somewhere to pull over and let others past  18) 80 km is slow enough .. all you will do is clog up roads even more , with people breaking more nose to tails. the speed is accurate for those very few properties .. they choose to buy a house there .. no one forced them to  19) 80 km is slow enough .. all you will do is clog up roads even more , with people breaking more nose to tails. the speed is accurate for those very few properties .. they choose to buy a house there .. no one forced them to You will cause major bottle neck effects .. not necessary</p>
291	Individual submitter	<p>1) I drive Intercity coaches regularly on this route and either 80km or 100km for this section instead of having short distances of different speeds.  4) I'm a coach driver who drives this route regularly and I can drive at 90km comfortably with no braking required. The existing speed limit in a car with competent drivers can easily be achieved - leave it at 100km  5) This is ok  7) As per previous, leave at 100km. It is not the speed that is problematic, it is the large amount of slow/incompetent drivers. Fix that rather than deprive the majority of drivers happy doing 100km!  8) As above, keep existing</p>

		<p>9) As above  10) Ok  11) As per previous, this can easily be driven safely at 100km/h  13) Leave as 100km, and put a couple of more passing lanes in. This allows overtaking of those drivers that find it necessary to brake heavily for every corner!  14) As per previous leave as 100km  15) Ok  16) Ok  17) Leave as is  18) Leave at 80km  19) 80km is ok here for consistency in speed</p>
292	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree with the proposed new speed limit of 80 km/h to improve safety  4) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons  5) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 50 km/h for safety reasons  7) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons  8) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h and 60 km/h for safety reasons  9) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons  10) I agree with the proposed speed limit of 60 km/h  11) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons  13) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons  14) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 60 km/h for safety reasons  15) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons  16) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons  17) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons  18) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 60 km/h for safety reasons  19) I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h for safety reasons</p>
293	Individual submitter	<p>1) No change  4) No change  5) No change  7) No change  8) No change  9) No change  10) No change  11) No change  13) No change-drive to the conditions  14) No change-drive to the conditions  15) No change  16) Leave as is  17) Leave as is but a decent road surface from Hira to Nelson would make a difference.  18) Leave as is  19) Leave as is. The road from Nelson to Blenheim is alright. Nelson side of Whangamoia needs re-lining.</p>
294	Individual submitter	<p>1) This does not need changed. It's a straight and safe road. Leave the speed limit at 100km.  4) Leave this at 100km  5) Leave this at 70km  7) No need to change, leave this at 100km  8) Yes to the 60km variable school zone  9) Keep this at 100km  10) Leave this as it is.  11) Keep the existing speed limit  13) Keep the existing speed limit  14) Keep the existing speed limit</p>

		<p>15) Keep the existing speed limit</p> <p>16) Yes great idea.</p> <p>17) Keep the existing speed limit</p> <p>18) Keep the existing speed limit</p> <p>19) Keep the existing speed limit</p>
295	Rai Valley Area School	<p>(1) The long straight in section 4 should be 100km with passing lanes. It is the only safe straight stretch that gives you the opportunity to pass trucks or slow vehicles but being so busy, often there is no opportunity to pass at present.</p> <p>(2) The long stretches in section 9 should also be 100km/h and again, if possible, with overtaking lanes, same reasons as above.</p> <p>(3) The straight section of 11 is again a place where overtaking lanes are needed, especially before Rai Valley and the hills.</p> <p>(4) I rarely see accidents on this stretch of road.</p>
296	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) Yes, there are no passing lanes. Slow moving vehicles choose not to allow others to pass. Leave the speed limit as it is and make some passing lanes.</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) There is no need to change this</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) Another passing lane and leave limit as is.</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) A passing lane please and leave limit as is</p> <p>13) Signage to encourage slow traffic to let others past. There are places to pull over- these are ignored.</p> <p>14) Signage as with the last proposal</p> <p>15) Same as before</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) Leave as is</p> <p>18) Leave as is</p> <p>19) Leave as is</p>
297	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>4) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>5) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>7) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>8) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>9) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>10) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>11) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>13) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>14) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>15) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>16) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>17) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier</p>

		<p>decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>18) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p> <p>19) I think that lowering the speed will either make people more frustrated with other drivers who aren't maintaining the speed limits and therefore the frustrated drivers will make riskier decisions and possibly cause accidents. Also if people are driving at lower speeds they may feel that they aren't required to focus on their driving and could lead them to be more easily distracted</p>
298	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on your proposal. I am very strongly in favour of the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80 kph on this section of highway 6. There are a number of roads and driveways opening directly on this road. Given the level of current and proposed housing development (e.g. Bay View and Dodsons Valley) the amount of traffic using highway 6 will continue to increase. Increasingly this section of the road is becoming more and more urban in nature. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
299	Individual submitter	<p>1) 100 is good</p> <p>4) 100 is good, what's the piont of change is to 80</p> <p>5) 70 is safety enough</p> <p>7) 100 is good</p> <p>8) 100 please</p> <p>9) 100 !</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) Stick to 100</p> <p>13) Whoever speeds will speed forever</p> <p>14) 60? Crazy</p> <p>15) 100 cool</p> <p>16) 100 cool</p> <p>17) Who proposed the new speed? Grandma and pas?</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) 100</p>
300	Flying Kiwi Adventures	<p>1) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>4) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>5) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>7) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>8) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>9) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>10) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>11) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>13) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>14) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>15) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>16) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>17) No Comment</p>

		<p>18) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p> <p>19) Stupid idea! It will not make to road safer!</p>
301	Individual submitter	<p>1) Slower speed improves longevity of road surface as well as lowering carbon emissions. Lowering the speed limit does save lives and is a win win for the environment.</p> <p>4) Environment. Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly.</p> <p>5) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>7) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>8) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>9) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>10) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>11) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>13) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>14) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>15) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>16) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>17) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>18) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p> <p>19) Lowering the speed limit is environmentally friendly</p>
302	Individual submitter	<p>1) Sensible, no concerns.</p> <p>4) I travel the road between Nelson and Blenheim frequently for business. This is silly, the road is fine and very little housing. This will increase travel time by 20%. Increasing costs and lowering productivity. Slower speeds will lead to increased driver frustration and more reckless overtaking leading to possible harm. Disappointed to see this is the only proposal from all the other options initially suggested. This is out of step with the rest of NZ roading and most of the road no worse than many NZ roads.</p> <p>5) Sensible in a built up area</p> <p>7) Do not agree. as per previous objections</p> <p>8) Agree within the school zone during school times. Disagree otherwise. 100km/h if the conditions allow is perfectly safe.</p> <p>9) Disagree. As previously</p> <p>10) Summer Seasonal speed restrictions are sensible, During the rest of the year there is nothing going on there that increases the risk. Disagree with yearly speed restriction.</p> <p>11) Disagree. as previous</p> <p>13) Disagree with reduction. Extensive road improvements have made large parts of this safer.</p> <p>14) 60km/h limit is ridiculous. Parts of the road dont permit driving at much more than that but this should be at the drivers discretion to drive to the conditions.</p> <p>15) dont agree</p> <p>16) agree</p> <p>17) Dont agree. road here is fine</p> <p>18) agree. area becoming increasingly built up</p> <p>19) agree as above</p>
303	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Based on my experience of driving this route every week I do not believe there is any evidence to justify a slower speed limit than the usual open road limit of 100 Km/hr. The road is of good quality and well formed. The only safety issues I occasionally observe on this road are impatient drivers making unsafe passing manoeuvres of slower traffic due to the lack of passing lanes. Rather than reduce the speed limit which will have a significant impact on the drive time for medical staff and other staff travelling to provide services in Wairau I would suggest prioritising 1-2 passing areas in the several suitable parts of this stretch of Highway.</p> <p>5) This seems inconsistent with speed limits in similar fringe of settlement areas and in my experience of driving the road weekly it is rare to encounter pedestrians, cyclists or slower local traffic in this zone.</p> <p>7) Based on my experience of driving this road weekly I do not believe there are any features of this stretch of road that justify having a lower speed limit to any other state highway. It is a short stretch of winding but high quality road with good passing opportunities at each end and I have rarely seen any unsafe driving on this section of road. Better advisory signage and advice re the next passing area would be helpful. Encouraging slower traffic to pull over in appropriate areas etc.</p> <p>8) This is a straight piece of road with one sweeping bend with excellent visibility. The only time that a slower speed might be justified is at school drop off and pick up time so rather than slow traffic for 24 hours a day 7 days a week why not have digital signs lowering the the speed limit at appropriate times. These will be much more effective.</p> <p>9) Based on my experience of driving the road weekly there is no justification to have a lower speed limit on this stretch of road. There is good visibility and many suitable places to pass slow traffic.</p> <p>10) Based on my experience of driving this road every week winter and summer would suggest 70/50. Every time I drive through this area I am amazed that there is not a lower speed restriction particularly in summer. This too me suggests that not a lot of notice is taken of local drivers who are well aware of the danger spots on this road and how target changes rather that a blanket</p>

		<p>lowering of the speed limit will achieve a significant improvement on safety.</p> <p>11) Based on my experience of driving this road every week I cannot see any evidence to justify a change of speed limit on this stretch of road that is well formed, has excellent visibility and many passing areas.</p> <p>13) Based on my experience of driving this road weekly I see no evidence to lower the speed limit on this stretch of road. There are a number of passing zones and plenty of advisory signs. I rarely see unsafe driving through the area other than when slower traffic such as tourist camper vans are on the road in the summer and I think this could be solved by better driver education and advisories asking them to pull over to allow faster traffic to pass.</p> <p>14) Based on my experience of driving this road every week I see no reason to lower the speed limit. Mostly people drive well below the limit on the winding section and there are plenty of advisory signs. The straight section is well formed with good visibility. Changing the speed limit on this section is unlikely to change driver behaviour.</p> <p>15) I see no reason to have a different speed limit on this section of state highway. It is a well formed road</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) Based on my experience of driving this road every week there is no reason to change the limit over this entire section however there are parts of this section where I strongly believe the speed limit should be lower particularly from Nelson North Country Club to 200 m north of The Glen Road Intersection where the limit should be 70. There is no need to have a slower limit on the straight areas of road with good visibility.</p> <p>18) There is know need to lower the limit in this area. A better options is to continue efforts to separate paedestrians and cyclists from road traffic.</p> <p>19) I'm not convinced this is necessary but it is not unreasonable.</p>
304	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't change it.</p> <p>4) Leave it as is.</p> <p>5) Don't change the limit.</p> <p>7) The road is fine as is.</p> <p>8) Only change it for the School section of the road.</p> <p>9) Leave it as is.</p> <p>10) Only slow traffic for the bridge as you have to slow down anyway. Then increase straight away to 100 kmh.</p> <p>11) Leave it as is.</p> <p>13) Leave it as is.</p> <p>14) Fix the road and it will be okay.</p> <p>15) It's fine now. Don't change it.</p> <p>16) Leave it as is.</p> <p>17) Don't change it.</p> <p>18) Don't change it.</p> <p>19) Don't change it.</p>
305	Individual submitter	<p>1) People basing timing for getting to work</p> <p>4) The amount of time it would add to the journey to get out there. Those roads are long and straight in a couple of places and that's just going to have people doing 100ks anyway. If that stretch of road needs to be 80ks the rest of the country needs to drop</p> <p>5) That speed limit is fine, havelock has grown and that area is now quite popular</p> <p>7) There is absolutely no need for that speed limit to change. There is nothing on that road that would cause for lower speed</p> <p>8) That is an area that is logical to have an 80k speed limit</p> <p>9) There. Is no need to change that speed limit</p> <p>10) The pelorus bring would be suitable to have a year round lower speed limit, it can be busy there all year round with people all over the road</p> <p>11) That road is mostly straight after pelorus, there's no need to lower that speed limit</p> <p>13) The Whangamoia hill could use the 80k speed limit because you can't driver faster than that anyway until you get in between the two hill. However all that new road way that was put in should be able to handle 100k</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
306	Individual submitter	<p>My husband and I do not agree with this proposal. We understand and accept restrictions in built-up areas - Atwhai, Rai, Pelarus and Havelock. But Havelock to Blenheim definitely can syat at 100kph, The hills actually dictate a slower speed anyway.</p>

		After finally improving and resurfacing Rai Saddle - you want to reduce it!? On the front page you say some people have told us.. Well, we would appreciate if you would consider that some people, are also now telling you that the speed left at 100ph in most places is acceptable.
307	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>4) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>5) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>7) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>8) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>9) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>10) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>11) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>13) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>14) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>15) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>16) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>17) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>18) FULLY SUPPORT</li> <li>19) FULLY SUPPORT</li> </ul>
308	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of cyclists on the route</li> <li>4) school buses, stock control, holiday makers</li> <li>5) number of people walking, number of towing vehicles</li> <li>7) weather conditions especially fog</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> <li>9) No comment</li> <li>10) The sharp turn into the picnic area that is unable to be done without a three point turn when travelling from Nelson</li> <li>11) No Comment</li> <li>13) No Comment</li> <li>14) No Comment</li> <li>15) No Comment</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) No Comment</li> <li>18) Extend this area at 60km to include the south entry exit of Atawhai crescent onto the highway as this is a busy corner where it takes time for vehicles to go from stationary to 80km and currently at 100kms causes a back up of traffic</li> <li>19) people looking at the view, number of driveways and road ways onto high way number of walkers and cyclists</li> </ul>
309	Pumps Nelson Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ok</li> <li>4) ok</li> <li>5) ok</li> <li>7) no</li> <li>8) no</li> <li>9) no</li> <li>10) ok</li> <li>11) No</li> <li>13) No</li> <li>14) No</li> <li>15) ok</li> <li>16) No</li> <li>17) No</li> <li>18) Ok</li> <li>19) Ok</li> </ul>
310	Individual submitter	1) I oppose changing the speed limit. Having been a victim of reckless driving on this route it was down to driver behaviour you need to put your resources on tackling the issues of drink, drugs and boy racer behaviour. Reducing the 100 k speed limit is only encouraging more overtaking maneuvers. You need to look at road modifications allowing safe overtaking movement so drivers don't



		<p>11) DON'T CHANGE  13) ok  14) ok  15) ok  16) ok  17) ok  18) DON'T CHANGE  19) ok</p>
312	Individual submitter	<p>I oppose the planed 80 kmh restrictions between Nelson and Blenheim.  I am 75 and I have found the highway good to drive over the 60 years I have been driving.  The biggest problem is with the drivers that can't judge the road conditions, don't give way at the sign and pull out into the 100k as if on a Sunday drive, slow drivers that won't pull over for following traffic, impatient drivers which points to more policing and education required Dropping the speed limit to 80k won't stop the idiots.</p>
313	Individual submitter	<p>I have been driving the Nelson to Blenheim Highway most weeks, for the last 25 years. During this time I have witnessed one incident. Whilst I acknowledge excessive peed is a factor in road accidents, I do not support a reduction in the speed limit across the whole route. In my opinion there is a number of areas along SH6 where it is safe to travel at 100km/h. In particular the locations marked 4, 7, 9, 11, part of 13 and 17 are well formed roads which suit a 100km/h speed limit.  Reducing speeds on these routes will lead to driver frustration and potentially poor decision making around overtaking. It will also affect the productivity of the many businesses that use this route.  By all means, look at speed reductions on parts of the route that are more dangerous, rather than a speed reduction across the whole route.  Suggestions to improve safety on the route are;  (a) More road enhancements through engineering solutions, such as the Rai Saddle realignment.  (b) More passing lanes and slow vechile bays  (c) More rigorous policing of the existing speed limit (perhaps using speed cameras as well)  (d) More driver education around driving to the prevailing conditions and also for overseas drivers visiting NZ.</p>
314	Individual submitter	<p>1) No other factors. I support this change.  4) No other factors. I support this change.  5) No other factors. I support this change.  7) No other factors. I support this change.  8) No other factors. I support this change.  9) No other factors. I support this change.  10) No other factors. I support this change.  11) No other factors. I support this change.  13) No other factors. I support this change.  14) No other factors. I support this change.  15) No other factors. I support this change.  16) No other factors. I support this change.  17) No other factors. I support this change.  18) No other factors. I support this change.  19) No other factors. I support this change.</p>
315	Individual submitter	<p>1) Some sections of the roadway may be safe at existing speed limit, others not.  4) Some sections of the roadway may be safe at existing speed limit, others not.  5) no  7) no  8) addition of flashing lights in school zones during school day  9) no  10) no  11) Some sections of the roadway may be safe at existing speed limit, others not.  13) Some sections of the roadway may be safe at existing speed limit, others not.  14) Some sections of the roadway may be safe at existing speed limit, others not.  15) no  16) no</p>

		<p>17) no</p> <p>18) no</p> <p>19) no</p>
316	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) This is an area of active housing development, which will increase traffic entering SH6 here, so the proposed reduction is consistent with the likely increasing risk of accidents.</p>
317	Individual submitter	<p>1) Accept proposed new speed limit. Reason, for safety of vehicles entering &amp; exiting side roads &amp; properties. Also people walking on sides othe road.</p> <p>4) Should be lower to 70km as it approaches the sharp bends when I was living in the area a small truck roll over in the bends.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Need at Least two seal pull off areas or Passing lanes Reason Tailgating trucks when driving at speed limit</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Need at Least two seal pull off areas or Passing lanes Reason Tailgating trucks when driving at speed limit.</p> <p>10) If it legal predestrian crossing as many tourist cross the road to walk down to the river. Or have LARGE predestrian signs.</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) Due to many double yellow lines and lot of winding road that is narrow. Many people regularly make dangerous manoeuvres to pass and have extremely insufficient distance before next corner. This stretch of road needs more passing lanes &amp; and pull off areas the pull areas are a essential.</p> <p>14) This area needs more pull off areas for safety reasons and down hill tailgating trucks</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) Extend the propsed 60 km to 300 metres south west of the access entry from Atawhai Drive. Also extend the length of the solid white line on the state Highway for vehicles coming out onto highway from Atawhai Drive turning right</p>
318	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it at 100km</p> <p>4) Keep.it at 100km</p> <p>5) Keep it at 70km</p> <p>7) Keep it at 100km</p> <p>8) Keep it at 100km with 60km the same in school zone</p> <p>9) Keep it at 100km</p> <p>10) 100/60km</p> <p>11) Keep.it at 100km</p> <p>13) Keep it at 100km</p> <p>14) Keep.it at 100km</p> <p>15) Keep at 100km</p> <p>16) Keep at 80km</p> <p>17) 100km</p> <p>18) 80km</p> <p>19) 100km</p>

319	Individual submitter	<p>1) Absolutely thrilled and hope the speed limit of 80ks goes ahead. A lot of motorists are driving well over 100ks in some areas of SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson. Many times I've been passed when driving at 100ks. Some people will still speed if the change goes ahead but hopefully unlikely to exceed 100.</p> <p>4) Big tick!</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
320	Individual submitter	<p>1) no</p> <p>4) no</p> <p>5) no</p> <p>7) no</p> <p>8) no</p> <p>9) no</p> <p>10) no</p> <p>11) no</p> <p>13) no</p> <p>14) no</p> <p>15) no</p> <p>16) no</p> <p>17) no</p> <p>18) no</p> <p>19) no</p>
321	NZCE	<p>I agree with lowering the speed limit on some but not all sections of the route. Nelson to the Glen should be 80 due to cars entering and exiting roads onto the highway but lowering to 60 is unnecessary and will cause frustration. 80 from there to the top of the Whangamoas is fine but from there to Rai valley could be 90. 80 will cause frustration and may result in risky passing. From Pelorous to Blenheim could safely remain 100 or be 90.</p> <p>Where there's schools or residential areas lower the limit but only where necessary.</p> <p>Overall there is a case to lower the limit, especially when the highway passes through residential zones but a blanket lowering to 80 and below may cause more issues than anticipated. For instance if the route is made less challenging it may result in driver inattention and drowsiness. Straighter and wider (and slower) roads may be perceived as being safer but not if they disengage the driver. We know median barriers along with wide shoulders are effective safety measures. Lowering the speed limit may not produce the desired result. No matter the speed there will always be accidents. In-car and external safety measures are known to be important as we need to lessen the result of mistakes as we won't prevent them. Blanket lowering of the limit doesn't seem to be the answer.</p>
322	Individual submitter	<p>1) I travel this section every day and very rarely do I see vehicles exceeding 100k. Generally the speed is closer to 90kmh. No need to change.</p> <p>4) Crazy, its a good 100k road, I travel it every week.</p> <p>5) No opinion as I do not know the road</p> <p>7) Its a good road, why change it. I drive it reguararly</p> <p>8) No opinion as I do not use that section</p> <p>9) Its a good road - why change the speed limit</p> <p>10) Might be a good idea</p> <p>11) Why would you want to lower the speed limit - the road is fine</p> <p>13) Nothing wrong with section really. It is a 100k capable road</p> <p>14) I can accept a reduction to 80knh -but 60 seems crazy</p>

		<p>15) Why on earth alter this from 100kmh</p> <p>16) Good idea</p> <p>17) Why drop it down to 80kmh seems crazy</p> <p>18) Probably a good idea, I have seen some odd driving in this area</p> <p>19) Possibly a good idea</p>
323	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) This section of road has very narrow or non existent shoulder. It has lots of trucks travelling at high speed. When biking along here in 2018 I was very very nearly wiped out by a truck travelling too fast and way to close to me. This was possibly the closer shave to death on the road I have EVER had.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) It is insane this section of road is 100 km!</p>
324	Individual submitter	<p>1) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>4) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>5) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>7) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>8) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>9) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>10) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>11) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>13) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>14) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p>

		<p>will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>15) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>16) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>17) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>18) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p> <p>19) The near complete disagreement of the Nelson Marlborough community on the need to reduce the speed limit. There are other actions available to save lives, ie adopt the Queensland police chase policy would save an average 6-7 lives per year. Tens of millions a year are spent on roading improvements to reduce travel times and the inherent costs of this and this speed limit reduction will render this investment null and void.</p>
325	Individual submitter	State highway 6. Leave speed alone. Be more the point if more highway patrol was active. Joke how many younger ones on cell phones lack of attention. Now stupid idiots in parliament want to legalise dope. For example Nelson st and Grove road intersecti...
326	Individual submitter	<p>1) Doesn't worry me if this changes to 80km.</p> <p>4) Absolutely stupid idea. Just needs more "pull over if you are holding up traffic" signs to stop backlogs and unsafe passing due to frustrated drivers being held up</p> <p>5) No problems with this</p> <p>7) Again stupid. Does anyone that make these desisions have to drive this road daily. 80km would create frustration and anger</p> <p>8) No problem with school zone</p> <p>9) Should be 60km through pelorus Bridge all year round. Rest of it stay at 100km</p> <p>10) Yes</p> <p>11) No. If you can't drive this roaf to the conditions at 100km you shouldn't be on the road</p> <p>13) Should be 80km on the Rai saddle only this is a dangerous piece of road even after driving it hundreds of times. Makes sense although the only passing lane is in the middle of this which defeats the purpose</p> <p>14) Whangamoas could be 80km but not the Valley between the two hills</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) Already fine</p> <p>17) The 80km zone should start where it is where Atawai drive changes to the other road before Clifton terrace</p> <p>18) 80km</p> <p>19) Yes fine</p>
327	Individual submitter	<p>1) Airport transit times affected</p> <p>4) Very open roads, no need to reduce. Stronger rules to educate tourists on rules and not crossing centre line would be a better idea.</p> <p>5) Very few accidents here.70km zone Assists in flow of traffic into havelock township.</p> <p>7) Clear roads. Few blind corners. No reduction necessary. Educate tourists!!</p> <p>8) 100 km zone is fine</p> <p>9) Road has good visibility. 100km is fine</p> <p>10) 80km zone out of peak</p> <p>11) Roads are open and good visibility. No need to change</p> <p>13) Clear straight roads. Don't change</p> <p>14) 80km in winding sections</p> <p>15) 100km is fine. Roads are open and flow well</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) Straight roads. 80km is fine</p> <p>18) 80k creates good traffic flow</p> <p>19) 100km by zone is appropriate with straight road and good traffic flow</p>

328	Nelson drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Keep it at 100</li> <li>4) Keep it at 100</li> <li>5) Keep it at 70</li> <li>7) Keep it at 100</li> <li>8) Keep it at 100</li> <li>9) Keep it at 100</li> <li>10) Keep it at 100</li> <li>11) Keep it at 100</li> <li>13) Keep it at 100</li> <li>14) Keep it at 100</li> <li>15) Keep it at 100</li> <li>16) Keep it at 80</li> <li>17) Keep it at 100</li> <li>18) Keep it at 80</li> <li>19) Keep it at 80</li> </ul>
329	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Leave the speed at it is already</li> <li>4) Leave the speed at it is</li> <li>5) Leave it at it is</li> <li>7) Leave it as it is</li> <li>8) Leave it as it is</li> <li>9) Leave it as it is</li> <li>10) Leave it as it is</li> <li>11) Leave it as it is</li> <li>13) Leave it as it is</li> <li>14) Leave it as it is. But take some corners off and realign it</li> <li>15) Leave it as it is</li> <li>16) Leave it as it is</li> <li>17) Leave it as it is</li> <li>18) Leave it as it is</li> <li>19) Leave it as it is</li> </ul>
330	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>4) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>8) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>9) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>10) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>11) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>13) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>14) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>15) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) Oppose any speed reduction from 100km/h here as it is unnecessary</li> <li>18) No Comment</li> <li>19) No Comment</li> </ul>
331	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) No Comment</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) No Comment</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> </ul>

		<p>9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) I drive this road everyday and see the only dangerous driving happening when other drivers aren't sticking to the speed limit. There needs to be more safe passing lanes for slower drivers. There is only one from Cable Bay Road to Nelson City.  18) More passing lanes.  19) No Comment</p>
332	Individual submitter	<p>1) do not reduce speed, keep as is  4) do not reduce speed, keep as is  5) do not reduce speed, keep as is  7) do not reduce speed, keep as is  8) do not reduce speed, keep as is  9) do not reduce speed, keep as is  10) do not reduce speed, keep as is  11) do not reduce speed, keep as is  13) do not reduce speed, keep as is  14) do not reduce speed, keep as is  15) do not reduce speed, keep as is  16) do not reduce speed, keep as is  17) do not reduce speed, keep as is  18) do not reduce speed, keep as is  19) do not reduce speed, keep as is</p>
333	Individual submitter	<p>1) good idea  4) good idea  5) good idea  7) ok with me  8) all good  9) all good  10) Good idea, need more arrows on road to remind tourists to keep left around here too.  11) fine  13) all good w me  14) You can't do 100 through there anyway. Median barriers would be good and slow people down too. Cyclists shouldn't be allowed through here it's too narrow, no space for 2 vehicles and bike, accident waiting to happen.  15) idea not just for this section... need to have signed pull in zones for slow drivers, not more passing lanes, pull ins are much cheaper.  16) good  17) good plan  18) good idea, lots going on in this area  19) I would just keep it at 60km because it's really confusing there already going from 100 to 80 the back to 100 then 50 once you hit the roundabout, I never know what speed i'm meant to be doing.</p>
334	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No, maybe add passing lanes or slow vehicle bays/pull over areas  5) No Comment  7) No, teach drivers to pull over and make existing areas safer to do so. Most issues are caused by slow drivers holding up traffic and not allowing them past.  8) Good idea, school zone  9) Once again, passing lanes and driver education to pull over  10) No Comment</p>

		<p>11) No, plenty of space for passing and lanes to go in</p> <p>13) Hell no</p> <p>14) How about open road signage and signage to remind people to let others pass</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No... Easy straights</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
335	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>4) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>5) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>7) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>8) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>9) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>10) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>11) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>13) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>14) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>15) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>16) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>17) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>18) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p> <p>19) Don't do it just make a medium barrier or 2 lanes the entire way to Nelson problem sorted slowing speeds is only going to cause more trouble for truck drivers who are already under enough time restrictions and will piss people off more which will cause more crashes cause trucks won't pull over at all cause they are doing the speed limit</p>
336	Individual submitter	<p>1) Slower speeds save lives. Look after cyclists.</p> <p>4) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>5) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>7) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>8) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>9) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>10) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>11) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>13) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>14) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>15) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>16) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p>

		<p>17) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>18) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p> <p>19) This is a no-brainer. A comparatively narrow winding road shared with cyclists needs a lower speed limit.</p>
337	Individual submitter	<p>1) 80km</p> <p>4) 100km should be kept the limit</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) 100km should be kept as the limit</p> <p>8) 100km should be kept as the limit with a variable school zone speed</p> <p>9) 100km should be kept as the limit</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) 100km should be kept as the limit</p> <p>13) 100km should be kept as the limit</p> <p>14) 100km should be kept as the limit, drivers drive to the conditions.</p> <p>15) 100km should be kept as the limit</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) 100km should be kept as the limit</p> <p>18) Keep at 80km</p> <p>19) 100km should be kept as the limit</p>
338	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) This is unreasonable. This road is absolutely fine to travel at the 100kph already. There will be more impatient drivers and more accidents. The issue is not the road. It's drivers</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This is unreasonable. This road is absolutely fine to travel at the 100kph already. There will be more impatient drivers and more accidents.</p> <p>8) This is unreasonable. This road is absolutely fine to travel at the 100kph already. There will be more impatient drivers and more accidents.</p> <p>9) This is unreasonable. This road is absolutely fine to travel at the 100kph already. There will be more impatient drivers and more accidents. Put in passing lanes so there's not people passing in places that aren't suitable</p> <p>10) Keep it as it is. During summer absolutely lower it. But there's no need in the off season.</p> <p>11) This is unreasonable. This road is absolutely fine to travel at the 100kph already. There will be more impatient drivers and more accidents.</p> <p>13) This is unreasonable. This road is absolutely fine to travel at the 100kph already. There will be more impatient drivers and more accidents.</p> <p>14) This will cause even more impatience from drivers.</p> <p>15) This is unreasonable. This road is absolutely fine to travel at the 100kph already. There will be more impatient drivers and more accidents.</p> <p>16) Sure, add in a school zone, it surprises me there isn't one already</p> <p>17) Add in passing lanes instead.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
339	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree</p> <p>4) Agree</p> <p>5) Agree</p> <p>7) Agree</p> <p>8) Agree</p> <p>9) Agree</p> <p>10) Agree</p> <p>11) Agree</p> <p>13) Agree</p> <p>14) Agree</p> <p>15) Agree</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) Agree</p> <p>18) Agree</p> <p>19) Agree</p>

340	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I support the change</li> <li>4) I support the change</li> <li>5) I support the change</li> <li>7) I think the 100kph should remain</li> <li>8) I support the change</li> <li>9) All good</li> <li>10) I think the 100kph should remain</li> <li>11) I think the 100kph should remain</li> <li>13) I think the 100kph should remain</li> <li>14) All good</li> <li>15) I support the change</li> <li>16) I support the change</li> <li>17) I support the change</li> <li>18) All good</li> <li>19) I support the change</li> </ul>
341	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Keep it at 100km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>4) Keep it at 100km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>5) Agree</li> <li>7) Keep it at 100km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>8) Agree. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>9) Keep it at 100km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>10) Agree</li> <li>11) Keep it at 100km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>13) Keep it at 100km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>14) agree</li> <li>15) Keep it at 100km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>16) Agree. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>17) Keep it at 100km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>18) Keep it at 80km/h. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> <li>19) Agree. Restrict cyclists to roads with 60km/h speed limit</li> </ul>
342	Individual submitter	<p>Some of the proposed speed limits are good, but there are sections of the road that are safe at 100km or 90km. I feel that multiple speed limits 80-90-100k is the way to go. I have driven a bit on rural roads in USA and their speed limits change frequently to suit the conditions. At the end of the day it is impatient drivers that cause most of the accidents. Keeping the speed at 80km or below are only going to make these people more frustrated and this will cause more accidents!!</p>
343	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No all good</li> <li>4) No, all good</li> <li>5) No, all good</li> <li>7) No all good</li> <li>8) No, good idea</li> <li>9) Should be 50 km at Pelorus bridge all year round</li> <li>10) Should be 50km at Pelorus Bridge all year round</li> <li>11) Good idea</li> <li>13) Good idea</li> <li>14) 80km speed limit and drive to the road conditions</li> <li>15) Good idea</li> <li>16) Good idea</li> <li>17) Good idea</li> <li>18) Be consistent and keep it 80km, to confusing to change speedlimits too often.</li> <li>19) Great idea. Please take the passing lane out. This is too often used as a race track and cars travelling well over the speed limit. You will need to allow budget for enforcing the speed limit and put a camera up or police patrol. In the 10 years I have lived in this area I have never seen a police patrol car doing speed control.</li> </ul>

344	Individual submitter	1) 100 4) 100 5) 80 7) 100 8) 100 9) 100 10) 100 11) 100 13) 100 14) 100 15) 100 16) 80 17) 100 18) 80 19) 100
345	Individual submitter	<p>I have been living in the Nelson/Tasman for almost 6 years now and being from Europe I have come from traffic a lot denser than it is here. People drive faster but still there are less accidents. Why? Better cars, better roads and most important: Better driver education! Good drivers drive to the conditions. Reducing the limits is just make up on a very ugly face and accidents with foreign drivers or drug related incidents won't just go away.</p> <p>Please, do not patronize drivers like that, we are not children that need boundaries, we are on the same side. Everybody wants to arrive safely.</p> <p>NO to unnecessary traffic limits on far stretches of straight, empty roads!  NO to 80 and 60 around Nelson!</p> <p>If you must regulate something, ban all old cars and trucks, up the WOF requirements.  Better and less noisy sealing for roads.</p>
346	Individual submitter	1) I support this reduction. 4) I support this reduction. 5) I support this reduction. 7) I support this reduction. 8) I support this reduction. 9) I support this reduction. 10) I support this reduction. 11) I support this reduction. 13) I support this reduction. 14) I support this reduction. 15) I support this reduction. 16) I would support a further reduction to 30kph where the road is within 3km of Hira school. The government expects that any roads within 3km of a school should be navigable by primary school aged children - on foot and/or by bike - as they deny those children free school bus travel. An 80kph speed limit is demonstrably not safe for school children to travel beside. Until such time as there is a separated cycle/foot path for all children to travel to school on within 3km of the school, the speed limit should not exceed 30kph OR the government should provide free school bus travel for these children. 17) I support this reduction - however, within 3km of Clifton Terrace School, the speed limit should not exceed 30kph on any road, until there is a safe, separated cycle/foot path for all children to travel to and from this school on within this radius. 18) Within 3km of Clifton Terrace School, the speed limit should not exceed 30kph on any road, or, at least until such time as there is a safe, separate and well protected cycle/foot path in place so that primary school aged children can travel to school securely and under their own steam - as is government policy and as is implied by failure to pay for school bus travel within this range. 19) I support this reduction.
347	Individual submitter	1) Doesn't need changing 4) Doesn't need changing 5) This is ok 7) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!

		<p>8) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine! School zone speed reduced is ok</p> <p>9) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!</p> <p>10) This is ok</p> <p>11) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!</p> <p>13) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!</p> <p>14) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!</p> <p>15) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!</p> <p>16) .</p> <p>17) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!</p> <p>18) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!</p> <p>19) Totally not required!! Current speed is fine!</p>
348	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think its crap you have decided to drop the speed limit from 100 to 80 on a open roads and as a resident of rai valley we have been asking to drop the speed limit to 50k through the township and 40k pass the school but you say know what shit you dont care but the safety in our town with kids walking to and from school people walking across the road to get to the toilets from the brick oven but yet let's change a open road speed have what a fucking joke start listening to what people actually want and dont come up with money and time wasting shit start looking after our town first Rai valley</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) So still nothing with dropping through rai to 50 This hole thing is bulshit wasting tax payer money</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
349	Individual submitter	<p>1) Has all ready been tried and was changed back</p> <p>4) Fairly straight road no need for change</p> <p>5) See no issue in this</p> <p>7) Again fairly straight road no need for change</p> <p>8) School zone seems reasonable but that stretch of road is on of the few areas you can pass those who are already holding up traffic by travelling to slow</p> <p>9) Again ne need for change</p> <p>10) See no harm in changing</p> <p>11) Again one of the few places to pass those all ready travelling to slow</p> <p>13) No need for change</p> <p>14) 80 would be ok 60 is being silly</p> <p>15) No need for change</p> <p>16) Seems reasonable</p> <p>17) No need for change</p> <p>18) Seems reasonable</p> <p>19) No need for change</p>
350	Individual submitter	<p>1) The traffic backs up more when the limit is 80km</p> <p>4) The frustration of going slowly and the fact there are not many great passing lanes. Its always been a nice drive but this will just make it frustrating and with longer lines of traffic mean more fatigue as your concertrating harder</p> <p>5) That would ke be fine in the township</p> <p>7) No it's open road area</p> <p>8) No it's open road</p>

		<p>9) No it's open road  10) No it's open road  11) No it's open road  13) No it's open riad  14) Open road speed limit  15) No open road limit  16) No its open road  17) It's open road  18) Unsure of this location  19) No open road</p>
<b>351</b>	Individual submitter	I would like to see the proposed changes to the speed limit
<b>352</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes leave it as it is. No need to fix what isn't broken  4) This is not a heavy traffic road. The road is good, signage is good and traffic police monitoring is frequent. Just leave it as a 100 zone  5) No objection to this proposal.  7) Good road, well sign posted . Just leave it has a 100 zone.  8) Forget about the 80 bit but include the school zone 60 or make the school zone an 80 zone.  9) leave it alone. Again good road, good visibility and again traffic is not heavy.  10) Leave it alone. There is good signage and plenty of warning re the one way bridge.  11) Leave it alone. Please stop filling the roads with unnecessary signs. It is perfectly safe to travel on this road at up to100k.  13) Leave it alone. The nature of the road and the various road signs re corners etc determine quite clearly that careful and attentive driving is needed and there are good passing zones  14) This is a dopey idea. The plethora of properly placed corner speed warning signs tell you all. No point in sticking in a 60 zone when it is not necessary.  15) Leave it alone. As already observed the nature of the road along with good signage and slow vehicle pull off places set the pace. No need to further threaten drivers.  16) No objection to this.  17) Leave it alone. Good road, passing lane , good visibility.  18) No objection.  19) No objection and probably an overdue change.</p>
<b>353</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) 80km/h imposed during early operation of the Alternate Route received limited public support and compliance. Will need sound evidence base to reduce to 80 km/h  4) At 80km/h with no adverse grades for heavy vehicles, much lower numbers of cars overtaking trucks can be expected. Will be safer. However, I expect some drivers will feel frustrated following a speed compliant driver and overtaking will inevitably occur.  5) No comment  7) No comment  8) No comment  9) No comment  10) No comment  11) Residents at Bulford intersection have previously sought assistance with sight distance issues. Speed reduction will resolve.  13) No comment  14) No comment  15) No comment  16) No comment  17) No comment  18) No comment  19) No comment</p>
<b>354</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) Add a cyclist and driver, I believe this section of road is screws and suitable for the current 100kph limit. It is straight, and had good shoulders. I think this is the only section of SH63 that is suitable for 100kph  4) Without a shoulder, and often with low visibility (due to corners), this is a road that I will never cycle on this road north of the Wairau river again. As a confident cyclist, and that means that the road is too narrow, or the speed is too fast  5) Great, less confusion  7) Great  8) Great</p>

		<p>9) Great</p> <p>10) Great</p> <p>11) Great. This road had lots of small dips and rises, and never has a shoulder</p> <p>13) There is virtually no part of the road where 100kph can be achieved, so no real change. I like it</p> <p>14) Same again</p> <p>15) All good</p> <p>16) Great</p> <p>17) Great</p> <p>18) I don't feel like the current 80kph limit is too fast. I believe there is cycle lane, a shoulder, and good visibility. No change is my recommendation</p> <p>19) All goods. A single consistent speed on this coastal section would be a good thing</p>
355	Individual submitter	<p>I drive this road every week &amp; consider myself a cautious driver. I've had some scares &amp; they've all been due to bullies in big utes &amp; confused tourists in slow camper vans. I've been run off the road twice on separate occasions by the same vehicle (big red hilux actually). Slow drivers as always are a frustration that will cause even a cautious driver to take risks. Regarding the speed limits they're not purely to blame &amp; some people will struggle to achieve the lower speed new speed limits. You will end up with people watching their speedos &amp; not watching the road. With respect to the individual limits: - Area 18) 60kmh on a main highway? You can't be serious! Areas 12 - 15) Agreed. Nobody gets much faster than 70kmh anyway. Area 4 - 12) Most of this area is safe at 100kmh Occasionally the Whangamoia &amp; Rai saddles are slippery at night in winter but that comes down to driving to the conditions. A real effort is needed to encourage motorists to do just that, The Rai Saddle project was a huge waste of money. The road is still steep &amp; requires low gear to negotiate &amp; I've heard that there are technical problems with the road surface</p>
356	Individual submitter	<p>1) N/A</p> <p>4) The majority of this section of highway is straight with good driver visibility. Why would you want to reduce the speed? Have there been numerous fatalities where vehicles have been travelling between 80 and 100? If there have been, have these accidents involved a common type of vehicle or driver or has there been a slow vehicle causing queues at the time? Perhaps there is another reason for the crashes other than speed. The road feels safe to drive at 100km/hr to me.</p> <p>5) N/A</p> <p>7) The majority of this section of highway is straight with good driver visibility. Why would you want to reduce the speed? Have there been numerous fatalities where vehicles have been travelling between 80 and 100? If there have been, have these accidents involved a common type of vehicle or driver or has there been a slow vehicle causing queues at the time? Perhaps there is another reason for the crashes other than speed. The road feels safe to drive at 100km/hr to me.</p> <p>8) Good idea</p> <p>9) The majority of this section of highway is straight with good driver visibility. Why would you want to reduce the speed? Have there been numerous fatalities where vehicles have been travelling between 80 and 100? If there have been, have these accidents involved a common type of vehicle or driver or has there been a slow vehicle causing queues at the time? Perhaps there is another reason for the crashes other than speed. The road feels safe to drive at 100km/hr to me.</p> <p>10) Seasonal speed variations make sense. 80/60.</p> <p>11) The majority of this section of highway is straight with good driver visibility. Why would you want to reduce the speed? Have there been numerous fatalities where vehicles have been travelling between 80 and 100? If there have been, have these accidents involved a common type of vehicle or driver or has there been a slow vehicle causing queues at the time? Perhaps there is another reason for the crashes other than speed. The road feels safe to drive at 100km/hr to me.</p> <p>13) The majority of this section of highway is straight with good driver visibility. Why would you want to reduce the speed? Have there been numerous fatalities where vehicles have been travelling between 80 and 100? If there have been, have these accidents involved a common type of vehicle or driver or has there been a slow vehicle causing queues at the time? Perhaps there is another reason for the crashes other than speed. The road feels safe to drive at 100km/hr to me, except for a couple of short windy sections. Perhaps these sections could be removed rather than reducing speeds just because the roads are not in good enough condition.</p> <p>14) N/A</p> <p>15) The majority of this section of highway is straight and wide with good driver visibility. Why would you want to reduce the speed? Have there been numerous fatalities where vehicles have been travelling between 80 and 100? If there have been, have these accidents involved a common type of vehicle or driver or has there been a slow vehicle causing queues at the time? Perhaps there is another reason for the crashes other than speed. The road feels safe to drive at 100km/hr to me.</p> <p>16) Good Idea. Trucks especially do not slow down from 100 to 80 past the school now. This is dangerous.</p> <p>17) The majority of this section of highway is straight and wide with good driver visibility. Why would you want to reduce the speed? Have there been numerous fatalities where vehicles have been travelling between 80 and 100? If there have been, have these accidents involved a common type of vehicle or driver or has there been a slow vehicle causing queues at the time? Perhaps there is another reason for the crashes other than speed. The road feels safe to drive at 100km/hr to me. The most dangerous aspects are the Cable Bay Rd and Glen Rd junctions with SH6. Money should be spent here. At Cable Bay Rd, vehicles heading east/ downhill cannot stop if a slow vehicle such as a truck and trailer or car towing or school bus is turning into SH6. 80 will not be slow enough to improve this. If a roundabout was constructed here, this would enforce a traffic slow down through Hira and significantly improve the safety of the intersection. Similarly safety at the blind corner heading east at The Glen turn-off would be greatly improved if a round-about were constructed here. The other big issue with this section of highway is the incredibly poor surfacing. The carriageway is failing in numerous areas and NZTAs contractors appear incompetent at resurfacing - often having two or three goes and still leaving it in a rubbish state..</p> <p>18) The majority of this section of highway is straight and wide with good driver visibility. Why would you want to reduce the speed? Have there been numerous fatalities where vehicles have been travelling between 80 and 80? If there have been, have these accidents involved a common type of vehicle or driver or has there been a slow vehicle causing queues at the time? Perhaps</p>

		<p>there is another reason for the crashes other than speed. The road feels safe to drive at 80km/hr to me. The school has carriageway separation and a safety fence now. Perhaps a 60km/hr variable school zone would be belt and braces, but not a permanent 60.</p> <p>19) This is madness. This section of road has restricted intersection access and no driveway access - more or less motorway standard. The road is dead flat, wide and has very long sight distance. The road condition is incredibly poor as NZTA appear to under fund maintenance here, but otherwise the road definitely should not have a speed reduction - there is nothing unsafe about it.</p>
357	Individual submitter	I travel weekly and have always believed that 100kph over the Whangamoia preposterous. Probably 70 would be more suitable. Perhaps a compromise speed between Blenheim and Havelock of 90 should be considered? Cycle lanes need to be considered and I feel the 60kph sign entering Rai Valley township and school could be lowered to 50.
358	Individual submitter	I am opposed to the speed limit change as time after time it drivers passing in the wrong places and slow drivers driving 10-20km under the speed limit and also driver who brake at every corner.
359	Individual submitter	[no comment]
360	Individual submitter	<p>1) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>4) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>5) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>7) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>8) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.. Just make a slower speed limit by the school.</p> <p>9) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>10) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>11) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>13) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>14) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>15) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>16) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions. Only have a slower speed near the school,</p> <p>17) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>18) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p> <p>19) This change is not necessary. Changing the speed will not change the idiot drivers. It could possibly make it worse. Drivers will be impatient and make bad decisions.</p>
361	Individual submitter	<p>1) This has already been trialed and was unnecessary, it should remain at 100.</p> <p>4) This is a good condition, wide and open section of state highway easily travelled at 100k during all normal road conditions.</p> <p>5) This zone provides a buffer to slow down prior to the town centre speed of 50k. Visibility is good and pedestrians are minimal. No need to change to 50.</p> <p>7) I suggest a 90k limit here, to match heavy vehicles and trailers as there are limited overtaking opportunities</p> <p>8) 90, with a variable speed school zone</p> <p>9) 90k to match heavy vehicles</p> <p>10) Agree with the proposed 60k zone</p> <p>11) Should remain at 100 k, this is a good section of road</p> <p>13) Remain at 100k, there are already suitable suggested speed signs for the corners</p> <p>14) Lower to 80k due to the tight nature of the road</p> <p>15) Continue the 90k limit</p> <p>16) Agreed</p> <p>17) Remain at 100 k, allowing the safe use of the passing bay</p> <p>18) 70k</p> <p>19) 90k</p>
362	Individual submitter	Hi , I do not agree with changing speed limits on the Nelson Blenheim Highway.
363	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's a straight piece of road leave it so people can pass slower vehicles</p> <p>4) Nothing wrong with the road</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) Leave it as it is</p> <p>8) Fine with the school there</p> <p>9) Once again no reason as good bit of road</p>

		<p>10) Ok  11) It a place to pass slower vehicles  13) Ridiculous drive to the condition  14) Make it 70  15) No  16) No Comment  17) Make it 90  18) It's 80 leave it alone  19) Make it 90...if you people drove the road 3 times a day and realise need more passing lanes if you make it 80 km it's going to be ridiculous</p>
364	Individual submitter	<p>1) No change, drive to the conditions  4) No change, drive to the conditions  5) No change, drive to the conditions  7) No change, drive to the conditions  8) No change, drive to the conditions  9) No change, drive to the conditions  10) No change, drive to the conditions  11) No change, drive to the conditions  13) No change, drive to the conditions  14) No change, drive to the conditions  15) No change, drive to the conditions  16) No change, drive to the conditions  17) No change, drive to the conditions  18) No change, drive to the cond  19) No change, drive to the conditions</p>
365	Rylec Electrical Ltd	<p>1) Leave the speed at 100km, encourage further driver training schemes, like Live to Ride motorcycle training  4) Again further driver training  5) Again further driver training, think about the cost to business with the extra time taken  7) Further driver training  8) Further driver training  9) Further driver training  10) Further driver training  11) Further driver training  13) Further driver training  14) Further driver training  15) Further driver training  16) Further driver training  17) Further driver training  18) Further driver training  19) Further driver training</p>
366	Individual submitter	<p>1) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I think it should remain as is.  4) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.  5) 70 km/h is fine for this section. I think it should remain as is.  7) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.  8) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is outside school hours. A variable school zone morning and afternoon is sensible.  9) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.  10) The existing arrangement works well and should remain.  11) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.  13) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.  14) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.</p>

		<p>15) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.</p> <p>16) The 80 km/h is unnecessary and should to revert to 100 km/h because the traffic flow is never that great. A variable 60 km/h school zone twice a day is OK</p> <p>17) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.</p> <p>18) 60 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 80- 100km/h is fine. I would be happy to see it increased to 100km/h. Extending the cycle way would be sensible too.</p> <p>19) 80 km/h is too slow and cause driver frustration. I have driven this section of road numerous times and 100km/h is fine. I think it should remain as is.</p>
367	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Should stay at 100 and be policed more readily.</p> <p>5) Stay at 70</p> <p>7) Stay at 100</p> <p>8) About time speed limit was reduced outside of the school. They have been asking for this for over 15 years!</p> <p>9) Stay at 100</p> <p>10) Good idea - very windy and plenty of tourists pulling in and out!</p> <p>11) Stay at 100</p> <p>13) Stay at 100</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
368	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a perfectly safe stretch of road that does not need to be dropped to 80km.</p> <p>4) I do not believe that this stretch of road needs to be reduced to 80km. It is straight, wide and safe for most of it. Where you catch people speeding and taking risk is because from Blenheim to Rai saddle approx 1hr drive there are zero passing or slow vehicle bays this is the problem with this stretch of road. I travel this road 2x a week and it is a perfectly safe road to travel at 100km. It is the frustrated drivers taking risks they wouldn't usually take. The answer here for this stretch of the road is not to reduce speed but to add passing lanes. There are plenty of sections of the road where these could be added.</p> <p>5) I agree that this change wouldn't have much impact.</p> <p>7) Another section of the road that does not need changing, it is perfectly safe to travel at 100km along here. Passing lanes can be added to alleviate frustrated drivers. If you look back at stats from accidents in this area from fatal crashes I believe most if not all have involved alcohol.</p> <p>8) This is the only piece of road between havelock and pelorous that is safe to over take. There are school zone signs in place already and there are double yellow lines well clear of the school. I think it would be reasonable to reduce speed during school drop off and pick up times only but not permanently. Reducing speed here may increase crashes or make criminals out of drivers simply wanting to pass vehicles that already travel between 70-80km along that stretch of road.</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) What on earth would this achieve? There are no recorded crashes that I can find on this section of the road in the first place with the existing 100km speed limit.</p> <p>11) It is still safe to travel at 100km along this stretch. Put more passing lanes in as there is still no passing lanes anywhere between this point and Blenheim.</p> <p>13) I agree with this decision. I think it would be wise to have an 80km speed limit on windy sections of the road between Hira and Rai Valley, realistically you can't safely drive any faster than that on some sections of this road anyhow. But FROM rai Valley to Blenheim it does not need to be 80km.</p> <p>14) 60km is too slow. It will feel like a crawl. Perhaps the Nelson side of the whangamoas could be redeveloped like the Blenheim side was years ago.</p> <p>15) I agree that most areas of this section of road you cannot travel any faster than 80km safely.</p> <p>16) It is already 80km through most of this section of road.</p> <p>17) I agree with this change.. There is a dangerous and narrow passing lane over the gentle Annie's that is difficult to get through if there is oncoming traffic.</p> <p>18) Residents have been advocating for this change for a while. I believe that it would make this safer for people trying to turn into side streets along this stretch of road.</p> <p>19) Agree with this proposal.</p>
369	Individual submitter	<p>1) Do not change</p> <p>4) Do not change</p> <p>5) This could change</p> <p>7) Do not change</p> <p>8) Have speed limit change in school times only 9am and 3pm</p> <p>9) Do not change</p> <p>10) This could change</p>

		<p>11) Do not change  13) Do not change  14) Do not change.... no one goes 100km thru here anyways. It's about people not pulling over and letting traffic go thats at fault here  15) Do not change  16) Yes to variable school zone speed change  17) DO NOT CHANGE but change at the glenduan turn off - that should be safer  18) This area could change with a school zone variable  19) DO NOT CHANGE.... this stretch of road is in terrible condition. Also so many people go between 50-70km thru here which encourages others to overtake unwisely - bring back the passing lanes! Focus on bad drivers with cellphones first!!!</p>
370	Individual submitter	<p>1) IT is a straight piece of road. No need to change  4) Nothing wrong with this road at 100kph  5) 70 kph ok  7) 100 kph ok.  8) Proposed limit ok  9) Existing speed ok  10) Proposed speed ok  11) existing ok  13) Existing speed ok. Remember people on a wage lose nothing going slower but people working for them selves loose. Also they put the speed to 80 kph about 45 years ago and it was a mistake and they had to change back. Drivers went to sleep and it cost the country a lot  14) Existing speed ok.  15) Existing speed ok  16) Proposes speed ok  17) Existing speed ok  18) Existing speed ok  19) Existing speed ok</p>
371	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave at 100k.  4) Leave at 100k. Install passing lanes and pull over bays. Upgrade highway. Remove trees that block view of oncoming traffic. No rail network.  5) Leave at 70k  7) Leave at 100k. Install passing lanes and pull over bays. Upgrade highway. No rail network.  8) Leave at 100k 80 k when school hours with a luminated sign advising so.  9) Leave at 100k. Install passing lanes and pull over bays. Upgrade road. No rail network.  10) Leave status quo  11) Leave at 100k. Install passing lanes and pull over bays. Upgrade Road. No rail network. Make sure trees do not block vision of highway.  13) Leave at 100k  14) Leave at 100k  15) Leave at 100k  16) Leave status quo  17) Leave at 100k  18) Leave at status quo  19) Leave at 100k. Summary of all questions is do not reduce speed. This is a backward move in this modern age, upgrade road. Fit passing lanes and pull over bays. Make sure vision not blocked by trees. RUC paid every day on that highway must be returned to that highway improvement or the Govt is not being honest or caring.</p>
372	Individual submitter	<p>1) No, the changes are justified and necessary.  4) No, the changes are justified and necessary.  5) No  7) No, the proposal is correct.  8) No  9) No  10) No, the change is appropriate.  11) No, the changes are appropriate.  13) No, the changes are appropriate.</p>

		<p>14) The proposed changes are appropriate.</p> <p>15) The changes are appropriate.</p> <p>16) The changes are fully justified.</p> <p>17) The proposed changes are appropriate.</p> <p>18) The proposed changes are appropriate.</p> <p>19) I fully support the proposed reduction in speed limits. This section of road was never appropriate for 100km/ph. The NZTA have studied this for many, many years and arrived at the correct solution.</p>
373	Individual submitter	<p>We agree with all the other petition signers, how silly it would be to reduce the speed limits between Nelson and Blenheim, in doing so there would be more aggression and dangerous driving if this were to happen. Also think of the poor truck drivers getting stuck behind slow drivers when they are already on tight schedules., even people driving to the ferry would have to add another half hour onto their travel time</p> <p>Also if the speed limit is reduced from 80k to 60k in the Atawhai/Wakapuaka Area no one will adhere to it,, as we live at The Glen we are well aware of how the traffic behaves in this area and folks certainly will not drive at 60k!?</p>
374	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it as is why have 80km change when it makes people more impatient and make poor decisions</p> <p>4) Put a passing lane in some where along here and slow vehicle bays, speed limit is sensible for roading here</p> <p>5) Nothing wrong with it as is</p> <p>7) Nothing wrong with speed limit needs rumble edge lines, slow vehicle bays though</p> <p>8) Put a passing lane in somewhere around here</p> <p>9) Nothing wrong with speed limit in this stretch leave it as is</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Keep it at 100km road safe enough with no windy bits</p> <p>13) This is where 80km speed limit restriction should start</p> <p>14) Keep it at max 80km through here</p> <p>15) Keep it 80km here</p> <p>16) Keep it same</p> <p>17) Needs to be 100km here nothing wrong with road speed way it is</p> <p>18) Keep it at 80km</p> <p>19) I drive the Blenheim to Nelson state highway multiple times a week, every accident iv witnessed has come down to driver error. I see people overtaking in blind corners because they are impatient and also fail to adhere to speed recommendations on most corners. I think from rai valley to just after hira school an 80km speed restriction is realistic and leave the rest of the highway as is. Get passing lanes in after canvastown, a new bridge at pelorous and a lot more slow vehicle bays.</p>
375	Individual submitter	<p>1) I love dropping it to 80 but keep this consistent all along the road. Adjust to school 60 km zones where needed but otherwise consistent. Too many changes are frustrating for drivers as well as confusing potentially leading to accidents caused by people trying to work out the limit</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) yes or just 60km to match school zones</p> <p>7) 80 good</p> <p>8) makes sense</p> <p>9) 80 good</p> <p>10) yes providing well signed throughout</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) I think 80 I can see that in the next few km's there are so many changes it will be confusing</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) If you have dropped it to 60 in Atawhai either keep at 60 or stay at 80km all the way through. This is confusing to change too many times.</p>
376	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) This is not required I feel the issue at hand is cost cutting by not upgrading the road, the road itself is fine it is not challenging to travel on, what is required is a passing lane each direction and widening of existing slow vehicle pull over bays with signage. Lowering the speed limit is not even a band aid for the current situation.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This is completely unnecessary it is possibly one of the safest stretches of sh6. It has kilometers of long straight roads and hundreds of meters of clear vision in each direction.</p>

		<p>8) I agree with school zone during the hours of school pick up and drop off only.</p> <p>9) This is another stretch of road with long straight roads and clear vision both directions I feel double yellow lines would be adequate through the entire stretch beside the pelorus river without a need to reduce speed</p> <p>10) The current scheme is adequate.</p> <p>11) The current scheme is adequate</p> <p>13) The road leaving Rai Valley is a good stretch of road with good visibility and long straight and combined with large slow vehicle bay gives traffic a chance to realign and prepare for the uphill of Rai saddle, stricter signage around the slow vehicle bay is required. The uphill of the Rai is as good as it can be and there a little safety concerns. Millions of dollars have been spent on the the Nelson side of Rai saddle realignment this would be ridiculous lowering speed here and Blenheim bound traffic would loose a prime overtaking lane. The rest of the road leading up to the long straight is impossible to do 100km 80km change wouldn't make a difference. The long straight needs widening or a pull over bay both directions. The road leading up to whangamoas is completely safe and accidents are driver error not road related and it is impossible to eliminate.</p> <p>14) 60km is ridiculously slow while it is often a speed reached in sections other sections 80km is optimal. Accidents here are cause by driver error, better signage coming into corners are needed I would even propose barrier cables between lanes</p> <p>15) 100 is perfect and is the last point for overtaking and pulling over prior to climbing whangamoas blenheim bound.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Unnecessary</p> <p>18) Atawai is becoming a increasingly busy area I support the 69km through atawai</p> <p>19) Unnecessary</p>
377	Individual submitter	<p>As a regular user of this road I have seen the results of a few accidents and it's never pretty, apart from the physical harm caused there is also the the pain and grief that is bought upon others after such trauma. I have been travelling from Nelson to Blenheim for several years and see no issue with the current speed limit however I do see issue with the way some people do drive on this piece of highway..</p> <p>I have witnessed the odd person trying to pass trucks heading up the Nelson side of the whangamoas in most stupid of places blind corners etc instead of being patient and waiting for the truck to pull over..</p> <p>The truckies do a great job in my experience of pulling off the road where they can to let people pass but the impatient folks seem to be unable to wait and do stuff that puts everyone else on the road at risk..</p> <p>I have seen people pull onto the highway from side roads who don't even seem to look left or right before doing so causing drivers to take evasive action.</p> <p>Maybe more big signage is required telling folks to slow down, look both ways etc.</p> <p>Maybe realignment of the highway especially on the Nelson side of the whangamoas needs to be looked at with more passing lanes put in.</p> <p>My opinion is that if we were to take away the frustration part of driving on this part of our state highway then a lot of the accidents would not happen and I don't believe that reducing the current speed from 100km to 80km will make any difference to the frustration levels of the road users if anything I feel that it will only increase the frustration levels of people and cause more stupid decisions to be made..</p>
378	Individual submitter	<p>1) I am not objecting to this as it is close to built up towns.</p> <p>4) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour limit. In the past I have driven this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drive it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfells Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying to put an 8 hour days work in and having to drive there and back in one day. Because many of us here do so and travel that road between Blenheim and Nelson in order to do it to put bread on our families tables and/or to provide enhanced Health Services with our DHB region that encompasses Blenheim and Nelson under one budget.</p>

5) this is a good idea as currently the Havelock portion of the SH has no footpath for some of it and often residents and school children walk along it and 70km/hour is fast for foot traffic.

7) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour liimit. In the past I have driven this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drived it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfells Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying to put an 8 hour days work in and having to drive there and back in one day. Because many of us here do so and travel that road between Blenheim and Nelson in order to do it to put bread on our families tables and/or to provide enhanced Health Services with our DHB region that encompasses Blenheim and Nelson under one budget.

8) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour liimit. In the past I have driven this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drive it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfells Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying to put an 8 hour days work in and having to drive there and back in one day. Because many of us here do so and travel that road between Blenheim and Nelson in order to do it to put bread on our families tables and/or to provide enhanced Health Services with our DHB region that encompasses Blenheim and Nelson under one budget.

9) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour liimit. In the past I have driven

this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drive it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfells Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying to put an 8 hour days work in and having to drive there and back in one day. Because many of us here do so and travel that road between Blenheim and Nelson in order to do it to put bread on our families tables and/or to provide enhanced Health Services with our DHB region that encompasses Blenheim and Nelson under one budget.

10) This is very sensible as there is a lot of foot traffic mainly in summer with tourists stopping at Pelorus Bridge

11) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour liimit. In the past I have driven this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drive it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfells Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying to put an 8 hour days work in and having to drive there and back in one day. Because many of us here do so and travel that road between Blenheim and Nelson in order to do it to put bread on our families tables and/or to provide enhanced Health Services with our DHB region that encompasses Blenheim and Nelson under one budget.

13) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour liimit. In the past I have driven this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drive it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfells Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying to put an 8 hour days work in and having to drive there and back in one day. Because many of us here do so and travel that road between Blenheim and Nelson in order to do it to put bread on our families tables and/or to provide enhanced Health Services with our DHB region that encompasses Blenheim and Nelson under one budget.

14) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans

and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour liimit. In the past I have driven this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drive it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfell's Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying to put an 8 hour days work in and having to drive there and back in one day. Because many of us here do so and travel that road between Blenheim and Nelson in order to do it to put bread on our families tables and/or to provide enhanced Health Services with our DHB region that encompasses Blenheim and Nelson under one budget.

15) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour liimit. In the past I have driven this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drive it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfell's Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying to put an 8 hour days work in and having to drive there and back in one day. Because many of us here do so and travel that road between Blenheim and Nelson in order to do it to put bread on our families tables and/or to provide enhanced Health Services with our DHB region that encompasses Blenheim and Nelson under one budget.

16) This is sensible with the school zone requiring heightened safety

17) This is open road and has several long and many short straights where 100km/hour or close to, is sensible and the 80km/hour limit will make the whole drive from Blenheim to Nelson intolerably slow. I am particularly concerned due to the nature of businesses in both Blenheim and Nelson regions that often service both areas and can make several trips per week. One example is our joint District Health Board the Nelson Marlborough DHB, has many services requiring travelling several times a week to run clinics etc. If the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson is put to 80km/hour, there is no way services such as our joint public Health Service, in particular, can service both regions easily and the fiscal fallout for both regions will be dire. Currently a sensible drive that takes two hours at the speed limits and going slower than that on the winding parts, will take I estimate three hours one way. I dont think you realise how many Work vans and cars that travel this road daily both ways. MY brother in law for example sends a worker three times a week to pick up bait from Port Nelson for his export crayfishing business. I dont think he is even aware of this proposed change and I have not mentioned it so I am not writing with any conflict of interest. I'm just a concerned Blenheim citizen who immediately thought this is going to impact our town a lot! They and many others will find it basically uneconomical to see clients/customers/patients in the region that for decades they have built up and relied upon as a customer base. Surely the NZTA will not be so short-sighted as to lengthen the drive so it is out of reach of these two relatively small populations that rely upon each other (in particular Blenheim) for treating both population bases as effectively one territory fiscally. I understand the NZTA's role is to make our roads safe, but equally the NZTA's role is to ensure our roading system is workable and fit for purpose. That is to allow interaction between towns and cities and in particular for trade. It is our trade that pays for these roads after all. It will be a death toll for many businesses that are already struggling to compete with an online market. 6 hours drive is what I estimate it would be to go to Nelson from Blenheim and home again at 80km/hour liimit. In the past I have driven this road for the DHB once a week for over 8 years so I do know that it takes time to drive it safely and I have actually never seen unsafe driving myself either during this time or more recently. It will be impossible to see clients or do work in the neighbouring town. My Grandmother used to live at Cape Campbell and drove by horse and trap around the Marfell's Beach coastline to shop for supplies in town and it took several days. While this is an exaggerated example I bring it up because what you propose is going to put us back effectively to the days of having horse and trap between townships and the current strong economic ties between Nelson and Blenheim will most certainly suffer. In particular for Blenheim. I have made my point and I sincerely hope NZTA will critically revise this with regard to keeping driving times sensible for someone trying

379	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is straight road, I think it would slow the traffic down too much.</p> <p>4) 80Km is far to slow for this easy to drive piece of road, 100 km is fine here. I have driven it an awful lot and the road is fine.</p> <p>5) Perhaps this may work, a short piece of road into Havelock, could slow traffic by the school perhaps</p> <p>7) This road is wide and easy to drive - needs leaving at 100km</p> <p>8) This is good road, leave at 100km</p> <p>9) Good road with lots of straight, needs to be left at 100km.</p> <p>10) needs to be left at existing speeds, only really busy when summer holidays are on</p> <p>11) Needs to stay at 100km, has straight easy to drive roads.</p> <p>13) Leave as is, some very good road with passing lanes, drivers handle this easily</p> <p>14) Leave as is, roads are good, need to work on passing lanes and median strips only</p> <p>15) Leave as is, good road</p> <p>16) Very good road with passing lanes, leave at 80, yes variable school zone good</p> <p>17) Leave at 100 as good road with passing lanes and clear vision</p> <p>18) leave at 80km, plenty of vision and passing areas</p> <p>19) Leave at 100km, plenty of room and vision here</p>
380	Renwick Transport	<p>1) There is no difference in other rural roads currently at 100</p> <p>4) Your decision will backfire from people trying to pass trucks sitting on 80 at equal speeds, I wont be pulling over to let people pass in my truck.</p> <p>5) Why 50 how many accidents have there been on this stretch of road, I've not heard of any in 18 years</p> <p>7) This is the stretch of road that cars will get impatient behind any HT vehicles. You will encourage people to pass at stupid places.</p> <p>8) 60 km in the school zone is good, but either side of the school zone is completely unnecessary long straight roads will encourage a small vehicle to overtake someone doing 80km.</p> <p>9) Its unnecessary to reduce and put even bigger burdens on those people who travel this road every day.</p> <p>10) 60km coming up to bridge is fine. With 50 for a seasonal period.</p> <p>11) It is critical not to slow vehicles here at this stretch of road impatient road users will pass and there will be more accidents than before.</p> <p>13) Why do this it's so dangerous as a truck driver with cars getting impatient</p> <p>14) We will take so much longer to get there and have multitude of cars behind us potentially a major risk</p> <p>15) No passing lanes for my 23m HT to let people pass.</p> <p>16) This isn't changing.</p> <p>17) The road conditions are fine enough to remain 100 I travel the road most days.</p> <p>18) 80km works so why change it.</p> <p>19) Some people are on deadlines you will be crucifying these people trying to do what they have done for years.</p>
381	Individual submitter	<p>1) Not a heavily populated area.</p> <p>4) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which inevitably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.</p> <p>5) Ok with this</p> <p>7) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which inevitably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.</p> <p>8) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic /</p>

population has increase which ineventably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.

9) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which ineventably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.

10) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which ineventably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.

11) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which ineventably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.

13) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which ineventably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.

14) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which ineventably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.

15) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which ineventably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.

16) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which ineventably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that

		<p>is the case.</p> <p>17) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which inevitably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.</p> <p>18) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which inevitably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.</p> <p>19) This is a national SH. Taxpayers have funded the build and constant improvement to the road. The road is vastly better than it once was as are the cars we drive. Most accidents are caused by drivers making bad decisions. Dropping the speed limit won't alter that - in fact it will likely increase the risks as drivers become frustrated at lower speed with so few overtaking opportunities. Cars will not legally be able to pass trucks or those towing as they may all travel at the same speed. There will be more risk taking leading to more dangerous roads. Your assessment of extra time is a theoretical desktop estimate, nothing like reality when stuck in queues behind trucks. The additional time and costs to business and all freight will be considerable. The amount of traffic / population has increase which inevitably leads to more accidents but as a percentage, rates are very low and do not warrant reducing the speed from Nelson to Blenheim. What an embarrassment for NZTA is having spent billions on our National SH's the end result is they are only fit for 80km speed limits. The entire organisation should b held accountable and sacked if that is the case.</p>
382	Individual submitter	I travel the road between Nelson and Blenheim once a fortnight on average. I have noticed the road has been patched in places which has made the car I drive lurch from side to side at times. Many times. Over the last 15 years of driving this road I have changed to a smaller car for better fuel economy and this may have added to it as the bigger car I had used to sit on the road better. I agree with lowering the speed.
383	Individual submitter	I have travelled this road for 45-50 years. The major problem has been very few places to pass and as vehicles have been able to maintain better speeds NZTA has done nothing. I was road transport assn member on the regional transport committee for a few years and passing lanes were discussed bu over marlborough roads were not progressive enough to do anything about it. The money spent on the Rai Saddle could have done other more urgent work; If you had asked the Rai Valley you wouldd have found there were more accidents after the works. In your own records it shows that 100kph outside schools is still ok on a large area on Sh6. As long as staff turn signs on or off and not leave them on where not required. Improve our network not blanket speed reductions.
384	Individual submitter	<p>1) To add additional passing lanes, but leabe the current speed at 100kmh</p> <p>4) As above comment - leave speed at 100 and consider passing lanes/extra signage</p> <p>5) Remain as 70kmh</p> <p>7) Additional passing lanes/pull over to let pass instead of reducing the speed.</p> <p>8) Variable school zone yes - but leave speed limit as is.</p> <p>9) As above - additional passing bays &amp; signage allowing drivers to drive at slower speed if less familiar with roads, but leave speed limit as is.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Remain as is.</p> <p>13) Remain as is.</p> <p>14) At least 80kmh</p> <p>15) Remain as is.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Remain as is.</p> <p>18) Remain as is.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
385	Individual submitter	<p>1) Why change you tried it when S/H 1 was closed and then put it back. I see no reason as the road is clear wide and good surface. it would be a money winner for highway patrol. The Airforce traffic are very good and a safe road.</p> <p>4) You say that the speed is too high and caused accidents. You have not got that correct. accident by north bank road was drugs, the child killed was he ran out a gate, the accident Okaramio stream was drunk and young driver showing off The accident in front Okaramio hotel was drunk and foreigner on wrong side Next was over correct at legal speed then at Dangerous Creek was inattention and to fast with heavy trailer next was driver went to sleep crossed center line and the two along Brownly straight was overtake on yellow line. The road is good the edge are narrow</p>

		<p>and if you had purchased the farm land offered 18 years ago we would have slow lane for the HMV. you can travel both ways at 100 or HMV 90 without crossing the center line. Just keep the surface up to date and repaired. I would say you have more accidents on Foxton Levin Otake that you reduce that area. I have patrolled this whole area 40 years and can see more accidents impatient drivers and trucks if you reduce. Widen the off road edge a grader blade wide to allow HMV to pull over but do not give the highway patrol the reason to write tickets at 100k. You have a closed access on this section and the farmers are happy with that Intersections are wide and clear visibility is very good with slow through the narrow section and good signage. I could go on but there is no need to change any of the speeds but a &amp;0 klm on the north side of Havelock to slow before the 50.</p> <p>5) Yes this is fine been trying for this over 10 years as pedestrians and more houses with family. Good call</p> <p>7) Only the 70 from the 50k to the Quarry at north end of the straight.</p> <p>8) No serious accident and yes when school out or start have warning signs and speed 80 as the school has off road parking and students can walk below road under bridge and across bridge. No reason to reduce speed other than for when students about. Intersection was changed some years ago to keep safe speed at 100</p> <p>9) Why as this is a good wide road, good surface and only one intersection the area is good to pass HMV as you can see 100 mtrs throughout the overtake. the accidents truck was distraction or asleep and van was speed by a youth who was showing off on wrong side on straight section</p> <p>10) This should be 60 all year. The accidents is try get on bridge first or driver on drugs</p> <p>11) You can not do 100 untill past Rai Falls then good but visibility poor. could say 80 to rai falls but leave as 100 as accident was driver on wrong side not speed and it is sharp bends.</p> <p>13) Yes this could be correct as the road is narrow till the intersection then a short straight. from the foot of rai saddle over to hira speed could be 80 as very hard to get any faster and stay on your side. This is the same travelling in other direction.</p> <p>14) 80 or leave as can not do 100 safely</p> <p>15) 80 would be fine as narrow and some poor corners. leave at 100 as accidents were all careless or deliberate swerve.</p> <p>16) 100 is fine and school slow when children about pass lane for passing HMV why change just to cause drivers to get caught as they pass slower vehicles</p> <p>17) I see no reason to change</p> <p>18) It would not make sense to change but unsure of reason why change</p> <p>19) yes slowing down for the 50 area</p>
386	Individual submitter	<p>1) Wide, clear road with good visibility. No need for speed reduction.</p> <p>4) Good road with mostly sweeping corners that can be negotiated comfortably at the current limit. No need for change.</p> <p>5) 50kph ok for this section.</p> <p>7) Good road with sweeping corners easily negotiated at current level.</p> <p>8) No problem with school zone but, again, this is a section of road easily managed at the current limit.</p> <p>9) Another section easily negotiated at the current limit. No reason to lower it.</p> <p>10) 60kph ok for this section.</p> <p>11) 90 mph would be a sensible reduction on this section.</p> <p>13) 80kph ok here due to windy nature of this section.</p> <p>14) 80kph more realistic.</p> <p>15) Reasonable for much of this section.</p> <p>16) No problem.</p> <p>17) 80kph ok.</p> <p>18) Keep at 80.</p> <p>19) 80 ok.</p>
387	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>4) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>5) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>7) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>8) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>9) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>10) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>11) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>13) 80 km/h</p> <p>14) 80 km/h</p> <p>15) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>16) Keep existing speed limit</p> <p>17) Keep existing speed limit</p>

		18) Keep existing speed limit 19) 80 km/h
388	Individual submitter	<p>Introduction: I retired to Nelson approx. 6 years ago after a working life that involved driving around 40,000 km per year mainly on roads around Northland – roads that were windy; often narrow and many were gravel/shingle. I have driven well over 1 million kms with only a couple of minor accidents/incidents causing minimal car damage only. I believe that I can speak with considerable experience about 'safe driving'.</p> <p>My Submission: I object to the almost blanket reduction in speed limits on SH 6 from Nelson to Blenheim. Certainly there are areas where lower speed limits are both logical and necessary, but the widespread reduction from 100 to 80 has the potential to increase the risk of accidents. In fact, the recommendation stands to penalise the 99.9%(?) of drivers who safely traverse that road without major incident, just to TRY to prevent 'idiot drivers' from causing serious accidents to themselves and others.</p> <p>Many of these specific recommendations lack logic and common-sense and seem to be based purely on the mantra that less speed = less accidents. If you follow the logic of that thinking, then zero speed should result in zero accidents. How ridiculous!</p> <p>My Argument (and reflected in other's submissions):</p> <p>1/. Every sensible driver knows, or should know that the 'Speed Limit' is not a target. The most basic safety principle is to "Always drive to the conditions", be they road, weather, traffic etc, etc. The 99.9% of drivers who do this don't have accidents or, because they are driving to the conditions with less speed, the consequences are minimised.</p> <p>On the NZTA website, there is a Section called 'Mythbusting speed', and a sub-section:</p> <p>'Myth': The problem isn't speeding – it's bad drivers not driving to the conditions or the rules. The writer(s) then expand that to say "even the most experienced of us drops the ball sometimes". No research is quoted to support this sweeping statement, but I acknowledge that it has a degree of truth. However, there is a big difference between 'sometimes' and 'regularly' dropping the ball (bad drivers). There is also a significant matter of degree to "dropping the ball" – minor or major; a fumble or complete miss?</p> <p>2/. The "rules of the road" including speed limits are largely obeyed and supported by the good-will and common-sense of the majority of sensible drivers. There is minimal visible or consistent enforcement by the police, but with the majority support of those sensible drivers there is majority compliance. However, in saying that it is also acknowledged that there will always be a small portion of drivers who will push the limits. That is why in my view, regular enforcement is an essential part of road safety with patrol cars and speed cameras.</p> <p>3/. Some accidents happen due to sudden unexpected events, and there is a (small) proportion of people who do not drive to the conditions; do not concentrate adequately and/or who make poor decisions (mistakes) – like "Does my car have enough power to pass quickly within the clear space ahead; can I see far enough ahead?". As previous submissions have noted, 'driver frustration' is a potential cause of accidents due to unsafe</p>
389	Individual submitter	<p>1) All I have to write concerning the new speed limits applies to all areas and pertains to the philosophical flaws and logical inconsistencies of the proposal as I encounter them. As there does not seem to be anywhere on this feedback form to outline general objections to the proposed speed changes it seems I will have to do so here. #1 Myth: Speed isn't a major cause of road crashes. To begin: A wise man once said, Freud's oedipal familial nightmare (i.e. the "over-protective mother figure") is now being rapidly transformed into social policy whereby the role of the over-protective mother is assumed by the State and its organs. The proposed speed limit restrictions fall directly into this category. Simply put, in order to achieve Safety one must focus on Competence. Competence comes first, not safety. Becoming competent in an area makes people as safe as they possibly can be. To ignore competence and focus our energies on inappropriate speed (a by-product of incompetence), is to act out a delusion. The results will sadly but obviously not follow the wishes of those making the proposal. #2 I note with concern that the website page "Mythbusting speed" contains extremely imprecise language and outright factual errors. For instance, Headings are displayed indicating that the ensuing paragraph is going to tackle a certain subject but the paragraph does no such thing. Viz: "Myth: Speed isn't a major cause of road crashes". This heading seems to be preparatory to an explanation of why speed per se is a bad thing. However we actually read that "inappropriate speed" is a "contributing factor in about a third of all fatal crashes". But nobody is taking issue with this. All know this to be so. It is obvious that inappropriate speed is a problem. But this is quite different from saying speed, in isolation, is the problem. Every day hundreds of New Zealanders travel all over our country at several hundred kilometers per hour in admirable safety. Why? Because they are flying in aeroplanes that are well maintained and piloted by trained &amp; confident professionals who know what they are doing. Competence. We hardly ever have fatalities due to aircraft crashes. But look at the enormous speeds involved! Surely this simple example shows that while inappropriate speed is a problem, speed per se is not? #3 Another statement in the PDF "Safer speed review: Consultation, SH6 Blenheim to Nelson" states that at the new speed limits the journey from Nelson to Havelock will increase in duration by a mere 4 minutes. I am completely dismayed at this statement. Last week I travelled from my home in Havelock to Nelson at the proposed new speed limits. Traffic was very light and I only had to pull over a couple of times to avoid impeding the flow of following traffic. This journey took me 65 minutes. On the return journey from Nelson to Havelock I travelled at the existing speed limits. The return trip, which involved much heavier &amp; slower traffic, with several delays overtaking, took me 48 minutes. Would you please explain to me how it is that there is a discrepancy of 13 minutes between your figures and mine for this short trip? I need to point out that at no time did I exceed any speed limit, nor did I drive recklessly or pass in dangerous spots on the return trip. I simply know the road and drove within my limits as I usually do. And I should also point out that the time differential would be significantly larger had I been riding my motorcycle as a bike is able to pass traffic much more easily than my car, which suffered several lengthy delays in overtaking traffic. Four minutes? I have proven that it will add much more time than that. #4 The frustration involved riding/driving at such a low speed is going to make travelling less, not more, safe. I have a friend who runs a half marathon every week. He tells me that forcing himself to run at a slower rate than is his natural gait is dangerous as it a) can lead to him injuring himself due to the constraints on his form and rhythm, and b) leads to an increased level of frustration that means he becomes even more tired than had he been running at his usual, faster speed. To me the implications are obvious. People who are not asked to engage with their environment at a level where they are concentrating and applying themselves will have their attention wander and make more mistakes. I have found this in my own experience over the years of driving trucks, vans, cars and motorcycles. It is simple human nature. The danger in dropping the speed limits to such ridiculously low levels is that they will ensure that the huge majority of drivers will not need to apply themselves to the action of driving. "Why should I pay attention? I have been told that this lower speed is much safer "all by itself"! I have signs to tell me how to drive - I needn't consider potential sunstrike, or ice in the winter, or diesel fuel spills on corners, or a sudden cross-wind" or the range of other issues that good drivers take into account when they travel. The unconscious message that the road is now "safe" at 80 or 60 kph will be enough to lull most drivers - even usually competent ones - into a false sense of security. I really don't see a reduction in deaths arising</p>

		<p>from this. In fact the opposite seems likely. #5 Lastly, I need to pass on some things that I have become aware that others are saying. Certainly this is just hearsay but it is nevertheless what I am hearing. I am hearing motorcyclists and car drivers saying that they will refuse to pay fines for exceeding the new speed limits, but will instead fight every single ticket in Court, thus taking up valuable Court time and draining Police resources from places where they could do more good. There exist even now motorcyclists who have made the conscious decision that "I'll lose my license for 140kph so I may as well do 240kph and be less likely to be apprehended". I have met them. Should the proposed speed limits be put in place there will only be an increase in the number of people who refuse to comply with the new limits which they consider humiliating, infantilising and demeaning - they will simply ignore them. Electing to evade Police rather than pull over. Have you thought what that may mean? I myself am a motorcycle road racer and I can tell you that I could ride my road bike (never mind my race bike) at 200kph all the way from Havelock to Blenheim and only have to ease off slightly for a couple of bends. Of course this does not take into account road works, wandering stock, wind, camper campervans and all the other realities of actually travelling on a public road. Nevertheless the road itself is an excellent road, well surfaced and well cambered with good visibility through most corners. To lower the speed limits as proposed is to treat the average driver with contempt. It seems to me that rather than raise the safety of our roads by providing more passing lanes or, better yet, increase ongoing driver training, this option elects to treat us all as if we are at the level of the poorest drivers on our roads! It will cause nothing but frustration. Additionally I've heard that Truck drivers are saying that if the new speed limits are brought in they will cease to pull over to allow traffic stuck behind them to pass. Can you imagine the levels of frustration and consequently the potentially reckless manoeuvres likely to occur? In summary I find the proposed speed limit changes to be quite insulting. As a person of over 40 years experience driving all sorts of vehicles and who has spent his whole working life driving a van - including 14 years in Nelson, Marlborough and the Kaikoura area - I resent being treated as incompetent. Many others will be similarly offended. Many will ignore the new limits as a matter of principle. I also find the arguments for the new speed limits to be thoroughly unconvincing - in some instances deceptive. To be honest it smacks of a government department having been directed by Government to institute new laws irrespective of their need or usefulness - this seems to me to be pure ideology driven by misguided politicians rather than genuinely concerned specialists who have real answers to real problems. I urge the NZTA not to go ahead with any of the proposed changes.</p> <p>4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
390	Individual submitter	<p>I am a regular user of this road, previously for business, now privately. I support the review of this road, but concerned the proposals are mostly unnecessary. This highway has been mostly neglected over the year - it is Nelsons vital link. Much more needs to be done to bring it up to acceptable modern day standard. The one piece of the road that needs close attention is between Pelorus Bridge and Rai Valley township. If speed limits are to be changed then 80km is unnecessary and should be 90km.</p>
391	Legacy Fishing Ltd	<p>1) Agree with this change.  4) Completely disagree with this change. This stretch of road is easily managed at 100km per hour. Our fishing company workers travel Blenheim to Nelson (return) in a company ute on a weekly basis. While there are stretches of road where the speed limit might be reduced, this is not one of them. It is important to keep some stretches of the Blenheim to Nelson road at the 100km limit in order to avoid driver frustration. Driver frustration cannot be legislated away, it is a human nature response and will remain despite the best intention of legislation. Therefore it must be a factor in decision making. Constraining drivers to an 80km limit when drivers can plainly see the sweeping curves and straights can accommodate a 100km speed will increase driver frustration and dangerous overtaking manoeuvres.  5) Agree and believe this has local community support.  7) Completely disagree with this change. This stretch of road is easily managed at 100km per hour. Our fishing company workers travel Blenheim to Nelson (return) in a company ute on a weekly basis. While there are stretches of road where the speed limit might be reduced, this is not one of them. It is important to keep some stretches of the Blenheim to Nelson road at the 100km limit in order to avoid driver frustration. Driver frustration cannot be legislated away, it is a human nature response and will remain despite the best intention of legislation. Therefore it must be a factor in decision making. Constraining drivers to an 80km limit when drivers can plainly see the sweeping curves and straights can accommodate a 100km speed will increase driver frustration and dangerous overtaking manoeuvres.  8) Agree speed should be lowered around the school.  9) Completely disagree with this change. This stretch of road is easily managed at 100km per hour. Our fishing company workers travel Blenheim to Nelson (return) in a company ute on a weekly basis. While there are stretches of road where the speed limit might be reduced, this is not one of them. It is important to keep some stretches of the Blenheim to Nelson road at the 100km limit in order to avoid driver frustration. Driver frustration cannot be legislated away, it is a human nature response and will remain despite the best intention of legislation. Therefore it must be a factor in decision making. Constraining drivers to an 80km limit when drivers can plainly see the sweeping curves and straights can accommodate a 100km speed will increase driver frustration</p>

		<p>and dangerous overtaking manoeuvres.</p> <p>10) Agreed as this is in essence a 'built up area'.</p> <p>11) Completely disagree with this change. This stretch of road is easily managed at 100km per hour. Our fishing company workers travel Blenheim to Nelson (return) in a company ute on a weekly basis. While there are stretches of road where the speed limit might be reduced, this is not one of them. It is important to keep some stretches of the Blenheim to Nelson road at the 100km limit in order to avoid driver frustration. Driver frustration cannot be legislated away, it is a human nature response and will remain despite the best intention of legislation. Therefore it must be a factor in decision making. Constraining drivers to an 80km limit when drivers can plainly see the sweeping curves and straights can accommodate a 100km speed will increase driver frustration and dangerous overtaking manoeuvres.</p> <p>13) Completely disagree with this change. This stretch of road is easily managed at 100km per hour. Our fishing company workers travel Blenheim to Nelson (return) in a company ute on a weekly basis. While there are stretches of road where the speed limit might be reduced, this is not one of them. It is important to keep some stretches of the Blenheim to Nelson road at the 100km limit in order to avoid driver frustration. Driver frustration cannot be legislated away, it is a human nature response and will remain despite the best intention of legislation. Therefore it must be a factor in decision making. Constraining drivers to an 80km limit when drivers can plainly see the sweeping curves and straights can accommodate a 100km speed will increase driver frustration and dangerous overtaking manoeuvres.</p> <p>14) Speed limit should be set at 80km.</p> <p>15) Agreed</p> <p>16) Agreed</p> <p>17) Agreed.</p> <p>18) Keep at 80 km.</p> <p>19) Completely disagree with this change. This stretch of road is easily managed at 100km per hour. Our fishing company workers travel Blenheim to Nelson (return) in a company ute on a weekly basis. While there are stretches of road where the speed limit might be reduced, this is not one of them. It is important to keep some stretches of the Blenheim to Nelson road at the 100km limit in order to avoid driver frustration. Driver frustration cannot be legislated away, it is a human nature response and will remain despite the best intention of legislation. Therefore it must be a factor in decision making. Constraining drivers to an 80km limit when drivers can plainly see the sweeping curves and straights can accommodate a 100km speed will increase driver frustration and dangerous overtaking manoeuvres.</p>
392	Individual submitter	<p>1) 90km/h As a frequent HT user of the Blenheim-Nelson transport route I believe reducing the speed for open highway from 100km/h to 90km/h would be a significant improvement in calming driver behaviour, reducing the perceived need by car drivers to overtake and speed.</p> <p>4) 90km/h</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) 90km/h</p> <p>8) 90km/h with 60 variable school zone</p> <p>9) 90km/h</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) 90km/h</p> <p>13) 90km/h</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) 90km/h</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) 90km/h</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) 90km/h</p>
393	Individual submitter	<p>Please, this is ridiculous, dropping the speed limit to 80km/h will only create frustration amongst drivers and adding another 20mins or so to the journey</p> <p>You will find most drivers will still drive at the realistic 100km/h and all you will be doing is putting more slower “obstacles” in their way creating more of a hazard.</p> <p>Seems to me your focus should be more directed on the improvement of that stretch of road especially widening where possible and adding a passing lane at all the locations you want to reduce the speed limit on, there are way more vehicles on the road now, its flow you want not congestion.</p> <p>I’m all for slower speeds at built up areas and around schools, that’s a no brainer.</p> <p>I wonder how many accidents on that road were caused by speed alone. Lowering the speed limit wont stop people looking at their cell phones or driving on the wrong side of the road or driving 20km/h slower than the actual speed limit, all creating more of a hazard, unfortunately this is all human nature that speed wont fix.</p> <p>Please, don’t go with the cheaper option, fix those road hot spots by widening and put in more passing lanes a must.</p>
394	Individual submitter	<p>1) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents.</p> <p>4) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Fix the roads.</p> <p>5) 70km/h is good speed for there</p> <p>7) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p>

		<p>8) 100 km/h with a 60 variable school zone</p> <p>9) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p> <p>10) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p> <p>11) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p> <p>13) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p> <p>14) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p> <p>15) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p> <p>16) Ok</p> <p>17) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p> <p>18) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed</p> <p>19) Reducing the speed limit here will only make people impatient and create more accidents. Make road safer not change the speed. Seems to me with more people on the road and as long as there is only a stripe in the middle of the road separating vehicles we will always have accidents. physically improve the roads at hot spots instead of the wishful thinking that lowering the speed will solve accident problems.. it wont. Also compulsory testing for all tourists a must. If you make the mistake of lowering the speed limits and accidents still trend i hope you raise them again.</p>
395	Individual submitter	<p>1) No leave as is</p> <p>4) No leave as is</p> <p>5) No leave as is</p> <p>7) No leave as is</p> <p>8) No leave as is</p> <p>9) No leave as is</p> <p>10) No leave as is</p> <p>11) No leave as is</p> <p>13) No leave as is</p> <p>14) No leave as is</p> <p>15) No leave as is</p> <p>16) No leave as is</p> <p>17) No leave as is</p> <p>18) No leave as is</p> <p>19) No leave as is</p>
396	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) No</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) Should be 50km</p> <p>11) No</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) No</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
397	Individual submitter	<p>1) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>4) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>5) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>7) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>8) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>9) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>10) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p>

		<p>11) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>13) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>14) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>15) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>16) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>17) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>18) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p> <p>19) The current speed limit is perfectly safe.</p>
398	Individual submitter	<p>1) I would have thought 100kms is fine through here. It comes down to driver</p> <p>4) That won't make a difference. Your talking 490m?</p> <p>5) Why how many accidents happen here?</p> <p>7) Again why? You will just upset people who already don't like sitting behind others</p> <p>8) Again why?</p> <p>9) This is insane</p> <p>10) I don't go 100kms through here anyway. 50 is a reasonable ask through here due to the amount of people around</p> <p>11) Whats wrong with 100kms through here</p> <p>13) Again stupid</p> <p>14) Stupid</p> <p>15) The cars aren't from 1960 anymore</p> <p>16) Isn't it that now?</p> <p>17) Stupid</p> <p>18) Why?</p> <p>19) Again why? We are talking good straight highways</p>
399	Individual submitter	<p>1) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>4) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>5) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>7) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>8) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>9) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>10) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>11) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>13) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>14) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>15) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>16) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>17) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p> <p>18) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p>

		<p>school or town.</p> <p>19) Default speed should be 100km and a reduction should be based on actual circumstance such as a school or town. The lower speed should only be for the immediate area either side of the school or town.</p>
400	Individual submitter	<p>1) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Installing a passing lane to help peak hour congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>4) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Installing a passing lane to help peak hour congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>5) This should stay at the existing speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Reducing it could lead to peak hour congestion and frustration.</p> <p>7) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Installing a passing lane to help peak hour congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>8) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Installing a passing lane to help peak hour congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>9) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Installing a passing lane to help congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>10) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit and note change at all .. By lanes to get traffic of the road on both sides for tourist parking. Installing a passing lane to help congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>11) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Installing a passing lane to help congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>13) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Installing a passing lane to help congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>14) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as although winding, a constant speed can be maintained. Installing a passing lane to help congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>15) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit Installing a passing lane to help congestion and help stop frustration.</p> <p>16) This should be increased to 100 km/h as per the nationwide speed limit with a variable school zone.</p> <p>17) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved.</p> <p>18) Increase to the nationwide speed limit and alter the roading/sound barriers to suit</p> <p>19) This should stay at the nationwide speed limit as it is a relatively straight road where constant speed is easily achieved. Installing a passing lane to help congestion and help stop frustration.</p>
401	Greg Winn Contracting Ltd	<p>1) Reducing any of these speed limits will not reduce accidents, in fact it will potentially increase accidents as people will make more risky passes and drivers in general will not be concentrating as intensely while travelling at the slower speed limit. Driver education and less distractions are what is required to increase road safety. Reducing speed limits will also increase the costs of road transport as drivers will run out of driving hours earlier and have to park up, this may result in extra trucks on the road to achieve the same results..</p> <p>4) Same as above</p> <p>5) Same as above</p> <p>7) Same as above</p> <p>8) Same as above</p> <p>9) Same as above</p> <p>10) Same as above</p> <p>11) Same as above</p> <p>13) Same as above</p> <p>14) Same as above</p> <p>15) Same as above</p> <p>16) Same as above</p> <p>17) Same as above</p> <p>18) Same as above</p> <p>19) Same as above</p>
402	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it as it is</p> <p>4) Leave it as it is it's a good speed 80km is too slow</p> <p>5) It's fine as it is</p> <p>7) There is no need to decrease the speed .focus on better roading</p> <p>8) No comment don't know the road well</p> <p>9) Leave it as it is</p> <p>10) Ok as it is</p> <p>11) Leave it as it is</p> <p>13) Leave it at 100km</p> <p>14) Leave it as it is</p> <p>15) Leave it as it is</p>



404	Individual submitter	We have driven the road between Blenheim to Nelson/Picton often in the past 50 years and think 80kph should be the maximum speed for most the highway. The lack of adequate shoulders, is often a concern.
405	Individual submitter	<p>1) Relatively straight piece of road with great visibility. 100kph is fine.do not change.</p> <p>4) Relatively straight length of road with very few corners great visibility. 100kph is perfectly achievable and safe travelling speed.do not change.</p> <p>5) Relatively straight piece of road with great visibility as you enter Havelock. 70kph is perfectly safe speed.do not change.</p> <p>7) Relatively straight lengths of road with few corners generally good visibility. 100kph is perfectly achievable and safe travelling speed on this stretch of road.do not change.</p> <p>8) Relatively straight lengths of road with few corners generally good visibility. 100kph is perfectly achievable and safe travelling speed on this stretch of road.do not change. Maintain 60kph variable school zone.</p> <p>9) Relatively straight lengths of road with few gentle corners generally good visibility. 100kph is perfectly achievable and safe travelling speed on this stretch of road.do not change.</p> <p>10) Split speed limits that are existing work perfectly. during the busy summer months this is necessary but during shoulder and winter months this is unnecessary as it is a gentle piece of road with clear road markings. I travel this road dozens of times a year and have never had or seen an issue with this stretch of road.</p> <p>11) Relatively straight lengths of road with few gentle corners generally good visibility. 100kph is perfectly achievable and safe travelling speed on this stretch of road.do not change.</p> <p>13) Agree that the speed limit from Rai Valley to Whangamoia saddle summit should be restricted to 80kph. Winding hilly road with good passing bays but generally can only and should only be travelled at 80kph max. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of the road would be a practicle outcome of this review.</p> <p>14) Agree that the speed limit from Whangamoia saddle summit to Teal Valley Rd should be restricted to 80kph. Winding hilly road with good passing bays but generally can only and should only be travelled at 80kph max. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of the road would be a practicle outcome of this review.</p> <p>15) Relatively straight lengths of road with few gentle corners generally good visibility. 100kph is perfectly achievable and safe travelling speed on this stretch of road.do not change.</p> <p>16) This proposal is fine.</p> <p>17) Relatively straight lengths of road with few gentle corners generally good visibility. 100kph is perfectly achievable and safe travelling speed on this stretch of road.do not change.</p> <p>18) This proposal is fine. Can be a high traffic area</p> <p>19) Relatively straight lengths of road with few gentle corners generally good visibility. 100kph is perfectly achievable and safe travelling speed on this stretch of road.do not change.</p>
406	Individual submitter	<p>1) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>4) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>5) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>7) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>8) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>9) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>10) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>11) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>13) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>14) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>15) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>16) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>17) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>18) Better skills and knowledge</p> <p>19) Better skills and knowledge</p>
407	Individual submitter	<p>1) No change required better driver education will do more to improve safety</p> <p>4) No change.better education of drivers</p> <p>5) No change needed. Reducing speed limit will mean people will concentrate lees</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) No change required</p> <p>9) No change needed</p> <p>10) No change</p> <p>11) No change required</p> <p>13) No change required better driver education will do more to improve safety</p> <p>14) No change required better driver education will do more to improve safety</p> <p>15) No change required better driver education will do more to improve safety</p> <p>16) No change required better driver education will do more to improve safety</p> <p>17) No change required better driver education will do more to improve safety</p>

		<p>18) No change required better driver education will do more to improve safety</p> <p>19) No change required better driver education will do more to improve safety</p>
408	Individual submitter	<p>1) I worked for ten years on the Nelson Marlborough rescue helicopter and St John Ambulances in Nelson. In that time, I have attended very few accidents on this highway, and of the ones I have attended, most were not speed related, but driver error, vehicle failure, driver fatigue etc. Try listening to the road users and actually make a decision that the public want. Speed is not the issue!</p> <p>4) Speed is not the issue, that section of road is mostly flat, with very few sharp corners and a lot of straights, why in gods name would you need to reduce the speed limit on such a nice stretch of road! Attended 1 serious crash on this section of road, driver fell asleep.</p> <p>5) That's ok, through a built up area.</p> <p>7) Unnecessary change, nice flowing section of road, 100kmph is not excessive. Don't change it, never attended any crashes on this section.</p> <p>8) Just reduce the bit past the school the rest should remain at 100</p> <p>9) No!! Beautiful flowing section of road, easy contours and corners, no cliffs or significant dangers, leave it at 100, never attended any serious accidents on this bit of road.</p> <p>10) Make it 80/60 in Dec Jan</p> <p>11) No unnecessary change, nothing wrong with that section of road. Changing the speed limit won't achieve anything except more impatient drivers. Never attended any crashes on this section.</p> <p>13) In 10 years working on the local rescue helicopter I've never been to an accident on that section of road, it is an unnecessary change, drivers already regulate their speed themselves to drive to the road conditions. Never attended any crashes on this section.</p> <p>14) Unnecessary change, drivers already self regulate their speed on this section of road, speed is not the issue. Dropping the speed to 60 will create more impatient drivers and drivers taking more risks to pass slow vehicles. If it says 60 you'll have people doing 40! Crazy. The accident rate will go up. Have attended several accidents on this section of road, trucks lost brakes, motorbike vs truck, bike on wrong side of the road, cars down banks, etc, none speed related, speed is not the issue.</p> <p>15) Change not needed here either</p> <p>16) That's fair enough past a school</p> <p>17) Change not needed</p> <p>18) Change not needed</p> <p>19) Change not needed</p>
409	Individual submitter	<p>1) It is a straight road with good visabiity and minimal driveways or intersections. If the crash rate is high here it's not due to the road being dangerous its due to the competency of the drivers</p> <p>4) I've been driving this road frequently for the last 17 years and haven't been close to having an accident once. The only factor in this section of road is the morning fog it's prone to. But this is where driving to the conditions is important which is once again a driver education issue.</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) Traffic congestion on a perfectly good peice of road. I've been driving it for the past 17 years and never had an accident on it.</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) The only peice of this road that could have some improvements made is where Daltons road enters as the viability isn't great. The rest of the road is safe to travel at 100kmph, has been for the last 17 year's I've driven it.</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) There is nothing wrong with this peice of road, the corners allready have speed restriction signs all you will succeed in doing is costing the region money by increasing travel time for tradesmen and transport operators.</p> <p>13) You have just spent hundreds of thousands of dollars realigning the rai saddle and your now saying it's not safe to travel at the speed it was designed for? Once again I have driven this peice of road for 17 years and not had an accident. What I have seen that has been a danger to other road users is in experienced drivers holding the traffic flow up and angering other motorist to the point were they make bad overtaking decisions.</p> <p>14) A speed limit of 80kmph through this section would be sufficient. It has been 100kmph through here for the 17 years I've driven these roads regularly and there has been alot of money spent on realigning and resurfacing this section of road and it is safer than ever. All you are doing by lowering the speed limit by 40kmph is admitting to myself and other locals is that the standard of education and skills the drivers have on our now days has fallen which is the root of the problem. Upskill the road users and it has an effect on every peice of road in the country.</p> <p>15) The entry of ross road could benefit from a reduced speed zone but the rest of the road is perfectly fine at 100kmph</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) Why? There is an overtaking lane here already so it has been deemed safe by roading engineers previously so what has changed? The skill level of the drivers not the road.</p> <p>18) Every time I use this peice of road 50 percent of drivers allready do 60kmph. So if it were drouped even lower I garrentee there will be more accidents because frustrated drivers will start overtaking slow motorists, with the side streets in this section of the road it will be a hazzard</p> <p>19) This road has excellent visibility and the surface is good. Why increase travel times for locals? If you crash here it is because of your inattention not the road. Changing a speed limit dosent fix stupid</p>
410	Individual submitter	<p>1) Nothing to add</p> <p>4) Length of road approximately 27 km? In my opinion, road is capable of being safely driven at 100km in its entirety, with possible exception of bridge over Wairau River (and minor clusters of houses). Any dangers with speed is - in my opinion - more likely to be resolved with better enforcement of existing 100km/h limit rather than punitive speed reduction over entire limit. Addition of passing lanes at regular intervals would be a better way to improve safety of road, as no need to cross centre lane.</p>

		<p>5) Nothing to add</p> <p>7) Proposed portion of state highway is - in my opinion - too far to justify limit of 80km/h over its entire distance - road is capable of being safely driven at 100km/h bar weather condition changes and tighter corners - which are slowed down for automatically. Safety better improved by addition of passing lanes, otherwise I believe accidents are as likely to happen at 80km/hr than at 100km/hr</p> <p>8) Nothing to add</p> <p>9) Proposed portion of state highway is - in my opinion - too far to justify limit of 80km/h over its entire distance - road is capable of being safely driven at 100km/h bar weather condition changes and tighter corners - which are slowed down for automatically. Safety better improved by addition of passing lanes, otherwise I believe accidents are as likely to happen at 80km/hr than at 100km/hr</p> <p>10) Nothing to add</p> <p>11) Proposed portion of state highway is - in my opinion - too far to justify limit of 80km/h over its entire distance - road is capable of being safely driven at 100km/h bar weather condition changes and tighter corners - which are slowed down for automatically. Safety better improved by addition of passing lanes, otherwise I believe accidents are as likely to happen at 80km/hr than at 100km/hr</p> <p>13) Road is safe at 100km/hr, with exception of overtaking due to lack of passing lanes. Slowing speed to 80km/hr will - in my opinion - not make the road any safer.</p> <p>14) off public highway? nothing to add</p> <p>15) Close to built up semi residential area - proposed reduction is acceptable.</p> <p>16) Nothing to add</p> <p>17) Road is capable of being driven at 100km/hr. Wakapuaka turnoff to Glen Rd may be justified in reducing speed either side if deemed high risk spot, but not in its entirety in my opinion.</p> <p>18) Includes school area and is built up. Speed reduction acceptable, though may be better suited to an even slower speed, only within school hours.</p> <p>19) Residential area is building up. In long term, accept that speed reduction to 80km/hr is acceptable.</p>
411	Individual submitter	<p>1) Its a straight bit of road so is not necessary.</p> <p>4) The road is wide and the corners gentle so it is unnecessary to reduce it to 80km</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This a straight road with gentle bends so doesn't need a reduced speed limit.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) This a straight road with gentle bends so doesn't need a reduced speed limit.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This a straight-ish road with gentle bends so doesn't need a reduced speed limit.</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
412	Individual submitter	<p>1) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p> <p>4) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p> <p>8) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes. The school zone is fair enough.</p> <p>9) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p> <p>10) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes. 60 is ridiculously slow for this area and I have been driving these roads my whole life with no issue maintaining a 100km speed limit</p> <p>11) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p> <p>13) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely</p>

		<p>continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes. Rai valley isnt extremely populated it doesn't make sense to lower the limit.</p> <p>14) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p> <p>15) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p> <p>16) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes. On this particular part of the road I feel it would be dangerous to lower the limit.</p> <p>17) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) I disagree with the limit drop as it implies the roads aren't safe due to the limit but realistically the majority feel happy and comfortable with 100k an hour and therefore will most likely continue doing 100km an hour despite 80km changes.</p>
413	Individual submitter	<p>1) There are never any crashes on this road, changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>4) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>5) DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT. Instead spend the money on making more overtaking lanes or places to pull over. Lowering the speed limit will just make drivers more frustrated.</p> <p>7) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>8) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>9) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>10) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT. This is nearly half the existing speed limit, people will still drive at 100 and all that will happen is people will get frustrated and drive fast and overtake in dangerous places.</p> <p>11) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>13) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>14) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>15) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>16) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>17) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>18) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p> <p>19) Changing the speed limit will do nothing but frustrate drivers and force them to overtake in dangerous place. If anything the road needs more overtaking lanes and places to pull over. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMIT</p>
414	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>4) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>5) It's always been driven at 70km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>7) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>8) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>9) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>10) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>11) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>13) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p>

		<p>14) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>15) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>16) It's always been driven at 80km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>17) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>18) It's always been driven at 80km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p> <p>19) It's always been driven at 100km/h. The drivers have gotten worse not the road. Keep it the same speed.</p>
415	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Making people drive slower has no direct link to the amount of crashes on the road</p> <p>13) Making people drive slower has no direct link to the amount of crashes on the road</p> <p>14) Making people drive slower has no direct link to the amount of crashes on the road</p> <p>15) Making people drive slower has no direct link to the amount of crashes on the road</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) Making people drive slower has no direct link to the amount of crashes on the road</p> <p>18) Making people drive slower has no direct link to the amount of crashes on the road</p> <p>19) Making people drive slower has no direct link to the amount of crashes on the road</p>
416	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it at 100km that speed limit is safe</p> <p>4) Keep it at 100km this is still a safe speed limit</p> <p>5) Keep it at 70km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>7) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>8) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>9) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>10) No accidents have really happen here and most drivers drive with caution through here</p> <p>11) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>13) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>14) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>15) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>16) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>17) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p> <p>18) 80km is a safe speed</p> <p>19) Keep it at 100km it's safe at that speed limit</p>
417	Individual submitter	<p>1) We need to consider the truck drivers who often have tight schedules and at least leave speed limit at 90km/h.</p> <p>4) Once again our truckies who have to live by their log books and have deadlines to meet. speed limit needs to be dropped no lower than 90km/h</p> <p>5) 70 k works just fine in this area</p> <p>7) Yes 80 km per hour is dangerously slow and could very well be accident causing.</p> <p>8) 60 at the school zone is good. once again please consider dropping speed limit to no lower than 90</p> <p>9) Too slow. This could be accident causing with frustrated drivers.</p> <p>10) this is a good idea as is a very busy area in holiday season.</p> <p>11) once again please consider our truck drivers. with their dead lines and log books.</p> <p>13) please drop speed limit to no lower than 90</p> <p>14) We can't travel 100 in this area anyway.....so why not drop it just to 90?</p> <p>15) once again please can we go for 90</p> <p>16) that's good</p> <p>17) Have there been alot of accidents on this stretch of road? if not please leave it as is.</p>

		18) i feel that 80 works fine in this area. 19) okay
418	Individual submitter	I would like to state would like the speed to drop to 80kms on State Highway 6, between Blenheim and Nelson. The 100kms has too fast and especially for the huge trucks!! To many accidents and feel you could start gd road speeds and be an example to the rest of New Zealand!! I believe the trucking companies that aren't happy are just greedy and not considering the smaller cars on the roads. They have always been too big and too fast. I've had many close calls and hope my email to be helpful!! Thank You-Mrs Heather Goulter
419	Individual submitter	1) No 4) No 5) No 7) No 8) No 9) No 10) The narrow bridge and curve may need special consideration 11) No 13) No 14) Really recommendable Do not forget the double midline with passing areas 15) No 16) No 17) No 18) No 19) No
420	Individual submitter	I'm fully backing the proposal to reduce the speed limit between Nelson and Blenheim to 80 kmh for the whole distance . If just one life can be saved then it was already worth it . Not to mention less pollution , noise etc. People will get used to it in no time . No need to overtake trucks which do 90 kmh because you are pushed from the back to do so . Tourists especially will appreciate the saver way to travel without always feeling obliged to do 100 km h . Speed reductions have worked in many countries to get injury and fatalities lower , there is absolutely no reason why it shouldn't work in Aotearoa . I hope that NZTA has the guts to make it happen even against some opposition . Many people will thank you !!!!! Good luck with it !!
421	Individual submitter	I drive this road Two times a month going over Tuesday back Wednesday afternoon. Have been doing this for 20 plus years .  Dropping the speed limit not going to help at all get those People in Power to install better roads Barriers Etc .  Like most Sales Reps i drove at 105 on cruise control and never had a problem with it.
422	Individual submitter	I believe that the proposed changes to the speed limits in this area is a very wise move.
423	Individual submitter	1) This is a good decision. The whole distance from Nelson to Blenheim should have a maximum speed of 80 km/h. 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment

		17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment
424	Individual submitter	<p>Below is my submission to the State Highway 6 Blenheim to Nelson Proposed Speed Restrictions.</p> <p>SUBMISSION</p> <p>Not to lower the “Blanket Speed Limit” State Highway 6 Blenheim to Nelson</p> <p>Consequences:-</p> <p>There are clearly area of this (so called) Highway that are more than capable of supporting the continuation of 100km/h – Should speed restrictions be placed on these areas, where the road speaks for itself – chastising the road user who will not perceive the reason for the reduced speed limit because the Road function supports retaining the higher limit. Those areas provide an opportunity for following traffic to overtake slower vehicles ahead. A manoeuvre that should be completed reasonably quickly, not possible with 80 km/h limit. Slower capped speeds will increase fatigue, diverted attention, lack of concentration, distraction, which causes errors, this combined with lack of clearly (advanced) signed, pull in areas, stopping bays, rest areas, let alone dedicated passing zones, (of which there are only two [up the Rai and Hira]. Makes one wonder “What has happened to the fees collected from the motorist and the amount earned from road user charges – per day, on that Highway?” Because very little (nothing) has been put into improvement [apart from safety realignment from top of the Rai] over the past fifteen years and N.Z.T.A. are blaming safety on speeding!</p> <p>I list 19 facts gleaned from road toll figures on S.H.6. – They speak for themselves as to speed!</p> <p>ACCIDENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Alcohol above limit hit Straying animal.</li> <li>2 Hit storm damage Alcohol above limit</li> <li>3 Driver under instruction Ice on Road</li> <li>4 Fatigue hit Birds and boulder on the road</li> <li>5 Wet Fatigue inattention hit bank.</li> <li>6 Failed to give way overseas driver T intersection.</li> <li>7 Went off the road to the right after hitting farm animals.</li> <li>8 Truck hit pedestrians walking in middle of road in the dark with dark clothing.</li> <li>9 Attention diverted by food, cigarettes at intersection coming off gravel road.</li> <li>10 Attention diverted failed to notice bend in road.</li> <li>11 Over taking a vehicle that then turned right.</li> <li>12 Alcohol over limit lost control on straight road.</li> <li>13 Fatigue, lost control hit straying animals.</li> <li>14 2 Motor cyclists entering road from driveway.</li> <li>15 Truck hit storm damage lost control returning to seal from non-seal.</li> <li>16 Lost control approaching slow vehicle at T intersection.</li> </ol> <p>17 2p. Alcohol fail to see bend in the road.</p> <p>18 Hit rear of vehicle turning right to a Farm inattention</p> <p>19 Inattention Fatigue, Alcohol hit animals while turning right.</p> <p>It is time to spend some money on the road!</p> <p>If you “the N.Z.T.A. Judge and Jury of the “Submissions”, put in, think that this proposed blanket reduction in the Speed Limit will have a vast decrease in D.S.I’s I assure you it is only a very small part of the equation.</p> <p>Rural school time controlled Electronic enforceable speed limit signs, activated during peak school traffic hours.</p> <p>Currently and looking toward the future this arterial State Highway #6 linking Blenheim to Nelson, in certain areas cannot and is not designed to carry this increased amount of vehicular traffic, is in urgent need of engineering and funding to raise its standard to an acceptable level:- This is where the major problem is! Not 20% speed reduction</p>

425	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Leave as 100km/h</li> <li>4) Leave as 100 km/h</li> <li>5) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>7) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>8) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>9) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>10) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>11) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>13) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>14) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>15) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>16) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>17) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>18) Leave as existing speed</li> <li>19) Leave as existing speed</li> </ul>
426	Individual submitter	<p>I believe the decision to change 'location' 5,6,8 &amp; 18 to be valid. All other 'locations' NO, I have been travelling this highway on a regular basis since 1972, and other than realigning Whangamoa (Westside), and more recently Gentle Annie (Westside) and Rua Saddle (Northside), little or nothing has been done to improve the road to ensure better driving conditions. Lowering the speed limits to '80' is a backward move, '100' is ok, just drive to the conditions on the day and all is fine. Maybe pull up the 'slow' drivers to keep traffic flowing would be a better solution.</p>
427	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) As with any consideration re accidents, speed is only one factor. Human behaviour is the most important. Whether it be drunk driving, drugged driving, driver tiredness, reckless behaviour, inattention (cell phones) and a raft of other factors. Do you really think that decreasing the speed limit will impact on peoples' behaviour. I would doubt it. contd. next section.</li> <li>4) Are you hoping that lower speed crashes will kill fewer people? If the speed limits are altered there will be many who will ignore the 80km/hr (reduced from 100km/hr) and travel safely as they always have. contd. next section.</li> <li>5) This will bring about a greater disparity in rates of travel. Those who stick to an 80km/h and those who dawdle more slowly. This will make the roads even more dangerous. "What will I meet around the next corner, what is happening out of view behind me". Contd. next section.</li> <li>7) I am dismayed that there is not the opportunity to make a general statement about the overall nonsense of this proposal. I am frustrated that my submission will be discounted as it has not responded to each little section. I think the questionnaire has been designed to disallow any personal statement. Perhaps it is deliberate. The proposers of the changes are afraid there will too many well reasoned arguments against the changes.</li> <li>8) Remember, the vast majority of drivers drive safely With an ever increasing number of vehicles on the country's roads it stands to reason that more accidents will happen. Contd. next section.</li> <li>9) Every time a person steps onto an aircraft, they take their life in their own hands, yet many people do. The same applies to travelling on the road. Accidents are inevitable. Yet, given the numbers travelling by road, accident numbers are minuscule.</li> <li>10) No Comment</li> <li>11) No Comment</li> <li>13) No Comment</li> <li>14) No Comment</li> <li>15) No Comment</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) No Comment</li> <li>18) No Comment</li> <li>19) No Comment</li> </ul>
428	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Surely this a stretch of dead straight road, why reduce the speed limit?</li> <li>4) The problem with this stretch of road is that there are no designated passing places. Instead of reducing the speed limit which will only build up frustration in drivers leading to risky overtaking, why not build some three lane overtaking sections on some of the straighter sections.</li> <li>5) I have no problem with this suggestion.</li> <li>7) Once again, this section could do with widening and a designated passing section needs building. Reducing the speed limit will only lead to risky overtaking as frustration builds up.</li> <li>8) this is a short stretch of straight road over a good bridge with good visibility. Apart from the Canvastown School which could have a school zone limit, why change from the existing speed limit?</li> <li>9) This again, is a fairly straight stretch of road with a few mild bends. What it needs is a three lane overtaking stretch on one of the straighter stretches before the bends around Pelorus Bridge</li> <li>10) I think the existing speed limit here is fine but the restrictions to 50kph should be extended to Dec/March</li> <li>11) this is a good stretch of road with a few mild bends. A three lane overtaking stretch on the straight to the south of Rai Valley would be a good idea and a better option than a blanket speed restriction.</li> <li>13) I would agree with this suggestion</li> </ul>

		<p>14) I think a revision to 70kph would be a better suggestion.</p> <p>15) I agree with this suggestion</p> <p>16) I agree with this suggestion</p> <p>17) This is a straight section of road over the Gentle Annie saddle with a three lane overtaking lane up the hill from the Nelson side. This is the last place for safe overtaking of trucks and motor homes before the Whangamoas and reducing the speed limit to 80kph will restrict the number of vehicles that can pass such slow moving vehicles. I think this is a ridiculous suggestion and should be dropped.</p> <p>18) The existing 80kph speed limit there is perfectly adequate for both the road width and visibility. I feel the proposed reduction to 60kph is a needless proposal.</p> <p>19) this is a long fairly straight stretch of good road and the proposed reduction in speed limit would be a waste of everybody's time. Overall, from Renwick to Nelson the suggested reduction in speed limits will add around 20 minutes to the journey. You will be increasing driver's frustration and forcing them to make risky decisions overtaking trucks, motor homes etc. To reduce accidents on this stretch of road you need to straighten some of the bends and put in some more three lane overtaking stretches on the straighter sections. Your proposed changes are an attempt at a cheap fix and probably won't work. Furthermore, you will be extending the period that vehicles are emitting exhaust fumes on this road by about 15% which will not improve our green credentials.</p>
429	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) there are several community roads on this stretch that debouch onto SH6 as a resident of this area I would much prefer to see the speed reduced to 60km/h on this stretch and a speed of 50km/h outside the school and shop.</p> <p>16) Hira school is a primary school and at Peak times there is lots of traffic attempting to access both the school and the highway from the school.the traffic at these times can be very intimidating particularly the trucks. Children also cross the road to access Ross road and the shop, 50km/h seems a much safer option with a small loss of time.</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
430	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) This road is safe for trained drivers, and having all traffic including trucks and vehicles with trailers travelling at the same will mean that as some drivers will always travel slower than the limit, we will have trucks and vehicles towing trailer passing cars and taking a long time to overtake increasing the danger of head-on collisions, Also driver will not feel the need to concentrate resulting in distracted driving and is likely to increase the crash rate.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This road is safe for trained drivers, and having all traffic including trucks and vehicles with trailers travelling at the same will mean that as some drivers will always travel slower than the limit, we will have trucks and vehicles towing trailer passing cars and taking a long time to overtake increasing the danger of head-on collisions, Also driver will not feel the need to concentrate resulting in distracted driving and is likely to increase the crash rate.</p> <p>8) This road is safe for trained drivers, and having all traffic including trucks and vehicles with trailers travelling at the same will mean that as some drivers will always travel slower than the limit, we will have trucks and vehicles towing trailer passing cars and taking a long time to overtake increasing the danger of head-on collisions, Also driver will not feel the need to concentrate resulting in distracted driving and is likely to increase the crash rate.</p> <p>9) This road is safe for trained drivers, and having all traffic including trucks and vehicles with trailers travelling at the same will mean that as some drivers will always travel slower than the limit, we will have trucks and vehicles towing trailer passing cars and taking a long time to overtake increasing the danger of head-on collisions, Also driver will not feel the need to concentrate resulting in distracted driving and is likely to increase the crash rate.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This road is safe for trained drivers, and having all traffic including trucks and vehicles with trailers travelling at the same will mean that as some drivers will always travel slower than the limit, we will have trucks and vehicles towing trailer passing cars and taking a long time to overtake increasing the danger of head-on collisions, Also driver will not feel the need to concentrate resulting in distracted driving, and is likely to increase the crash rate.</p> <p>13) This road is safe for trained drivers, and having all traffic including trucks and vehicles with trailers travelling at the same will mean that as some drivers will always travel slower than the limit, we will have trucks and vehicles towing trailer passing cars and taking a long time to overtake increasing the danger of head-on collisions, Also driver will not feel the need to concentrate resulting in distracted driving and is likely to increase the crash rate.</p>

		<p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) This road is safe for trained drivers, and having all traffic including trucks and vehicles with trailers travelling at the same will mean that as some drivers will always travel slower than the limit, we will have trucks and vehicles towing trailer passing cars and taking a long time to overtake increasing the danger of headon collisions, Also driver will not feel the need to concentrate resulting in distracted driving, and is likely to increase the crash rate.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
431	Individual submitter	I drive class 5 as a full time job. I travel each day, sometimes twice a day. As a professional driver, if we can drive our vehicles/trucks upwards of 40 ton plus without accidents. Why should I be punished for the regular car driver not driving to the conditions?
432	Individual submitter	<p>SH6 BLENHEIM TO NELSON SPEED REVIEW CONSULTATION SUBMISSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· I OPPOSE the proposed comprehensive reduction in speed limit between Nelson and Blenheim from 100 kmh to 80 kmh. Significant areas of this road are relatively straight with good camber responsible drivers have no problem navigating these sections at 100 kmh. Significant road improvements have recently been completed in sections over the Rai saddle.</li> <li>· I support a comprehensive speed limit of 80 kmh between Allisdair St through to Trafalgar St in Nelson. This is a built up area where presently have a section requiring 80 kmh, I think it is important to have consistency in speed limits not fragmentation over short periods of road as we presently have.</li> <li>· I OPPOSE a reduction in speed limit from 80 kmh to 60 kmh between Allisdair St and Atawhai Cres, for the reason above, it should all be designated 80 kmh</li> <li>· I support a comprehensive 80 kmh speed limit from the start of the passing lane, Nelson side of the Cable Bay turnoff, right through to the top of the Whangamoia Saddle.</li> <li>· I support Electronic school zone signs (50kmh) activated 30 mins before and after (1 hour in total) school starts and finishes, outside of these hours 80 kmh.</li> <li>· I support a mandatory speed limit of 80 kmh at Pelorus Bridge and a reduction to 50kmh over the Dec/Jan period.</li> <li>· I OPPOSE a reduction from 100 kmh to 80 kmh at Canvastown, support a variable school zone 60 kmh 30 mins either side of the start and finish of school. The road through Canvastown is relatively straight; making allowance for the start and finish of school by way of a speed reduction 30 mins either side is adequate.</li> <li>· I support the extension of the 50 kmh zone to past Queen Charlotte Drive in Havelock</li> </ul>
433	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) This pulled directly out of the Clifton Terrace Newsletter 25 October "Last week, we received a phone call from the wife of a Nelson truck driver. She rang as he was too upset. He was travelling near CTS when a younger child fell off his bike on to the road space. The truck took evasive action and luckily the child managed to get himself off the road in time. This was a good result. However, it highlights the importance of safety around the main road at any time. Please do talk to your children about being safe near roads. I would be devastated if anything should happen to anyone." Please consider the community and change the speed to 50km/h.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
434	Individual submitter	I am emailing regarding this ridiculous proposal to reduce the speed between Blenheim & Nelson to no more than 80kmh. Have I missed something? Have we slipped back to 1955? Are we really even considering doing this in 2019 when everybody is time poor in an era when everyone has better safer cars than ever before. I actually find it hard to put into words how ridiculous this is. It

		<p>appears as though you don't want to treat us like adults &amp; as a result you don't get buy in from the public. Without that you have nothing. I've just been from Blenheim to Christchurch return twice recently &amp; the 80km &amp; 60km zones around the coast &amp; thru the hills are just ignored because they are too slow &amp; there is no buy in. It's not that people are racing thru them. All they are doing is going a speed that suits the road &amp; the conditions like sensible adults. If you change this speed people will ignore because people don't appreciate ridiculous change like this. Pandering to the lowest common denominator will not fix the problem it will simply dumb down society &amp; we've already gone down that path to far already. Surely better training &amp; harsher penalties for drug, drink &amp; distracted driving are a better option. Blanket speed reduction is such a cop out &amp; just punishes everyone for a few peoples stupidity.</p> <p>I drive this road regularly &amp; it's a great drive &amp; pretty easy on a good road. There is NO need for this change. More passing lanes would be good but a with bit of patience &amp; you can pass safely. I also think if it gets changed all that will happen is that people will look to make up time in other areas, dodgy passes etc. They will also have no tolerance for those not doing right on 80kmh. With the current 100kmh limit people have a tolerance for those a bit under the limit as they are still doing a decent clip but I doubt that would continue at the lower speed.</p> <p>What about the lost time in the hundreds of truck movements on that road everyday? Who's going to pay for that? I hope all the truck companies charge NZTA for the lost time but I'm sure the general public will foot the bill as usual.</p> <p>I cannot emphasize how much I believe this is an extremely poor decision to even be considering making. It is poorly thought out &amp; is nothing more than dragging this country back into the dark ages. DO NOT CHANGE THE SPEED LIMITS BETWEEN BLENHEIM &amp; NELSON.</p>
435	Individual submitter	<p>1) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>4) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>5) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>7) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>8) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>9) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>10) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>11) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>13) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>14) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>15) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>16) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inpatient drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p>

		<p>17) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inopmtitent drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>18) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inopmtitent drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p> <p>19) The problem is tourists, old people etc already going 80 and under causing frustration and making people take risks to get past some of the lines of traffic they make. Keeping unconfident and inopmtitent drivers off the road and bringing in mandatory driving tests for senior citizens once every 5 years is what will help, but I'm guessing that's too much effort for the nz govt to keep our roads safe.</p>
436	Individual submitter	<p>In my opinion speed should be at 50km a hour for in town residential area in the country renwick havelock rai valley perlous hira.</p> <p>The road though the whatamanga at 80km and in some parts 50km.</p> <p>All country residential should be 50 km a hour our road deaths numbers are high it will effect our tourist visitors</p>
437	Havelock automotive	<p>1) It's a straight piece of road with very few obstacles, what's not safe at 100kmph?</p> <p>4) Takes long enough to get through already, if cars cant handle that piece of road then they need repairs or maintenance and if a driver can't handle it either train up on there abilities or move over to let others pass and drive at your own pace. Make a passing lane or two</p> <p>5) That's probably not a bad idea seeing all those houses and side streets</p> <p>7) Again. Easy piece of road with bugger all corners, few holes in the road would be the only safety issue</p> <p>8) Straight piece of road, maybe one or two kids even cross that road as all are either picked up or go on the buses. Maybe school zone speeds around starting and finishing times of the school.</p> <p>9) Again holey road, safe at 100kmph, piece between doultons bridge and the atomic is probably the worst for holes. Doesn't need a change</p> <p>10) This is the most logical and sensible idea you guys have come up with so far</p> <p>11) Again has a few holes but is pretty safe at 100kmph. Could put in corn speed warnings on a couple corners</p> <p>13) Again another straight road. Few corns at the start, maybe move the 60 zone up to the ronger turn off?</p> <p>14) Most people struggle to do 100kmph up the hills and you just spent millions making some of that bit "safe" but in reality it's just as prickly, leave it 100kmph. Most don't drive the hill that fast anyway. Ice is the killer there, speed or not you will slip</p> <p>15) Best left alone, works well already</p> <p>16) That's a no brainer</p> <p>17) Recommendations on corner speed and left alone be fine</p> <p>18) Traffic flow can be slow enough already, pretty open well flowing road. Leave it</p> <p>19) Road is open and flows well, again trafic, maybe put pre warning for the 50k zone a head</p>
438	Individual submitter	<p>1) The whole of State Hyway 60 should be 80kmph. It will save lifes and cut down carbon emissions.</p> <p>4) 80 kms for the whole highway</p> <p>5) 80 kms for the who highway</p> <p>7) 80 kms for the whole highway.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) 80 kmph maximum for the whole state 60 highway</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
439	Individual submitter	<p>Leave the speed limits as they are!</p> <p>I object to all the changes you suggested.</p> <p>Please stop wasting money (and people's time) on these suggestions. If an area is unsafe - fix it, don't try to reduce speeds. You are creating irritated drivers who are much less safe. If the conditions do not allow fast driving the drivers will allow themselves.</p>
440	Individual submitter	<p>1) Why when this piece of road is straight and wide, people already travel at 80 if you make if 80 they will travel at 60 or 70 as they already do if they are travelling at 80 and arrive into the 80km limit at Woodbourne they slow down even more. How about lifting the skills of drivers with compulsory defensive skills for anyone caught driving inconsiderately, including too slowly. Half the</p>

		<p>time these driver have no idea anyone is behind them.</p> <p>4) Anyone who can't safely drive this road in good conditions at 100km needs to get some driver confidence training. People already travel at 80 if you make it 80 they will travel at 60 or 70 as they already do if they are travelling at 80 and arrive into the 80km area they slow down even more. How about lifting the skills of drivers with compulsory defensive skills for anyone caught driving inconsiderately, including too slowly. Half the time these driver have no idea anyone is behind them. Driving from Blenheim to Grovetown the other day - following cars doing 60kms. Why are these drivers not targetted. All the drivers in the que were following too closely and constantly braking. Why are we constantly being asked to conform to account for the lowest common denominator? This move will just cause impatience and more people will take risks, how many slow and inconsiderate drivers are actually ticketed? The numbers would be interesting.</p> <p>5) Make it 60km if you have to!</p> <p>7) Anyone who can't safely drive this road in good conditions at 100km needs to get some driver confidence training. People already travel at 80 if you make it 80 they will travel at 60 or 70 as they already do if they are travelling at 80 and arrive into the 80km area they slow down even more. How about lifting the skills of drivers with compulsory defensive skills for anyone caught driving inconsiderately, including too slowly. Half the time these driver have no idea anyone is behind them. Speed is not the only factor - in fact speed on it own is probably not even the issue, speed and impatience, speed and bad decisions, speed and distractions. And all these other factors will still exist for incompetent drivers. Increase driver skill and make all roads safer, you can stop spending money on expensive road upgrades cos our roads are not the issue!!!</p> <p>8) Aren't vehicles already suppose to slow during school times?</p> <p>9) At 80km people are more likely to look at the scenery. Did you take that into account?</p> <p>10) A slower limit in the busy season is adequate.</p> <p>11) Slow drivers are the cause of accidents, and you are about to cause more.</p> <p>13) How about a maximum speed limit of 80 in outside lane of the passing lanes so idiots don't try to drag you off when you are passing them. Leave the limit as is.</p> <p>14) How about a maximum speed limit of 80 in outside lane of the passing lanes so idiots don't try to drag you off when you are passing them. Leave the limit as is.</p> <p>15) Leave it!, finally somewhere to pass all those that break on every damn corner cos they are scared of driving.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) Really? People will travel at 40 just you watch!</p> <p>19) Perfectly good piece of road to travel at 100kms</p>
441	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) A nature area, high recreative values.</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) Too dangerous at any other speed, it is narrow &amp; winding</p> <p>15) Cell phone access is re-established after coming over the Whangamoia Saddle, drivers are distracted by their phones. Very dangerous area for pedestrians, cyclists and oncoming traffic.</p> <p>16) Cell phone access is re-established after coming over the Whangamoia Saddle, drivers are distracted by their phones. Very dangerous area for pedestrians, cyclists and oncoming traffic.</p> <p>17) Area frequented by cyclists, no shoulder to speak of for cyclist to bike on. Traffic passing in the lanes provided on Annies Saddle create a real squeeze when cyclist are on this stretch at the same time. Also cars cannot see the cyclist when passing another vehicle potentially setting up a very dangerous scenario.</p> <p>18) Schools, built up area, side roads coming in. Recreation area for wind/kite-surfers. Cars leaving the state highway at too fast a speed into primary collector area, crossing a cycling lane.</p> <p>19) The proposed speed limit is still too fast as for reasons given in 18. Also the cycling lane is used by families, children are only 10 metres away from the highway in places. There is a skatepark 30m away from SH6, recreation areas immediately adjacent to the SH do not get used partially because of the fast moving noisy traffic. Many busy arterial roads and primary roads connect with the SH6 as Atawhai has built up in the last number of years. People using the cycle lane (which has many give way signs unlike the railway reserve in Stoke?), have to look in three/four different directions to ensure it is safe to cross. Cars coming off the highway at even a reduced 70 km/h will be hard to anticipate. The cycle lane must no longer be seen as only a recreational area but also for the purposes of commuting to town by alternative transport. The multiple give way signs, numerous driveways, and noise of fast moving traffic discourages this facility to be used to its full potential. It encourages cyclist to use the State Highway. Heavy traffic uses the area, with multiple trucks passing through between four and five in the morning to catch the ferries leading to sleep disturbance. A reduced speed and smooth surface will mitigate this problem. Also it will discourage boy/girl racers of using this section of highway for their nocturnal purposes.</p>
442	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't do it! Leave it at 100 to prevent confusion.</p> <p>4) Absolutely not! It's ridiculous, there is NO reason to believe that will prevent accidents, in fact due to aggravation it will probably cause more!</p> <p>5) No opinion on that part</p> <p>7) Leave at 100!</p> <p>8) Leave at 100</p>

		<p>9) Leave at 100  10) Leave at 100  11) Leave at 100  13) Leave at 100  14) Leave at 100  15) Leave at 100  16) Leave at 100  17) Leave at 100  18) Leave at 80  19) Leave at 100</p>
443	Individual submitter	<p>1) coasting downhill could be unenforced if greater than 80kph  4) yes to this . it should be lessened to that in any case  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
444	Individual submitter	<p>I suggest you focus on the real problem with drunk and drugged drivers, instead of penalising everyone else for obeying the law, you guys made the road and set that limit so obviously it is a safe speed, it not the roads thats dangerous its people who cant drive, why not focus on making people better drivers! Just another idiotic idea by the government</p>
445	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
446	Individual submitter	<p>1) no  4) no  5) no  7) no  8) no  9) no  10) no  11) no</p>

		<p>13) no</p> <p>14) no</p> <p>15) no</p> <p>16) no</p> <p>17) no</p> <p>18) no</p> <p>19) no</p>
447	Individual submitter	<p>1) Too slow. Open straight road suitable for 100km</p> <p>4) Far too long to drive at 80km. Drivers will do risky overtaking and be impatient.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Too long at 80km. Great straight roads enable traffic to flow. Drivers will be impatient at 80km and less (some drivers will not even do the speed limit) and there will be risky overtaking with angry drivers. Inattention is a risk when driving slowly especially on straight roads.</p> <p>8) Ok for school zone during school hours/school terms only, not holiday time or early morning and late afternoon</p> <p>9) Too far at 80km. Angry, impatient, inattentive driver risk at that speed limit.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Too slow. Angry, impatient or inattentive drivers are higher risk where there is a slow limit than at present with 100km.</p> <p>13) Too slow. Teach drivers to drive to the conditions.</p> <p>14) Too slow. Teach drivers how to drive.</p> <p>15) Too slow. Teach drivers how to drive</p> <p>16) Ok for school zone during school hours and terms</p> <p>17) Too slow. Teach drivers how to drive</p> <p>18) Too slow. Teach drivers how to drive</p> <p>19) Too slow. Teach drivers how to drive</p>
448	Individual submitter	<p>1) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>4) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>5) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>7) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>8) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>9) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>10) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>11) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>13) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>14) Im sorry Im not aware of this stretch of road.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) This is a non residential area and 80kms is preferred.</p> <p>17) 80 is still too fast. Coming into a residential area.</p> <p>18) 60 is a good speed for this stretch of road.</p> <p>19) I am relatively new to Nelson, and I know this is a subject that you have very much in your sights, but I feel so strongly about the speed limit on SH6, that I felt yet another email may add to the concern the people of Nelson have about the speed limits in and around the city. In short, the speed of SH6, particularly Atawhai to Nelson, being 100km an hour is totally ridiculous. Living as we do a few minutes from town, the concept of turning out of a quiet, residential side road onto a full flowing 100km an hour motorway is to say the least extremely dangerous. At worse, totally suicidal and leads to dangerous driving, the likes of which I have never witnessed before. I had driven in most Continents in the world, and have witnessed nothing as unbelievable as the concept of trying to join a stream of traffic doing 100k from a standing start. Merging like a zip is more like 'go hell for leather and hope for the best. You have seconds to gain speed and not cause a collision. I have made the most illegal manoeuvres in all honesty to avoid being in a collision from oncoming speeding cars. Visibility is poor, and it's incredibly hard to judge just how fast a car is coming, particularly if you have to do a right hand turn onto a motorway. Sadly New Zealand drivers have an extremely bad reputation the whole world over, but I am quickly realising it has nothing or little to do with the driving, it has to do with the ridiculous speed limits that are enforced, with no continuity or thought to the flow of adjoining roads. When can we expect this dangerous, untenable situation to be addressed and lives saved.</p>
449	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support safer, lower speeds throughout the area. People have got too used to driving too fast and are mistaken that this is safe. They are unaware of basic physics that force is the square of speed so even a seemingly small increase in speed has a catastrophic impact on the human body and the inverse is also true.</p> <p>4) Support reduction</p> <p>5) Support reduction</p>

		<p>7) Support reduction  8) Support reduction  9) Support reduction  10) Support reduction  11) Support reduction  13) You can't travel even that fast safely for most of it  14) I support safer, lower speeds throughout the area. People have got too used to driving too fast and are mistaken that this is safe. They are unaware of basic physics that force is the square of speed so even a seemingly small increase in speed has a catastrophic impact on the human body and the inverse is also true.  15) Support reduction  16) Support  17) Support  18) Fair enough and this should apply for section around Bayview and Malvern ave intersections. This is a settlement and the same should apply as if a settlement was on the open road speed should reduce to 60 km for safety of the many pedestrians and people on bikes, people crossing the road, etc  19) Support reduction but this is still too high speed for the section from either side of the Bayview and Malvern ave intersections. These are increasingly busy intersections and there is more activity on and around the road than a supposed through road. There are kids, cyclists, people crossing the road to take photos or to kayak etc. People who want to drive fast are simply closing their minds to the risks faced by speeding vehicles. Even if someone else makes a mistake, takes P or looks at their mobile no human body is made to withstand a high speed impact. I support safer, lower speeds throughout the area. People have got too used to driving too fast and are mistaken that this is safe. They are unaware of basic physics that force is the square of speed so even a seemingly small increase in speed has a catastrophic impact on the human body and the inverse is also true. Please hold strong to reducing speeds. It isn't a popularity contest. You are right about the need to reduce speeds overall.</p>
450	Individual submitter	<p>1) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  4) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  5) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  7) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  8) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  9) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  10) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  11) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  13) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  14) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  15) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  16) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  17) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  18) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times  19) This will considerably increase the time it takes to get from Nelson to Blenheim. Being a truck driver it is a daily frustration of slow vehicles travelling under the speed limit and this will only further slow the traffic down and increase travelling times</p>

451	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Good how it is</li> <li>4) No Comment</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) Keep canvas town at 100</li> <li>8) Leave at 100</li> <li>9) This is stupid leave at100</li> <li>10) No Comment</li> <li>11) 100 is what it should be</li> <li>13) Keep at 100. 80 causes congestion</li> <li>14) 100. 60 is a urban speed</li> <li>15) 100 new</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) Keep 100</li> <li>18) Keep same</li> <li>19) Keep same</li> </ul>
452	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>4) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>5) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>7) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>8) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>9) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>10) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>11) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>13) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>14) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>15) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>16) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>17) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>18) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> <li>19) Improve driver skill with better training regulations and leave the speed limit as it is.</li> </ul>
453	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</li> <li>4) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> <li>9) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be</li> </ul>

		<p>evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</p> <p>13) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) As a regular traveller on these roads for many years (we are based in Wellington, but have family in the Nelson area), I have no issue with reduced speeds around communities (such as Canvastown), but the reduction in all open road speeds from 100km to 80km over the entire distance seems to be unnecessary and I would say excessive. If the government of NZ determines that an 80km top speed limit is appropriate on all open roads, then so be it. But this has not been legislated and therefore this attempt to impose this between Blenheim and Nelson seems to be evidence of significant overreach on the part of NZTA. The road is of a reasonable quality and, where there are communities along the way, by all means lessen the speed limit in those areas, but do not do that elsewhere.</p>
454	Individual submitter	<p>1) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.</p> <p>4) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions,</p>

as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.

5) No, this is a sensible targeted speed limit change.

7) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.

8) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.

9) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed

reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.

10) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.

11) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2011). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.

13) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.

		<p>14) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.</p> <p>15) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side streets. 2. Install road safety features such as passing lanes, rumble strips etc, to make the existing roads safer at a speed that the majority of drivers feel comfortable driving at. 3. Install warning signs at known accident "black spots". Targeted speed reductions would have more affect than blanket limits. 4. Leave all other speed limits as they are now.</p> <p>16) I disagree with portions of the SH6 speed limit reduction proposal, specifically the blanket 80km/h limit on any portion of SH6 currently at 100km/h. A blanket speed limit will not be as effective as targeted speed reductions in slowing drivers down. People drive at a speed they feel safe at. This speed can be different from driver to driver, depending on experience. If people can drive at a speed they feel comfortable with then they are less likely to try to overtake a slower vehicle. These speed variations can be reduced using passing lanes. Your previous request for proposals earlier this year identified the lack of passing lanes as the number one concern of submitters, but there are no passing lanes included in your proposal. By law you must take account of these submissions, as per Land Transport Rule 54001/2017, Setting of Speed Limits 2017 rule 2.7(3) When deciding whether to set a speed limit, a road controlling authority must take account of submissions received during consultation on the proposed speed limit. You state that Passing Lanes are not part of the scope of this project as they provide efficiency improvements, not safety improvements, but efficient roads are safe roads. Germany has 6.4 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles, but New Zealand has 10 road fatalities per 100,000 motor vehicles. Both Germany and New Zealand have a rural road speed limit of 100km/h. Why does Germany have a lower level of fatalities than New Zealand with the same rural speed limit? The difference is the design of the roads WHO, ed. (2018). Global Status Report on Road Safety 2018 If this proposed speed limit reduction goes ahead what is the review period for this change? Will the limits revert back to 100km/h if the speed reduction has no affect on the amount of fatalities? Accidents involving vehicles travelling at a higher speed have greater consequences than those of lower speeds, which results in calls for a speed limit reduction. Shouldn't we be focused on reducing accidents from occurring in the first place? To help lower the level of accidents on SH6 I propose the following: 1. The speed limit to be set at 80km/h from Trafalgar St, Nelson, to Allisdair St, Atawhai. One quarter of all fatalities between Nelson and Blenheim from 2006 to 2016 occurred on a short stretch of 100km/h road in Atawhai. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road may not prevent 25% of fatalities, but a speed reduction would prevent some of the injury accidents caused by drivers turning into or out of side st</p>
455	Individual submitter	<p>1) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing  4) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing  5) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing  7) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing  8) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing  9) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p>

		<p>10) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p> <p>11) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p> <p>13) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p> <p>14) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p> <p>15) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p> <p>16) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p> <p>17) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p> <p>18) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p> <p>19) Speeds not a factor people that can't drive are e.g tourist and older people that need re testing</p>
456	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's not the speed it's the stupidity of driver why not put speed cameras up instead</p> <p>4) Put speed cameras up and live feed cameras it's not speed it's the driver</p> <p>5) It's the driver</p> <p>7) It's the driver</p> <p>8) It's the driver not the speed</p> <p>9) Its the driver not the speed</p> <p>10) Around pelorus bridge agree with speed reduction but it should be a two lane bridge put in</p> <p>11) Same as all my other answers driver not the speed</p> <p>13) It's the driver not the speed</p> <p>14) Nope 80 would be ok not 60</p> <p>15) Ya 90 be ok</p> <p>16) 80 but school zone</p> <p>17) No it's the driver not the speed</p> <p>18) No keep at 80</p> <p>19) No 100 is fine it's the driver stupidity</p>
457	Individual submitter	<p>1) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>4) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>5) Not apposed to this change</p> <p>7) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>8) Driver education not speed reduction better school zone signage and a posted speed sign for this zone</p> <p>9) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>10) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>11) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>13) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>14) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>15) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>16) This should be in place</p> <p>17) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>18) Driver education not speed reduction</p> <p>19) Driver education not speed reduction</p>
458	Individual submitter	<p>1) It is a straight piece of road. Modern vehicles are more than capable of travelling at the current speed limit without being dangerous. Educate drivers! if they can't drive that piece of road safely at 100 km/h I don't think they could do stat 80km/h</p> <p>4) the existing speed limit is safe. Educate drivers that cannot manage that road at a speed limit of 100km/h</p> <p>5) No. it is a residential area where 50 km/h would be a good idea</p> <p>7) All vehicles and drivers should easily be able to manage this stretch of road safely at the current speed limit. It doesn't need to change</p> <p>8) Better signage is all that is needed to ensure traffic slows down at school times</p> <p>9) No need to change current speed limit. If a driver can't safely drive that road at the current speed limit they need to be re-educated or stopped from driving</p> <p>10) the current speed limit works well why change?</p> <p>11) existing speed limit is safe!</p> <p>13) Many millions were spent on this stretch recently to improve safety and flow. going to 80km/h is a backwards step and means all that \$\$ spent was unnecessary</p> <p>14) A fabulous road that should have the existing speed limit kept as - is. Educate drivers that find it difficult so when they come across other winding roads in NZ they can safely drive them rather</p>

		<p>than dumbing down already bad drivers</p> <p>15) Better signage around the school. Leave the speed limit alone</p> <p>16) Absolutely no need to change anything</p> <p>17) Again no need to change anything</p> <p>18) 80 is what NZTA is regarding as safe everywhere else why go to 60 here?</p> <p>19) Are you people for real? if drivers cannot drive that part at the existing speed limit then they should not be driving</p>
459	Individual submitter	<p>1) It doesn't matter the speed limit along this section of road although 100ks seems more appropriate. The area isn't built up and it's straight so it isn't the road but the people that are causing the problems</p> <p>4) This is straight open road and should stay at 100. again it is the people not the road causing the problems</p> <p>5) yes down to 50 the area is getting built up with houses and footpath there should be a reduced speed.</p> <p>7) stay at 100 open easy driving road smooth bends does not need to be reduced.</p> <p>8) Yes agree should reduce as very close to the school and the only signage there is school zone. Put in an actual speed level sign so people know the speed limit they can go. School sign means nothing.</p> <p>9) stay at 100ks for the same reasons as above relatively straight road, not built up.</p> <p>10) yes reduce the level around the cafe toilets and bridge area and make the changes very clear. The Dec/Jan reduced speed limit is not clear enough</p> <p>11) as above stay at 100. straight, not built up etc</p> <p>13) stay at 100.</p> <p>14) Place this as open road as some area especially over the whangamoas there is no way to do 100 and sometimes even 60 would be too much . Put in signage to give an indication on speed for a corner.</p> <p>15) stay at 100</p> <p>16) no change suggested but if you are going to put in a variable school zone please don't say school zone give us a number ie 40 or 50km/hr etc</p> <p>17) 80 is fine this area is getting built up and the speed should be reduced.</p> <p>18) 80 is ok along here</p> <p>19) 80 is fine along here</p>
460	Individual submitter	<p>1) The crossing with Bell's Road is dangerous. so I agree with 80kms/hr</p> <p>4) fine</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) 80 kms is right</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) 60 kms seems right</p> <p>11) Quite winding at places</p> <p>13) OK</p> <p>14) 50 kms / hr may be even better here</p> <p>15) OK</p> <p>16) OK</p> <p>17) OK</p> <p>18) agree</p> <p>19) 80 km</p>
461	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's a perfect good road No need to drop to 80 Just teach people to drive properly</p> <p>4) Frustration of drivers It's really unnecessary Improve people driving skills</p> <p>5) Ok</p> <p>7) Not needed It's not a difficult road to drive</p> <p>8) Ok</p> <p>9) Keep it at 100 It's fine as it is</p> <p>10) Ok</p> <p>11) 100 is fine on the open highway</p> <p>13) Still fine on the open road</p> <p>14) Teach people to drive properly It's not hard drop to 80 ok</p> <p>15) No Comment</p>

		<p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) 100 is fine Improve people's driving skills</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
462	Individual submitter	<p>I am writing to oppose the review changes to lower the speed limit between Nelson and Blenheim SH6. It would be a huge mistake to lower the speed to 80km. Clearly there are areas around schools and townships for lower speed limited definitely not SH6. I have driven this road for 35 years without incident so feel entitled to express my view. The speed limit is not the issue it's all about drivers education and driving to the conditions. How about putting some safe pull off areas and a passing lane. There are no passing lanes between Rai Valley and Blenheim. I realise your on a budget why not put some of the rates money or ACC leveys aside. You will cause more accidents by lowering the speed limit. People get very impatient and frustrated already believe me I have experienced this slower will make the situation worse. I would appreciate it very much if somebody from your department would actually drive this road a few times and experience how it actually is. Please take notice of us everyday citizens that know this road well. I look forward to your decision. Kind regards</p>
463	Individual submitter	<p>I agree with proposals, which in some areas are long overdue. Regarding 18 and 19 - new subdivisions in Atawhai over past 20 years have increased higely, and at this moment more farmland is being cleared for 169 new sections exiting onto the highway! Please install speed reductions urgently</p>
464	Individual submitter	<p>1) Perfectly safe to drive at 100kph depending on traffic levels and road conditions</p> <p>4) Ridiculous to reduce this to 80kph. It's a perfectly safe road with easy corners and good visibility to drive at 100kph depending on traffic and road conditions</p> <p>5) No major concerns about this</p> <p>7) Ridiculous to restrict this to 80 when it's a safe road with easy corners and good visibility to drive at 100kph depending on traffic and road conditions</p> <p>8) Ridiculous to restrict this to 80 when it's a safe road with easy corners and good visibility to drive at 100kph depending on traffic and road conditions. Happy about school limitations.</p> <p>9) Ridiculous to restrict this to 80 when it's a safe road with easy corners and good visibility to drive at 100kph depending on traffic and road conditions</p> <p>10) Probably okay but you wouldn't drive this at 100 anyway as the road is far too winding. Use common sense not speed limits. Also driver education.</p> <p>11) Ridiculous to restrict this to 80 when it's a safe road with easy corners and good visibility to drive at 100kph depending on traffic and road conditions</p> <p>13) It's not possible to drive this winding road at 100 or even 80 so why bother with speed limits when the road limits itself. Plus driver education is needed</p> <p>14) It's not possible to drive this at even 60 in some places but other places are perfectly safe at 100. Why do this? Plus driver education is needed.</p> <p>15) Still safe at 100 depending on traffic and road conditions</p> <p>16) No worries</p> <p>17) Still safe at 100 depending on traffic and road conditions</p> <p>18) Still safe at 100 depending on traffic and road conditions</p> <p>19) Still safe at 100 depending on traffic and road conditions</p>
465	Individual submitter	<p>Open highway - I am opposed to reducing the open highway speed limit from 100 to 80. It is after all a limit and not compulsory. Driving this SH6 frequently, I find traffic varies between 60 and 100 of its on its own accord depending on the road conditions. Long stretches give vehicles the opportunity of speeding up to 100 to pass slower vehicles, keeping traffic flowing and drive frustration down. There will always be stupid, bad drivers and no amount of legislation will stop driving crazy. Built up settlements and Townships - please get rid of al the confusing varying speed limits and go back to just 50. Plenty fast enough where pedestrians and children are on the sides of the road. This does not apply to the highway coming into Nelson which is a great stretch of road with good vision and few bends. There is a walk/cycle way in place and Clifton Terrace School is off the main road with its separate parking area.</p>
466	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a safe part of the drive to stick to 100k I believe reducing speed here will encourage more drivers to tail gate and put pressure on drivers driving to the reduced speed limit</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Is there a need to reduce speed here? It's a straight forward drive pressure from other drivers causes others to panic, it may cause stupid decisions being made I.e. dangerous overtaking</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Not a lot of risk here driving at 100k. Reducing speed here would not be a good idea</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) Reducing speed for schools and towards the town is a good idea.</p> <p>17) This does not make sense. 80 is too slow for this stretch of road</p> <p>18) Not a good decision to reduce the speed to 60. Far too slow for that stretch of road. I do not believe speed is a factor for accidents here but non competent drivers.</p> <p>19) Reducing the speed to 80 is not a silly idea as it will give drivers time to adjust to driving conditions from their stretch from picton</p>
467	Individual submitter	<p>1) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>4) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>5) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p>

		<p>7) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>8) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>9) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>10) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>11) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>13) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>14) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>15) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>16) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>17) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>18) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p> <p>19) Speed is not the issue. Lack of driver ability is. This will cause more frustration and bad decision making.</p>
468	Individual submitter	<p>1) This length of road needs passing lanes. Not more restrictions. It is one of the few clear straight bit of roads in the area</p> <p>4) This is the most open visibility areas of road and does not require lesser speed limit</p> <p>5) Until more resources are devoted to foot paths and cycle ways. Lowering the speed limit will achieve nothing</p> <p>7) The few straight pieces of road in the area. Passing lanes would be appropriate not reducing the speed limit</p> <p>8) Only the school area needs a reduced speed limit</p> <p>9) Also open straight stretch of road. Build passing lanes and leave the speed limit as it stands</p> <p>10) Traffic lights on the bridge would be a better use of finances</p> <p>11) Straight open area of state highway passing lanes need built anywhere possible</p> <p>13) People who cant manage to navigate this road without having a crash will do so no matter the speed limit. More focus needs to be put on prosecuting people who hold up queues of traffic resulting in frustration and poor overtaking decisions. Leave the speed limit alone</p> <p>14) People who cant manage to navigate this road without having a crash will do so no matter the speed limit. More focus needs to be put on prosecuting people who hold up queues of traffic resulting in frustration and poor overtaking decisions. Leave the speed limit alone</p> <p>15) People who cant manage to navigate this road without having a crash will do so no matter the speed limit. More focus needs to be put on prosecuting people who hold up queues of traffic resulting in frustration and poor overtaking decisions. Leave the speed limit alone</p> <p>16) Only the school zone needs a reduced speed limit</p> <p>17) People who cant manage to navigate this road without having a crash will do so no matter the speed limit. More focus needs to be put on prosecuting people who hold up queues of traffic resulting in frustration and poor overtaking decisions. Leave the speed limit alone</p> <p>18) The motorway was built to ease traffic out of Nelson. Reducing the speed limit undoes what the infrastructure was built for in the first place</p> <p>19) If people cant drive at 100kph there is another road available already. No need to reduce the speed limit on a motorway</p>
469	Individual submitter	<p>1) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>4) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>5) no issue with this.</p> <p>7) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>8) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>9) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not</p>

		<p>progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>10) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>11) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>13) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>14) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>15) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>16) no issue with this.</p> <p>17) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>18) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p> <p>19) The current speed limit is perfectly fine, the volume of traffic and the fact that there are no passing lanes are absolutely the issue. I drive the road weekly, lowering the speed limit will have driver less engaged with driving, this is evident on other roads in the region that have had the speed limit lowered the number of accident has not decreased. Reducing the speed limit is not progress, this is stepping back to 1980, cars and the road are both significantly superior today. At the end of the day, you can only drive at the speed of the traffic flow, as passing option are extremely limited.</p>
470	Individual submitter	<p>1) Invest more money on roads instead</p> <p>4) Yes Improve the road rather than reduce the speed limit</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) Just fix the road</p> <p>8) Just fix the road and maintain it properly for a change</p> <p>9) Just maintain the road to a decent standard</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) Just maintain the road properly instead of reducing the speed limits</p> <p>13) Fix the road please</p> <p>14) Fix the road please</p> <p>15) Fix the road please</p> <p>16) Fix the road please</p> <p>17) Fix the road please</p> <p>18) Fix the road please</p> <p>19) Fix the road please</p>

471	Individual submitter	<p>I say NO to the proposed speed reduction on SH6.</p> <p>Drivers always need to drive to the conditions and gauge safety on every road, and reducing speed limits on safe roads simply causes driver frustration and increases police revenue. If this were the right choice, why not make it 30kph on every road?</p> <p>DO NOT reduce speed limits on all traffic simply because some drivers are unable to adhere to the requirements for safe driving. This is ridiculous.</p>
472	Renwick Transport	<p>Renwick Transport is a company whom has been operating for the past 26 years. We have a fleet of 27 trucks. We have travelled millions of kms on the Blenheim - Nelson - Blenheim route for the past 20 years so have a good insight into this road. We have a 5 star rating which confirms our company is very reputable &amp; we pride ourselves on running our gear to a high standard of health &amp; safety among professionalism. Our drivers have seen a multitude of events on this road.</p> <p>Ultimately the more drivers on the road, the more possible accidents happen because people make mistakes. We have seen a significant increase over the years of the traffic volume on this road. We feel, as a team, reducing the speed limit isn't ever going to stop 'Lawbreakers' killing themselves or others or people making mistakes.</p> <p>If the speed is reduced the likelihood of some road users becoming frustrated &amp; making 'judgement errors' would increase. They can become annoyed &amp; impatient, fatigued from being on the road longer, trying to rush, complacency to name just a few. All contributing factors for accidents.</p> <p>Making sure the road is kept to a high standard &amp; there is police present will reduce/minimize our accidents.</p> <p>Leaving the speed limit as it is and driving to the conditions of the road &amp; environment is very important to road safety. Reducing the speed near schools &amp; 'built up areas' makes sense &amp; is safer for everyone, especially young children.</p> <p>We would encourage a NZTA employee (relative to this discussion) to travel in our trucks to get an indication of what we are talking about.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing a positive response to our submission.</p>
473	Renwick Transport Ltd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> <li>4) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment</li> <li>5) We agree to reducing the speed in this built up area due to safety</li> <li>7) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> <li>8) We agree to reducing the speed for this school zone due to safety.</li> <li>9) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> <li>10) Should be left as existing &amp; drive to the conditions of the road/environment</li> <li>11) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> <li>13) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> <li>14) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment</li> <li>15) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> <li>16) We agree to reducing the speed for this school zone due to safety</li> <li>17) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> <li>18) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> <li>19) The existing speed limit of 100km/hr is safe. Drive to the conditions of the road/environment.</li> </ol>
474	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is a straight road and relatively flat, already 80km around congested areas (airport). Proposed area is not a high risk piece of road</li> <li>4) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>5) No issue with this</li> <li>7) Invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>8) No issues with proposed change. School zone so reasonable</li> <li>9) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>10) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>11) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>13) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>14) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>15) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>16) No issues, school zone</li> <li>17) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> <li>18) Why!?!?</li> <li>19) No issues with current speed, better to invest in safer areas for passing and pulling over. Leave speed at 100km/h</li> </ol>
475	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) No Comment</li> </ol>

		<p>5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
476	K&J Ploughing	Yes stop people using their cell phone. I have seen multiple truck drivers and courier drivers and ordinary people on their phone. Fix drivers first.
477	Individual submitter	<p>1) leave the status quo  4) This is definite a 100kph zone. Passing lanes are required  5) maintain status quo  7) this should be 100kph passing lanes where possible  8) status quo  9) leave this at 100kph provide passing lanes  10) 60 kph during summer tourist season, 70kph otherwise  11) 100 kph Passing lanes near Bullford Bridge  13) 80kph reasonable through the saddles  14) Road not capable of high speed 80kph max  15) leave status quo  16) proposed changes acceptable  17) leave status quo  18) leave it at 80kph  19) leave status quo</p>
478	Individual submitter	I agree with this proposal change to 80kph on Nelson to Blenheim road SH6. I use this road often, I see lunacy on this road everytime most people see the 100kph as a target with plus 10kph as being okay. Most drivers have no idea on how handle corners on this road, especially SUV drivers. You will need to patrol SH6 with extra police and motorcycle police for atleast 3 months to get the new speed to sink in. Also I would like NZTA to consider increasing the pentalty for drivers on cell phones.
479	Individual submitter	We have lived in the Nelson North area for 20+ years and 100% support your proposed speed limit reductions for both Bn to Nn 80k and Wk to Atawhai 60k. If that's not possible, at least 80k all the way in from Hira to Nelson would be great.
480	Individual submitter	I like the new safer speeds proposed. Invariably, when I am driving that route at what I consider to be a safe speed, vehicles follow too closesly behind and sometimes attempt risky passes. With the increasing number of tourists unfamiliar with winding NZ roads, the reduced speed limits make sense.
481	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment</p>

		18) No Comment 19) No Comment
482	Individual submitter	<p>I have been driving to and from Nelson to Pelorus Bridge roughly every month for 6 years to do a predator trap line at Pelorus bridge.</p> <p>It is a scary drive with big trucks, motor bikes and speedsters overtaking when its marginal. Its quite upsetting to see the wrecks beside the road, and the broken barriers. The road is also risky with boulders falling onto it from slips, and if you are going too fast you wont be able to avoid them. The two second rule is often not observed as queues of vehicles crawl up the hill.</p> <p>I have EV Nissan Leaf for the last year and you get much better range if you drive 80 or 90 instead of 100km/hr. I have appreciated the increased number of pullover places installed after the Kaikoura EQ made this SH very busy.</p> <p>If I can extrapolate from a section of the road I know well, to the other section from Pelorus to Blenheim I consider that for consistency it should be lowered as well. It is a scenic route, and people should enjoy that aspect, and not regard it as a boring commute.</p> <p>I strongly support lowering the speed as proposed</p>
483	Spray Point Station - Off The Map - Tourist accommodation	<p>When making your decision regarding the proposed speed changes on SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim, please consider the following additional factors:</p> <p>Driver frustration: Many slow camper vans and trucks already travel along this road. Often large lines of traffic pile up behind slow drivers who will not pull over. Limiting speed further will only exacerbate this problem and when people do pass, there is a greater chance they will be breaking the law to do so safely.</p> <p>Many of us have been driving these roads all our lives without incident at current speed levels. Forced speed restrictions adds longer to travel time which is inconvenient and frustrating and means everyone has to travel to suit the lowest skilled drivers and those unfamiliar with our roads, who already have the option of choosing a speed which is appropriate for them.</p> <p>Additional cost: Time equates to money today, so this proposed change will inevitably add to freight prices and travel changes for contractors etc going to work.</p> <p>Impact of additional traffic on alternative route: I personally will travel to Nelson using the alternative route of SH63 if further speed restrictions are placed on SH6 and believe many others will do the same. This road has already suffered significant damage and cost significant money in repairs resulting from the Kaikoura road closure and a continued and increased use of it will require more repair and upgrade work.</p> <p>Better Use of Money in Other Ways: Instead of preparing consultation documents, changing signage etc; I believe there would be a more direct benefit in adding additional passing lanes to the road or straightening some of the worst original corners on the Nelson side of the Whangamoas.</p> <p>Long term vision requires a different solution now: With the projected increase in tourist visitor numbers in the region, even over the next 5 years, slowing speed is not the holistic safety solution that is needed. Speed reduction in built up areas such as Rai Valley, Pelorus Bridge and Havelock is a valid method; however this overall speed reduction will not solve the problems of driver skill levels, road quality and lack of safety features such as passing lanes, barriers and straighter bends. Progressive and safety conscious countries such as Germany, focus on improving road quality and driver education and take away speed limits altogether in some places.</p>
484	Individual submitter	<p>1) Please don't change it 4) Places for people to let drivers pass 5) Can't see why 7) Perfectly fine already 8) Perfectly good place to pass slower drivers after school signs 9) Definitely don't need to change speed except at Pelorus during summer 10) Only dec/ jan 11) Nothing wrong with that road except for foreigners driving 13) Ridiculous to change it 14) One or two more pullover places for useless drivers</p>

		<p>15) Don't do it please  16) Stay the same  17) Please don't change it  18) Have a slow lane  19) Ridiculous to change it</p>
485	Individual submitter	<p>1) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  4) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  5) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  7) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  8) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  9) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  10) It is useful to slow the traffic in high season by there is no need to slow it in the off season  11) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  13) At last a passing lane - why would you slow the speed limit??  14) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  15) If you slow the speed of general traffic you will encourage in appropriate overtaking. There are straights here that people use for overtaking slow vehicles  16) No Comment  17) Why would you? - it is a perfectly decent stretch of road  18) Why would you? - it is a perfectly decent stretch of road  19) Why would you? - it is a perfectly decent stretch of road</p>
486	Individual submitter	<p>The only need for attention of speed change is the Wangamas, Nelson side to the top could 80kmh. There isn't any real main issues just the drivers.</p>
487	Individual submitter	<p>1) agree with this first question but this is what's said for the whole road, there is no need to change the main highway speed limits apart from major townships and the wangamoas, the rai saddle is easily driven mostly at 100km/h but the wangamoas your lucky to get to 80km/h so that im happy for the road on the wangamoas to be set down to 80km/h just the rest is all mostly straight pieces of road with plenty of vision to pass and all, i drive this road once a week sometimes more and the main issue is that i have is either slow cars not pulling over during the wangamoas or cars going in excess of 100km/h on the long straights then slowing down plenty heaps for corners so sometimes yes that makes it difficult to pass, there is only 4 passing lanes in total both ways from blenheim to nelson, is it time to put more in?  4) most of that road is smooth with plenty of straights for passing, well kept roads fully capable of 100km/h  5) could be changed to 60km/h not 50km/h?  7) there is nothing wrong with that road, it is fully smooth and flowing with wide straights and atleast 3 straights to use as passing  8) i agree  9) long flowing wide roads fully capable of 100km/h  10) agree but cant that be 100m either side of the bridge?  11) yes that section is windy and twisty, agree with 80km/h but can be driven at 100km/h with relative ease  13) that road is rather fine, the rai saddle can be driven up at 100km/h easy enough  14) not 60km/h but 80km/h can be done a majority on that  15) straight roads, easy for 100km/h  16) straight wide roads, easy for 100km/h  17) long straights and long swooping corners easy for 100km/h down there the whole way without needing to slow down  18) agree  19) people already do 80km/h through there, youll just make them do 60km/h if it get put to 80km/h</p>
488	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) This is a good stretch of open road. Its feels safe and easy to drive, with no tricky corners, hidden rises etc. It is, however, very busy with commuters and tourists, and there are no passing lanes. In my opinion, the thing that makes this bit of road dangerous, is driver impatience and poor decision making - i.e. people trying to overtake slow traffic when they shouldn't. I think the better solution would be to put in a couple of passing lanes. Reducing the speed limit could just make the problem worse.  5) No Comment  7) This is a good stretch of open road. Its feels safe and easy to drive, with no tricky corners, hidden rises etc. It is, however, very busy with commuters and tourists, and there are no passing lanes. In my opinion, the thing that makes this bit of road dangerous, is driver impatience and poor decision making - i.e. people trying to overtake slow traffic when they shouldn't. I think the better solution would be to put in a couple of passing lanes. Reducing the speed limit could just make the problem worse.  8) No Comment</p>

		<p>9) This is a good stretch of open road. Its feels safe and easy to drive, with no tricky corners, hidden rises etc. It is, however, very busy with commuters and tourists, and there are no passing lanes. In my opinion, the thing that makes this bit of road dangerous, is driver impatience and poor decision making - i.e. people trying to overtake slow traffic when they shouldn't. I think the better solution would be to put in a couple of passing lanes. Reducing the speed limit could just make the problem worse.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This is a good stretch of open road. Its feels safe and easy to drive, with no tricky corners, hidden rises etc. It is, however, very busy with commuters and tourists, and there are no passing lanes. In my opinion, the thing that makes this bit of road dangerous, is driver impatience and poor decision making - i.e. people trying to overtake slow traffic when they shouldn't. I think the better solution would be to put in a couple of passing lanes. Reducing the speed limit could just make the problem worse.</p> <p>13) This is a good stretch of open road. Its feels safe and easy to drive. It is, however, very busy with commuters and tourists, and there are very few places to safely pass. In my opinion, the thing that makes this bit of road dangerous, is driver impatience and poor decision making - i.e. people trying to overtake slow traffic when they shouldn't. I think the better solution would be to put in a couple of passing lanes. Reducing the speed limit could just make the problem worse.</p> <p>14) This is a good stretch of open road. Its feels safe and easy to drive. It is, however, very busy with commuters and tourists, and there are very few places to safely pass. In my opinion, the thing that makes this bit of road dangerous, is driver impatience and poor decision making - i.e. people trying to overtake slow traffic when they shouldn't. I think the better solution would be to put in a couple of passing lanes. Reducing the speed limit could just make the problem worse.</p> <p>15) This is a good stretch of open road. Its feels safe and easy to drive. It is, however, very busy with commuters and tourists, and there are very few places to safely pass. In my opinion, the thing that makes this bit of road dangerous, is driver impatience and poor decision making - i.e. people trying to overtake slow traffic when they shouldn't. I think the better solution would be to put in a couple of passing lanes. Reducing the speed limit could just make the problem worse.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) This is a good stretch of open road. Its feels safe and easy to drive. It is, however, very busy with commuters and tourists, and there are very few places to safely pass. In my opinion, the thing that makes this bit of road dangerous, is driver impatience and poor decision making - i.e. people trying to overtake slow traffic when they shouldn't. I think the better solution would be to put in a couple of passing lanes. Reducing the speed limit could just make the problem worse.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
489	Individual submitter	Definitely leave the 100km limit as is for the journey between Nelson and Blenheim, but think that it would be wise to have a speed limit from Todds Bush road right into Nelson at 80km. There is lots of traffic pulling in and out of roads along this stretch of road and feel it would be safest to have this at 80km.
490	Individual submitter	<p>1) Support</p> <p>4) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced.</p> <p>5) Oppose</p> <p>7) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced.</p> <p>8) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced. Support. variable speed limit in school zone</p> <p>9) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced.</p> <p>10) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced. Support. Reduced speed limit in Dec/Jan</p> <p>11) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced.</p> <p>13) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced.</p> <p>14) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced.</p> <p>15) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced.</p> <p>16) Support. Variable speed limit in school zone</p> <p>17) Oppose. Open roads should remain at 100km and only built up areas should be reduced.</p> <p>18) Support reduced speed limit in built up areas</p> <p>19) Support reduced speed limit in built up areas. Could even be 60 all the way from Allisdair St to Trafalgar St</p>
491	Individual submitter	<p>1) Unnecessary to reduce speed. Road is straight and clear and a main artery. Will just make drivers irritated and frustrated and more likely to result in silly passing moves</p> <p>4) Unnecessary to reduce speed. Road is clear and safe to drive at current limit. Will just make drivers irritated and frustrated and more likely to result in silly passing moves especially past trucks and on corners. Dont change it</p> <p>5) This would be ok. People wont stick to it and will speed but is more residential so understandable</p> <p>7) Absolutelt no need to do this. Road is safe and good visibility. Have never had any trouble here. Consider passing lanes if possible here instead</p> <p>8) Understandable while passing the school and not unreasonable</p> <p>9) Absolutely not. Again it is good clear road. No need to reduce speed here. Will just make drivers irritated and frustrated and more likely to result in silly passing moves</p> <p>10) Reasonable. Not well sign posted currently and busy section</p> <p>11) Absolutely not. Again good clear road. There are much worse roads throughout New Zealand which are still 100 km than this one. Don't change it</p> <p>13) No. Not necessary. Good clear roads. Will just make drivers irritated and frustrated and more likely to result in silly passing moves. Consider more passing or slow vehicle lanes instead</p> <p>14) No. Will just make drivers irritated and frustrated and more likely to result in silly passing moves</p>

		<p>15) Not necessary. Train the drivers. Put up more safe driving signs. But do not try to over regulate because people will only become frustrated.</p> <p>16) Reasonable given near a school</p> <p>17) No. Again just NOT NECESSARY!</p> <p>18) Don't believe this is necessary. Good clear road and 80 is low enough</p> <p>19) Reasonable. Eliminates the small gap at 80 km returning to 100 km before the town.</p>
492	Individual submitter	<p>1) agree with speed change</p> <p>4) agree with speed change</p> <p>5) agree with speed change</p> <p>7) agree with speed change</p> <p>8) agree with speed change</p> <p>9) agree with speed change</p> <p>10) agree with speed change</p> <p>11) agree with speed change</p> <p>13) agree with speed change</p> <p>14) agree with speed change</p> <p>15) agree with speed change</p> <p>16) agree with speed change</p> <p>17) agree with speed change</p> <p>18) agree with speed change</p> <p>19) I would like the speed limit for 17. to include being reduced to 60 all the way to Trafalgar St, as there are a lot of residents and recreational walkers/bikers in this zone, and the road noise level is extremely high. In addition drivers (especially tourists) are distracted by the beautiful sea view and not concentrating.</p>
493	Individual submitter	<p>1) Unnecessary straight road don't see what's the point on reducing speed in this part</p> <p>4) Not a risky or windy part of the road unnecessary to reduce speed limit</p> <p>5) Agreed</p> <p>7) Unnecessary</p> <p>8) Unnecessary</p> <p>9) Unnecessary</p> <p>10) Agreed</p> <p>11) Unnecessary</p> <p>13) Agreed</p> <p>14) Agreed</p> <p>15) Unnecessary</p> <p>16) Agreed</p> <p>17) Unnecessary</p> <p>18) Unnecessary</p> <p>19) Unnecessary</p>
494	Individual submitter	<p>1) no</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) no</p> <p>7) no</p> <p>8) no</p> <p>9) no</p> <p>10) no</p> <p>11) no</p> <p>13) no</p> <p>14) no</p> <p>15) no</p> <p>16) no</p> <p>17) no</p>

		18) no 19) no
495	Individual submitter	1) Increase the speed to 110 as this is fine 4) No way this should be 80, 10p minimum. 5) Practicality is essential. 7) Increase to 110 as the road should be improved not the speed limit lowered. 8) Ridiculous. 9) Ridiculous 10) Ridiculous 11) Ridiculous 13) Ridiculous 14) Ridiculous 15) Ridiculous 16) Ridiculous 17) Ridiculous, if you can't drive at 100 on this road you shouldn't be driving. 18) 60? Basically going backwards on that stretch of road. Safety is very important on the roads, but hey the road toll would be 0 if we all drove at 10kmh. It's just not practical. 19) Stupid.
496	Individual submitter	I fully agree with what you are proposing except No 19. The speed limit should be 60kph because of the pull offs and turning lanes are totally inadequate for a proposed 80km/h speed limit, 60 is more realistic. There is a large and growing number of households in location 19 - and the length of the turning lanes creates hazardous conditions.
497	Individual submitter	1) No 4) This is open road, with no sharp bends. It is perfectly safe to drive at 100km/h. This whole proposal is based on the assumption that 100km/h is inappropriate for the entire section of road. Most of the deaths which have occurred are in single vehicle accidents, in which a vehicle has left the road. Bad or drunk or drug driving or not wearing seat belts are the most likely causes, not the speed limit. Money would be better spent on changing driver behaviour and upskilling. 5) No 7) There are no sharp bends on this section of road. It is safe to drive at 100km/h 8) No 9) There are no sharp bends on this section of road. It is safe to drive at 100km/h 10) No 11) There are no sharp bends. It is safe to drive at 100km/h. 13) On most of this section of road, there are no sharp bends, and it is safe to drive at 100km/h. Approaching Whangamoia Saddle, the bends have advisory safe speeds, which, if obeyed, ensure safe driving 14) It is not possible to drive at even 60km/h on most of this section 15) No 16) No 17) There is no reason why this should not remain at 100 km/h, as there are no sharp bends 18) No 19) No. In semi-urban areas, where traffic density is higher, lower speed limits are warranted. On open State Highways, where there are no bends or other hazards, they are not.
498	Individual submitter	Dear Sir/ Madam, I have read with interest you proposed speed limits on SH6 and in general fully support your plans to lower speeds on most sections of this road. We live on the corner of Atawhai Drive and Malvern Avenue, very close to the main road. Speed and noise is our major issue. Our corner has a number of N bus and school bus movements that are very dangerous, as the buses endeavour to join traffic traveling at up to 100kph. We would suggest that the speed limit from Clifton Terrace School to the city should be 70kph, although 80kph will be a big improvement. Our other issue is road noise. We have lived in Atawhai for over 33 years and have seen traffic volumes at least triple. Please can we have a low noise surface put on the road when it is next resealed. I understand NZTA have had a report stating the noise is having an effect on the health of our community. We cannot understand why this section of State Highway is the only main road in Nelson City with the noisy course chip surface and like Wakefield Quay has residential on only one side.
499	Individual submitter	1) Retain current limit 4) Retain current limit 5) Concur 7) Retain 100 kmh to 200 metres before Wakamarina road intersection at which point 80 kmh zone starts 8) start of this should move to 200 metres prior to Wakamarina Road intersection with SH 6 9) retain 100 kmh zone

		<p>10) retain existing limits including seasonal reduction  11) agree  13) 60 kmh thru Rai township, rest of way ok @ 80kmh.  14) Agree  15) agree  16) agree  17) agree. Too many side roads to continue with 100kmh  18) 80kmh as at present  19) agree</p>
500	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) There are quiet long sections of this road that are ok for 100 km. During that late 1970s I drove commercially during the reduced speed restrictions 80kmph bought in because of the oil crisis. Travelling at 80 km at that time over long distances in a near new vehicle was tiresome it being hard to maintain concentration over a period of time due to the lower concentration required. Admittedly I did not have air con  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) Maybe 80 km would be more appropriate as there are some reasonable stretches of easy flowing road.  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) Is this really required as the 80 limit there now seems ok  19) No Comment</p>
501	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree with proposed new limit. Aligns with 80 Km/Hr section between Woodbourne and Renwick at present.  4) Disagree with proposed new speed limit. Road is mostly flat and with good visibility throughout. Road conditions do not warrant decreasing speed.  5) Agree with new proposed speed limit.  7) Disagree with proposed new speed limit. Road is mostly flat and with good visibility throughout. Road conditions do not warrant decreasing speed.  8) Disagree with proposed new speed limit. Road is mostly flat and with good visibility throughout. Road conditions do not warrant decreasing speed.  9) Disagree with proposed new speed limit. Road is mostly flat and with good visibility throughout. Road conditions do not warrant decreasing speed.  10) Don't have variable speed limits, stick to one speed year round. Suggest 80 Km/Hr  11) Disagree with proposed new speed limit. Road is mostly flat, although twisty in places, and with good visibility throughout. Road conditions do not warrant decreasing speed.  13) Agree with proposal.  14) Disagree with proposal. Speed should be 80 Km/Hr to maintain continuity.  15) Agree with proposal.  16) Agree with proposal.  17) Disagree with proposal. Speed limit should stay at current limit. Roadway is flat with good visibility.  18) Disagree with proposal. Speed should stay at present limit.  19) Agree. There should be minimal speed changes along this journey.</p>
502	Individual submitter	<p>I am quite happy with the new proposed speed limits, but I can't help wondering if it would make some of our more impatient drivers even more so.</p>
503	Individual submitter	<p>I agree to the proposed speed limit changes.</p>
504	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a perfect good piece of road, plenty wide enough and should stay at 100 km/h. Since the speed was raised from 55mph to 60mph around 1980, the road surface has improved, the line marking has improved, the cat's eyes have been added, marker posts have been improved, furthermore, vehicles have improved, better tires, ABS breaking, airbags, vastly improved steering, easier to drive to name a few. What was the point of all these safety improvements if the speed is now reduced on a good piece of road.  4) Unbelievable! One of the safest sections of the road! This is a perfect good piece of road, plenty wide enough and should stay at 100 km/h. Since the speed was raised from 55mph to 60mph around 1980, the road surface has improved, the line marking has improved, the cat's eyes have been added, marker posts have been improved, furthermore, vehicles have improved, better tires,</p>

		<p>ABS breaking, airbags, vastly improved steering, easier to drive to name a few. What was the point of all these safety improvements if the speed is now reduced on a good piece of road.</p> <p>5) Happy with this being reduced. Entering built up zone.</p> <p>7) Also a perfectly good piece of road, plenty wide enough and should stay at 100 km/h. Includes long straights. Since the speed was raised from 55mph to 60mph around 1980, the road surface has improved, the line marking has improved, the cat's eyes have been added, marker posts have been improved, furthermore, vehicles have improved, better tires, ABS breaking, airbags, vastly improved steering, easier to drive to name a few. What was the point of all these safety improvements if the speed is now reduced on a good piece of road.</p> <p>8) Should stay at 100 km/h with a 60 km/h variable school zone during school hours. One of the straightest, widest pieces of road.</p> <p>9) This is a perfect good piece of road, plenty wide enough and should stay at 100 km/h. Since the speed was raised from 55mph to 60mph around 1980, the road surface has improved, the line marking has improved, the cat's eyes have been added, marker posts have been improved, furthermore, vehicles have improved, better tires, ABS breaking, airbags, vastly improved steering, easier to drive to name a few. What was the point of all these safety improvements if the speed is now reduced on a good piece of road.</p> <p>10) Agree with reducing speed limit to 60 km/h at Pelorus Bridge.</p> <p>11) This is a perfect good piece of road and should stay at 100 km/h. Since the speed was raised from 55mph to 60mph around 1980, the road surface has improved, the line marking has improved, the cat's eyes have been added, marker posts have been improved, furthermore, vehicles have improved, better tyres, ABS breaking, airbags, vastly improved steering, easier to drive to name a few. What was the point of all these safety improvements if the speed is now reduced on a good piece of road.</p> <p>13) Crazy to reduce this to 80 km/h when so much has been invested recently on improvements. Although some areas of the road area a little windy, these areas have speed signs on corners to warn vehicles. This road should stay at 100 km/h. Since the speed was raised from 55mph to 60mph around 1980, the road surface has improved, the line marking has improved, the cat's eyes have been added, marker posts have been improved, furthermore, vehicles have improved, better tyres, ABS breaking, airbags, vastly improved steering, easier to drive to name a few. What was the point of all these safety improvements if the speed is now reduced on a good piece of road.</p> <p>14) Happy for this section of road to 60 km/h. Very hard to go over 60 km/h on this stretch of road anyway.</p> <p>15) Good piece of road and not built up at all. Should stay 100 km/h</p> <p>16) Agree with this staying 80 km/h due to built up area with variable speed zone outside the school.</p> <p>17) This is a perfect good piece of road, plenty wide enough and should stay at 100 km/h. Since the speed was raised from 55mph to 60mph around 1980, the road surface has improved, the line marking has improved, the cat's eyes have been added, marker posts have been improved, furthermore, vehicles have improved, better tires, ABS breaking, airbags, vastly improved steering, easier to drive to name a few. What was the point of all these safety improvements if the speed is now reduced on a good piece of road.</p> <p>18) Happy to reduce to 60 km/h through this area.</p> <p>19) This is a perfect good piece of road, plenty wide enough and should stay at 100 km/h. I travel the road between Nelson &amp; Blenheim very regularly and this push to reduce speed limits. Nelson is an extremely isolated region with limited access routes and does not deserve to be further distanced from the rest on NZ. Nelson people pay their fair share of road user taxes and this proposal is insult to injury.</p>
505	Individual submitter	<p>1) A principal reason for the number of accidents (ie speeding) is reinforced due to lack of enforcement. Check the types of accidents, where they occur, identify the causes and impacts, then ask: could this be happening because the driver is taking unnecessary risks, or is certain that there will be no police radar in use to catch them and fine them? NZ often relies on 'self-certification' for abiding by rules and the NZTA is no different, via its speed limits. However, by now, it would be painfully clear that a certain percentage of drivers (10%?) do not care about the rules UNLESS there is a certainty of being caught and punished (fined). Tighten up the enforcement of speed limits, particularly in the 'bad' areas, and you will undoubtedly find that accidents drop as do fatalities and injuries. To take the easy way out and drop the speed limit to 80, begs the question of the 10%+ who will break the speed limit in any case, and if there is no enforcement, and the speed limit is seen as 'too low', then the system is only encouraging otherwise law-abiding drivers to speed. It unjustly, unnecessarily, and stupidly penalises those who drive well and/or whose livelihoods rely on schedules, based on adherence to current limits, which arguably, are safe.</p> <p>4) See response to 1. - same applies. Look at enforcement, not wholesale lowering of speed limits. if drivers sense that limits are 'too low' they will inevitably speed; why facilitate that?</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) see 1. and 4. -- enforcement of current speed limits and perhaps better signage at key danger points are better solutions than a wholesale reduction, which will only invite drivers to speed.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
506	Individual submitter	<p>Many road users are tourists. Thus, I am infavour of reducing the overall speed limit to a maximum of 8kph.</p> <p>Where there is a risk of collision between vehicles and pedestrians, as in all school zones the max speed should be a variable speed zone of 50kph with a max of 80ph. So amend 8 and 16 to 50</p>

		<p>variable school zone. Where road is particularly tricky as in 14 - the max speed should be 50kph. In 9 the proposal represents an increase from existing speed limits. This makes no sense. Moreover, at present there is insufficient warning of the need to drastically reduce speed when approaching Pelours Bridge. I would support a max speed of 30kph in this section, throughout the year.</p>
507	Atawhai Safety Group	<p>This group has no formal position on the proposal to lower the speed limit on SH6 from Nelson to Blenheim; we will only comment on matters relating to traffic to and from the North in the Nelson City boundary.</p> <p>Over the years a major concern of ours has been the lack of a very clear indication at the City boundary from the north that road conditions become very different to "open road" . The 60kph proposal would do that but should be extended to the southern Dodsons Valley intersection. This is the busiest intersection and is also situated just past a corner.</p> <p>Residential development continues apace in Atawhai with major proposals underway up Bay View Road. There will be much construction traffic followed by new residential traffic, all with very challenging access to Bay View Road.</p> <p>We ask that NZTA be alert to these matters and be able to respond promptly with design and speed limit changes as needed.</p> <p>Clearly we strongly support the proposed lowering of the general limit to 80kph in Atawhai.</p>
508	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) Additional subdivisions proposed in Bay View area will increase volume of traffic joining the highway and the growing use of the cycleway adjacent to the highway indicate that 80km may be too high and a change to 70km would be more appropriate.</p>
509	Individual submitter	<p>I consider NZTA's intention to reduce the speed limit to mostly 80kmh or the journey between Blenheim to Nelson to be short sighted, unrealistic and dangerous. The explanation given, will only increase the time taken for the journey by 9 mins. How ingenious. As we all know this section of the road is a major highway between Blenheim and Nelson, with its port, freezing workers, major city, and large population and a major tourist destination. Here's the scenario: 3 campervans in front of a queue going the same speed under 80kmh travelling close together (no room to pass), somewhere in the queue 3 stock trucks fully laden doing 65/75kmh, 6 log trucks going to the port (less than 65/77kmh) and me at the back of the queue going 30/40 kmh and not one chance of passing after Renwick. After travelling at 60/65kmh what truck is going to pull over. It's all nonsense, can you imagine the frustration, impatience, the risks taken and the 9 minutes slower well before Havelock. We go 60kmh past Havelock School now and the Canvastown one. Leave the speed limit the same and save lives.</p>
510	Individual submitter	<p>1) No, this is in between built up areas so i can understand the reasoning behind the decision. 4) My first question is why? This is a standard two lane section of NZ state Highway which is reasonably wide, open and without any tight radius curves. When compared to other pieces of highway in the region/country, this is well above average. The reduction of the speed limit no more than band-aid as it will not prevent crashes in the future. A reduction in impact force may drop the number of deaths which looks good on the books but doesn't actually resolve issues that occur on our highways or the number of crashes. How about working on better education for drivers and making gaining a licence more challenging to obtain? What about trying to manage the general lack of consideration for others that is regularly seen on the open road. The simple act of pulling over if you are holding up traffic will go a long way to reducing impatience and people trying risky maneuvers to get ahead. The concept of driving to the conditions (road type and weather effects) seems to be lost along with general common sense these days and we are required to cater for the lost common denominator. I am an ex heavy commercial vehicle operator who has regularly traveled between Blenheim and Nelson up to three times a day. A large amount of this road can be traveled at the posted heavy vehicle speed limit comfortably so I don't understand why there is a need to reduce the posted speed limit below this. 5) I agree with this recommendation. 7) No, See comments in Question 4 8) This I can understand as it is a high speed environment around a school.</p>

		<p>9) No. See comments in Question 4</p> <p>10) I agree with this recommendation</p> <p>11) No See Question 4 comments</p> <p>13) NO. While the road is tighter in places along this stretch it is no worse than large areas of state highway around the country. It comes back to driving to the conditions, being courteous to other road users and general common sense.</p> <p>14) NO. This is a tighter piece of road which some drivers may find challenging but it comes back to driving to the conditions, being courteous to other road users and general common sense. If you must, a drop to 80 km would match sections of SH6 further south but I don't think that this will have a significant impact on peoples inability to read the road and drive accordingly.</p> <p>15) Only if previous section is lowered but otherwise no</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) NO, see comments in Question 4. Possibly consider extending existing Atawhai 80km zone north to just beyond Todd Bush Rd intersection.</p> <p>18) No. Consider school speed reductions around Clifton Terrace School.</p> <p>19) Agree with this recommendation</p>
511	Individual submitter	<p>1) NZTA Submission Blenheim – Nelson Highway. I would like to start by putting some context around myself. My Background • I travel the Nelson - Blenheim Road at least once a week and often 2- 3 times. • I have driven over 3 million kilometres in trucks, cars, SUVs and motorcycles. • Last year I completed a two-year training course that made me a full member of the Institute of Advances Motorists (IAM). This course takes 15 - 20 weekends. • The next accident I have will be my first. • I have no demerit points or convictions. • I am 71 and have held a licence for over 56 years. • I ride a motorcycle 25,000 km and drive other vehicles 20,000km and often 30,000km each year. • Following a career in aviation, I am now an aviation safety consultant. Measuring the Road Toll There is a belief that the road toll is way too high. When one considers just the numbers it may seem that way. But the toll doesn't provide us with any useful statistic. What should be analysed is the RATE of fatal accidents measured against the number of registered vehicles. Using NZTA's published data we can see that the fatal accident rate has never been lower. Your survey will not let me show the graph. I really believe that the misunderstanding of this is what is behind the knee jerk reaction of politicians through the NZTA. If NZTA's focus is on numbers alone, then close the roads and we'll all be safe. Reality tells me that the more drivers on the road, the more accidents because people make mistakes. More people, more mistakes. So focus on rates, not numbers. NZTA statistics show that 20 lives have been lost on the Blenheim – Nelson Road in the last 10 years. My question is, how many people didn't die? If you knew this then you could calculate the fatal accident rate. If the annual average number of vehicles was only 4 per hour then 54,730 vehicles used the road in the same period and didn't kill anyone. You and I know that this is a major understatement of the traffic volume. Lawbreakers But the news tells us that law breakers make a big contribution to the toll. For example: • Failure to stop for Police • No seat belts worn • Drug impaired drivers (we can't afford to test for drugs) • Alcohol impaired drivers • Inattention (distracted by cellphones and in-car technology) So 80/60 kph isn't ever going to stop this element killing themselves - and others. But I would love to know the number of others who died just through making mistakes. The point is that everyone is going to be penalized to, I suspect a large extent, because of the law breakers. Safety Case I believe that the proposal will INCREASE the accident rate – and this is why. Frustration is one of four major causes of errors. (Rushing, fatigue and complacency are the others). So shouldn't NZTA examine what will cause drivers to become frustrated? • They are used to travelling at 100kph on this road and many will be annoyed and impatient. Impatience was blamed by the Police for the larger number of accidents in Marlborough last Christmas. • In the 1980's when we had to drive at 80 because we were told the world was running out of oil (!) the accident rate was shocking. Why? It was inattention, as many of my age group can remember well. At 80 kph on open straight roads the mind and eyes wander much more than at 100 kph. • I'm imagining that the road will see a lot more no passing yellow lines if SH 63 is anything to go by. The effect of this is that everybody has to travel at the speed of the slowest driver! Frustrating. I predict that these three outcomes will be the cause of risk taking and a higher accident rate. I've seen so many examples of this behaviour on SH 6, 7, 63. NZTA's Decision Making The media would have us believe that NZTA is out of control. I'm not so sure that is the case but I do think it is being misguided. For example: 1) The relatively new risk assessment tool being applied is way too restrictive and causes silly decisions. Take the Rai Saddle where at least \$10m has been spent improving two curves. This project is surely an embarrassment given that the new piece is still causing trouble. And the camber is all wrong too. But why was this amount wasted on the Rai when the winding Whangamoia Saddle is 15 minutes further along the road? 2) There seems to be a belief in NZTA that its actions are the panacea for all road deaths when road design is but one element. Drivers' decision making and ability is another and no matter what NZTA does to improve roads (even if it had the funding) we will still have bad drivers. I personally support much more driver training – both initial and on-going. But that is another matter. The point is that NZTA cannot stop all accidents, or even minimize their outcomes, so should stop trying. 3) Why is it so important to make our roads safer when the stats clearly show a constantly improving fatal accident rate? 4) I believe that the NZTA philosophy is wrong. The police enforce traffic speed – NZTA controls traffic flow and that means that NZTA should build many more passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. NZTA's philosophy needs to change so that people get to their destination with the minimum of fuss. Lastly NZTA's Andrew James is quoted as suggesting that the proposed speed reduction is a temporary action until the road is improved. I'm sorry to be skeptical but the evidence on SH 63 is the opposite. Millions was spent upgrading this road for the Christchurch traffic but the road has now returned to its former traffic flows and the 80kph speed limits are still in place wherever there are winding sections of road.</p> <p>4) Same comment as 1.</p> <p>5) Yes I support this</p> <p>7) Same comment as in 1.</p> <p>8) Support this.</p> <p>9) Same comment as in 1.</p> <p>10) Support this</p> <p>11) Same comment as in 1.</p> <p>13) Same comment as in 1.</p> <p>14) Same comment as in 1.</p>

		<p>15) Same comment as in 1.  16) Support this  17) Same comment as in 1.  18) DO NOT SUPPORT. Keep it at 80.  19) Support</p>
512	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal 3. comparison against a less restrictive option eg 90km/hr  5) No Comment  7) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal 3. comparison against a less restrictive option eg 90km/hr  8) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal 3. comparison against a less restrictive option eg 90km/hr  9) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal 3. comparison against a less restrictive option eg 90km/hr  10) No Comment  11) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal 3. comparison against a less restrictive option eg 90km/hr  13) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal 3. comparison against a less restrictive option eg 90km/hr  14) No Comment  15) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal 3. comparison against a less restrictive option eg 90km/hr  16) No Comment  17) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal 3. comparison against a less restrictive option eg 90km/hr  18) 1. travel time for local road users 2. the marginal safety benefit of your proposal  19) No Comment</p>
513	Stark Environmental Ltd	<p>I object to the blanket reduction in speed limits. While I agree that the consequences of a crash are worse at faster speeds, it is not speed per se that is the reason for most crashes. Modern cars are safer than ever, and the roads are no worse these days (but could be a lot better - wider, twin lanes with median barriers, more passing lanes etc.). The main problems are poor driver behaviour (bad decisions, inexperience, driving beyond one's ability, not driving according to the conditions, or foreign drivers not used to driving on the LHS or in NZ conditions). The Police and NZTA focus on the easy and cheapest solutions (speed and speed reduction) rather than concentrating on dealing with poor driving. The fines for poor driving in NZ are a joke compared with (say) Australia. A few km/h over the speed limit in good conditions is unlikely to have serious adverse consequences compared, for example, to plain idiotic driving behaviour. There are some long straight sections on SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim where 100km/h is perfectly safe. To reduce the speed limit there will cause frustration. I do not believe that the result of the proposed changes will only add 9 minutes to the Nelson - Blenheim trip. There will be drivers who consistently drive below the speed limit (whatever it is) and hold people up. Driving at 80km/h will mean that long trips will take even longer and there is even more danger of falling asleep at the wheel (a fact that is never mentioned by those advocating speed reductions). It's simply boring to drive slowly for long distances. I have no problem with lower speed limits where it isn't possible to drive safely at 100km/h (like over the Whangamoia Hill), but to impose 80km/h or less on straight roads with bends that can be negotiated safely at well over 80km/h will not only be unpopular but will take most of the fun out of driving. This is simply another case of poor behaviour of the few resulting in changes that the rest of us have to endure. The focus should be on improving roads, better driver training, and more focus on, and higher penalties for, poor and dangerous driving. Tourist drivers should have to demonstrate good driving ability before being able to rent vehicles in NZ (I have seen some terrible driving by tourists and reported a shocking example between the galciers and Haast Pass to Wanaka Police last year). I live just off SH6 in Marybank and work from home. I may drive into Nelson once or twice per week. Often, cars pull out from side streets (like Marybank Rd) right in front of me and then dawdle along at 70km/h in a 100km/h zone. I am not opposed to speed reduction here, but again, the issue is poor behaviour (pulling out in front and driving too slowly) - not speed. Indicating at roundabouts in Nelson is also poor and many people turning right from Milton St -Atawhai Drive onto SH6 go right across to the left despite the large notice instructing people to keep to the centre lane. I have never seen Police monitoring this poor driving behaviour.</p>
514	Individual submitter	<p>1) This appears to make sense  4) I do not support this, the majority of this road is open road over farmland with good visibility and easy corners. lowering this to 80km will create significant frustration to drivers stuck behind slow vehicles (as many drivers will elect to drive well below the limit. overtaking tends to be the result of this frustration however due to the fear of exceeding the speed limit during overtaking, distances become excessive. this is made worse when overtaking long vehicles. without the addition of new overtaking bays the number of head-on accidents will most likely increase.  5) agree  7) I do not support this, the majority of this road is open road with good visibility and easy corners. lowering this to 80km will create significant frustration to drivers stuck behind slow vehicles (as many drivers will elect to drive well below the limit. overtaking tends to be the result of this frustration however due to the fear of exceeding the speed limit during overtaking, distances become excessive. this is made worse when overtaking long vehicles. without the addition of new overtaking bays the number of head-on accidents will most likely increase.  8) agree  9) I do not support this, the majority of this road is open road over farmland with good visibility and easy corners. lowering this to 80km will create significant frustration to drivers stuck behind slow vehicles (as many drivers will elect to drive well below the limit. overtaking tends to be the result of this frustration however due to the fear of exceeding the speed limit during overtaking, distances become excessive. this is made worse when overtaking long vehicles. without the addition of new overtaking bays the number of head-on accidents will most likely increase.</p>

		<p>10) agree</p> <p>11) I do not support this, the majority of this road is open road over farmland with good visibility and easy corners. lowering this to 80km will create significant frustration to drivers stuck behind slow vehicles (as many drivers will elect to drive well below the limit. overtaking tends to be the result of this frustration however due to the fear of exceeding the speed limit during overtaking overtaking, distances become excessive. this is made worse when overtaking long vehicles. without the addition of new overtaking bays the number of head-on accidents will most likely increase.</p> <p>13) I do not support this, the majority of this road is open road over farmland with good visibility and easy corners. lowering this to 80km will create significant frustration to drivers stuck behind slow vehicles (as many drivers will elect to drive well below the limit. overtaking tends to be the result of this frustration however due to the fear of exceeding the speed limit during overtaking overtaking, distances become excessive. this is made worse when overtaking long vehicles. without the addition of new overtaking bays the number of head-on accidents will most likely increase.</p> <p>14) agree</p> <p>15) Agree</p> <p>16) agree</p> <p>17) agree</p> <p>18) agree</p> <p>19) agree</p>
515	Individual submitter	<p>Please analyse upsurge in accidents following uptake of social media &amp; public following by iphone whenever and wherever. I have observed drivers lack of attention all the time while travelling this road. Lack of driving skills is another issue- in the past motorsport ran day meetings to teach driving improvement skills. The current limit is quite satisfactory as it is, waste of time meddling when the problem is the drivers not the road. The old adage- drive carefully and considerately. Also pay attention to the road and not all the media that vehicles are loaded with today!!!</p>
516	Individual submitter	<p>I wish to submit the following feedback with regard to the proposal to lower the speed limit on SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim.</p> <p>This is a road that I have travelled extensively over the past 40 years and with which I have great familiarity. Although I have never witnessed the occurrence of any accidents along this route I have certainly seen the location of many such accidents after the event.</p> <p>The current proposal gives as one of it's main reasons that there have been a significant number of accidents, including serious injuries and deaths, that have occurred within the 100 kmh zones along this section of SH6, and that reducing the speed limit will significantly contribute to a reduction in these figures. I disagree with this suggestion as I believe:</p> <p>A large number of these incidents occur at well below the speed limit. There are sections of this road that are tight and twisting and can be subject to slippery conditions caused by rain, ice, loose metal, and spillages from stock trucks. The Whangamoas Hill in particular has been the subject of many accidents at speeds which are well below the speed limit. It is up to drivers to drive to the conditions and within their capabilities. There is no cheap or easy fix for the Whangamoas other than improving signage and road markings and protective barriers.</p> <p>Lowering the speed limit will not prevent the "idiot factor" or the "incompetence factor" which prevails on our roads and is a significant contributor to the poor statistics along this Highway. The Highway is subject to very high proportionate volumes of traffic for whom the regulated speed is 90 kmh. High volumes of truck and trailer units, camper vans, and vehicles towing caravans, boats and trailers use SH6 and in my experience this has the effect of regulating ALL traffic to 90 kmh for much of this route. The one area I see as being the most beneficial to road safety would be to have frequent passing lanes in order that slower traffic may be safely passed. I have frequently been caught up in a string of slow moving traffic that has built up behind a slow truck or a nervous tourist and this gives rise to frustration and risk taking by some motorists in order to get past.</p> <p>Accordingly, I am opposed to the blanket reduction of the speed limit and suggest that the current speed limit is retained or is changed to an open road limit. I believe safety on this route would be better served by improvements to the road itself, improved signage, safety barriers and passing lanes. The use of electronic warning signs could be utilised to good effect in areas such as the Whangamoas where conditions can vary day to day. I note the speed detecting signage that is utilised to good effect toward the northern end of the Desert Road and wonder why some of these modern technologies are not being applied here? Simply proposing to lower the speed limit for the length of SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim will not solve the problem NZTA is trying to address.</p>
517	Individual submitter	<p>1) Bad idea. It is a flat straight piece of road with good visibility and wide berms.</p> <p>4) Why. the road is an wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>5) leave the speeds alone</p> <p>7) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>8) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>9) Why. the road fine and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>10) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>11) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>13) Why? the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>14) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>15) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>16) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p> <p>17) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers</p>

		18) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers 19) Why. the road is wide and slowing down traffic will make it more dangerous because of frustration causing people to make dangerous overtaking maneuvers
518	Tour Aotearoa	1) Speed limit needs to be dropped to 60 km/h with a speed camera. This is a major tourist cycle route on the Tour Aotearoa and vehicles pass too fast and way too close. serious consideration must be given for a wide lane for cycles to travel with safety. 4) see my first comment applies here. 5) 50 is ideal. A wide verge for safe tourist cycling must also be given. 7) lower speed limit to 70km/h. see earlier comment main route for Tour Aotearoa. 8) Agree 9) Wide verge for safe cycling. 10) Agree 11) Agree 13) Agree 14) Agree 15) Agree 16) Agree 17) agree 18) agree 19) we agree
519	Individual submitter	1) This reduction will save lives 4) This reduction will save lives 5) This reduction will save lives 7) This reduction will save lives 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment
520	Individual submitter	1) The speed limit should not be changed 4) The speed limit should not be changed 5) The speed limit should not be changed 7) The speed limit should not be changed 8) The speed limit should not be changed 9) speed limit should not be changed 10) The speed limit should not be changed 11) The speed limit should not be changed 13) The speed limit should not be changed 14) The speed limit should not be changed 15) The speed limit should not be changed 16) The speed limit should not be changed 17) The speed limit should not be changed 18) The speed limit should not be changed 19) The speed limit should not be changed
521	Individual submitter	1) No 4) No

		<p>5) No</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) No</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) No</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
522	Individual submitter	<p>1) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>4) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>5) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>7) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>8) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>9) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>10) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>11) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>13) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>14) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>15) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>16) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>17) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>18) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p> <p>19) changing the speed limit won't change anything. Adding more passing lanes and stopping points would be a better solution. Truck freight companies would suffer the most from this change.</p>
523	Individual submitter	<p>1) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>4) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>5) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>7) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>8) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit. maybe just 80 km near the school</p> <p>9) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>10) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit. Having a different speed limit at varying times of the year is too complicated. Tourists are obviously the problem here. Get tougher on tourists being allowed to drive on NZ roads, which are different from other countries roads. Don't make the rest of us suffer.</p> <p>11) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>13) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>14) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit...common sense tells you what speed to drive this route.</p> <p>15) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>16) leave as is</p> <p>17) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p> <p>18) I disagree with the proposed new speed limit Leave as is....all you will do is frustrate your average driver . Try spending some of the revenue generate off fuel tax in the Nelson region, and spend it upgrading LOCAL roads, not North Is.</p> <p>19) disagree with the proposed new speed limit</p>
524	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Not necessary</p> <p>5) Not necessary</p> <p>7) Absolutely not necessary</p> <p>8) Excellent idea</p>

		<p>9) Not necessary  10) Good idea  11) Good idea  13) Good idea  14) Good idea  15) Good idea  16) Good idea  17) Not necessary  18) Not necessary  19) Not necessary</p>
525	Individual submitter	I am NOT in favour of any of the proposed speed reductions in SH6 Nelson to Blenheim.
526	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's not speed that is causing the problem. It's people and all the new technology that is distracting them. New cars come out with all sorts of bells and whistles. Lowering the speed will cause more frustration and more crashes as people will then be trying to pass cars going even slower than the proposed limit. Its ridiculous. Adding more time to an already long trip. 80km will be a crawl. It's a long straight road. It doesnt need to be lowered  4) It's a straight road it doesnt need to be lowered  5) No  7) It doesnt need to be lowered  8) Lowering around the school is a good idea but everywhere else no  9) Doesnt need to be lowered  10) No  11) Again it's a nice road to drive it doesnt need to be lowered  13) Doesnt need to be lowered  14) Whoa 60? ! Seriously? That's a definite no  15) No  16) This one is fine  17) Are you planning to lower the speed in all of nz or just the top of the south? This is getting ridiculous  18) Doesnt need to be lowered. We will be called the snail city  19) Good grief no</p>
527	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) The proposed change to 60 km/h is an excellent (and much overdue) change.  19) I think there is some merit in considering a reduction to 60 km/h, instead of 80 km/h, given that this is a small connecting piece between a 50 km/h zone and a soon-to-be 60 km/h zone. There are many side roads (all 50 km/h), which have young children crossing on the bike path, etc. Having cars round a corner at 80 km/h and then immediately come across families crossing the road with their bikes is obviously not ideal. My 3-year-old son's life is at risk daily because of this: a 60 km/h limit would greatly improve the situation.</p>
528	Individual submitter	Futher to my online opposition I wish to add. The current speed limit of 100km on the open road means slow traffic moves at approx 85kms so reducing the speed limit to 80km would inevitably mean slow traffic will travel at approx 70km - the danger of this is the same ascurrent speed limits not enough passing lanes. Also the crashes on this stretch of road have been minimalised dut to the recent major road work/ reclaimed land on the hills. How can we be digressing our driving when most countires have higher open road limited is not acceptable.

529	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) This is a state highway open road current speed limit of 100 should remain as totally suitable for road/driving conditions - I oppose the proposed reduced speed limit</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) State highway open road - 100 is safe for road/driver conditions - I oppose the reduced speed limit</p> <p>8) School zone reduction of speed acceptable but the state highway open road speed should remain at 100 - this road is an easy road to drive, speed reduction limit completely unnecessary</p> <p>9) Open road safe to drive at 100, speed reduction proposal ludicrous</p> <p>10) Speed limit proposal of 60 to apply to all 12 months</p> <p>11) Open road safe to remain at 100 not speed limit reduction necessary</p> <p>13) Again this open road is safe to drive at 100 no speed limit reduction necessary, completely absurd</p> <p>14) This is governed by corners etc that would make driving at 100 impossible to sustain but to make the whole stretch of road 60 is too much of a reduction as some areas are completely safe to drive at 80 or 80+ - I oppose 60 but would support 80</p> <p>15) 100 is suitable speed for this area I oppose reduction of speed limit</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) This is safe to drive at 100 can't see any need for a speed reduction</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
530	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Some people won't concentrate when doing 80km/h so please leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>5) okay</p> <p>7) Keep at 100km/h</p> <p>8) Don't change it</p> <p>9) 100 km/h is fine</p> <p>10) okay</p> <p>11) leave it the way it is now</p> <p>13) You must be joking - leave as it is now</p> <p>14) okay</p> <p>15) 100 km/h</p> <p>16) okay</p> <p>17) 100 km/h thanks</p> <p>18) 80 km/h thanks</p> <p>19) Just remember that people who think quickly make mistakes at 80 km/h - leave as is</p>
531	Individual submitter	<p>1) I totally am opposed to this change.. Travel these roads between Nelson and Blenheim weekly and have done for years and dont believe this kind of change is necessary.. I dont believe the roads are the problems. I believe it is mainly a minority of drivers.. Some travelling too slow sometimes and making drivers behind them take unnecessary risks.. Why should the majority of safe and sensible drivers be penalised for the actions of a few idiots.. Maybe instead of limit change How about more passing lanes, more policing and bigger fines.. What about the impact on business's that travel the road every day and the increased costs to the businesses which has to be passed on to the end users in the end.. All goods into Nelson are carried on these roads Ridiculous move and becoming a nanny state even more.. Please leave as is..</p> <p>4) I totally am opposed to this change.. Travel these roads between Nelson and Blenheim weekly and have done for years and dont believe this kind of change is necessary.. I dont believe the roads are the problems. I believe it is mainly a minority of drivers.. Some travelling too slow sometimes and making drivers behind them take unnecessary risks.. Why should the majority of safe and sensible drivers be penalised for the actions of a few idiots.. Maybe instead of limit change How about more passing lanes, more policing and bigger fines.. What about the impact on business's that travel the road every day and the increased costs to the businesses which has to be passed on to the end users in the end.. All goods into Nelson are carried on these roads Ridiculous move and becoming a nanny state even more.. Please leave as is..</p> <p>5) I totally am opposed to this change.. Travel these roads between Nelson and Blenheim weekly and have done for years and dont believe this kind of change is necessary.. I dont believe the roads are the problems. I believe it is mainly a minority of drivers.. Some travelling too slow sometimes and making drivers behind them take unnecessary risks.. Why should the majority of safe and sensible drivers be penalised for the actions of a few idiots.. Maybe instead of limit change How about more passing lanes, more policing and bigger fines.. What about the impact on business's that travel the road every day and the increased costs to the businesses which has to be passed on to the end users in the end.. All goods into Nelson are carried on these roads Ridiculous move and becoming a nanny state even more.. Please leave as is..</p> <p>7) I totally am opposed to this change.. Travel these roads between Nelson and Blenheim weekly and have done for years and dont believe this kind of change is necessary.. I dont believe the roads are the problems. I believe it is mainly a minority of drivers.. Some travelling too slow sometimes and making drivers behind them take unnecessary risks.. Why should the majority of safe and sensible drivers be penalised for the actions of a few idiots.. Maybe instead of limit change How about more passing lanes, more policing and bigger fines.. What about the impact on business's that travel the road every day and the increased costs to the businesses which has to be passed on to the end users in the end.. All goods into Nelson are carried on these roads</p>



		19) I totally am opposed to this change.. Travel these roads between Nelson and Blenheim weekly and have done for years and dont believe this kind of change is necessary.. I dont believe the roads are the problems. I believe it is mainly a minority of drivers.. Some travelling too slow sometimes and making drivers behind them take unnecessary risks.. Why should the majority of safe and sensible drivers be penalised for the actions of a few idiots.. Maybe instead of limit change How about more passing lanes, more policing and bigger fines.. What about the impact on business's that travel the road every day and the increased costs to the businesses which has to be passed on to the end users in the end.. All goods into Nelson are carried on these roads Ridiculous move and becoming a nanny state even more.. Please leave as is..
532	Individual submitter	Tourists should be vetted before using a rental. Especially if they drive on the right hand side.
533	Individual submitter	I disagree that speed limit should be reduced for the whole trip to Blenheim from Nelson. There are safe roads where the 100 km speed limit should remain on the flat after negotiating the hills. It is unrealistic to reduce the speed limit to 80km for the whole trip.
534	Individual submitter	1) Frustrated motorists leave it how it is it's not the speed miss use of a motor vehicle motorists need to pay more attention and become more alert 4) Dropping speed limits just going to get the govt more money from motorists via tickets don't change it fine how it is give more visibility along the road clearer corners less foliage hanging trees 5) Yeah needs to be 60 not 50 like rai valley 7) Leave it the way it is bigger wider roads more passing lanes! 8) Trim trees again lots of viewing obstructions passing lanes or slow vehicle lanes widen road 9) Trees chop again and cut corners out 10) Replace the one lane bridge! Chop trees and corner. Don't change 11) Leave it alone as above 13) Leave it as is 14) Leave it as is 15) Leave it as is 16) Leave it as is 17) Leave it as is 18) Leave it as is 19) Leave it as is
535	Individual submitter	1) No Comment 4) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section. 5) Leave the speed limit at the current 70km/hr for this section. It has been fine up until now and it not a cause of accidents 7) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section. This is a wide open section of road 8) Yes this is OK around the school when the school is running 9) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section. 10) Leave it at the current situation with a seasonal speed limit 11) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section. Again, a wide open section of road 13) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section. 14) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section. 15) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section. 16) Current situation is fine 17) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section. 18) Leave the speed limit at the current 80km/hr for this section. This is a state highway 19) Leave the speed limit at the current 100km/hr for this section.
536	Individual submitter	1) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoia-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders. 4) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoia-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders. 5) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoia-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders. 7) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoia-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders. 8) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoia-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders. 9) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoia-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much

		<p>better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p> <p>10) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoara-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p> <p>11) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoara-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p> <p>13) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoara-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p> <p>14) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoara-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p> <p>15) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoara-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p> <p>16) I don't oppose this one.</p> <p>17) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoara-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p> <p>18) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoara-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p> <p>19) It should be considered that the current speed limit is doing fine. It's the likes of the Whangamoara-Rai Saddle stretch that pose any issue. More comprehensive driver training would be a much better alternative. Teach new drivers how to handle the road. Include more high speed driving in the licence test. Competence and confidence would do wonders.</p>
537	Individual submitter	<p>1) Mainly rural area, fine at 100km/h</p> <p>4) Nothing wrong with this section of road at 100km/h, could be improved with passing lanes on the straights somewhere south of Havelock.</p> <p>5) Has been 70km/h for a long time with few incidents, maybe 60km/h? Or leave at 70km/h. Not 50.</p> <p>7) Nothing wrong with current speed of 100km/h. Do Not change!</p> <p>8) Make this area 60km/h school zone, with LED lights, outside school hrs 100km/h.</p> <p>9) Nothing wrong with 100km/h in this area, leave at 100.</p> <p>10) Traffic lights on bridge asap!!</p> <p>11) Leave at 100km/h, nothing wrong with speed. Fit armco barrier near hebbards road where road is close to rai river.</p> <p>13) Leave at 100km/h, nothing wrong with road. I have been driving it regularly since I was 15, so 23 years with no accidents or issues. Some corner bashing between mill gully and Kokoroa straight would stop ice in winter and make safer.</p> <p>14) Not necessary, fine at 100km/h, re name stopping bays, slow vehicle bays to encourage slow vehicles to pull over.</p> <p>15) Leave at 100km/h nothing wrong here</p> <p>16) Agree, 80 and school zone like canvastown at hira, 60km/h</p> <p>17) Leave at 100, good road</p> <p>18) Leave at 80km/h good road</p> <p>19) Leave at 100km/h, good road</p>
538	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is ridiculous</p> <p>4) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>5) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>7) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>8) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>9) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>10) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>11) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>13) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>14) O totally valid.... NOT This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>15) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>16) This is reasonable</p> <p>17) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>18) This is even more ridiculous</p> <p>19) This is even more ridiculous</p>

539	Individual submitter	<p>1) That the current limit is safe enough</p> <p>4) The road is straight and has good shoulders. Is easily travelled at 100km/h. Lowering the limit will just frustrate drivers and lead to dangerous passing</p> <p>5) There are long stretches of the road that this is unnecessary for. Around certain tight stretches fair enough</p> <p>7) The road is safe enough for 100km/h. Lowering will just create frustrated drivers</p> <p>8) Same as above</p> <p>9) Lowering will create dangerous overtaking</p> <p>10) Do you just want us to walk everywhere</p> <p>11) Again. Road is wide enough and straight enough for 100km/h. Lowering will just create frustrated drivers</p> <p>13) Same as above</p> <p>14) 60 is too far. 80 is fair enough. There are many straights which you can comfortably do 80 on</p> <p>15) You'll just create frustrated drivers and create more accidents</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) I dont think population build up requires lowering</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
540	Individual submitter	<p>1) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>4) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>5) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>7) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>8) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>9) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>10) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>11) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>13) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>14) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>15) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>16) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>17) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>18) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p> <p>19) Fixing road and drivers capabilities, lowering speed will not lower chances of crashes will only lower fatality rate but not by much</p>
541	Individual submitter	<p>1) This portion of road could be dropped to 80kmh as most of the drivers in the mornings travel at 60-80kmh anyway. This portion of road especially the Bells road intersection (the most badly executed upgrade I have ever seen as it made it more dangerous) makes 80 sensible.</p> <p>4) This portion of road is not builtup in terms of inhabitants per km. The road is flowing and at 100kmh is safe and allows for free flow of traffic.</p> <p>5) This proposed limit can go ahead. I see the sense in it.</p> <p>7) No this should not be changed.</p> <p>8) Agree</p> <p>9) No it should not be changed. The road is wide and non impinged view is good for safe driving and overtaking of vehicles</p> <p>10) Agree</p> <p>11) This portion of road is self regulating anyway as it lends itself to slower initial speed on exiting the Pelorus reserve then opens out to a safe 100kmh.</p> <p>13) You can safely travel at 100kmh until the Rai portion of road and then it becomes self regulating in the type of road and structure of corners.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) Absolutely keep this at 100kmh. Good pull off areas and safe overtaking of turning/slow vehicles.</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) No keep it at 100. Apart from maybe upgrading Cable Bay turnoff the road is safe. The existing passing lane needs to be at 100kmh</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) Please keep this section and speed limits as presently regulated.</p>
542	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't change it.</p> <p>4) Don't change it</p> <p>5) Don't change it</p> <p>7) Don't change it</p>

		8) Don't change it 9) Don't change it 10) Don't change it 11) Don't change it 13) Don't change it 14) Don't change it 15) Don't change it 16) Don't change it 17) Don't change it 18) Don't change it 19) Don't change it
543	Individual submitter	I have just filled in your online submission form. It appears to be designed specifically to discourage submissions. There is nowhere on the form for submitters to simply write that they support the proposed speed reductions or why. You should try it yourself. I thought your paper submission form might be better and visited my local council office (Nelson) for one, as instructed by the article in the Nelson Weekly. They knew nothing about the forms and set about printing the online form for myself and the other woman there for one. We want to make submissions approving the proposed changes, but you are making it hard!! Any changes that you can make to your submission form, even just a Disapprove/Approve button on each question would aid submitters enormously.
544	Individual submitter	1) That I approve. 4) I approve 5) I approve 7) i approve 8) i approve 9) I approve 10) I approve 11) I approve 13) I approve 14) I approve 15) I approve 16) More likelihood of cyclists here. Please reduce the speed 17) Very necessary for improved cyclist safety 18) Necessary change for cyclist safety 19) Necessary change to reduce risk to cyclists
545	Fulton Automotive Nelson	1) No Comment 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment
546	Individual submitter	1) No Comment 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) Not necessary to change the speed limit on this piece of road!

		<p>8) Not necessary to change the speed limit on this piece of road only at school times.</p> <p>9) Not at all necessary. Drivers slow to the conditions as it is. Often drivers we drive at 80km and now the restrictions will make it even slower and driver frustration more causing overtaking in dangerous places!</p> <p>10) The same as stated previously. Not needed</p> <p>11) Same as before. Not needed</p> <p>13) Same as before. Not needed</p> <p>14) Same as earlier stated. Not needed</p> <p>15) Same as before. Not needed</p> <p>16) Same as before. Not needed</p> <p>17) Same as before. Not needed</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
547	Individual submitter	<p>1) Straight piece of road, lots of visibility so don't think there is a problem with this piece of road</p> <p>4) Straight piece of road, lots of visibility so don't think there is a problem with this piece of road</p> <p>5) This makes sense, built up area</p> <p>7) Nothing wrong with the current speed limit on this section</p> <p>8) Nothing wrong with the current speed limit on this section except agree about the school zone exclusion</p> <p>9) Nothing wrong with the current speed limit on this section</p> <p>10) This is often a busy section of road with lots of cars stopping and tourists, I agree to reduce speed through here</p> <p>11) The first piece of road coming out of Pelorus Bridge is quite difficult but don't think the reduced speed needs to go all the way to Rai Valley, just through the windy, uneven bit</p> <p>13) Speed restriction only needed once start claiming the Whangamoia Hills</p> <p>14) Speed restriction only needed once start claiming the Whangamoia Hills till when it straightens out at the bottom</p> <p>15) Nothing wrong with the current speed limit on this section</p> <p>16) Nothing wrong with the current speed limit on this section</p> <p>17) Nothing wrong with the current speed limit on this section</p> <p>18) Nothing wrong with the current speed limit on this section</p> <p>19) Agree, still seems a built up area</p>
548	Individual submitter	<p>1) I do not understand the need to reduce this as it is a straight piece of road</p> <p>4) It is not speed that is the problem</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Have more driver education free rather than reducing speed</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) Most people are not doing 100 km in this area due to the riads</p> <p>14) Ridiculous reduction proposed!</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
549	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't change it. Leave the speed limit at 100 km/h. It doesn't need changing.</p> <p>4) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>5) Don't change it. Leave it at 70 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>7) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>8) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>9) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>10) Change it</p> <p>11) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p>

		<p>13) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>14) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>15) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>18) Don't change it. Leave it at 80 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p> <p>19) Don't change it. Leave it at 100 km/h. It doesn't need to be changed!</p>
550	Individual submitter	<p>1) There is no requirement for this road to be 80kph. There are no dangerous turnings, there is good visibility and the road is in good condition.</p> <p>4) This is absolutely insane. The road there is in good condition, has good visibility and has no dangerous turns.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This is not a necessary change</p> <p>8) This is not a necessary change</p> <p>9) This is not a necessary change</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This is not a necessary change</p> <p>13) Okay sure</p> <p>14) 80. 60 is not necessary</p> <p>15) Not necessary</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Not necessary</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
551	Individual submitter	<p>1) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>4) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>5) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>7) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>8) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>9) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>10) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>11) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>13) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>14) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>15) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>16) There is no change?</p> <p>17) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>18) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p> <p>19) Speed isn't the problem, it's idiots behind the wheel. Lowering the speed is just going to cause more accidents because of all the impatient drivers. Educate people, stop dropping the limits.</p>
552	Individual submitter	<p>1) I believe this is a straight and safe piece of road therefore 100km/h is a safe speed limit.</p> <p>4) I believe this is a safe piece of road therefore 100km/h is a safe speed limit. To increase safety, i think a few passing lanes would be a great addition to allow faster traffic to pass slower moving traffic safely</p> <p>5) no</p> <p>7) I believe this is non technical section of road therefore 100km/h is a safe speed limit.</p> <p>8) I believe this is non technical section of road therefore 100km/h is a safe speed limit.</p> <p>9) I believe this is non technical section of road therefore 100km/h is a safe speed limit.</p> <p>10) no</p> <p>11) I believe this is non technical section of road therefore 100km/h is a safe speed limit. A passing lane could help ease frustration faster drivers experience when behind slow moving traffic</p> <p>13) I feel the section should start at the small straight by Mt Richmond Motels and the 80km zone should continue until serpentine straight</p> <p>14) I feel the 60km speed limited should start at the end of the passing lane and continue until Hira.</p> <p>15) no</p> <p>16) no</p>

		<p>17) i feel this is a non technical section of road at 100km/h is safe.</p> <p>18) Keep it as 80km/h</p> <p>19) no</p>
553	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) I see no need to specify this speed limit - there are stretches of road where 100 is safe, and others you need to slow down. Have some faith in drivers' judgement.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) I see no need to specify this speed limit - there are stretches of road where 100 is safe, and others you need to slow down. Have some faith in drivers' judgement.</p> <p>8) happy with the variable limit around the school</p> <p>9) I see no need to specify this speed limit - there are stretches of road where 100 is safe, and others you need to slow down. Have some faith in drivers' judgement.</p> <p>10) ok</p> <p>11) I see no need to specify this speed limit - there are stretches of road where 100 is safe, and others you need to slow down. Have some faith in drivers' judgement.</p> <p>13) I see no need to specify this speed limit - there are stretches of road where 100 is safe, and others you need to slow down. Have some faith in drivers' judgement.</p> <p>14) I see no need to specify this speed limit - there are stretches of road where 100 is safe, and others you need to slow down. Have some faith in drivers' judgement.</p> <p>15) I see no need to specify this speed limit - there are stretches of road where 100 is safe, and others you need to slow down. Have some faith in drivers' judgement.</p> <p>16) good idea</p> <p>17) I see no need to specify this speed limit - there are stretches of road where 100 is safe, and others you need to slow down. Have some faith in drivers' judgement.</p> <p>18) ok</p> <p>19) ok</p>
554	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is reasonable, with entry and exit to the airport involved and in between two townships of Blenheim and Renwick</p> <p>4) On an open stretch of road, there are those who will reduce even further from proposed 80km, causing frustration, leading to unwise passing. 100km means more vehicles stay on the left-hand side of the road, (more safety). The area which leads off to Rapaura Road just before the Wairau Bridge heading for Nelson (just out of Renwick) is a dangerous area and should be 80km til over the bridge.</p> <p>5) A country area and fine at 70km. There are trucks and buses using this 114km stretch who have schedules to keep to, and I doubt your estimate of only 9 mins added to the journey.</p> <p>7) As your spokesman stated in the Nelson Mail, whether a driver is doing 100km or 80km an hour, the results of a head-on crash are still severe injury or death. Remove poles, widen sections of road and put in more passing lanes on open stretches.</p> <p>8) It has been 100km per hour for years. Keep 100km on open road straight stretches, widen roads, remove poles, put in passing lanes. Limit frustration of drivers. Keep them on the left hand side where it is safe.</p> <p>9) Keep at 100km. It is a long journey as it is, prevent driver frustration and risky passing by maintaining 100km speed limit. It is unreasonable to make it 80 and allow driving at 70 and 75km as legal, when it holds up drivers with appointments at hospital, truck and bus drivers on schedules, leads to risky behaviour.</p> <p>10) Agree with year round 60km approaching Pelorus Bridge from both sides - a one-way bridge requires a cautious approach.</p> <p>11) Retain at 100km on this stretch. Widen road, more passing lanes, remove any dangerous poles, keep drivers on the left at 100km, not passing in frustration with others doing 70/75/80km.</p> <p>13) This is a newly improved, widened section of hill road, it should remain at 100km, why improve it if people have to crawl up it and down it at 80km? Just does not make sense.</p> <p>14) This is a variable area of turns and straights, where in some parts it is safe to travel above 60km. Signs suggesting a safe limit, drive with care, with driver sense being used.</p> <p>15) 80km is fine, no point in doing more on this short section, with Hira area immediately following.</p> <p>16) Fine</p> <p>17) An area with passing lane, requires 100km to use safely and return to left lane asp.</p> <p>18) Keep at 80km. Clifton Terrace school is off the main road with its own parking area off the main road. No school bus should stop on the main highway.</p> <p>19) Consistent speed of 80 all along Atawhai Drive from Clifton Terrace school to roundabout is a good move.</p>
555	Individual submitter	<p>The 100kph limit is fine. Because the road is heavy with large trucks most of the daylight hours because there are no trains. I find truck drivers fantastic always stopping to allow traffic congestion to flow. Large volume of traffic during the summer. We need trains. During summer months due to the above I need to leave sooner for work because of traffic going too slow, with few areas of passing. Reducing speed would just cause frustration.</p>
556	Individual submitter	<p>1) agree</p> <p>4) agree</p> <p>5) agree</p> <p>7) agree</p> <p>8) agree</p> <p>9) agree</p> <p>10) agree</p> <p>11) agree</p> <p>13) agree</p>

		<p>14) agree  15) agree  16) agree  17) agree  18) agree  19) agree</p>
557	Individual submitter	<p>I would like to submit that these proposed changes are totally unnecessary. What you don't seem to be aware of, is that the speed is not the issue on this stretch of road. No matter what the speed limit is, there are always going to be 'idiots' that take dangerous risks. Some get away with it, others unfortunately cause accidents and even death sometimes. As far as I can see, all the lowering of the speed limits will do is to cause MORE impatience and dangerous manoeuvres, as there will be more holdups &amp; less ability to get past slow drivers, and trucks etc. The lowering of the limit to 80km/hr will in effect mean you will not be able to pass a truck, or heavy slow vehicle even on a passing lane, as you are likely to get a speeding ticket while trying to overtake.</p> <p>The lower speed limits will also mean a much longer trip between Nelson and Blenheim, which in turn will increase the freight costs, as drivers will be on the road longer, and this in turn will increase the price of goods.</p> <p>Please reconsider these proposed changes, and just put more police cars on the road to try and target the people actually breaking the law now!</p>
558	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment</p> <p>18) I live at 1 Mary bank Road. I have a young son who is five and attends Clifton Terrace School. I will not allow him to walk, scooter or bike to school because I do not feel it is safe when there are trucks and cars going past him at 100km an hour. I support the decision to change the speed limit from 80 km/ph to 60 km/ph for this reason. I also find it EXTREMELY terrifying when I am on State Highway 6 waiting to turn right into Marybank Road and am unfortunate enough to have trucks coming both ways at 100+km an hour as I am stuck between them. My son's friends Lenny(4) and Nina (2) live across the road and they often cross the road to go and play with each other. We have aproblem with 'boy racers' taking the Marybank corner at RIDICULOUS speed, and we are constantly concerned they will hit our children. We hope a speed reduction along our stretch of highway. My son would like a pet but, because of the 100km speed limit I am reluctant to get one, as I am afraid they will be hit by traffic at 100km+ and hour trying to cross the road. We have a lot of trucks use our highway and noise wakes us in the morning, I think that a reduced speed limit would also help stop this problem. Finally, my greatest concern is that my son and/or I will be taken out while waiting to turn into Marybank Road by a texting driver. I see them DAILY on my way to and from work driving 100 km/ph while texting along State Highway Six between my home and town. I hope that a reduced speed limit would lower the risk of this happening.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
559	Individual submitter	<p>1) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers  4) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers  5) no  7) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p>

		<p>8) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>9) I lost a sister on this stretch of road and it was not speed that was the factor in the crash but the stupidity of the driver who crossed the center line, neither car was doing over the speed limit</p> <p>10) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>11) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>13) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>14) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>15) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>16) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>17) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>18) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p> <p>19) Think it's a crazy idea is not the speed of cars it's the drivers</p>
560	Individual submitter	<p>1) Gay</p> <p>4) Gay</p> <p>5) Gay</p> <p>7) Gay</p> <p>8) Gay</p> <p>9) Gay</p> <p>10) Gay</p> <p>11) Gay</p> <p>13) Gay</p> <p>14) Gay</p> <p>15) Gay</p> <p>16) Gay</p> <p>17) Gay</p> <p>18) Gay</p> <p>19) Gay</p>
561	Individual submitter	<p>The speed of traffic between Nelson and Marlborough has been factored in to the decisions on funding of the Hospital facilities in Marlborough, much of the facilities and ALL of the specialists are based in Nelson. You are proposing to significantly disadvantage the health and well being of all Marlborough residents we have the highest proportion of old people in NZ.</p> <p>There are a number of factors feeding into the road deaths I can think of a few you might not have thought of. Motor cycle tourism, the Whangamoia is part of a South Island tour of motorcyclist who travel from all over the world to tackle these roads with prejudice. These people are not travellers as such but are using the roads in ways unfriendly to normal traffic.</p> <p>As I mentioned before All of the Medical Specialist are based in Nelson a lot of older couples have to travel to Nelson to get the results, these are often very negative and its not unknown for "Death by truck or tree" to be the result, I don't see how a speed limit change will fix that.</p> <p>The cost of Transport. The speed at which a truck can traverse corners is astounding, I know I own a small fleet of 8X4 Mercedes trucks, try keeping up with one, good luck! A further slowing down of the transport fleet will follow through in costs of everything, some times much more the you would at first think, food, delivery of blood for testing in the laboratory, the viability of a shopping trip to Nelson, the survivability of an ambulance trip to Nelson.</p> <p>Has an ECONOMIST been anywhere near this project? Have you figured out the cost of what you propose on the living.</p>
562	Individual submitter	<p>The only factors that need to be considered with regard to the proposed speed changes on SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson are factors relating to safety. Therefore I am fully in favour of the suggested speed changes.</p>
563	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) No</p>

		<p>5) No</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) No</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) No</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
564	Individual submitter	<p>100kph is not fast. Everyone who gets a licence knows the open road speed limit can not be done on a number of roads. Blenheim to Nelson gets very busy in the summer with tourists. A number of these people go very slow. This leads to frustrated overtaking. I can understand a speed reduction over the Whangamoas but everyone knows you can't do 100kph there. The road from Pelorus to Blenheim is safe, you're penalising everyone for the sake of a few inattentive drivers. When the road is quiet 100kph is not a problem in most parts of the road. By making it 80kph you are restricting drivers from travelling at a reasonable speed. I am opposed to the reduction of speed.</p>
565	Individual submitter	<p>1) Acceptable</p> <p>4) Several safer passing places exist already. Slowing general traffic flow will lead to increased frustration when the road is quite driveable at 100 kmh</p> <p>5) Acceptable, within the town boundary</p> <p>7) Few safer passing places, but road capable of speeds greater than 80. Perhaps 90 kmh.</p> <p>8) Acceptable</p> <p>9) Frustration generated by inability to use at least two good straights for passing. Road quite suitable for 100 kmh speeds</p> <p>10) Acceptable</p> <p>11) Frustration levels rise when speed limit is lower than road conditions would allow. Inability to use straights for passing.</p> <p>13) Acceptable</p> <p>14) Acceptable - excellent idea</p> <p>15) Acceptable</p> <p>16) Acceptable</p> <p>17) Road conditions allow for 100 kmh safely at present - no need to reduce speeds.</p> <p>18) Unnecessary drop. Good visibility on intersections. Good road widths.</p> <p>19) Acceptable. If (16) is left at 80kmh, there would be an easier, smoother traffic flow without the need to slow down and speed up again in a relatively short distance on the overall route surveyed.</p>
566	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) We have to travel two hours to get to Nelson and 80 k makes it a very long trip Police should be getting the people that go over 100 k I always have people overtaking on the high way so they must be going 110 k there is always at least 6 of them in my travels stop them not lower it to 80</p> <p>5) 50 is very slow</p> <p>7) To slow</p> <p>8) To slow</p> <p>9) To slow</p> <p>10) To slow</p> <p>11) To slow</p> <p>13) To slow</p> <p>14) To slow</p> <p>15) To slow</p> <p>16) To slow</p> <p>17) To slow</p> <p>18) To slow</p> <p>19) To slow</p>

567	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No</li> <li>4) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>5) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>7) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>8) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>9) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>10) More signage up state it's a one lane bridge and who has right of was for the tourists</li> <li>11) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>13) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>14) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>15) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>16) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>17) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>18) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> <li>19) Need passing lanes to make it safer to pass</li> </ul>
568	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No</li> <li>4) This isn't going to stop the crashes in fact it will probably increase them</li> <li>5) No</li> <li>7) Again this is not going to fix the issues</li> <li>8) No</li> <li>9) This is not going to stop the issues</li> <li>10) 60 is a good idea with all the foot traffic</li> <li>11) This is not going to fix the issues</li> <li>13) This is not going to fix the issues</li> <li>14) This is not going to fix the issues</li> <li>15) This is not going to fix the issues</li> <li>16) No</li> <li>17) This is not going to fix the issues</li> <li>18) No</li> <li>19) No</li> </ul>
569	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No. Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>4) No. Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>5) No, keep it at 70</li> <li>7) No. Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>8) No. Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>9) No. Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>10) No. Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>11) Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>13) Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>14) Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>15) Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>16) Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>17) Keep it at 100km/h</li> <li>18) Keep it at 80!</li> <li>19) Keep it at 100km/h</li> </ul>
570	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The road is flat and straight. Driving conditions are normally good. There is no reason to reduce the speed limit.</li> <li>4) This section of the highway is arguably the best in terms of road conditions. Speed limit should be retained at 100 kph.</li> <li>5) No objection to reducing speed limit on this section of SH6.</li> <li>7) Speed limit should be retained, as is.</li> <li>8) Variable school zone is ok. Otherwise no change.</li> </ul>

		<p>9) No need to reduce speed on this section of SH6.</p> <p>10) No objection to reduction of speed in this zone.</p> <p>11) No reduction to speed limit necessary.</p> <p>13) No reduction in speed limit necessary</p> <p>14) Proposed change is too much. Would support reduction to 80 kph.</p> <p>15) No reduction necessary.</p> <p>16) Support proposed changes.</p> <p>17) No reduction necessary.</p> <p>18) No reduction necessary, but improvements to road surfacing, which is disgraceful for a state highway.</p> <p>19) No reduction necessary. Maintain road surface properly please. It is in a disgraceful state.</p>
571	Individual submitter	<p>I have had a drivers license for a long time and feel qualified to pass judgment on the speed review on State Highway 6.</p> <p>In my view I feel reducing the max speed to 80 kph would absolutely have a very minimal effect if any, to a reduced accident rate on this road. It is slow traffic that causes problems and it's not always trucks either. There are some very good stretches of road on SH6 where 100 kph is fine and the rest is plain common sense.</p> <p>Please don't alter the present speed limit, it is fine.</p>
572	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>4) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>5) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>7) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>8) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>9) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>10) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>11) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>13) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>14) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>15) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>16) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>17) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>18) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p> <p>19) I think speed limits should stay the same and that driver sensibility is the factor here. You are always going to get snails and rabbits no matter what the speed is set at.</p>
573	Individual submitter	<p>1) Widen the road and put a 2.5 meter median strip down the middle for any turning vehicles and KEEP THE SPEED LIMIT AT 100km/h.</p> <p>4) Straighten out the corners north and south of Okaramio. Put in at least 1 passing lane each way between Renwick and Havelock. Put in center barriers at the worst patches of road and KEEP THE SPEED LIMIT AT 100 km/h. The NZ government need to spend some money on roads rather than wasting it on rail which no one uses and it only becomes a liability to the government. Lowering the speed limit on this section of road is a band-aid tactic that does not fix the root cause of the problem which in most cases is vehicles crossing the center line.</p> <p>5) Put in a median strip.</p> <p>7) Widen the road in the worst patches and put in median barriers. A vehicle crossing the center line at 80 km/h and hitting another vehicle could still result in a fatality but a center barrier will prevent this even when vehicles are travelling at 100 km/h. The NZTA should look around NZ at all the roads with center barriers and count up the number of times those barriers have been hit and that will roughly be the number of head-on crashes that have been prevented. Regardless of the cost, center barriers actually save lives. Dropping the speed limit to 80km/h does not. On this section of road it would be wise to KEEP THE SPEED LIMIT AT 100 km/h.</p> <p>8) Spend some money, widen the road and put in a median strip.</p> <p>9) This is a good piece of road but a passing lane both ways would be an improvement. Once again the NZTA should spend some money on median barriers. A median barrier only has to save one life and it's paid for itself regardless of how much it cost. A bunch of signs with 80 printed on them might be the cheapest option, but they WILL NOT SAVE LIVES. The speed limit on this piece of road should stay at 100 km/h and as many safety improvements as possible should be done regardless of the cost. The government has got a big surplus at the moment and it could be even bigger if they didn't waste money on rail projects that no one will use.</p> <p>10) Improve visibility either side of the bridge for approaching traffic.</p> <p>11) Leave the speed limit at 100 km/h for this entire section of road. Straighten the 2km of road north of Bulford road. Straighten the 1.5km section of road north of Pelorus bridge. How about putting in some median barriers because they actually save lives whereas lowering the speed limit to 80 doesn't.</p> <p>13) It is very critical that the speed limit on this section of road stays at 100 km/h. Lowering it to 80 would be very counter productive. To improve the road, the NZTA could straighten out the</p>

		<p>worst patches of the road through the Collins valley and straighten out the corners between the Rai Saddle Summit and Kokorua road. Another thing this road needs is a whole bunch of 'Traffic behind you - Let it pass' signs. These signs need to be erected on all state highways around NZ. Widen bad patches of the road and put in median barriers because these actually stop vehicles crossing the center line whereas 80km/h signs don't.</p> <p>14) The NZTA needs to get it's act together on this piece of road and straighten it out because it's about 30 years overdue. Whether the speed limit is 100 or 60 on this piece of road won't make any difference because people just drive to the conditions. The NZTA should spend whatever it will cost to get this road straightened out and get it done urgently. Lowering the speed limit to 60 is not going to improve the condition of the road because most of the traffic only travels at 60 now anyway.</p> <p>15) Leave the speed limit at 100 km/h. Widen the road and put slow vehicle bays going both ways along the straight and put in a Median barrier.</p> <p>16) No.</p> <p>17) The speed limit should stay at 100 km/h for this section. Make wider and longer turning lanes into Cable Bay road from both directions. Put in a median barrier all the way over the Gentle Annie hill. Put in long, wide turning lanes to Glen road. Between Glen road and Allisdair street the road could be widened in some places and put in median strips. Also improve visibility for cars pulling out of side roads especially Boulder Bank drive. And please don't lower the speed limit.</p> <p>18) The NZTA should just leave the speed limit at 80 for this section. The NZ economy is going slow enough now without being slowed down anymore. NZ should be trying to increase it's productivity, not make it any worse.</p> <p>19) Just don't make any decision on this piece of road all will be absolutely fine. Everyone will live happily ever after. But if NZTA do want to make a decision on this piece of road they should decide to put in a passing lane heading south-west and put in a few median barriers. AND LEAVE THE SPEED LIMIT AT 100 km/h.</p>
574	CMT Group	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Yes!!! This is crazy! This will only jamm up the roads more and lead to more crazy passing acts and ultimately more deaths!</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Yes this is ridiculous!! Its a perfectly fine piece of road!</p> <p>8) This one makes sense with the school etc</p> <p>9) Crazy again!! I drive this road every week and there is absolutely no need to reduce the 100km/h limit on these good stretches of road! All it will do it congest the roads ultimately reducing productivity! I thought the government wants to increase productivity?? This is a move in the opposite direction!</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Again a brainless idea!</p> <p>13) No need for this at all</p> <p>14) Why on earth doesn't NZTA actually look at improving this stretch of road rather than the easy option of dropping the limit? This whole concept is warped!</p> <p>15) Again a stupid idea</p> <p>16) Makes sense</p> <p>17) Again no need for this. This stretch of road should be a 2 lane each way road to increase traffic flow. NZTA have got the wrong idea</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) Again crazy</p>
575	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree</p> <p>4) I agree</p> <p>5) I agree</p> <p>7) I agree</p> <p>8) I agree</p> <p>9) I agree</p> <p>10) I agree</p> <p>11) I agree</p> <p>13) I agree</p> <p>14) I agree</p> <p>15) I agree</p> <p>16) I agree</p> <p>17) I agree</p> <p>18) I agree</p> <p>19) I agree</p>
576	Vintners Retreat	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) Yes, dropping the limit will cause (some) people more frustration and that in turn will cause them to overtake at silly times, in silly spots. This will cause more accidents, purely because of frustration. Trucks need to be doing at least 90km, to get up some of those hills, dropping them down to 80km, will just slow everyone down. The road is 'open' and really should stay at 100kms.</p> <p>5) I agree with this change.</p>

		<p>7) Yes, dropping the limit will cause (some) people more frustration and that in turn will cause them to overtake at silly times, in silly spots. This will cause more accidents, purely because of frustration. Trucks need to be doing at least 90km, to get up some of those hills, dropping them down to 80km, will just slow everyone down. The road is 'open' and really should stay at 100kms.</p> <p>8) Yes, dropping the limit will cause (some) people more frustration and that in turn will cause them to overtake at silly times, in silly spots. This will cause more accidents, purely because of frustration. Trucks need to be doing at least 90km, to get up some of those hills, dropping them down to 80km, will just slow everyone down. The road is 'open' and really should stay at 100kms.</p> <p>9) Yes, dropping the limit will cause (some) people more frustration and that in turn will cause them to overtake at silly times, in silly spots. This will cause more accidents, purely because of frustration. Trucks need to be doing at least 90km, to get up some of those hills, dropping them down to 80km, will just slow everyone down. The road is 'open' and really should stay at 100kms.</p> <p>10) I don't know this section of road.</p> <p>11) I don't know this section of road.</p> <p>13) I don't know this section of road.</p> <p>14) I don't know this section of road.</p> <p>15) I don't know this section of road.</p> <p>16) I don't know this section of road.</p> <p>17) I don't know this section of road.</p> <p>18) I don't know this section of road.</p> <p>19) I don't know this section of road.</p>
577	Individual submitter	<p>Please stop the debilitating procrastination and just do it. It is irresponsible of any authority to allow dangerous speeds to continue on substandard roads. Why roading engineers are allowed to escape liability for negligence in not addressing our woefully inadequate regional state highways is disturbing. Any private operator who , in similar situations didn't ensure safety standards are met would be sued. Your records of deaths do not include the many that occurred prior to the dates quoted. Apart from the single fatalities, on two occasions four people were killed at once, how it doesn't happen more often is surprising so please, until new roads are designed for modern speeds get out there tomorrow and change the signs. I would not like to have to sit with a mother and her dead son again as I have had to experience in the past.</p> <p>As for the cost of adequate roading . The government has declared a five billion surplus so any argument that finances aren't available is unacceptable.</p> <p>No more time wasting on repeat after repeat of fruitless consultation, make the responsible decision to hopefully avoid anymore unnecessary deaths.</p>
578	Individual submitter	<p>Happy to leave sections 11,7,8, 9 &amp; 4 as 100km w/drivers to adjust speed as needed by road. Strongly agree to reduce speed 14-19 particularly near Hura School and the corner near the Glen turnoff.</p>
579	Highrev Limited	<p>1) Leave it at 100!</p> <p>4) Leave it at 100!</p> <p>5) 50 here is ok but 70 works aswell so leave it at 70</p> <p>7) Its a straight road why the hell would you want it to be 80.. Leave it at 100 for god sake</p> <p>8) Same as before.. If ya can't drive at 100 you shouldn't be on the road</p> <p>9) Couldn't find a safer piece of road if i tried.. Leave it at 100</p> <p>10) Im ok with lowering this to 60 as thats what i do here anyways</p> <p>11) Theres no need to be 80 as its a easy drive.. Leave at 100 please</p> <p>13) 100 is fine.</p> <p>14) 60km/h your hardly moving... Leave it as is.</p> <p>15) Just leave it as is!</p> <p>16) No issues with this</p> <p>17) 80km/h id probably fall asleep at the wheel so wake me up and let me drive at 100</p> <p>18) 80 is already slow through there so just leave it</p> <p>19) Just leave it at 100.. Lowering the speed limit isn't the issue on the road its the lack of driver training!</p>
580	Individual submitter	<p>1) This road is a good basically straight road with plenty good visibility, many areas have double yellow lines which deter reckless driving so for this reason I see it is not necessary to lower the limit. I travel this stretch of the road 5 days out of 7 and very rarely get above 90 kmph. Dropping this area to 80k would see the average speed drop to 70k</p> <p>4) We have modern cars with airbags, traction control plus many other safety devices and you propose us to go slower. Perhaps NZTA should bring in maximum speed limits for cars without all the modern safety devices. No Airbags max speed 80kmph</p> <p>5) Is this an area with high levels of pedestrians, if not there is no reason to lower to 50 which would mean 40kmph when adding the "Tourist Factor"</p> <p>7) Road is reasonable quality and I cannot see how it can be justified lowering the limit</p> <p>8) 100kmph is fine I would suggest 50 variable during school periods</p> <p>9) Justification for lowering would be what? Number of deaths? How many this year in this location?</p> <p>10) Justification for lowering would be what? Number of deaths? How many this year in this location</p> <p>11) Justification for lowering would be what? Number of deaths? How many this year in this location</p> <p>13) Justification for lowering would be what? Number of deaths? How many this year in this location</p>

		<p>14) Justification for lowering would be what? Number of deaths? How many this year in this location</p> <p>15) Justification for lowering would be what? Number of deaths? How many this year in this location</p> <p>16) 100kmph and 50kmph for variable speed for school times</p> <p>17) Justification for lowering would be what? Number of deaths? How many this year in this location</p> <p>18) Leave at 80kmph</p> <p>19) Justification for lowering would be what? Number of deaths? How many this year in this location</p>
581	Individual submitter	<p>I support the proposed speed restriction.</p> <p>I am a cyclist and will be using this bit of road in early March 2020.</p> <p>I don't want to die.</p> <p>I would invite anyone who supports the higher speed restriction to spend a day cycling in the area to get some understanding of just how scary it is having the speeding cars pass just "oh so close".</p> <p>Crazy.</p> <p>Just slowing down a little makes a huge difference - and the lower speed limits will save lives, - maybe mine.</p> <p>It really is time this nonsense idea of car drivers owning all the road comes to terms with other peoples safety. They drive sensibly in France.</p> <p>Why not here ?</p> <p>Egality, Fraternity Liberty</p>
582	Individual submitter	<p>1) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>4) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>5) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>7) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>8) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>9) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>10) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>11) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will</p>

		<p>reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>13) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>14) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>15) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>16) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>17) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>18) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p> <p>19) Teach people to drive motor vehicles correctly. Current legal requirements and codes of practice are perfectly suited to every motoring circumstance. The total issue with road safety rests with a lack of adequate education for new licence applicants and a corresponding total lack of policing for the matters that really contribute to unnecessary deaths on our roads. Prevention is better than cure and until the NZTA recognises this and does something to address the lack of education and the carefree way in which new applicants are taught - NOTHING you do with speed limits will reduce the senseless loss of life that the Agency presides over.</p>
583	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) No</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) No</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) No</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
584	Individual submitter	<p>Tena koe,</p> <p>I would like to support the proposal to change speed limits from 100km to 80km along sections of the SH6 Blenheim to Nelson road. I have driven this road frequently, doing the return trip from Nelson to Blenheim often within a single day as part of a regular work trip. While many stretches of the road demand a moderate speed due to frequent bends and tight corners, on the longer stretches I often feel under pressure to drive faster or to pull over to allow other cars to pass. It can be difficult to find sections of road that are safe for passing.</p>

		<p>A lower speed limit would make for a safer driving experience, with less pressure on cars to 'speed up' to the 100km limit.</p> <p>I have heard about many accidents over the years along this driving route, and would certainly support any changes intended to make this road safer. Lowering speed limits is a great way to make these kind of roads safer. I am fully supportive of this approach.</p>
585	Individual submitter	<p>Roads do not cause accidents- bad driving does.</p> <p>The speed limits should remain as they are. Drivers who cause accidents should be made to take a driving instruction course before they are allowed to drive again.</p> <p>Most drivers do not drive to the limit - we have experienced a limit reduced from 70 to 50 and now when I drive that road we are doing 35 or 40 max.</p> <p>Your calculation of an extra nine mins is no doubt calculated on 100 versus 80 whereas in reality we will be driving at 60 - it will cause more accidents through frustration.</p> <p>Totally opposed to change of limit on any stretch of the road.</p>
586	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave at 100  4) Leave at 100  5) Change to 50  7) Leave at 100  8) Leave at 100, 60 for schools is good  9) Leave at 100  10) Change to 60  11) Leave at 100  13) Leave at 100  14) Leave at 100  15) Leave at 100  16) 80 is fine  17) Leave at 100  18) Leave at 80  19) Leave at 100</p>
587	Individual submitter	<p>I write in regards to the proposal to reduce the speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson to 80kmh.</p> <p>As a regular user of this road I am totally against this and strongly advocate for the speed limit to be kept at 100kmh.</p> <p>I am surprised at the seemly one-eyed approach of NZTA in regards to the cause of accidents on our roads.</p> <p>Speed is promoted as being the cause or major contributing factor, however I would challenge this, and venture to suggest that the real root cause of so many of our accidents is in fact frustration.</p> <p>I appreciate that road users could be broken up into many type of demographics, for this example take the following 3 groups:</p> <p>A to B travellers – people that want to travel A-B and get there as quickly, safely and efficiently as possible. Like many regular road users, drive according to the conditions and know that many stretches of this road can safely be traveling at speeds at around 100kmh. These drivers, are often held up by the following two groups, resulting in frustration:</p> <p>Heavy transport – trucks and buses. The drivers of these units have typically got professional training and are very aware and considerate of the road conditions and other travellers. Typically these drivers will let traffic past and ease the frustration of hold-ups at first opportunity.</p> <p>Scenic travellers – these include those that seem to have all the time in the world to get there, with most being Tourists. These drivers are often driving unaware of the great trail of traffic behind them. This leads to other road users making bad choices in when to pass through frustration. This would be by far the main contributor to any unsafe driving that I have seen on our open roads. However I do note that these “road lice” are also a key contributor to our tourist economy.</p> <p>With this is mind, can I suggest that in the absence of making the road 4 lanes, that the following are options are considered in order to help reduce the frustration on our roads.</p> <p>More pull over areas and passing lanes for slow traffic.</p> <p>Keep these well sign posted – “passing lane in 2.5km” informs all road users of opportunity to allow passing or to pass.</p> <p>Obligate Rental companies to inform visiting tourist drivers how to pull over when traffic behind, along with keeping left, etc.</p> <p>For areas of Tourist attraction, have national camera symbol and a pull over areas for tourists to take advantage of the attraction without hindering the safety of other road users. Example of this is at Hawks Crag, West Coast.</p> <p>In regards to bikes, could the Mangatapu track be improved and promoted as a alternative route to Nelson – this would make a great extension to the great taste trail.</p> <p><a href="https://www.heartofbiking.org.nz/other-trails/cycle-touring-routes/mangatapu-track/">https://www.heartofbiking.org.nz/other-trails/cycle-touring-routes/mangatapu-track/</a></p>

588	Individual submitter	<p>For the last umpteen years the road has been set at 100kms. And for the 99% of road users this have been perfectly adequate. Considering the statistics of past crashes the reason for the crash has not been the speed but the way drivers have reacted or driven there vehicles. By lowering the limit you do not fix the problem but merely increase the frustration that causes a majority of crashes in the first place.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allow for better passing and or turning ability. Alleviating the need to pass dangerously. And risk of a crash.</li> <li>2. teach drivers and foreign drivers( to which an staggering amount of bad driving is displayed from tourists etc)to driver considerately and safely instead of punishing the good drivers just trying to get from place to place.</li> </ol> <p>Common sense people, how hard can it be. Stop being a cop out and face the proper issue. Drivers not the roads.</p>
589	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Keep the speed limit the same. More passing lanes</li> <li>4) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>5) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>7) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>8) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>9) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>10) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>11) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>13) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>14) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>15) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>16) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>17) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>18) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> <li>19) Keep the speed limit the same more passing lanes</li> </ol>
590	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Yes why not Rapaura road too. Three different sped Limits - accidents waiting to happen Trucks bikes and 100km plus per hour. Jackson's/ Gifford's road is the WORST and Jackson's middle Ren I hope the speed limits are being looked at there too</li> <li>4) No</li> <li>5) Should have been done years ago!</li> <li>7) No</li> <li>8) No this is great</li> <li>9) No comment</li> <li>10) No Comment</li> <li>11) No Comment</li> <li>13) No Comment</li> <li>14) No Comment</li> <li>15) No Comment</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) No Comment</li> <li>18) No Comment</li> <li>19) No Comment</li> </ol>
591	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It shouldn't be changed its a very fair speed for open road</li> <li>4) Should stay the same</li> <li>5) Residential its understandable</li> <li>7) Should stay the same</li> <li>8) Stay 100</li> <li>9) Stay the same</li> <li>10) Stay the same</li> <li>11) Stay the same</li> <li>13) Stay the same</li> <li>14) Stay the same</li> <li>15) Stay the same</li> </ol>

		<p>16) Stay the same  17) Stay the same  18) Stay the same  19) Stay the same</p>
592	Individual submitter	<p>1) Better driver training/ better road conditions, alcohol and drug testing, better car inspections  4) see above  5) see above  7) see above  8) see above  9) see above  10) speeds dont need to be reduced is all training  11) see above  13) see above  14) driver training  15) driver training  16) advanced driver training, including tourists and campervan and house bus testing  17) see above  18) see above  19) No Comment</p>
593	Individual submitter	<p>1) Slow drivers don't concentrate, slow speeds cause people to not concentrate  4) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  5) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  7) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  8) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  9) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  10) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  11) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  13) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  14) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  15) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  16) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  17) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  18) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert  19) Slow drivers don't concentrate Speed keeps drivers alert</p>
594	Individual submitter	<p>1) If it ain't broke dont fix it. It's a straight peice of road that doesnt need fixing  4) Passing lanes instead of speed change  5) No  7) Passing lanes instead of speed change  8) Passing lanes instead of speed change  9) Passing lanes instead of speed change  10) 80kmh  11) Passing lanes instead of speed change  13) Passing lanes instead of speed change  14) Passing lanes instead of speed change  15) Passing lanes instead of speed change  16) Passing lanes instead of speed change  17) Passing lanes instead of speed change  18) Make the road safer instead of taking the easy way out and dropping the speed limit  19) Make the road safer instead of taking the easy way out and dropping the speed limit</p>

595	Individual submitter	<p>1) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>4) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>5) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>7) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>8) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>9) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>10) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>11) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>13) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>14) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>15) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>16) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>17) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>18) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p> <p>19) Unnecessary delays to travel and increased frustration among ordinary drivers that could increase the number of overtaking manoeuvres and the risk of a crash.</p>
596	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) I just wanted to say when I read that the proposed new limit was 60 to and around Clifton Terrace School it brought a tear to my eye as it's just so dangerous and it was only yesterday that a new entrant tried to do a runner and was caught very close to the 100k highway with massive trucks and traffic hurtling past. I hate to think what would have happened if he'd managed to get just a little further. We live at 48 Wakapuaka Road, so only 800m north of the school and its impossible to walk there and even too scary for my eldest to catch a bus into town where she goes to school as going anywhere near the road is too dangerous. I think what you're proposing in this area is highly needed and overdue with the amount of development in the area and increased traffic. I commend your decision and look forward to a safer road for our children and families.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
597	Individual submitter	<p>1) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>4) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>5) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>7) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>8) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>9) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>10) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>11) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>13) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>14) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>15) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>16) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>17) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections.</p> <p>18) opposed - refer to reasons under section 17 below. These reasons/ factors apply to all sections. The cycle path between Marybank Rd and Sybil Way is very narrow and used heavily by school kids. Reducing the speed limit to 60 in this section will not prevent an accident. can you please install a barrier (similar to the fenced section between Tui Glen Rd and Bayview Rd) along the narrow stretch to prevent small children falling onto the road.</p>

		<p>19) Cutting down speed limits will not change things . NZTA are only trying to make their reputation look better . When they hand out survey results showing increased road tolls, they should also include other details, e.g. how much more traffic flow is on a road built back in the 1960s or how many of the accidents were a result of drunk drivers/ influence of drugs, or tourists. If more money was spent on rebuilding roads to handle current traffic flow, there would be less accidents . slowing speed limits is only going to benefit the nz police . as a professional driver, i have travelled this rd in trucks at 90 km/h plus and can do so safely, so I believe cars can travel safely at 100km/h. cars are now built safer and driver training has improved, so what really needs to improve is the roads/ state highways - rather than lowering the speed limit.</p>
598	Individual submitter	<p>1) In all my traveling along that road there is no reason to slow down the traffic.  4) I do not agree with this proposal  5) I accept in towns as safety does apply  7) Do not agree  8) I agree  9) I do not agree  10) I agree  11) I do not agree  13) I do not agree  14) I do not agree  15) I do not agree  16) Agree  17) I do not agree  18) I do not agree  19) I do not agree</p>
599	Individual submitter	<p>1) this limit should remain as is. Its a straight piece of road with no problems  4) this section of road has many unhindered sections without the need for change.  5) the proposed new speed limit would be good to fit in with the existing 50km/h limit especially on the approach to the built-up area of Havelock  7) should remain as 100 km/h this is a mainly straight road  8) this should be changed to 80 km/h only thru the school zone.  9) leave at 100 km/h  10) yes, lower to 60 km/h as this is a very busy section for pedestrians.  11) leave at the existing limit  13) No Comment  14) yes change to 60. Condition of road self-limits to 60 anyway.  15) leave at 100  16) leave at 80  17) leave at 100  18) leave at 80  19) leave at 100</p>
600	Individual submitter	<p>1) It is a straight bit of road that is in good condition. Plenty wide enough and very safe. The limit was lowered after the earthquakes and put back up again. I dont think the lower speed limit made the road any safer and vice versa  4) I travel this road every day at least two times. The majority of unsafe driving is from either tourists or people who are traveling well above the 100k speed limit. The amount of police presence on this road is virtually non existent. I do not think the speed needs to be reduced but the current speed does need to be policed to make sure people are sticking to it  5) Yes. I agree. It is a built up area with schools and footpaths quite often with children walking home.  7) This road is wide, well maintained and an easy road to drive. I believe that tourists need to be more educated about driving in our country  8) It should be lower than 60 in a school zone.  9) This part of the road is not too windy and not difficult to drive at 100k. I disagree with lowering the speed  10) No  11) Again. Not windy. More education for drivers perhaps  13) Yes this road is windy and you dont really get to 100km/h anyway  14) No  15) Agreed  16) Agreed  17) This is a wide road, well maintained. No issues. Keep it at 100</p>

		18) No 19) No
601	Individual submitter	<p>Have just read a report by Jim Harland one of your regional directors . It is quite clear to me that this person has little knowledge of heavy duty vehicles (trucks trailers and buses ) travelling over the SH6 route. I have been driving and still am heavy motor vehicles all over NZ since arriving here in 1966. I think therefore I do have a little knowledge of road behaviour, I also spent 6 years as an officer of the MOT in Palmerston North and Dunedin .</p> <p>I recently moved here from the Coromandel. A similar situation arose up there where a really dangerous piece of road leading off SH1 at Bombay to the Thames turnoff. Motorists were getting killed regularly. The fix for that road was a restriction to 80Kms but three passing lanes were built into it at the same time. Good lengthy sections. Deaths have reduced considerably so we would have to say that might well be the formula.</p> <p>Now in this proposal it seems you are trying to get a cheap fix which will only make the road more dangerous. I travel this route regularly with a large bus. From Renwick to just about a 1km past Canvastown there is little safe space for any passing but where there is ,as a driver if I have a line of cars behind be remembering my limit is 90kms then I slow down and let them past . So for this section of the highway unless you build in a couple of passing lanes the road should be left at 100. From Canvastown to Nelson for the most of it most vehicles except for a few places would have to stick to around 80kms anyway and by all means make that change. I have spoken to a lot of professional drivers and they all agreed with my thoughts. Most of these accidents are caused by drivers not wanting to get stuck behind a heavy motor vehicle and so by slowing them down over the section mentioned more people are going to take a chance.</p> <p>I have made a submission similar to this letter but there was no provision for personal comments</p>
602	Individual submitter	<p>1) Having uniformity on a highway is advantageous on this section of road</p> <p>4) I drive truck/trailers and large buses , I slow down where I get a build up behind me . On this section there is only one safe spot so slowing me down would not be of any advantage to anyone and will only frustrate those behind me .Better to keep to 100 over this section</p> <p>5) Why change this section , never seems to be much movement so should be left</p> <p>7) better to keep traffic moving in this section not dangerous</p> <p>8) same as previous comments , very nice straight road with excellent visibility and an area I slow down and let cars past if they are there</p> <p>9) Would agree that 80 might be safer owing to the uneven road surface</p> <p>10) Would agree with this change</p> <p>11) Yes again 80 would probably be more suitable</p> <p>13) In a heavy vehicle its operationally good to get a run at the first hill ( less emissions ) but for continuity 80 better for drivers knowing the limits</p> <p>14) Should be left t 80 as its almost impossible to go any faster . Any accident in this area is just plain bad driving . Not the fault of road engineering</p> <p>15) Keep at 80</p> <p>16) Same again</p> <p>17) Same again</p> <p>18) Keep at 80</p> <p>19) Same again 80 Khm</p>
603	LexisNexis New Zealand	<p>1) I travel the road occasionally and have never felt unsafe on this stretch, compared to other stretches of SH6 between Nelson &amp; Blenheim. While speed can be a factor in accidents it is not often the cause, as I will explain in future comments.</p> <p>4) I travel this road regularly for work and personal. I have been involved in one head on accident with a tourist on the wrong side of the road. I would like to see funding come from tourists and go to a driver education program. The road is what it is and this is NZ.</p> <p>5) Have there been any accidents causing injury where speed is the PRIMARY cause that would justify this change? Travelling the road regularly I have seen no issue here at all.</p> <p>7) I travel this road regularly and see no issue. You should actively seek driver experience from Renwick Transport and TNL (Transport Nelson Limited) as they see everything on this stretch of road and can advise you the problems (if any) to put in an EFFECtIVE solution for.</p> <p>8) Same answer as Q4.</p> <p>9) Same answer as Q4 &amp; 5.</p> <p>10) Same answer as Q4, 5 &amp; 6.</p> <p>11) Same answer as Q4, 5, 6, 7 &amp; 8</p> <p>13) In my experience is an area of people driving on the wrong side of the road, having exiting French Pass and Tennyson Inlet, miracously not having hit anyone on these roads (I have had close calls but the corners keep the speeds down for all). Tourism is a major consideration as to a solution for this area. Speed is not a cause of accidents, nor has any bearing on the outcome. Instead I recommend reviewing the road layout, an education programme and considering variable speed restrictions.</p> <p>14) As a regular road user, this seems a rediculously large and unnecessary change. Driver education programmes and variable speed limits due to current conditions are most cost effective. Esp. given the ability to Police this speed limit. Vehicle design means that, dependant on conditions, you can safely navigate this stretch at higher speeds. Truck drivers are ususally considerate and pull over and I have never seen any driver behaviour that I would describe as 'dying to get there'. Don't dicate, please educate. Easy to see but investing in such things as RYDA (Rotary Young Driver Awareness) can make all the difference, witthout a high cost of infrastructure changes and excessive policing.</p> <p>15) Same answer as Q12</p> <p>16) Same answer as Q12 &amp; 13.</p>

		<p>17) Same answer as Q12, 13 &amp; 14.  18) Same answer as Q12, 13, 14 &amp; 15  19) Same answer as Q12, 13, 14, 15 &amp; 16.</p>
604	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep at 100 its good straight road  4) Keep at 100 its good straight road  5) Existing is fine  7) Keep at 100 its good straight road  8) Proposed is fine  9) Keep at 100 its good straight road or look to increase limit to 110km/h.  10) Proposed is fine  11) Keep at 100 its good straight road  13) Keep at 100 some of it is good straight road and the rest just need to drive to the conditions  14) keep at 100  15) keep at 100  16) fine  17) Keep at 100 its good straight road  18) 80km/h is fine  19) Keep at 100 its good straight road</p>
605	Individual submitter	<p>1) Simply reducing the limit will make very little difference. This will simply result in greater frustration which will lead to more unsafe overtaking manoeuvres being undertaken.  4) As per number one. Additionally greater signage and engineering improvements such as improved road markings and improvement of sight lines will assist here. Overtaking opportunities are few and far between here so lowering the limit will exacerbate this situation.  5) I agree with this proposal.  7) As per number two. This is a popular tourist route and lowering the limit will simply make it harder and therefore more risky to clear people dawdling along this piece of road.  8) The variable school speed zone is a good idea but as per my previous answers the general reduction is not required.  9) As per numbers 4 and 5.  10) Greater signage and markings signifying the single lane bridge would help here. Again lowering the limit on its own does little if nothing to improve driver behaviour.  11) As per my previous answers ref overtaking opportunities and frustration.  13) Engineering improvements would help here, as well as greater signage to give drivers/riders greater information.  14) Such a drastic reduction indicated that this isn't simply about the speed but rather other factors. Surely such a drastic lowering of the limit will simply mask the other issues with this stretch?  So no, I don't support simply lowering the limit in this manner.  15) As per my previous answers, especially number 12.  16) I agree with this proposal.  17) Again, this will simply rob people of valuable overtaking opportunities.  18) Greater policing of the existing limit would help here.  19) I agree with this proposal.</p>
606	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) This road is good and there is no need to reduce the speed limit. It should stay at 100km/hr. There are very few tighter corners on this stretch of road and plenty of stretches where good passing lanes could be put in. The road signage (warning of obscured views of oncoming traffic maybe) and possible suggested cornering speeds on a few bends should be all that is needed. The majority of bad driving I have seen on this stretch is from impatient drivers making bad decisions when passing. Passing on bends is not the road's fault. Driver education and clamping down on bad driving in all situations would change people's attitudes.  5) This is a good idea as there is a larger population in this area than when the speed limits were set.  7) Again, this road should be left at 100km/hr. The road is good, and if drivers drive to the conditions, ie road surface condition, traffic conditions and type of road (straight or corners), then the road is safe. Driver education and clamping down on bad driving in all situations would change people's attitudes to driving in general. Reducing the speed limit will make people who already take risks when driving, take even more risks as they think they have more time. The 2017 consultation showed the majority of people expressed their view that what was needed was more passing lanes to stop drivers taking risks to pass. This is a driver attitude problem, not a road/speed problem. There needs to be money spent on upgrading road warning signage and passing lanes. The road surfaces need to be improved and driver training implemented. A speed reduction will only mask the real problem and may even exasperate it. 80km/hr has been proven overseas to be a very dangerous speed to travel at, the brain goes to sleep. Drivers will switch off and fall asleep more. What happened to the extra barriers and safety improvements that were proposed?  8) I think the lower speed for the school is great, and have no problem with localised speed limits for communities. However the rest of the road should be left at 100km/hr. The road is good, and if drivers drive to the conditions, ie road surface condition (which needs to be improved greatly!), traffic conditions and type of road (straight or corners), then the road is safe. Driver education and clamping down on bad driving in all situations (open road and town driving) would change people's attitudes to driving in general. Reducing the speed limit will make people who already take</p>

		<p>risks when driving, take even more risks as they think they have more time. The 2017 consultation showed the majority of people expressed their view that what was needed was more passing lanes to stop drivers taking risks to pass. This is a driver attitude problem, not a road/speed problem. There needs to be money spend on upgrading road warning signage and passing lanes. The road surfaces need to be improved and driver training implemented. A speed reduction will only mask the real problem and may even exasperate it. 80km/hr has been proven overseas to be a very dangerous speed to travel at, the brain goes to sleep. Drivers will switch off and fall asleep more. What happened to the extra barriers and safety improvements that were proposed?</p> <p>9) This section of road should be left at 100km/hr. The road is good, and if drivers drive to the conditions, ie road surface condition (which needs to be improved greatly!), traffic conditions and type of road (straight or corners), then the road is safe. Driver education and clamping down on bad driving in all situations (open road and town driving) would change people's attitudes to driving in general. Reducing the speed limit will make people who already take risks when driving, take even more risks as they think they have more time. The 2017 consultation showed the majority of people expressed their view that what was needed was more passing lanes to stop drivers taking risks to pass. This is a driver attitude problem, not a road/speed problem. There needs to be money spend on upgrading road warning signage and passing lanes. The road surfaces need to be improved and driver training implemented. A speed reduction will only mask the real problem and may even exasperate it. 80km/hr has been proven overseas to be a very dangerous speed to travel at, the brain goes to sleep. Drivers will switch off and fall asleep more. What happened to the extra barriers and safety improvements that were proposed?</p> <p>10) This is a great idea.</p> <p>11) This road should be left at 100km/hr. The road is good, and if drivers drive to the conditions, ie road surface condition (which needs to be improved greatly!), traffic conditions and type of road (straight or corners), then the road is safe. Driver education and clamping down on bad driving in all situations (open road and town driving) would change people's attitudes to driving in general. Reducing the speed limit will make people who already take risks when driving, take even more risks as they think they have more time. The 2017 consultation showed the majority of people expressed their view that what was needed was more passing lanes to stop drivers taking risks to pass. This is a driver attitude problem, not a road/speed problem. There needs to be money spend on upgrading road warning signage and passing lanes. The road surfaces need to be improved and driver training implemented. A speed reduction will only mask the real problem and may even exasperate it. 80km/hr has been proven overseas to be a very dangerous speed to travel at, the brain goes to sleep. Drivers will switch off and fall asleep more. What happened to the extra barriers and safety improvements that were proposed?</p> <p>13) This section of road is windier and needs more attention when driving, however, it should be left at 100km/hr. There is room here for a more consistent corner speed suggestion/warning signs, as there are some corners that should have warnings that don't. The road is good, and if drivers drive to the conditions, ie road surface condition (which needs to be improved greatly!), traffic conditions and type of road (straight or corners), then the road is safe. Driver education and clamping down on bad driving in all situations (open road and town driving) would change people's attitudes to driving in general. Reducing the speed limit will make people who already take risks when driving, take even more risks as they think they have more time. The 2017 consultation showed the majority of people expressed their view that what was needed was more passing lanes to stop drivers taking risks to pass. This is a driver attitude problem, not a road/speed problem. There needs to be money spend on upgrading road warning signage and passing lanes. The road surfaces need to be improved and driver training implemented. A speed reduction will only mask the real problem and may even exasperate it. 80km/hr has been proven overseas to be a very dangerous speed to travel at, the brain goes to sleep. Drivers will switch off and fall asleep more. What happened to the extra barriers and safety improvements that were proposed?</p> <p>14) This hilly section is no doubt a challenge for many motorists. I do not see the need to reduce the speed here though, as this is open road afterall, and driving to the conditions should be the only thing needed to be applied to make this road safe. There seems to be an attitude from the NZTA that everyone is trying to keep to the speed limit at all times. Police the reckless drivers that are not driving to the conditions, and change the drivers attitudes. Better safety improvements and repairing the road properly to improve conditions, but driver education and an attitude shift is what is going to make this road safer.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
607	Individual submitter	<p>I live in Atawhai, Nelson.</p> <p>For five years I have travelled twice daily, 5 days a week from Springlea Heights to Clifton Terrace School.</p> <p>I am so relieved the speed limit on the highway there was dropped to 80 k. Even at 80 k it can be hairy turning right out of Atawhai Crescent onto the highway as the vehicles turning into Atawhai Crescent sometimes block the view and I have seen some close calls.</p> <p>I'd love to see the small strip between Atawhai Crescent and Clifton Terrace even lower than 80k.</p> <p>The worst of it is how many drivers I have seen with a phone in their hand, looking down at their screens as they drive past me heading towards the city as I wait on the highway to turn right into Marybank Road. It's very scary. I've even seen truck drivers with heads bent towards their phones. Last week I saw a truck driver trying to tear open a parcel as he steered.</p> <p>Turning right out of the Glen towards Atawhai can be dicey. I wasn't shocked at all to hear of the cyclist's death some months ago.</p> <p>I frequently travel between Blenheim and Nelson. I drive at the speed limit so cause no other drivers any delay, yet often someone, or several cars will overtake a vehicle on a blind bend or several</p>

		<p>blind bends through out the journey. Often the passing lanes turn into a fury of cars trying to floor it past all the others resulting in them overtaking at the end of the passing lane with those behind them having to slow right (sometimes unsafely) down to accommodate them.</p> <p>I'm truly surprised that the death toll isn't greater.</p> <p>I truly hope all those jumping up and down at the prospect of it being lowered don't get their way. I can handle an extra 9 minutes commute time to arrive safely at my destination.</p>
608	Industrial Marine Electrical Ltd	<p>1) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>4) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>5) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>7) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>8) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>9) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>10) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>11) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>13) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>14) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>15) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>16) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>17) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>18) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a></p> <p>19) Driver frustration, there is not one person I have spoken to that thinks any of these speed reductions are a good idea. How about improving the road if it's so dangerous? You reference how</p>

		busy it is as a reason for your reductions but in Auckland if a road is busy, it gets upgraded, not slowed down, why is it different on this side of the Strait? More maintenance and upgrades are required. It's also been proven that reducing speed can actually increase road accidents, have a look at <a href="https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm">https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/12/181212135021.htm</a>
609	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes , if lowering the speed limit saves lives, YES</p> <p>4) 80 would be fine</p> <p>5) 50 ok</p> <p>7) Yes down to 80k</p> <p>8) Yes lower to 80</p> <p>9) Lower to 80</p> <p>10) 60 k</p> <p>11) Ok</p> <p>13) 80k</p> <p>14) 60k</p> <p>15) 80k</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) 80k</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) 80k</p>
610	Individual submitter	I see from the RNZ news that a petition has been organized to protest against lowered speed limits on SH6. I fully support your move to lower the speed limits. Lower limits do bring safety especially on winding and narrow roads. So please count my email as a vote against the petition and a vote for rational safety.
611	Individual submitter	<p>1) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>4) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>5) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>7) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>8) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>9) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>10) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>11) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with</p>

		<p>driving.</p> <p>13) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>14) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>15) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>16) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>17) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>18) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p> <p>19) It will frustrate and stress every single driver on the road because it will take longer to travel the same distance, and will ultimately cost our economy because of how much longer each journey will take. When drivers are stressed or frustrated they will make rash decisions and take extra risks. This frustration is increased by the knowledge that our vehicles are far superior in safety than vehicles even 10 years ago. The speed limits were fine then, so why, when we are already much much safer, do we also need to reduce speeds??? You will never remove the risk associated with driving.</p>
612	Individual submitter	<p>1) Is this a largely residential area or near a school?</p> <p>4) Is this a largely residential area or near a school?</p> <p>5) Existing limit is low already.</p> <p>7) Is this a largely residential area or near a school?</p> <p>8) Existing speed limit with 40k variable speed at school drop off pick up as for other schools.</p> <p>9) Is this a largely residential area or near a school?</p> <p>10) Is this a largely residential area or near a school?</p> <p>11) This area includes a newly engineered road with good passing lanes. There's no need to reduce the limit on a brand new road engineered for current rules/risk factors.</p> <p>13) This area includes a new stretch of road engineered for current speed limit and with good passing lanes. There's no need to reduce the speed limit.</p> <p>14) Is this a largely residential area or near a school? Leave limit as is and reduce to 40km at school drop off and pick up times as for schools in residential areas.</p> <p>15) Is this a largely residential area or near a school?</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) Current speed to be retained as the school isn't on the main highway, there's plenty of parking and good cycle lanes.</p> <p>19) It makes sense to retain the 80km limit from Allisdair St right to the city. The current change from 100km to 80km and back to 100km is confusing.</p>
613	Individual submitter	<p>1) Does not allow opportunities for safely passing trucks and caravans etc</p> <p>4) Does not allow opportunities for safely passing trucks and caravans</p> <p>5) Does not allow opportunities for safely passing trucks or caravans etc</p> <p>7) Does not allow opportunities for safely passing trucks or caravans</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Does not allow opportunities for safely passing trucks or caravans etc</p>

		<p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Does not allow opportunities for safely passing trucks or caravans etc</p> <p>13) Does not allow many opportunities for safely passing trucks or caravans etc</p> <p>14) 70 km/h would be more appropriate.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Does not allow opportunities for safely passing trucks or caravans etc</p> <p>18) Keep existing limit</p> <p>19) Keep existing limit</p>
614	Individual submitter	<p>1) This will only make people speed more.</p> <p>4) Maybe put in slow bay lanes or passing lanes instead as this is not going to be any good for anyone</p> <p>5) I think yes this should be put in place. As I live in Havelock and so many people speed threw here still doing 100</p> <p>7) More passing lanes and leave it at 100</p> <p>8) Leave at 100 but make it 60 around school</p> <p>9) More passing lanes as there isnt much room to do so</p> <p>10) Leave it</p> <p>11) More slow bays instead of reducing limit</p> <p>13) More passing bays</p> <p>14) This will only cause so many issues</p> <p>15) Leave it</p> <p>16) Leave it</p> <p>17) Leave it</p> <p>18) Make it slower</p> <p>19) Leave it</p>
615	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think 80k's on this particular stretch makes sense as you have already reduced the other section between Woodbourne &amp; Renwick.</p> <p>4) I live on this stretch of road at Okaramio right where the road straightens up at Mt Riley Road so it is often used to pass, I see many near misses but not sure reducing the speed the whole way to Havelock is the right approach. The speed is 100k's now &amp; people are still passing so making everyone go slower will make people pass more....the problems that I see is the winding area between Kaituna &amp; Mt Riley - this is where drivers do crazy passing on blind corners often passing traffic going 100k's already. I'd say yes def need to reduce the speed limit in this area to 80k's but it needs slow lanes too!! Otherwise the dangerous passing just continues...</p> <p>5) makes sence</p> <p>7) There is no reason this area needs to be 80k's the road is fine just add inn some slow lanes &amp; put signage asking campervans &amp; slow vehicles to pull over.</p> <p>8) yes I agree with this speed reduction.</p> <p>9) Add a slow lane in instead on the long straights as this is where people try to pass.</p> <p>10) makes sence</p> <p>11) makes sense this isn't the easiest stretch or road.</p> <p>13) agree with the 80ks</p> <p>14) there are area's between Rai &amp; Hira that could be 80ks so just use common sense &amp; only reduce the very bad winding areas to 60ks</p> <p>15) as previous any good stretches of road could be 80 but the last very windy stretch of the Whangamoas should be 60k's</p> <p>16) makes sense</p> <p>17) agree</p> <p>18) agree</p> <p>19) agree</p>
616	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think you need local drivers (ie local police, truck drivers, people making the trip often) to help advise on this, not just someone in an office up North making a decision based on some accidents. How many thousands of cars use this road compared to the number of crashes.</p> <p>4) It would be helpful to have a map of these areas</p> <p>5) Are there many pedestrians in this area that it needs to be lowered?</p> <p>7) This is an easy piece of road to drive and the limit does not need to be lowered. It would be unfortunate to lower this section for the minority of people who crash here</p> <p>8) Certainly a drop for school zone when school is in is good. No need to drop to 80 apart from school zone</p> <p>9) This is an easy piece of road to drive and the limit does not need to be lowered. It would be unfortunate to lower this section for the minority of people who crash here. Perhaps pull in areas/passing lanes</p>

		<p>10) Heavily populated area at times, and narrow bridge. Dropping limit here is sensible</p> <p>11) This is an easy piece of road to drive and the limit does not need to be lowered. It would be unfortunate to lower this section for the minority of people who crash here. Perhaps pull in areas/passing lanes</p> <p>13) I think people drive over the hill at speeds they are comfortable at. I think more signs telling slow drivers to pull over perhaps could be a way to go instead of slowing down all drivers. Most drivers are capable of driving this stretch of road comfortably at 100.</p> <p>14) 60!!! Have you driven this before????? I think people drive over the hill at speeds they are comfortable at. I think more signs telling slow drivers to pull over perhaps could be a way to go instead of slowing down all drivers. Most drivers are capable of driving this stretch of road comfortably at 100.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) Why change this area limit?????????</p> <p>19) Why change this area limit????????? There are no pedestrians!!!!!!</p>
617	Individual submitter	<p>I live on Queen Charlotte Drive and commute to Blenheim via Havelock on a daily basis. I have never had an issue with the road speeds, and have always loved my commute to work. I think it would be ridiculous to lower the speed on this section of SH6 and do not see what benefit it could possible bring.</p> <p>It would only cause frustration for drivers and probably increase the risk of accidents. It would also increase my travel time needlessly – do you want us to work and be independent or rely on government hand-outs for unemployment.</p> <p>If the Council does not trust drivers to drive safely, the answer is not to lower speed limits but to increase training and safety awareness. Accidents happen! You cannot prevent them altogether – perhaps the Council’s time and money would be better spent in improving safety barriers and enforcing current speed limits.</p>
618	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) It is a suitable 100km road. Dropping the speed limit is not going to stop crashes ave at 80km people will still die.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) It is a suitable 100km road. Dropping the speed limit is not going to stop crashes ave at 80km people will still die.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) It is a suitable 100km road. Dropping the speed limit is not going to stop crashes ave at 80km people will still die.</p> <p>10) Just make it 50km. 60km odds a dicky speed most people are not used to holding and takes attention of the road</p> <p>11) It is a suitable 100km road. Dropping the speed limit is not going to stop crashes ave at 80km people will still die.</p> <p>13) It is a suitable 100km road. Dropping the speed limit is not going to stop crashes and at 80km people will still die.</p> <p>14) A more suitable speed limit would be 80km. 60km would make this stretch slow and tedious. Slow drivers are generally good at pulling over.</p> <p>15) It is a suitable 100km road. Dropping the speed limit is not going to stop crashes and at 80km people will still die.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) It is a suitable 100km road. Dropping the speed limit is not going to stop crashes and at 80km people will still die.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
619	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>



		<p>9) Inconvenience to business and regular travellers. There is no need to reduce this open road speed and no evidence to suggest it will result in any less accidents.</p> <p>10) I agree with this adjustment.</p> <p>11) Inconvenience to business and regular travellers. There is no need to reduce this open road speed and no evidence to suggest it will result in any less accidents.</p> <p>13) Inconvenience to business and regular travellers. There is no need to reduce this open road speed and no evidence to suggest it will result in any less accidents.</p> <p>14) 60 km will slow the traffic down too much causing congestion and result in increased road rage. 80km per hour would be a sufficient reduction</p> <p>15) Inconvenience to business and regular travellers. There is no need to reduce this open road speed and no evidence to suggest it will result in any less accidents.</p> <p>16) Yes agree here</p> <p>17) Inconvenience to business and regular travellers. There is no need to reduce this open road speed and no evidence to suggest it will result in any less accidents.</p> <p>18) No this will slow the traffic down too much resulting in congestion and increased road rage.</p> <p>19) Inconvenience to business and regular travellers. There is no need to reduce this open road speed and no evidence to suggest it will result in any less accidents.</p>
622	Individual submitter	<p>1) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>4) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>5) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>7) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>8) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>9) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>10) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>11) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>13) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>14) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>15) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>16) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>17) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>18) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p> <p>19) All 100 limits should be reduced to 90km/h, which I maintain is a safe and practical speed and I am surprised is not considered.</p>
623	Individual submitter	<p>1) There will be an increase in dumb passing maneuvers on a road with several blind spots of you really want to make a difference bulldoze the hump west of the bells road middle renwick road intersection. Also I'm a firm believer in a 100 kmh speed limit, restricting people to these speeds in long straight stretches of road is a display of overreach by the NZTA but more to the point causes drivers to switch off causing more "asleep at the wheel" style accidents</p> <p>4) The speed limit should stay at 10p km/h per hour. This road is capable of being driven at this speed safely. Doing this will cause drivers to switch off and cause more incidents where drivers are either asleep at the wheel or frustrated and making dumb passing manouvers</p> <p>5) Why? There's no point. Housing hasn't increased there's not a large number of accidents there due to people doing the speed limit. Lowering the speed limit isn't going to stop people breaking the law</p> <p>7) This road has multiple long straight passages of road. It has several large banked sweeping corners and given a little more work could have the limit raised to 110. Dont lower the speed limit. You will cause more accidents</p> <p>8) I have no issue with the variable school zone. Constant 80kmh seems pretty over the top</p> <p>9) No. This road has many straights and is a good road for 100kmh all you'll do is increase speeding silly passing and drivers away with the fairys</p> <p>10) Why would you do this? It's a complete waste of time. All that's going to happen is police are going to sit there and revenue gain. I've never seen someone not give way st that bridge it is a non issue</p> <p>11) No. This road has many straights and is a good road for 100kmh all you'll do is increase speeding silly passing and drivers away with the fairys. Have any of you clip board carriers been here? Fark</p> <p>13) No. No. This road has many straights and is a good road for 100kmh all you'll do is increase speeding silly passing and drivers away with the fairys. There maybe some hazard to speeding at peak traffic hours but this is due to misinvestment in straightening the and widening the road.</p> <p>14) No not 60 no sir. Maybe 50 years ago "when automobile manufacturers couldn't design a car that could go around a corner but not today. If people dont know how to drive their vehicle and to the conditions that isn't the general public's fault. Invest in education and continue with widening the road</p> <p>15) No. This is an easy going stretch of wide road let people drive to the conditions</p> <p>16) I have no issues with this</p> <p>17) No. This is a straight section of road with wide banked sweeping corners. There's two passing lanes. Restricting this would be criminal</p> <p>18) No. This is ridiculous. That's a separate road zone off from the rest of the town. This is going to cause speeding</p> <p>19) No separate highway off from the town nice wide road good passing lanes why do it</p>

624	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) Every other residential and school zone in so many regions you go from 80 or 100 to 50 so why not here?? So many residential houses and young children on bikes, scooters, walking, including people with pushchairs. It's terrifying watching the school bike run with all these little people while large trucks, motorhomes, cars and motorcycles speed past at 80plus!! Even when I go running I get nervous with the big lorry trucks going past, it knocks you about. On another note I witness so many drivers going towards the Nelson city centre and over taking on the other sides double passing lane and what for?? Just to hit a roundabout in less than a km that then takes you to 50km?? What is the point of this ridiculously fast stretch of road? Going the other way towards picton and users go excessive speeds on that passing lane, over 100km to get past cars all just to then turn into the turnoff to Rainbow Drive and Dodson Valley? 100km is just causing unnecessary speed and if anything a lot of people go in excess of this speed when reality is this a residential area just with a state highway as the name of the road so suddenly it's all okay to go 100km? You also have many turn offs into popular residential and tourist spots like Cable Bay and The Glen and the pressure is on to get to 100km very quickly. In addition The Glen turnoff is a bit of a blinds pot and site of a few fatal accidents so again why keep it at 100?  19) WHY 80 and not even considering 50 or 60??Every other residential and school zone in so many regions you go from 80 or 100 to 50 so why not here?? So many residential houses and young children on bikes, scooters, walking, including people with pushchairs. It's terrifying watching the school bike run with all these little people while large trucks, motorhomes, cars and motorcycles speed past at 80plus!! Even when I go running I get nervous with the big lorry trucks going past, it knocks you about. On another note I witness so many drivers going towards the Nelson city centre and over taking on the other sides double passing lane and what for?? Just to hit a roundabout in less than a km that then takes you to 50km?? What is the point of this ridiculously fast stretch of road? Going the other way towards picton and users go excessive speeds on that passing lane, over 100km to get past cars all just to then turn into the turnoff to Rainbow Drive and Dodson Valley? 100km is just causing unnecessary speed and if anything a lot of people go in excess of this speed when reality is this a residential area just with a state highway as the name of the road so suddenly it's all okay to go 100km? You also have many turn offs into popular residential and tourist spots like Cable Bay and The Glen and the pressure is on to get to 100km very quickly. In addition The Glen turnoff is a bit of a blinds pot and site of a few fatal accidents so again why keep it at 100?</p>
625	Individual submitter	<p>1) I don't agree  4) This is a State Hight - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  5) This is a State Hight - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  7) This is a State Hight - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  8) This is a State High - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  9) This is a State High - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  10) This is a State High - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  11) This is a State High - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  13) This is a State Hight- I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  14) This is a State High- I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  15) This is a State High- I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  16) No Comment  17) This is a State High - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  18) This is a State High - I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts  19) This is a State High- I do not agree to any chnages in the existing speed limts</p>
626	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight section of road with good visibility and good surface. There is no need to reduce the speed limit here. Other factors must be at play if there are safety concerns for this area of road so look at fixing those up first  4) This is a main state highway, an important freight route. Reducing the speed over the whole length will increase freight prices even further. Again, this stretch of road has a couple of quirks, a couple of areas where the camber is off and some tricky bends. The crashes happen when people are driving too fast for the conditions, ie at night or when it's raining or they drive too fast in general. Reducing the speed limit is not the answer, improving the road is a far better solution. Better signage of the bends where vehicles need to slow down would be a better solution.  5) No Comment</p>

		<p>7) This is open road, and not a bad one. There are not many crashes here so why reduce the speed?</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Predominantly open straight road with good visibility, no need to reduce the speed</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Predominantly straight open road, this is not a problematic section of road</p> <p>13) Rai valley to bottom of whangamoas is straight good road. No need to reduce speed. No harm in reducing speed to 80 over whangamoas.</p> <p>14) Ridiculous! 80 I could understand but not 60. This is a main State highway!</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) I thought this was in place already. Good idea</p> <p>17) Straight good road. No need to reduce here</p> <p>18) Straight good road. Is this actually a problem area?</p> <p>19) No problem</p>
627	NZ School Speeds	<p>1) If vulnerable road users use this road, does this consider their needs enough?</p> <p>4) If vulnerable road users use this stretch of road, is this reduction enough for them?</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) If vulnerable road users use this stretch of road are their needs considered?</p> <p>8) School zone should be 60km/h with a variable 30km/h school zone. Are there enough safe routes for children to walk or cycle to school</p> <p>9) If vulnerable road users use this stretch of road, are their needs seen to?</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) If vulnerable road users use this stretch of road are their needs considered?</p> <p>13) If vulnerable road users use this stretch of road are their needs considered?</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) If vulnerable road users use this stretch of road are their needs considered?</p> <p>16) School zones should be 60km/h with a 30km/h variable speed limit</p> <p>17) If vulnerable road users use this stretch of road are their needs considered?</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) If vulnerable road users use this stretch of road are their needs considered?</p>
628	Individual submitter	<p>1) This should stay at 100km/h.</p> <p>4) This is a clear piece of road and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>5) There is no valued reason to reduce this speed, it should stay at 70km/hr</p> <p>7) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>8) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>9) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>10) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>11) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>13) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>14) Put more funding into straightening the road, which will make it safer, not reducing the speed limit.</p> <p>15) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>16) Keep this at 80km</p> <p>17) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr</p> <p>18) There is no need to reduce this speed even further</p> <p>19) This is a safe piece of road, and should stay at 100km/hr. By reducing the speed in all of the above locations you will only insight frustration in drivers, causing reckless decisions, and dangerous overtaking. By slowing the speed down, there will be further accidents. What is needed is more input on the actual roads, making the road safer with a better surface, and more passing bays. This will only anger people more. Perhaps better driver education is required as well. Reducing the speed in all these areas is not the answer.</p>
629	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree</p> <p>4) Agree</p> <p>5) Agree</p> <p>7) Agree</p> <p>8) Agree</p> <p>9) Agree</p>

		<p>10) Agree  11) Agree  13) Agree  14) Agree  15) Agree  16) Agree  17) Agree  18) Agree  19) Agree</p>
630	Individual submitter	<p>1) don't change  4) don't change  5) don't change  7) don't change  8) don't change  9) don't change  10) don't change  11) don't change  13) don't change  14) don't change  15) don't change  16) don't change  17) don't change  18) don't change  19) don't change</p>
631	Individual submitter	<p>Keep the speed limits as they are and fix the roads.</p> <p>Stop being bad at the one job you have.  Demand more from drivers.  Put in cameras to catch people on mobile phones.  Demand more from the civil companies who do the work so the roads are safer and better constructed.</p> <p>7000+ people have signed the petition to keep the road speed the same.</p>
632	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment</p> <p>18) Is this because of the school? It would seem more sensible to keep the 80 km speed limit all the way from Trafalgar Street to Blenheim, then it's clear to everyone - unless the change is because of concerns about the school.</p> <p>19) 80 is definitely a good idea. There are so many dangerous turn-offs on this section of the road</p>
633	Individual submitter	<p>1) Slow drivers peeing off drivers causing frustration, people doing dangerous maneuvers.  4) When are we going to build new roads to better standards, get our country moving. We are not third world.</p>

		<p>5) When are we going to build new roads to better standards, get our country moving. We are not third world.</p> <p>7) Keeping traffic flowing</p> <p>8) Tyres honour school zone however keep traffic flowing, not get drivers frustrated. This causes accident!!!</p> <p>9) No need for knee jerk reaction,</p> <p>10) Build wider roads, straighter, with barriers into the middle of them. Look at Sweden's results when they installed barriers. Accidents fell hugely</p> <p>11) No keep flowing</p> <p>13) Build more roads to take volumes of traffic</p> <p>14) Our economy depends on moving people and goods</p> <p>15) Ditto to last question</p> <p>16) I want to live in a progressive county and lowered speeds doesn't stop idiots on roads. Build better roads</p> <p>17) I'm starring to think this is a revenue opportunity for the Govt. Conspiracy????</p> <p>18) I can't believe the proposal it's over the top</p> <p>19) No keep my city moving</p>
634	Rayner Contracting	<p>1) A reduction in speed is nor required here</p> <p>4) Ridiculous, it's a good piece of road, 80km is not required here.</p> <p>5) No, the 70 down to 50 gives people time to adjust their speed safely</p> <p>7) No, this stretch of road is a good drive and a reduction isn't required</p> <p>8) These straights are some of the best and safest places to pass slow vehicles on the Bhm Nel trip. Absolutely no to reductions here.</p> <p>9) No, this section of road is a good drive and reductions are not required here.</p> <p>10) Ok with this</p> <p>11) No, again another ok piece of road, no reduction required</p> <p>13) No, there are already restrictions on the appropriate sections of road to slow traffic as required.</p> <p>14) You can't drive 100 in this area anyway but 60 is too low. 80 would be suitable</p> <p>15) No, again there's a straight here that allows traffic to get moving so no.</p> <p>16) 80 is fine through here</p> <p>17) No, again there's a passing lane here that needs to be 100 and the road is not a difficult stretch of road.</p> <p>18) No, another good piece of road, foolish to reduce this section of road</p> <p>19) No, good visibility through here, straight and 100 is fine</p>
635	Individual submitter	<p>1) High traffic flow - Good idea to lower speed limit.</p> <p>4) Nasty intersection in there. Lots of tourists. High crash rate. Good option to lower speed.</p> <p>5) As above.</p> <p>7) As above.</p> <p>8) Busy tourist route. Good choice</p> <p>9) Good idea to slow inroad into bridge.</p> <p>10) As above.</p> <p>11) Twisty, busy road. Good choice to lower speed limit</p> <p>13) High crash rate, good idea to lower speed limit.</p> <p>14) As above.</p> <p>15) Safety for local community should be paramount, lower the speed limit</p> <p>16) As above.</p> <p>17) Lots of tourist, lower the speed limit</p> <p>18) Very difficult to turn onto this road, great idea to lower the speed limit</p> <p>19) As above.</p>
636	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This is an area of long straights where, at this speed, people will get impatient and in all likelihood either break the speed limit, which is too slow for these long straights, or try to pass which will cause accidents. People will inevitably tailgate.</p> <p>8) The school zone should certainly be reduced, but the rest of the road includes long straights which are suited to 100km speed limit. Any slower and people will get impatient and pass, causing accidents.</p>

		<p>9) This is an area of long straights where, at this speed, people will get impatient and in all likelihood either break the speed limit, which is too slow for these long straights, or try to pass which will cause accidents.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This is an area of long straights where, at this speed, people will get impatient and in all likelihood either break the speed limit, which is too slow for these long straights, or try to pass which will cause accidents.</p> <p>13) The area of road where there are tight turns is the area that should be the focus of a speed reduction, not the long straights leading up to it. Allowing traffic to pass slower vehicles in the leadup to these hills is more sensible than having it all back up in an impatient manner, causing subsequent accidents when people speed on the hill itself (as 80kmh is too fast for many of the hillside corners).</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
637	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't support this change. Road is flat, wide and straight and should stay at 100. The only dangerous part is the intersection with Jacksons Rd which could be improved by putting in a turning bay like at the Bells Rd/St Leonards Rd intersection.</p> <p>4) Don't support this change. Road is suitable for 100kph speed limit for the majority of this section. I think if you lower the speed limit to 80 along here, the majority of drivers would not obey it. You'd get a small percentage that do and everyone else would probably just ignore it.</p> <p>5) Support. Residential area so 50 makes sense and makes it safer with the intersections with side roads.</p> <p>7) Don't support. Leave at 100 as the road is generally very wide and flat along this section. Some bends but no sharp corners or anything.</p> <p>8) Given the school and a couple of intersections 80 makes sense here. School zone is good too.</p> <p>9) Don't support. Road flat and not many sharp bends. Should stay at 100.</p> <p>10) Support</p> <p>11) Don't support. Should stay at 100.</p> <p>13) Support. Intersection with Opouri is dangerous for traffic turning out, so lowering to 80 makes sense. 80 over the hills is sensible. Don't get up to 100 much in this area anyway.</p> <p>14) Support. Very windy section with narrow roads. 60 makes sense.</p> <p>15) Support.</p> <p>16) Support.</p> <p>17) Support. Kind of makes the passing lanes a bit redundant though</p> <p>18) Support.</p> <p>19) Support.</p>
638	Individual submitter	<p>1) people do this now</p> <p>4) leave it alone</p> <p>5) understandable</p> <p>7) i can understand this.</p> <p>8) this is a bit stupid you got a school zone with no speed restriction, it does need to be sorted out.</p> <p>9) leave it alone</p> <p>10) 70 kph would be fine, 50 kph Dec/Jan</p> <p>11) leave it alone.</p> <p>13) leave it alone</p> <p>14) 60 kph i can understand this, but i think 70kph be ok.</p> <p>15) leave it alone.</p> <p>16) understandable</p> <p>17) leave it alone.</p> <p>18) understandable.</p> <p>19) leave it alone.</p>
639	Individual submitter	<p>With up yo 20 deaths on this SH6 over the years, spend limit can be an important part of the solution to making this road safer. I fully endorse the government's strategy in making NZ roads safer by focussing on speed and road design to reduce the risk of injury and death. A 'Vision Zero' or 'Road to Zero' strategy is the right approach. Accidents will happen, people will have moments of inattention etc. Let's just engineer the roads and set speed limits so that injuries and deaths are reduced. I support an 80km speed limit along the entire route proposed.</p>

640	Individual submitter	<p>1) I do not support this speed reduction. There is no need for this reduction. Traffic often limits the speed naturally anyway and when traffic is light the road is straight, flat and wide being a state highway.</p> <p>4) I do not support this outright reduction but favour more yellow signs to indicate zones where speed should be reduced for camper vans or other larger vehicles. Also more double yellow lines if required.</p> <p>5) I am ok with this change.</p> <p>7) I do not support wholesale speed reduction changes to this stretch of road.</p> <p>8) Support the school zone reduction, I do not support the other change.</p> <p>9) I do not support this speed reduction for such a large stretch of relatively open road with good visibility.</p> <p>10) I support this change to 60km year round. I do not support a 50km December/Jan change</p> <p>11) I do not support this change. Often traffic is very light here and there is a good option for overtaking slow vehicles on a straight just out of Pelorus.</p> <p>13) I do not support this change.</p> <p>14) I do not support this change.</p> <p>15) I am supportive if this.</p> <p>16) I am supportive of this.</p> <p>17) I do not support this change.</p> <p>18) I do not support this change</p> <p>19) I do not support this change</p>
641	Individual submitter	<p>I oppose the reduction in the speed limit from Blenheim to Nelson to 80 km/h for the following reasons.</p> <p>From Blenheim to the Rai Valley, excluding Renwick and Havelock is a very easy drive, nothing challenging at all for the average driver.</p> <p>From the Rai Valley to Nelson it is a more interesting drive which has all the safety rails, speed advisory signs, double yellow lines to make the drive easy.</p> <p>I drive this route fortnightly and find the speed range, [i.e. driving average speed] to vary from just under 100kms/h down to about 70 km/h on the “straight” sections. Slower still on the bends in the open road sections. In the Restricted area of Atawhai the range is 60km/h to 80km/h. Numerous drivers when the speed limit is 80 km/h drive at 65 to 70km/h</p> <p>To reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h will not only lengthen the drive, it will increase driver frustration immensely because all traffic will be going slower there will be huge increases in long Queues in traffic, leading to inexperienced drivers behaving badly.</p> <p>We all want safer roads, firstly driver’s getting a full license should be instructed for at least 3 hours in an open road situation and tested in the same situation, also have to complete a defensive driving course, as in a Greg Murphy driving school. It is apparent at present that inexperienced drivers, drive at 70 to 80 km/h on open road and yet speed up to 105 – 110km/h on passing lanes. They also think that slow lanes/pullouts are for trucks only. Most car drivers do not use these facilities to let traffic past. Trucks and Camper Vans/caravans do, but cars think that they are for other people; not them.</p> <p>The Rai Saddle has just been improved at a huge cost, now you are going to reduce the speed limit, why did you spend all of that money, we have been to a couple of meetings already with NZTA and have spoken at length with truck drivers and other road users who all believe that it is driver education that will reduced the fatal accidents.</p> <p>I must say that the truck drivers are excellent, indicating when it is safe to pass and pulling over when applicable, unfortunately many car drivers will not pass therefore holding up the traffic once again making for more frustration.</p>
642	Individual submitter	<p>I fully support the proposed changes around Atawhai Cres. A. The speed is too great for cars pulling out from Bayview Rd and Malvern Ave onto the main road. B. The noise level from speeding traffic along this area is unacceptable when vehicles are speeding. C. 100kmh - the exit from Malvern Ave to the main road is dangerous as the is at present.</p>
643	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it at 100 . The only thing this will cause is frustration. It is a straight road !</p> <p>4) It is a good road , 100k is good....if you want to change anything put in more passing lanes.</p> <p>5) Why change something that is working ...slowing down the traffic will only cause more frustration.</p> <p>7) A good clear road why slow down a state highway ...put a passing lane in !</p> <p>8) Good as it is , straight road lots of visabilty</p> <p>9) Flat straight road keep as is this is the main highway to Nelson .</p> <p>10) Good idea , less confusion. Always a lot of people around this area. Better for approaching bridge.</p> <p>11) Keep 100 ....good road</p> <p>13) Good road will cause more frustration . Need more passing lanes ...going slower behind the slower trucks will cause people to take worse risks. The roads are the problem ...make them driver friendly not slow everyone down</p> <p>14) You cant speed around the corners anyway so why not just make it 80 or leave at 100 so that we are not confused with what speed we should be going.</p> <p>15) Flat straight road ...make a passing lane here that would help !! The main obstacle to frustrations on the Whangamoas is the build up of traffic from road works that are always going on ...but the road id just forever patched up ( except the big road new road on the saddle side )</p> <p>16) Leave as is ...this is a state highway and only route from Blenheim to Picton . have you calculated how much longer this will make the journey? This is the only frieght route -no train - so give us a break .</p> <p>17) Good road ...passing lane , leave as is.</p>

		18) Keep as is, slow enough already 19) Flat straight road ...more passing lanes required not slower ... I drive the Rai Valley - Nelson returns twice a week and have done for 15 years. I am happy to discuss the problems .
644	Individual submitter	1) 80 is good 4) 80 is good 5) 50 for sure 7) 80 8) 80 and 40 for school zones 9) 80 10) 60 11) 80 13) 80 14) 60 15) 80 16) 80 and 40 for school. 17) 80 18) 60 19) 80
645	Individual submitter	1) No 4) No 5) No 7) No 8) No 9) No 10) Nono 11) No 13) No 14) No 15) No 16) No 17) No 18) No 19) 70 would be even better
646	Individual submitter	1. leave it at 100km. 4. leave it at 100km. 5. Leave it at 100km. 7. Leave it at 100km but put in passing lanes. 8. Leave it at 100km but put in passing lanes. 9. Leave it at 100km but put in passing lanes. 10. Leave it the same. 11. Leave it at 100km but put in passing lanes. 13. Leave it the same drive to the conditions of the road. 15. Leave it the same. 16. Leave it at 100km but put in passing lanes. 18. Leave it as it is. 19. Leave it at 100km - it's good.
647	Individual submitter	1) Traffic flow and build up. Leave it at 100 km. 4) Leave it at 100 km, put some actual passing lanes in so people can drive and pass safer without taking silly risks. 5) Leave that at 70km it is a good speed. 7) Leave it at 100 km and put in some real passing lanes, you can't always pass on the straights as some cars speed up on the straights or oncoming cars are approaching at that particular piece of road. 8) Leave the school zone there for when children are present but leave the rest at 100 km and put some passing lanes in. 9) Leave it at 100km and put some passing lanes in.le 10) In the summer make it 60 just before pelorus bridge but leave the rest to 100 km.leave it at 11) Leave it at 100 km and put in some passing lanes. 13) Leave it at 100km but put in some passing lanes on the REM straight. 14) Leave it at 100 km people can just drive to the conditions. 15) Leave it at 100 km and put in a real passing lane. 16) Leave it at 80 km. 17) Leave it at 100 km and put in some real passing lanes.

		18) Leave it at 80 km. 19) Leave it at 100 km.
648	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree 4) Agree 5) Agree 7) Agree 8) Agree 9) Agree 10) Agree 11) Agree 13) Agree 14) Agree 15) Agree 16) Agree 17) Agree 18) Agree</p> <p>19) Agree. We live above this section of the road so for us, road noise is also a big issue. I approve of lowering the speed limit from the safety point of view but beg for noise reduction seal as well. The difference in noise between 100 and 80 kms is barely noticeable, it is not until the speed is lowered to 30-50kms by roadworks or accidents that we notice a significant reduction in road noise. Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission.</p>
649	Individual submitter	<p>1) I definitely agree with the continued speed limit of 80 from Blenheim to Renwick. Drivers take no notice when there are constant changes of speeds. 4) This is a winding road and should definitely be 80 all the way as stated 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) Picnic and tramping area so lower speed is needed. 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment</p>
650	Individual submitter	<p>1) Lowering the speed limit will cause frustration as I have witnessed when speeds reduce to 80km the average speed then becomes 65 - 70km per hour. Accidents usually occur because of poor driver skills, in attention &amp; substance abuse. Lowering the speed limit will not change this. When the road is not busy or at night when it is easy to see other traffic due to the light from headlights then the new speed limit will be way to slow for those how are competent drivers &amp; know how to handle a vehicle. Why should responsible drivers be penalties because of those who are incompetent. Maybe, the drivers test needs to be reviewed &amp; a practical defensive drivers course be compulsory. It needs to harder for overseas drivers to be able to drive on our roads, as many are not familiar with the type of road conditions within NZ. 4) Same as in question one. 5) Same as in question one 7) Same as in question one 8) As as in question one 9) Same as in question one 10) As as in question one 11) Same as in question one 13) Same as in question one 14) Same as in question one 15) Same as in question one 16) Same as in question one</p>

		<p>17) Same as in question one</p> <p>18) Same as in question one</p> <p>19) Same as in question one</p>
651	Individual submitter	Could not load attachment with comments
652	Individual submitter	<p>1) I am in favor of you new speed limit to be 80 km between Blenheim and Nelson on SH6 and some 60km/h sections. I live on SH 6 in Rai Valley and my husband is a member of the local volunteer fire brigade. We drive mostly our electric car from home to Blenheim or Nelson. Most parts of SH 6 between Blenheim and Nelson are not suitable to drive 100 km/h, so making the speed limit 80 km/h for the whole stretch will be safer and clear vs some short 100 km/h sections. Cars and trucks will be using less petrol/diesel by driving slower and electric cars go further, so I can only see positive outcomes to the proposed new speed limit.</p> <p>4) same as I wrote before ...</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
653	Individual submitter	<p>i would like to make a submission on the proposed speed limit change.</p> <p>Before I can do this I need the following information</p> <p>The speed data from the recorded crashes on the road between Nelson and Blenheim</p> <p>The weather conditions on the day of the crashes.</p> <p>What was the speed limit or advisory speed at the point of the crash.</p> <p>The best option would be sent a copy of the Police TCR for all the crashes.</p> <p>I am happy for this information to be in electronic format</p>
654	Individual submitter	<p>1) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>4) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>5) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>7) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>8) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>9) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>10) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>11) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>13) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>14) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>15) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>16) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>17) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>18) Do not lower the speed limits</p> <p>19) Do not lower the speed limits</p>
655	NZ Bulk Ltd	<p>1) There is absolutely nothing wrong with traveling at 100kmh on this section of road. I travel it 10-12 times a week and have no issues with it. Disagree with your proposal strongly.</p> <p>4) There is absolutely nothing wrong with traveling at 100kmh on this section of road. I travel it 6-8 times a week and have no issues with it. Totally disagree with your proposal</p>

		<p>5) No real issue with this, travel in built up areas should be 50 Kmh anyway.</p> <p>7) There is absolutely nothing wrong with traveling at 100kmh on this section of road. I travel it 6-8 times a week and have no issues with it. Totally disagree with your proposal</p> <p>8) Yes, agreed. Speed limit needs to be reduced past the school.</p> <p>9) There is absolutely nothing wrong with traveling at 100kmh on this section of road. I travel it 6-8 times a week and have no issues with it. Totally disagree with your proposal</p> <p>10) As this changes during the summer season i can't see any real issue with it being year round.</p> <p>11) There is absolutely nothing wrong with traveling at 100kmh on this section of road. I travel it 6-8 times a week and have no issues with it. Totally disagree with your proposal</p> <p>13) There is absolutely nothing wrong with traveling at 100kmh on this section of road. I travel it 6-8 times a week and have no issues with it. Totally disagree with your proposal</p> <p>14) As most vehicles traveling on this section of road wouldnt get up to 100 kmh I see no issue in reducing the speed limit but i would only support it dropping to 80 kmh not 60.</p> <p>15) Agree with this as long as 80 kmh is adopted across the Whangamoas. Kep it at 80 kmh until past the school at Hira. Too many different speed zones just becomes confusing.</p> <p>16) Agreed past the school.</p> <p>17) There is absolutely nothing wrong with traveling at 100kmh on this section of road. I travel it 6-8 times a week and have no issues with it. Totally disagree with your proposal</p> <p>18) There is absolutely nothing wrong with traveling at 80 kmh on this section of road. I travel it 6-8 times a week and have no issues with it. Totally disagree with your proposal</p> <p>19) Yes I agree with this.</p>
656	Individual submitter	<p>1) Be careful about a compromise where some sections will be 80 and some might be 100 (e.g. bends 80 and long straight stretches 100) as it is easy to get confused by repeated changes in limits.</p> <p>4) as above</p> <p>5) as above</p> <p>7) as above</p> <p>8) as above</p> <p>9) as above</p> <p>10) as above</p> <p>11) as above</p> <p>13) as above</p> <p>14) as above</p> <p>15) as above</p> <p>16) as above</p> <p>17) as above</p> <p>18) as above</p> <p>19) as above</p>
657	Individual submitter	<p>1) My comments apply to the overall speed reduction for the entire journey from Nelson to Blenheim. 1. the claim that the journey time will only increase by 9 minutes is flawed. if the average journey time is 75 minutes to travel the 100km, a 20% reduction in average speed will take an extra 18 minutes. 2. NZTA has not taken into consideration the economic impact of that extra 18 minutes. 3. all freight between the two towns is by road. There is no other option. The increase in journey time will have significant impacts on transport operators which will increase their costs. That increase in cost will, in turn, be passed onto consumers in both towns. 4. Efforts should be put into improving the road, particularly the Whangamoas Saddle, which truck operators describe as the worst piece of road in the country. 5. I do not support any of the proposed changes.</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
658	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes terrible idea if you cant drive at 100km on that road you shouldn't have a licence.</p> <p>4) Yes dont do it. Terrible idea</p> <p>5) No</p>

		<p>7) Stay at 100 or if you cannot drive at the speed return your licence</p> <p>8) Do not lower speed</p> <p>9) Do not lower speed</p> <p>10) No do not lower</p> <p>11) Do not lower speed</p> <p>13) Do not lower speed</p> <p>14) Do not lower speed</p> <p>15) Do not lower speed</p> <p>16) Do not lower speed</p> <p>17) Do not lower speed</p> <p>18) Do not lower speed</p> <p>19) Do not lower speed</p>
659	Individual submitter	<p>1) Before commencing this survey I note there is no allowance made for overall comments and concerns. Also some questions are repeated. Along with this I have made enquiries to get more information from Lachlan Forsyth / Principal Advisor NZTA and Warwick Taylor from Data Quality and Access Advisor, Crash Analysis System. The replies have been far from satisfactory and stalling in my quest to get accurate data. My real concern is that this whole review of this piece of road has been very poorly and inaccurately executed and seems very biased towards just reducing the speed limit to try for a 'quick fix'. I have had 3 immediate family members killed in a road accident so road safety is close to my heart but we need to improve the roads rather than slow down the traffic. re the above question There is an increasing amount of agricultural machinery using this road. The population is increasing. Is slowing down the traffic really the solution? this will mean more traffic on the road at any one time, longer queues, more frustrated motorists. NZTA need to look at the systemic issues. Widen roads, passing lanes, 2 lanes each way. Safety barriers. Help the traffic 'flow' don't just slow it down. Basically this road has not changed for 40 years.</p> <p>4) I travel this road constantly. It can be comfortably driven at 100km per hour. The issue is not this speed limit. The issue is the traffic 'flow'. Decreasing the speed will be counterproductive. More cars on road at any one time, longer queues, more frustrated motorists. NZTA need to look at the systemic issues. Widen roads, passing lanes, 2 lanes each way. Safety barriers. Help the traffic 'flow' don't just slow it down. Basically this road has not changed for 40 years.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This is a good piece of road with some new barriers and can be comfortably traveled at 100km hr. there is no major intersections. The issue is not this speed limit. The issue is the traffic 'flow'. Decreasing the speed will be counterproductive. More cars on road at any one time, longer queues, more frustrated motorists. NZTA need to look at the systemic issues. Widen roads, passing lanes, 2 lanes each way. More safety barriers. Help the traffic 'flow' don't just slow it down. Basically this road has not changed for 40 years.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) This is a good piece of road and that can be comfortably traveled at 100km hr. there is no major intersections. The issue is not this speed limit. The issue is the traffic 'flow'. Decreasing the speed will be counterproductive. More cars on road at any one time, longer queues, more frustrated motorists. NZTA need to look at the systemic issues. Widen roads, passing lanes, 2 lanes each way. More safety barriers. Help the traffic 'flow' don't just slow it down. Basically this road has not changed for 40 years.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This is a good piece of road and that can mostly be comfortably traveled at 100km hr. The issue is not this speed limit. The issue is the traffic 'flow'. Decreasing the speed will be counterproductive. More cars on road at any one time, longer queues, more frustrated motorists. NZTA need to look at the systemic issues. Widen roads, passing lanes, 2 lanes each way. More safety barriers. Help the traffic 'flow' don't just slow it down. Basically this road has not changed for 40 years.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>13) Rai Valley township is in this area? 80km is too fast for that.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
660	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p>

		<p>14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) While the speed reduction to 80 is a great start, I would actually like you to consider expanding your proposed 60kph speed limit so it ends south (town side) of Tui Glen Rd. From this point south 80 would suit. Thank you</p>
661	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave speed limit as it is, the accidents are because drivers don't know what side of the road to drive on!  4) There is no issue with 100 speed limit  5) The current limit is fine.  7) 100 limit works fine Again this stretch of road drivers keep driving into then wrong side of the road  8) As above  9) Leave as it is !!!!  10) Leave the current limit as it is  11) 100 is fine ... again drivers drive on the wrong side of the road causing accidents  13) Leave as 100  14) Leave as 100  15) Leave as 100  16) Leave as 100  17) Leave as 100  18) Leave as 80  19) Leave as it 100</p>
662	Individual submitter	<p>Though approximately 100 people have died in the past 10 years, this is a significant reduction in injury rate compared to earlier years, especially so when compared to the number of road users. Not all injuries will be caused by speed. Ice, distraction, poor road layout etc will be the cause of some. As the recent safety improvements have further reduced the number of crashes in the past 12 months. I suggest that a two year delay is made so the new improvements can be further evaluated. Two more years with more passing bays and cars of no passing and an opponents to review any new crashes that occur seems a reasonable step forward as compared to the blanket speed reductions.</p>
663	Lifestyle AV	<p>1) Please dont change the limit!!  4) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  5) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  7) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  8) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  9) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  10) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  11) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  13) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  14) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  15) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  16) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  17) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  18) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!  19) Please dont change the speed limit!!!!</p>
664	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a dead straight road that is well maintained. I see no reason to change to 80. Leave it at 100.  4) This road is relatively flat and doesn't have tight corners. There is no reason to change to 80. Changing would unnecessarily cost people who travel the road everyday a lot of time.  5) This is close to the township and would be a sensible and practical change. I support it.  7) This road is relatively flat and doesn't have tight corners. There is no reason to change to 80. Changing would unnecessarily cost people who travel the road everyday a lot of time.  8) This road is relatively flat and doesn't have tight corners. There is no reason to change to 80. Changing would unnecessarily cost people who travel the road everyday a lot of time.  9) This road is relatively flat and doesn't have tight corners. There is no reason to change to 80. Changing would unnecessarily cost people who travel the road everyday a lot of time.  10) Support this change  11) This road is relatively flat and doesn't have tight corners. There is no reason to change to 80. Changing would unnecessarily cost people who travel the road everyday a lot of time.  13) Most of this road is safe to drive at 100km/h. Making the speed limit lower would cost people time and cause frustration.</p>

		<p>14) Only the more windy section closer to Teal Valley Road should be made 80</p> <p>15) This section is windy and an 80 km/h speed limit would improve safety. Most drivers would be doing well under 80 in this section anyway.</p> <p>16) It is not necessary to change the speed limit in this area. Leave at 100.</p> <p>17) This road is relatively flat and doesn't have tight corners. There is no reason to change to 80. Changing would unnecessarily cost people who travel the road everyday a lot of time.</p> <p>18) This road is relatively flat and doesn't have tight corners. There is no reason to change to 80. Changing would unnecessarily cost people who travel the road everyday a lot of time.</p> <p>19) This road is relatively flat and doesn't have tight corners. There is no reason to change to 80. Changing would unnecessarily cost people who travel the road everyday a lot of time.</p>
665	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>8) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>9) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>13) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>14) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>15) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) How many accidents are because of speed? And not because of road quality or tourists??</p>
666	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>10) Ridiculous, Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>11) Ridiculous. Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>13) Terrible idea, Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>14) Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>15) Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>16) Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>17) Why? Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>18) This is seriously stupid. Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p> <p>19) No. Why this is a good stretch of road and 100kph is more than suitable. Look at more passing lanes to remove frustration. Slowing people further will just increase the frustration as some tourist insist on driving slower than the speed limit. You will cause more accidents with this approach.</p>
667	Individual submitter	<p>1) What factors have you considered for me to comment with other factors?</p> <p>4) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p> <p>5) How many crashes have there been in this area</p>

		<p>7) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p> <p>8) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted. Keep at 100 but have a 40kph variable speed zone for school times</p> <p>9) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p> <p>13) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p> <p>14) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p> <p>15) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) Speed limit does not need to be lowered in this area. I have driven this road thousands of times in the last 20+years and the road is safe at 100km/h. There are other factors i.e drivers cant drive safely at any speed or distracted.</p>
668	Individual submitter	<p>The proposal to reduce the speed limit on various open roads is crazy. It is not speed that kills. Rather is it speed in the hands of those who cannot or do not know how to handle a car. They may be elderly, or inexperienced, intoxicated or under the influences of drugs, driving on th eleft, distratcted. In that case, it's not speed that kills. It's an easy cop out. Another significant cause of road death is T-boning at intersections or driveways through someone failing to stop or give way, such as the Waverly crash and crashes in Canterbury in the past year or so. Lowering the open road speed limit will not make one iota of a difference. Europe has much higher road limits, such as Germany, they do not say "Speed Kills". Instead they have properly engineered roads.</p> <p>Different open-road speed limits throughout the country will make long-distance travellers easy pray for speed detectors. So my conclusion is that all these speed reductions are to boost revenue.</p> <p>Drivers should be trusted to drive at a universal 100kph limit. Head-on crashes will still occur no matter what the speed limit is. The lower the limit, the more likely they are.</p> <p>Sh6 needs more passing bays, around Pelorus where there are very few stretches of straight road.</p>
669	Individual submitter	<p>1) Idiots, cars are safer, fix the road surface perhaps?</p> <p>4) If you can't maintain 100kph on the highway you should re-sit your license</p> <p>5) Total BS show us the statistics?</p> <p>7) Rubbish NOTHING YOU PROPOSE IS GOING TO IMPROVE ROAD SAFETY</p> <p>8) Stupidity. school has a huge parking bay</p> <p>9) common sense should be considered. Obviously you are COMPLETELY lacking in any</p> <p>10) IF you can't maintain 100kph in this section you shouldn't be driving</p> <p>11) IF you can't maintain 100kph in this section you shouldn't be driving</p> <p>13) IF you can't maintain 100kph in this section you shouldn't be driving</p> <p>14) Do you really want to destroy the economic sustainability of the Nelson region? Your proposed change would achieve only frustration, higher transport costs and NOTHING POSITIVE FOR SAFETY</p> <p>15) IF you can't maintain 100kph in this section you shouldn't be driving</p> <p>16) IF you can't maintain 100kph in this section you shouldn't be driving</p> <p>17) IF you can't maintain 100kph in this section you shouldn't be driving</p> <p>18) IF you can't maintain 100kph in this section you shouldn't be driving</p> <p>19) IF you can't maintain 100kph in this section you shouldn't be driving</p>
670	Individual submitter	<p>1) More passing lanes</p> <p>4) No</p> <p>5) Not reducing speed</p>

		<p>7) No  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No</p>
671	Individual submitter	<p>1) 90 kms per hour is a much more practical solution, car drivers will accept and much more efficient for heavy transport to remain at 90  4) A good stretch of road, 100 is fine along here. Slowing heavy transport down to 80 from 90 is inefficient. This will only cause more frustration from motorists following trucks at 80. Passing lanes are urgently required.  5) Built up area and a busy intersection turning to Queen Charlotte Drive. Makes sense to slow all traffic down through here.  7) A good stretch of road, 100 is fine along here. Slowing heavy transport down to 80 from 90 is inefficient. This will only cause more frustration from motorists following trucks at 80. Passing lanes are urgently required.  8) 90 kms per hour is a much more practical solution, car drivers will accept and much more efficient for heavy transport to remain at 90  9) 90 kms per hour is a much more practical solution, car drivers will accept and much more efficient for heavy transport to remain at 90  10) 90 kms per hour is a much more practical solution, car drivers will accept and much more efficient for heavy transport to remain at 90  11) This section of road needs upgrading, 100 is fine, more passing lanes required.  13) 90 is required here, there is a need to keep heavy trucks travelling at an efficient speed.  14) 80  15) 90  16) Agree  17) 90  18) 90  19) 90, keep the trucks moving. There are trucks that make the trip from Blenheim to Nelson and reverse three times a day. The lower speed limits will put unnecessary pressure on those vehicles. I would suggest dropping the limits to 90, more people would accept this. However, in the long run the road needs major upgrading, what are the traffic volumes going to be like in 25 years? There's no trains to Nelson, truck traffic is going to increase sooner than most will believe with the bigger ferries being built and population increase.</p>
672	Individual submitter	<p>1) Support the speed reduction  4) Support the speed reduction  5) Support the speed reduction  7) Maybe leave at 100  8) Support the speed reduction  9) No comment  10) Support the reduction  11) No Comment  13) Support the speed reduction  14) Support the speed reduction  15) No Comment  16) Brilliant idea to reduce the speed here and to have the variable school zone  17) Great idea to go to 80  18) Great idea to reduce speed  19) Keep it all at 80</p>
673	Individual submitter	<p>1) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (&lt;20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their</p>

bumber. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

4) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumber. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

5) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumber. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

7) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumber. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

8) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumber. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

9) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumber. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

10) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past

them and in the lead up to the passing manouever and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

11) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouever and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

13) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouever and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

14) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouever and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

15) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouever and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.

16) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (<20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouever and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with

		<p>it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.</p> <p>17) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (&lt;20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.</p> <p>18) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (&lt;20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.</p> <p>19) It is not speed that makes these roads dangerous it is the exact opposite. Slow drivers (&lt;20km below the posted limit) cause a lot of frustration. Drivers will take riskier manouvers to get past them and in the lead up to the passing manouver and for several km's once past, the driver is angry and annoyed at the inconsideration of the slow driver be it a tourist, an older driver or some form of agricultural vehicle. During this period of anger and frustration the senses are not in tune with other road users, the environment, the other people in the car and basically are an accident waiting to happen. These drivers that are going too slow are not expected to race along at the speed limit but simply to be curtious and pull over once one or more cars start to get close to their bumper. What is so hard about that? That is what makes them so dangerous on the roads. The slow drivers are ignorant of the vast majority of us who drive to the speed limit and understand the conditions. We drive within the law and the only change to that is coming across one of the above. We have all experienced it. PS A very bad habit of the older generation of kiwi's is deliberately slowing down when being followed ' too close', but in Europe it is recognised someone just wants to pass and get on with their day! It's accepted. But within the good old NZ roading system with it's winding, hilly and often gritty roads, these oldies just stubbornly either slow right down or drive in such a way that they deliberately hinder you. They are so proud to be keeping the 'speeding' driver at bay that they do not realise they probably cause a very large percentage of the road accidents we see today. Thank you.</p>
674	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment</p> <p>16) Hira sees a lot of traffic movements. People have been asking for a reduced limit there for ages. REduce it to 60 going through that area then increase it back up to 100 until Atawhai. There seems no logic for any of the changes between Blenheim, The built up areas such as through Rai Valley and Pelorus should have reduced limits. The rest of the open road is perfectly safe at 100 if people drive to the conditions. It is increased numbers of road users which leads to more accidents. Improve the roads! Reducing the limit to 80 on the open roads between North of Nelson and Blenheim is only going to INCREASE driver frustration which will lead to more accidents.</p> <p>17) The speed limit through Atawhai should be 80. It is a suburb of Nelson. Why does the LTSA continue to maintain inappropriate speed limits in built up areas and yet continually want to whack 20kim off the limits on open roads? It doesn't make sense. It is the state of NZ roads which need fixing.</p> <p>18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
675	Individual submitter	<p>1) This applies to every question below. Is this necessary? Is it a high accident zone? This is the main arterial route for Blenheim/ Christchurch traffic to Nelson so I think it is important that the road from Blenheim to Nelson be left at the highest speed limit possible. Is it possible to identify the high crash zones and make those an 80Km/hr speed limit?</p>

		<p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
676	Individual submitter	<p>1) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>4) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>5) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>7) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>8) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>9) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>10) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>11) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>13) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p>

		<p>14) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>15) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>16) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>17) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>18) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p> <p>19) I nzta needs to look around the other places in the world and see what they do.. i am in Scotland and the have parts like the rai saddle at 80 then the more straight plane parts at 120 as in from Blenheim to havelock.... the idea of 80km all the way is just stupidity In fact I think a 80km speed limit will increase deaths as the traffic build up will be higher therefore drivers will be more aggressive and passing in stupid places and on coming traffic as I have has this experience when driving tractors on the road people get way to impatient and put them and others in danger just to pass on a corner ..</p>
677	Individual submitter	<p>1) Dont change it make more passing lanes listen to everyone</p> <p>4) 100km</p> <p>5) 70km</p> <p>7) 100km</p> <p>8) 100km with 60km during pick up and drop off</p> <p>9) 100km</p> <p>10) 100k</p> <p>11) 100km</p> <p>13) 100km</p> <p>14) 100km</p> <p>15) 100km</p> <p>16) 80km</p> <p>17) 100km</p> <p>18) 80km</p> <p>19) 100km</p>
678	Individual submitter	<p>The proposed speed limit reductions between Nelson in Blenheim are not the correct way to reduce harm on the stretch of road, I and many others travel the road regularly and the slower speeds and increased travel times will ultimately lead to driver frustration and people taking unnecessary risks.</p> <p>Tools that need to be tried first are those which educate drivers of the road conditions and hazards, safety features such as edge guards and median strips and physically improving the more “perceived” dangerous parts of the road.</p> <p>Driver training and infrastructure improvements will ultimately benefit all road users.</p> <p>Ultimately this blanket reduction of speed will have economic impacts with increased drive times affecting Freight and logistics companies.</p> <p>The blanket reduction would also mean all trucks and cars travelling at the same speed, as opposed to the 10km buffer between the trucks at 90 and Cars at 100km/h, thus meaning the</p>

		<p>opportunity for cars to pass the trucks will be severely reduced.</p> <p>This blanket reduction assumes all drivers are bad drivers, more monitoring and policing of bad drivers will ultimately make the road safer.</p>
679	The Bottling Company	<p>The road and cars are not the problem, the drivers are the problem. It's a bad idea to lower the speed limit between Renwick and Havelock. The number of freight vehicles on the road means if you reduce the limit to 80km, there will be a constant line of traffic often, and difficult to pass, therefore higher driver frustration and driver mistakes mean higher crash incidents. The lower speed limit will have an impact on our business, it is likely that bottle deliveries could be reduced by 30% as drivers can only do 2 not 3 runs/day. Do not lower the speed limit between Renwick and Havelock.</p>
680	Individual submitter	<p>1) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  4) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  5) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  7) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  8) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  9) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  10) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  11) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  13) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  14) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  15) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  16) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  17) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  18) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.  19) Passing lanes are needed to increase safety, not reduced speed limits. Reduce speed limits outside schools but not the entire highway.</p>
681	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes us!  4) Yes us who drive it without incident! !!  5) Yes us!  7) Yes us who drive it safely  8) Yes us  9) Yes us  10) Yes us  11) Yes us  13) Yes us  14) Yes us  15) Yes us!!!  16) Thats cool  17) Yes everyone who drives it safely everyday without incident  18) Yes us who drive it without incident  19) Yes us!!!!</p>
682	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's a straight bit of road with ample road space and seal is ok. Why change it?  4) The road is ok, good seal, wide enough. The only thing you need to consider is putting up warning signs for places that may have ice.  5) The 70km lead up from the south end of Havelock is fine, just make the signage more prominent at the Queen Charlotte turnoff  7) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas.  8) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas. School warning lights that flash during school drop off and pick up times would be great but, again, it's not an issue.  9) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas.  10) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazards In saying that, this is a tight area for traffic crossing the bridge so, a 60km 500m/1km either side of the Pelorus bridge isn't a bad idea.  11) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas.  13) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas.  14) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas.  15) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas.  16) Not a bad idea.  17) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas.</p>

		<p>18) No reason to change. Put warning signs up for hazardous areas. This is an area that is prone to traffic anyway and slowing it down isn't really going to help unless is only during peak traffic times.</p> <p>19) Same as above.</p>
683	Individual submitter	<p>1) As an electrician working out of Renwick my travel time will increase therefore the cost to my customers will have to increase to account for this, this will also start to affect retail prices due to heavy goods transit time</p> <p>4) I commute from Queen Charlotte drive to Renwick Monday to Friday this will therefore impact my travel time and make me more tired whilst driving thus increasing the likelihood of a vehicle related incident, If you want to reduce accidents increase the checks on logging trucks as the only incidents to happen to me over the last couple of years is a pieces of timber from the logging truck have come free and smashed my windscreen (Twice),</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur</p> <p>8) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur, I do however agree to have speed restrictions in school zones</p> <p>9) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>10) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>11) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>13) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>14) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>15) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>16) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>17) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>18) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p> <p>19) bulk transport will be affected thus increases in retail prices will occur,</p>
684	Individual submitter	<p>1) Safety First - i support the lower limit</p> <p>4) Safety First - I support the lower limit</p> <p>5) Safety First - I support the lower limit</p> <p>7) Slower is better for all.</p> <p>8) Definitely slower here - too many races and impatient drivers.</p> <p>9) Slower is better. Esp due tourist destination for the Hobbit locations.</p> <p>10) Absolutely agree.</p> <p>11) Slower is better and safer.</p> <p>13) Definitely slower. Too many goons and hoons</p> <p>14) Slower is better. Agreed</p> <p>15) Agree</p> <p>16) 100% AGREE</p> <p>17) Agree</p> <p>18) Agree</p> <p>19) Agree</p>
685	Individual submitter	<p>It is not the speed that creates the problem</p> <p>I drive this road every week and I find the Mobile homes, campervans and holiday makers all travelling at 70/80 k's who won't let us pass them</p> <p>They do not seem to look in their rearview mirror and they drift from side to side and won't pull over in the areas provided (where the road widens on their side)</p> <p>I have seen queues of over 20 vehicles held up by one mobile home/campervan because we can not pass them.</p> <p>Large trucks pull over where they can to let the traffic go.</p> <p>A lot of these slow drivers are town drivers and are not used to driving windy hilly roads, there needs to be more driver training done especially our overseas visitors.</p> <p>It is not the speed it is the number of incompetent drivers causing the problem.</p>
686	Individual submitter	<p>1) This reduction is unnecessary. This is a straight piece of road with clear visibility at intersections. Reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>4) This reduction is unnecessary. This roads design limits the speed at which it can be driven. I would suggest placing additional passing lanes, as my experience of near misses on this piece of road have been when other traffic has become frustrated by slow drivers and attempted dicey overtaking maneuvers. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>5) No, I think this proposal is very reasonable given the residential housing within this piece of road.</p> <p>7) This reduction is unnecessary. This roads design limits the speed at which it can be driven. I would suggest placing additional passing lanes, as my experience of near misses on this piece of road</p>

		<p>have been when other traffic has become frustrated by slow drivers and attempted dicey overtaking maneuvers. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>8) The reduction of the permanent speed limit is unnecessary. This is a fairly straight piece of road with good visibility. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers. I think the variable school zone is very reasonable however, and should be implemented as soon as possible.</p> <p>9) This reduction is unnecessary. This roads design limits the speed at which it can be driven. I would suggest placing additional passing lanes, as my experience of near misses on this piece of road have been when other traffic has become frustrated by slow drivers and attempted dicey overtaking maneuvers. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>10) No, I think this is reasonable.</p> <p>11) This reduction is unnecessary. This roads design limits the speed at which it can be driven. I would suggest placing additional passing lanes, as my experience of near misses on this piece of road have been when other traffic has become frustrated by slow drivers and attempted dicey overtaking maneuvers. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>13) This reduction is unnecessary. This roads design limits the speed at which it can be driven. I would suggest placing additional passing lanes and slow vehicle bays, as my experience of near misses on this piece of road have been when other traffic has become frustrated by slow drivers and attempted dicey overtaking maneuvers. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>14) This reduction is extremely unnecessary. This roads design limits the speed at which it can be driven. I would suggest placing additional passing lanes and slow vehicle bays, as my experience of near misses on this piece of road have been when other traffic has become frustrated by slow drivers and attempted dicey overtaking maneuvers. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>15) This reduction is unnecessary. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers. This is a short stretch of road which is not at all difficult to drive. There is a straight stretch on which passing maneuvers can often safely be accomplished. Reducing the limit will inhibit use of this straight piece of road for passing, and likely result in increased frustration.</p> <p>16) I suggest a variable 60kph enforcable school zone here. Blenheim bound traffic is often speeding up to 100kph on this piece of road after passing through Hira, and I think the limit should be lower and enforcable near the school.</p> <p>17) This reduction is unnecessary. I would suggest placing additional passing lanes, as my experience of near misses on this piece of road have been when other traffic has become frustrated by slow drivers and attempted dicey overtaking maneuvers. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>18) This reduction is unnecessary. I would suggest placing additional passing lanes. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p> <p>19) This reduction is unnecessary. More passing lanes or additional enforcement would be great though, more than once I have witnessed impatient drivers overtaking slower traffic on the flush median on this piece of road. I feel reduction of the limit is likely to be ignored by trouble drivers, while frustrating/inconveniencing the 'good' drivers.</p>
687	Individual submitter	<p>1) Dont change it</p> <p>4) Dont change it.</p> <p>5) Dont change it.</p> <p>7) Dont change it.</p> <p>8) Dont change it.</p> <p>9) Dont change it.</p> <p>10) Dont change it.</p> <p>11) Dont change it.</p> <p>13) Dont change it.</p> <p>14) Dont change it.</p> <p>15) Dont change it.</p> <p>16) Dont change it.</p> <p>17) Dont change it.</p> <p>18) Dont change it.</p> <p>19) Dont change it.</p>
688	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Put in some passing lanes and slow bay areas. More driver education especially for tourists. Improve the condition of the road surface.</p> <p>5) Agree with this as too many people dont slow down for the school.</p> <p>7) No need for this to change. Improve the condition of the road surface. Slow vehicle bays/pull over areas and driver training especially tourists.</p> <p>8) How about they just get the school zone signs working properly in line with school starting and finishing times.</p> <p>9) No need for this to change. Improve the condition of the road surface. Slow vehicle bays/pull over areas and driver training especially tourists.</p> <p>10) Agree with this.</p>

		<p>11) No need for this to change. Improve the condition of the road surface. Slow vehicle bays/pull over areas and driver training especially tourists. The 60km speed limit through Rai Valley needs to be moved out to Hills road. Traffic past the school is not slowing down enough.</p> <p>13) No need for this to change. Improve the condition of the road surface. Slow vehicle bays/pull over areas passing lanes and driver training especially tourists.</p> <p>14) Dropping the speed limit here will not stop accidents. On average you can only do 70km anyway. Driver training, more signs telling slow drivers to pull over. Improve the condition of the road surface.</p> <p>15) Dropping the speed limit here will not stop accidents. On average you can only do 70km anyway. Driver training, more signs telling slow drivers to pull over. Improve the condition of the road surface</p> <p>16) Fine as is.</p> <p>17) Driver training, more signs telling slow drivers to pull over. Improve the condition of the road surface</p> <p>18) No need to drop this speed limit, pointless and will just cause more driver frustration.</p> <p>19) Agree with this</p>
689	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it at 100, most people drive to the conditions on this section of road</p> <p>4) Leave it at 100, the road here is quite safe a 100. 80K will only frustrate regular users. More passing lanes or laybys would be better. Speeding drivers who already travel over the limit will not slow down, law abiding drivers will be disadvantaged</p> <p>5) OK</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) 100 with school zone</p> <p>9) 100 is a safe speed here, once again the road along the Pelorus river should be straightened or passing lanes built</p> <p>10) ok</p> <p>11) 100, good safe road.</p> <p>13) 100, safe at this speed, Only require speed sugerstions on corners</p> <p>14) ok</p> <p>15) ok</p> <p>16) ok</p> <p>17) 100 is fine here, passing lanes in place so quite safe</p> <p>18) 80</p> <p>19) Most people seem to travell at 80 here anyway but 100 is safe enough.</p>
690	Individual submitter	<p>1) No change needed</p> <p>4) No change needed add passing lanes to stop frustrated drivers taking silly risks to overtake</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No change needed</p> <p>8) No change needed. But def lower speed round school it is dangerous for our children as people are often still doing 100km past there</p> <p>9) No change needed</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No change needed</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No change needed on all of the above. Stick to 100km fix the roads!! It is used heavily and more passing lanes between Rai and Blenheim</p>
691	Access community health	<p>1) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed</p> <p>4) Quality of the roads</p> <p>5) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed</p> <p>7) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed</p> <p>8) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going</p>

		<p>to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed. Understand the Variable for the school zone. That is practical</p> <p>9) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed</p> <p>10) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed. Trucks, businesses and professionals need to be considered as well, such a dramatic reduction in speed is going to effect their work and efficiency dramatically.</p> <p>11) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed. Trucks, businesses and professionals need to be considered as well, such a dramatic reduction in speed is going to effect their work and efficiency dramatically.</p> <p>13) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed. Trucks, businesses and professionals need to be considered as well, such a dramatic reduction in speed is going to effect their work and efficiency dramatically.</p> <p>14) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed. Trucks, businesses and professionals need to be considered as well, such a dramatic reduction in speed is going to effect their work and efficiency dramatically.</p> <p>15) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed. Trucks, businesses and professionals need to be considered as well, such a dramatic reduction in speed is going to effect their work and efficiency dramatically.</p> <p>16) This so far is the only practical suggestion of changing the speed.</p> <p>17) Keep existing speed, however focus on making the physical road safer. Wider roads, passing lanes etc. unfortunately crashes occur frequently in our area but only reducing the speed isn't going to stop that. The roads are the problem, not the speed. Trucks, businesses and professionals need to be considered as well, such a dramatic reduction in speed is going to effect their work and efficiency dramatically.</p> <p>18) Keeping this speed at 80km seems safe as all the people living in that area understand how to merge onto the highway. It is a low traffic, rural area so 60km is absolutely way too slow to be practical.</p> <p>19) This road is perfectly safe and speed is already appropriate. The reality is all the speed limits in NZ are lower than other countries as it is. Maybe it's the driving system that needs to be reviewed? Teaching people to drive, have higher expectations of what they need to achieve before being on their restricted. Having learners plates on cars ONLY when a learner is driving so people know to take more care, have certain plates on restricted drivers so it's easier for police to identify if they have a passenger when they aren't allowed yet.</p>
692	Individual submitter	<p>1) I am opposed to all changes outlined I. This question and all below. I don't think lower speed limits will make it safer. Infact I think it will make it worse. How about more passing lanes for a start. Driver education on how to handle our roads. Tourist education/licensing etc. Lowering speed limits everywhere just creates frustration. I have been driving this road for over 10 years consistently and never had a slight issue. Not even a near miss. A lot of other factors are being ignored here. Again u strongly oppose the change and as a member of the Nelson community and a former member of the Marlborough community I am not the only one!</p> <p>4) .</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
693	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) This road is perfectly ok with the existing 100km/h limit. Bends are relatively open and the terrain is relatively level. The biggest limitation on this section of road is the lack of passing opportunities when vehicles are backed up behind slow vehicles (campers, trucks, vehicles towing caravans or boats) all of which frequent this road. Including some sensibly positioned passing lanes or at the least slow vehicle bays would be an excellent improvement and improve the flow of traffic, reducing the likelihood of impatience and potential risky passing manoeuvres.</p> <p>5) Reducing this to 50km/h would be an excellent idea. The intersection with QC Drive has a turning bay from the Renwick direction, which is good, but it is a busy intersection at times and the</p>

		<p>approach doesn't have great visibility at 70km/h. A reduction to 50km/h would be supported here.</p> <p>7) This road is perfectly ok with the existing 100km/h limit. Bends are relatively open and the terrain is relatively level. The biggest limitation on this section of road is the lack of passing opportunities when vehicles are backed up behind slow vehicles (campers, trucks, vehicles towing caravans or boats) all of which frequent this road. Including some sensibly positioned passing lanes or at the least slow vehicle bays would be an excellent improvement and improve the flow of traffic, reducing the likelihood of impatience and potential risky passing manoeuvres.</p> <p>8) This road is perfectly ok with the existing 100km/h limit. Bends are relatively open and the terrain is relatively level. The biggest limitation on this section of road is the lack of passing opportunities when vehicles are backed up behind slow vehicles (campers, trucks, vehicles towing caravans or boats) all of which frequent this road. Including some sensibly positioned passing lanes or at the least slow vehicle bays would be an excellent improvement and improve the flow of traffic, reducing the likelihood of impatience and potential risky passing manoeuvres.</p> <p>9) This road is perfectly ok with the existing 100km/h limit. Bends are relatively open and the terrain is relatively level. The biggest limitation on this section of road is the lack of passing opportunities when vehicles are backed up behind slow vehicles (campers, trucks, vehicles towing caravans or boats) all of which frequent this road. Including some sensibly positioned passing lanes or at the least slow vehicle bays would be an excellent improvement and improve the flow of traffic, reducing the likelihood of impatience and potential risky passing manoeuvres.</p> <p>10) There are many vehicle movements in this Pelorus Bridge area with side roads, driveways within 1km on the Canvastown side, rest areas, a single lane bridge with shady and tight approaches, and the cafe entrance. I definitely support the reduction of the speed limit to a year round 60km/h in the immediate vicinity of this bridge.</p> <p>11) This road is perfectly ok with the existing 100km/h limit. The only thing I would suggest is the area approximately 1km westward from the Pelorus Bridge should be kept at 60km/h. There is some tight and tricky road in this 1km stretch and often fog or frost in this section of road. There is a large shingle area where vehicles often pull off and the approach to this is blind from both directions. For the balance of the road between Pelorus and Rai, the following applies: Bends are relatively open and the terrain is relatively level. The biggest limitation on this section of road is the lack of passing opportunities when vehicles are backed up behind slow vehicles (campers, trucks, vehicles towing caravans or boats) all of which frequent this road. Including some sensibly positioned passing lanes or at the least slow vehicle bays would be an excellent improvement and improve the flow of traffic, reducing the likelihood of impatience and potential risky passing manoeuvres.</p> <p>13) The area immediately west of Rai township up to the turnoff to French Pass should be reduced speed. It is shady, often damp and relatively tight bends, and a number of vehicles turn in and out to the French Pass road. I would support a reduction in speed for this section up to perhaps 400m west of the French Pass turnoff around the first bend. Then 100km/h is absolutely fine especially the straight at Rai engineering/ Rai cemetery which is open and flat. The balance of the road up to the saddle is relatively steep and windy and can only reasonably be negotiated at a reduced speed. I do not see that reducing the limit in this area is necessary.</p> <p>14) The new section of road from the saddle west is not great. The gradient is steeper than is sensible on a road with a long straight run downhill ending in a reasonably tight left hand bend. This is tighter than it first appears and I suspect that heavy vehicles, those towing heavy trailers such as horse floats or car trailers, and vehicles with light rear axles such as unladen utes could have the potential to run into trouble on this section of road. A poorly designed piece of roading. Yes it has eliminated a lot of the tight bends we had before, but at least with those we were forced to travel downhill slowly due to the bends. Nice to have what could be considered an improvement, but unfortunately presents a new set of challenges.</p> <p>15) A reduction of speed to 80km/h would be supported on this section of road.</p> <p>16) Agree. Could even be 70km/h</p> <p>17) This would be sensible. The volume of traffic in this section of road and the number of side roads, driveways, farm gateways, sports facilities and other hazards mean a reduction to 80km/h would be supported on this section of road.</p> <p>18) It often feels oddly fast to travel at 80km/h along this stretch of road with the houses, school, roadside pull off areas and estuary adjacent. A reduction to 60km/h may be slower than necessary - 70km/h would be welcomed though</p> <p>19) Yes please 80km/h is a sensible solution for this section of road.</p>
694	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) keep it at 100. Its a great road, need a passing lane somewhere. There are none between Blenheim and Rai. I live in Havelock and know the road is great. Lots of slow tourists though. Bad drivers have accidents. Don't penalize the people who live here and drive safely</p> <p>5) I agree and proposed this at the Havelock meeting, but also it needs to be 50 kmph all the way from Havelock school to 70km sign coming into Havelock from Renwick side. People and trucks speed into Havelock and theres lots of children trying to safely walk to school, including mine. He as to cross State Hwy 6 in Havelock at Beach Place, with traffic doing 70 - 80 kmsph in town. So dangerous. Havelock is growing, on the Renwick side so speeds need to drop from 70 to 50 further out.</p> <p>7) I drive that all the time its currently safe. keep at 100.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p>

		18) No Comment 19) No Comment
695	Individual submitter	<p>1) Slow and non Confident drivers already pushing back traffic. No passing lanes.</p> <p>4) Lack of passing lanes will make this road more dangerous. People will travel at 60kmph and will cause for irritated drivers and careless desicions.</p> <p>5) The road is fine at 70kmph. No accidents and slow moving vehicles move to the side.. Making this 50kmph will further Increase the agitation and irritation of people wanting to go the speed limit.</p> <p>7) This stretch of road is perfectly fine.. But again, no passing lanes. At all.. Nowhere for slower traffic to merge to the side, make this 80kmph and the death rate with definitely hike up</p> <p>8) That the lack of passing lanes and slower limit will increase agitation and more In-paitent drivers causing more accidents then now due to not wanting to travel at 60kmph the whole way. People already do 80kmph, now they will do 60.</p> <p>9) That the lack of passing lanes and slower limit will increase agitation and more In-paitent drivers causing more accidents then now due to not wanting to travel at 60kmph the whole way. People already do 80kmph, now they will do 60.</p> <p>10) That the lack of passing lanes and slower limit will increase agitation and more In-paitent drivers causing more accidents then now due to not wanting to travel at 60kmph the whole way. People already do 80kmph, now they will do 60.</p> <p>11) That the lack of passing lanes and slower limit will increase agitation and more In-paitent drivers causing more accidents then now due to not wanting to travel at 60kmph the whole way. People already do 80kmph, now they will do 60.</p> <p>13) Is a silly idea and will create more crashes and people making silly dangerous passes.</p> <p>14) Dangerous idea. People will try and overtake anywhere they can, blind corners and all..</p> <p>15) Dangerous idea</p> <p>16) Fine</p> <p>17) Nope.. Silly idea again.. People already travel at this speed along that stretch of road.. Making the limit slower will propose people to drive slower. Making very impaitent people behind with nowhere to pass.</p> <p>18) The 80kmph is fine.. No crashes, why change it.</p> <p>19) That the majority of people crashing here are tourists NOT WATCHING THE ROAD. has nothing to do with the speed limit. If you took tourists for a practical test, this would happen less often.</p>
696	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) We are delighted to note the recommended reduction to 80k, however it seems logical in the interests of safety, to continue with the same speed from Alastair through to Trafalgar Street. An increase in speed from Atawhai Crescent would mean a likely tendency for drivers to accelerate unnecessarily. We live on Atawhai Drive and gauging the speed of heavy vehicles is a constant concern. Maintaining a constant speed (60) would help considerably. Thanks</p>
697	Individual submitter	<p>1) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>4) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>5) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>7) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>8) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>9) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>10) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>11) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>13) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>14) Dont do it. Build better roads</p>

		<p>15) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>16) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>17) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>18) Dont do it. Build better roads</p> <p>19) Dont do it. Build better roads</p>
698	Individual submitter	I agree to this 80kph Nelson to Blenheim reduction, much safer for all drivers, it is a bad road. If this should go ahead you will need to police this road with more highway patrol cars and motor-cycle police. For 3 months and make sure drivers understand. 80 mean 80, not 100.
699	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it at 100</p> <p>4) Keep it at 100</p> <p>5) 50k is ok</p> <p>7) Keep it at 100</p> <p>8) Keep it at 100</p> <p>9) Keep it at 100</p> <p>10) Keep it at 100</p> <p>11) Keep it at 100</p> <p>13) Keep it at 100</p> <p>14) Keep it at 100</p> <p>15) Keep it at 100</p> <p>16) Keep it at 80</p> <p>17) Keep it at 100</p> <p>18) Keep it at 80</p> <p>19) Keep it at 100</p>
700	Individual submitter	<p>1) This should be kept at the current speed.</p> <p>4) This stretch of road isn't bad. It was improved a few years ago. Speed should remain the same.</p> <p>5) I agree with this change.</p> <p>7) This road is fine. Should be 100.</p> <p>8) Keep 100.</p> <p>9) Keep 100. The road is fine.</p> <p>10) Make this 80 except for the 50 in Dec/Jan.</p> <p>11) This road is fine. Keep at 100.</p> <p>13) This road is good. Keep 100</p> <p>14) 60 is far too slow. Maybe change this to 80.</p> <p>15) Keep 100</p> <p>16) Like this change.</p> <p>17) Keep 100</p> <p>18) Keep 100</p> <p>19) Keep 100</p>
701	Individual submitter	<p>1) I am fine with this change</p> <p>4) This is an easy stretch of road that does not need a speed change</p> <p>5) This should have happened already due to the increased traffic thru the queen charlotte sound road</p> <p>7) Yet again pointless change it is an easy road to travel at 100km/h. There is room for road improvement by adding more signposted pull over and slow vehicle bays.</p> <p>8) Keep the existing speed limit of 100km/h but do add a variable speed zone for the school</p> <p>9) Speed limit to stay the same at 100km/h but make improvements to the road by adding signposted pull over bays and a passing lane in both directions</p> <p>10) I am happy with this change due to the amount of visitors to the bridge the slower speed would make pulling in and out safer for all concerned</p> <p>11) Speed limit to stay the same at 100km/h. Road is easy to drive some money needs to be spent on fixing potholes properly and create a passing lane in both directions on the straight from Bulford Road to allow safe passing Of slower drivers</p> <p>13) Speed should be kept at 100km/h due to truck up to 57000kg need to hit the bottom of the hill at 90 to make it all the way up nelson bound at a safe speed</p> <p>14) Speed limit to stay at 100km/h</p> <p>15) This can be changed to 80km/h</p> <p>16) Nothing changes here</p>

		<p>17) I am happy with this being slowed down to 80km/h due to traffic volumes and drivers entering and exiting the road</p> <p>18) No reason to change this speed limit</p> <p>19) I am happy to see this change 100km/h is to fast because of the amount of side roads and driveway exits</p>
702	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think that is a good idea</p> <p>4) This road is good enough to stay at 100. Some passing lanes would help safety.</p> <p>5) Good idea</p> <p>7) This road is good enough to stay at 100. Some passing lanes would help safety.</p> <p>8) Good idea</p> <p>9) This road is good enough to stay at 100. Some passing lanes would help safety.</p> <p>10) Good idea</p> <p>11) This road is good enough to stay at 100. Some passing lanes would help safety.</p> <p>13) Parts of this road is good enough to stay at 100. Some passing lanes would help safety.</p> <p>14) 80 would be better</p> <p>15) Put in a passing lane on the long straight, this is one of the few places where you can pass</p> <p>16) Fine</p> <p>17) This road is good enough to stay at 100. Some passing lanes would help safety.</p> <p>18) Good idea</p> <p>19) This is long overdue. There is too much traffic already for safe exit and entry to this section of highway. There are over 100 new sections being proposed for the bay View Area. Where else is there a section of 100 kmh speed limit within a city boundary with numerous intersections? I would support an even lower speed limit.</p>
703	Individual submitter	<p>I have travelled the road between Blenheim to Nelson on a weekly basis. There is nothing wrong with the 100kph limit.</p> <p>I do support reducing the limit in built-up areas and schools.</p> <p>Between Nelson to Rai 100kph is not very often reached as you should drive to the conditions, not the set limit.</p> <p>Reducing the speed from Rai to Blenheim is going to cause more frustrated and impatient drivers with risky overtaking.</p> <p>More passing lanes would be better. If this road needs the speed reduction, so does all of New Zealand.</p>
704	Individual submitter	<p>1) Present pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, also future investment and construction in these areas. The many wineries in this area, busy entry and exit points.</p> <p>4) Wairau River Bridge. The many trucks (mostly logging and farm supply) that use this road. Farm access (entry/exit points) and animal movements.</p> <p>5) Dropping the proposed speed limit even further. 40 km/h, slower the speed, safer it is for all road users.</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) Variable school zone should be lowered to 40 km/h for child safety and new proposed speed limit likewise to match the above.</p> <p>9) The amount of logging trucks using this road, incredible amount. The terrain, some steep sections, surrounded by forest. Adverse weather conditions often in this area can combine for tricky driving conditions. Cycle tourists who use this route and not many wide parts of the road for vehicles to safely pass.</p> <p>10) Busy area, a place for people to stop and enjoy the scenery. Frequently used entry/exit car park on both sides of the road for access to the Pelorus Bridge itself, rest/picnic area and cafe/motor camp. Many pedestrians use this area.</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) The winding nature of this road, steep terrain and amount of vehicles using this road for purposes of sight seeing/tourism along with big logging trucks!</p> <p>14) Winding nature of this road is quite often surprising to many new drivers to this road, many tight corners and much of this road is in shade most of the day (creating hazardous surface conditions). No passing lanes and very few if any pullover areas for slower vehicles or cyclists.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) Variable school zone of 80km/h? If so should be much lower with children a potential hazard. Slower speeds and protection on roads is critical.</p> <p>17) Increased traffic as you approach/leave the greater Nelson area. Road restricted on one side by Tasman Bay and the other by hills. Farmers access.</p> <p>18) Lowering to 50km/h. Same as a general urban area</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
705	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree</p> <p>4) Agree</p> <p>5) Agree</p> <p>7) Agree</p> <p>8) Agree</p> <p>9) Agree</p> <p>10) Agree</p> <p>11) Agree</p>

		<p>13) Agree</p> <p>14) Agree</p> <p>15) Agree</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) Agree</p> <p>18) Agree</p> <p>19) Agree</p>
706	Individual submitter	I oppose you changing the speed from 100 to 80. It is not the speed that's causing accidents. There are no passing lanes. There are two very small pull-over bays. People get impatient and frustrated so people pass in dangerous areas, causing accidents. We should have money invested into road maintenance. Please listen to people who have driven these roads for years.
707	Individual submitter	<p>1) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2.</p> <p>4) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. less overtaking required .</p> <p>5) less problems at 50km/h.</p> <p>7) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p> <p>8) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p> <p>9) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p> <p>10) less over taking required saves lives.</p> <p>11) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p> <p>13) we cannot drive at 100km/h so 80km/h speed is a good idea.</p> <p>14) 60km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p> <p>15) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p> <p>18) 60km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p> <p>19) 80km/h speed saves 30 fuel less co2. Less overtaking required save lives.</p>
708	Individual submitter	(A) Most accidents which are heard about on the news tend to have been on the windy parts of this road (Whagamous, Rai Saddler etc) And these parts can't be driven on at full speed anyhow. (B) Lowering speeds in areas where there are passing lanes which can alleviate lines of backed up vehicles may contribute to frustration and risk-taking. Assessing the approach to, and length of passing lanes may help to improve this moew rhan speed reduction. (C) Inconsistently changing the speed limit is confusing when one is not resident of the area. One consistent speed may be easier to observe! Likewise, adding a 60km/h limit of Atawha is more likely to confuse and frustrate drivers. Wire-rope median barriers in busy, faster areas would help. (D) A slower approach to Pelorus Bridge where there are many pedestrians, as well as a one-way bridge is a good idea but choose one speed - year round.
709	Individual submitter	<p>1) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>4) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>5) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>7) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>8) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>9) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>10) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>11) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>13) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>14) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>15) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>16) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>17) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>18) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p> <p>19) cyclist safety - please do reduce the speed limit to save lives</p>
710	Individual submitter	<p>This is not going to make cycling easier from Hira to Nelson. We need to have safer cycling lanes for this stretch of road as it is not the speed alone that makes it dangerous. Talking to regular commuters to and from Malborough, they are very upset about this proposal but - do agree with restricting speeds in some areas however there are few passing lanes so we may seem some frustrated drivers.</p> <p>I live at a dangerous intersection (Glen turnoff from SH6 and hvae in 30 years seen 2 fatal accidents there and other cars going off the road because of speed.) Please consider moving this intersection and no widening it as already very scary to cross over it! As a cyclist and pedestrian especially!</p>

711	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's not the speed it's the drivers leave as it is</p> <p>4) I drive this route every week to change make my journey longer people will drive at 60</p> <p>5) That's ok it is a built up area</p> <p>7) Leave it it's mainly straight it's a open road for goodness sake</p> <p>8) Leave it as it is 60 at the school yes</p> <p>9) Leave it as it is</p> <p>10) It's ok the way it is</p> <p>11) Leave it alone keep to what it is</p> <p>13) Leave as it is</p> <p>14) For goodness sake leave it as it is</p> <p>15) Leave it as it is</p> <p>16) That's ok</p> <p>17) Leave it as it is</p> <p>18) Leave it as it is</p> <p>19) Leave as it is</p>
712	Bow To Stern NZ	<p>1) It is only a short section of road potential future foot traffic, could make sense. - I am neutral on this area.</p> <p>4) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p> <p>5) I support this proposal, there is often a lot of foot traffic in this area, especially with the link pathway.</p> <p>7) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p> <p>8) Possibly this makes sense, due to the presence of the school.</p> <p>9) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p> <p>10) There is often foot traffic in this area, a lower speed limit would make it safer.</p> <p>11) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p> <p>13) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p> <p>14) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p> <p>15) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p> <p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p> <p>18) I oppose this. The road is wide and I don't see this area as dangerous. There is currently plenty of room for vehicles and pedestrians, with safely designated areas. the speed should remain at 80</p> <p>19) I oppose this proposal. This will slow down the commute for commercial and business travellers considerably, especially where time is a factor in their operations (Ie; logbooks, delivery &amp; appointment deadlines etc) Most people using this section of road are commuting between Blenheim and Nelson. I don't believe many crashes on this section of road are speed related.</p>
713	Civil Engineering Laboratory Services Ltd	<p>1) No, I have never had a problem driving this section at 100km/h in the past 24 years.</p> <p>4) No, I have never had a problem driving this section at 100km/h in the past 24 years.</p> <p>5) No, I have never had a problem driving this section at 100km/h in the past 24 years.</p> <p>7) No, I have never had a problem driving this section at 100km/h in the past 24 years.</p> <p>8) No, I have never had a problem driving this section at 100km/h in the past 24 years. Yes 60 for the school zone.</p> <p>9) No, I have never had a problem driving this section at 100km/h in the past 24 years. BUT yes slow to 80 through the reserve.</p> <p>10) Yes 60 through here. Lots of tourists and children.</p> <p>11) Straighten the corners out</p> <p>13) 60 - 80 on the corners 100 on the straights. I have never had a problem driving this section at 100km/h in the past 24 years.</p> <p>14) Yes 60 km/h. The road needs widening with more passing lanes and signs telling people to pull over.</p>

		<p>15) The road needs widening with more passing lanes and signs telling people to pull over.</p> <p>16) Yes agree.</p> <p>17) The road needs widening with more passing lanes and signs telling people to pull over. I have never had a problem driving this section at 100km/h in the past 24 years.</p> <p>18) Yes people will start driving at 50km/h or less!!</p> <p>19) Yes people will start driving at 50km/h or less!!</p>
714	Individual submitter	<p>I oppose the following proposed speed changes on SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson in the following locations as per the proposal document:</p> <p>location 1/1,7,9,11,13,14,15,1/8 and 19. These areas should remain with the current speed limit.</p> <p>I have no opposition to Location 2,3,5,6,8,10,12, and 16 as reducing speeds in the vicinity of schools is a sensible move.</p> <p>This stretch of road has had a high proportion of accidents attributed to passing manoeuvres going wrong. Reducing the speed to 80 km/hr will not result in all the traffic travelling at the same speed. Consideration should be given to adding additional slow traffic lanes to allow faster vehicles the ability to pass. Heavy vehicles take a lot longer to increase speed especially on an uphill gradient and regardless of reducing the speeds to 80km/hr cars will still attempt to pass the trucks even if the speed limits are the same as a car and a truck travel at different speeds as a result of the difference in their ability to safely negotiate a road this includes the vehicles ability to power out of corners and travel up and down gradients. An example of this would be a corner with a recommended speed of 60km/hr a truck and trailer would start to decrease their speed from 80km/hr at least 100-200 meters before a car would start to even consider slowing down. The truck would also negotiate the corner at 10 km/hr below the posted speed limit so they would be at 50 km/hr. Coming out of the corner a truck would take longer to then increase speed back to 80 km/hr. Slowing the speed limit to 80km/hr will not result in all traffic is travelling at the same speed. This is of particular importance since 8% of the deaths and serious injuries were attributed to passing on this stretch of road. Therefore additional areas need to be considered for slow moving traffic, these do not need to be passing lanes but rather slow traffic lanes.</p> <p>The proposed 80km/hr will have significant impacts and increased costs on everyone, the cost of living will increase for the wider community as it will now cost more to transport goods by reducing the speed as the trucks will not be able to complete as many loads in a day. A driver will no longer get three loads to Nelson and back they will only be able to achieve two within their hours.</p> <p>We would like to see the RUC that we pay put into the maintenance and improvement of the roads, lowering the speed limit is a poor way to deal with the failings of the roading infrastructure in this country.</p>
715	Individual submitter	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I feel STRONGLY that whilst NZTA has the road users best interests at heart, reducing the speed limit to reduce serious harm is NOT going to reduce serious harm on its own.</p> <p>I recommend a staged approach;</p> <p>Stage 1 abandon the designated "stopping areas" and provide designated and well-marked overtaking lanes.</p> <p>Stage 2 from approx. 400m East of Slaters Creek Rd to Forestry Rd East, extend passing area, that allows truck "B " trucks travelling East to West, to slowly travel uphill without delaying traffic.</p> <p>Stage 3 in 2026 review crash data and engage with communities/road users to ascertain whether or not speed restrictions are a viable option.</p> <p>I have travelled this road very frequently over the past 13 odd years, weekly the last 4 years. I've seen accidents that are not a result of poor road design or condition, but driver error. Speed in overtaking in areas of road not suitable for overtaking, young inexperienced drivers not understanding the capabilities of their vehicle or driving ability are some of the contributing factors. You can tell very quickly when coming up behind a vehicle in the section of road, whether or not the driver knows the road layout/condition and recognise to keep a more than safety distance from the inexperienced driver. Not many drivers utilise the stopping areas, preferring to drive on, causing a build-up of vehicles behind and driver frustration. I suggest the areas be reviewed, with the view of changing/modifying to becoming passing bays.</p> <p>Also, I feel for the truckies who have a heavy load on, travelling to Nelson, on the Eastern side of the summit. They are crawling along and have nowhere to pull over and allow vehicles etc to safely overtake. Surely the road can be widened a further 2-3 metres at not a considerable cost.</p> <p>Lastly, once these changes have been made, let's evaluate accident statistics and then the possibility of reducing speeds then.</p> <p>I've seen the changes in driving patterns on SH 6 Appleby Highway, where the speed limit has been reduced from 100km/hr to 80km/hr and still people overtake on double yellow lines. No matter what rules you put in place, you will never stop the idiots on the road who don't comprehend the danger of illegal manoeuvres or their ability to avoid collisions.</p> <p>Please...do NOT reduce the speed limit yet !</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
716	Individual submitter	<p>1) Before considering any speed changes please consider the benefit of numerous passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. I have been using this road monthly for 16 years and it is the serious lack of passing lanes that in my mind causes the most concern. Driver impatience is very clearly a problem on this road. Fortunately I know all the passing places and there are very few of them but if I am a few cars behind a slower vehicle it is next too impossible to over take. Clear signage showing how far ahead a passing lane is would really assist drivers. I think reducing the speed to 80km is the wrong decision. The danger on this road is the lack of places to pass slower drivers. I see it all the time.</p> <p>4) Before considering any speed changes please consider the benefit of numerous passing lanes between Blenheim and Nelson. I have been using this road monthly for 16 years and it is the serious lack of passing lanes that in my mind causes the most concern. Driver impatience is very clearly a problem on this road. Fortunately I know all the passing places and there are very few of them but if I am a few cars behind a slower vehicle it is next too impossible to over take. Clear signage showing how far ahead a passing lane is would really assist drivers. I think reducing the speed to 80km is the wrong decision. The danger on this road is the lack of places to pass slower drivers. I see it all the time.</p>



		them but if I am a few cars behind a slower vehicle it is next too impossible to over take. Clear signage showing how far ahead a passing lane is would really assist drivers. I think reducing the speed to 80km is the wrong decision. The danger on this road is the lack of places to pass slower drivers. I see it all the time.
<b>717</b>	Individual submitter	Leave as is, do NOT change
<b>718</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't live in that area, so can't comment</p> <p>4) Don't live in that area, so can't comment.</p> <p>5) Can't comment</p> <p>7) Don't agree with reducing the speed limit.</p> <p>8) Don't agree with a reduction of the speed limit.</p> <p>9) Don't agree with a reduction of the speed limit</p> <p>10) Don't agree with a reduction of the speed limit.</p> <p>11) Don't agree with a reduction of the speed limit.</p> <p>13) Don't agree with a reduction in the speed limit.</p> <p>14) Don't agree with a reduction in the speed limit.</p> <p>15) Don't agree with a reduction in the speed limit.</p> <p>16) Agree with a reduction in the speed limit.</p> <p>17) Agree.</p> <p>18) Don't agree, should remain 80.</p> <p>19) Agree.</p>
<b>719</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>4) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>5) No. Sounds good</p> <p>7) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>8) No. Sounds good</p> <p>9) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>10) No. Sounds good</p> <p>11) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>13) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>14) No. Sounds good</p> <p>15) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>16) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>17) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p> <p>18) No. Sounds good</p> <p>19) No. 80 km/h is appropriate and I fully support this proposal</p>
<b>720</b>	Individual submitter	<p>1) Is this really a high risk location? A straight piece of road with large open ditches on each side? If you want to make it safer, reduce the speed passing through Woodburn to 60 to allow people to safely enter and exit the airport.</p> <p>4) Completely unnecessary and will have no effect on safety. If you genuinely want to improve safety, build passing lanes, properly maintain the road surface, stop painting white dashed lines around blind corners/over hills/sections too short to legitimately pass.</p> <p>5) Again why? This is not a hazardous zone, all you will do is cause congestion and frustration needlessly.</p> <p>7) Again this is not going to solve the safety issue. PROPER road maintenance, passing lanes, correctly paint portions that are not safe to pass with double yellow not white dashes.</p> <p>8) Yes I fully support this to improve safety for the students and road users alike</p> <p>9) Yet again, proper road markings, proper road maintenance, passing or pull off lanes would solve the issues. Reducing speed will not.</p> <p>10) Agree this is logical and needed.</p> <p>11) Proper road markings, proper road maintenance, pull off or passing lanes will make a difference. This speed reduction will just cause congestion, frustrate people and possibly create more hazards.</p> <p>13) Agreed, the speed limit over the Whangamoā's to be at 100 is silly, 90% of it can't be driven at that speed anyway. Also, proper road markings will help.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p>

		18) No Comment 19) No Comment
721	Individual submitter	We have lived in the Nelson North area for 20+ years and 100% support your proposed speed limit reductions for both Bn to Nn 80k and Wk to Atawhai 60k. If that's not possible, at least 80k all the way in from Hira to Nelson would be great.
722	Individual submitter	1) Seem unnecessary. This is good section of road with few hazards and good visibility with the exception of the small bridge. A few extra right hand turning bays might be more useful improvement for example into Jackson's Road. Slowing traffic in this section will add time for commuters and cost for commercial traffic. 4) This is a good section of road, with generally good visibility and many open and straight/sweeping sections. Slowing traffic in this section will add significant travel time for commuters and cost for commercial traffic. 5) Good idea. 7) Again this is perfectly good section of road. Slowing traffic in this section will add significant time for commuters and cost for commercial traffic. 8) Again this is perfectly good section of road. Slowing traffic in this section will add significant time for commuters and cost for commercial traffic. The school zone is a difficult issue. It's right on the straight and this is the best place to overtake the many campervans that travel at <70 and rarely pull over. 9) Again this is perfectly good section of road. Slowing traffic in this section will add significant time for commuters and cost for commercial traffic. 10) Good idea. Having seasonal speed limits is quite confusing for regular road users. A fixed year round limit make sense and it's only 700m of road. 11) 100 is fine for this area. Slowing traffic will add cost and waste time. 13) 100 is fine for this area. Slowing traffic will add cost and waste time. The proposed 80 area includes a very good straight. 14) This can only be described as bewildering. NZTA just spent Millions on this section of road putting in a new passing area. This section is highly variable with some good open sections and some sections were 50 or 60 would be unsafe some corners. Imposing a blanket speed is unreasonably restrictive. This would add substantially to the real journey time between Nelson and Blenheim, it would also result in all traffic queueing up behind trucks/campervans *(which travel at <60 for much of the section) with no possibility of passing at 60 and resulting congestion. 15) This is workable but again question the logic of limiting a good straight to 100. 16) No Comment 17) Why drop the speed of an area with passing lane in both direction to 80? It has only been a few years since the Blenheim bound passing lane was upgraded 18) I used to live here 80 works just fine in this area. It would be preferable to keep this at the same speed as Atawhai Cres to Trafalagar St, rather than change to 60 and have it continue to be a revenue generating speed trap between two higher speed zones. 19) Realistically traffic often moves at 80 or less along this section so change wont' make much difference. May as well remove the Blenheim bound passing lane (which a number of motorist use as turning lane into Atawhai Dr.
723	Individual submitter	1) There is no requirement to make a change it is a straight piece of Road. 4) This is a reasonable piece of road there is no need to reduce the speed limit 5) agree with reducing the limit 7) There is no requirement to reduce this limit as roads are somewhat ok. 8) Yes reduce it 9) no leave it alone at 100. 10) Yes reduce it you have to slow down to get over a one lane bridge anyway use your brain. 11) There are a number of straight pieces on this road leave it alone. 13) Please tell me where u can do 100 through here do not be stupid 14) once again where the hell can u do 100 through here. 15) Fine do it 16) no problem 17) Fine 18) Fine do it 19) Get the traffic moving straight pieces of road
724	Individual submitter	1) nope 4) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away. 5) No issues 7) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away. 8) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way

		<p>to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away. Variation around schools is good.</p> <p>9) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away.</p> <p>10) no issue</p> <p>11) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away.</p> <p>13) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away.</p> <p>14) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away.</p> <p>15) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away.</p> <p>16) no problems</p> <p>17) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away.</p> <p>18) there is not benefit to reducing to 60 here as there is clear access on and off the state hwy and there is no houses directly on it.</p> <p>19) Disagree, working in the transport sector with trucks going to Nelson every day, means major cost and service implications for our company without any benefit. Reducing the speed all the way to Nelson is very narrow minded and does not consider the wider economical effects on local business. The trip as it stands now is too long. Perhaps spend more money on improving the roads. The people that have accidents will still have them, inattention and bad over taking etc will never go away.</p>
725	Individual submitter	<p>1) Why! i 100km is fine.</p> <p>4) This is nonsense. There is no problem with the current speed.</p> <p>5) Ok</p> <p>7) Again this is nonsense. 100 is both practical and safe.</p> <p>8) 100 is fine. Drivers are not stupid and do slow down if necessary.</p> <p>9) 100 is fine</p> <p>10) ok</p> <p>11) 100 is ok and logical for this stretch of road.</p> <p>13) leave as is</p> <p>14) I'm sure this section includes the newly formed road. if so how bloody ridiculous. 100 is fine.</p> <p>15) leave at 100. Usually you are behind a truck and at a lower speed anyway.</p> <p>16) ok</p> <p>17) no need to reduce speed here</p> <p>18) ok</p> <p>19) 100 is fine</p>
726	Brightwater Engineering	<p>1) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>4) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>5) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>7) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>8) None of these deaths were speed related. Yes the limit should be dropped around any schools!</p> <p>9) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>10) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>11) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>13) None of these deaths were speed related.</p>

		<p>14) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>15) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>16) None of these deaths were speed related. Yes speeds should be dropped around all schools.</p> <p>17) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>18) None of these deaths were speed related.</p> <p>19) None of these deaths were speed related.</p>
727	Individual submitter	<p>1) Please keep the road at the existing limit</p> <p>4) Please keep the road at the existing limit.</p> <p>5) The speed limit should stay the same unless this is a high use pedestrian area</p> <p>7) The speed limit should stay at 100km/h</p> <p>8) There should be a variable speed limit</p> <p>9) Speed limit to stay at 100km/h</p> <p>10) 100km/h with signs</p> <p>11) 100km/h</p> <p>13) Open road speeds should apply</p> <p>14) 100km/h</p> <p>15) 100km/h keep the open road speed</p> <p>16) Variable speed is a good idea</p> <p>17) Open road speeds should apply</p> <p>18) Should stay at 80km/h</p> <p>19) Leave it at 100km/h</p>
728	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave at 100km</p> <p>4) Just leave at 100km</p> <p>5) Leave at 70km</p> <p>7) Leave at 100km</p> <p>8) That's fine</p> <p>9) Leave at 100km</p> <p>10) Leave as is</p> <p>11) Leave at 100km</p> <p>13) Leave at 100km</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Leave at 100km</p> <p>18) Leave at 80</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
729	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's a straight piece of road, if people can't pull out of an intersection properly take their license off them don't ruin it for the rest of us.</p> <p>4) If you make this 80 all the people that currently do 90 will be doing 60-70. Don't be idiots</p> <p>5) Nothing wrong with it leave it alone</p> <p>7) I drive this road at 100 multiple times a month, never had any problems. Take the idiots off the road.</p> <p>8) Already signs in place for the school zone, don't change it</p> <p>9) Don't be stupid take the people who can't handle it off the road</p> <p>10) It works fine with the speed limit being dropped for summer only, leave it alone</p> <p>11) Nothing wrong with this piece of road</p> <p>13) Leave it alone, road is fine</p> <p>14) Most people do 40 anyway, leave it alone</p> <p>15) Leave it alone</p> <p>16) Already has school signs in place, leave it alone</p> <p>17) Leave it alone</p>

		18) Get your penis fingers off it. (Leave it alone) 19) Works fine, leave it alone
730	Canvastown School	1) This should stay at 100km, 4) This stretch of road is safe to drive at 100 km. Often when there is a lot of traffic the speed is determined by the speed of the trucks and is 80km. But when traffic is light 100km is safe. 5) No Comment 7) 100km is a safe speed 8) Yes! 80km. Larger signage for the school is needed. Drivers come over the bridge and overtake turning vehicles into the school on the double yellow line - cars and trucks. 9) This is an easy stretch of road - 100 km is fine 10) Great idea 60km. A speed limit to match campervan season - Nov-Feb. 11) 100km is fine 13) 80km is fine 14) 60 km is fine 15) 80km is fine 16) agree 17) 100km 18) 80km is fine 19) 80km is fine
731	Individual submitter	The current 100kph for us feels unsafe as we join this highway (Bay View Road). When we turn the join SH6 the view can look clear and before you know it vehicles can be right up behind you travelling at 100kph or more? With the proposed speed special housing area of 160 homes above and along the ridge connecting to our road will mean increased traffic. Our neighbourhood has felt strongly for years that this stretch of highway should be 80kph, We would all feel safer.
732	Individual submitter	Pleased be advised that we are emphatically opposed to reducing the speed limit on this highway. We believe if the proposal went ahead there will be more accidents not less due to the frustration of not only slower drivers but if following heavy truck & trailers belching out diesel fumes drivers and motorcyclists will try to pass these trucks and will need to increase their speed to pass opening themselves up to being pinged by traffic police. We are opposed to the proposed speed limit of 80 k on this highway. It's crazy.
733	Individual submitter	1) No Comment 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) The Whangamoia Saddle Road reduction of speed to 60km is totally necessary. Most vehicles only do about this speed currently due to the very winding nature of the road. As a competitive road cyclist this piece of road is exceptionally dangerous for a cyclist as the road edge marked by the white line often trims the edge a large run-off ditch. A cyclist often can get wedged into this ditch as a car or truck passes them. 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) As a regular cyclist on this piece of road the Hira side of Gentle Annie Saddle is extremely dangerous. Either side of the h/way the road edge white line is on the gravel road edge. This could easily be widened by 1m for cyclist safety. 18) This is an extremely dangerous section for cars entering and turning off into household driveways. Reduction of speed to 60 km is very good 19) This is an extremely dangerous section for cars entering and turning off into household driveways and the several road access sections. Reduction to 60 km is very good.
734	Individual submitter	Dear Sir/Madam I wish to make a submission on the proposed speed reductions on route SH 6 Firstly the idea of reducing speed on tight and demanding roads in the top of the south is a good idea as it will reduce the accident casualty rate. The proposal however of reducing the speed limit on the entire highway from Blenheim to Nelson is not a good idea. It will immediately cause frustration in drivers and risky overtaking behaviors and head on encounters with oncoming traffic. You will be forcing a no overtaking environment for a large section of the highway causing traffic build up behind heavy traffic for unacceptable times again causing irrational behavior in drivers trying to overtake with no acceptable speed margin. More use of passing lanes and no passing lines will be more effective than a speed sign that is erected as the cheap option but does not reflect the real driving environment. Please reconsider this proposal with these points in mind

735	M&J Gibbons Ktd	<p>To come straight to the point.....could we have some common sense please. I drove that road for 22 years on a daily basis, at least 2 and sometimes 3 return trips per day, 5 days per week.</p> <p>That is a very acceptable road overall. Yes, still needs work but overall its ok. I chucked in truck driving for a spell after a motorist overtook my truck and B-Train Unit going over the top of the Rai Saddle....a 100% blind left hand corner. That was the final straw for me at the time. That was not a road issue, it was a motorist issue. And that accounts for 95% of the madness/accidents I have witnessed.</p> <p>Overtaking lanes on Brownlee Straight, just south of Havelock or between the site of the old Okaramio Pub and Mt Riley Rd or both, would be a much smarter move.</p> <p>Money is obviously not an issue given the massive waste recently on the work done at the top of the Rai Saddle . Huge overkill. Could have spent half of it a kilometre or so further down in to the Collins Valley and would have created a much safer road.</p> <p>I realise that over the last 10 years or so there seems to have been a production line churning out staff with limited abilities at NZTA but this particular issue calls for someone with a bit of basic old-fashioned common sense.</p> <p>Reduced speed limits?? In a small handful of spots.</p> <p>Passing lanes....crucial and needed urgently</p> <p>A few corners trimmed to reduce the severity of the angle</p> <p>Investment in the Collins Valley eastern section</p> <p>Increased signage in places</p> <p>In-depth study off accident figures to separate the idiot factor from the roading factor</p> <p>Please inject common sense in to the final decision</p>
736	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) Nothing wrong with the present limit. Good road with good visibility. Knee jerk reactions because " a few people" think it's a good idea. What about the thousands of others that don't think it's a good idea  5) No Comment  7) Good road, no need to reduce  8) school zone okay but not the rest of it  9) Good road, no need to reduce speed  10) busy time of the year with lots of pedestrians around, and your'e making it faster????? WTF  11) Wide clear vision road. No need to reduce  13) Road is fine where it is open and straight/flat. 100kph not obtainable on hilly areas anyway.  14) Why? Can't do 100kph anyway  15) 1km of straight road, Why?  16) No Comment  17) fine as it is. No change needed  18) bleating locals  19) No Comment</p>
737	Individual submitter	<p>I have driven this road 100 times in the last 60 years. I have no trouble doing 100kphs. Road and cars have improved. Have you considered wire fences in the middle of the road? Where it is not safe to pass? Or the upright bending stick uou use in some places.</p> <p>If you put rumble strips in the middle of the road and both sides of the road that would atleast remind the minority of drivers who cant stay on the right side of the road. If you reduce all the speeds from Blenheim to nelson, it's a big overkill. Have you talked to the trucking companies who use this road every day? I also can't believe that it only adds 9 minutes onto this trip.</p>
738	Individual submitter	<p>I would not like to see you introduce a max 80km/h speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson.</p> <p>There are definitely places where the speed should be reduced and these are included in your proposal.</p> <p>At the same time areas where the existing 10110km/h is fine.</p>

		<p>Item 4, Between Gee Rd at Renwick to the Queen Charlotte Drive turn off should remain at 100km/h. I drive this road frequently and comfortably at 100km/h. If you conclude that a speed reduction is required in this section of the road then please do not go below 90km/h.</p> <p>Item 7, Between Havelock and Canvas Town should remain at 100km/h. If you conclude that a speed reduction is required in this section of the road then please do not go below 90km/h.</p> <p>Item 11, After the proposed 60km/h zone at Pelorous Bridge to Rai Valley School should remain at 100km/h. If you conclude that a speed reduction is required in this section of the road then please do not go below 90km/h.</p> <p>Item 13, After the proposed 60km/h zone at Rai Valley to the old forestry camp at the beginning of the Rai Saddle should remain at 100km/h. If you conclude that a speed reduction is required in this section of the road then please do not go below 90km/h.</p> <p>Item 17, Cable Bay Turn off to Atawhai should be 100km/h. If you conclude that a speed reduction is required in this section of the road then please do not go below 90km/h.</p> <p>If you reduce the max speed to 80km/h it will increase the journey time considerably and this will increase freight costs for trucks etc.</p> <p>If you reduce the speed limit to 80km/h you will have to build many more overtaking zones. Without these drivers will become impatient and that is when accidents happen. Installing more overtaking areas would be a better solution than reducing the speed limit.</p> <p>The traffic density will continue to increase over the years so you will need to improve the road and the overtaking zones will be the incremental solution.</p> <p>There should be no problem having different speed limits for different road sectors as long as the signs are large enough. Then it is simply a matter of policing.</p> <p>Those are my thoughts.</p>
739	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No keep 100km</li> <li>4) Keep 100km or more accident will happen</li> <li>5) That fine from start of havelock till end should be 50km as it hard to get out of that road that queencharollte drive comes out of</li> <li>7) Keep 100km</li> <li>8) Keep 100km except during school hours lower to 80km</li> <li>9) Keep 100km</li> <li>10) Keep 100km</li> <li>11) 100km keep it at</li> <li>13) 100km keep it at</li> <li>14) Keep at 100km</li> <li>15) 100km</li> <li>16) Keep at 80km except during school zone area during school hours</li> <li>17) Keep 100km</li> <li>18) Keep at 80km</li> <li>19) Keep at 100km</li> </ol>
740	Individual submitter	<p>We think 80k is going to take so much longer. If there were just a few mmore pullover bay, where slow drivers could let others passs. This is where drivers try to pass and things go wrong. I think the speed should be 50k going through Rai. There are a lot of cars and shops and people working over the road, maybe Havelock needs a place for people crossing. The roads are narrow and there's nowhere to pull over. Please not 80k all the way from Nelson to Blenheim. We need to slow down where schools or build up area but not slow all th way, may god help us.</p>
741	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) No Comment</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) No Comment</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> <li>9) No comment</li> <li>10) No Comment</li> <li>11) No Comment</li> <li>13) No Comment</li> <li>14) No Comment</li> <li>15) No Comment</li> <li>16) There needs to be more sign posting about the school. There also needs to be safe turning bays to get on to the road.</li> <li>17) Improve the condition of the road. The big sweeping corner coming up to the Glen turn of needs to be addressed. Too often have I met people slowly drifting across the centre line here.</li> <li>18) No Comment</li> <li>19) The new limit is too slow. People already only drive 80km on there. I think that when limits change, they will slow down even more. I think people.need better education on how and when to safely enter a 100km stretch of road.</li> </ol>

742	Individual submitter	We both fully endorse the proposed speed changes and reducing the speed on all other roads in New Zealand, needs to be considered.
743	Individual submitter	<p>I am writing this to speak against your proposal to reduce the speed limit on this road to a maximum of 80 kmph.</p> <p>I have driven the section of the road between Nelson and Rai Valley ten times per week for 35 years, and during those many trips, I have not seen one accident caused by speed.</p> <p>I have though seen a number of accidents and many more, very near accidents that have been caused by inattention and driver frustration. It is my strong belief that these two accident causes will only be increased with a reduction of the speed limit in places where the vast majority of drivers feel it is unnecessary.</p> <p>For a few years, there was one sign in the Graham Valley with wording similar to,  “Traffic behind? Pull over. Let it pass”.</p> <p>That sign is now gone, and now nowhere on the 46km section of road between Rai and Nelson, either way, is there even one sign or similar encouraging considerate driver behaviour. Is this not something that NZ Transport should be addressing rather than a blanket punitive measure that definitely will increase driver frustration?</p> <p>The truly dangerous drivers who do cause accidents with high speed, are ignoring the present limit and will do so even more with a reduced limit. Yes to, “the greater the speed, the greater the damage”, but most things in life are a compromise, and an appropriate balance would be the 100 kmph limit remaining for most of the road.</p> <p>On sections of the road such as though Atawhai, Hira and Rai, a speed limit of 60-70 kmph would be sensible to most people, and similarly over the Whangamoas though here it is hardly necessary as the bends in the road make the dangers obvious.</p> <p>Over the Whangamoas, I have observed many very near accidents that have been caused by driver frustration with inconsiderate drivers causing long lines of traffic behind them. On this section some “Traffic behind? Pull over. Let it pass” signs could hopefully improve driver behaviour and safety. Of course, more passing bays etc would be good though these are expensive and difficult to build, but there are a number of stopping areas that slower drivers could be encouraged to use.</p> <p>For the rest of the Nelson to Rai road, and on through at least to Renwick, there is no reason why this is more of a speed hazard than most other 100 kmph roads in New Zealand, and no justification for it being treated differently. Accordingly I urge you not to apply an 80 kmph maximum to this road.</p>
744	Individual submitter	<p>I support this.  Who is in such a rush we need to die to get there.</p> <p>I would also support additional passing lanes.</p>
745	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep the speed limit at 100 km hour for the efficiency of the motoring public. Much money has already been spent to make thew a 100 km/h road</p> <p>4) Reduced eefficiency in vehicle transit. lost opportunity to pass slower vehicles. Build up of frustration of vehicles that cannot pass slower vehicles at 80 km/hr safely</p> <p>5) Road seems to work well the way it is leave alone.</p> <p>7) Road is good at 100 km leave alone</p> <p>8) Suppoprt</p> <p>9) Leave alone works finme as it is. Already good opportunities to pass slower vehicles</p> <p>10) support</p> <p>11) Leave alone good working road</p> <p>13) Leave alone good passing opportunities would be wasted and builds frustration</p> <p>14) No way already spent a fortune on this road to get it to a standard. Leave alone Slow down at whangamoas saddle to Hira and leave the passing lane comming up to the saddle.</p> <p>15) Support</p> <p>16) Support</p> <p>17) Leave already has a passing lane</p> <p>18) Leave at 80 km/hr or variable speed</p> <p>19) Leave alomne works as it is</p>
746	Individual submitter	<p>1) no</p> <p>4) no</p> <p>5) no</p> <p>7) no</p> <p>8) no</p> <p>9) no</p> <p>10) no</p> <p>11) no</p> <p>13) no</p> <p>14) no</p> <p>15) no</p> <p>16) no</p>

		17) no 18) no 19) no
747	Individual submitter	<p>I am sure this submission will end up in the nearest bin but what the heck Make the speed max 80, provide twice the Policing and do a whole lot more. It is appalling management that allows a main highway to operate without 24/7 video surveillance by properly trained staff with the ability to flash critical messages to a range of high tech display signs at high crash locations.</p> <p>Much of the highway is not a highway but just a tar sealed potholed goat track with no shoulder both sides.</p> <p>Many truck drivers do 100kph plus and bugger anyone in their way. At 80kph you had better expect many trucks to be driven closer than four meters to cars in front. That will be normal behaviour. Behaviour changes when Police are nearby. They know there is zero surveillance by air or fixed cameras.</p>
748	Individual submitter	<p>1) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>4) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>5) No comment here</p> <p>7) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>8) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>9) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>10) Speed decrease around the Pelorus bridge makes sense.</p> <p>11) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>13) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>14) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>15) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>16) This makes sense</p> <p>17) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p> <p>18) This should remain 80</p> <p>19) I strongly believe lowering the speed limit will have a negative effect of drivers making the roads no safer. I believe the speed limit should remain 100.</p>
749	Individual submitter	<p>1) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>4) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>5) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>7) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>8) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>9) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit. Turning on and off side roads is particularly hazardous on this section of road.</p> <p>10) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit. This is a particularly hazardous section of road with multiple side road turn-offs and pedestrians especially in the summer.</p> <p>11) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>13) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>14) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>15) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>16) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p> <p>17) I strongly support reduction in the speed limit on this section of road. I have had 2 near misses at intersections on this section, one of my coworkers had a collision, and I am aware of many accidents on this section. Please reduce the speed limit on this section of road before more people are injured or killed.</p> <p>18) I'd prefer to leave this section at 80 km/h to be consistent with the new speed limits on the rest of SH6.</p> <p>19) I have no objection to this reduction in the speed limit and support any efforts to make roads safer including lowering the speed limit.</p>

750	Individual submitter	It's been a long time coming but the proposals are everything that needs to be done. As our population is growing and the cities spread out, changes need to be observed and made accordingly. Safety is critical on our roads, entering and exiting properties along the main highway need to be safe manouevers, particularly where cornering traffic travelling at speed come to blind spots. we should be able to cycle safely throughout our countries roads. Additional space need to be created on the shoulders of every road.
751	Ducati Owners Club	<p>ATTENTION: SH6 BLENHEIM TO NELSON SPEED REVIEW CONSULTATION</p> <p>A bloke attending a boxing class.</p> <p>The trainer said</p> <p>“If you step in this ring prepared to be hit”</p> <p>“I can hit you in the stomach, arm and Face”</p> <p>“Or we could implement a new policy, Where I hit you 20% Slower”</p> <p>“Surely there’s another option, I just want to get fit”, he said.</p> <p>“We could put this foam padding between you and my fist and then hit you”</p> <p>“Sounds Better “</p> <p>“Or I could teach you to see the signs of me getting ready to hit you and you will be able to adjust your position in time to get out of the way”</p> <p>Which option do you think was chosen?</p> <p>If there is going to be such a reduction in accidents by lowering the speed limit, why was so 9.5 million spent on realignment of the Rai Valley Hill? Where there was only five serious crashes and 11 minor injury crashes. Over 10yrs</p> <p>To get rid of so few corners. Only 5 !!</p> <p>Why not just stick and 80k sign in there?/ If it was so bad , and the millions of dollars spent could have been used for driver training? Education and public awareness, equipping drivers with skills they can use wherever they go, rather than being restricted to one area where the new signage is.</p> <p>By lowering the speed limit from 100 kilometres to 80/60, as it was between 1975 /1985, you are saying that it was unwise to increase the speed limit in the first place.</p> <p>It was stated in an article in the Nelson Mail Nelson Mail 19th Oct, there was evidence to show there could be a 8%- 12% reduction in road deaths and injury in a Urban Area by lowering the speed limit, 90% area proposed for change is not an Urban environment , there are more vehicles in an Urban Area.</p> <p>By reducing the speed limit you could unduly open up the can of worms and mental torment ?? , from those that have been injured or family s that have lost family members , that negligence and or a duty of care was not followed in raising the speed limit in the first place, and the potential for a class action lawsuits ??</p> <p>With the advent of safer vehicles and continued appetite for motor vehicles. Data released by the Ministry of Transport (oct 2018) shows 48.2 billion kilometres were driven on New Zealand roads over 2017 – a record high. The record is a six percent increase on 2016 and a 17 percent increase over a decade. (using the same six percent increase year on year makes 54.15 billion kilometres for 2019)</p> <p>But Road Deaths And reported injury casualties 1923 to 2016 report Shows a decrease per KM travel.</p> <p>We should be celebrating the successes. Yet we keep getting tolled the road toll has gone up?? In n business if the turnover has stayed the same but your gross profit margin has increased you are doing well!!There are more vehicle movements and less vehicle incidents , so the risk to the individual per kilometres travelled has dropped.</p> <p>And this is prior to making changes lowering speed limits from 100 KM 80.eg Lewis pass Murchison area.</p> <p>So by getting Target fixation on the number of Deaths and Injury you will forever find yourself chasing the tail, quest to having a 0 road toll is an unrealistic goal with an increasing population, increase in vehicles and kilometres travelled, you are always going to have accidents, this is just a fact of life and is inevitable, and to think that you can stop this from happening it's some sort of Utopia mindset that's not achievable.</p> <p>Improving everyone's driving skills, and their ability to read the road, would have a positive impact on the speeds people travel and the harm done on our roads. Speed is one risk that good drivers can minimise.</p> <p>In fact, it has been found that: if all road users complied totally with all road rules, fatalities would fall by around 50 per cent and injuries by 30 per cent, therefore around 50 per cent of fatalities and 70 per cent of injuries would remain (Elvik R, 1997.) Nelson Mail 19th Oct NZTA)</p> <p>It is unrealistic to believe that by training you would get 100% of people on board but even if you got 12.5% to25% of people on board with this it would mean on current figures 20 to 40 lives saved in one year, you cannot tell me that making these changes to speed limits between Nelson and Blenheim you will say 20 to 40 lives in a year.</p> <p>Can I strongly suggest you re-look at your cost benefit Matrix, when it comes to roading projects like Rai Valley and think of the long game, properly training in equipping people to be situational aware when driving. 10million would go a very long way, the years between 2009-2018 , 20people died in the Nelson to Blenheim road , if training was in place you could have save 200 to 400 lives over the whole country in the same time frame.</p> <p>Investing into people to make a driving culture change for the next generation and those to come, it has to start at some point why not now.</p> <p>In conclusion there is only one area that I support a speed change and that is in front of the Canvastown school during school hours.</p> <p><a href="https://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh6-rai-saddle-improvements/">https://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh6-rai-saddle-improvements/</a>  <a href="https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/116685496/nzta-turns-myth-buster-in-battle-to-cut-speed-limits">https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/116685496/nzta-turns-myth-buster-in-battle-to-cut-speed-limits</a>  <a href="https://www.transport.govt.nz/mot-resources/road-safety-resources/road-deaths/annual-number-of-road-deaths-historical-information/">https://www.transport.govt.nz/mot-resources/road-safety-resources/road-deaths/annual-number-of-road-deaths-historical-information/</a>  <a href="https://www.transport.govt.nz/news/land/we-are-driving-further-and-more-than-ever-before/">https://www.transport.govt.nz/news/land/we-are-driving-further-and-more-than-ever-before/</a></p>

752	The Little Pig Building Company	45 Club Members. Only supports one part of the proposed speed limit change from Nelson to Blenheim and that is lowering the speed limit during school hours in front of Canvastown school. Submission by Nick Marer was read at annual AGM on 5,Nov and sent out to Club members all we're in agreeance with it.
753	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) keep it 100</li> <li>4) Keep it 100</li> <li>5) 50 is fine</li> <li>7) Keep it 100</li> <li>8) Keep it 100</li> <li>9) keep it 100</li> <li>10) keep it 100/50</li> <li>11) Keep it 100</li> <li>13) Keep it 100</li> <li>14) Keep it 100</li> <li>15) Keep it 100</li> <li>16) Keep it 80</li> <li>17) Keep it 100</li> <li>18) Keep it 80</li> <li>19) Keep it 100</li> </ul>
754	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>4) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>5) There already is signage with suggested speed on corners on Q.Charlotte drive.</li> <li>7) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>8) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>9) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>10) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>11) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>13) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>14) Certain times of year, the Whangamoas are notoriously dangerous due to ice and the wet. When in fine warmer conditions, the road is easily driven.</li> <li>15) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>16) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>17) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> <li>18) The road sits off housed areas, 80km works.</li> <li>19) Drivers whom hold restricted and full driver licenses are trained to drive on the open road. By changing the speed limited in the highlighted areas from 100km to 80km does not hold drivers whom hold these licenses nor the licensing process with much respect at all. Why punish the many, for the few whom break the law.</li> </ul>
755	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) No Comment</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) No Comment</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> </ul>

		<p>9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) This change is crucial for the safety of children getting to and from Clifton Terrace School. There is a cycle train that my 6 year old daughter goes on where there is approximately 20 children on it. Lowering the speed limit reduced the risk of accidents. There has been the odd near miss where children have strayed from the footpath onto the road while on scooter or bike. The reduction of noise that the speed lowering will bring will also help when trying to communicate with kids/pre-schoolers along the cycleway. We really need the speed reduction to happen.  19) Lowering the speed limit along this stretch is crucial for the safety of the many children and other commuters along the cycleway.</p>
756	Individual submitter	<p>1) No  4) No - agree  5) No - agree  7) No - agree  8) No agree  9) No agree  10) No agree  11) No -agree  13) No -agree  14) No -agree  15) No -agree  16) No -agree  17) No -agree  18) No -agree  19) This should also be 60 - from Hira to Nelson - esp with volume of new housing in the area</p>
757	Individual submitter	<p>1) i object to this it should remain 100km  4) i propose 80km from gee street until Rapaura Road due to the cyclists after that 100km  5) i object to this it should remain 70 km/h  7) it should stay 100km  8) remain 100km/h  9) remain 100km  10) i agree to the new speed limit in this area  11) i object to the new limit  13) i object to the new limit - road has been improved a lot  14) bring it down to 80km/hr rather than 60  15) agree to this  16) agree to this  17) agree to this  18) i object to this  19) i agree to this</p>
758	Individual submitter	<p>1) Good  4) Great  5) Totally agree.  7) Agree  8) Perfect  9) Agree  10) Yes good  11) Totally agree</p>

		<p>13) Perfect  14) Yes agree  15) Yes agree  16) Nice agree  17) Yes agree  18) Yes agree  19) Yes agree</p>
759	Individual submitter	<p>1) Why? What is the purpose of doing so?  4) I have driven this stretch of road all my life at 100km/h and never had an accident. Teach drivers how to drive properly, not penalise everybody.  5) Slowing down through communities is a good idea  7) As per answer 2, I have driven this stretch of road all my life at 100km/h and never had an accident. Teach drivers how to drive properly, not penalise everybody.  8) As per 2, but perhaps wise to slow down past school. Again this could be achieved with driver education.  9) Completely unnecessary if you drive to conditions. Stop being a nanny state and encourage people to think for themselves. We don't need to be forced to slow down if we are smart enough to drive to the road and conditions  10) No Comment  11) No need, see previous answers  13) No need, as per other answers  14) Teach people how to drive, not penalise everyone  15) No, as previously mentioned  16) Good idea  17) No need  18) No need  19) No need</p>
760	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave at 100km/h  4) Leave at 100km/h  5) Leave at 70km/h  7) Leave at 100km/h  8) Leave at 100km/h  9) Leave at 100km/h  10) Leave 100/50  11) Leave at 100km/h  13) Leave at 100km/h  14) Leave at 100km/h  15) Leave at 100km/h  16) No  17) Leave at 100km/h  18) Leave at 80km/h  19) Leave at 100km/h</p>
761	Individual submitter	<p>1) Common sense  4) Common sense  5) Common sense  7) Common sense  8) Common sense  9) Common sense  10) No Comment  11) Common sense  13) Common sense  14) Common sense  15) Common sense  16) No Comment</p>

		<p>17) Common sense  18) Common sense  19) No Comment</p>
762	Individual submitter	<p>We are a family of 5, our children are 7, 10 and 12 years old. We have lived at 48 Wakapuaka Road for 5 years now (section 18 on your table). All our children have gone to or are at CliftonTerrace School which is approx 800 meters from our house. This road is so unsafe we are unable to walk or bike to school. It is extremely dangerous, we have multiple large trucks and vehicles doing 100kph past our gate all day. Even just driving into our driveway is very dangerous. We have vehicles coming both ways at 100kph so more often than not we have to keep driving so we can turn around somewhere safer. There have been multiple serious accidents on the corner just past the school, speed is clearly a factor in these crashes.</p> <p>I am so happy about the proposed speed restrictions, however I really believe they need to go a step further in the vicinity of Clifton Terrace School. I would like to see the digital speed restriction signs like the ones outside Nelson College for Girls on Trafalgar Street and Saint Joeseph, upper Collingwood Street, where just before school starts and finishes the 40kph signs are in force.</p> <p>The population is growing so fast in this area and the current speed limits just aren't appropriate anymore. There are a much larger number of cyclists on the road now and more families living in the area. We often hear stories from families and friends of near misses on this stretch of road. It is a ticking time bomb.</p> <p>I welcome these new speed limits and cant wait for them to be implemented.</p>
763	Individual submitter	<p>I support in full this proposal. Today's large comfortable vehicles encourage drivers to excess speeds. Research shows by slowing down, reduced damage and fatalities. Today's powerful vehicles encourage faster speeds.</p>
764	Individual submitter	<p>Leave the SH6 speed limit - upgrade and maintain the road  Locals knner the roads better  Target slow drivers who hold up traffic  This will make the travel time 20/30 mins slower.</p>
765	Individual submitter	<p>1) I am a professional truck driver and I drive a petrol tanker and I don't think that is necessary.  4) I am a professional truck driver and I drive a petrol tanker, the fuel tanker is a live load that moves and I have not had a problem with the 90kph speed which I can travel at most of the time. I also traveled in my car the other day this root and only had to slow down to 90 kph for 4 corners so I don't think this is necessary.  5) I don't have a problem with that.  7) Basically the same as question 2.  8) I don't have a problem with that.  9) Basically the same as question 2.  10) I don't have a problem with that.  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
766	Individual submitter	<p>1) Room for cyclists to traverse safely  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment</p>

		<p>10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
767	Individual submitter	<p>1) Quality of the road  4) Quality of the road, what difference is changing the speed limit actually going to do ? Speed isn't the biggest issue on our roads  5) No it makes sense for it to be 50 as it is a built up residential area  7) Open good quality roads should stay at 100km , think of how much freight and post etc will get slowed down, it will have a knock on effect everywhere  8) Considering there is a school and a few not particularly good intersections here 80km makes sense  9) The road is nice and wide and straight on this section what is the point of slowing traffic on good roads?  10) Makes sense gives more time to see bridge etc  11) Big section of the road has been re done making it a lot safer don't see any point in lowering it  13) Good wide road straight road with no reason to slow people down for no reason  14) 60!!!? What idiot thought up an idea as stupid as that!  15) Leave it at 100  16) Yes do the school zone  17) No need to change it here  18) 80km is fine there  19) Yes good to change it to 80</p>
768	Individual submitter	<p>1) Dropping the speed limit will cause more congestion leaving blenheim &amp; more accidents  4) Slow traffic bays/lanes instead, more keep to left signs &amp; road markings  5) Maintaining roads &amp; vision at intersections instead  7) More extensive license obtaining requirements - improve the drivers  8) No Comment  9) Same alternative options previously mentioned &amp; any others deemed fit. Decreasing speed will not decrease accidents but enable inattentive drivers to become more inattentive.  10) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license  11) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license  13) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license  14) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license  15) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license  16) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license  17) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license  18) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license  19) More requirements such as time or courses to obtain driver license</p>
769	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) no changes over any of the road from rai valley to atawhai speed limits. i drive this road twice every day and the only problem i have is people driving too slow and not pulling over to let past. i believe if the limit changes to 80 we wont be able to pass these cars doing 60 still without breaking the speed limit. these cars do 60 regardless the speed limit.  14) No Comment</p>

		<p>15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
770	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) Leave at 100 km/h  5) Leave at 70 km/h  7) Leave at 100 km/h  8) Leave as is but factor in the school zone.  9) Leave at 100 km/h  10) Leave as is  11) Leave at 100 km/h  13) Leave at 100 km/h - traffic is slower anyway because of the hills  14) Leave as is 100 km/h  15) Leave at 100 km/h  16) Agree with this change  17) Change to 80 km/h  18) Leave at 80 km/h to keep consistency with previous proposed stretch  19) change to 80 km/h so there's no confusion from south of Lud Bay</p>
771	Individual submitter	<p>1) yes you r responding to a minoritys opinion.and you seem to think speed causes all crashes.speed has nothing to do with so many crashes.and this 80kph is giving rise to people doing 70.60 and less on a good country road.appleby st.is a good example of slow coaches.its been 100kph for 70 years,what is the problem.its now a frustrating drive.  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
772	Individual submitter	<p>1) SLOWING DOWN THE SPEED LIMITS WILL ONLY PISS PEOPLE OFF AND DO STUPID THINGS THAT WILL BE MORE CRASHES  4) NO NEED FOR IT  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment</p>

		18) No Comment 19) No Comment
<b>773</b>	Individual submitter	1) I believe it is completely unnecessary to reduce the speed limit to 80ks for the total journey. Yes, make adjustments on certain points, certainly reduce the speed outside schools, consider more overtaking lanes. More accidents are likely to occur thanks to the frustration of 80k speed limitations for the total journey 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) Proposed new speed limit for these areas could be reduced to 80ks in consideration that the 100kph limit stays as is. 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment
<b>774</b>	Individual submitter	1) Dont do it 4) Dont do it 5) Dont do it 7) Dont do it 8) Dont do it 9) Dont do it 10) Dont do it 11) Dont do it 13) Dont do it 14) Dont do it 15) Dont do it 16) Dont do it 17) Dont do it 18) Dont do it 19) Dont do it
<b>775</b>	Individual submitter	1) Nope...shit idea 4) Nope.shit idea 5) 20 people have died in 10 years...that's not a reason to ridiculously drop speeds. Do we ban ropes because 600 people a year hang themselves? 7) God no 8) 60 school zone ok 9) Nope good drive 10) Nope 11) Nope 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment
<b>776</b>	Individual submitter	1) No Comment 4) No Comment

		<p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) The entire area from rai valley to hira should be 80 not the entire state highway from Nelson to blenheim but there are places along this route that would benefit from this</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
777	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>4) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>5) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>7) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>8) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>9) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>10) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>11) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>13) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>14) This section of road like many others in New Zealand requires the judgement of the driver to choose an appropriate speed. When wet sometimes 30 when dry and clear 100 in some sections. Okiwi Bay road is 100 for most of it even though it would be impossible to do such speed. This is an example of people driving safely to the conditions regardless of the speed limit being "high" for the okiwi Bay section of road.</p> <p>15) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>16) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>17) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>18) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p> <p>19) It's not the speed it's the ability and decision making skills of the driver that effect the safety of our roads.</p>
778	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Reducing the limit here is overkill, this will impact drivers to and from work drastically. the road does need improving, please widen the road first, add passing lanes, or more signs - reducing the limit should be a last resort for such a continues stretch of road!</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Reducing the limit here is overkill, this will impact drivers to and from work drastically. the road does need improving, please widen the road first, add passing lanes, or more signs - reducing the limit should be a last resort for such a continues stretch of road!</p> <p>8) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p> <p>9) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p> <p>13) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p> <p>14) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p> <p>15) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p> <p>16) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p> <p>17) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No, improve the road first with passing lanes and rumble strips, signs even... reducing the speed limit here will impact commuters from Havelock to Nelson</p>
779	Individual submitter	<p>1) The road is fine, there's no need lower the speed. Educate drivers. Most these deaths involve alcohol and drugs not speed so sort that out first.</p> <p>4) No there isn't because the road is in good condition</p> <p>5) Why? What's wrong with the road for that to happen? We're already going slow</p>

		<p>7) There's nothing wrong with the road buddy. Nothing wrong with the speed.</p> <p>8) I agree with implementing this speed limit. Put the school sign in place has been needed for years</p> <p>9) No need to lower the speed</p> <p>10) I agree with this one because drivers don't give way at the bridge and crashes are regular avoid there</p> <p>11) Nope. Don't lower the speed limit. Haven't been in a car crash in my whole life on that road</p> <p>13) No need to change the speed limit. Drivers know what they're capable of</p> <p>14) Yes that people drive it everyday and have no trouble with it</p> <p>15) Yes people drive it everyday and have no trouble with it.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Why wreck something that isn't broken</p> <p>18) The saying don't try fix something if it isn't broken comes in place here</p> <p>19) Why do this?</p>
780	Individual submitter	<p>I travel most days on part of this SH6. If you reduce the speed limit to 80km you will make the matters worse. As people will not be able to pass vehicles holding up traffic (mainly tourists in camper cans) if you must reduce the speed I suggest 90km would be ok. I would like to say that travel time between Pelorus Bridge and Havelock takes more than 1 minute as you state in the how much longer would it take to drive section. If you wish to make the road safer I suggest reducing the speed limit in Rai Valley township to 50km as there are small children walking to school on the footpath.</p>
781	Individual submitter	<p>I have been driving in this area since 1978 and drive about South Island to Dunedin several times a year.</p> <p>I am opposed to any further wholesale lowering of the speed limit between Nelson and Blenheim.</p> <p>The road has been improved so much since I have lived in Nelson. Now we have sealed roads, centre lines marked, road edges marked....these changes have happened since the 1970's.....to make safer roads. There are still some off camber corners that , in my opinion, need changing to make them safer.</p> <p>What we really want and need is more passing lanes, not more yellow " no passing" lines. More passing lanes are needed urgently.</p> <p>Very rarely have I seen speeding drivers causing a potential danger....and then I wonder if this was caused by frustration at slow inconsiderate drivers.</p> <p>Drivers distracted by cellphones, passengers in the car ,or the view are far more dangerous. I would like to see more practical driver training in schools.</p> <p>The worst driving, and most dangerous , I have seen is by tourists . Failure to keep left, not indicating, crossing the centre line on corners, slow inconsiderate driving, failure to allow vehicles following to pass, inattention.</p> <p>Tourists are in the country on average 2 weeks...statistics released to the media imply the accident/death rate for tourists is no greater than that for residents....but does this take into account tourists are here for eg an average of 2 weeks, and residents 52 weeks a year? In my opinion, the tourists crash rate needs to be weighted by a factor of eg 26</p> <p>Our cars are so much safer with the ABS, ESC etc systems in modern vehicles as well as airbags.</p> <p>I see no need at all to drop the speed limit for the trip of Nelson to Blenheim, but agree with the concept of variable school zone speed limits.</p> <p>100 + years ago more people were killed and injured on our roads per 1000 population.</p> <p>In fact when horses were the only transport ie 1-4 hp vehicles ie I suggest the accident rate was higher.</p>
782	Individual submitter	<p>1) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>4) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>5) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>7) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>8) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>9) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>10) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>11) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>13) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>14) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>15) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>16) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>17) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>18) No other factors. I support this decision.</p> <p>19) No other factors. I support this decision.</p>
783	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's a straight part of the road. I'm not sure why it would need to be reduced to 80km</p> <p>4) I don't think a restriction of speed is necessary. Maybe install high crash area signs instead in key areas</p> <p>5) People can't go much more than 50km there anyway</p> <p>7) I disagree with changing the limit to 80. I do not think it's necessary</p>

		<p>8) 60km for the school zone yes. Everything else should remain at 100km</p> <p>9) I disagree with this proposed change. I think signage stating a high crash rate area should be sufficient</p> <p>10) I disagree with this proposed change. I think signage stating a high crash rate area should be sufficient</p> <p>11) I disagree with this proposed change. I think signage stating a high crash rate area should be sufficient</p> <p>13) I think this change would be ok</p> <p>14) No</p> <p>15) I disagree with this proposed change. I think signage stating a high crash rate area should be sufficient</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) I disagree with this proposed change. I think signage stating a high crash rate area should be sufficient</p> <p>18) I disagree with this proposed change. I think signage stating a high crash rate area should be sufficient</p> <p>19) No</p>
784	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is fair and I agree.</p> <p>4) Will make travel time longer and make people will be more impatient and will take more risks of speeding.</p> <p>5) Keep it the same.</p> <p>7) Keep it the same</p> <p>8) Keep it the same.</p> <p>9) Lots of straight roads and people will still do 100kmh</p> <p>10) Crazy.</p> <p>11) Keep same</p> <p>13) Keep same</p> <p>14) Keep same</p> <p>15) Keep same</p> <p>16) Keep same</p> <p>17) Keep same</p> <p>18) Keep same</p> <p>19) Keep same</p>
785	Individual submitter	<p>1) Increase speed</p> <p>4) Increase speed</p> <p>5) Increase speed</p> <p>7) Increase speed</p> <p>8) Increase speed</p> <p>9) Increase speed</p> <p>10) Increase speed</p> <p>11) Increase speed</p> <p>13) Increase speed</p> <p>14) Increase speed</p> <p>15) Increase speed</p> <p>16) Increase speed</p> <p>17) Increase speed</p> <p>18) Increase speed</p> <p>19) Increase speed</p>
786	Individual submitter	<p>First, NZTA was quoted in the Nelson press as saying at a 80km/h limit it would be only 9 min more for the 120 km distance. Well Google Earth calculates it takes 1hr30min at an average speed of about 80km/h, given a 100km/h speed limit. If you would lower that by 20km/h to an average 60km/h it would of course take 2hrs, half an hour more or 30min extra.</p> <p>Secondly, yes roads are much better and cars are much better, but drivers are not. I've driven this route many 100 times, and the worst and speedy drivers are utes &amp; pick-ups (single &amp; double-cab), and large heavy 4-wheel-drive vehicles, not build to rally.</p> <p>Thirdly, the problem with 80km/h on open roads is attention and focus drops as soon as driving become monotone and for a longer period.</p>

		<p>Drivers mind becomes wondering and attention waning. I drive cars, trucks and motorbikes and need a certain amount of excitement to stay alert and drive at my best.</p> <p>Pedestrians and cyclist can be fatally wounded at 40km/h or less. Distraction, bad judgement and pure control are probably the real culprit.</p>
787	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) should be lower as it is a town i.e. 50 km/h 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment</p>
788	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support the proposed new limit. 4) I support the proposed new limit. 5) I support the proposed new limit. 7) I support the proposed new limit. 8) I support the proposed new limit. 9) I support the proposed new limit. 10) I support the proposed new limit. 11) I support the proposed new limit. 13) I support the proposed new limit. 14) I support the proposed new limit. 15) I support the proposed new limit. 16) NA 17) I support the proposed new limit. 18) I support the proposed new limit. 19) I support the proposed new limit.</p>
789	Individual submitter	<p>I don't support any speed reductions anywhere. I am comfortable with all speed zones as they currently are. My reasons are because the slower the speed limit the more frustrated I get and when speed is restricted/slowed. I personally see more drivers on their cellphones or over taking in a dangerous area. Please do not reduce any speed anywhere. It is the driver that is the problem not the speed.</p>
790	Individual submitter	<p>1) Seem to be considering residential and School areas and 100 km areas seem to always mean 20 km or more to some drivers so 80 in some of these areas is a good idea. 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) Should make a huge difference especially when Ivey winter conditions and grit. Great! 15) Yes OK with that. 16) Yes OK with that.</p>

		<p>17) This should improve existing speed limits but maybe slowing down to lower from about Teal Valley ready for Clinton Terrace School?</p> <p>18) This should be reduced to 50 km in consideration of several factors: It has Primary School children walking in this area who feel very unsafe with the fast traffic and noise as they walk along the extremely narrow part (first part of path) for those travelling from Marybank to Dodson Valley. Residents living above this stretch of road access their homes via right of ways with several homes per driveway and due to the speed of traffic travelling this stretch of road at speeds in excess of the present legal 80 km mostly, many residents travelling from town find it safer to sit on the roadside (road seal has a huge hunk out of it to bump to the verge) for how ever long it takes. It really does feel very unsafe sitting waiting as heavy traffic thunders by before felling safe to turn across road and up driveway. The roar of this never ending traffic well above the existing speed limit can be heard as drivers appear to increase their speed at Atawhai Crescent and not honour the present speed limit. I consider that the limit should be brought down to at least 50 km in keeping with other 'built up' residential zones, even a 40 km stretch taking in the School zone as with other schools throughout Nelson area? Apart from the safety for children, noise pollution and driveways safe access, these rare paying residents should be able to enjoy the fresh air and relax in their outside space or open their doors in the heat without the mental stress that prevents this happening at present. This Northern Atawhai area has had an extended population explosion since the days of the 'notional railway' days and the road between Nelson City and Hira speed limits need a major re-think. Don't make a hash of new speed reductions by not make this total stretch of roadway speeds low enough not only for safety reasons but to also consider and satisfy these tax paying residents, elderly, young, parents, road users and perhaps monitor the speed of this area at strategic times. Drop limit lower than 60km preferably to 40 km from Frost farm gate around corner before hitting School and buses and children attending the school!</p> <p>19) Having experienced a sign written business vehicle overtaking me between Founders and Trafalgar Street last year when I was slowing down for the 50 km area, and then cut in front of me and virtually stop while showing me the 'finger sign' before taking off I have no doubt that this whole stretch needs lowering so that traffic travelling along this whole stretch between say Marybank and Trafalgar Street would all be travelling at day 59 km and this rude 'Gate Company' driver would have to comply. I have his number and still marvel that the vehicles behind me did not all pile into my car while he sped off! One speed for whole stretch and make it safe for all. It should be lowered from to 59 km about the Cemetery to Trafalgar Street at very least.</p>
791	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) This stretch of road is safe to remain at 100km and doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>5) No.</p> <p>7) This stretch of road is safe to remain at 100km and doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>8) The other schools in Marlborough have electronic variable speed signs to use at times when children are arriving 8.30-9am and departing after 3pm so this should be the same here.</p> <p>9) This stretch of road is safe to remain at 100km and doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>10) This is a high use over summer so 100/50 should be for a longer season of Dec until say April. In winter there are few people in this area and having 60 would be unnecessary.</p> <p>11) This stretch of road is safe to remain at 100km and doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>13) This stretch of road is safe to remain at 100km and doesn't need to be changed. There is a passing lane and it would be hard to use with a lowered speed in this place plus the Collins Valley should have a passing lane installed.</p> <p>14) 60km is far too low and 80km would be more practical. It's a pity NZTA cannot improve this road with so many trucks nowadays that you can be caught behind and they have less than enough pull-over areas.</p> <p>15) No leave this as it is.</p> <p>16) The other schools in Marlborough have electronic variable speed signs to use at times when children are arriving 8.30-9am and departing after 3pm so this should be the same here.</p> <p>17) This stretch of road is safe to remain at 100km and doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>18) This should be okay to stay as 80km and needs no change.</p> <p>19) This stretch of road is safe to remain at 100km and doesn't need to be changed.</p>
792	Individual submitter	<p>Lowering the speed limit to 80kph from Nelson to Blenheim will make THAT road safer.</p> <p>Improving the driving skills of ALL drivers will make all of NZ roads safer.</p> <p>The current test for a restricted licence is under an hour and for a full licence is less. This does not allow time for the applicant to be faced with more than a few potential hazards to demonstrate their capability and yet – having been taught by virtually any other driver licenced under the same system they can drive for the next almost 60 years without a review</p> <p>I, personally, believe that a more targeted program should be instigated ensuring that higher skills are taught prior to the issue of even a restricted licence. This would require many highly trained instructors and cost a lot more. I believe the cost of learning to drive in some European countries can exceed 1500 euros</p> <p>While this move would be politically unpopular it would indicate that our politicians really care about our lives lost on our roads and not whether it will win them votes</p>
793	Individual submitter	<p>The only change should be the Whangamoia saddle and Rai Valley Saddle, which could drop down to 80.</p> <p>Half of the trouble is the drivers too impatient with slower (older) drivers, who do not pull over.</p> <p>Idea to reduce on open roads is rubbish. A lot of accidents come from drunk driving, drugs and phones</p>
794	Individual submitter	<p>Sir I have been travelling between Nelson and Blenheim on a very frequent basis over the last 20 years to provide Urological Surgery care at Wairau Hospital. I believe I am a reasonably astute observer as to the issues on this stretch of road and can compare it to other state highways across all of New Zealand.</p> <p>By far the greatest issue is the density of truck traffic which is no doubt related to the historic isolation of Nelson to an adequate freighting alternative. This in turn is compounded by the geography and road design that makes opportunities for cars to safely pass very limited and with the slow truck speed over hilly sections long queues of very frustrated drivers.</p> <p>It is this frustration which often leads to dangerous driving behaviour and this is even more evident in wet driving conditions where the risk of extended driving in the spray thrown by multi wheeled vehicles has to be balanced by the overtaking risk.</p> <p>Perversely lowering the speed limit from 100 to 80 km will significantly increase this risk given that the law would require overtaking to occur within the 80km limit.</p>

		<p>On the other hand any difference in outcomes between accidents at these 2 speeds particularly when head on closing speeds are double is very modest and the likelihood of survival of a crash at 80km/hr is both low and quite random. The focus on this road should be to reduce the likelihood of accidents rather than survivability of accidents and the best way to achieve this is to provide many more sections of passing lanes.</p> <p>Finally there is one other significant unintended consequence of the proposed changes and that is the impact of health service provision for Wairau patients. An important component of Wairau's service is provided by Nelson specialists that travel over to provide surgery and patient consultations. The increased driving time ( and I think the quoted difference is totally naive as it will become the time it takes for a truck to drive this route) will be time that will not be spent providing this service to the detriment of this population</p>
795	Cycling Action Network Inc.	<p>1) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz  4) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz  5) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz  7) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is on the route of Tour Aotearoa, and is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection.  8) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is on the route of Tour Aotearoa, and is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection  9) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is on the route of Tour Aotearoa, and is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection  10) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is on the route of Tour Aotearoa, and is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection  11) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection.  13) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection.  14) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection.  15) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection.  16) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection.  17) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection. Note: <a href="https://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/news/111819052/cyclist-killed-in-accident-near-nelson">https://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/news/111819052/cyclist-killed-in-accident-near-nelson</a>  18) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection.  19) I support this, on behalf of Cycling Action Network Inc. can.org.nz This is a key route for recreational cyclists. We deserve protection.</p>
796	NZAA member	<p>The publicity about this route is so misleading, you state (Jim Harlane) 2 deaths in the last 2 weeks. One was suicide the other was on Bulford Road. I drive this road at least 6 times a week in heavy trucks which I can do 90kph to Havelock and 90kph to Pelorus Bridge. You talk of cyclists in the last 6 months I have seen only 2. 80kph will frustrate motorists then there will be bad passing moves as some motorist will do 70kph, we need passing lanes and you have been told this more than anything. NZTA spend many millions on the Rai which was never asked for by the motorist or Transport companies. Be truthful about the cause of deaths on this stretch of highway, the 100kpm limit is not the problem - the poor surface has more to do with it. Just spend some of the millions of dollars you collect from this highway back on it, the Whangamoas need it badly on the Nelson side, I have driven this highway for 55 years and we had more spent on it in the 60's than we have had in the last 30 years. Please do not make this road 80kph.</p>
797	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support this  4) I Support this  5) I Support this  7) I support this  8) I Support this  9) I support this  10) I support this  11) I support this  13) I support this  14) I support this  15) I support this  16) I support this  17) I support this  18) I support this  19) I support this, and all of the other proposals. I am a cyclist that planning to cycle this route in March. Lower speed limits favour cyclists and improve safety for all, but particularly cyclists who are so vulnerable. Thank you for taking this initiative.</p>
798	Individual submitter	<p>I fully support a decrease in speed limits between Blenheim to Nelson as decreased on attached map.</p>
799	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment</p>

		<p>7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) Need electronic warning signs for one lane bridge at pelorus. Speed limit should be 40kmh.  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
800	Individual submitter	<p>have traveled for the last 40 years, and have found nothing wrong with the road, I realize it's easy to sit at a desk and look at figures all day and come up with ideas to justify your job, but to change the speed limit to 80 kmph is just a knee jurk reaction to this problem</p> <p>The main problem (which is not going to change if you change the speed) is the driver who doesn't know how to use his/her mirror, driving at 70-80 kmph and holding up the main flow of traffic, the people get frustrated and take silly risks</p> <p>The RIGHT THING TO DO would be put a lot more passing Lanes in, if NZTA can afford to change the Nelson side of the Rai saddle (a total waist of money if you intended to put the speed down)</p> <p>I travel this road at least once a week and sometimes up to 4 times a week, I think I have seen most that happens on it, it's not the road that's the problem it's a few ( very few) idiots that use it, a few more cops might help - might even help with their quoters</p> <p>NZTA actually need to get of their office chairs - stop read stats and reports and get out into the real world, but mainly they need to stop adding to what has become a NAÑNY STATE</p>
801	Individual submitter	<p>Many of the suggestions are excellent, particulars around towns, villages and sections. However the blanket speed 80kph limit is inappropriate and will have unforeseen consequences. Some of theroute is straight and quite capable of safe 90 plus. Limiting those to 80 willll mean dangerous overtaking and agresive driving, especially given the limit amount of passing lanes.</p>
802	Individual submitter	<p>1) You tried 80 k to Woodbourne and it didnt work so why go back wards  4) There is plenty of room for you to make passing lanes this is just folly on a straight peast of road  5) Yes this makes sense as you are in a build up area  7) Yes this is so silly as I have traveled on this road from 1977 until 1992 up to 6 times a week and to reduce this area is nonsense  8) Again Put more passing lanes in The Govt. has got plenty of money PLEASE use IT Bosting of being in surplus  9) This is a good road if you reduce the speed it will make drive non responsive and not concercate on driving  10) Leave this as it is .  11) No put a passing lane before the hills keep at 100km  13) A lot of this road you can only travel 70 to 80 anyhow so why resick it  14) There is no need to police this as how fast can you travel down the other side of the hill FIX the road you have plan for the last 20 years We have paid more RUC on this road than another in the country 1960 Sir Keith Holyoake said they wood give us a first class road but he didn't WHEN  15) Put another passing lane in after we have followed trucks as there is no Rail to Nelson and Camper Vans Slow Drivers  16) No leave as it is  17) This is no problem as it is  18) Leave it as we are now getting close to Nelson  19) Put another passing lane into the city as well as out</p>
803	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree. I would like to add that important to me as personal safety is, climate change is a bigger overall issue/existential threat and that a nation wide reduction of our 100kph default upper limit to 80kph has an enormous CO2 reducing potential in the order of 50%. NelsonCC is an adopter of the Climate Emergency concept, and this consideration should be at the beginning of deliberation of any change of policy in any domain.  4) agree  5) agree  7) agree  8) agree  9) agree</p>

		<p>10) would prefer 50</p> <p>11) agree</p> <p>13) agree</p> <p>14) strongly agree</p> <p>15) agree</p> <p>16) agree</p> <p>17) the road here urgently requires a separate cycle track</p> <p>18) agree</p> <p>19) agree</p>
804	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) 100</p> <p>5) 50</p> <p>7) 100</p> <p>8) 100</p> <p>9) 100</p> <p>10) 50</p> <p>11) 100</p> <p>13) 100</p> <p>14) 100</p> <p>15) 100</p> <p>16) 100</p> <p>17) 80</p> <p>18) 60</p> <p>19) 60-80. I'm for the changes when entering congested areas/ towns. In between should be 100.</p>
805	Individual submitter	<p>1) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>4) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>5) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>7) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>8) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>9) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>10) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>11) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>13) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>14) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>15) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>16) Variable school zone is one of the few things that makes sense</p> <p>17) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels</p> <p>18) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training</p>

		and skill levels 19) This does little to address the problems making a real contribution to nz road safety NZTA has their head in the sand on drug driving, distracted drivers and fatigue let alone the lack of training and skill levels
806	Individual submitter	<p>1) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?</p> <p>4) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?</p> <p>5) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?</p> <p>7) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?</p> <p>8) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate</p>

due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?

9) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?

10) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?

11) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?

13) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in

many areas should be increased?

14) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?

15) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?

16) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?

17) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?

18) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of

		<p>everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?</p> <p>19) Cars have been required to meet higher safety standards, roads have been improved. Speed itself doesn't cause accidents rather it is the inappropriate use of speed. You are required to drive to the conditions so if on any particular occasion the speed limit is inappropriate you are already required by the law to drive slower. It's a speed limit, not a target. You cannot legislate the speed limit to the lowest common denominator otherwise you would have no movement on the roads at all. I have lived in areas where the speed limit was reduced due to a relatively high accident rate due to speed. A lot of publicity was given to the speed factor in these accidents however the authorities went strangely quiet after a reduction in the speed limit which didn't stop those that previously drove at inappropriate speeds for the conditions still doing so and those that exceeded the old speed limit also still doing so along with additional drivers under the new speed limit. The only real immediate change was an increase in revenue as the new limits were attempted to be enforced. The unforeseen cost of such unwarranted change though is huge. Cost of transport of everything rises due to the extra transit time and while initially, this may seem small it is actually very very high as it moves through the economy affecting absolutely everything. Consider an increase in transit time of just 10%. That requires an equivalent increase in drivers, vehicles, pollution produced by these extra vehicles, longer delivery times, slower movement of goods and people through the economy. All these costs will be passed on to the entire community yet drivers will still be driving at inappropriate speeds for the conditions irrespective of the limit as well as exceeding the limit. Why have we paid already for the increased safety improvements to vehicles to then have the benefits significantly degraded by reduced speed limits, surely the speed limits in many areas should be increased?</p>
807	Individual submitter	<p>1) Working vehicles that travel this section of road multiple times a day will be affected by proposed change, educating international drivers and regular tests for retired community should be mandatory.</p> <p>4) Working vehicles all affected and also already existing delays from traveling international visitors and non confident drivers.</p> <p>5) The current speed in the section states is fine the slow down point is well before the school and reducing this speed would serve no purpose but lengthen travel times over all for some one traveling from the south towards Nelson via state high</p> <p>7) Instead of reducing the speed, widen the road?</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) Yes</p> <p>10) Yes</p> <p>11) Yes</p> <p>13) Yes</p> <p>14) Yes</p> <p>15) Yes</p> <p>16) Yes</p> <p>17) Yes</p> <p>18) Yes</p> <p>19) Yes</p>
808	Individual submitter	<p>1) Not that I am aware. Support the proposed change.</p> <p>4) Support a reduction to 80km only on certain sections that warrant it (based on visibility/road condition/crash history) This may be the whole section but my impression is that there are sections that are better than others.</p> <p>5) Support if crash history/no of private driveways etc. warrant it</p> <p>7) Support a reduction to 80km only on certain sections that warrant it (based on visibility/road condition/crash history) This may be the whole section but my impression is that there are sections that are better than others.</p> <p>8) Support</p> <p>9) Support a reduction to 80km only on certain sections that warrant it (based on visibility/road condition/crash history) This may be the whole section but my impression is that there are sections that are better than others.</p> <p>10) Support</p> <p>11) Support a reduction to 80km only on certain sections that warrant it (based on visibility/road condition/crash history) This may be the whole section but my impression is that there are sections that are better than others.</p> <p>13) Support</p> <p>14) Support</p> <p>15) Support</p> <p>16) Support</p> <p>17) Support</p>

		18) No not support. Consider 80km Ok for the time being 19) Support
809	Individual submitter	1) No Comment 4) While I agree that in places 100 is not suitable making the whole stretch 80 seems excessive. Has 90 been considered? 5) 50 just seems ridiculously slow for such an open area. Surely 70 is satisfactory? 7) Again while I agree that in places 100 is not suitable making the whole stretch 80 seems excessive. Has 90 been considered? 8) Not familiar with the school there. 9) Again while I agree that in places 100 is not suitable making the whole stretch 80 seems excessive. Has 90 been considered? 10) This seems fine although cars approaching the bridge from the east at 60k seems a bit fast for some of the dumb/reckless drivers I encounter on our roads. 11) Again while I agree that in places 100 is not suitable making the whole stretch 80 seems excessive. Has 90 been considered? 13) Again while I agree that in places 100 is very obviously not suitable making the whole stretch 80 seems excessive. Has 90 been considered? 14) While there is no where in this stretch where any one should attempt to drive at 100, 60 is excessive. Dropping speed limits doesn't fix idiots, it just punishes everyone who abides the law. 15) That's fine but then ideally we would then have a passing lane at the first straight by the weigh bridge so traffic can pass slow traveling vehicles coming off the Whangamoa. 16) seems ok. 17) Again while I agree that in places 100 is not suitable making the whole stretch 80 seems excessive. Has 90 been considered? 18) Please no!!!! 19) Again while I agree that in places 100 is not suitable making the whole stretch 80 seems excessive. Has 90 been considered?
810	Individual submitter	This submission does NOT support the proposed changes to speed limits. I would like to support a general open road speed limit change that increased the speed limit from 100 to 110km/h. I would also appreciate if NZTA could withdraw the proposal and considering increasing and reducing the open road speed limits. Please find full report, which has been sent to Mark Ratcliff
811	Individual submitter	I travel this road relatively frequently, at one stage three to four days per week. My impression is that most of the problems I see on this road is poor driving ability, not the the road itself. I don't consider this stretch of road to be particularly unusual or different from many other stretches of the road throughout the country that maintain a 100km/h limit. There are many sections of the road that are safe to travel at up to 100km per hour. I am absolutely staggered that NZTA would even consider making the whole road no more than 80km/h. A lot of work has been done over recent years to improve the road. It makes no sense at all to create such a low speed restriction over such a long length of road. Given the type of issues that I have observed with drivers on this road in the past I can only see the lower speed limit encouraging impatience and poor overtaking decisions. NZ Transport Agency National Office Private Bag 6995 Wellington 6141 ATTENTION: BLENHEIM TO NELSON SPEED REVIEW CONSULTATION FORM FreePost Authority 65090 FOLD HERE PRIVACY STATEMENT The information requested in this consultation/survey is being collected by the NZ Transport Agency (the Transport Agency) for the purpose of seeking feedback on the proposed changes to speed limits on SH6 Blenheim to Nelson, in accordance with the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017. The survey is being administered by Crestani Communications Limited (Crestani), on behalf of the Transport Agency. Any personal information you submit as part of this process will be stored and processed on the Transport Agency's behalf by Crestani (who will use the information for analysis and reporting purposes), in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993. Please note that any feedback you provide is public information, and the Transport Agency may identify you as the submitter should it publish your feedback or provide it to a third party if requested under the Official Information Act 1982. Please clearly indicate, therefore, if your feedback is commercially sensitive, or if for some other reason your feedback should not be disclosed and/or you should not be identified as the submitter. Any other personal information that you provide, however, will not be made public. Under the Privacy Act 1993 you have the right to request access to and correction of any personal information you supply as part of this process. If you wish to do so, please email Nelson.Marlborough.speed.reviews@nzta.govt.nz
812	Individual submitter	1) No Comment 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment

		19) I fully support this proposal for safety reasons. In particular as population density has increased and is increasing and because of the number of vehicles now on the road it is long overdue that there is a speed reduction on this built up section of the highway. I note that the NCC also supports this measure.
813	Individual submitter	<p>1) there is nothing wrong with the current speed limit of 100km/h on that stretch of road</p> <p>4) there is nothing wrong with the current speed limit of 100km/h on that stretch of road</p> <p>5) there is nothing wrong with the current speed limit on that stretch of road</p> <p>7) there is nothing wrong with the current speed limit of 100km/h on that stretch of road</p> <p>8) there is nothing wrong with the current speed limit of 100km/h on that stretch of road. Just have a reduced speed of 60 km/h during school start and finish times (the same as they do in Queensland Australia on 100 km/h stretches of road from 8am to 9.15am and again at 2.30pm to 3.30pm to allow for the safety of dropping and picking up children, and only effective during school days - not school holidays)</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) this is the only change that makes sense, it is a short stretch so no harm in doing a slower speed, and all year round would make it easier for regular travellers</p> <p>11) leave it as is</p> <p>13) there is nothing wrong with the current speed limit of 100km/h on that stretch of road.</p> <p>14) leave it as is</p> <p>15) leave it as is, if people drove to conditions it wouldn't be a problem</p> <p>16) Just have a reduced speed of 60 km/h during school start and finish times (the same as they do in Queensland Australia on 80 km/h stretches of road from 8am to 9.15am and again at 2.30pm to 3.30pm to allow for the safety of dropping and picking up children, and only effective during school days - not school holidays)</p> <p>17) leave at 100km/h</p> <p>18) leave as is</p> <p>19) leave as is</p>
814	Individual submitter	<p>1) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>4) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>5) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>7) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>8) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>9) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>10) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>11) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>13) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>14) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>15) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>16) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>17) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>18) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p> <p>19) I'm a cyclist and I strongly support making roads safer by reducing speed limits - I support this proposal</p>
815	Individual submitter	I travel between Blenheim and Nelson on an average of once a month and don't really have any trouble with the speed zones but if you really have to change them why not bring the 100 down to 90 for car and trucks from 90 to 80 that gives you the same buffer as you have now so that you can actually pass a truck with out breaking the speed limit.
816	Individual submitter	I feel very safe driving to Nelson or Blenheim. Unsafe driving is the reason for accidents not speed. Leave the speed as it is, then trucks and cars do not need to pass as everyone is going the same speed. More passing bays would be a sound idea.
817	Individual submitter	<p>1) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>4) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>5) Limit should remain at 70</p> <p>7) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>8) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>9) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>10) Limit should remain the same</p> <p>11) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>13) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>14) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>15) Limit should remain at 100</p>

		<p>16) Limit should remain at 80</p> <p>17) Limit should remain at 100</p> <p>18) Limit should remain at 80</p> <p>19) Limit should remain at 100</p>
818	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a stretch of road I travel frequently with very few people crossing, no school, few cyclists and few accidents, it should remain at 100 km/h</p> <p>4) 25 km stretch with so few properties and people living along it, hardly any cars join the highway on this stretch and not overly windy section, should remain at 100 km/h will add too much time for little benefit</p> <p>5) Sensible reduction</p> <p>7) Not a difficult section of road, few cars joining the road, sensible to leave at the current speed limit of 100 km/h then reduce speed through Canvas town especially during school hours</p> <p>8) Sensible reduction</p> <p>9) No difficult bends on this stretch of road, a stupid reduction of limit. Should remain at 100 km/h</p> <p>10) Sensible reduction with the number of people crossing the road</p> <p>11) Easy section of road, should remain at 100km/h</p> <p>13) Very little traffic joining the road, no schools, should remain at 100 km/h</p> <p>14) Sensible reduction, but should be 80 k/mh</p> <p>15) Silly reduction in limit should remain at 100 km/h</p> <p>16) Sensible</p> <p>17) Should remain at current level, little traffic joining the highway.</p> <p>18) Seems extreme to reduce to 60</p> <p>19) reasonable reduction</p>
819	Individual submitter	<p>1) Hi...its a straight road. Leave as is.</p> <p>4) Country driving...teach people to drive</p> <p>5) A town....ok</p> <p>7) Normal country driving...leave as is</p> <p>8) Leave as is</p> <p>9) Leave is ...country driving</p> <p>10) Lots of people walking around...ok. I slow anyway</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) Drive to the conditions....cant do 100 anyway</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) This is a start of slowing down the country by the greens which the have promised....learn to drive!!</p>
820	Individual submitter	<p>1) I disagree with this proposed change. Reducing the speed on these straight stretches of road will only increase the levels of frustration by road users which in turn will lead to more drivers taking more risky decisions, leading to more crashes. Ironically, reducing the speed on these straight stretches of road might actually lead to an increase in crashes, injuries and deaths.</p> <p>4) Do not support, for the reasons mentioned above.</p> <p>5) I consider the existing 70km speed limit in this location to be appropriate.</p> <p>7) Opposed to this change, for the reasons explained above.</p> <p>8) Opposed to this change, for the reasons explained above. However, I do support the lower speed limit of 60km (or even 50km) outside the school between 8 and 9am and 3 and 4pm during a day when school is in session.</p> <p>9) Do not support, for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>10) I think the current restrictions here are fine. The 60km limit is unnecessary.</p> <p>11) Do not support, for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>13) There is probably some merit in reducing the speed here to 80km given the demanding nature of the road.</p> <p>14) There is probably some merit in reducing the speed limit here to 80km given the nature of the road, but I think 60 km/h is not necessary. This will only lead to increased levels of frustration by road users.</p> <p>15) Not necessary, for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>16) I would support a lower speed of 60 or 50km/h around the school itself between 8-9am and 3-4pm on a day when the school is in session.</p>

		<p>17) Not necessary, for the reasons listed above,  18) I have often thought 70km/h is probably a better speed for this section of road.  19) I am actually supportive of this change given that a lot of people live in this area.</p>
821	Nelson Marlborough DHB	<p>Introduction 1. Nelson Marlborough Health (Nelson Marlborough District Health Board) (NMH) is a key organisation involved in the health and wellbeing of the people within Te Tau Ihu. NMH appreciates the opportunity to comment from a public health perspective on the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) SH6 Blenheim to Nelson Safety Improvements.</p> <p>2. NMH makes this submission in recognition of its responsibilities to improve, promote and protect the health of people and communities under the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 and the Health Act 1956.</p> <p>3. Given that NMH staff regularly travel this road to undertake activities within the community and at the various NMH facilities situated across Nelson and Blenheim, this submission also incorporates the views of staff on road safety along this route. General support NMH supports the proposed speed limit reductions. NMH continues to advocate that the legal speed limit is based on the road type rather than having the same open road speed limit for all roads. This submission follows our earlier submission on the safety improvements in March 2019. Road crashes and injuries have major impact on people and communities. The average 2018 social cost is estimated at \$5.07 million per fatal crash, \$525,600 per serious crash, \$29,900 per minor crash, this includes estimated cost of loss of life and life quality, loss of output, medical cost, property damage costs and legal and court costs incurred. 1 6. Speed affects the likelihood and the severity of its consequences. Small reductions in impact speeds greatly increase the chances of surviving a crash. World Health Organisation states that an increase of 1 km/h in mean vehicle speed results in an increase of 4-5% of fatal crashes. 2 The Ministry of Transport's Safer Journey report 3 states that there is a 10% probability of death for car drivers in frontal impact collisions travelling at 70km limit compared with 30% probability for car drivers travelling at 95km/h and 50% probability for drivers travelling at 105 km/h.</p> <p>7. NMH is supportive of the objectives of the Ministry of Transport's Safer Journey Strategy to improve the roads so that each type of road has recognisable and distinctive set of self-explaining features such as signage, lane width, road markings and speed limits. This will encourage people to travel at speeds that best fit the design and function of the road. 8. Speed also has adverse effects on levels of environmental and noise pollution, and the "liveability" of urban areas 4 • Lower vehicle speeds and volumes lead to reduced noise, vibration and emissions in the environment. Residents in neighbourhoods with good street environments tend to walk and cycle more, take public transport more and drive less than comparable households in other areas 5 which has environmental impacts.</p> <p>9. NZ is the third worst OECD country for road deaths of those aged 0-14 years. Maori children showed a disproportionately high rate of injury from motor vehicle traffic crashes, and Pacific Island children had the highest rate of non fatal injuries as pedestrians. 6 In order to make our streets safer for those who are the most vulnerable in our communities, we must reduce road speeds. Specific Comments 10. NMH supports the proposed speed limit changes in all areas as indicated within the consultation document.</p> <p>11. NMH is particularly pleased that the speeds will be reduced around Clifton Terrace School as this was highlighted as an area of concern in our earlier submission this year.</p> <p>12. NMH encourages NZTA to continue its infrastructure improvements in high risk spots on SH6 especially in regards to the installation of passing lanes and median barriers. Conclusion 13. NMH strongly supports NZTA's goal of improving safety on State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson and thanks NZTA for the opportunity to comment on existing issues from both a public and staff safety point of view.</p>
822	Individual submitter	<p>Speed changes are not necessary. Ensure overseas tourists know NZ Road rules and drive on the left of the road. Have a war on Drug and Drink driving.</p>
823	NZAA member	<p>I oppose the following proposed speed changes on SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson in the following locations 1,4 7, 9,11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 19. These areas should remain with the current speed limit.</p> <p>I have no opposition to location 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 16 as reducing speeds in the vicinity of schools is a sensible move.</p> <p>This stretch of road has had a high proportion of accidents attributed to passing maneuvers going wrong. Reducing the speed to 80km/h will not result in all the traffic travelling at the same speed. Consideration should be given to adding additional slow traffic lanes to allow faster vehicles the ability to pass. Cars will still try to overtake trucks at 80km, thus going over the 80 speed limit.</p> <p>The proposed 80km/hr will have significant impacts and increased costs on everyone, the cost of living will increase for the wider community as it will now cost to transport goods by reducing the speed as the trucks will not be able to complete as many loads in a day. A driver will no longer get three loads to Nelson and back, they will only be able to achieve two.</p> <p>We would like to see the RUC that we pay put into the maintenance and improvement of the roads, lowering the speed limit is a poor way to deal with the failings of the roading infrastructure in this country.</p>
824	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes, build a roundabout at the exit from the Marlborough airport  4) Yes, do not lower the speed limit for this whole section. It needs 2-3 overtaking lanes or bays instead.  5) No  7) do not lower the speed limit for this section  8) School zone okay but does this also have school buses stopping? That would require 20 kph  9) Do not lower the speed limit here  10) Slow speed in vicinity of the bridge and one lane bottleneck is appropriate  11) Do not lower the speed limit in this area</p>

		<p>13) Do not lower the speed limit in this area. Additional overtaking lanes are needed</p> <p>14) Do not lower the speed limit to 60 in this area. It is hard enough to overtake slow moving trucks in this area and more overtaking bays are needed</p> <p>15) Do not lower the speed limit in this area</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
825	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Reducing the speed limit on the 100km sections of the road will not solve the increase in accidents, rather it will increase it. What needs to be addressed is the cause of the accidents. In my experience the cause is driver frustration. Why? Drivers become impatient because they have been unable to overtake for long periods of time, due to having to sit behind slow drivers or vehicles that are only able to travel at 90km legally, and the lack of safe passing opportunities. The solution is obvious: provide passing opportunities and passing lanes along the 100km sections to enable vehicles to pull over and others to overtake safely. Here's another solution. Increase the speed limit for ALL vehicles to 100km in 100km sections, in which case the need for overtaking would to a large extent be negated. Better still do both; provide passing opportunities and increase the speed limit to 100km. NZTA must pull their heads out of the sand on this issue as continued inaction will only result in the loss of more precious lives and serious injury.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Reducing the speed limit on the 100km sections of the road will not solve the increase in accidents, rather it will increase it. What needs to be addressed is the cause of the accidents. In my experience the cause is driver frustration. Why? Drivers become impatient because they have been unable to overtake for long periods of time, due to having to sit behind slow drivers or vehicles that are only able to travel at 90km legally, and the lack of safe passing opportunities. The solution is obvious: provide passing opportunities and passing lanes along the 100km sections to enable vehicles to pull over and others to overtake safely. Here's another solution. Increase the speed limit for ALL vehicles to 100km in 100km sections, in which case the need for overtaking would to a large extent be negated. Better still do both; provide passing opportunities and increase the speed limit to 100km. NZTA must pull their heads out of the sand on this issue as continued inaction will only result in the loss of more precious lives and serious injury.</p> <p>8) Reducing the speed limit on the 100km sections of the road will not solve the increase in accidents, rather it will increase it. What needs to be addressed is the cause of the accidents. In my experience the cause is driver frustration. Why? Drivers become impatient because they have been unable to overtake for long periods of time, due to having to sit behind slow drivers or vehicles that are only able to travel at 90km legally, and the lack of safe passing opportunities. The solution is obvious: provide passing opportunities and passing lanes along the 100km sections to enable vehicles to pull over and others to overtake safely. Here's another solution. Increase the speed limit for ALL vehicles to 100km in 100km sections, in which case the need for overtaking would to a large extent be negated. Better still do both; provide passing opportunities and increase the speed limit to 100km. NZTA must pull their heads out of the sand on this issue as continued inaction will only result in the loss of more precious lives and serious injury.</p> <p>9) Reducing the speed limit on the 100km sections of the road will not solve the increase in accidents, rather it will increase it. What needs to be addressed is the cause of the accidents. In my experience the cause is driver frustration. Why? Drivers become impatient because they have been unable to overtake for long periods of time, due to having to sit behind slow drivers or vehicles that are only able to travel at 90km legally, and the lack of safe passing opportunities. The solution is obvious: provide passing opportunities and passing lanes along the 100km sections to enable vehicles to pull over and others to overtake safely. Here's another solution. Increase the speed limit for ALL vehicles to 100km in 100km sections, in which case the need for overtaking would to a large extent be negated. Better still do both; provide passing opportunities and increase the speed limit to 100km. NZTA must pull their heads out of the sand on this issue as continued inaction will only result in the loss of more precious lives and serious injury.</p> <p>10) Reducing the speed limit on the 100km sections of the road will not solve the increase in accidents, rather it will increase it. What needs to be addressed is the cause of the accidents. In my experience the cause is driver frustration. Why? Drivers become impatient because they have been unable to overtake for long periods of time, due to having to sit behind slow drivers or vehicles that are only able to travel at 90km legally, and the lack of safe passing opportunities. The solution is obvious: provide passing opportunities and passing lanes along the 100km sections to enable vehicles to pull over and others to overtake safely. Here's another solution. Increase the speed limit for ALL vehicles to 100km in 100km sections, in which case the need for overtaking would to a large extent be negated. Better still do both; provide passing opportunities and increase the speed limit to 100km. NZTA must pull their heads out of the sand on this issue as continued inaction will only result in the loss of more precious lives and serious injury.</p> <p>11) Reducing the speed limit on the 100km sections of the road will not solve the increase in accidents, rather it will increase it. What needs to be addressed is the cause of the accidents. In my experience the cause is driver frustration. Why? Drivers become impatient because they have been unable to overtake for long periods of time, due to having to sit behind slow drivers or vehicles that are only able to travel at 90km legally, and the lack of safe passing opportunities. The solution is obvious: provide passing opportunities and passing lanes along the 100km sections to enable vehicles to pull over and others to overtake safely. Here's another solution. Increase the speed limit for ALL vehicles to 100km in 100km sections, in which case the need for overtaking would to a large extent be negated. Better still do both; provide passing opportunities and increase the speed limit to 100km. NZTA must pull their heads out of the sand on this issue as continued inaction will only result in the loss of more precious lives and serious injury.</p> <p>13) Reducing the speed limit on the 100km sections of the road will not solve the increase in accidents, rather it will increase it. What needs to be addressed is the cause of the accidents. In my experience the cause is driver frustration. Why? Drivers become impatient because they have been unable to overtake for long periods of time, due to having to sit behind slow drivers or vehicles that are only able to travel at 90km legally, and the lack of safe passing opportunities. The solution is obvious: provide passing opportunities and passing lanes along the 100km sections to enable vehicles to pull over and others to overtake safely. Here's another solution. Increase the speed limit for ALL vehicles to 100km in 100km sections, in which case the need for overtaking would to a large extent be negated. Better still do both; provide passing opportunities and increase the speed limit to 100km. NZTA must pull their heads out of the sand on this issue as continued inaction</p>

		<p>will only result in the loss of more precious lives and serious injury.</p> <p>14) No Comment 15) No Comment 16) No Comment 17) No Comment 18) No Comment 19) No Comment</p>
826	Individual submitter	<p>1) No reduction required 4) Not required. Unnecessary reduction on a well maintained road. No difficult corners. No reduction required. This is not a difficult road to drive. Speed reduction would increase frustration, encourage speeding and, consequently, lead to increased accident rates 5) Agreed - This is built-up area with pedestrian traffic 7) No reduction required. This is not a difficult road to drive. Speed reduction would increase frustration, encourage speeding and, consequently, lead to increased accident rates 8) Agreed 9) No reduction required. This is not a difficult road to drive. Speed reduction would increase frustration, encourage speeding and, consequently, lead to increased accident rates 10) Agreed 11) No reduction required. This is not a difficult road to drive. Speed reduction would increase frustration, encourage speeding and, consequently, lead to increased accident rates 13) Not required 14) Not required 15) Reduced speed limit required on approx 7 km downside North) of Whangamoas suggest 60km. Particular reminder to foreign drivers that this twisting road requires care 16) Agreed 17) No reduction required. This is not a difficult road to drive. Speed reduction would increase frustration, encourage speeding and, consequently, lead to increased accident rates 18) Agreed 19) Agreed</p>
827	Individual submitter	<p>1) No 4) Yes, 100 limit is ok for this area - poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 5) No 7) Yes, 100 limit is ok for this area - poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 8) Yes, 100 limit is ok but include 60 school zone - poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 9) Yes, 100 limit is ok for this area - poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 10) No 11) Yes, 100 limit is ok for this area - poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 13) Yes, 100 limit is ok when driving to the conditions, but poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 14) Yes, 80 limit is ok when driving to the conditions, but poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 15) Yes, 100 limit is ok when driving to the conditions, but poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 16) Yes, 100 limit is ok when driving to the conditions, but poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 17) Yes, 100 limit is ok when driving to the conditions, but poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 18) Yes, 80 limit is ok when driving to the conditions, but poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor 19) Yes, 100 limit is ok when driving to the conditions, but poor road maintenance, inconsiderate and incompetent drivers are the biggest factor</p>
828	Individual submitter	<p>1) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 4) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 5) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 7) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 8) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 9) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 10) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 11) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 13) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 14) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 15) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take. 16) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take.</p>

		<p>17) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take.</p> <p>18) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take.</p> <p>19) No, please go ahead with the proposed lower speed limit. It will assist reducing the road toll in return for just a little bit of extra time that the journey will take.</p>
829	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it at 100</p> <p>4) More passing lanes so the cars don't build up behind trucka</p> <p>5) Leave that at the speed</p> <p>7) More passing lanes there are straights there that will handle a passing lane</p> <p>8) Leave that because of the school</p> <p>9) More passing lanes</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Leave at 100</p> <p>13) One long straight so one passing lane</p> <p>14) Need to round corners off and more passing bays</p> <p>15) All good</p> <p>16) Leave at that because of school</p> <p>17) Leave at 100 good piece of road</p> <p>18) Should not not be dropped</p> <p>19) That's another good bit of road</p>
830	Individual submitter	<p>1) Reasonable and acceptable change.</p> <p>4) Completely unreasonable change - there is no issues with the majority of this road being 100kph. Around communities, this could be reduced to 80kph. However, a blanket 80kph speed is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>5) Reasonable and acceptable change.</p> <p>7) Completely unreasonable change - there is no issues with the majority of this road being 100kph. Around communities, this could be reduced to 80kph. However, a blanket 80kph speed is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>8) Reasonable and acceptable change.</p> <p>9) Completely unreasonable change - there is no issues with the majority of this road being 100kph. Around communities, this could be reduced to 80kph. However, a blanket 80kph speed is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>10) Reasonable and acceptable change.</p> <p>11) Completely unreasonable change - there is no issues with the majority of this road being 100kph. Around communities, this could be reduced to 80kph. However, a blanket 80kph speed is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>13) Completely unreasonable change - there is no issues with the majority of this road being 100kph. Around communities, this could be reduced to 80kph. However, a blanket 80kph speed is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>14) Changes may be required - there are issues with the Whangamoia Saddle due to the nature of the road. However, a blanket 60kph speed is unnecessary and unwarranted. Any changes should exclude the passing lanes on the north of the Whangamoia Saddle.</p> <p>15) Reasonable and acceptable change depending on Whangamoia changes.</p> <p>16) Reasonable and acceptable change.</p> <p>17) Completely unreasonable change - there are no issues with the majority of this road being 100kph. Around communities, this could be reduced to 80kph. However, a blanket 80kph speed is unnecessary and unwarranted. By changing the speed limit to 80kph, this makes the overtaking lanes on the Gentle Annie hill pointless.</p> <p>18) Unneeded change - very few dwellings with access directly to the road. 80kph with a variable speed zone at Clifton Tce School would be sufficient.</p> <p>19) Reasonable and acceptable change.</p>
831	Individual submitter	<p>I am totally against reducing the speed limit on this road for the following reasons.</p> <p>1/ You spent about \$13 million on the changes to the Rai Saddle. This was most likely in response to a death on this part of the road. The fact that there are almost zero passing lanes on the rest of the road mean that when drivers get to the previous passing lanes on the Rai Saddle, they drive at excessive speed to get past the slow buggers that do stupid stuff on this road. I drive this road a lot and see this all the time. Don't be reactionary to the fact that a death occurred on the Rai Saddle but why did it occurred in that spot, likely a passing lane or nearby.</p> <p>2/ Keeping in mind the above, if NZTA had provided a lot more passing lanes to the whole highway, they will drastically reduce the accident rate on this total hi road. As I previously stated, I drive this road on a regular basis and see the "accidents waiting to happen" on a very regular occurrence.</p> <p>3/ This highway is a well used Tourist Highway just like around Otago/Queenstown. As such, you get many campervan people taking in the views and not checking out the long line of traffic behind them as they likely travel on multi lane highways in their own country. It is common to see a Campervan with 10+ vehicles behind it.</p> <p>4/ When you decide to put in a lot more passing lanes, police the highway to ensure drivers are respecting the purpose of a passing lane. Also have signs stating drivers WILL be fined if they don't</p>

		<p>comply with this.  No disrespect but the solutions are so easy to reduce the problems on this road. Talk to the professional drivers and you'll see what I mean.</p>
832	Individual submitter	<p>1) This section is straight, wide, and flat. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  4) This road is wide with no steep grades. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  5) No Comment  7) This road is wide with no steep grades. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  8) This road is wide with no steep grades. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  9) This road is wide with no steep grades. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  10) No Comment  11) This road is wide. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  13) This road is wide. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  14) This road is wide. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  15) This road is wide with no steep grades. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  16) No Comment  17) This road is wide. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  18) This road is wide with no steep grades. Visibility is good. There is no need to alter the limit on this road. Driver education / training about appropriate speeds for conditions would be money better spent.  19) No Comment</p>
833	Individual submitter	<p>1) its OK at 100km/hr  4) This is ridiculous. Most of the road is quite safe at 100km/hr maximum. Some parts could be reduced to 80km/hr eg over the wairau bridge  5) 70km/hr is quite safe in this zone  7) majority of this road quite safe at 100 km/hr max  8) Sounds OK  9) All of this road is OK at 100km/hr  10) that's OK  11) existing 100km/hr is OK  13) this section contains one of the few overtaking possibilities on the Blen to Nelson road. PLEASE LEAVE AT 100KM/HR  14) 80km/hr is fine  15) 100km/hr is OK  16) OK  17) Most of this is OK at 100km/hr.  18) 80km/hr is OK  19) 100km/hr is OK here</p>
834	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) will there are corners that it is not safe to drive at 100km, and because most of this road is straight to reduce the speed to 80km over the whole area, will result in frustration and the likelihood of increased accident because motorist travelling behind say 75km vehicles will take a lot longer to pass to keep within the 4km per hour limit above 80km speed limit. this will an extremely dangerous discision to frustrate motorist on straight roads.  5) No Comment  7) again their will be frustrated drivers who will cause more accidents  8) No Comment  9) as above frustrated drivers on straight roads, more accidents will occur  10) No Comment  11) again frustrated drivers  13) though there are parts of this road that 100km is not a safe speed there will be frustrated drivers on the straight sections and if considering this why was the rai valley saddle straightened, it would have been far better to straighten the corners between the saddle and whangamoia as I live in tuna bay, and have had to drive to emergency in nelson, reducing the whole area to 80km or</p>

		<p>less could result in death as there is no ambulance here and time for any callout takes longer than currently driving, 1.5hrs at current speed limit, likely to be 2.5hrs under proposal, if speed restrictions go ahead, then more will die from strokes and heart attacks because of travel time, helicopters cannot always fly due to weather and most heart attacks start out as minor and deteriorate. So emergency travel at 80km or less will be attributing to death.</p> <p>14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) frustrated drivers wont be able to pass in passing lanes  18) its an easy 80km road  19) No Comment</p>
835	Individual submitter	<p>1) No - this road is fine at present speed  4) No need to change speed here - leave as is  5) No problems here - leave alone  7) Leave alone - no issues  8) Leave alone - the school zone is effective  9) Yes change the speed to 80k - windy road  10) Yes reduce speed through here - many distractions on 2 legs to deal with  11) Leave this at 100 - no change needed  13) Yes this could be changed -  14) This warrants change but not as slow as proposed - 80 would be fine  15) Yes definitely lower speed here  16) Agree leave as is  17) Dont agree with this change - leave at 100  18) 80 through here is fine - leave as is  19) Yes slow this section down - too busy for 100</p>
836	Individual submitter	<p>1) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  4) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  5) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  7) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  8) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  9) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  10) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  11) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  13) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  14) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  15) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  16) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  17) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  18) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits  19) dont do it, train and test drivers better so they are capable of driving at the current speed limits</p>
837	Individual submitter	<p>1) The accidents are caused by stupid drivers, they will drive stupid no matter what speed! They will break the speed limit no matter what. If they are driving 110km now they will still drive 110km. The road is an easy road to drive and the speed limit could actually be raised. Stop bringing our country down and stop making us go backwards. Stop wasting tax payer money and make / repair / design the roads properly. Lazy and useless. Be accountable. You take so much tax from us for these roads and then waste it.  4) The accidents are caused by stupid drivers, they will drive stupid no matter what speed! They will break the speed limit no matter what. If they are driving 110km now they will still drive 110km. The road is an easy road to drive and the speed limit could actually be raised. Stop bringing our country down and stop making us go backwards. Stop wasting tax payer money and make / repair / design the roads properly. Lazy and useless. Be accountable. You take so much tax from us for these roads and then waste it.  5) The accidents are caused by stupid drivers, they will drive stupid no matter what speed! They will break the speed limit no matter what. If they are driving 110km now they will still drive 110km. The road is an easy road to drive and the speed limit could actually be raised. Stop bringing our country down and stop making us go backwards. Stop wasting tax payer money and make / repair / design the roads properly. Lazy and useless. Be accountable. You take so much tax from us for these roads and then waste it.  7) The accidents are caused by stupid drivers, they will drive stupid no matter what speed! They will break the speed limit no matter what. If they are driving 110km now they will still drive 110km. The road is an easy road to drive and the speed limit could actually be raised. Stop bringing our country down and stop making us go backwards. Stop wasting tax payer money and make / repair /</p>



		<p>and often frost in the winter</p> <p>18) I believe the current 80Km speed limit is appropriate for this area</p> <p>19) I support lowering the speed limit in this area as there are often pedestrians and cyclists on this piece of road. This piece of road is a nightmare for cyclists as there is heavy traffic, winding road and inadequate verges.</p>
839	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes, 90km/h !!</p> <p>4) Existing speed limit of 100 km/h is ok. Do not want it changed. (If downgraded then 90 km/h is more sensible)</p> <p>5) Yes, downgrade to 60 km/h.</p> <p>7) This is a very good road and 100 km/h is fine. Do not change. (Any downgrade s/be 90 km/h, not 80 km/h)</p> <p>8) This is a very good road, current 100 km/h speed limit is fine. School zone reduction is fine.</p> <p>9) This is a good road, 100 km/h is fine.</p> <p>10) Agree, 60 km/h fine.</p> <p>11) This is a good road, current speed limit is fine.</p> <p>13) Should stay at 100 km/h except for between bottom of Rai Saddle up to the long straight - very winding and 80 km/h is more suitable. Rest to Nelson 100 km/h.</p> <p>14) Whangamoia Hill road after the overtaking lanes should be 80-90 km/h.</p> <p>15) Leave at 100 km/h.</p> <p>16) Fine.</p> <p>17) Leave at 100 km/h. Overtaking lanes on Whangamoia side of Hira hill are narrow and should be 90 km/h limit. Maybe this whole stretch 90 km/h</p> <p>18) 80 km/h is fine</p> <p>19) Reduce to 90 km/h</p>
840	Individual submitter	<p>1) No, lower speed limit there is a good idea.</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) This is a crowded settled area and the lower speed is appropriate.</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) 60 still seems high given the high number of pedestrians along this stretch in the summer</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) You might want to consider a higher speed limit on the passing lane going up to the summit</p> <p>14) I often cycle this stretch of road and find that people go way too fast through all the curves. I don't think any of the curves can be safely taken at 60.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) The limit through Hira should be much lower. Lots of pedestrians in this area.</p> <p>17) I think 80 is still too high along this stretch, where I know of at least two fatalities in recent years. 70.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) 80 is still too high for this busy stretch with lots of peds and bicycles.</p>
841	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>

842	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) This is a good road that travels well. It would be good to see a passing lane in to help with the number of campers etc that can help cause frustration for other motorists  5) No Comment  7) This road travels well.  8) During school drop off and let out drop the speed but all other times keep it the same  9) this is a good road as well. Its wide and maintained  10) 60 would be good through here  11) no need to drop speed. This road is mainly straight and a good road.  13) a lot of this section is windy and tight so its pretty hard to maintain 100km but the section in between could easily accomdate and addional paasing lane migating the build up of traffic  14) i would support a drop to 80km but 60 seems very slow and the volume of cars would build up very fast resulting in people making stupid passing manouvres.  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) this is a good road, wide with a passing lane.  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
843	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree with 80 km/h.  4) I agree with 80 or 90 as the proposed new speed limit. This means all traffic is going at the same speed.  5) No  7) I agree with 80 kms or 90 kms as the speed limit. It is a good road.  8) Between 40 and 60 for the variable school zone. Most schools have a 40 mph within some time frames.  9) Speed limit 80 mph or 90 mph.  10) Agree with 60.  11) Speed limit 80 kms or 90 kms. Recently there was a road accident where the Bulwer Road meets SH1 and a motor cyclist died.  13) Agree with 80.  14) Definitely agree with 60. The freight trucks have got bigger, wider and longer. If larger ferries bring over more trucks there will be increased traffic to consider. The populations of Nelson and Marlborough are ageing and this needs to be factored in to the future changes.  15) New speed limit of 80 or 90.  16) New speed limit 80 or 90.  17) New speed limit 80. There is a turnoff to Glenduan that can be dangerous for those coming from The Glen/Glenduan and turning right to the city. A person died there recently.  18) There is a school, Clifton Terrace, and more houses being built all the time. This brings more families to the area.  19) I agree.</p>
844	Individual submitter	<p>The proposed speed reductions on the Blenheim to Nelson highway I feel that more accidents are are going to be happening. Due to DRIVER frustration. This road has a few passing bays that are used regularly by trucks, campers and other larger road users. I would like to know how you got 9 minutes longer to the trip. That is another fabricated figure I feel.  With no accurate figures of the amount and types of traffic using this road I believe that MTA are having a knee jerk reaction that is only going to compound problems, on roads that are not well maintained.</p>
845	Individual submitter	<p>Hi there regarding your proposed speed reductions between Blenheim and Nelson i do not agree with the entire plan,  I travel these roads 6 days a week and have done so for 32 years ,Renwick to pelorus bridge should not change except past Canvastown school (should be 80).  Put some passing bays in-between havelock and Renwick, there are plenty of places to do so; you can waste \$11 million on the Rai saddle to shave 3 minutes of travel time now you want to make that 80 kms when you should have done that in the first place!  That money would have been a lot better off putting some passing bays in, our roads have gotten a lot busier now especially with tourists and you have done nothing to accommodate the growth!  Reducing the speed limit is a cheap temporary fix! spend some money on our roads and go forward, not backwards!  I shouldn't have to spend more of my time on these roads which are more than adequate in most places, where are the highway patrol, I do not see them anymore? The roads are now left to be managed by our own common sense and some people do not have any.  I want to emphasise that passing bays will rectify much of the problem along with adequate signage with up and coming passing bays and this will stop people taking un-necessary risks- 80Kms will not solve the problem.</p>
846	Individual submitter	<p>1) keep it at 100km people are going to fall asleep at the wheel  4) keeping it at 100km people are going to fall asleep at the wheel  5) keeping it at 70km  7) yes keeping it at 100km  8) yes keeping it at 100km</p>

		<p>9) yes keeping it at 100km  10) keep it at the same speed  11) keeping it at 100km  13) keeping it at 100km  14) keeping it at 100km you got to be kidding me REALLY  15) keeping it at 100km  16) keep it the same  17) keeping it at 100km  18) you have already dropped it from 100km  19) REALLY keep it at 100km it's a State High way</p>
847	Individual submitter	I agree with the changes. I wish there were plans to revive the railroading and coastal shipping to eliminate the stacked long trailored trucks and all the accidents that come with them.
848	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
849	Individual submitter	<p>1) This change is unnecessary  4) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  5) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  7) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  8) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  9) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  10) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  11) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  13) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  14) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  15) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  16) Not necessary  17) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  18) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit  19) This proposal is ridiculous, this road is safe with the current speed limit</p>
850	Broadbridge Transport	<p>Broadbridge Transport have been operating for 72 years and our trucks have been travelling to and from Nelson since then on a regular basis.  We are concerned for the frustrations of reducing the speed on this stretch of road will cause further accidents.  Our drivers regularly see other vehicles making dangerous manoeuvres on blind corners due to impatience.  We feel that the blanket speed adjustment is a band aid approach for the bigger problem, which is the road itself and the lack of experience drivers.  The money budgeted for this area should be invested in further passing lanes, the road is kept to a high standard and increased police present.  We agree that there needs to portions of the road changed, the school zones and built up areas should be 50km for safety purposes of pedestrians.  We would appreciate your feedback and would like you to consider our opinions.</p>

851	Broadbridge Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Straight piece of road in a rural area, no reason for the change</li> <li>4) Instead of reducing the speed a passing lane would be appropriate for this strip of road</li> <li>5) Built up area, I agree with this change</li> <li>7) Passing lanes to be invested instead of speed change</li> <li>8) Passing lanes should be invested, dropping the speed around the school to 50km but having either side of the school zone at 100km</li> <li>9) Passing lanes to be invested instead of speed change</li> <li>10) Passing lanes to be invested instead of speed change</li> <li>11) Passing lanes to be invested instead of speed change</li> <li>13) Rai Valley should be 50km as it is a built up area, passing lanes to be invested instead of speed change for the rest of the road</li> <li>14) Passing lanes to be invested instead of speed change</li> <li>15) Passing lanes to be invested instead of speed change</li> <li>16) This needs to be 50km at school times</li> <li>17) Passing lanes to be invested instead of speed change</li> <li>18) Built up area, agree with this change</li> <li>19) Built up area, agree with this change</li> </ul>
852	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>4) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>5) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>7) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>8) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h (60km/h school zone) - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>9) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>10) I support reduction of the speed limit to 60km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>11) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>13) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>14) I support reduction of the speed limit to 60km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>15) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>16) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h (with a variable school zone) - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>17) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - but would like to suggest reduction to 60km/h near Hira school and The Glen intersection - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>18) I support reduction of the speed limit to 60km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> <li>19) I support reduction of the speed limit to 80km/h - please don't be swayed by vocal opposition</li> </ul>
853	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Reducing the speed limit will increase the chance of accidents due to impatient driving. Retain at 100</li> <li>4) Reducing the speed limit will increase the chance of accidents due to impatient driving. Retain at 100</li> <li>5) Reducing the speed limit will increase the chance of accidents due to impatient driving. Retain at 70</li> <li>7) Leave as status quo</li> <li>8) Retain as status quo</li> <li>9) Retain as status quo. Reducing speed limit will have the ability of increasing accidents due to overtaking maneuvers due to impatience</li> <li>10) Retain as status quo. Reducing speed limit will have the ability of increasing accidents due to overtaking maneuvers due to impatience</li> <li>11) Retain as status quo. Reducing speed limit will have the ability of increasing accidents due to overtaking maneuvers due to impatience</li> <li>13) Retain at 100. Unsafe overtaking due to impatience will prevail if speed limit is reduced.</li> <li>14) Reduce to 80</li> <li>15) Retain at 100. Unsafe overtaking due to impatience will prevail if speed limit is reduced.</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) Retain at 100. See comments below</li> <li>18) Retain at 80. Drivers dropping to 60 now, if it is lowered more chance for accidents due to impatient drivers.</li> <li>19) Retain at 100. I have lived at Wakapuaka for 28 yrs &amp; strongly feel the speed limit doesn't justify been lowered. It is a very open safe road, the safest drives I have had along that road is when everyone is driving to the speed limit. You lower it and impatience will heighten risk of accidents. I would like to see evidence that the accidents caused between Blenheim &amp; Nelson is due to driving at 100. I'm guessing alcohol, drugs, inattention (cell phones etc) &amp; overseas drivers are the biggest contributors of having accidents. The Glen corner requires improved safety &amp; I would recommend purchasing land off the farmer on the Glen corner to enable improvements to corner. I have been canvassing the Nelson City Council for the cycleway to be extended from Allistair st to The Glen. There is room on side of road on Transit land to enable the construction of a cycleway.</li> </ul>

854	NMH	I have been travelling over this section of road for the last 6 months and these are the issues I have noted. I have also travelled the Richmond-Motueka stretch where the proposed speed reduction has already been implemented. Reducing the speed limit between Richmond and Maisey's Road has increased the long streams of traffic making it more difficult for vehicles trying to enter the main highway. The number of accidents does not seem you have reduced. Increased level of frustration noted in general conversation among people frustrated with drivers who routinely travel 10-20km slower than the speed limit, whatever it is. This also applies to drivers who think double yellow lines means 80kmh speed limit. Our roads don't gave enough safe passing lanes. One of the [passing lanes Blenheim to Nelson is positioned on a bend and the yellow is on the passing lane side of centre. On a couple of occasions I have tried to use this passing lane, expecting it to be a safe passing area, only to find opposing traffic using the lane. I have noticed this in other areas also. Passing lanes should be protected by double yellow lines, to ensure safe used through the entire manoeuver. Our main highways should be 3 lanes wide wherever possible with alternating passing lanes. This would prevent the unsafe passing maneouvers I have witnessed, because drivers would know there is a safe passing lane coming up. Currently our passing lanes are few and far between, and traffic levels are such that safe passing is not safe without a properly marked lane. If we were able to implement this 3 lane system, a double yellow line would replace the current centre line completely, thus making passing illegal except in designated lanes. It may also reduce confusion for foreign drivers that cross the centre line and are then unaware of which side they should be on. A reminded that the driver should be positioned in the middle of the road may help this. If the driver is travelling beside the gutter - he is on the wrong side. PS: I don't agree with the proposed reduced speed limit. Thanks for the opportunity.
855	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>4) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>5) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>7) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>8) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>9) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>10) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>11) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>13) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>14) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>15) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>16) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>17) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>18) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> <li>19) Cyclists will suffer fewer serious injuries or death if the speed limit is lowered.</li> </ul>
856	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) More passing lanes</li> <li>4) More passing lanes</li> <li>5) No</li> <li>7) Speed limit is max speed, people need to use own judgement</li> <li>8) Own judgement once again, thought any school was 40km</li> <li>9) 100km is fine</li> <li>10) 100/50 is fine, blind corner going onto bridge, 60 may be too fast for people to stop safely</li> <li>11) 100km is fine, it is a max speed not a mandatory speef</li> <li>13) As above, more passing lane</li> <li>14) People drive to abilify as above max speed, not requirement</li> <li>15) As above</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) Leave at 100</li> <li>18) Road rage, it is a highway, give people credit for being able to drive safely on a highway</li> <li>19) Leave as is</li> </ul>
857	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) I have frequently driven in Denmark, where all main roads have an 80 km/h restriction (only four lane motorways with median safety barrier have speed extension 100 km/h). Under the 80 km/h rule traffic flows, very few impatient drivers, most can keep to speed limit and definitely makes for a more relaxing and safe travel experience</li> <li>5) Number of caravans, trailers etc using this stretch makes 50 km/h logical</li> <li>7) Number of caravans, boat trailers being towed, would assist a smoother traffic flow for all</li> <li>8) Logical - often travel this stretch and when slow down for potential school traffic, cars overtake dangerously.</li> <li>9) No comment</li> <li>10) At moment, confusing , often traffic stop/turn at short notice creating hazards,</li> <li>11) When travelling this stretch have observed many dangerous overtaking manouevres - round curves etc. 80 km/hr is logical speed, and eliminate potential danger of overtaking as this is speed a</li> </ul>

		<p>most vehicles will comfortably do.</p> <p>13) Would help in that trucks would not tailgate and try to pass, and then slow down when reaching rising slopes.</p> <p>14) Sensible safe recommendations. Would prevent dangerous overtaking that I have often observed on this stretch</p> <p>15) A speed most motorist already adopt - causing impatient overtaking. Sensible suggestion and will make little change to travel time.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) Sensible safety for children, increased number of cyclists.</p> <p>19) Would improve traffic flow and increase safety for increased number of commuters and cyclists cyclists. As someone who regularly drive from Nelson to Havelock, I thoroughly support all recommendations made in this survey!</p>
858	Individual submitter	<p>I wish to comment of these proposed changes. Over years many millions of dollars have been spent improving this road. It is a wide road with mainly good sight lines anyone who disagrees with that should see specsavers. Yes the bottom of the Rai Saddle and Collins Valley should be 80ks but the rest should stay the same. Restriction will impact taffic volume and congestion. Also Clifton Tce School does not exit onto main road so cars are fine. Travelling at 80k means using a lower gear meaning an increase of fuel use especially travelling uphill.</p>
859	Individual submitter	<p>1) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>4) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>5) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>7) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>8) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>9) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>10) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>11) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>13) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>14) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>15) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>16) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>17) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>18) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p> <p>19) The road speeds are fine should only be dropped around schools. signs like the ones on the way to Christchurch should be put into place: traffic behind you let it pass in all pull over bays a little bit more education is what's needed</p>
860	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>4) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>5) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>7) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p>

		<p>8) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>9) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>10) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>11) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>13) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>14) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>15) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>18) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p> <p>19) I support this change and all the proposed speed limit restriction changes. All these roads should have speed reduced to encourage drivers to slow down in these areas and drive to the conditions.</p>
861	Individual submitter	<p>I was unable to find the online petition via the NZTA website so I will email you instead. I would like to express my opinion in this matter and offer a possible solution.</p> <p>As I have been a Canvastown resident for 22years and commute to work in Blenheim on a regular basis, I believe I deserve the right to be heard</p> <p>Disagree:</p> <p>I appose to the speed limit to decrease in the 100km down to 80km areas as proposed. I do not believe that this will solve the problem of in-patient drivers and slow towing or tourists vehicles not pulling over when a chance presents itself causing a back load of drivers behind them- this comes down to driver attitudes..</p> <p>Suggestion: Simply- Add passing bays where able- Currently there are no passing bays available between Canvastown and Blenheim and there requires more passing bays between Canvastown and the Whangamoia. I believe that in most car accidents along these roads are caused by drivers exceeding the current speed limit as it stands and dropping the speed limit will not stop these drivers from their erratic behaviour</p> <p>Agree:</p> <p>I agree with the proposal of the speed limit reduction in the Canvastown school area.</p> <p>I agree with the speed limit reduction at the Rai Valley area school where children present.</p> <p>Suggestion:</p> <p>I have always had expressed my concerns regarding Children crossing the main roads to get to school- the school bus will not pick up children within a 3.2km radius of the school so that leaves children to make their own way to school and with crossing the main road sometimes with no parents to guide them- I was always riding bikes with both my children to and from school as this is my responsibility for the safety of my children.</p> <p>I believe a wider road edge is required for the cyclists as I had 2 near misses by a truck and trailer a year ago and I had no where where to get off the road with my push bike- I expressed my concerns at that time to the appropriate people including my concerns regarding the Canvastown school area speed limit.</p>
862	Individual submitter	<p>1) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>4) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>5) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>7) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p>

		<p>8) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>9) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>10) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>11) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>13) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>14) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>15) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>16) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>17) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>18) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p> <p>19) Travelling for this amount of time at 80km/h is adding a lot of extra time on to peoples current travel time. Christchurch has already become extended time wise, Wellington is 3 hours minimum away on a ferry, our only other direction that is quick and easy is Nelson, so, it is not fair to extend this time to make the journey longer than it needs to be. 100km/h has always seemed very safe to travel for me. If anything it would be better to keep it at this speed but put more passing lanes in for those who wish to travel slowly to avoid any accidents if that is the worry.</p>
863	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) It is drivers that cause accidents. We see just as meny in 50km and 80 km speed zones</p> <p>8) 60 km school zone yes but leave limit at existing speed. Again it is driver problem not the speed or road condition.</p> <p>9) Again leave at 100km .Look to where the problem is DRIVERS</p> <p>10) NO</p> <p>11) NOT a speed problem leave existing</p> <p>13) NOT a problem area leave existing 100 km</p> <p>14) LEAVE existing speed limit Its idiots and those that do not drive to the conditions so adjusting the speed is not going to change anything</p> <p>15) 100 km is good and overtaking possible</p> <p>16) O K</p> <p>17) yes reduce inside overtaking lane to 80 km to allow safe overtaking as most slow drivers speed up instead of maintaining the speed that they were doing</p> <p>18) Existing speed is fine</p> <p>19) no</p>
864	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep at current speed limit.</p> <p>4) Keep at current speed limit.</p>

		<p>5) Keep at current speed limit.  7) Keep at current speed limit.  8) Keep at current speed limit.  9) Keep at current speed limit.  10) Keep at current speed limit.  11) Keep at current speed limit.  13) Keep at current speed limit.  14) Keep at current speed limit.  15) Keep at current speed limit.  16) Keep at current speed limit.  17) Keep at current speed limit.  18) Keep at current speed limit.  19) Keep at current speed limit.</p>
865	Individual submitter	<p>Could you re-brand Stopping Bays as something else for pulling into let traffic pass. As some people may be like "I'm not stopping so I won't pull in"???. Could the lower speed increase road rage incidents and stupid overtaking attempts. Push back the 60/100km sign on the Blenheim side of Rai Valley - suggestion 60 from Hills Road. Too many people still do 100 or close to by school.</p>
866	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) This is a good road where you can actually do at least 90km/h the whole way. With very few places to pass lowering the speed limit is going to be very frustrating and will cause a lot more crashes in my opinion.  5) No Comment  7) This is a good road where you can actually do at least 90km/h the whole way. With very few places to pass lowering the speed limit is going to be very frustrating and will cause a lot more crashes in my opinion.  8) No Comment  9) This is a good road where you can actually do at least 90km/h the whole way. With very few places to pass lowering the speed limit is going to be very frustrating and will cause a lot more crashes in my opinion.  10) No Comment  11) This is a good road where you can actually do at least 90km/h the whole way. With very few places to pass lowering the speed limit is going to be very frustrating and will cause a lot more crashes in my opinion.  13) You can't do much more than 90km/h on this piece of road anyway. However, if you do reduce the speed limit, this means the tourists will travel at 60km/h and still frustrate everyone. There needs to be more "pull over" signs like on the Upper Buller Gorge road and more areas to pull over.  14) I think this should be only reduced to 80km/h. Again with the previous stretch of road there needs to be more pull over signs and places to pull over for the tourists.  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
867	Individual submitter	<p>I oppose the reduction in the speed limit from Blenheim to Nelson to 80 km/h for the following reasons.</p> <p>From Blenheim to the Rai Valley, excluding Renwick and Havelock is a very easy drive, nothing challenging at all for the average driver.</p> <p>From the Rai Valley to Nelson is a more interesting drive which has all the safety rails, speed advisory signs, double yellow lines to make the drive easy.</p> <p>I drive this route often and find the speed range, [i.e. driving average speed] to vary from just under 100kms/h down to about 70 km/h on the "straight" sections. Slower still on the bends in the open road sections. In the Restricted area of Atawhai the range is 60km/h to 80km/h.</p> <p>To reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h will lengthen the drive by more than 9 minutes, it takes around 80 tom90 minutes at present. A 20% reduction means an increase of 14 to 16 minutes, it will increase driver frustration immensely because all traffic will be going slower there will be huge increases in tailbacks, leading to inexperienced drivers behaving badly.</p>

		<p>If you want safer roads, driver's getting a full license should be instructed for at least 3 hours in an open road situation and tested in the same situation. It is apparent at present that inexperienced drivers, drive at 70 to 80 km/h on open road and yet speed up to 105 – 110km/h on passing lanes. They also think that slow lanes/pullouts are for trucks only. Most car drivers do use these facilities to let traffic past. Trucks and Campervans/caravans do, but cars think that they are for other people; not them.</p> <p>If it is reduced, I can foresee a large increase in accidents/mistakes, which may or may not lead to an increase in fatalities. Spend more money on driver education and more lives will be saved.</p>
868	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) Most of SH6 here is safe for 100km/hr. Lowering the limit to 80km/hr will have no effect on safety  8) No Comment  9) Long stretches of this part of SH6 are safe at 100km/hr. I suggest lowering the limit to 80 will frustrate drivers and may lead to a less safe outcome  10) No Comment  11) long safe stretches of road where 100km/hr are perfectly safe.  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
869	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) This section should be 60kph for consistency along the urban section of QE II Drive and to significantly reduce noise pollution. Currently proposed reduction will not bring road noise into compliance with NZS 6806</p>
870	Individual submitter	<p>It is acceptable to lower open road speed limits past schools. It's a safe thing to do. However it is unacceptable to lower speed limits on all of SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim. I travel this road often and lowering the speed limit will cause more accidents because drivers will get very frustrated and do dangerous passing activity. Please leave it st 100km/h except at towns or schools. And please fix the damned road, more passing lanes, straighten at the corners, upgrade the width. Dont slow the traffic down.</p>
871	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment</p>

		<p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) It's absolutely crazy dropping the speed limit on the open road! Try putting in some new passing lanes, that would truly make a difference.</p>
872	Individual submitter	<p>1) Against the change. Speed limit is fine. Drivers are the issue.</p> <p>4) Against the change. Speed limit is fine. Drivers are the issue.</p> <p>5) Against the change. Drivers are the issue.</p> <p>7) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>8) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>9) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>10) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>11) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>13) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>14) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>15) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>16) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>17) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>18) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p> <p>19) Against the change. Drivers are the issue. Ignorant proposal to change the current limit.</p>
873	Individual submitter	<p>1) This change makes sense.</p> <p>4) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>5) I'm ok with this change</p> <p>7) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>8) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>9) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>10) I'm ok with this change</p> <p>11) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>13) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>14) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>15) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>16) I'm ok with this change</p> <p>17) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p> <p>18) 80kmph through here is absolutely fine, no change needed.</p> <p>19) There is absolutely no reason for this change. 100 kmph on this road is perfectly fine. I have driven trucks on this road for over 25 years and can not see any reason for the speed limit to be lowered now. This decision would be absolutely crazy and obviously made by someone who does not travel the route regularly. Leave it alone!!!</p>
874	Te Atiawa O Te Waka-	<p>1) Status Quo to remain. Other measures such as shoulder increase/truck reduction/Enforcing headlights in poor conditions/Truck pull off areas need to be investigated and implemented. This area is in our rohe and we believe our economic advancement and growth will be negatively effected as staff will spend ever increasing times on the road travelling between our Marae and Offices from Golden Bay to Picton.</p>



		<p>13) If lowering the speed limit will save lives that is the best thing to do</p> <p>14) If lowering the speed limit will save lives that is the best thing to do</p> <p>15) If lowering the speed limit will save lives that is the best thing to do</p> <p>16) If lowering the speed limit will save lives that is the best thing to do</p> <p>17) If lowering the speed limit will save lives that is the best thing to do</p> <p>18) If lowering the speed limit will save lives that is the best thing to do</p> <p>19) If lowering the speed limit will save lives that is the best thing to do</p>
876	Individual submitter	<p>The proposed speed changes would have to been the most weak minded gutless load of twaddle i have ever meet. What about spending some road tax dollars on improving the road?</p> <p>Having seen the balls up reducing the speed limit on the Appleby straight and beyond has created I have absolutely no doubt imagining the stuff up ahead, What used to be a pleasant drive to Motueka is now travelling in a line of traffic all gathered up behind some tosser who decides that 60 in an 80 area is fine!</p> <p>I have been driving the road between Nelson &amp; Blenheim on a regular basis for nearly 40 years so know it pretty well. Most of the problems i have seen are because of slow drivers who are travelling at 30-40km under the speed limit, completely unaware of other drivers and road users who have a full day ahead.</p> <p>I can understand that a few areas could be tidied up but reduce the speed for the whole trip is simply ridiculous.</p> <p>Nelson to Blenheim. the is one over taking lane on Gentle Annie (right at the Nelson end) and a substandard over taking lanes at the bottom of the Rai Saddle which is too short. from there on to Blenheim nothing. Very poor. As a fix up what about adding some over taking lanes ? What about some signage telling slow drivers to let the cue behind them when there are places they can pull over and let the traffic go. What about an increased police presense targetting the slow drivers with 10 to 50 cars behind them.</p> <p>Blenheim to Nelson. No over taking lanes until you get to the Rai Saddle where the overtaking lane is on a winding piece of road. then the whangamoia and gentle annie.</p> <p>There should be some over taking lanes around Havelock &amp; Pelorus.</p> <p>Why was the Nelson side of the Rai Saddle altered when the Rai Valley side of the hill was far more deserving. AND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS SPENT WITH NO OVERTAKING LANES. WHAT THE HELL</p> <p>If the road between Nelson &amp; Blenheim is so dangerous why does it have 55 tonnes trucks on it. We were told that these overweight trucks would not be used on roads not suitable for them.</p>
877	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>4) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>5) No leave at present limit</p> <p>7) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>8) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>9) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>10) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>11) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>13) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>14) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>15) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p> <p>18) Leave at current</p> <p>19) Leave it at 100 then you can choose to drive slower if conditions dictate.</p>
878	Individual submitter	<p>1) Will cause congestion and drivers who are already pissed off with people who can't drive the road holding them up more. fix the roads don't reduce the speed. How much money would be spent rolling out the speed change? With this being a main route for trucks why hasn't something already been put in place so the road doesn't take a hiding</p> <p>4) None of it needs changing. People can pull over and let other motorists who know the roads well pass</p> <p>5) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>7) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>8) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>9) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>10) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>11) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>13) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>14) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>15) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>16) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p> <p>17) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads</p>

		18) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads 19) Waste of money spend it on fixing our roads
879	Individual submitter	1) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 4) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 5) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 7) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 8) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 9) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 10) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 11) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 13) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 14) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 15) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 16) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 17) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 18) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed 19) Make the road bigger not reduce the speed
880	Individual submitter	1) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 4) 90km would be OK 5) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 7) 90 ok 8) 90 ok 9) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 10) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 11) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 13) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 14) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 15) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 16) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 17) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety. 18) I agree with the lower speed limit near school. Improves safety and reduces stone chips. 19) I agree with the lower speed limit. Improves safety and reduces stone chips.
881	Individual submitter	1) Turning bay at Jackson Rd to decrease risk. Leave at 100 4) Leave at 100,this road is in good condition. 5) Reduce to 50, a number of intersections and driveways present. 7) Leave at 100 8) Leave at 100 with a 60 variable school zone. 9) Leave at 100 10) Reduce to 60 11) Leave at 100 13) Leave at 100 14) Leave at 100, 60 is a dramatic decrease 15) Leave at 100 16) Agreed 17) Leave at 100 18) Leave at 80 19) Reduce to 80
882	Individual submitter	I wish to strongly support the proposal to reduce speed limits on SHY 6 as presented.  As your department is aware speed limits on NZ's narrow winding single carriageway roads, despite them being major routes, are high in comparison to similar roads in countries with lower per

		<p>capital road tolls e.g. Europe, North Queensland etc.</p> <p>There has been lots of media criticism of this move with claims that people will continue to do 100kph and therefore overtake dangerously. The answer to this is active enforcement! The Marlborough road policing team is very efficient at this as any regular traveller between Kaikoura and Blenheim will confirm.</p> <p>As a regular traveller between Christchurch and Picton we would regularly see rolled over trucks through the Hundalees pre earthquake; since the road reopened with 80 and 60 kph speed limits we have yet to see a single roll over!</p> <p>I am not a geriatric woozer having been actively involved in motor sport in my younger years.</p>
883	Individual submitter	<p>1) Do not agree with any speed reduction.</p> <p>4) No change is necessary.</p> <p>5) Agree with speed reduction for this location</p> <p>7) No change is necessary</p> <p>8) Agree with reduction for school location.</p> <p>9) Do not agree with speed reduction.</p> <p>10) Agree with this speed reduction.</p> <p>11) Do not agree with speed reduction.</p> <p>13) No reduction necessary.</p> <p>14) No reduction necessary.</p> <p>15) No speed reduction necessary.</p> <p>16) Agree with change.</p> <p>17) Agree with speed reduction.</p> <p>18) No change is necessary.</p> <p>19) Agree with change</p>
884	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) Yes this road still supports the safe driving at 100kph to slow traffic down in this area will cause more accidents due to distractions caused slower driving and drivers concentrating on their speedometer and not the road</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) Leave it at 100kph nothing will be gained by slowing down this traffic</p> <p>8) Safe at 100kph and slow to 60 or 40 for school zone times</p> <p>9) Leave at 100kph nothing gained by slowing it down</p> <p>10) Good decision as due to high foot traffic this is a good safe speed</p> <p>11) Leave at 100kph nothing gained but frustration for driver's driving at slower speeds</p> <p>13) Leave it at 100kph nothing gained by slowing it down</p> <p>14) Leave at 100kph nothing gained by slowing traffic</p> <p>15) Leave at 100kph nothing gained by slowing down traffic</p> <p>16) Leave as is</p> <p>17) Leave at 100kph</p> <p>18) Leave at 80kph</p> <p>19) Leave at 100kph</p>
885	Clifton Terrace School	<p>As a school that has grown significantly over the past 10 years, we believe that an increase in traffic has caused significant issues on the section of the road from Allisdair St - Atawhai Crescent. The school would be happy to see the speed limit reduced to the proposed 60kph.</p> <p>Careful consideration should also be given to the children and pedestrians who walk and cycle daily on the cycle path. These users must cross several roads with the most dangerous being Marybank road. A speed reduction would enable pedestrians to cross with increased safety. I would be happy to discuss this further.</p>
886	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) This is ridiculous there are many areas along this stretch that should be 100 KM/h. It's a good piece of road</p> <p>5) OK no problem</p> <p>7) This is ridiculous thus is good road and worthy of 100 km/h</p> <p>8) Should be 100km/h</p> <p>9) This is good road worthy of 100 km/h.</p>

		<p>10) To slow should be 80 kmh. With the Christmas period remaining</p> <p>11) Should be 100kmh</p> <p>13) Should all be 100kmh this is good road. You will create more accidents with impatience</p> <p>14) Should be 80 kmh. Again you will create accidents through impatience</p> <p>15) Should all be 100kmh</p> <p>16) Ok</p> <p>17) Ok</p> <p>18) Should remain at 80 kmh</p> <p>19) Should remain at 100 kmh</p>
887	Individual submitter	<p>1) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>4) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>5) 70km / h is sensible for this area</p> <p>7) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>8) 80kmh by canvastown school YES</p> <p>9) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>10) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>11) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>13) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>14) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>15) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>16) Yes I Agree</p> <p>17) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>18) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 80km/h</p> <p>19) ABSOLUTELY not nessacery to lower speed. Leave it at 100km/h 9/10 times traffic driving here is going 80kmh anyway, so why spend ratepayer money to change the signs ?</p>
888	Individual submitter	<p>1) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>4) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>8) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>9) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>13) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>14) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>15) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p> <p>18) The speed limit should stay at 80km.</p> <p>19) The speed limit should stay at 100km.</p>
889	Individual submitter	<p>1) clean straight road. Why would you even consider it ? Leave at 100</p> <p>4) It is an easy road to negotiate and really how many accidents on this section. Leave at 100</p> <p>5) Entrance to Queen Charlotte DR is tricky and 50 is probably sensible.</p> <p>7) Crazy??? really good stretch of road. mostly straight. Leave at 100</p> <p>8) Leave at 100.and change to 80 for passing school area. School is well off the road and can be seen.</p> <p>9) Leave at 100 . easy stretch of road</p> <p>10) Agreed. For this area.</p> <p>11) Good road , no reason to reduce here. Its a long enough drive without putting restrictions on where not needed.</p> <p>13) No reason to change. good road.</p> <p>14) Agreed. Cant really drive faster than that anyway.</p> <p>15) Agree</p>

		<p>16) Agree</p> <p>17) Why. Good safe road .leave at 100</p> <p>18) Its a good stretch of road . Good visibility. No reason to change</p> <p>19) Same as last one . No reason to change</p>
890	Individual submitter	<p>1) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>4) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>5) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>7) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>8) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>9) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway</p> <p>10) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway</p> <p>11) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>13) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>14) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway</p> <p>15) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>16) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>17) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>18) Scrap speed reduction plan. Improve Highway.</p> <p>19) Scrap speed reduction plan.</p>
891	Individual submitter	<p>1) Do not drop the limit</p> <p>4) No do not drop the limit</p> <p>5) Don't be foolish no need to drop the limit</p> <p>7) We do not need a speed reduction here</p> <p>8) Do not drop the limit</p> <p>9) Foolish to drop the limit</p> <p>10) Don't do it silly</p> <p>11) No</p> <p>13) No please do not drop the limit</p> <p>14) Dropping the limit would be silly</p> <p>15) Do not do this</p> <p>16) No nessary</p> <p>17) It would be stupid to reduce the speed it is not nessary</p> <p>18) Don't do it.</p> <p>19) Don't do it</p>
892	Individual submitter	<p>1) Speed doesn't cause accident. Incompetent or inattentive driving does. The focus should be on identifying and attending to these factors. Lowering speed limits increases congestion. If a given number of vehicles are to use a road and the longer they take to travel it the more vehicles will be on it. Increased congestion will make a road less safe. Adding to the congestion will be more trucks. Because of the log book system that limits the hours that can be driven in a day, increasing travel times reduces the distance a truck can travel each day. If you have a set mount of goods to transport a set distance in a set time and you effectively reduce the time allowance you will have to increase the number of trucks, and drivers, in which to do it. An example could be a truck maybe able to do two return trips each day from Picton to Nelson currently. Adding ten minutes each way to the travel times would add forty minutes to the day which may put him over his hours. another truck and driver would need to be found for the route. Travelling at to slow a speed increases your chance of being distracted or becoming inattentive (bored).</p> <p>4) Speed doesn't cause accident. Incompetent or inattentive driving does. The focus should be on identifying and attending to these factors. Lowering speed limits increases congestion. If a given number of vehicles are to use a road and the longer they take to travel it the more vehicles will be on it. Increased congestion will make a road less safe. Adding to the congestion will be more trucks. Because of the log book system that limits the hours that can be driven in a day, increasing travel times reduces the distance a truck can travel each day. If you have a set mount of goods to transport a set distance in a set time and you effectively reduce the time allowance you will have to increase the number of trucks, and drivers, in which to do it. An example could be a truck maybe able to do two return trips each day from Picton to Nelson currently. Adding ten minutes each way to the travel times would add forty minutes to the day which may put him over his hours. another truck and driver would need to be found for the route. Travelling at to slow a speed increases your chance of being distracted or becoming inattentive (bored).</p> <p>5) Speed doesn't cause accident. Incompetent or inattentive driving does. The focus should be on identifying and attending to these factors. Lowering speed limits increases congestion. If a given number of vehicles are to use a road and the longer they take to travel it the more vehicles will be on it. Increased congestion will make a road less safe. Adding to the congestion will be more trucks. Because of the log book system that limits the hours that can be driven in a day, increasing travel times reduces the distance a truck can travel each day. If you have a set mount of goods to transport a set distance in a set time and you effectively reduce the time allowance you will have to increase the number of trucks, and drivers, in which to do it. An example could be a truck</p>



		<p>number of vehicles are to use a road and the longer they take to travel it the more vehicles will be on it. Increased congestion will make a road less safe. Adding to the congestion will be more trucks. Because of the log book system that limits the hours that can be driven in a day, increasing travel times reduces the distance a truck can travel each day. If you have a set amount of goods to transport a set distance in a set time and you effectively reduce the time allowance you will have to increase the number of trucks, and drivers, in which to do it. An example could be a truck maybe able to do two return trips each day from Picton to Nelson currently. Adding ten minutes each way to the travel times would add forty minutes to the day which may put him over his hours. another truck and driver would need to be found for the route. Travelling at to slow a speed increases your chance of being distracted or becoming inattentive (bored).</p> <p>17) Speed doesn't cause accident. Incompetent or inattentive driving does. The focus should be on identifying and attending to these factors. Lowering speed limits increases congestion. If a given number of vehicles are to use a road and the longer they take to travel it the more vehicles will be on it. Increased congestion will make a road less safe. Adding to the congestion will be more trucks. Because of the log book system that limits the hours that can be driven in a day, increasing travel times reduces the distance a truck can travel each day. If you have a set amount of goods to transport a set distance in a set time and you effectively reduce the time allowance you will have to increase the number of trucks, and drivers, in which to do it. An example could be a truck maybe able to do two return trips each day from Picton to Nelson currently. Adding ten minutes each way to the travel times would add forty minutes to the day which may put him over his hours. another truck and driver would need to be found for the route. Travelling at to slow a speed increases your chance of being distracted or becoming inattentive (bored).</p> <p>18) Speed doesn't cause accident. Incompetent or inattentive driving does. The focus should be on identifying and attending to these factors. Lowering speed limits increases congestion. If a given number of vehicles are to use a road and the longer they take to travel it the more vehicles will be on it. Increased congestion will make a road less safe. Adding to the congestion will be more trucks. Because of the log book system that limits the hours that can be driven in a day, increasing travel times reduces the distance a truck can travel each day. If you have a set amount of goods to transport a set distance in a set time and you effectively reduce the time allowance you will have to increase the number of trucks, and drivers, in which to do it. An example could be a truck maybe able to do two return trips each day from Picton to Nelson currently. Adding ten minutes each way to the travel times would add forty minutes to the day which may put him over his hours. another truck and driver would need to be found for the route. Travelling at to slow a speed increases your chance of being distracted or becoming inattentive (bored).</p> <p>19) Speed doesn't cause accident. Incompetent or inattentive driving does. The focus should be on identifying and attending to these factors. Lowering speed limits increases congestion. If a given number of vehicles are to use a road and the longer they take to travel it the more vehicles will be on it. Increased congestion will make a road less safe. Adding to the congestion will be more trucks. Because of the log book system that limits the hours that can be driven in a day, increasing travel times reduces the distance a truck can travel each day. If you have a set amount of goods to transport a set distance in a set time and you effectively reduce the time allowance you will have to increase the number of trucks, and drivers, in which to do it. An example could be a truck maybe able to do two return trips each day from Picton to Nelson currently. Adding ten minutes each way to the travel times would add forty minutes to the day which may put him over his hours. another truck and driver would need to be found for the route. Travelling at to slow a speed increases your chance of being distracted or becoming inattentive (bored).</p>
893	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment</p> <p>17) This road passes the North Nelson Country Club, the Wakapuaka Play Centre and the Wakapuaka Tennis club. There is a lot of right turning traffic off from SH6 into the carparking area for all these facilities. When playing tennis I always pull over to the left verge, when coming from Nelson, and wait for a clear space in both directions before making the right turn. I often see cars straddling the mid-section of the road waiting to turn right while heavy trucks, travelling at 100kph both ways almost sandwich these imprudent drivers. This particular section should be reduced to 60kph and include the Glenduan turn-off which is a most hazardous T junction due to the curve of SH6. Cars waiting to come out of the Glen road en route to Nelson must gamble on not meeting a speeding north bound vehicle as the nature of the curve conceals the vehicle's approach. There was a death of a cyclist there this year.</p> <p>18) This is a very sensible reduction partly due to the school and also due to the houseing intensification being experienced in the area. Also the 4 Square shop by Dodson Valley Road attracts many customers and the area is also experiencing a building boom. May I suggest continuing this speed all the way to Trafalgar Street as the entire length is highly populous.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
894	Individual submitter	<p>I filled the online questionnaire in. However, there was one section of road question repeated (320m north east of Pelorus Bridge to 210m north of Hills Rd Rai Valley) and one missed out (210m north of Hills Rd to 180m north of Bryants Road, Rai Valley).</p> <p>I would like to put my input into this section of road, basically Rai Valley. I believe as it's an urban section the speed should be in line with other conurbations and reduced to 50kph (keeps it simple for everyone, including tourists) with a 40kph electronic variable school zone sign.</p> <p>I would also like to add (not been given the opportunity on the online form) that, as a frequent traveler of the road between Nelson and Blenheim, that I believe most of the road is fine at 100kph.</p>

		<p>There are still some idiots who drive over this speed and these are the people who need cracking down on, not the safer drivers. I don't think reducing the speed is going to have an effect on these drivers. The road is fine, some drivers aren't.</p> <p>Whilst I also appreciate the fact that NZTA is pushing for lower speed limits because of the extent of resulting injuries, we could reduce everything back to horse and cart speed and totally eliminate injuries. There has to be a reasonable compromise. Speaking with experience of a full head on crash on August 24th just outside of Nelson, I still feel that 100kph is fine and the roads are suitable for this. Reduction of speed in towns and townships is definitely paramount, with lower variable speed limits outside of schools. I also attended one of the NZTA roadshows and didn't actually see much in the way of comments on reducing speed. There was more emphasis on passing places. Whilst passing places may be expensive, some simple pulling over places would be easy, especially on the Whangamoas. Trucks already TRY to pull over when they can, and it wouldn't take much to just widen the road slightly to allow for better traffic flow which equals less irate drivers, pulling stupid manoeuvres, endangering themselves and others.</p> <p>The effect of slower speeds on the roads will lead to more frustration and longer journey times (I don't know who worked out the estimated increase in times in the brochure, but would question these). It would also lead to increased costs for businesses and transportation. It may even lead to heavier traffic on the Wairau Valley road.</p> <p>In short the road isn't the problem it's some drivers. I think reducing speed on some of the better stretches of road is too much of a knee jerk reaction and not the answer to the issues behind the crashes.</p> <p>Regards</p>
895	Individual submitter	<p>1) I can't see why this needs to be reduced to 80. It should be left at 100</p> <p>4) Totally ridiculous idea reducing a perfectly good road to 80kph. There is nothing wrong with this road and it should be maintained at 100kph</p> <p>5) Totally agree. It's in an urban area</p> <p>7) Again ridiculous reduction on a perfectly sound road with no severe bends. This should be maintained at 100kph</p> <p>8) Agree</p> <p>9) Again nothing wrong with this stretch of road. Leave at 100kph</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Nothing wrong with the quality fo this road and it should stay the same at 100kph</p> <p>13) This should remain at 100kph, as the road is pretty much self regulating anyway. You're not actually going to stop the idiots who don't adhere to the speed limit anyway.</p> <p>14) Again this should be left at 100 as self regulating on this road. It's not a target. Driving to the conditions. A low speed limit is going to lead to a lot of frustration and annoyance. Just put in pull in places (they don't have to be major, expensive, passing lanes)</p> <p>15) Leave at 100kph</p> <p>16) Happy with this. An electronic variable school zone would be fine.</p> <p>17) 100kph is fine on this good section of road too.</p> <p>18) Leave at 80.</p> <p>19) Definitely, there are too many roads trying to access this fast bit of road and it's semi urban, so 80 is good.</p>
896	Individual submitter	<p>Up grade the road to make it safer NOT drop speed limit. It's a NO to dropping speed limit</p>
897	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a ridiculous great big leap backwoods - All vehicles are far safer now than 30 plus years ago when the speed limit was 80km. This is not needed and would be seem to be a revenue gathering exercise for the Police. It will only frustrate drivers leading to dangerous overtaking. NZTA has ruined the road from Nelson to CHCH after the earthquake with the same ridiculous 80km zones on long straight stretches. NZTA needs to focus on driver training rather than punishing the general public who drive carefully. No analysis has been provided by NZTA as to the causes of the crashes causing deaths etc on this stretch of the road as I'm sure there are many other aspects that have contributed to these accidents beyond speed. Those need to be focused on rather than punishing the general public with this proposed change.</p> <p>4) This is a ridiculous great big leap backwoods - All vehicles are far safer now than 30 plus years ago when the speed limit was 80km. This is not needed and would be seem to be a revenue gathering exercise for the Police. It will only frustrate drivers leading to dangerous overtaking. NZTA has ruined the road from Nelson to CHCH after the earthquake with the same ridiculous 80km zones on long straight stretches. NZTA needs to focus on driver training rather than punishing the general public who drive carefully. No analysis has been provided by NZTA as to the causes of the crashes causing deaths etc on this stretch of the road as I'm sure there are many other aspects that have contributed to these accidents beyond speed. Those need to be focused on rather than punishing the general public with this proposed change.</p> <p>5) This is a ridiculous great big leap backwoods - All vehicles are far safer now than 30 plus years ago when the speed limit was 80km. This is not needed and would be seem to be a revenue gathering exercise for the Police. It will only frustrate drivers leading to dangerous overtaking. NZTA has ruined the road from Nelson to CHCH after the earthquake with the same ridiculous 80km zones on long straight stretches. NZTA needs to focus on driver training rather than punishing the general public who drive carefully. No analysis has been provided by NZTA as to the causes of the crashes causing deaths etc on this stretch of the road as I'm sure there are many other aspects that have contributed to these accidents beyond speed. Those need to be focused on rather than punishing the general public with this proposed change.</p>



		<p>gathering exercise for the Police. It will only frustrate drivers leading to dangerous overtaking. NZTA has ruined the road from Nelson to CHCH after the earthquake with the same ridiculous 80km zones on long straight stretches. NZTA needs to focus on driver training rather than punishing the general public who drive carefully. No analysis has been provided by NZTA as to the causes of the crashes causing deaths etc on this stretch of the road as I'm sure there are many other aspects that have contributed to these accidents beyond speed. Those need to be focused on rather than punishing the general public with this proposed change.</p> <p>19) This is a ridiculous great big leap backwoods - All vehicles are far safer now than 30 plus years ago when the speed limit was 80km. This is not needed and would be seem to be a revenue gathering exercise for the Police. It will only frustrate drivers leading to dangerous overtaking. NZTA has ruined the road from Nelson to CHCH after the earthquake with the same ridiculous 80km zones on long straight stretches. NZTA needs to focus on driver training rather than punishing the general public who drive carefully. No analysis has been provided by NZTA as to the causes of the crashes causing deaths etc on this stretch of the road as I'm sure there are many other aspects that have contributed to these accidents beyond speed. Those need to be focused on rather than punishing the general public with this proposed change.</p>
898	Individual submitter	<p>1) The proposal is wrong. This lower limit will not reduce accidents.</p> <p>4) The proposal is wrong. This lower limit will not reduce accidents. It is likely to increase them.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) The proposal is wrong. It will not reduce accidents and is likely to increase them.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) The proposal is wrong. It will not reduce accidents.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) The proposal is wrong. It will not reduce accidents.</p> <p>13) The proposal is wrong. It will not reduce accidents</p> <p>14) The proposal is wrong. It will not reduce accidents.</p> <p>15) The proposal is wrong. It will not reduce accidents.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) The proposal is wrong. It will not reduce accidents.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
899	Individual submitter	<p>If it's not broken, why try and fix it? This is a very busy and vital road more so in the summer time when the number of campers vans and big RVs are using the road. The Marlborough Sounds population triples over this time of the year. Already there are limited areas where you can pass. The trucks that use the roads regularly pull over.</p> <p>I live in Okiwi Bay and travel to Nelson 9 days out of 14 so I am very familiar with the road. Some of these accidents have actually been suicides. I strongly feel none of the existing speed limits needs to change- but levelling out the Teal Valley to Whangamoia Saddle would be a huge improvement. The suggested time frame for the trip, is rubbish it will take much longer than that in the summertime.</p>
900	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) There are several driveways on the south side of road which are very dangerous to turn right into with limited visibility limited places to pull off the road to the left. I would support a reduction to 50 km/hr</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
901	Individual submitter	<p>1) agree</p> <p>4) Disagree, should be 100kph on open road to Havelock, 80kph will encourage impatient drivers to make bad overtaking. This road is safe at 100kph for sensible drivers</p> <p>5) agree, slower through Havelock to 50kph</p> <p>7) disagree, this is a good safe road at 100kph driven by capable drivers</p> <p>8) Agree with school advisory of 60kph, but otherwise 100KPH</p>

		<p>9) disagree, a good safe road when driven by sensible drivers</p> <p>10) Existing 100/50kph limits seem to work fine, however I could accept a 60 or 70kph permanent zone</p> <p>11) disagree, 100kph open road speed safe for competent drivers who drive to the conditions</p> <p>13) Disagree. This is where a road limit of 100kph is possible in most places, but also where 80kph is dangerous in some corners and driving conditions. Let drivers make considered choices and drive to the conditions</p> <p>14) Disagree. This is where a road limit of 100kph is possible in most places, but also where 80kph is dangerous in some corners and driving conditions. Let drivers make considered choices and drive to the conditions</p> <p>15) disagree, a safe road for 100kph</p> <p>16) agree</p> <p>17) disagree, a safe drive at 100kph in most condtions</p> <p>18) agree, a built up area with a school</p> <p>19) disagree, again a safe road at 100kph. NZTA should ensure traffic merging in from feeder roads can merge safely</p>
902	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>4) Disagree, leave the status quo for this stretch. At least for west of the Wairau River Bridge to Havelock.</p> <p>5) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>7) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>8) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>9) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>10) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>11) TOTALLY agree with reduction.</p> <p>13) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>14) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>15) TOTALLY agree with reduction.</p> <p>16) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>17) Agree with reduction. I have biked this section numerous times and it is very very dangerous on a bike particularly going towards Nelson with no road shoulder at all!</p> <p>18) Agree with reduction.</p> <p>19) TOTALLY agree with reduction. The number of side streets, home entrances and vehicles entering this road make the proposed reduction for this section imperative. I live here and it is a very difficult and dangerous piece of road. Some road carpet/hot mix on the passing lane section by Miyazu Park would be a great help for local noise also.</p>
903	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree great idea</p> <p>4) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. Addition of slow bays so people can safely pull over. Plus increased signage (e.g if traffic behind you let it pass)</p> <p>5) Totally Agree, built up area and busy area</p> <p>7) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. Addition of slow bays so people can safely pull over. Plus increased signage (e.g if traffic behind you let it pass)</p> <p>8) Totally agree</p> <p>9) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. Addition of slow bays so people can safely pull over. Plus increased signage (e.g if traffic behind you let it pass)</p> <p>10) Totally agree</p> <p>11) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. Addition of slow bays so people can safely pull over. Plus increased signage (e.g if traffic behind you let it pass)</p> <p>13) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. Addition of slow bays so people can safely pull over. Plus increased signage (e.g if traffic behind you let it pass)</p> <p>14) Totally agree</p> <p>15) totally agree</p> <p>16) Totally agree</p> <p>17) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. Addition of slow bays so people can safely pull over. Plus increased signage (e.g if traffic behind you let it pass)</p> <p>18) Agree</p> <p>19) Agree</p>
904	Individual submitter	<p>1) More speed cameras</p> <p>4) No</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) No</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) No</p>

		<p>11) No</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) No</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
905	Individual submitter	<p>It's really quite hard to find where the consultation is by searching the NZTA website.</p> <p>In my opinion the removal of 100km/h will make it extremely difficult for people to legally overtake slower vehicles, even where visibility is good and the road is straight. The posted speed is not a target - fair enough/ Drivers being courteous and letting following traffic past - now there's a good target.</p>
906	Individual submitter	<p>1) No change needed</p> <p>4) No change needed</p> <p>5) No change needed</p> <p>7) No change needed</p> <p>8) No change needed</p> <p>9) No change needed</p> <p>10) No change needed</p> <p>11) No change needed</p> <p>13) No change needed</p> <p>14) No change needed</p> <p>15) No change needed</p> <p>16) Fair enough</p> <p>17) No change needed</p> <p>18) No change needed</p> <p>19) No change needed</p>
907	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) This is a road of good standard and with few tight corners. 80kmh is a reaction to perceived bad drivers not road conditions.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) This is a good wide section of road with good visibility. The number of driveways and roads off it is not high nor is the number higher than typical NZ roads.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Wide road, good standard, aside from a few km NE of Pelorus 80kmh is unreasonably restrictive.</p> <p>13) Good road, 80kmh is too restrictive.</p> <p>14) 60 is a joke, Police will be ticketing downhill cyclists at this. 80 is fair.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Way to restrictive for a wide relatively straight road.</p> <p>18) 80 is fair 60 a joke. What will it be when there are road works 10?</p> <p>19) Quite fair.</p>
908	Individual submitter	<p>I have looked at all the proposed changes and agree with them.</p> <p>Personally it will make little difference to my travel between Nelson and Picton as I generally take the Queen Charlotte Drive route and now that route will become quicker (in time) if the changes go ahead.</p> <p>If the lower speed changes happen, I won't be so concerned about drivers cutting corners or on wrong side of the road - my insurance for that is to follow (from a distance) a SUV that could take a hit better than my Honda Airwave.</p> <p>As an ex North Islander, it took me a while to get used to the less hectic speeds of the Top of the South, but now I enjoy the ride - think it may also have something to do with my age = now being a responsible 71 year old!</p>



		<p>17) I strongly object. It is a knee jerk reaction. 2 fatalities a year divided by thousands of traffic movement is probably less than fatalities with airlines. Is speed the cause of these fatalities? Fallen asleep? Distracted by phones? Mechanical failures.. intoxicated by alcohol or drugs? The financial cost to the society and business will be staggering! What's needed is investment in upgrading roads, widening, barriers dividers. Look at Sweden they did that increased speed limit to 120 and serious accidents and fatalities fell dramatically. This new suggested speed limits need to be thrown out and officials need to sit down and do some real work and not cop out like this I vote NO !!</p> <p>18) I strongly object. It is a knee jerk reaction. 2 fatalities a year divided by thousands of traffic movement is probably less than fatalities with airlines. Is speed the cause of these fatalities? Fallen asleep? Distracted by phones? Mechanical failures.. intoxicated by alcohol or drugs? The financial cost to the society and business will be staggering! What's needed is investment in upgrading roads, widening, barriers dividers. Look at Sweden they did that increased speed limit to 120 and serious accidents and fatalities fell dramatically. This new suggested speed limits need to be thrown out and officials need to sit down and do some real work and not cop out like this I vote NO !!</p> <p>19) I strongly object. It is a knee jerk reaction. 2 fatalities a year divided by thousands of traffic movement is probably less than fatalities with airlines. Is speed the cause of these fatalities? Fallen asleep? Distracted by phones? Mechanical failures.. intoxicated by alcohol or drugs? The financial cost to the society and business will be staggering! What's needed is investment in upgrading roads, widening, barriers dividers. Look at Sweden they did that increased speed limit to 120 and serious accidents and fatalities fell dramatically. This new suggested speed limits need to be thrown out and officials need to sit down and do some real work and not cop out like this I vote NO !!</p>
911	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) Creating passing bays  5) No Comment  7) If there were some passing bays could then do double yellow lines where there is a bad accident record - as has been done on the Appleby Straight in Nelson area.  8) No Comment  9) Passing bays so slow traffic can pull over.  10) Safe space for cyclists and walkers on the bridge  11) Where there is a long straight out of Rai township leave it at 100kph. Double yellow lines through the twisty part of the road.  13) Double yellow lines thru the twisty party of the road at the bottom of Rai Saddle on Nelson side. However develop proper passing bays so slow traffic eg trucks can pullover safely and let other traffic through  14) A lower speed limit makes sense on the Whangamoia as impossible to drive at 100kph on the hill. Again some proper passing bays for slow traffic would be helpful.  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) Improve Cable Bay intersection. Sight line is too short.  18) Double yellow lines rather than lowering the speed limit.  19) Keep it at 80kph out to the city limits. Having too many odd speed limits is confusing.</p>
912	Individual submitter	<p>Urban area at Atawhai, Nelson  - Noise level at Urban areas in Atawhai  - Road surfaces are poor  - More Passing lanes needed - Teal Valley Road and Whangamoia Saddle.  - Wider berms on the road.  - Safety barrier for Passing lanes on Atawhai Drive/SH6 near Malvern Ave, Nelson.  Please review sheets for further info</p>
913	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) There needs to be a stop sign where the Glen rd intersects with state highway 6 and the road widened to allow northbound traffic to overtake right turning traffic safely. ie traffic turning into the Glen rd from Hira. There needs to be overtaking lanes or minimum speed which requires slow drivers to pull over and let cars travelling at the speed limit to pass. This should apply all the way into Nelson.</p>

		<p>18) No, stay at 80. I have driven this road almost every day for 37 years and it is not necessary to drop the limit and would be confusing for drivers.</p> <p>19) It would be safer if speed limits were painted on the road. The sides of the road are too cluttered with multiple signs which is confusing and distracting.</p>
914	Individual submitter	<p>1. I disagree with lowering the speed limit to 80kph between Blenheim to Nelson.</p> <p>2. Passing lanes badly needed on the highway, or atleast a pull over bay that is well signposted.</p> <p>3. I agree with the poposal to lower the speed on the Whangamoia and Rai Saddler, also schools and all other settlement areas: Canvastown, Rai Valley, Hira and Atawhai.</p> <p>4. Driver education required for slower drivers.</p>
915	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No. Lowering the speed limits is an excellent way of giving people more chance of controlling their car should something unexpected happen on the road. It doesn't matter how safe modern cars are. Humans' ability to control them at high speeds has not evolved in the same way. This is an excellent proposal and I fully support it. It is long overdue. It will also reduce traffic noise through built up areas.</p>
916	Individual submitter	<p>1) Happy with this proposal</p> <p>4) Don't agree with this proposal as it will have the opposite effect on what you are trying to achieve. The road in this area is relatively easy driving with easy flowing corners. What it does need is more passing lanes to reduce the frustration that drivers have when they encounter traffic that is travelling 15 - 20 Km below the speed limit. I believe that more accidents would result in lowering the speed limit to 80Km as then there would be traffic travelling at 65 - 70Km as per what is happening on the Appleby - Richmond section of road since the speed limit was reduced. I have been travelling over this section of road for the past 40 odd years and the only thing wrong with it is there aren't enough passing lanes.</p> <p>5) I would be happy with this speed reduction if it is truly justified.</p> <p>7) I do not accept that this speed reduction is necessary. Putting in passing lanes for both directions would be a better idea.</p> <p>8) I would be happy with this speed reduction if there was also more passing lanes put in.</p> <p>9) I do not accept that this speed reduction is necessary, I believe most accidents happen along this stretch of road due to the lack of suitable passing opportunities and drivers take risks because they are frustrated with slow traffic.</p> <p>10) I would be happy with this speed reduction as it is very busy here over the summer months and there is not good visibility, also the one lane bridge causes issues so traffic needs to be slowed down</p> <p>11) I believe that 90Km per hour would be more acceptable</p> <p>13) No make it 90Km</p> <p>14) 90Km</p> <p>15) Better passing bays on the Hira side of Gentle Annie</p> <p>16) Yes agree with this proposal</p> <p>17) No, make it 90Km</p> <p>18) No, leave it as it is or if you really must lower the speed limit make it 70Km</p> <p>19) I would be acceptable to this proposal as the traffic travels at 80Km most of the time now anyway!</p>
917	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.</p> <p>4) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.</p> <p>5) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.</p> <p>7) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.</p> <p>8) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.</p> <p>9) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.</p> <p>10) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.</p>

		<p>11) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.  13) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.  14) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.  15) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.  16) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.  17) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.  18) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.  19) I support speed reduction to improve road safety.</p>
918	Individual submitter	<p>With regard to the proposed new speed restriction between Blenheim and Nelson, let me say I am alarmed and dismayed that such a proposal be made. This proposal is an insanity and a knee jerk response to reduce road casualties. I fear it is a panicked response to demonstrate that something is being done without having considered the ramifications. Regardless, it seems the good driving, law abiding motorist will suffer this stupidity.</p> <p>I am a former Traffic officer with the City of Auckland, a Rural Nurse Specialist now recently retired. I am a driver and motorcyclist with almost 50 years experience and drive frequently between Picton and the West Coast and Picton to Nelson (and beyond)</p> <p>Where are these accidents happening, why are these accident happening ? I believe this proposal has not been entirely forth coming in the information it has provided to give the public the necessary information to make an informed opinion. You have not provided data about the accidents. You have not provided the distances between centres that will be the most affected by these changes. I interpret this as misleading as it is the most substantial area covered under the changes that will cover speed and travel times.</p> <p>It is so easy to blame speed when in most cases it is not the cause but just a factor in the injury outcome. This distinction is rarely made, its gets so much more economy out of words to just let people think that speed was “the” factor, which infers it was the cause. If you are going to be serious about reducing deaths you would have to restrict all road speeds because vehicles pass within a metre or so of each other at collective speeds of 200kph. Even on roads restricted to 80 kph the collective speed is 160kph and sufficient to cause harm or death should their be a collision.</p> <p>Speed can be measured and police can fine you, and the government coffers will never complain, and the road accidents continue as before. But how do you police the real problems; stupidity, inexperienced drivers, distracted drivers, slow inconsiderate self entitled drivers who impede traffic and cause aggressive responses from following drivers, poor roads, inappropriate road markings, tourist from some countries that have no clue about driving in any country let alone NZ., It seems you cant legislate against STUPID.</p> <p>Just take a look at most New Zealand rural roads, a classic example where winding roads use the “Overtaking” white broken lines to separate the road into two lanes. How stupid and misleading to drivers to give them the incentive to overtake in the worst possible places.</p> <p>There is no merit in putting speed restrictions on perfectly good stretches of road, and there is much of it between Blenheim and Nelson. Even the slow winding sections manage themselves in that the bends slow people down significantly. Why does the motorist have to be micro managed with these offensive restrictions.</p> <p>I believe most of the proposed speed restrictions are unnecessary and will actually cause problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. travel times will be increased much more than suggested,</li> <li>2. Trucking and bus services will be affected</li> <li>3. Camper vans etc will drive even slower (they rarely pull over the allow traffic past)</li> <li>4. The slower traffic will lead to increased driver frustration and risky moves to get past traffic.</li> <li>5. The police will continue to focus on speed rather than on factors that will assist to keep traffic flowing freely (dealing with slow drivers that do not consider other traffic following them and pull over where there is a place to do so). **** Tasmania recently introduced traffic laws making it an offence for slow drivers not to allow following traffic to get past when reasonable opportunities were available for them to do so.</li> <li>6. Businesses along the route will get less customers because traffic users like me will avoid travelling on the road because it is a pain and no longer an enjoyable thing to do.</li> </ol> <p>I would support speed restrictions in school zones.</p> <p>I do not support the removing of the 70 kph zones</p> <p>I do not support the removal of any 100 kph speed zones,</p> <p>HOWEVER IN THE AREAS THAT WERE 100 BUT REDUCING TO 60</p> <p>I would support the implementation of UNRESTRICTED zones in tight winding road sections,</p>

		<p>I would support “conditional speed zones” in tight winding roads that at the time is subject to rain, frost/ice. These sections could have an illuminated speed sign at both ends of the section in question. I have seen these in parts of Australia and they are very effective, more so than just a plain speed sign. It lets people know there are some serious road conditions current that need special care. A plain speed sign would have even local drivers after some time be sceptical and disregard the restriction .</p> <p>I believe this would be more effective than the current suggestions and would be more welcomed by the regular users including truck and bus drivers.</p>
919	Individual submitter	<p>1) Given there are is no 'overall feedback question' I'll add this here with A) B) C): The whole way on the main state highway to Nelson, really? A) According to your statistics (<a href="https://www.transport.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Research/Documents/f1e9274b9d/Regional-2017-web-v2.xlsx">https://www.transport.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Research/Documents/f1e9274b9d/Regional-2017-web-v2.xlsx</a>) - the Nelson/Marlborough region has the lowest number of 'speed' related 'open road' deaths in the reported period 2012-1026 (4 in total). So why this particular state highway, over one with a worse track record else where? B) who came up with 'extra 9 minutes over the full distance'? - who are you kidding, who did your maths? Say for example I averaged 90kmh for 115 km and that reduced to 70kmh average - thats an extra 22mins. Then factor in the additional congestion (eg unable to pass truck or slow vehicle due to the 80km/h limit - say several times adding a minute or more each time, compounded by the lack of passing lanes and safe passing areas, increased distance passing at at 80kmh - thats suddenly going to be over 30mins extra for a typical trip). I'll test it in the next week, expect I'll get tooted at a lot though. C): If the road is unsafe - spend some \$\$ on it, or make it safer in other ways (like many other roads have had): better signs on corners, yellow centre lines where it's unsafe to pass, improve passing lanes and pull-over bays, etc. etc.). Answering this question #1: Old Renwick Rd west of Severne St: Keep it at 100km/h (ideal would be passing lane, widening and cycle lanes). Alternate safety option keep at 100km/h and add double yellow line for the whole section.</p> <p>4) Keep it at 100km/h This is a pretty good section of road (I doubt I'd drop the cruse-control from 100km for more than a handful of corners). Again a few double yellow lines would make it safer. 80km/h will just encourage people to speed along here.</p> <p>5) While I think 70km/h here is ok, no problem with it reducing to 50km/h. 60km/h would flow better though - particularly in summer when it can be busy here.</p> <p>7) Again a good section of road. Keep at 100km/h. Could do with passing lanes, pull over areas, widening cycle lanes etc. - Quick fix again, better signs &amp; yellow lines on blind corners.</p> <p>8) Agree with during school hours. No problem with proposed.</p> <p>9) Keep at 100km/h. Instead better signs or yellow line on the 'gently windy sections that have potential blind spots'. Yet again a section of road that's seen little improvement in decades.</p> <p>10) Firstly - while it's an 'iconic bridge', it is 70+ years old and one-lane - any plans to improve it? (Also have you looked at the map - the road doesn't travel north-east or south from the bridge?) Back to the speed limit on this strip: - Agree it should be lower year around. - Alternately suggest: 70-80km for 400m either side of the bridge, and 50km for the few hundred metres of bridge and cafe / campsite entrance area. 320m on the north (Rai Valley) side of the bridge seems a bit far at excessive at 60km/h.</p> <p>11) A big part of this section is good road and should stay at 100km/h. Could reduce the windy section from Pelorus bridge north (first 1km or so) to 80km/h or just add a yellow centre lane to this first section and keep it all at 100km.</p> <p>13) Keep it at 100km/h - this bit of road has had a number of improvements over the years and it mostly ok. Again to improve safety - improve corner signs, road surface, and yellow line - particularly to the windy section at the bottom of the north end of the Rai saddle to the straight before Kokorua Road (the bit that should have been upgraded instead of spending so much on Rai saddle just to take our 'one and a bit corners'.</p> <p>14) Drop it from 100km/h to 60km/h for this whole section, are you kidding!? Are you going to reduce the speed limit on every other hill in NZ too? And why 1/2 way down the straight past Teal Valley Rd? - that's a good passing lane when following trucks and slow vehicles off the hill. There are a number of accidents on his section of road - drop it to 80km and plan to improve it asap! Oh and not 1/2 way down that straight toward Hira.</p> <p>15) Keep it at 100km. As mentioned above, good straight for passing slow traffic (either way).</p> <p>16) No.</p> <p>17) Keep the majority at 100km, most of this is good road with visibility for passing and passing lanes on the hill. (Could reduce to 80km from Hillwood Drive to approx 400m past Glen Road / around the corner - the Wakapuaka &amp; Glen turnoff area). However ideally keep 100km but improve the turning-off / merging lanes from Glen Road and Todd Bush Road.</p> <p>18) Pedestrians don't typically cross this section of road, why make it 60km/h? (CTS school is well off the highway and fenced). The most dangerous part here is the numerous side streets and footpath lane for kids biking/walking on the shared pathway on the east side of the SH to and from school. Ideally improve turn in / turn out lanes, and make the shared pathway raised over the side streets (so cars slow more and lookout for people walking/biking). I've come across multiple people on bikes that have come in contact with cars - all have been low speed but caused by cars not looking when they are trying to pull out onto the SH.</p> <p>19) Keep most at 100km. Instead: 1) Extend the 80km from mid-Atawhai to 100m south of Tui Glen Road (start of Atawhai, when coming from Nelson immediately before two occasionally busy intersections). 2) Improve the turn off options at BayView Rd and Malvern Ave. Ideally extend the Atawhai Drive side road from Malvern to BayView and only have one entry/exit onto the SH for these two. Alternately improve the merge lanes layout. 3) Extend the turn out merge lanes when turning out from the Founders / Miyazu Gardens part of Atawhai onto SH6 north bound. 4) Improve the shared pathway crossing Malvern Ave and BayView Rd.</p>
920	Individual submitter	<p>I do not agree with the blanket approach to reducing most of the Nelson - Blenheim highway back to 80kmspeed limit. Using stats like the two recent deaths is misleading, one being someone speeding and looked like a suicide and the other a car pulling out in front of a motor bike was just bad driving. Reducing the speed limit would not and does not stop stupidity but will create lots more issues where good drivers are being punished for the poor driving of a few. I drive this road a lot and over the last twenty years the road has got safer and my vehicle certainly is. I would like to see more passing bays or slow vehicle bays as this will stop impatience and allow a smoothetraffic flow. Happy to have short sections of road where there is real risk or danger reduced to 80 km but needs to have better system to make drivers aware they are in an 80 km area i.e. different colour road markers or side posts. I find driving to Chch I am often unaware of which spped limit applies</p>
921	Individual submitter	<p>1) The speed limit is not the problem, it's driver impatience and people who are unfamiliar with the road going very slowly and not pulling over to let others pass. The people over taking dangerously at 130km aren't going to abide by 80km any more than they do 100km!</p>

		<p>4) Again, irresponsible drivers are the issue. They aren't abiding by speed limits regardless and this just makes for a longer commute for sensible drivers</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) I commute from Canvastown to Nelson Monday-Friday for work and already leave very early to give myself a lot of time so that I can drive to the conditions. This will make my trip longer and not solve the issue of dangerous drivers</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) People already slow down here apart from those who don't take heed of limits regardless</p> <p>13) We just need more overtaking lanes for impatient drivers and places for slow vehicles to pull over. Also education so people know to pull over</p> <p>14) Most of this road is not taken at 100km anyway and the corners are graded. Leave it as is!</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) You already have to slow don't going through Atawhai, that's enough!</p>
922	Individual submitter	<p>1) No not necessary, just as the anti smacking law hasn't stopped children being killed neither will this proposal save lives. There are always going to be poor drivers who won't drive to the conditions. I agree with dropping speed near schools but nowhere else. I have spent the last six months driving a large truck on this road five days a week and road is good and speed limits bang on</p> <p>4) Same as above</p> <p>5) Same as above</p> <p>7) Same as above</p> <p>8) Same as above</p> <p>9) Same as above</p> <p>10) Same as above</p> <p>11) Same as above</p> <p>13) Same as above</p> <p>14) Same as above</p> <p>15) Same as above</p> <p>16) Same as above</p> <p>17) Same as above</p> <p>18) Same as above</p> <p>19) Same as above</p>
923	Individual submitter	<p>1) none</p> <p>4) none</p> <p>5) none</p> <p>7) none</p> <p>8) none</p> <p>9) none</p> <p>10) none</p> <p>11) none</p> <p>13) none</p> <p>14) none</p> <p>15) none</p> <p>16) none</p> <p>17) none</p> <p>18) none</p> <p>19) none</p>
924	Individual submitter	<p>Re: Proposed Speed Restriction between Blenheim and Nelson on SH 6.</p> <p>While I fully support speed restrictions around schools (which should be 20-30 KPH when children are coming/going and at lunch times, and be adequately enforced), I do not support blanket reduction of the open road speed limit between Blenheim and Nelson. I fail to see how this can be justified on safety grounds and I think this is a kneejerk reaction to greater driver problems that</p>

		<p>NZTA would be better addressing. These greater problems centre around poor driving and distracted/lack of attention driving (think cell-phone use, eating, drinking, smoking, talking to passengers amongst other causes). I think lowering the open road speed limit to 80 KPH would further enhance distracted/lack of attention driving and make drivers all the more impatient.</p> <p>Our roads are well served with warning signs around safe cornering speeds, but these are rarely adhered to. While fatigue plays a part in road safety, I also believe that fatigued drivers are just as dangerous at 80 KPH as they are at 100 KPH.</p> <p>Lower speeds, for those that adhere to them, will become even more of an obstruction with the resultant risk takers passing adherers to the rule, with the resultant risks. Lowering the speed limits would also result in far more incidences of tailgating which has become quite obvious on the newly regulated section SH 60 between Richmond and Maisey Rd, in the Tasman District. Again, impatient drivers. It makes one wonder if anyone has heard of the 2 second requirement.</p> <p>One can often see drivers not controlling speed and driving to the road conditions. NZTA can't control this at 100 KPH and will be unable to control this at 80 KPH. This is about driver responsibility and awareness.</p> <p>I have recently gone through a driver's test, funded by the AA. This test was carried out because of self-interest rather than a need, generally required by age. I learned a lot through this test, and would recommend that all drivers have to go through this test periodically (I would suggest every 10 years) to maintain a license. This test should be driver funded.</p> <p>I also think the legal consequences of illegal driving are currently far too light.</p> <p>Driving on our roads is a privilege, not the right that most drivers seem to think it is.</p>
925	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>4) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>5) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>7) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>8) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>9) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>10) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>11) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>13) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>14) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>15) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>16) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>17) I think the divide and rule nature of this survey is abysmal. Apart from settlements like Havelock and Rai Valley, for example, SH6 from Renwick to Atawhai should be treated as an entity.This survey overly complicates the process and is obviously written to drive NZTA agendas.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
926	Individual submitter	<p>1) 100 km/h is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>4) 100 km/h is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p>

		<p>5) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>7) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>8) I agree with this change.</p> <p>9) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>10) I agree with this change.</p> <p>11) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>13) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>14) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>15) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>16) I agree with this change.</p> <p>17) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>18) Current speed limit is perfectly safe in good driving conditions. Driver education / skill and judgement should be used / improved in busy or poor driving conditions.</p> <p>19) I agree with this change.</p>
927	Individual submitter	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I oppose a blanket decrease in speed limit all the way from Blenheim to Nelson because I believe there are better, safer ways to achieve a decrease in accidents, injuries and deaths.</p> <p>Lowering the speed limit could have the unintended consequence of decreasing driver concentration by lulling people into a false sense of security that because they are going slower that they can relax and lessen their focus on the road.</p> <p>It would seem a much more sensible accident prevention action would be to increase the number of passing lanes or slow vehicle pull-off areas between Blenheim and Rai Valley (for example, between Blenheim and Havelock there are no overtaking lanes, nor are there any between Havelock and Pelorus Bridge, or Pelorus Bridge to Rai Valley. Even where the road is straight for stretches, the terrain is often undulating or there is oncoming traffic preventing overtaking.) This would bring this road into line with Rai Valley to Nelson where there are several areas to slow vehicle pull off or overtaking lanes. Signs indicating these areas coming up often influences driver behaviour because people know there is a safe passing area coming up soon.</p> <p>For example, the Blenheim to Picton route is one I drive often and see driver behaviour being influenced positively by the overtaking lanes. Between Blenheim and Picton there are overtaking lanes at Spring Creek, Mount Pleasant and Para. There are the usual signs leading up to these overtaking lanes, with the result that at no time are drivers more than a few minutes/km from a designated overtaking area, so people tend to wait and overtake safely. Have 3 passing lanes on a 27km stretch Blenheim to Picton and in contrast having none on the 69km stretch Blenheim to Rai valley stretch seems illogical. Being stuck behind another slower vehicle for up to 50 minutes is too long.</p> <p>Dropping the speed limit will not stop people travelling under the speed limit so overtaking will still be an issue as people will become impatient with slower vehicles which could lead to risky overtaking behaviour and more accidents.</p> <p>I am opposed to a blanket decrease in speed but there are some areas where the proposals have merit:</p> <p>I have no objection to the proposed changes for locations 1, 8, 10, 16.</p> <p>I would support decreasing the speed limit to 80 km/hour in location 14 but feel 60km/hr is too slow over the whole stretch, as the bends are well signed already reducing speeds to slower speeds around the tighter bends.</p> <p>I would support just the winding stretch of road over the Whangamoia Saddle decreasing to 80km/hr in location 13 but not the entire stretch.</p> <p>I do not object to any areas where there is no change.</p> <p>The Nelson to Blenheim route, while a state highway, isn't any busier and may be even less so than the Blenheim to Kaikoura route, or the Blenheim to Picton route and there are 100km/hr speed limits on these roads, along with slower limits where appropriate. I suggest the Blenheim to Nelson route could take a similar approach. A large portion of road users seem to be lorries or tourists in rental cars and campervans who are not familiar with the roads or the vehicle they are driving, therefore passing lanes and slow lane pull offs in areas along this route would seem to be the logical answer. This should not be about the cheapest answer to the problem but the best one.</p>
928	Individual submitter	<p>1) 100ok 4) 100ok 5) 60</p>

		<p>7) 100ok  8) agree  9) 100 ok good road good viability  10) 80 ok here  11) 100 ok good road good viability  13) Most of this road is safe at 90 to 100. Make it 90 but 80 too slow for most of it  14) Can't travel at 100 here anyway but 70 ok for some stretches. Make it 70.  15) 100 ok  16) No Comment  17) 100 ok  18) 80 ok  19) 80 bit slow here as good road good vis make it 90</p>
929	Individual submitter	<p>There is an area of road between Pelorus Bridge and Rai Falls that definitely needs to be 80kph.</p> <p>The Rai Valley village road speed needs to be 50kph - way too fast at 60kph, people are constantly crossing the road around the middle of the village. Always hear toots of vehicles. Lots of close calls. Someone's gonna get run over one day. It gets very busy at times!</p>
930	Individual submitter	<p>1) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  4) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  5) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  7) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  8) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  9) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  10) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  11) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  13) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  14) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  15) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  16) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  17) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  18) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.  19) That bad drivers will ALWAYS cause a problem, slowing everyone down will only incur stress for all involved, not only this but going slower uses more fuel, thusly more pollution into the air.</p>
931	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a general statement for all proposed changes (100 km/h to 80 km/h) - Blenheim to Nelson. This road suffers from a lack of passing lanes which can lead to poor decisions for drivers stuck behind. This issue is made worse by the large number of trucks which use this road. The new (expensive) road lay-out at Rai Saddle is good, but it only cuts out 2 or 3 bends. Such money could be better spent on providing more passing lanes, a wider road shoulder at dangerous bends and safety run- off areas. Making a blanket speed reduction is a "lowest common denominator - head in the sand response" and is not the best solution. Just remember that on this road, a modern motorcycle doing 120 km/hr is still way, way, way safer than a heavy truck going 90 km/hr.</p> <p>4) see above  5) No Comment  7) see above  8) see above  9) see above  10) see above  11) see above  13) see above  14) see above  15) see above  16) see above  17) see above  18) see above  19) see above</p>

932	Individual submitter	<p>1) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>4) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>5) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>7) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>8) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>9) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>10) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>11) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>13) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>14) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>15) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>16) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>17) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>18) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p> <p>19) Disagree to proposed speed restriction as they make an already long journey from the sounds even longer. Improving road conditions, filling potholes etc would be far more effective.</p>
933	Individual submitter	<p>1) Do not agree with this</p> <p>4) Do not agree with this</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Do not agree with this</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Do not agree with this</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Do not agree with this</p> <p>13) Do not agree with this</p> <p>14) 80km if you have to</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Do not agree with this</p> <p>18) Do not agree with this</p> <p>19) Do not agree with tjis</p>
934	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
935	Individual submitter	<p>1) I filled in almost the lot and it disappeared so this will be briefer concerning the part I use regularly. Overall I think the suggested changes are mostly ridiculous. Considering the money spent on the Rai Saddle then these changes. That money could have been spent in smaller amounts increasing passing Bays and signage on difficult bits of the road.</p> <p>4) As above</p> <p>5) As above</p> <p>7) As above</p>

		<p>8) As above  9) As above  10) As above  11) As above  13) I drive Nelson to Rai regularly. Driving has improved over the years with slower cars and campervans pulling over. On the whole trucks are excellent. However so- called stopping bays have not always been sensibly chosen and there should be more. The title Stopping Bay does not really educate. Should be called Passing Bay or not as good, Pullover Bay. People do not want to stop and it doesn't indicate the reason for the sign. On the Nelson side of the Rai Saddle the biggest passing bay is not indicated. Nor is the passing area at the top of the Rai side of the Whangamoia on the Rai side indicated and unless you know it is there it is too late to use it. The odd truck having held everyone up then drives gaily on. Another bay about two bends down from the Whangamoia Saddle on the Nelson side is not indicated and again you have to know it is there. Lots of small bays on the Nelson side are never used. More signage to encourage people to allow vehicles familiar with the road to pass. At present many drivers tend to drive slowly on the bends then although they have a long row behind them, speed up and then repeat the process. Many of the accidents are single car and this is just poor driving and it is doubtful if speed limits would improve their skill!!  14) The opinion of peopleusing the road.  15) As above  16) As above. The road should govern the speed not enforced limits.  17) As above  18) Yes to change as it is more of a built up area  19) As above</p>
936	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) I am absolutely shocked at this announcement NZTA. My wife and I have been living in the Rai for the past year and commuting daily to Nelson. Lowering the speed limit through this section is unnecessary. Especially considering the new upgraded section travelling west after the Rai Saddle. I agree the section of road west off the top of Whangamoia's could drop to 80km, but not this section 11. Yes I get you've had a recent accident on there, but I think this is a knee jerk reaction. Have you considered how many of us drive this road 4-5 times a week? For me it's already a push of a commute, only necessitated through rising house prices in Nelson. I truly fear the prospect of being limited to 80km, that just sounds soooooo sloooooow for a road that I can vouch for being safe if DRIVEN SAFELY. The kid that crashed, as sad as it is, was 19. When I was 19 I sure as hell wasn't driving "safely", instead trying to push the speed wherever possible and look cool. So please, reconsider this. Work on some better signage and awareness. Put more speed cameras out there (I very really see them and very often see others flying past at 120kmH+. Please for my sanity don't make me crawl to work each day.....  14) I drive this multiple times a week. I would never reach 100 through here, but feel 80 kmph is reasonable.  15) no need 100km is fine  16) ? what is all this about!!! Are you lowering speeds randomly all around the country or just targeting this area??!! It's an open road!  17) ??? Why  18) ??? 80 is again fine....  19) Nope again... That road is more than well built for 100kmph</p>
937	Individual submitter	<p>1) no  4) no  5) no  7) no  8) no  9) no  10) no  11) no  13) no  14) no  15) no  16) no</p>

		<p>17) cable bay road should be 50 once the curves ( currently 100kph! )come in and 30kph once in the settlement</p> <p>18) no</p> <p>19) no</p>
938	Individual submitter	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.</p> <p>To put it succinctly, I am completely dumb-founded by this proposal. Have those that are proposing the speed reductions ever driven the road? Do they actually know its condition? Do they know how much money has been spent on improvements in the last decade? I have driven this road, without incident, hundreds of times in the past 32 years and was a passenger for the 15 years prior to that. I consider myself to know this section of State Highway 6 very well.</p> <p>Let me take you on a journey.</p> <p>Departing Renwick you set the cruise control at 100km/h. You can easily and safety travel at this speed until you arrive in Havelock.</p> <p>After leaving Havelock you re-set the cruise control to 100km/h. With the exception of a single bend (Kaiuma turn-off) you can easily and safety travel at this speed until you arrive at Pelorus.</p> <p>The section of Highway between Pelorus and Rai Valley is a perfect over-taking opportunity and again the majority of it can be safely driven at the current open road limit.</p> <p>The next section of Highway from Rai Valley to Hira has seen many upgrades and changes over the years. It is essentially a “drive to the conditions” piece of road. Having said that there are still numerous sections that can safely be driven at the current open road limit. A point of note; as you descend the East side of the Whangamoia Saddle unless you wish to overheat your brakes it is virtually impossible to keep below the current open road speed limit!</p> <p>West of Hira you have the Gentle Annie where there is finally a passing lane. It would make no sense to have any form of speed reduction here.</p> <p>You have already implemented unnecessary speed reductions in areas such as Hundalee on SHW1. Don’t ruin this Section of Highway 6, unnecessarily, in the same way. What needs to happen on this road is some good old-fashioned Policing – like there was many years ago by a certain Havelock based officer. The biggest problem on SHW6 between Blenheim and Nelson are the motorists who travel between 75 &amp; 85km/h and do not look in their rear-view mirrors. It is not the state of the road, adverse weather conditions or any other factor that cause problems on this highway. It is simply inconsiderate drivers who get away with it and create a world of frustration for other motorists because of the lack of enforcement.</p> <p>Twenty deaths on this road over a ten year period is 20 too many, but a speed limit reduction is not going to address this. It also has to be remembered that not all these deaths were in any way related to vehicle condition or road conditions at the time.</p> <p>Finally, on a positive note, there are three sections in your proposal I do support. Section 8 near the Canvastown School and sections 18 &amp; 19 around Atawhai. For the sake of common sense leave the rest of the Highway as it is. Another couple of safety measures that should be considered as an alternative to speed reductions are; the installation of more signs alerting drivers to use their rear-view mirrors and if they see three or more cars behind them, they should find a safe place to pull aside. Having signs targeting ‘slow drivers’ does not achieve the desired result because these are the same people who do not pull over in a slow vehicle bay because they don’t believe they are a problem. Targeted signage or an advertising campaign stressing the use of rear-view mirrors would be far more effective as would a Police initiative to ‘educate’ these drivers. Secondly, the installation of rumble strips on the approach and around right-hand bends in the centre of the road should also be considered to ensure lane adherence. Please do not consider installing rumble strips in any location on the left side of a lane. This is frustrating and also dangerous as it has the unintended consequence of forcing vehicles further towards the centre line unnecessarily.</p> <p>Back in 1984 the speed limit was 80km/h. In that year we had approximately half the number of vehicles on the road as we have today and the annual road fatality rate was double what it is now. Are you proposing to return to those days?</p> <p>Thanks again for the opportunity to submit on this proposal.</p>
939	Individual submitter	<p>1) Please refer to item 15.</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Thank you, this is a great proposal. Resident driveways open directly on to this stretch of road. The current 100km/h speed limit, combined with poor lines of sight, increase the number of close collision encounters that are experienced under the current arrangements and road traffic accident fatalities have occurred. In the interests of safety, an 80km/h speed limit change would be preferable.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
940	Individual submitter	<p>1) I fully support this new proposed speed limit. I have personally observed many instances of exceptionally poor driving at speed along the whole route from Blenheim to Nelson. I believe a reduction in speed limit would reduce this. I have personally observed how the new recently introduced reduced speed zone from Nelson to Motueka has had a moderating effect on poor driving,</p>



		<p>clearly unacceptable, and until further major alterations can be made to the road to make higher speeds safe, a lower speed limit is an appropriate interim measure. Any inconvenience on the part of motorists with regards to a speed limit reduction is inconsequential compared to the potential lives saved.</p> <p>16) I fully support this new proposed speed limit. I have personally observed many instances of exceptionally poor driving at speed along the whole route from Blenheim to Nelson. I believe a reduction in speed limit would reduce this. I have personally observed how the new recently introduced reduced speed zone from Nelson to Motueka has had a moderating effect on poor driving, and believe that would have a similar effect on poor driving between Blenheim and Nelson. I understand that there is a high rate of deaths on the stretch of road from Blenheim to Nelson. This is clearly unacceptable, and until further major alterations can be made to the road to make higher speeds safe, a lower speed limit is an appropriate interim measure. Any inconvenience on the part of motorists with regards to a speed limit reduction is inconsequential compared to the potential lives saved.</p> <p>17) I fully support this new proposed speed limit. I have personally observed many instances of exceptionally poor driving at speed along the whole route from Blenheim to Nelson. I believe a reduction in speed limit would reduce this. I have personally observed how the new recently introduced reduced speed zone from Nelson to Motueka has had a moderating effect on poor driving, and believe that would have a similar effect on poor driving between Blenheim and Nelson. I understand that there is a high rate of deaths on the stretch of road from Blenheim to Nelson. This is clearly unacceptable, and until further major alterations can be made to the road to make higher speeds safe, a lower speed limit is an appropriate interim measure. Any inconvenience on the part of motorists with regards to a speed limit reduction is inconsequential compared to the potential lives saved.</p> <p>18) I fully support this new proposed speed limit. I have personally observed many instances of exceptionally poor driving at speed along the whole route from Blenheim to Nelson. I believe a reduction in speed limit would reduce this. I have personally observed how the new recently introduced reduced speed zone from Nelson to Motueka has had a moderating effect on poor driving, and believe that would have a similar effect on poor driving between Blenheim and Nelson. I understand that there is a high rate of deaths on the stretch of road from Blenheim to Nelson. This is clearly unacceptable, and until further major alterations can be made to the road to make higher speeds safe, a lower speed limit is an appropriate interim measure. Any inconvenience on the part of motorists with regards to a speed limit reduction is inconsequential compared to the potential lives saved.</p> <p>19) I fully support this new proposed speed limit. I have personally observed many instances of exceptionally poor driving at speed along the whole route from Blenheim to Nelson. I believe a reduction in speed limit would reduce this. I have personally observed how the new recently introduced reduced speed zone from Nelson to Motueka has had a moderating effect on poor driving, and believe that would have a similar effect on poor driving between Blenheim and Nelson. I understand that there is a high rate of deaths on the stretch of road from Blenheim to Nelson. This is clearly unacceptable, and until further major alterations can be made to the road to make higher speeds safe, a lower speed limit is an appropriate interim measure. Any inconvenience on the part of motorists with regards to a speed limit reduction is inconsequential compared to the potential lives saved.</p>
941	Individual submitter	<p>1) Speed should remain at 100km/hr. This is only a horticultural area, and it has wide grass verges. If this is shown to be a high accident area, then the addition of either slow vehicle lanes or passing lanes would be beneficial</p> <p>4) Speed should remain at 100km/hr. There are easy curves and straights, but little opportunity to pass safely making it frustrating. Add passing lanes to reduce accident rates</p> <p>5) Yes, change to 50</p> <p>7) Speed should remain at 100km/hr. There are easy curves and straights, but little opportunity to pass making it frustrating. Add passing lanes to reduce accident rates. Change this section to finish 100m Est of Wakamarina Rd (not West)</p> <p>8) Change starting point to 100m East of Wakamarina Rd (not West), and Yes, reduce speed to 80 with a 60 variable school sign</p> <p>9) Speed should remain at 100km/hr. There are good straights with easy curves, but limited opportunities for passing, causing frustration. Add passing lanes to reduce accident rates</p> <p>10) Yes, change to 60km/hr</p> <p>11) Speed should remain at 100km/hr. Road is mainly flowing curves and short straights, leading to limited opportunities to overtake, causing frustration. Add passing lanes to reduce accidents</p> <p>13) Speed should remain at 100km/hr. The roads are curvy, but flow well. Add passing lanes to reduce accident rate</p> <p>14) Reduce speed to 70km/hr (not 60). While there are a lot of tight bends, there are also a few straights that safely allow a bit more speed. There are a number of gravel pull-off areas, but few slow vehicles use them, because it requires them to actually leave the road (and they are far too small for the trucks). Consequently, the average vehicle gets frustratedly stuck behind these vehicles. Add more places that large vehicles can pull over, without them losing their own momentum. Also, finish this section 50m North of Teal Valley Road (not 280m)</p> <p>15) Speed should remain at 100km/hr. Road has good straights and easy curves. A passing lane should be added for the Blenheim bound traffic, because average vehicles make a last ditch attempt here to not get caught behind the slow vehicles for the twists ahead. Section should start 50m North of Teal Valley Road (not 208m)</p> <p>16) Yes, speed should be 80, with a 60 variable school zone</p> <p>17) Speed should remain at 100km/hr. The road flows well.</p> <p>18) Speed should remain at 80. The road flows well. Possibly consider removing either the Clifton Place or the Western Tresillian Ave entry road.</p> <p>19) Yes, I agree the speed should be reduced to 80km/hr</p>
942	Individual submitter	<p>1) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>4) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>5) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>7) This is a good condition Highway with a high rate of new and safe vehicles travelling on it, consider other options than undoing the work of roading and vehicle safety improvements</p> <p>8) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>9) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>10) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>11) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p>

		<p>13) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>14) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>15) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>16) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>17) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>18) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p> <p>19) Improving currently unable drivers to be able to reach the current speed limit safely and/or knowing how to safely allow faster traffic to pass</p>
943	SPATNZ	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) The intersection to Glenduan is very dangerous. I had an accident there 7 or so years ago and see near misses all the time. Consider additional safety measures, warning signs, mirrors etc.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
944	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) This road is fine, 100 speed limit should remain. If possible add a passing line and where possible widen road and have double white line in middle. Barrier/or pipe open ditches</p> <p>5) AGREE completely, there is very little space between the footpath and the traffic, local kids ride/scooter/walk along here with big trucks whizzing by, only a matter of time before a child has an accident. Also there is no pedestrian crossing in Havelock, nowhere actually safe to cross</p> <p>7) Speed should remain 100, signs in same place</p> <p>8) This road is a difficult one as a school is close to highway, the speed should of course reduce around the school, but I think you need to deter people from overtaking on this stretch as if they do, they get to great speeds near the school. I would suggest lower speed for well beyond the school then make a passing lane available around the corner on the next long stretch</p> <p>9) 100 is fine</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) 100 should remain</p> <p>13) 100 should remain, with increased large signage for slower speeds at bends</p> <p>14) 100 should remain. increased signage for lower speeds going around corners</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
945	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p>

		<p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) This area is a school zone - although Clifton Terrace school is in a pull in bay the children still walk home along this busy road, with multiple roads to cross, please consider dropping the speed to 50km.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
946	Individual submitter	<p>1) I think 100km on this stretch of road is perfectly fine. There are stop signs at the major intersections which work well.</p> <p>4) Most of the way from Havelock to Renwick is pretty straight with good visibility. I don't see why it should be reduced to 80km. I think reducing the speed limit will cause more accidents as there will be impatient drivers attempting dangerous passing manoeuvres increasing the risk of more accidents.</p> <p>5) I agree with this change as there are a lot of houses and if children walk to and from school they are at risk. Also the intersection at Queen Charlotte drive would be easier to turn into and out of if the speed limit was 50km</p> <p>7) Again the road is pretty good from Havelock to Wakamarina Rd. Reducing the speed limit will cause more impatient drivers, increasing the risk of dangerous passing manoeuvres. All the corners that require you to go a bit slower are marked well with recommended speeds which most people follow</p> <p>8) I agree with a slower speed by the school, however I have never actually seen any children around the road side in Canvastown as the school carpark is well off the road. I think having a reduced speed during pick up and drop off times would be ok, but unnecessary during the rest of the day</p> <p>9) When I have driven this part of the road nearly every time someone has passed me on the straight by the dairy farm just after Canvastown. I am usually travelling at between 90km-100km and they still pass. Reducing the speed to 80km will make people want to pass on that straight even more than they do now.</p> <p>10) This is good, although if there is a queue for the bridge you need to stop anyway</p> <p>11) Reducing the speed during this section of the road will make people want to pass the car in front and there are virtually no safe passing spots in this stretch of road</p> <p>13) Keep it at 100km. Its a good reasonably straight piece of road</p> <p>14) Some corners you need to slow right down to 30km but I think 80km would be a more appropriate speed on the straight bits</p> <p>15) Some corners you need to slow right down to 30km but I think 80km would be a more appropriate speed on the straight bits</p> <p>16) I agree this is a good idea</p> <p>17) I don't see why this piece of road cannot stay 100km. It is a straight piece of road with a reasonable hill where most cars would struggle to get up to 100km let alone go over 100km.</p> <p>18) 80km is a good speed for this stretch of road</p> <p>19) This is a reasonable speed change for this stretch of road</p>
947	Individual submitter	<p>1) Does not need to be reduced</p> <p>4) Does not need to be reduced. Needs passing lanes</p> <p>5) 70km is a good speed for this area</p> <p>7) Does not need to be reduced</p> <p>8) Very safe school area - with a huge pull of area. I attended this school and know 100km past it is safe. Do not reduce the speed</p> <p>9) Does not need to be reduced</p> <p>10) Does not need to be reduced</p> <p>11) Does not need to be reduced</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) Needs more passing lanes</p> <p>15) Needs more passing lanes</p> <p>16) Ok</p> <p>17) Ok</p> <p>18) Too slow</p> <p>19) Does not need to be reduced</p>
948	Individual submitter	<p>1) Don't change it. Leave it at 100.</p> <p>4) Don't change it.</p> <p>5) Don't change it.</p> <p>7) Don't change it.</p> <p>8) Outside the school, yes, 60. Elsewhere don't change it.</p> <p>9) Don't change it.</p> <p>10) Don't change it.</p> <p>11) Don't change it.</p> <p>13) Don't change it.</p> <p>14) Don't change it.</p>

		<p>15) Don't change it.  16) Ok.  17) Don't change it.  18) Don't change it! People drive at 60 already ffs!  19) Don't change it!</p>
949	Individual submitter	<p>1) Inconsiderate drivers no matter the speed cause accidents.  4) This is some of the better road. This road is fine to use at 100KPH. There is no need advantage to blanket speed restriction approach without justification.  5) I do not agree. this area is rural. It does not have the population density to warrant a speed reduction.  7) slowing traffic is unnecessary when better roads can be engineered and maintained correctly. A road user who makes a choice to use excess speed or take adverse risk will still be a hazard regardless. A blanket approach to speed will not stop those that chose to speed or take risks and endanger other road users.  8) slowing traffic is unnecessary when better roads can be engineered and maintained correctly. A road user who makes a choice to use excess speed or take adverse risk will still be a hazard regardless. A blanket approach to speed will not stop those that chose to speed or take risks and endanger other road users. Canvastown population is not growing at a substantial rate. I do support slowing traffic to 60 threw a "school zone"  9) slowing traffic is unnecessary when better roads can be engineered and maintained correctly. A road user who makes a choice to use excess speed or take adverse risk will still be a hazard regardless. A blanket approach to speed will not stop those that chose to speed or take risks and endanger other road users.  10) I agree this is very sensible  11) slowing traffic is unnecessary when better roads can be engineered and maintained correctly. A road user who makes a choice to use excess speed or take adverse risk will still be a hazard regardless. A blanket approach to speed will not stop those that chose to speed or take risks and endanger other road users.  13) slowing traffic is unnecessary when better roads can be engineered and maintained correctly. A road user who makes a choice to use excess speed or take adverse risk will still be a hazard regardless. A blanket approach to speed will not stop those that chose to speed or take risks and endanger other road users.  14) I would support 80 KPH a near 50% reduction is unimaginable.  15) This road is ill suited for speed reduction. The road is open and rural setting. The population has not increased. Road users who chooses to put others at risk will still do so .  16) I agree with this  17) This road is ill suited for speed reduction. The road is open and rural setting. The population has not increased enough to warrant this. Road users who chooses to put others at risk will still do so .  18) This road is ill suited for speed reduction. The road is open and rural setting. The population has not increased enough to warrant this. Road users who chooses to put others at risk will still do so . Please Fix the corner turning to "the Glen" Poor engineering has resulted is lives lost.  19) This road is ill suited for speed reduction. The road is open and rural setting. The road traffic has not increased enough to warrant this. Road users who chooses to put others at risk will still do so .</p>
950	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it 100  4) Leave it 100  5) Leave it 100  7) Leave it 100  8) Leave it 100  9) Leave it 100  10) Leave it 100  11) Leave it 100  13) Leave it 100  14) Leave it 100  15) Leave it 100  16) Leave it 100  17) Leave it 100  18) Leave it 100  19) Leave it 100</p>
951	Individual submitter	<p>1) No , go ahead and do it  4) No go ahead and do it  5) No go ahead and do it  7) No go ahead and do it  8) No go ahead and do it  9) No go ahead and do it</p>

		<p>10) No go ahead and do it</p> <p>11) No go ahead and do it</p> <p>13) No go ahead and do it</p> <p>14) No go ahead and do it</p> <p>15) No go ahead and do it</p> <p>16) No go ahead and do it</p> <p>17) No go ahead and do it</p> <p>18) No go ahead and do it</p> <p>19) No go ahead and do it</p>
952	Individual submitter	<p>1) sensible &amp; long overdue...limits today can be raised later if safety statistics warrant such. Please consider this my response for following 16 boxes</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
953	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) Since there is nowhere on this survey to make a general comment, I would like to submit that I FULLY support these moves to reduce speed on SH6.</p>
954	Pitt Investments Ltd	<p>1) Common sense.....speed reduction not warranted</p> <p>4) No reduction required</p> <p>5) Ok</p> <p>7) No change required</p> <p>8) No change required</p> <p>9) No change required</p> <p>10) No change required</p> <p>11) No change required</p> <p>13) No change required</p> <p>14) No change required</p> <p>15) No change required</p>

		<p>16) No change required</p> <p>17) No change required</p> <p>18) No change required</p> <p>19) No change required</p>
955	Individual submitter	<p>1) Why blanket rule 80kph where there is no need to.</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) 100kph Maximum limit fine for this stretch of road</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Why</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) Nothing wrong with 100pkh maximum limit</p> <p>14) What why</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) 80 kph fine, 60pkh when school starting and finishing maybe</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
956	Individual submitter	<p>1) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in</p> <p>4) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in</p> <p>5) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in</p> <p>7) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in</p> <p>8) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in</p> <p>9) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in</p> <p>10) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in</p> <p>11) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in Why would you penalise all drivers who use this road on a daily basis because visitors who make no contribution to pay for said road haven't been informed of common courtesy</p> <p>13) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in Why would you penalise all drivers who use this road on a daily basis because visitors who make no contribution to pay for said road haven't been informed of common courtesy</p> <p>14) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in Why would you penalise all drivers who use this road on a daily basis because visitors who make no contribution to pay for said road haven't been informed of common courtesy</p> <p>15) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in Why would you penalise all drivers who use this road on a daily basis because visitors who make no contribution to pay for said road haven't been informed of common courtesy</p> <p>16) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in Why would you penalise all drivers who use this road on a daily basis because visitors who make no contribution to pay for said road haven't been informed of common courtesy</p> <p>17) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who dive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in Why would you penalise all drivers who use this road on a daily basis because visitors who make no contribution to pay for said road haven't been informed</p>

		<p>of common courtesy</p> <p>18) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who drive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in Why would you penalise all drivers who use this road on a daily basis because visitors who make no contribution to pay for said road haven't been informed of common courtesy</p> <p>19) There is nothing wrong with the road or current speed limit, the only issue is tourist drivers who drive slowly hold up traffic and do not pull over to let other traffic past, could easily be rectified by putting some safe passing areas in Why would you penalise all drivers who use this road on a daily basis because visitors who make no contribution to pay for said road haven't been informed of common courtesy</p>
957	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes. The problem is bad drivers, not the speed.</p> <p>4) Yes. Frustration causes people to make poor decisions.</p> <p>5) Yes, frustration makes people drive poorly not speed</p> <p>7) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>8) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does Introduce a variable school zone before and after school times</p> <p>9) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>10) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>11) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>13) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>14) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>15) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>16) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>17) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>18) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p> <p>19) Yes, speed doesn't cause accidents, poor decision making does</p>
958	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Dear Sir/Madam, as a resident of The Glen, I fully agree with a reduced speed limit in this proposed zone. Especially important is the stretch around the turn-off to Glenduan (Glen Road). The current 100km speed limit is very dangerous. I was friends with the woman killed on her bike at this corner and am aware of some of the other people who have been injured at this intersection. The speed perhaps should be reduced even lower than the proposed 80km/hour for the 150 meters prior to this turn-off. A separate issue is the need for a cycleway to connect The Glen with the existing cycleway at Clifton Terrace. Yours respectfully, Shaun McKenzie-Pollock</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
959	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a strait road, consider extending and widening turning lanes rather than reducing limit.</p> <p>4) This road is perfectly fine at 100kph all the way... so safe that i do not need to use the brake on this entire journey. I would suggest adding 1-2 passing lanes... i travel this route a couple of times a week.</p> <p>5) This would be ok by me but not really necessary.</p> <p>7) I travel this route daily, 100kph is fine. i get frustrated getting stuck behind slow drivers doing 80kph on this stretch because it can be safely traveled at 100. Maybe one corner should have a 90kph corner that is all.</p> <p>8) I agree with this new limit as it is outside a school. Also the bridge needs to be widened with a safety rail for school students to cross to go to wakamarina.</p> <p>9) This route is completely fine at 100kph.</p> <p>10) 60kph for this area would be fine... but thats the speed people generally travel at here anyway because of the one lane bridge.</p> <p>11) this stretch is fine and can safely be traveled at 100kph.</p>

		<p>13) This stretch is fine at 100kph, it already has signs indicating corners that need to be traveled at a lower speed.</p> <p>14) Its a slow windy stretch, people do not need a new signed speed limit, but drive to the conditions sign might be a better idea.</p> <p>15) Its pretty much already 80 here apart from a long straight stretch where 100kph is safe, so not needed to change.</p> <p>16) 80kph is already the limit, just mark the ACTUAL limit in the school zone would help!</p> <p>17) keep it 100 but widen the overtaking lane, its way to tight!</p> <p>18) lower this one as a lot of residents are calling for it.</p> <p>19) 100kph on this long fairly strait road is fine.</p>
960	Individual submitter	<p>1) No need to reduce the speed. This is a good section of road that is straight with wide shoulders.</p> <p>4) Completely unnecessary. The road meets the requirements for 100kph speed limit. It is safe to drive at this speed</p> <p>5) Waste of time. This seems like PC gone mad. Reducing the speed purely because everything else is reduced. This is a safe uphill stretch of road that is wide and easy to drive.</p> <p>7) Waste of time. Even the times listed in your summary are wrong. I have driven it at current and proposed speeds and had a 3 minute time difference between Havelock and Pelorus, you state 1m 14s. The road has long straights with good shoulders and there is no need to reduce the speed</p> <p>8) Support the reduced speed past the school.</p> <p>9) No. See my earlier answer. This section of road is good and safe to drive with long straights.</p> <p>10) Support this. The change is road speed over Dec/Jan is confusing and can catch people out.</p> <p>11) No. Large sectors of this part of the road are safe to drive at 100kph and reducing it is unnecessary.</p> <p>13) Unnecessary. Parts of the road you can't drive at 80 while others are very comfortable at 100kph. No need to change it.</p> <p>14) No need for a speed limit reduction. The first part of the road was rebuilt a few years ago with a wide uphill passing lane and sweeping corners. Reducing the speed before a safe uphill section is just stupid. Carrying your momentum up the first part of the hill is the safest and most efficient way.</p> <p>15) No need.</p> <p>16) Support the speed control past the school</p> <p>17) No need to reduce the speed. The section of road has long striahts with wide shoulders and is safe to drive at 100kph.</p> <p>18) No. It was only a few years ago this was reduced from 100 to 80 for safety reasons. It seem perverse to say this was inadequate and should be reduced further. Where is the eveidence this is necessary. You haven't provided the statistics to support this.</p> <p>19) Support. This whole process is a farse and PC BS gone mad. There has been no real supporting evidence provided. All "facts" are very generalised without specifics. No crash maps, cause of accidents or other information has been provided to allow really informed decisions. This is being based on emotion and appears to be politically driven with incorrect timing information (we measured it in a real life situation) and is an effort to reduce the need for maintenance and improvements. There is also a complete lack of enforcement. We drive the road weekly and have not seen a police vehicle on station in over 3 years. Unacceptable.</p>
961	Individual submitter	<p>1) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>4) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>5) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>7) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>8) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>9) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>10) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>11) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>13) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>14) Ridiculously slow and restrictive</p> <p>15) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>16) Good</p> <p>17) Totally unnecessary</p> <p>18) Too slow unnecessary</p> <p>19) Too slow unnecessary</p>
962	Individual submitter	<p>1) why does it have to be so radical....surely 90 is fine</p> <p>4) unnecessary to make such a change</p> <p>5) probably ok as there are a lot of dithering tourists</p> <p>7) 90 is a good compromise</p> <p>8) school zone only should be restricted unless there are some passing / parking areas for school drop offs, bus etc</p> <p>9) the road is self limiting in many places..better to spend money on rumble strips as cutting corners is more dangerous than speed regardless of what it is</p> <p>10) probably ok given the traffic movements in summer but again it is limited by traffic patterns</p>

		<p>11) far too restrictive...speed is not the only factor its frustration &amp; 80 kph is dumb for a main highway</p> <p>13) theres enough signage now to get people to slow down</p> <p>14) probably unnecessary as the road is self limiting</p> <p>15) why change, need more passing bays first</p> <p>16) school zone safety supported</p> <p>17) probably reduce to 90</p> <p>18) traffic density may make this acceptable</p> <p>19) traffic density may make this sensible</p>
963	Individual submitter	<p>I have found it impossible to find relevant information I require to make an informed decision on this subject so I can only say what I feel &amp; have experienced personally during my working days with the NZRTA &amp; Roadsafte Nelson Committee.</p> <p>I very strongly do NOT support the NEW Speed limit proposal and submit that it is entirely WRONG to just blanket lower all the speeds by 20kph. This is a "slow" 115kms of SH6 with winding road, undulating terrain, several villages, Whangamoas, with many advisory speed corners. To slow it down even more will create even more driver frustration. There are so many factors that need to be considered and full consultation needs to take place. Some questions I would ask are:</p> <p>++ What are the average daily traffic (ADT) figures ? Breakdown... Cars, Heavies, Bikes.</p> <p>++ At the intersection of SH6 &amp; SH62 Rapaura Road, is there a seagull island or slip lane installed to allow vehicles to make a safer right turn? (Rapaura to SH6)</p> <p>++ What came out of the safety review of improvements to be carried out on the same stretch of SH6 about 18 months ago?</p> <p>++ I have not been able to find any relevant info on the 20 fatalities/crashes mentioned by NZTA? Research via news media I find that some of the deaths were on advisory speed corners &amp; signed road work gravel surfaces, motorbikes, &amp; a pedestrian killed at night. If this is correct....Lowering the speed limit will not prevent deaths in these instances.</p> <p>++ Are there any slow vehicle bays proposed to be built... Where &amp; when?</p> <p>++Does NZTA work with Police &amp; encourage more enforcement for not only speeding BUT for IMPEDING the TRAFFIC.?</p> <p>++What is NZTA doing about reducing driver frustration on this stretch of SH6?</p> <p>In Summary I do NOT support this proposal and strongly advise NZTA to rethink this proposal.</p>
964	Individual submitter	<p>1) Entirely disagree. Slowing traffic will cause more issues than it fixes .</p> <p>4) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>5) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>7) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>8) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>9) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>10) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>11) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>13) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>14) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>15) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>16) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>17) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p>

		<p>18) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p> <p>19) Totally unreasonable, I have driven this road most days for over 15 years . Cars are safer with every year and the accidents which are put down to speed mostly a combination of speed and inattention/drugs/alcohol/poor driving.</p>
965	Individual submitter	<p>1) Speed restriction til just after the roundabout by Cherryland</p> <p>4) Driver education and suitable passing lanes.</p> <p>5) Makes sense</p> <p>7) Driver Education and passing areas</p> <p>8) Makes sense during school hours</p> <p>9) Driver Education and passing areas</p> <p>10) This does make sense.</p> <p>11) Driver Education and passing areas</p> <p>13) Driver Education and passing areas</p> <p>14) Driver Education and passing areas</p> <p>15) Makes sense</p> <p>16) Makes sense</p> <p>17) Driver Education and passing areas</p> <p>18) Driver Education and passing areas</p> <p>19) This makes sense</p>
966	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) Maybe put up more signs to look out for cyclists/motorbikes?</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) No</p> <p>8) Flashing speed detector for the school zone? If not already</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) No</p> <p>11) No</p> <p>13) No</p> <p>14) If this bits quite steep older cars might really struggle with not having enough momentum getting up the hill</p> <p>15) No</p> <p>16) No</p> <p>17) No</p> <p>18) No</p> <p>19) No</p>
967	Individual submitter	<p>Re the above subject. I have been driving now for nearly 60 years and have had 2 minor accidents both at about 15 kph. Back when I started driving roads in NZ were always Ok to me. You drove to the conditions that existed whether it was sealed or gravel roads. We had less powerful cars and far less gadgets to play with or distract us from driving, a major concern these days I think. There were less cars also, but were we taught how to drive better in those days .I see some of the things people do these days which makes me wonder how on earth did they get their licience. Now days cars are more powerful which can get people into trouble, however we all know the mechanics of cars these days are far superior. So Is speed that bigger enemy. Excessive speed is and you will never stop idiots trying their limits and killing themselves. Our roads are definitely better , big sweeping corners,( great for speed) and much straighter, (boring you could say). The majority of people I have spoken to agree that 100 KPH is a good speed in the majority of our roads outside cities or townships. Going through housed areas, eg The Rai, yes 60 KPH is a sensible speed, Pelorus , Renwick , those sorts of places a speed reduction is necessary to suit conditions. I have looked at the intended speeds or your map drawing and think the NZTA has gone mad. The majority of open road should be 100 KPH and if you think that is to fast well perhaps you shouldn't be driving. Personally when I drive at lower speeds I loose concerntration and find it boring. I really think you need to look at other accident prevention areas. Driving is a full time job, alertness is a must and I think many people fail in this area causing accidents. These drivers will always be with us. A head on crash At 80 + 80 = 160 KPH will probable do the same damage as 200 KPH. The NZTA needs to find other areas to accident prevention, Distraction while driving is a big one, the one I believe causes the most accidents.</p>
968	Individual submitter	<p>I am opposed to the speed being reduced on SH6. Please leave it at 100km/hr and make improvements to the road such as passing lanes.</p>
969	Individual submitter	<p>1) Stretch of road is straight wide and open so reduction is not necessary</p> <p>4) Speed limit does not need reducing here normal NZ highway</p> <p>5) Could be reduced but is already less than 100kmph and not as built up as main part of town</p>

		<p>7) Normal NZ highway doesn't need to be reduced leave at 100</p> <p>8) Leave at 100 with variable speed zone for school</p> <p>9) Leave at 100 normal NZ highway a passing lane would be good on the long straights</p> <p>10) I agree with a speed limit change to 60 through this area all year around</p> <p>11) Speed limit could be 80 through the windy part</p> <p>13) Some of the windy sections could be changed to 80 for example up the rai valley side of the rai saddle but not the whole way examples like the rai saddle realignment have increased road safety and having that at 80 will cause motorists to get frustrated and do silly things</p> <p>14) I think a limit reduction is a good idea but to 80 not 60</p> <p>15) Leave at 100</p> <p>16) I agree with the proposal in this area</p> <p>17) This area is ok at 100 it has passing lanes and is reasonably open and straight</p> <p>18) 80 is ok but maybe to future proof it 70. No 60</p> <p>19) This is a busy area with lots of traffic and distractions so I agree with 80</p>
970	Individual submitter	<p>Today I will be driving between Dunedin and Balclutha.</p> <p>Yesterday I travelled from Christchurch to Dunedin, and from Timaru south the road deteriorated considerably most notable were the slow down when wet due to the road surface having no top course for grip, many places the surface was breaking up.</p> <p>What's my point?</p> <p>These are the roads you are tasked to provide safe passage for all users, I don't feel safe using the roads you provide, look at the distance between trucks when they pass each other, the roads are too narrow.</p> <p>I can say that today I will find more roads without adequate top surface, speed reductions for poor road condition, rutted roads with standing surface water. These are the same issues with the Blenheim to Nelson road.</p> <p>And next week I will be traveling on the Blenheim to Nelson road, so as you may now gather I spend alot if time traversing your roads in order to do business, your under resourcing and under delivering of road building will make alot of businesses unproductive or more costly.</p> <p>Fix the roads, and that's the whole south island.</p>
971	Individual submitter	<p>1) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction</p> <p>4) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a</p>

major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

5) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

7) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

8) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

9) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

10) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some

attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

11) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

13) I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

14) Are you going to apply this to all of the South Island? There are plenty of others that are worse yet don't seem to get a mention, Kawerau gorge is dangerous, still 100, Haast pass, the whole of the west coast! I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction

15) Are you going to apply this to all of the South Island? There are plenty of others that are worse yet don't seem to get a mention, Kawerau gorge is dangerous, still 100, Haast pass, the whole of the west coast! I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described

		<p>above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction</p> <p>16) Are you going to apply this to all of the South Island? There are plenty of others that are worse yet don't seem to get a mention, Kawerau gorge is dangerous, still 100, Haast pass, the whole of the west coast! I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction</p> <p>17) Are you going to apply this to all of the South Island? There are plenty of others that are worse yet don't seem to get a mention, Kawerau gorge is dangerous, still 100, Haast pass, the whole of the west coast! I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction</p> <p>18) Are you going to apply this to all of the South Island? There are plenty of others that are worse yet don't seem to get a mention, Kawerau gorge is dangerous, still 100, Haast pass, the whole of the west coast! I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I described above and you have a recipe for disaster, no traction due to standing water or sufficient top course to provide grip, result is cars leaving the road for no reason, doesn't sound very good. FIX THE ROADS! The current engineering of our roads needs some attention, we have bigger vehicles on our roads which most of are maximum width meaning minimum safety, we have a booming tourist sector that encourages self drive and unfortunately the tourists are either inexperienced drivers or used to wider roads, there needs to be more passing lanes and signage to educate people how to behave in different conditions. My experience using the roads you provide so I can undertake business is that of poor maintenance, poorly designed roads, no investment in the infrastructure. Every five weeks I do a trip from CHCH to Invercargill then back via Central Otago and up through the Mackenzie home again, I also have a house in Marlborough and access it along this stretch of road from Blenheim to just past Rai valley, which is a major arterial route to the Port of Nelson. The road isn't great, lumpy bouncy bits, undulating road surface, surface lacking top course, rutted bits etc, all the same as described above. You need to lobby the transport minister and get some of the surplus to sort out the roading issues facing every south islander, cars aren't going away. I do not support the speed reduction</p> <p>19) Are you going to apply this to all of the South Island? There are plenty of others that are worse yet don't seem to get a mention, Kawerau gorge is dangerous, still 100, Haast pass, the whole of the west coast! I do not support the speed reduction The general condition of the roads under your tenure are an abysmal train wreck, why is it that when the road surface becomes so worn that it loses the top course and exposes the tar that you then reduce the speed to 70 km/hr as is the case in numerous places throughout the south island, not just this piece of road but State Highway One for example in the Otago district has several of these temporary speed restrictions? Fix the roads! The allowance of 50 ton trucks on our roads without preparing the roads for these vehicles results in the road becoming rutted, the ruts hold surface water which makes it dangerous for small vehicles, combine this with what I de</p>
972	Penketh Property Law	I am a frequent driver along this route and strongly object to the proposed speed limit reduction – I do not believe a reduction in speed limit to 80kph is at all necessary or helpful
973	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree with this proposal</p> <p>4) The road is very safe to travel at the current speed limit of 100km. It does not need to be reduced. It would make for a very frustrating trip. Need arrows painted on the roads, need signs indicating best practice is to have head lights on, need bends signage and slow driver lane areas. High traffic area for tourists and campervans, educate these people to pull over if have long line of traffic behind</p> <p>5) Agree with this proposal, lots of side roads and children</p>

		<p>7) Again this is a safe road to travel 100km, the road requires arrows painted on the road and bend signs with speed</p> <p>8) We have been wanting this to be reduced for several years. A township and school area should always be reduced from 100. Why does Hira have reduced speed and not Canvastown?? What is the difference?</p> <p>9) Again safe to resume travelling at a speed of 100km</p> <p>10) Agree with reducing speed in this area but down to 80/50 not 60 all year round</p> <p>11) Speed of 100 can be resumed but requires bend speed limit signs through immediate area after pelorus bridge, and again arrow signage painted on the roads</p> <p>13) Travel as the road allows, signage of the bends, arrows painting on roads</p> <p>14) Through the valley, 100km speed is safe, need slow lanes and signage to indicate these, head lights for safety</p> <p>15) Travel to road conditions through the bends, head lights on</p> <p>16) remain at 80km</p> <p>17) 90km not 80km</p> <p>18) 90km</p> <p>19) 90km</p>
974	Individual submitter	<p>1) Disagree proposed change Was dropped to 80km following earthquake and subsequently put back up. If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>4) Disagree proposed change Open road, but not many places where it is easy to pass. put in passing lanes or slow vehicle bays. If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Disagree proposed change Open road, but not many places where it is easy to pass. put in passing lanes or slow vehicle bays. If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>8) Disagree proposed change Open road, but not many places where it is easy to pass. put in passing lanes or slow vehicle bays. If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>9) Disagree proposed change Open road, but not many places where it is easy to pass. put in passing lanes or slow vehicle bays. If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>10) fine with new limit campers etc</p> <p>11) Disagree proposed change Open road, but not many places where it is easy to pass. put in passing lanes or slow vehicle bays. If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) Disagree proposed change If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>15) Disagree proposed change If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>16) Makes sense</p> <p>17) Disagree proposed change Open road, If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>18) Disagree proposed change If because of accidents, how many on this stretch? Were they speed related?</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
975	Individual submitter	<p>1) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>4) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>5) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>7) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>8) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>9) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>10) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>11) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>13) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road,</p>

		<p>because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>14) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>15) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>16) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>17) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>18) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p> <p>19) There is no problems with this stretch of road, why do we have to pander to the minority, if this crazy unthoughtout idea goes ahead, there will be more cars on the wrong side of the road, because of drivers becoming impatient, overtaking. You seem to forget , we have no Rail and a lot of truck movement 24/7, yea brilliant idea... Much safer ??</p>
976	Individual submitter	<p>1) With residential expansion this is speed seems justified</p> <p>4) The road can be comfortably driven at 100km/h without braking with no traffic, there is no need to lower the speed limit</p> <p>5) Dependant on residential properties this could be justified</p> <p>7) This stretch of road can also comfortably be driven at 100km/h with out braking dependant on traffic</p> <p>8) Yes to the 60km school zone but the rest is comfortable at 100km/h there is ample turning space into the Wakamarina Rd with wide shoulder</p> <p>9) Another stretch of rural road that is comfortable at 100km/h maybe a passing lane instead of lowering speed limit</p> <p>10) I agree with lowering the speed limit to 60 through Pelorus especially with the one laned bridge</p> <p>11) Apart from a few corners that could be straightened this road is comfortable at 100km/h</p> <p>13) Yes the Rai saddle is fine at 100km especially with the new roading that has been accomplished in the past 2years, the stretch from the bottom of the Rai (Nelson side) to Kokoroa Straight could be lowered to 80km</p> <p>14) Yes, this is my absolute favourite piece of road in the world and I've driven alot of NZ and Australian roads. If you have to drop it dont go lower than 80km. The road is safe if you know how to control a car</p> <p>15) Consider making the straight a passing lane instead</p> <p>16) This could be lowered to 60 with a 40 school zone</p> <p>17) Road is fine and safe to drive at 100kmh consider extending the bicycle track from Clifton Terrace School further out to Hira</p> <p>18) 80km is plenty slow enough and dont allow the turning bay at the proposed residential subdivision at the start of Wakapuaka Road</p> <p>19) Resigned to this one but a passing lane or double laned would be more efficient</p>
977	Individual submitter	<p>1) Great idea!</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) Just make it 60, variable zones are confusing.</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
978	Individual submitter	<p>1) it get's busy and people get easily distracted, so it is good to reduce speed</p> <p>4) Section is popular with cyclists, so good to reduce speed. 80km/h is much safer than 100 km/h but need to be enforced and supported by cycle and safety signs to explain to motorists why speed is recommended as it is. Keep hard shoulder wide and clear of rubbish and overgrowth for cyclists and general traffic safety.</p> <p>5) turn off to Q C Drive is difficult to make out coming rom south.</p> <p>7) Section is popular with cyclists, so good to reduce speed. 80km/h is much safer than 100 km/h but need to be enforced and supported by cycle and safety signs to explain to motorists why</p>

		<p>speed is recommended as it is. Keep hard shoulder wide and clear of rubbish and overgrowth for cyclists and general traffic safety.</p> <p>8) Section can be made popular with cyclists, so good to reduce speed. 80km/h is much safer than 100 km/h but need to be enforced and supported by cycle and safety signs to explain to motorists why speed is recommended as it is. Keep hard shoulder wide and clear of rubbish and overgrowth for cyclists and general traffic safety. Think about take over lanes to help enforcing limits and allow faster traffic to pass slow holiday maker and lodgries safely.</p> <p>9) see above</p> <p>10) pedestrian traffic</p> <p>11) ? suitable ovetake area with additoinla lane in stretches</p> <p>13) cyclists safty as above</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) cyclists safty as above</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) cyclists safty as above</p> <p>18) cyclists safty as above</p> <p>19) cyclists safty as above</p>
979	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight peice of road, how many trucks use it for freight to Nelson</p> <p>4) How many trucks use this price of road and what are the reasons for dropping the limit to 80</p> <p>5) Built up area and the surrounds are I have no problem with this proposed limit</p> <p>7) This is a flat peice of road with no passing lanes what are the reasons for dropping the limit to 80 causing frustration to freight and motorists</p> <p>8) School zone is important but why does the speed need to be at 80 ?</p> <p>9) Again what are the reasons for dropping the limit consider the trucks and the sensible drivers who can make a decision how to drive the road</p> <p>10) There are a lot of cars and tourists about this area</p> <p>11) Consider the thousands of locals who use this road daily weekly and know how make a sensible decision on what speed is appropriate for the conditions</p> <p>13) Consider the thousands of locals who use this road daily weekly and know how make a sensible decision on what speed is appropriate for the conditions</p> <p>14) Consider the thousands of locals who use this road daily weekly and know how make a sensible decision on what speed is appropriate for the conditions</p> <p>15) Consider the thousands of locals who use this road daily weekly and know how make a sensible decision on what speed is appropriate for the conditions how much extra cost will be incurred on freight between Nelson and picton/the North island</p> <p>16) No problem with this</p> <p>17) Consider the thousands of locals who use this road daily weekly and know how make a sensible decision on what speed is appropriate for the conditions and the freight trucks who use the road at 90km per hour.... this will cause disruption to freight</p> <p>18) What factors have been considered to make this reduction this is a smooth modern peice of road with passing lanes as an approach to Nelson andthere are very few driveways onto it just roads ... this will also affect freight and trucks and daily commuters</p> <p>19) What factors have been considered to make this reduction this is a smooth modern peice of road with passing lanes as an approach to Nelson andthere are very few driveways onto it just roads ... this will also affect freight and trucks and daily commuters</p>
980	TIL Freight	<p>To reinforce my views on the lowering of the speed limits a couple of points I would like put to you,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Would only increase the journey by nine minutes." This is incorrect has the avg. speed has now dropped by 20kmph it would now take at least 15mins extra, this could increase if you get stuck behind slower vehicles. Which brings me to my second point,</li> <li>2. Not enough passing lanes, it is a road used by many, travelling at slower speeds causes drivers to get frustrated and make poor overtaking decisions.</li> <li>3. There needs to better driver education about driving to their skills and conditions as thousands of people use this road every day without an issue.</li> <li>4. Lowering the speed would save deaths on the road but it would have an effect of more seriously injured people as the crashes would still happen, so a false economy as the tax payer would be paying more in the long run for on going medical issues. In saying that, no one wants to see any deaths on our roads just as no one wants any long term disabilities and health issues from a crash either.</li> <li>5. This appears to be the NZTA going with the cheapest option not the safest.</li> </ol>
981	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p>

		<p>8) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>9) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>10) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>11) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>13) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>14) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>15) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>18) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p> <p>19) There has been millions of vehicle movements over the period that you have reported and yet there there was 20? deaths so the percentage would be in the region of 0.000001% deaths per the road movements. Why Should the 999980 other vehicle movements be punished for poor decisions of 20 drivers. How many of drivers were affected by medical event, alcohol, drugs, or just wanted to end there lives. Therefore a speed reduction would not have in most cases any effect as they are already breaking the law.</p>
982	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) Ridiculous idea...road is safe at 100kms with no braking required whatsoever at that speed. i drive it everyday and trucks are safe at 90kms in this section.</p> <p>5) This is a good idea...the queen charlotte drive intersection has near misses at 70 kph.</p> <p>7) 100kph speed limit is appropriate.</p> <p>8) 100kph</p> <p>9) 100kph</p> <p>10) 100/60</p> <p>11) 100kph</p> <p>13) 100kph</p> <p>14) 100kph</p> <p>15) 100kph</p> <p>16) 80kph</p> <p>17) 100kph</p> <p>18) 80kph</p> <p>19) 100kph</p>
983	Individual submitter	<p>1) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower speeds as drivers will not be concentrating.</p> <p>4) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower speed limits as drivers will not concentrate on driving</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower limits as drivers will not concentrate on driving</p>

		<p>8) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower limits as drivers will not concentrate on driving</p> <p>9) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower limits as drivers will not concentrate on driving</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower limits as drivers will not concentrate on driving</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower limits as drivers will not concentrate on driving</p> <p>15) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower limits as drivers will not concentrate on driving</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Given only approx 11% of accidents occur over the speed limit, the chances of more accidents happening are likely to be greater at lower limits as drivers will not concentrate on driving</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
984	Individual submitter	<p>1) OK</p> <p>4) I see no need to reduce the speed limit on this section</p> <p>5) ok</p> <p>7) Consider 90?</p> <p>8) ok</p> <p>9) Consider 90?</p> <p>10) ok</p> <p>11) Consider 90?</p> <p>13) Consider 90?</p> <p>14) ok</p> <p>15) ok</p> <p>16) ok</p> <p>17) ok</p> <p>18) ok</p> <p>19) ok</p>
985	Steele contractors	<p>1) Leave it as it is</p> <p>4) Leave it as it is</p> <p>5) Don't reduce the speed limit</p> <p>7) Leave it as it is</p> <p>8) Leave it as is</p> <p>9) Leave it as it is</p> <p>10) Leave it as it is</p> <p>11) Leave it as it is</p> <p>13) Leave it as it is</p> <p>14) Leafed it as it is</p> <p>15) Leave it as it is</p> <p>16) Leave it as it is</p> <p>17) Leave it as it is</p> <p>18) Leave it as it is</p> <p>19) Leave it as it is</p>
986	Individual submitter	<p>1) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>4) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>8) OK to vary school zone. Other suggestion is Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>9) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p>

		<p>13) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>14) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>15) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Stupid idea will be very frustrating to drivers. Will most likely be COUNTER PRODUCTIVE &amp; deliver opposite intended aim. ie I suggest drivers will adopt more risky driving behaviour</p> <p>18) OK</p> <p>19) Excellent idea. Area is notorious for "tailgating" in this increasingly built up area.</p>
987	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave at 100kms</p> <p>4) Leave at 100 kms</p> <p>5) Leave at 70 kms</p> <p>7) Leave at 100kms</p> <p>8) Leave at 100 kms</p> <p>9) Leave at 100 kms</p> <p>10) Keep existing</p> <p>11) Keep existing</p> <p>13) Keep existing</p> <p>14) Keep existing</p> <p>15) Keep existing</p> <p>16) Keep existing</p> <p>17) Keep existing</p> <p>18) Keep existing</p> <p>19) Keep existing</p>
988	Individual submitter	<p>1) At the moment there's no enough police on the roads to pull over slow drivers that continue to block the flow of traffic fix that first</p> <p>4) This will encourage damage to signage for the speed limits If these aren't readable what what is the speed then</p> <p>5) You travel to the road conditions on the day and the road uses will decide that not the national body that don't live there Safety first Stop spending money on silly stuff an improvement of the road would be money well spent</p> <p>7) Leave at 100km</p> <p>8) Leave the Existing 100km</p> <p>9) 100 km is great</p> <p>10) 100km great</p> <p>11) 100 km great</p> <p>13) 100 km great</p> <p>14) 100 km great</p> <p>15) 100 km great</p> <p>16) Close the school It's so close to Nelson and why should a school be on a state highway Bloody silly</p> <p>17) 100 km great</p> <p>18) 80 km great</p> <p>19) 100 km great</p>
989	Individual submitter	<p>1) Waste of money and time.</p> <p>4) Waste of money and time</p> <p>5) Waste of money and time</p> <p>7) Waste of money and time</p> <p>8) Good for school zone</p> <p>9) Waste of time and money. Won't solve anything</p> <p>10) Busy tourist section. May benift</p> <p>11) Won't achieve anything</p> <p>13) Waste of time and money</p> <p>14) Waste of money and time</p> <p>15) Waste of money and time</p> <p>16) Waste of money and time</p>

		<p>17) Waste of money and time</p> <p>18) Waste of money and time</p> <p>19) Waste of money and money. This is my neighbourhood and it's not necessary to make the change.</p>
990	Individual submitter	Please no speed limit change, traffic moves slowly enough as it is,, maybe a few more passing lanes could help..
991	Individual submitter	<p>1) unnecessary - bad idea For this whole survey this will only increase driver frustration and increase the risk of accidents. Slower drivers need to be encouraged' to pull over to let the queue behind them pass. Some of the sections would be safe to drive at more than 100km/h. If you reduce in some areas look to increase in others.</p> <p>4) Very bad idea</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) very bad idea - unnecessary</p> <p>8) unnecessary - bad idea</p> <p>9) unnecessary - bad idea</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) unnecessary - bad idea</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) unnecessary - bad idea</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) unnecessary - bad idea</p> <p>18) unnecessary - bad idea</p> <p>19) unnecessary - bad idea</p>
992	Individual submitter	<p>1) No keep it 100</p> <p>4) No keep it at 100</p> <p>5) Keep at 70</p> <p>7) Keep at 100</p> <p>8) Keep at 100 and 60 at school zone</p> <p>9) Keep at 100</p> <p>10) Keep at 100</p> <p>11) Keep at 100</p> <p>13) Keep at 100</p> <p>14) Keep T100</p> <p>15) Keep at100</p> <p>16) Up to 100</p> <p>17) Keep at 100</p> <p>18) Up to 100</p> <p>19) Keep at100</p>
993	Individual submitter	<p>I would like to strongly object to any proposal to reduce speed limits between Nelson and Blenheim to 80km/hr. This is totally unnecessary.</p> <p>My preferred options are-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Invest in more passing and slow vehicles lanes, especially between Nelson and Rai Valley.</li> <li>2. Better enforcement of road rules targeting slow drivers and heavy vehicles that travel above 90km/hr and drivers that refuse to allow other vehicles to pass safely.</li> <li>3. More emphasis on driver training and defensive driving courses for learner drivers and drivers that continually break the rules or have been involved in accidents. Fines don't work.</li> <li>4. Improvements to the road surface, widening of shoulders and installation of safety barriers on the hill sections ie: Rai Saddle (on the Rai Valley side) and the Whangamoas (on the Nelson side).</li> </ol>
994	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it at 100km/hr</p> <p>4) Leave it at 100km/hr</p> <p>5) Leave it at 70km/hr</p> <p>7) Leave it at 100km/hr</p> <p>8) Ok</p> <p>9) Leave it at 100km/hr</p> <p>10) Ok</p> <p>11) Leave it at 100km/hr</p>

		<p>13) Leave it at 100km/hr  14) Leave it at 100km/hr  15) Leave it at 100km/hr  16) Ok  17) Leave it at 100km/hr  18) Leave it at 80km/hr  19) Ok</p>
995	Individual submitter	<p>1) Agree with a proposed speed limit of 80km/h in this section of road due to volume of traffic early morning and after COB in the afternoon. 1.Propose a double center line from Blenheim to Nelson to increase separation of vehicles 2. Cycle lane not fit for purpose on this section of road  4) I have been driving for 53years cars,trucks and travel the road to Nelson from Blenheim 3/4 times a week, my comments in this are base on my observations travelling this road many times. 1. Agree Renwick Transport owners and school principles comments on delays, limiting flow of traffic by lowering the speed limits. 1. Dont agree with lowering speed limit. 2. By lowering the speed limit to 80km/h cars cannot overtake Trucks travelling 80km/h without exceeding the speed limit. If you think trucks are going to slow from 80km/h to allow other vehicles to pass you are dreaming. 3. My observations are with lowering the speed limit so all vehicles travel at 80km/h the first opportunity to pass a truck when without exceeding the 80km/h limit when it leaves blenheim will be when it climbs the Rai valley saddle. 4. Any new passing lanes built on this or any flat section of road when trucks and other vehicles are all travelling at the new 80m/h speed limit will be useless. Cars wanting to overtake trucks will have to exceed 80km/h and will get a speeding ticket. Trucks will only slow down and allow cars to pass when they dramatically slow when going up a hill. 5. In my experience travelling on other NZ roads where the speed limit is the same for all vehicles, people get really impatient, frustrated, make up for having to travel slower that the trucks start fiddling with their cellphones become inattentive and normal people make bad decisions.  5) Agree with this proposal  7) I'm getting annoyed at repeated statement"are there any other factors that we should consider when making our decision" It sounds like you have already made your mind up or am I filling out the wrong form. 1. I do not agree with lowering the speed limit for the entire Blenheim to Nelson road. 2. Most people I come across in the entire trip to Nelson that cause issues are drivers of vehicles (cars/Cars towing trailers) travelling at 60/70km/h who refuse to pull over and let faster traffic pass. Even at 80km/h these vehicles cannot sustain the same average speed as a competent driver of a car. This whole proposal to lower the speed limit for the entire road will totally frustrate people driving cars that can sustain a higher average speed without risk to other road users.  8) Keep speed at 100km/h 1. Only lower speed limit past the school, but change the sign to a "flashing" one like outside Fairhall school, these are more visable, if you proceed to drop the speed limit to 80km/h because there will be longer lines of cars/trucks and even travelling at the recommended distance behind a truck at 80km/h any other sign other than the flashing one will no be visable to most drivers. 2. Repeat my earlier suggestion of a double center line for the entire State Highway.  9) Keep existing speed of 100km but build a passing lane so cars traveling at 100km/h can pass trucks traveling at 90km/h. 1. double centre line  10) Agree with proposed speed limit of 60 for this section of road.  11) Retain 100km/h speed limit 1. double center line  13) Keep existing speed limit 1. Change diagonal lines on new road on Nelson side of saddle to passing lane. My experience Tourists, some elderly drivers dont know what the diagonal lines mean.  14) No lower to 80km/h not 60  15) No lower to 80km/h not 60  16) Keep existing speed. Lower speed past school, but invest in speed zone sign that flashes like the one outside Fairhall school  17) Retain existing 100km/h speed limit  18) Keep at 80km/h  19) lower to 80km/h</p>
996	Individual submitter	<p>1) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  4) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  5) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  7) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  8) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  9) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  10) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  11) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  13) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  14) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  15) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  16) positive idea  17) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  18) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact  19) this will have a low impact on road safety . maintenance will have a greater impact</p>

997	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The lack of need to reduce speed limit</li> <li>4) No need to reduce speed, it is safe</li> <li>5) No need to change at all it is safe</li> <li>7) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>8) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>9) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>10) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>11) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>13) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>14) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>15) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>16) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>17) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>18) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> <li>19) Lack of need to reduce speed. It is safe currently</li> </ul>
998	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Long straight road often with little traffic. I would support maintaining present 100kph limit.</li> <li>4) I would support maintaining present 100kph limit.</li> <li>5) If there is evidence of accidents in this stretch, reduction of speed to 50kph could be justified</li> <li>7) I would support maintaining present 100kph limit.</li> <li>8) I would support maintaining present 100kph limit.</li> <li>9) I would support maintaining present 100kph limit.</li> <li>10) I support the lower speed limit given the one-lane bridge</li> <li>11) I would support maintaining present 100kph limit.</li> <li>13) I support a lower limit (80kph here) over the whole Whangamoia saddle.</li> <li>14) I support a lower limit (60kph here) over the whole Whangamoia saddle.</li> <li>15) I support the reduction to 80kph in this area</li> <li>16) I support 80kph in this area</li> <li>17) I would support maintaining present 100kph limit.</li> <li>18) I support maintaining 80kph in this area</li> <li>19) I support a reduction to 80kph in this area</li> </ul>
999	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is not required keep it at 100</li> <li>4) Do not change it</li> <li>5) Probably a good idea to keep all speed limits in built areas the same 50 is good</li> <li>7) Don't do it</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> <li>9) Don't do it</li> <li>10) Don't do it</li> <li>11) Don't do it</li> <li>13) Don't do it</li> <li>14) Don't do it</li> <li>15) Don't do it</li> <li>16) When school is in then all good</li> <li>17) Don't do it</li> <li>18) Don't do it</li> <li>19) Don't do it</li> </ul>
1000	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) good move</li> <li>4) good move</li> <li>5) good move</li> <li>7) good move</li> <li>8) good move</li> </ul>

		<p>9) good move  10) good move  11) good move  13) good move  14) good move  15) good move  16) good move  17) good move  18) good move  19) good move</p>
1001	Individual submitter	<p>1) Disagree  4) disagree 100km  5) Agree  7) Disagree 100km/h  8) Disagree 100km/h with variable school zone  9) 100km/h  10) Agree  11) 100km/h  13) 100km/h  14) 80km/h  15) 100km/h  16) agree  17) 100km/h  18) agree  19) Agree</p>
1002	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes let adults be adults and stop trying to force a nanny state  4) Yes it is a good road, stop letting the actions of a few control the many  5) No this is a good idea  7) Leave it at 100 as a normal driver will adjust to the conditions  8) Good idea for the variable speed limit  9) Leave it at 100 as a normal driver will adjust to the conditions  10) Good idea  11) No leave it at 100 as a normal driver will adjust to the conditions  13) Keep it at 100  14) Keep it at 100  15) Keep it at 100  16) Good idea  17) Keep it at 100  18) Keep it at 80  19) Keep it at 100</p>
1003	Individual submitter	<p>This email is to vehemently disagree with the proposal of changing the speed limit on the highway from Blenheim to Nelson from 100 kms to 80 kms. I travel from Koromiko to Nelson and back twice a week and sometimes three times, it is quite safe to travel at a 100 kms an hour to you get to the Pelorous bridge, the windy bits after the bridge could go to 60 kms, then back to a 100kms to Rai valley From the bottom of the Rai saddle to the top could be 60 kms..From the top of the Whangamoas to the bottom to Hira could be 60 kms. I also believe it would be a much safer road &amp; cause much less frustration if some passing lanes were put in between Rapara road &amp; Havelock. I will also send in a written submission as well.</p>
1004	Individual submitter	<p>This is a more detailed report on why i am totally opposed to lowering the open road speed limit from 100 kms to 80 kms although i have some areas where the limit could be changed. I drive to Nelson and back at least twice a week sometimes three, taking a dialysis patient to Nelson hospital and have been doing this trip for six years and i find at least ninety percent of this road can be driven safely and very comfortably at 100 kms. If the speed limit is lowered to 80 kms you will have no speed differential between the many trucks ,campervans, cars towing caravans and boat trailers plus the many freedom campers which is going to cause extremely long lines of traffic especially in the warmer months and that in turn will cause much frustration to drivers which in turn will cause drivers to take extreme risks causing more accidents. One thing which is needed on that road between Blenheim and Havelock is passing lanes as there is not one. Here are some ideas on where i think the speed limits could be changed. From Pelorous bridge the speed could be 70 kms for 1.8 kms then back to 100 kms. From Rai valley for 1.2 kms down to 70 kms. From the</p>

		bottom of Rai saddle on the Blenheim side down to 70 kms to the passing lanes then to 90 kms to the bottom of the saddle, then to 80 kms for 1.9 kms then 60 kms for 1.4 kms, and to make the road safer for some drivers the speed limit could be lowered to 90 kms to after the passing lanes then down to 80 kms to you get to the top of the Whangamoas then down to 60 kms to the bottom of the Whangamoas.
1005	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>8) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>9) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>13) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>14) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>15) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>18) Speed is not the main factor in accidents. Poor decision making and bad technique is. Slowing the speed limit down will only further frustrate drivers where too many people are already driving well below the speed limit and frustrating drivers. I drive on this road often and have dobbed in drivers for driving at 30km/h below the current speed limit. This will only get worse.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
1006	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
1007	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep speed at 100km hr. It would create huge bottlenecks and dangerous passing as people get impatient. People drive 80ks now which slows traffic.</p> <p>4) Keep speed at 100kms, the road has been worked on, Rai has been widened and straightened.</p> <p>5) Current limit fine</p> <p>7) Keep current limit, too long for passing manoeuvres when traffic builds around 80ks</p> <p>8) Current speed limit efficient</p> <p>9) There are lots of slow vehicle bays and pullover places, speed limit remain the current 100kms</p> <p>10) The road does not justify a reduction in speed.</p>

		<p>11) No</p> <p>13) There are pullover bays. Unfortunately people do not read these and create traffic build up. This would be worse with a speed reduction.</p> <p>14) Whangamoia has been realigned and adequate slow bays are available. Speed should not change</p> <p>15) There already has been a speed reduction before Atawhai</p> <p>16) Keep it the same</p> <p>17) Road has been adequately widened and contoured, keep the same limit</p> <p>18) Keep it at 80km</p> <p>19) People apparently think this is already 80km and regularly do this speed</p>
1008	Individual submitter	<p>1) Unnecessary change</p> <p>4) There is no need for this</p> <p>5) No need for this</p> <p>7) Ridiculous - there is nothing wrong with this road to reduce the speed</p> <p>8) It is a safe road and should not have the speed reduced</p> <p>9) Do not do this</p> <p>10) It works well as it is</p> <p>11) Not needed</p> <p>13) This road has been substantially upgraded and works well - no change to speed needed</p> <p>14) This road has been substantially upgraded and works well - no change to speed needed</p> <p>15) This road has been substantially upgraded and works well - no change to speed needed</p> <p>16) Acceptable change for opening and closing of school</p> <p>17) This road has been substantially upgraded and works well - no change to speed needed</p> <p>18) This road has been substantially upgraded and works well - no change to speed needed</p> <p>19) This road has been substantially upgraded and works well - no change to speed needed</p>
1009	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is an excellent idea, as even on the relatively “easy” piece of road one can end up behind a slow-moving vehicle (truck to/from ferry, campervan to/from ferry) so travelling at 100kph isn’t an option. Reducing speed limit will reduce impatience and bad passing decisions by drivers.</p> <p>4) See above</p> <p>5) Definitely a good idea. Even 70kph was fast on this section of road.</p> <p>7) See above. Due to lovely estuary scenery—a driver distraction—changing to a lower speed limit is a sensible, safe change.</p> <p>8) See above</p> <p>9) See above</p> <p>10) See above</p> <p>11) See above</p> <p>13) See aboveexcellent idea given many</p> <p>14) Excellent idea, given the increased number of dwellings and therefore vehicular traffic in this section of road</p> <p>15) See 12</p> <p>16) See 12</p> <p>17) See 12</p> <p>18) See 12</p> <p>19) See 12</p>
1010	Individual submitter	<p>1) I do not support this proposed change in speed limit</p> <p>4) I do not support this proposed change in speed limit.</p> <p>5) I have no strong feelings about this proposed change.</p> <p>7) I do not support this proposed change in speed limit.</p> <p>8) I do not support this proposed speed limit change except in the school zone.</p> <p>9) I do not support the proposed change in speed limit.</p> <p>10) I have no strong feeling here. I only do this proposed speed in this area without needing to be told.</p> <p>11) I do not support this proposed change in speed limit.</p> <p>13) I do not support this proposed change in speed limit.</p> <p>14) I do not support this proposed change in speed limit.</p> <p>15) I do not support this proposed change in speed limit.</p>

		<p>16) Seems obvious if there is a school involved.</p> <p>17) I do not support the proposed change in speed limit.</p> <p>18) I do not support the proposed change in speed limit</p> <p>19) I do support this change. I find I only do 80 in this area anyway.</p>
1011	Individual submitter	<p>1) Cyclists having an adequate `shoulder ' along the route</p> <p>4) Cyclists having an adequate `shoulder' all along the route</p> <p>5) Cyclists, especially cycle tourists from all over the world as well as NZ, need an adequate `shoulder'</p> <p>7) Cyclists having an adequate `shoulder' all along the route. This is a main cycling route for cycle tourists.</p> <p>8) Again - providing an adequate shoulder for cycle tourists</p> <p>9) That this is a major route for cycle tourists and they need an adequate `shoulder'</p> <p>10) That it's a major route for cycle tourists and they need an adequate `shoulder'</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) That it's a major route for cycle tourists, and they need an adequate safe `shoulder'</p> <p>14) Cycle tourists! This is a terrible stretch of road for cyclists, and is the route that is used by 99% of them Picton - Nelson. There is absolutely NO shoulder in places for cyclists, and the long buses, logging trucks etc often nearly swipe the cyclists as they pass. We have been able to touch these vehicles as they pass, and we've been sandwiched between a rock wall and the vehicle. It's extremely dangerous, but there's no viable alternative. Even a 40-50km speed limit would help.</p> <p>15) Cyclists</p> <p>16) Cyclists</p> <p>17) Cyclists</p> <p>18) Cyclists and children, and residential driveways giving directly on to the highway</p> <p>19) Cyclists, children</p>
1012	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave as is</p> <p>4) Leave as is</p> <p>5) That's ok to change</p> <p>7) Leave as is</p> <p>8) Variable school zone is ok but the rest of the road should be left at 100</p> <p>9) Leave as is</p> <p>10) Speed limit 60 ok</p> <p>11) Leave as is</p> <p>13) Leave as is</p> <p>14) Leave as is</p> <p>15) Leave as us</p> <p>16) This proposal is fine</p> <p>17) Leave at 100</p> <p>18) Leave at 80</p> <p>19) Leave as is</p>
1013	Individual submitter	<p>1) No</p> <p>4) This road is not too bad, I've never seen any accidents along this stretch so why change it?</p> <p>5) No</p> <p>7) This road stretch is quite good, leave as is</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) this road is great, why are you trying to make it bad?</p> <p>18) Leave it alone! road is good</p>

		19) Are you trying to make this a traffic jam as well as Rocks Road? It's not only the speed that makes accidents happen it's the actual road between Nelson and Blenheim. Should never have been built on the hills, should have been put through the valleys to come out at Richmond.
1014	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a good change as there are some busy intersections in this stretch</p> <p>4) The existing limit is fine. A safer option would be to install passing lanes to allow for safer passing - slow drivers who slow for the corners &amp; speed on the straights are usually the biggest danger on this stretch.</p> <p>5) The existing limit is fine - the road is wide, and the speed changes to 50 well before the school</p> <p>7) No need for speed change - this road is open and flowing. Passing lanes or slow pull over bays would be good - also signs to say check your mirrors to allow vehicles behind you to pass</p> <p>8) This is a good change for the variable zone, but keep it as 100 varying to 60</p> <p>9) Existing speed is fine, maybe change to 80 from 100 a bit sooner, then 60 through the actual bridge</p> <p>10) This is a good change - this is a busy area especially in summer, and low visibility on the bridge</p> <p>11) There is no need to change the speed here, the road is open and well formed. Passing lanes or slow vehicle pull over bays would be good though.</p> <p>13) This is fine - more passing lanes or slow vehicle pull over bays would be good.</p> <p>14) 80km/h would be a better limit through here, and pull over areas &amp; passing lanes. If the slow vehicle bays are better sign posted &amp; more signs to say check your mirrors for following cars then this would help</p> <p>15) The 80km/h zone should extend past cable bay road, then 100 is fine after that. the passing lanes are good.</p> <p>16) The school zone limit is a great idea</p> <p>17) No need for change</p> <p>18) 80 is fine, no need to lower further</p> <p>19) This could be a good thing as the road is starting to get busier here.</p>
1015	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) I live at Atawhai Drive which lies between Bay View Road and Malvern Avenue. Across the road from this address there has been a fatality and I am very passionate about the speed restrictions. I believe the speed restriction of 60kmph should continue from Atawhai Crescent to Malvern Ave because: 1. A lot of traffic comes down the hills in the mornings particularly, while school buses pull up and cyclist cross the pathway. Trying to get out on my drive is a serious hazard. Pulling out behind the bus into 100kmph traffic which does not slow down, finding enough space with speeding vehicles feels life threatening. Cars ram up the back of my vehicle, even though I am putting my foot down hard to make sure I do not inconvenience any body. More sections are being made available up these hills, the road needs to be considered as a suburban street! 2. Outside my address is a bus stop, in the morning multiple school buses stop, I have not yet seen a car, truck or van slow to 20kmph to pass this bus in the morning, they scream past at 100kmph. Surely this is a hazard! 3. I have seen so many near misses, especially when the bus indicates to pull left to collect a passenger and the car or van on Bay View road thinks the indication is to go up Bay View Road and they pull out in front of a full bus. The sheer stress of getting over the road from Bay View Road into 100kmph traffic seems to prevent the driver noticing it is a bus pulling up on Atawhai Drive. 4. On the left hand side of the road pulling into my driveway is also stressful with cars screaming up behind me, confusion lies when cars come off the dual carriage-way and pull to the middle of the road behind me, expecting I am going up BayView as I indicate right and I have almost been rear ended twice. Should this happen I would be sent straight into 100kmph traffic. No mercy! These are just a few person comments and experiences, please take our safety serious and slow this traffic down from Atawhai Cres to just past Malvern Ave where there are no residential driveways and the speed could increase to 70kmph.</p>
1016	Wairau Hospital	<p>1. Haveloch township should have a speed restriction of 30km - trucks and cars travelling at 50km through this built up area is very dangerous. 2. I travel from Nelson to Blenheim and return weekly and would encourage you to consider the risk the very slow drivers put on other drivers. I am opposed to the reduction on the current 100km you will make it more frustrating for the regular drivers who are safe drivers. The slow traffic as I see on a regular basis will not give any opportunity for the regular drivers to pass. For example it is not uncommon to see 3 campervans following each other closely and 15 vehicles behind of which I was one. These slow drivers never pull over into the slow lanes which is designed for these drivers. I find truck drivers are most courteous of all but have never had a campervan pull over. Need more signs like on the way to Murchison or worse to that effect. 3. The massive roading spend on the Rai Saddle to address one tight corner is ridiculous and was safe before. The road surface broke up soon after the project was completed causing more broken windscreens. 4 I have witnessed huge squads of road workers</p>

		when the resealing occurs and then leave with speed restrictions of 50km when the road is still covered in loose chip. The road surface should be cleaned up properly, this is a situation when the speed should be 30km until the road surface is safe. 5. On the whole I witness good driving on the Nelson to Blenheim route as it is, just made worse by campervans, so it would be most unfair to penalise the general population of road users. I would debate the time differences you have pointed out, slow drivers have cost me 12-15 minutes and I stay within the speed limit.
1017	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. More passing bays/slow bays would help. The speed limit is a limit; essentially says it is never safe to drive above this speed. It is up to the driver to drive to the conditions. Setting the limit too low risks drivers flouting the law. Cars are better designed these days to handle road conditions and keep people safe in accidents. Focus on education, better enforcement, road improvement including passing bays.</p> <p>5) Seems too low</p> <p>7) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. More passing bays/slow bays would help. The speed limit is a limit; essentially says it is never safe to drive above this speed. It is up to the driver to drive to the conditions. Setting the limit too low risks drivers flouting the law. Cars are better designed these days to handle road conditions and keep people safe in accidents. Focus on education, better enforcement, road improvement including passing bays.</p> <p>8) Variable school zone is a good idea.</p> <p>9) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. More passing bays/slow bays would help. The speed limit is a limit; essentially says it is never safe to drive above this speed. It is up to the driver to drive to the conditions. Setting the limit too low risks drivers flouting the law. Cars are better designed these days to handle road conditions and keep people safe in accidents. Focus on education, better enforcement, road improvement including passing bays.</p> <p>10) ok</p> <p>11) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. More passing bays/slow bays would help. The speed limit is a limit; essentially says it is never safe to drive above this speed. It is up to the driver to drive to the conditions. Setting the limit too low risks drivers flouting the law. Cars are better designed these days to handle road conditions and keep people safe in accidents. Focus on education, better enforcement, road improvement including passing bays.</p> <p>13) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. More passing bays/slow bays would help. The speed limit is a limit; essentially says it is never safe to drive above this speed. It is up to the driver to drive to the conditions. Setting the limit too low risks drivers flouting the law. Cars are better designed these days to handle road conditions and keep people safe in accidents. Focus on education, better enforcement, road improvement including passing bays.</p> <p>14) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. More passing bays/slow bays would help. The speed limit is a limit; essentially says it is never safe to drive above this speed. It is up to the driver to drive to the conditions. Setting the limit too low risks drivers flouting the law. Cars are better designed these days to handle road conditions and keep people safe in accidents. Focus on education, better enforcement, road improvement including passing bays. Make it 80km/h</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) Totally disagree as this stretch of road is suitable/safe for 100km/h travel. More passing bays/slow bays would help. The speed limit is a limit; essentially says it is never safe to drive above this speed. It is up to the driver to drive to the conditions. Setting the limit too low risks drivers flouting the law. Cars are better designed these days to handle road conditions and keep people safe in accidents. Focus on education, better enforcement, road improvement including passing bays.</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
1018	Individual submitter	<p>I use this road at least once a week. What we have heard is misleading when you say "people told us they had concerns about the number of crashes and the current speed limits". People could be two or three and such numbers could be found for any or very road in NZ and thus cannot be legitimately used on your argument.</p> <p>Numbers 1,2 and 3 I favour your proposal.</p> <p>Number 4 - I am not dead against this. There are so many parts, perhaps all, of this section that an 80km would put drivers to sleep. There are adequate yellow-no passing lines to assist decisions.</p> <p>Number 5 - not sure the reasoning behind this. Even in mid-summer, it is not a busy turn off. Number 6 - Happy with this.</p> <p>Number 7 - A lovely stretch of road with lots of safe passing opportunities and should remain at 100km.</p> <p>Number 8 - A school zone - I'm happy with 80km.</p>
1019	Individual submitter	<p>1) Definitely lower it</p> <p>4) Definitely lower it</p> <p>5) Lower the limits</p> <p>7) Lower it</p> <p>8) Lower it</p> <p>9) Do it</p> <p>10) Sure</p> <p>11) Do it</p> <p>13) Do it</p> <p>14) Lower it to 80</p>

		<p>15) Do it</p> <p>16) School zone should be 60</p> <p>17) Do it</p> <p>18) Do it</p> <p>19) Do it</p>
1020	Havelock School	<p>1) The overall time it will take for people to get from Nelson to Blenheim and vice versa will be greatly affected by the proposed changes. Not only for working people who regularly commute back and forth, but also courier companies working in the top of the south. Prices are likely to increase because time taken will increase. Also, workers who are paid travel allowances will be expected to pay their workers more. This puts more people under stress and pressure.</p> <p>4) The overall time it will take for people to get from Nelson to Blenheim and vice versa will be greatly affected by the proposed changes. Not only for working people who regularly commute back and forth, but also courier companies working in the top of the south. Prices are likely to increase because time taken will increase. Also, workers who are paid travel allowances will be expected to pay their workers more. This puts more people under stress and pressure.</p> <p>5) As a worker in Havelock, I have not known there to be many if any traffic incidents in that 70km stretch of road. I have however noted numerous incidents where vehicles travelling in the 50km stretch in front of the school before Lawrence St have smashed into the traffic island. This shows that a reduced speed limit hasn't helped careless drivers.</p> <p>7) The overall time it will take for people to get from Nelson to Blenheim (or Rai Valley to Havelock) and vice versa will be greatly affected by the proposed changes. Not only for working people who regularly commute back and forth, but also courier companies working in the top of the south. Prices are likely to increase because time taken will increase. Also, workers who are paid travel allowances will be expected to pay their workers more. This puts more people under stress and pressure. Majority of people who travel these roads know them well and are not the people crashing. Having been a member of the fire brigade in the past it has often been foreigners and/or young inexperienced drivers who take risks by overtaking that are causing the issues. More passing lanes would be the better option.</p> <p>8) This area could certainly do with a reduction in speed limit due to the proximity of the school.</p> <p>9) The overall time it will take for people to get from Nelson to Blenheim (or Rai Valley to Havelock) and vice versa will be greatly affected by the proposed changes. Not only for working people who regularly commute back and forth, but also courier companies working in the top of the south. Prices are likely to increase because time taken will increase. Also, workers who are paid travel allowances will be expected to pay their workers more. This puts more people under stress and pressure. Majority of people who travel these roads know them well and are not the people crashing. Having been a member of the fire brigade in the past it has often been foreigners and/or young inexperienced drivers who take risks by overtaking that are causing the issues. More passing lanes would be the better option. I ride my horses along this stretch of road and find it is a safe enough stretch of road to continue to be 100km/h. During Summer speed restrictions are put in place at Pelorus Bridge as it gets very busy. I see no problem with this reduced speed limit being seasonal.</p> <p>10) During Summer speed restrictions are put in place at Pelorus Bridge as it gets very busy. I see no problem with this reduced speed limit being seasonal.</p> <p>11) The overall time it will take for people to get from Nelson to Blenheim (or Rai Valley to Havelock) and vice versa will be greatly affected by the proposed changes. Not only for working people who regularly commute back and forth, but also courier companies working in the top of the south. Prices are likely to increase because time taken will increase. Also, workers who are paid travel allowances will be expected to pay their workers more. This puts more people under stress and pressure. Majority of people who travel these roads know them well and are not the people crashing. Having been a member of the fire brigade in the past it has often been foreigners and/or young inexperienced drivers who take risks by overtaking that are causing the issues. Once again, more passing lanes would be the better option.</p> <p>13) The overall time it will take for people to get from Nelson to Blenheim and vice versa will be greatly affected by the proposed changes. Not only for working people who regularly commute back and forth, but also courier companies working in the top of the south. Prices are likely to increase because time taken will increase. Also, workers who are paid travel allowances will be expected to pay their workers more. This puts more people under stress and pressure. Majority of people who travel these roads know them well and are not the people crashing. Having been a member of the fire brigade in the past it has often been foreigners and/or young inexperienced drivers who take risks by overtaking that are causing the issues. Once again, more passing lanes would be the better option. Another significant factor for those of us who live in rural areas is that the impact this will have on housing market as the time taken to get to Nelson (our nearest town) will significantly increase and therefore make purchasing a home in Rai Valley less viable. Our community is slowly growing as more people realise that the commute from Rai Valley to Nelson is not that significant when you're familiar with the road, therefore we are seeing more and more people seeking a rural lifestyle with the advantage of working in Nelson. This is likely to decline and affect us rural people greatly. Emergency services will also be affected by reduced speed limits. This is yet another impact for use rural people.</p> <p>14) This piece of road has had significant money spent on it adding barriers to almost the entire side of the hill. This had a positive impact on keeping the road safer, but still there will be people who don't drive sensibly and cause accidents. These are also the same people who don't abide by road rules anyway, so I don't see that reducing the speed limit will help them at all.</p> <p>15) The overall time it will take for people to get from Nelson to Blenheim and vice versa will be greatly affected by the proposed changes. Not only for working people who regularly commute back and forth, but also courier companies working in the top of the south. Prices are likely to increase because time taken will increase. Also, workers who are paid travel allowances will be expected to pay their workers more. This puts more people under stress and pressure. Majority of people who travel these roads know them well and are not the people crashing. Once again, more passing lanes would be the better option.</p> <p>16) This is a suitable speed given there is a school there, a variable school zone would make sense too.</p> <p>17) Why? This is a good piece of road.</p> <p>18) If this is the piece by Clifton School, the school is back from the road anyway so 80km/h is suitable.</p> <p>19) Why? This is a good piece of road.</p>

1021	Individual submitter	<p>1) Sounds good.  4) Nope  5) Sounds good  7) Great  8) Good  9) Great  10) Great  11) Great  13) Yes  14) Yes  15) Yes  16) Good  17) Yes  18) Yes ... slow down all the way into Nelson  19) Perfect</p>
1022	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) Cable bay intersection dangerous so should be 80 but after that heading into nelson needs to be 100. Its not the speed its the drivers, lack of concentration, slow speeds lets the mind wonder.  18) Keep at 80, the flow of traffic into nelson needs to keep going, drivers will get frustrated  19) Same again, keep at 100. Driver's need to concentrate. Driving is a huge responsibility, if not done properly it can cause death.</p>
1023	Individual submitter	<p>1) agree  4) agree  5) agree  7) agree  8) agree  9) agree  10) agree  11) agree  13) agree  14) agree  15) agree  16) agree  17) agree  18) agree  19) agree</p>
1024	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight road connecting the airport to town, instead of making it 80km, how about just adding an extra lane each way from round about at westwood drive to west of the airport. This way it would improve traffic flow and keep the traffic moving at a decent speed.  4) there is no need to make the road 80km, a few small changes to the road is all that is needed, a passing lane or 2 each way. Around the Kaituna valley, the road should be either straightened or more level so you can overtake if required and still being able to see a safe distance ahead. The straight from Douslins Gully Road towards Havelock needs the rise taken down so it is flat and you can see along the whole straight, ideal position for a passing lane in both directions.</p>

		<p>5) This makes sense being a residential area, no problem here.</p> <p>7) No need to reduce the speed limit, this section of the road is fine except for the bridge/corner over Racecourse Creek just east of Canvastown, the camber on this corner is wrong and makes it difficult for drivers that do not know the road.</p> <p>8) This should stay at 100km but needs the 60km variable school zone.</p> <p>9) This should stay at 100km however the road alongside the pelorus river needs to be straightened or more larger gentle curves with better sight lines so overtaking is possible if required.</p> <p>10) This should be 80km with a variable zone so that in the summer when the area is busy with holiday makers it can be lowered to 50km or 60km.</p> <p>11) No need to lower the limit, it needs to stay at 100km, the area of road from Bulford Road to Hills Road needs realignment, this is a narrow winding road than needs to be straightened and widened.</p> <p>13) This should be left at 100km however a lot of modification needed to the road, from the bottom of the Rai saddle (South bound passing lane) to the base of the whangamoia (Southwest bound passing lane uphill) needs to be straightened and at least 1 passing lane either way to be added. the road is also very narrow so needs to be widened, there is a lot of places on this section of road that simply cutting back the hill and straightening the road or making it more gentle curves would result in a safer road.</p> <p>14) This should be left at 100km however the West side of the Whangamoia needs a major realignment. This whole west side of the hill is narrow and winding with no areas for slow vehicles, trucks etc to let traffic past without them losing their speed and having to start again. The Eastern side of the whangamoia is great, the Western side needs to be like this and with decent length slow vehicle bays so trucks etc can safely pull over and let traffic past.</p> <p>15) no need to change this, 100km is perfectly fine.</p> <p>16) all good, this makes sense.</p> <p>17) This should be left at 100km, the road needs to be widened in areas and the curve north east of Glen Road needs to be less sharp than it is, it needs to be a much more gentle curve. A passing lane from just east of this curve heading West would be great as well.</p> <p>18) This is fine as it is, the house etc on this stretch of road have plenty of room to see traffic in both directions before entering the road, the lowest the speed limit here should be is 70km however 80km is preferred.</p> <p>19) There is no need to reduce the speed here, the only thing that should happen is that it should be 2 lanes in both directions and the speed limit at 100km.</p>
1025	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>4) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>13) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>14) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>15) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>18) Leave it as it is, it doesn't need to be changed.</p> <p>19) Leave it at 100 kph, it doesn't need to be changed.</p>
1026	Individual submitter	<p>1) agree - with proposal, makes the road safer for tourists, the elderly , people on bikes less fuel used, less environmental fuel pollution</p> <p>4) agree, trucks would not hold up traffic, same legal speed as cars, tourists, bikes, cars towing boats ,elderly drivers, less stress and safer for everyone.</p> <p>5) Vehicular traffic has to slow down to make suburban areas safer for pedestrians</p> <p>7) all the above, fog is also a factor.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p>

		19) I am one of the many people who agree with the proposed changes, we are silent, probably the silent majority, this is my reason for responding here on this document. I frequently use these roads, I ride a bike, I almost crashed at speed into a wayward tourist's van, trucks and cars with trailers frequently drive over the legal speed limit, there are very few passing bays . Rain, fog and frost occur but people often drive too fast for the conditions, forcing other traffic to also drive too fast
1027	Individual submitter	<p>1) No this should stay at 100 as it is straight and flat</p> <p>4) This should also stay at 100 as it is an easy driving road</p> <p>5) It should stay as 70</p> <p>7) This is easy driving open road and should stay at 100</p> <p>8) Should change to 80</p> <p>9) Should stay at 100</p> <p>10) Yes this should be changed to 60</p> <p>11) This is easy clear road and stay at 100</p> <p>13) Getting in winding road ...so should be 80</p> <p>14) Should be 80</p> <p>15) Should be 80</p> <p>16) Yes to the change</p> <p>17) Yes to 80</p> <p>18) This should stay at 80</p> <p>19) Should be 80</p>
1028	Individual submitter	<p>1) Slow down the areas with schools, and the danger areas, not the whole state highway, nothing wrong with the roads its the people doing stupid things, slowing it down won't fix the issue, will make slower drivers going slower, with the lack of overtaking bays causes frustration and impatience which will in turn cause more accidents, 20 deaths over 10 years to me with how many people use this road is not bad at all, a death is bad at the worst of times, but you can't control people's bad habits unless they are trained better, plus tourists, aren't tested either, and they do cause accidents, I totally object to the whole state highway being slowed down, slow down the road from Rai to Pelorus, but from Pelorus to Renwick should be 100km/h, even to Blenheim, it's an easy road to drive. Nice sweeping corners, good visibility, I have been driving this road for 15 years and never had a close call, but have seen lots of bad mistakes due to frustration, due to lots of slow drivers and lack of overtaking areas and slow driver bays.</p> <p>4) Slow down the areas with schools, and the danger areas, not the whole state highway, nothing wrong with the roads its the people doing stupid things, slowing it down won't fix the issue, will make slower drivers going slower, with the lack of overtaking bays causes frustration and impatience which will in turn cause more accidents, 20 deaths over 10 years to me with how many people use this road is not bad at all, a death is bad at the worst of times, but you can't control people's bad habits unless they are trained better, plus tourists, aren't tested either, and they do cause accidents, I totally object to the whole state highway being slowed down, slow down the road from Rai to Pelorus, but from Pelorus to Renwick should be 100km/h, even to Blenheim, it's an easy road to drive. Nice sweeping corners, good visibility, I have been driving this road for 15 years and never had a close call, but have seen lots of bad mistakes due to frustration, due to lots of slow drivers and lack of overtaking areas and slow driver bays.</p> <p>5) Slow down the areas with schools, and the danger areas, not the whole state highway, nothing wrong with the roads its the people doing stupid things, slowing it down won't fix the issue, will make slower drivers going slower, with the lack of overtaking bays causes frustration and impatience which will in turn cause more accidents, 20 deaths over 10 years to me with how many people use this road is not bad at all, a death is bad at the worst of times, but you can't control people's bad habits unless they are trained better, plus tourists, aren't tested either, and they do cause accidents, I totally object to the whole state highway being slowed down, slow down the road from Rai to Pelorus, but from Pelorus to Renwick should be 100km/h, even to Blenheim, it's an easy road to drive. Nice sweeping corners, good visibility, I have been driving this road for 15 years and never had a close call, but have seen lots of bad mistakes due to frustration, due to lots of slow drivers and lack of overtaking areas and slow driver bays.</p> <p>7) Slow down the areas with schools, and the danger areas, not the whole state highway, nothing wrong with the roads its the people doing stupid things, slowing it down won't fix the issue, will make slower drivers going slower, with the lack of overtaking bays causes frustration and impatience which will in turn cause more accidents, 20 deaths over 10 years to me with how many people use this road is not bad at all, a death is bad at the worst of times, but you can't control people's bad habits unless they are trained better, plus tourists, aren't tested either, and they do cause accidents, I totally object to the whole state highway being slowed down, slow down the road from Rai to Pelorus, but from Pelorus to Renwick should be 100km/h, even to Blenheim, it's an easy road to drive. Nice sweeping corners, good visibility, I have been driving this road for 15 years and never had a close call, but have seen lots of bad mistakes due to frustration, due to lots of slow drivers and lack of overtaking areas and slow driver bays.</p> <p>8) Slow down the areas with schools, and the danger areas, not the whole state highway, nothing wrong with the roads its the people doing stupid things, slowing it down won't fix the issue, will make slower drivers going slower, with the lack of overtaking bays causes frustration and impatience which will in turn cause more accidents, 20 deaths over 10 years to me with how many people use this road is not bad at all, a death is bad at the worst of times, but you can't control people's bad habits unless they are trained better, plus tourists, aren't tested either, and they do cause accidents, I totally object to the whole state highway being slowed down, slow down the road from Rai to Pelorus, but from Pelorus to Renwick should be 100km/h, even to Blenheim, it's an easy road to drive. Nice sweeping corners, good visibility, I have been driving this road for 15 years and never had a close call, but have seen lots of bad mistakes due to frustration, due to lots of slow drivers and lack of overtaking areas and slow driver bays.</p> <p>9) Slow down the areas with schools, and the danger areas, not the whole state highway, nothing wrong with the roads its the people doing stupid things, slowing it down won't fix the issue, will make slower drivers going slower, with the lack of overtaking bays causes frustration and impatience which will in turn cause more accidents, 20 deaths over 10 years to me with how many people</p>



		<p>drivers and lack of overtaking areas and slow driver bays.</p> <p>19) Slow down the areas with schools, and the danger areas, not the whole state highway, nothing wrong with the roads its the people doing stupid things, slowing it down won't fix the issue, will make slower drivers going slower, with the lack of overtaking bays causes frustration and impatience which will inturn cause more accidents, 20 deaths over 10 years to me with how many people use this road is not bad at all, a death is bad at the worst of times, but you can't control people's bad habits unless they are trained better, plus tourists, aren't tested either, and they do cause accidents, I totally object to the whole state highway being slowed down, slow down the road from Rai to Pelorus, but from Pelorus to Renwick should be 100km/h, even to Blenheim, it's an easy road to drive. Nice sweeping corners, good visibility, I have been driving this road for 15 years and never had a close call, but have seen lots of bad mistakes due to frustration, due to lots of slow drivers and lack of overtaking areas and slow driver bays.</p>
1029	Individual submitter	<p>1) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>4) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>5) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>7) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>8) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>9) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>10) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>11) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>13) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>14) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>15) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>16) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>17) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>18) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p> <p>19) Please dont reduce the speed its not the speed limit at fault its the bad drivers, i would avoid that road like many other people will if its reduced to rediculously slow worst idea ive heard ive driven it far too many times for work and its excellent how it it</p>
1030	Individual submitter	<p>As an aircraft engineer who regularly works between nelson and Blenheim. I often commute between the 2 airports daily, generally driving in the early morning and evening. These proposed speed limit reductions would seriously impact my day and I believe could lead to more accidents due to driver fatigue and frustration.</p>
1031	Tasman District Council	<p>Attention: Blenheim to Nelson Speed Review Consultation Submission – SH6 Blenheim to Nelson Speed Limit Review</p> <p>Tasman District Council acknowledges that the Transport Agency is seeking to reduce harm associated with crashes on SH6, Blenheim to Nelson by implementing safe and appropriate speeds as a key road network management tool in reducing harm, as evidenced by international research by the International Transport Forum<sup>1</sup>. Case studies from the international research confirm that where speed limits are lowered, the severity of crashes and number of deaths and serious injuries decreased.</p> <p>We applaud the Transport Agency for being proactive and prioritising the road safety issues being experienced in the top of the South. We also strongly encourage you to plan and fund infrastructure improvements such as barriers, intersection improvements, wider shoulders and passing bays to provide greater road safety gains.</p> <p>Tasman District Council is submitting on your proposal as many residents in our community travel on SH6 from Blenheim to Nelson from time to time.</p> <p>We have some concerns with aspects of the formal proposal being consulted on, outlined as follows. These factors should be considered by the Transport Agency when making your decision regarding proposed speed changes.</p> <p>1. Misalignment with Principles of Speed Management Guide (the Guide)</p>

		<p>The Council, based on engagement with our community over the last few years, believes that people will accept and understand speed limit changes were the risks are clear and the proposed speed limit aligns with peoples' sense of acceptable risk An example of this was when SH1 at Kaikoura was closed and the 'alternate AH1' route of SH6, SH65 and SH7 had lower speed limits applied to some high-risk sections of that route.</p> <p>Similarly SH60 Appleby to Maisey Road was another example of successful engagement and implementation of a safe and appropriate speed limit which has so far produced benefits in terms of reduced harm from crashes.</p> <p>The success of this approach was that it was targeted, with the majority of road users understanding and ultimately accepting the change.</p> <p>The current SH6 Blenheim-Nelson proposal does not make it clear where the higher risk areas are and appears to take a blanket approach by proposing changes along the entire route. This does not align with the underpinning principles of the Speed Management Guide in particular "prioritise high benefit areas that improve both safety and economic productivity, and also areas that will contribute to the credibility of speed management". Our Council is concerned that trying to implement blanket changes as proposed will undermine the credibility of speed management.</p> <p>The New Zealand Transport Agency's Mega Maps tool identifies Sh6 from Nelson to Havelock in the top 10% death and serious injury (DSI) saving opportunities. Reviewing the speed limit on this section of road aligns with the principles of the guide. However, the tool does not identify Blenheim to Havelock as being in the top 10% and does not necessarily align with the principals of the guide. We understand that early indications of public feedback is that a lowering of the speed limit here is not widely supported which reflects that the risks on this road are either not significant, or have not been adequately communicated to road users.</p> <p>It is not clear from the information provided how the crash risk or crash history varies along the different sections of the route. For example, does the Blenheim to Havelock section have a crash history that is high, lower or similar to the Havelock to Atawhai section?</p> <p>Conclusion 1 – The New Zealand Transport Agency should restrict speed limit changes to the sections of road that are within the top 10% DSI saving opportunities and that align with the communities' perception of risk. Alternatively, provide more supporting information outlining why the Blenheim to Havelock section is being reviewed.</p> <p>2. Misalignment with Safe and Appropriate Speeds</p> <p>While the Mega Maps tool is acknowledged as providing an indication of safe and appropriate speeds, rather than being a decision making tool in itself, we are concerned that the Transport Agency has not clearly stated why the proposed new speed limits do not align with Mega Maps and what it suggests is safe and appropriate in some instances. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Blenheim to Havelock – Mega Maps suggested safe and appropriate speed is 100km/h. Proposed new speed limit is 80km/h.</li> <li>- Whangamoas – Mega Maps suggested safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. Proposed new speed limit is 60km/h.</li> </ul> <p>Tasman District Council considers that without more information that shows the evidence and reasoning behind the proposed lower speed limits for these two sections, it is unlikely they will be accepted and supported by the community.</p> <p>Conclusion 2 – that the Mega Maps safe and appropriate speed be adopted as the new speed limit, or that further information be provided detailing why the proposed new speed limits have been chosen.</p> <p>Reference:</p> <p>1. <a href="https://www.itf-oecd.org/speed-crash-risk">https://www.itf-oecd.org/speed-crash-risk</a></p>
1032	Individual submitter	<p>1) Ridiculous. I've been driving that road for 25 years at this speed limit, I'm in my 60's now and highly trained as defensive driver. I strongly believe it is inattention and stupid decisions that cause problems. In the very windy parts accidents happen at much lower than 100kmh. Just because it's a 100 km zone doesn't mean people are doing 100 in the sharp twisties. Then there are long open parts of road that are easily capable of sustaining 100 or frankly more. Putting cars in a slow line dribbling along at 80 will create more inattention, frustration, and accidents. Then we have our right to use a road that's better than ever, in newer cars that handle much higher speeds, at a speed it's been for decades. Imo this is just a desperate measure because you can't afford any better solutions. I'd advocate much higher standards of testing, retesting drivers every 10 years, etc.</p> <p>4) Ridiculous. I've been driving that road for 25 years at this speed limit, I'm in my 60's now and highly trained as defensive driver. I strongly believe it is inattention and stupid decisions that cause problems. In the very windy parts accidents happen at much lower than 100kmh. Just because it's a 100 km zone doesn't mean people are doing 100 in the sharp twisties. Then there are long open parts of road that are easily capable of sustaining 100 or frankly more. Putting cars in a slow line dribbling along at 80 will create more inattention, frustration, and accidents. Then we have our right to use a road that's better than ever, in newer cars that handle much higher speeds, at a speed it's been for decades. Imo this is just a desperate measure because you can't afford any better solutions. I'd advocate much higher standards of testing, retesting drivers every 10 years, etc.</p> <p>5) No problem with this bit.</p> <p>7) As above 100 is easily okay</p> <p>8) Past school and over bridge at canvas town no problem</p> <p>9) As above 100 is fine</p> <p>10) 60 through pelorus is fine</p> <p>11) No 100 is fine it's open highway</p> <p>13) Love,y open road.</p> <p>14) What? 60? That's ludicrous and an Afront to tax payers.</p> <p>15) Why? There is open straight roads here</p> <p>16) Yes to school zone</p> <p>17) Open good highway including big areas of dual lane for passing on hills. You'll just stop legal safe passes of numerous trucks and camper vans and create more frustration.</p>

		<p>18) Again why. No problems there.</p> <p>19) No need nice open road with easy turn8ng areas</p>
1033	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it at 100</p> <p>4) Leave it at 100</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Leave it at 100</p> <p>8) 100 with a 60 variable speed zone</p> <p>9) Leave it at 100</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Leave it at 100</p> <p>13) Leave it at 100</p> <p>14) Leave it at 100</p> <p>15) Leave it at 100</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Leave it at 100</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) Leave it at 100</p>
1034	Individual submitter	<p>1) Good change</p> <p>4) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over</p> <p>5) Good change</p> <p>7) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over</p> <p>8) Good change</p> <p>9) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over</p> <p>10) Good change</p> <p>11) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over</p> <p>13) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over</p> <p>14) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over. Have flashing signs on tight bends or slow speed for the Whangamoas only.</p> <p>15) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over</p> <p>16) Good change</p> <p>17) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over</p> <p>18) 60 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over. Or change to dual carriageway so there is a slow lane</p> <p>19) 80 is too slow. Instead install more pullover bays for slow vehicles and more viewing/ picnic spots to allow people to pull over</p>
1035	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) The speed limit from Marybank to Nelson should be much lower. There also needs to be speed cameras to Encourage traffic to adhere to the limit (especially for early morning traffic and trucks at night)</p>



		<p>over and letting people pass..... more education or even a licence for overseas buyers to be able to drive and rent a car or campervan here..... i drive this road at least 4 times a week so this will have a huge impact on me and my business. All of the areas you have identified as potential hazard or high risk areas are very safe at their current speed limits providing you are a good driver, not drunk, on your phone, under the influence of drugs etc.....</p> <p>14) This one is just outright ridiculous, you can drive at this speed towing a caravan or horse float, let alone when you are just in a car commuting daily.... we all know you have to drive to the conditions ei if the roads are busy, icy etc but honestly go and drive that section of road at 60Kmh an hour and you will see how ridiculous and frustrating this will be. it will more likely cause more crashes with drivers getting angry, impatient and passing around dangerous corners and bends.....</p> <p>15) I do not want to make comments on all of these separately, but look at the big picture. if you take out of all the crashed/fatalities that involve tourists, drugs, alcohol and then look at what speed all these remaining accidents happened at, i do not think this is the solution. people will always speed, break rules or drive dangerously on phones etc. I think rather than slowing down the millions of people using these roads each year, maybe looking to fix some of the actual problems would be a better start. More pull over and over taking bays with more signage about pulling over and letting people pass..... more education or even a licence for overseas buyers to be able to drive and rent a car or campervan here..... i drive this road at least 4 times a week so this will have a huge impact on me and my business. All of the areas you have identified as potential hazard or high risk areas are very safe at their current speed limits providing you are a good driver, not drunk, on your phone, under the influence of drugs etc.....</p> <p>16) I do not want to make comments on all of these separately, but look at the big picture. if you take out of all the crashed/fatalities that involve tourists, drugs, alcohol and then look at what speed all these remaining accidents happened at, i do not think this is the solution. people will always speed, break rules or drive dangerously on phones etc. I think rather than slowing down the millions of people using these roads each year, maybe looking to fix some of the actual problems would be a better start. More pull over and over taking bays with more signage about pulling over and letting people pass..... more education or even a licence for overseas buyers to be able to drive and rent a car or campervan here..... i drive this road at least 4 times a week so this will have a huge impact on me and my business. All of the areas you have identified as potential hazard or high risk areas are very safe at their current speed limits providing you are a good driver, not drunk, on your phone, under the influence of drugs etc.....</p> <p>17) I do not want to make comments on all of these separately, but look at the big picture. if you take out of all the crashed/fatalities that involve tourists, drugs, alcohol and then look at what speed all these remaining accidents happened at, i do not think this is the solution. people will always speed, break rules or drive dangerously on phones etc. I think rather than slowing down the millions of people using these roads each year, maybe looking to fix some of the actual problems would be a better start. More pull over and over taking bays with more signage about pulling over and letting people pass..... more education or even a licence for overseas buyers to be able to drive and rent a car or campervan here..... i drive this road at least 4 times a week so this will have a huge impact on me and my business. All of the areas you have identified as potential hazard or high risk areas are very safe at their current speed limits providing you are a good driver, not drunk, on your phone, under the influence of drugs etc.....</p> <p>18) I do not want to make comments on all of these separately, but look at the big picture. if you take out of all the crashed/fatalities that involve tourists, drugs, alcohol and then look at what speed all these remaining accidents happened at, i do not think this is the solution. people will always speed, break rules or drive dangerously on phones etc. I think rather than slowing down the millions of people using these roads each year, maybe looking to fix some of the actual problems would be a better start. More pull over and over taking bays with more signage about pulling over and letting people pass..... more education or even a licence for overseas buyers to be able to drive and rent a car or campervan here..... i drive this road at least 4 times a week so this will have a huge impact on me and my business. All of the areas you have identified as potential hazard or high risk areas are very safe at their current speed limits providing you are a good driver, not drunk, on your phone, under the influence of drugs etc.....</p> <p>19) I do not want to make comments on all of these separately, but look at the big picture. if you take out of all the crashed/fatalities that involve tourists, drugs, alcohol and then look at what speed all these remaining accidents happened at, i do not think this is the solution. people will always speed, break rules or drive dangerously on phones etc. I think rather than slowing down the millions of people using these roads each year, maybe looking to fix some of the actual problems would be a better start. More pull over and over taking bays with more signage about pulling over and letting people pass..... more education or even a licence for overseas buyers to be able to drive and rent a car or campervan here..... i drive this road at least 4 times a week so this will have a huge impact on me and my business. All of the areas you have identified as potential hazard or high risk areas are very safe at their current speed limits providing you are a good driver, not drunk, on your phone, under the influence of drugs etc.....</p>
1037	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is a straight piece of road. If you can't drive 100 kph here without crashing and adjusting your speed when required, you shouldn't have a licence. Don't change it.</p> <p>4) This piece of road is amongst the easiest to drive at 100kph in the whole country and 100 already feels slow. 80 will cause frustrated local drivers and reckless overtaking. If you can't safely drive 100 here, you shouldn't have a licence. Don't change it. As a local, I feel I would be more likely to have an accident driving through here at night than at 100 because going so slow is sleep inducing.</p> <p>5) This makes sense during summer with lots of tourists around, but not at night or during the rest of the year. Have it variable throughout the year.</p> <p>7) There are large sections of straight road in this and locals will happily drive 100 here. There is no valid reason to change the speed limit here. As a local, I feel I would be more likely to have an accident driving through here at night than at 100 because going so slow is sleep inducing.</p> <p>8) This is a straight piece of rural road. The variable school zone makes sense but doing 80 the rest of time does not.</p> <p>9) There are large sections of straight road here and the sharp corners are already signposted with appropriate speed suggestion signs. Doing 80 through here would be ridiculous. As a local, I feel I would be more likely to have an accident driving through here at night than at 100 because going so slow is sleep inducing.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) Like other sections in this proposal, there are sections of straight road where 80 would feel like a crawl and corners with appropriate speeds clearly signposted. It would be silly to change the speed limit here. As a local, I feel I would be more likely to have an accident driving through here at night than at 100 because going so slow is sleep inducing.</p> <p>14) Like other sections of this road, there are sharp corners with appropriate speeds signposted and the rest of this section it is appropriate to speed up on the straights. As a local, I feel I would be</p>

		<p>more likely to have an accident driving through here at night than at 100 because going so slow is sleep inducing.</p> <p>15) Like other sections in this proposal, there are sections of straight road where 80 would feel like a crawl and corners with appropriate speeds clearly signposted. It would be silly to change the speed limit here. As a local, I feel I would be more likely to have an accident driving through here at night than at 100 because going so slow is sleep inducing.</p> <p>16) This is a good idea.</p> <p>17) Like other sections in this proposal, there are sections of straight road where 80 would feel like a crawl and corners with appropriate speeds clearly signposted. It would be silly to change the speed limit here. As a local, I feel I would be more likely to have an accident driving through here at night than at 100 because going so slow is sleep inducing.</p> <p>18) This is a straight piece of road with good intersections. 60 would be absolutely sleep inducing. Don't be ridiculous.</p> <p>19) Like other sections in this proposal, this is straight road where 80 would feel like a crawl. It would be silly to change the speed limit here. As a local, I feel I would be more likely to have an accident driving through here at night than at 100 because going so slow is sleep inducing.</p>
1038	Individual submitter	<p>1) Dont do it</p> <p>4) Dont do it</p> <p>5) Dont do it</p> <p>7) Dont do it</p> <p>8) Dont do it</p> <p>9) Dont do it</p> <p>10) Dont do it</p> <p>11) Dont do it</p> <p>13) Dont do it</p> <p>14) Dont do it</p> <p>15) Dont do it</p> <p>16) Dont do it</p> <p>17) Dont do it</p> <p>18) Dont do it</p> <p>19) Dont do it</p>
1039	Individual submitter	<p>1) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>4) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>5) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>7) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>8) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>9) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>10) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>11) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>13) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>14) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>15) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>16) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>17) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>18) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p> <p>19) impatient drivers will cause more havoc</p>
1040	Individual submitter	<p>1) No, its a good decision as it is close to an urban fringe, with lots of potential distractions</p> <p>4) Yes, it is all rural with lots of long straights and little distractions. An 80 K limit will increase hazard because of half the traffic sticking to 80 with the other half continuously overtaking.</p> <p>5) No opinion as I don't know that stretch of road well enough. If its rural, it should be 70 K. If urban, 50.</p> <p>7) Yes, this is a rural road with wide curves and good safety features. There are many straights where 80 K will increase traffic hazards as half the traffic will stick to 80 while the other half will continuously overtake.</p> <p>8) Yes, if this is the section passing through Canvastown, it should be 80 k. The school should have a pedestrian crossing with an island in the middle.</p> <p>9) Yes, this road has many stretches that could easily support 100 K. It is rural and has straights. An 80 K limit would increase hazard due to constant overtaking.</p> <p>10) No, I agree this is a sensible change.</p> <p>11) Yes I agree. It is sensible to have an 80 k limit through the built up area where there are multiple potential distractions.</p> <p>13) Yes, since the upgrade of the hilly section, this section of this road can easily support a speed of 100 k. Reducing to 80 k will increase hazard by inducing rampant overtaking. The limited section where the road is unimproved and extremely windy it is impossible for any reasonable motorist to achieve 100 k anyway, so the change of limit to 80 k will have no effect. Crazy drivers will not</p>

		<p>change their behavior by whatever the speed limit says.</p> <p>14) This I believe is the windy and steep section east of the saddle. Only a crazed driver would attempt to achieve 100 k in this section, and if so, they would fly off the hill. Any sane driver would know to limit their speed to what is practical. A limit of 60 K is too low as parts of the road will support up to 75 k, and will only cause frustration and long running queues as traffic backs up - it is impossible to overtake on this section. I think it is best to leave it as an open road. The road already has recommended speeds on each corner. There is an important principle that is being ignored with this suggestion - the speed limit is not a recommended speed for motorists, it is a maximum permissible speed. It does not imply that all motorists should strive to achieve it at all times, no matter the conditions. Nobody thinks that.</p> <p>15) Yes, this limit is overly restrictive for this part of this rural and relatively straight section of road, and will increase hazard due to increased pressure to overtake. A general point on all these 100 to 80 k reduction proposals on straight sections of rural roads - it will encourage lawbreaking as the law will obviously be an ass.</p> <p>16) No. The current limit is appropriate as there are buildings and an intersection</p> <p>17) Yes, the road is rural, built for at least 100 k and has straights. Reduction to 80 will increase hazard, especially as this is busy with local traffic many of which will ignore the obviously pedantic nature of the reduced limited.</p> <p>18) Yes, The current limit is appropriate for a rural fringe, which there are only limited potential distractions and not many intersections</p> <p>19) No, I agree this should be reduced to 80 k to keep it consistent with the stretch through Atawhai. It makes no sense to have a short stretch of open road within the urban perimeter.</p>
1041	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) This is not a windy or difficult road. Look at where accidents have occurred and WHY before blanketly lowering speed on that entire length of road. Many accidents here are from poor driver judgement. Driver education, more signage at high crash areas and looking at the condition of the road surfaces/road camber on bends may be a better solution. I do not agree that a blanket lowering throughout that entire length of road is the solution to stopping accidents. Poor driver choices can not be stopped by simply lowering speed limits. Put your money into more passing lanes and better driver education. This is NZTAS opportunity to future proof a road that desperately needs more passing lanes!!</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Blanket lowering of speed limits will not stop poor driver judgement. You need to look at the exact location of any past accidents on this section of road and WHY they occurred. Look at the road surfaces, appropriate signage for any accident black spots and if more passing lanes are required. This is not a bad stretch of road, reducing the speed will not stop poor drivers from crashing it will only increase driver frustration and impatience on a perfectly good road.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Put in a passing lane!!! There is a fairly straight stretch of road that would be a perfect location for a passing lane here. The current speed limit is fine, it's a good stretch of road and many people already use it as a great opportunity to pass so why not make it a legally safe passing lane to reduce the add incident risk. Put your funds into future proofing this stretch of road by putting in the passing lanes it is an obvious place for! Lowering the speed will not stop crashes on this stretch of road because it's not the speed that's the issue, it's drivers trying to pass.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) This road is fine, there is no need to lower the speed limit. Lowering the speed will not stop poor driver choices! Driver education, putting in more passing lanes and maintaining the road surfaces should be where your funding needs to go. All you do by lowering the speed on this section of road is increase driver frustration because it's a perfectly good stretch of road. Lowering the speed on this stretch of road is not necessary and will not stop poor drivers making poor judgement calls.</p> <p>13) You just spent millions straightening one side of the Rai Saddle road and now you will make drivers crawl up that stretch of paying lane?! What a waste of money!! Yes the Rai Valley side of the Rai Saddle should be lower speed as it's still very windy BUT these bends are all sign posted with speed advisory signs. I don't believe lowering the speed here will make any difference to the accidents. You can't stop poor driver choices unless you are prepared to put more funding into driver education.</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) I don't believe lowering the speed on this stretch of road will stop the accidents here. A lot of money has already been spent on improving the Gentle Annie Hill. Drivers making poor judgement calls coming off side roads have also been a factor on this stretch of road. The road surface is also poor in places along this road too.</p> <p>18) You have already lowered the speed here down to 80. There is nothing wrong with this road!! People coming off side roads are a big issue here and that's simply poor judgement calls. Lowering the speed limit will not stop the accidents but it will lead to driver frustration when the rest of the road either side of this section is a higher speed. Dropping it in this section is just confusing drivers and a bad idea, all it will do is gather revenue for the speed cameras.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
1042	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave it at 100km</p> <p>4) Leave it at 100km</p> <p>5) Leave it at 80km</p> <p>7) Leave it at 100km</p> <p>8) Leave it at 100km</p> <p>9) Leave it at 100km</p> <p>10) Leave it at 100km</p> <p>11) Leave it at 100km</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13) Leave it at 100km</li> <li>14) Leave it at 100km</li> <li>15) Leave it at 100km</li> <li>16) Leave it alone</li> <li>17) Leave it at 100km</li> <li>18) Leave it at 80km</li> <li>19) Leave it at 100km</li> </ul>
<b>1043</b>	Individual submitter	<p>RE SH6 speed review consultation.</p> <p>The online submission form numbering of the various locations differs from the "What we are proposing" tables &amp; PDF on your website. And there is at least one duplication of locations.</p>
<b>1044</b>	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> <li>4) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> <li>5) Agree</li> <li>7) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> <li>8) Agree</li> <li>9) Too heavy handed reduction not necessary</li> <li>10) Agree</li> <li>11) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> <li>13) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> <li>14) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary. I'd suggest most accidents on this stretch occur well under 60kmh anyway.</li> <li>15) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> <li>16) Agree</li> <li>17) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> <li>18) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> <li>19) Too heavy handed, reduction not necessary</li> </ul>
<b>1045</b>	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) There is no problem driving this stretch at present speed limited</li> <li>5) No Comment</li> <li>7) Leave at 100km</li> <li>8) No Comment</li> <li>9) Leave at 100km</li> <li>10) Ok</li> <li>11) Leave at 100km</li> <li>13) Leave at 100km</li> <li>14) 80km</li> <li>15) Ok</li> <li>16) No Comment</li> <li>17) 100km</li> <li>18) 80km</li> <li>19) 100km</li> </ul>
<b>1046</b>	Individual submitter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) This is a straight well formed road. There should be no reason for it to be less than 100kph</li> <li>4) This is a well formed generally straight road with open corners. There is no reason to reduce the speed limit. Perhaps a few speed warnings on some of the tighter corners</li> <li>5) I have no problem with this</li> <li>7) This is a good stretch of road. Gentle winding corners with plenty of straight sections. I don't see why the speed limit cant stay at 100 kph</li> <li>8) It is a very good idea reducing the speed around schools</li> <li>9) Once again a good road with plenty of straights. Some more speed warnings on the corners at Daltons would be all that should be required. 100kph is a good speed limit for this section</li> <li>10) I agree with this</li> <li>11) Some speed suggestions on the corners and a 100kph limit until south of Hills rd. With a 60kph from Hills rd to the School. Perhaps 40kph from 8.30am to 9am and 2.45 to 3.15 in the school zone with flashing lights</li> <li>13) This road is generally smooth with well formed corners. In most places it is safe to travel the speed limit of 100kph and if drivers follow the advised corner speeds they will arrive safely. I see no need to reduce the speed limit in this area.</li> </ul>

		<p>14) 60kph is ridiculous. I accept a reduction to 80kph on the Hill is worth looking at but 60 is too slow and will cause holdups, slowing trucks etc. Heavy vehicles will have to slow further as they lose momentum. At the moment traffic seems to flow quite well at about 80kph</p> <p>15) Nothing wrong with this section but if reducing the hill the extra 1km distance won't hurt to be 80 either</p> <p>16) Great idea. Flashing lights for school start and finish times to keep kids safe.</p> <p>17) This is a good well formed road so I don't see any reason for this reduction</p> <p>18) I don't see any reason for this reduction but perhaps add a school zone for Clifton tce?</p> <p>19) This is a generally straight well formed road. There is no reason to reduce from 100kph</p>
1047	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's safe changing speed won't teach people to drive limit fine</p> <p>4) It's safe changing speed won't teach people to drive limit fine</p> <p>5) It's safe changing speed won't teach people to drive limit fine</p> <p>7) It's safe changing speed won't teach people to drive limit fine</p> <p>8) It's safe changing speed won't teach people to drive Speed limit is fine</p> <p>9) It's safe changing speed won't teach people to drive Speed limit is fine</p> <p>10) It's safe changing speed won't teach people to drive Speed limit is fine</p> <p>11) It's safe changing speed won't teach people to drive Speed limit is fine</p> <p>13) Change hill to 80</p> <p>14) Change to 80</p> <p>15) Make it 80</p> <p>16) Good</p> <p>17) Keep 100</p> <p>18) 80 it safe</p> <p>19) Keep 100 easy as to drive</p>
1048	Individual submitter	<p>1) Inclusion of speed cameras and increasing fines as a deterrent</p> <p>4) Incorporate if possible passing lanes</p> <p>5) No additional comments</p> <p>7) Include passing lanes if possible and/or speed cameras</p> <p>8) no comments</p> <p>9) Incorporate passing lanes if possible and/ or speed cameras</p> <p>10) No comments</p> <p>11) Include speed cameras</p> <p>13) Include passing lanes if practical and/or speed cameras</p> <p>14) 60km/hr sounds like a realistic speed given the winding road</p> <p>15) No comments</p> <p>16) No comments</p> <p>17) include speed cameras</p> <p>18) No comments</p> <p>19) A good decision</p>
1049	Individual submitter	<p>1) Keep it at 100, add in passing lanes instead.</p> <p>4) A ridiculous idea. Make some more passing lanes, dropping the speed isn't going to help people's impatience or take away others stupidity</p> <p>5) That's a fair enough option given it's a residential area.</p> <p>7) Once again add in some passing lanes, it's not going to help people's impatience or take away others stupidity.</p> <p>8) Once again add in some passing lanes, it's not going to help people's impatience or take away others stupidity, however I agree with the variable school zone speed.</p> <p>9) Ridiculous! Add in some passing lanes, it's not going to help people's impatience or take away others stupidity.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Once again add in some passing lanes, it's not going to help people's impatience or take away others stupidity.</p> <p>13) Ridiculous. Once again add in some passing lanes, it's not going to help people's impatience or take away others stupidity.</p> <p>14) A great idea over the whangamoas.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Once again add in some passing lanes, it's not going to help people's impatience or take away others stupidity.</p>

		18) No Comment 19) No Comment
1050	Individual submitter	I drive from Picton to Nelson quite regularly. I realise there have been a couple of fatalities on that highway recently and others over the years. The problem is not really speed although it is a factor with younger drivers in high speed cars and lack of experience to control them. This is a problem all over New Zealand. If you decrease the speed limit it only makes the traffic back up especially trucks and campers and cause frustration to vehicles following wanting to overtake. Likely to cause accidents. Please do not decrease the speed limit, I think it will not be any safer.
1051	Individual submitter	Hi i drive from Blenheim to Nelson quite regularly and in my opinion what should be addressed ,is the slower drivers that hog the road and will not pull over and let the faster traffic through. It is these slower drivers that cause people to get impatient and take risks. I am not saying that they ( the slower drivers) should have to travel above their comfort levels, but should be aware that other drivers want to stick to the open road speeds and they should pull over where safe and let the faster traffic through. This is common decency and road awareness, so to all concerened I think that this should be addressed before any decisions are made to lower the current speed limit.
1052	Individual submitter	1) No Comment 4) Totally unnecessary and will cause impatience and frustration to drivers - that results in accidents! 5) No Comment 7) Ridiculous. This will frustrate drivers and cause accidents! It's poor driving that is the problem - and I say that as someone with 50 years experiene on European roads! 8) No Comment 9) Crazy.Unnecessary and dangerous. Frustrated drivers will cause accidents 10) No Comment 11) Absurd. Will cause frustration in drivers, impatience and irritation - that cause accidents! 13) Daft. JUst irritates drivers, increases frustration and causes accidents 14) Quite silly. More frustration for driver, more accidents. Certainly not safer! 15) Absurd 16) No Comment 17) Why!? Achieves nothing more than irritating drivers! 18) Crazy. Visibility is very good, very few pedestrians(if any) so why the lower limit. I presume just to fit in with national policy 19) Good visibility, no pedestrians, wid roads. What on earth are you trying to achieve. Nonsense to reduce the speed limit
1053	Individual submitter	I don't think that changing the speed limit all the way from Nelson to Blenheim is practical or necessary. I have driven this route many times and think that reducing the speed limit for the entire distance will not make any difference to the fatalities caused by bad driver decisions, but will only cause frustration and probable further risk taking by motorists. I think it would be relevant to reduce the speed limit to 80kms per hour for the Whangamoia and Rai Saddles but all the current speed limits should remain as they are.
1054	Hira kindergarten	1) No Comment 4) No Comment 5) No Comment 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment 11) No Comment 13) No Comment 14) No Comment 15) I fully support this due to increased traffic, tourism, more residential properties, schools and kindergarten. 16) fully support this due to increased traffic, tourism, more residential properties, schools and kindergarten. 17) fully support this due to increased traffic, tourism, more residential properties, schools and kindergarten. 18) fully support this due to increased traffic, tourism, more residential properties, schools and kindergarten 19) fully support this due to increased traffic, tourism, more residential properties, schools and kindergarten
1055	Individual submitter	1) 100kmh is not a dangerous speed limit for this area & reducing it to 80kmh will make no difference at all. 4) This stretch of road is mostly straight or gentle corners & safely drive able at 100kmh, changing the speed limit to 80kmh would be absolutely ludicrous! 5) This is a light traffic area approaching the towns 50kmh area & should be kept at 70kmh, very safe piece of road. 7) No Comment 8) No Comment 9) No comment 10) No Comment

		<p>11) Once again cutting this speed limit down is absolutely crazy &amp; will benefit no-one, only make it more frustrating for drivers &amp; therefore result in more fatal crashes!!</p> <p>13) Once again cutting this speed limit down is absolutely crazy &amp; will benefit no-one, only make it more frustrating for drivers &amp; therefore result in more fatal crashes!!</p> <p>14) Once again cutting this speed limit down is absolutely crazy &amp; will benefit no-one, only make it more frustrating for drivers &amp; therefore result in more fatal crashes!!</p> <p>15) Once again cutting this speed limit down is absolutely crazy &amp; will benefit no-one, only make it more frustrating for drivers &amp; therefore result in more fatal crashes!!</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) Once again cutting this speed limit down is absolutely crazy &amp; will benefit no-one, only make it more frustrating for drivers &amp; therefore result in more fatal crashes!!</p> <p>18) Once again cutting this speed limit down is absolutely crazy &amp; will benefit no-one, only make it more frustrating for drivers &amp; therefore result in more fatal crashes!!</p> <p>19) Once again cutting this speed limit down is absolutely crazy &amp; will benefit no-one, only make it more frustrating for drivers &amp; therefore result in more fatal crashes!!</p>
1056	Individual submitter	<p>Agree on lowering speed limit around school zones.</p> <p>The roads need upgrading in a lot of areas between Nelson and Blenheim with equal importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some current giveaways change to stops.</li> <li>2. Turning lanes for pulling off and onto highway.</li> <li>3. Slow vehicle lanes, lots more. Volume of traffic now vs. when road was designed is apparent!</li> <li>4. Passing lanes, although "slow vehicle" lanes could be preferred to keep speed mentality.</li> </ol>
1057	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Slower drivers lead to frustrated drivers. Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>4) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>5) Keep it 70km/h</li> <li>7) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>8) Keep it 100km/h. Add the school zone</li> <li>9) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>10) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>11) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>13) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>14) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>15) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>16) Keep it 80km/h</li> <li>17) Keep it 100km/h</li> <li>18) Keep it 80km/h</li> <li>19) Keep it 100km/h</li> </ol>
1058	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I don't know the area well enough to comment</li> <li>4) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>5) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>7) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>8) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>9) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>10) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>11) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>13) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>14) I don't know the area well enough to comment.</li> <li>15) Anywhere that close to housing without slip lanes and safe crossing should be 80km/h.</li> <li>16) Anywhere that close to housing without slip lanes and safe crossing should be 80km/h.</li> <li>17) The road is rather narrow, especially where there are overtaking lanes and it is incredibly scaring for cycling there. Nevertheless - driver training should be paramount as well. Compulsory lessons with a qualified instructor like in other countries.</li> <li>18) see above</li> <li>19) This must be reduced to 80km/h. It is insane how long this has taken and doesn't need any further consultation. Where else is 100km/h inside city boundaries? We have an everincreasing population, another 175 houses planned up Bay View Road and no sliplane to enter a 100km/h traffic. Especially with so many people having a very bad attitude to slowing down - I feel bullied on a daily basis. Try to stand there while the logging or other trucks thunder past. I thought this was announced to happen before Christmas 2019 - why is it part of the consultation? Another delay in reducing the speed limit would be madness.</li> </ol>
1059	Individual submitter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No Comment</li> <li>4) No Comment</li> </ol>

		<p>5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) I support a lower limit as this stretch has tight bends and a steeper gradient and is frequented by cyclists, and frequently drivers push their driving skills to limits and loose control of their cars. Whilst I'm relying purely on personal experience, this is one area that may benefit from a speed limit of 70km/h  15) I support this change as there are often cyclists and cars entering/exiting side roads on this stretch and the sweeping corners encourage traffic to take "racing car lines" around them. As extra safety I support rumble strips to elevate the safety levels for cyclists.  16) I support this  17) I enthusiastically support this change. As a commuting and recreational cyclist on this stretch of road for over 20 years, I have become alarmed with the increasingly careless disregard by drivers. This stretch of road becoming busier with large transportation eg articulated trucks from forestry and freight etc, recreational towing eg caravan and boats as well as increasing numbers of commuters. Cyclist safety is further compromised with cars entering/exiting side roads on this stretch of SH6 and the sweeping corners which encourage traffic to take "racing car lines" around them despite visibility being reduced and the road edge being unformed and dangerous to ride on. As extra safety I strongly support the installation of rumble strips on these corners to elevate the safety levels for cyclists.  18) This section of SH6 has reasonable separation for pedestrian and cycling school traffic with curbs and separation from the road. The danger is for serious recreational and commuting cyclists, where parked cars clog the cycling lane and force us into the traffic. It would increase safety measurably if parking is limited to stretches that have sufficient width to accommodate both activities. NB no serious cyclist uses this stretch of the shared pathway. It is suicide. For the above reasons it is my opinion that reducing the speed limit here is not as essential as in other portions of SH6 that I've commented upon.  19) I support this change as generally traffic volumes increase through this stretch of SH6 and lower speed limit will increase safety.</p>
1060	Individual submitter	<p>1) With the increased safety features of cars and adhering to the 100 km/h speed limit is absolutely fine for this stretch of road. Fatal accidents are often the product of speeds far exceeding the 100 km/h speed limit. Enforce max. speed limit of 100km/h more stringent.  4) With the increased safety features of cars and adhering to the 100 km/h speed limit is absolutely fine for this stretch of road. Fatal accidents are often the product of speeds far exceeding the 100 km/h limit. Enforce 100 km/h speed limit more stringent.  5) fine  7) Object, see 1  8) Fine  9) Object - see 1  10) Agree  11) Object, see 1  13) Object, see 1  14) fine  15) Object, see 1  16) Fine  17) Object, see 1  18) fine  19) fine</p>
1061	Individual submitter	<p>1) The change in speed limit will change nothing- start looking at the idiot behind the wheel...you obtain your full licence, you never have to do anything again until your. 80! Everyone who has had a licence more than 10 years get them to sit a test like our restricted drivers have to pass now and...Re-test every 10years!!  4) The change in speed limit will change nothing- start looking at the idiot behind the wheel...you obtain your full licence, you never have to do anything again until your. 80! Everyone who has had a licence more than 10 years get them to sit a test like our restricted drivers have to pass now and...Re-test every 10years!!  5) The change in speed limit will change nothing- start looking at the idiot behind the wheel...you obtain your full licence, you never have to do anything again until your. 80! Everyone who has had a licence more than 10 years get them to sit a test like our restricted drivers have to pass now and...Re-test every 10years!!  7) The change in speed limit will change nothing- start looking at the idiot behind the wheel...you obtain your full licence, you never have to do anything again until your. 80! Everyone who has had a licence more than 10 years get them to sit a test like our restricted drivers have to pass now and...Re-test every 10years!!  8) No  9) No comment  10) No Comment</p>

		<p>11) No Comment  13) Stay the same  14) Can't drive at 100 anyway  15) No  16) No stay the same  17) Stay the same  18) The change in speed limit will change nothing- start looking at the idiot behind the wheel...you obtain your full licence, you never have to do anything again until your. 80! Everyone who has had a licence more than 10 years get them to sit a test like our restricted drivers have to pass now and...Re-test every 10years!!  19) The change in speed limit will change nothing- start looking at the idiot behind the wheel...you obtain your full licence, you never have to do anything again until your. 80! Everyone who has had a licence more than 10 years get them to sit a test like our restricted drivers have to pass now and...Re-test every 10years!!</p>
1062	Individual submitter	<p>1) It is a straight piece of well maintained road with good visibility- I see no reason to lower the speed.  4) This is an important route connect g Havelock with Blenheim, used by commuters everyday. I believe lowering the speed limit us unnecessary.  5) Are you joking? 50 k/r, if anybody cannot drive this road at 70 they should not be driving - seriously.  7) A relatively straight piece of road - no need to lower the speed limit.  8) School zone yes, don't know the road that well but 100km on other parts should be ok  9) Again this us a relatively straight piece of road and in modern cars 100 k should be fine  10) Around holiday time I see no issue with reducing to 50 k but test of year should be 100 as no one is there in winter!  11) Stay at 100 km we are talking about about 2019 Not 1919!  13) Leave as is  14) Again if people can't drive these roads safely at 100km in modem cars they shouldn't be driving  15) See above  16) No issues with 60 around schools during school hours  17) See 16 above  18) Why don't we make the driving license harder to get and require resorting every 10 years to keep driving standards better...  19) See 16 above.</p>
1063	Individual submitter	<p>I am in favour of the proposed speed changes. I have seen massive increases in the number of vehicles on this windy road. Many more people have moved into this area. It is also increasingly dangeous for motorcyclists. I would like to see the area from Nelson city to Hira - at the start of Whangamoas reduced even further, to a much safer 70kph (not 80) due to the number of residents, and schools (and accidents) in this increasingly high use area. The time difference for vehicle commutes would be minimal.</p>
1064	Individual submitter	<p>1) Yes  4) Yes  5) Yes  7) Yes  8) Yes  9) Yes  10) Yes  11) Yes  13) Yes  14) Yes  15) Yes  16) Yes  17) Yes  18) Yes  19) Yes</p>
1065	Individual submitter	<p>1) No  4) No  5) No  7) No  8) No  9) No  10) No</p>

		<p>11) No 13) No 14) No 15) No 16) No 17) No</p> <p>18) Am absolutely delighted that you are proposing to drop the speed in this area to 60. There is now so much traffic entering and exiting this part of SH6 and with many construction vehicles entering and leaving this area for the new housing areas this will make it much much safer for everyone - thanks NZTA - I so hope that this will happen</p> <p>19) I'm wondering if the 60kph should continue from the proposed 60 kph area that finishes at Atawhai Cres. There isn't much road left until you get to Trafalgar St.</p>
1066	Individual submitter	<p>1) Do not change the speed limit 4) Do not change the speed limit 5) Do not change the speed limit 7) Do not change the speed limit 8) Do not change the speed limit 9) Do not change the speed limit 10) Do not change the speed limit 11) Do not change the speed limit 13) Do not change the speed limit 14) Do not change the speed limit 15) Do not change the speed limit 16) No 17) Do not change the speed limit 18) Do not change the speed limit 19) Do not change the speed limit</p>
1067	Individual submitter	<p>The 20 road deaths - were they all speeding? Leave our 100km speed limit where they are on Blenheim to Nelson highway. Build a highway 4-lanes both ways. Stop drivers from cell phone and texting while they are driving. Straighten up all of the bends and corners. This highway requires future vision now! Don't use \$\$ money \$\$ as any excuse. We are below 3rd world for our pathetic roads and road surface conditions. Invite the Chinese to come here and show how...</p>
1068	Individual submitter	<p>1) road has excellent visibility and there is no need to reduce speed 4) maintain the road as intended and no need to reduce speed limit 5) leave it as it is. 7) do the necessary road maintenance and no change is required 8) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 9) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 10) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 11) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 13) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 14) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 15) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 16) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 17) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 18) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required 19) do the necessary road maintenance and no reduction in speed required</p>
1069	Individual submitter	<p>1) This is silly, it is long straight wide road with masses of clear space either side. It should stay at 100 4) This is a long stretch of open flowing road. There no reason at all for it to be any less than 100. I am strongly opposed!!! In fact this is LUDICROUS! Anyone at the NZTA seriously suggesting this changed needs ot be investigated as to the suitability in their role. 5) Why? 70 is totally acceptably for this area. STRONGLY OPPOSED. 7) This is a long stretch of open flowing road. There no reason at all for it to be any less than 100. I am strongly opposed!!! In fact this is LUDICROUS! Anyone at the NZTA seriously suggesting this changed needs ot be investigated as to the suitability in their role. 8) The variable school zone makes sense, the rest needs to remain at 100. This is a long stretch of open flowing road. There is no reason at all for it to be any less than 100. I am strongly opposed!!! In fact this is LUDICROUS! Anyone at the NZTA seriously suggesting this changed needs to be investigated as to the suitability in their role.</p>

		<p>9) This is a long stretch of open flowing road. There is no reason at all for it to be any less than 100. I am strongly opposed!!! In fact this is LUDICROUS! Anyone at the NZTA seriously suggesting this changed needs to be investigated as to the suitability in their role.</p> <p>10) The 60kmh over the bridge makes sense, but the zone should stay the same as the current 50km signs close to the bridge.</p> <p>11) This is a long stretch of open flowing road. There is no reason at all for it to be any less than 100. I am strongly opposed!!! In fact this is LUDICROUS! Anyone at the NZTA seriously suggesting this changed needs to be investigated as to the suitability in their role.</p> <p>13) silly idea, most of this road is easy 100kmh. You do not need to lower speed limits over a large portion of road, just because a small portion has a few corners. Stonly opposed. Keep it at 100. Making it 80 would also remove one of the few passing opportunities on this route, a ludicrous idea!</p> <p>14) 60? In all seriousness who suggest 60? 60 is the MINIMUM speed that road can be cruised at on a motorcycle. Even in a laden work ute 60 is crawling. Strongly opposed!!!</p> <p>15) This is a long stretch of open flowing road. There is no reason at all for it to be any less than 100. I am strongly opposed!!! In fact this is LUDICROUS! Anyone at the NZTA seriously suggesting this changed needs to be investigated as to the suitability in their role.</p> <p>16) This makes sense</p> <p>17) This is a long stretch of open flowing road. There is no reason at all for it to be any less than 100. I am strongly opposed!!! In fact this is LUDICROUS! Anyone at the NZTA seriously suggesting this changed needs to be investigated as to the suitability in their role.</p> <p>18) There is nothing wrong with the existing limit, lot of work had been done for the school already. No change needed.</p> <p>19) . This is a long stretch of open flowing road. There is no reason at all for it to be any less than 100. I am strongly opposed!!! In fact this is LUDICROUS! Anyone at the NZTA seriously suggesting this changed needs to be investigated as to the suitability in their role.</p>
1070	Individual submitter	<p>I disagree with changing the speed limit from 100 to 80 on open road, in built up areas. Yes, I agree.</p> <p>Speed is not the problem. It's bad drivers, fatigue, drugs and alcohol. Millions of dollars spent on the Rai alignment. Built up areas, yes I agree with a lesser speed. Straight stretches of the road should remain 100k.</p>
1071	Individual submitter	<p>1) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>4) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>5) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>7) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>8) I am opposed to this speed reduction of 100km/h to 80km/h but do support the variable school zone.</p> <p>9) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>10) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>11) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>13) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>14) I am opposed to this speed reduction. Dropping all the way from 100 to 60 is just taking the piss.</p> <p>15) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>16) 60 for the school variable speed zone.</p> <p>17) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>18) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p> <p>19) I am opposed to this speed reduction.</p>
1072	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>8) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>9) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p>

		<p>11) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>13) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>14) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>15) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>16) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>17) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>18) the speed limit is fine as it is. The number of vehicles travelling over the present speed limit and involved in crashes are minimal. It is common road sense that is lacking. Failing to keep left, turning without clear road etc. Your statistics will show this when you unmanipulate them to show what you want. Very poor policing of the roads. Police are taking the money you supply and use it for other stuff. Most only look for speed and are less concerned with poor driving. Many are not trained well enough to carry out good enforcement.</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
1073	Individual submitter	<p>1) OK</p> <p>4) This is a good road, is the reduction necessary</p> <p>5) OK</p> <p>7) Also a good road, is this decrease in speed necessary?</p> <p>8) OK</p> <p>9) Again, good straight road, is this reduction necessary?</p> <p>10) OK</p> <p>11) Another good straight road, is the reduction to 80 KMPH necessary, what about 90?</p> <p>13) OK</p> <p>14) OK</p> <p>15) OK</p> <p>16) OK</p> <p>17) Again, a good straight road, is the severe reduction necessary, What about 90?</p> <p>18) I am totally in favour of this reduction, at present it is almost impossible to get out of Marybank Road without ending up with a huge truck or car right up your tail, even when the road is clear as you exit.</p> <p>19) Again, totally in favour of this change, exiting from any of the private properties or side roads on this stretch of highway is very difficult when the passing traffic is travelling at 100 KMPH.</p>
1074	Individual submitter	<p>What a ridiculous idea. How many highways in NZ have an 80km restriction for 100km? This road is used by many trucks every day. At 80km there is going to be large queues backing up which will cause frustration leading to improper overtaking. Where is your evidence to say it will only add 9 minutes to the journey. What utter nonsense many of the deaths have had nothing to do with the speed limit. Numerous deaths have been caused by intoxicated, distracted drivers and foreigners not keeping left. The Rai Saddler realigning should have gone to upgrading the Takaka Hill which is down to one lane in places. If the road is bad, put up more safety barriers or close it completely. I believe fatalities will increase.</p>
1075	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) I am totally opposed to a reduction of the speed limit in this area. 80km/h is unnecessarily slow on this stretch of road. A better idea would be to provide passing lanes to allow drivers that would like to drive at the current speed limit to pass those that prefer to drive a bit slower. Educate drivers with signage stating not to speed up but let others pass along passing lanes. I quite often drive this stretch of road and set my cruise control to 100 km/h at Wairau river bridge and go all the way to Havelock without any issues. 80 km/h is frustratingly slow in an area where it is unnecessary.</p> <p>5) A smaller reduction to 60 km/hr would be more appropriate along this area.</p> <p>7) Totally opposed to a reduction of the speed limit in this area. 80 km/h is unnecessarily slow along this road. Provide passing lanes as an alternative for those who prefer to drive slower.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p>

		<p>9) Totally opposed to a reduction of the speed limit in this area. 80 km/h is unnecessarily slow along this stretch of road. Provide passing lanes.</p> <p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) Totally opposed to a reduction of the speed limit on this stretch of road. 80 km/h is unnecessarily slow.</p> <p>13) Totally opposed to a blanket reduction of the speed limit along this stretch of road. 80 km/h is unnecessarily slow along the majority of this section of road. Provide more advisory speed signs for the tighter sections.</p> <p>14) I am opposed to a reduction of the speed limit from 100 km/hr to 60 km/hr. Parts of this section cannot be driven at 100 km/hr anyway but a restriction to 60 km/h is unnecessarily slow and the majority of traffic will ignore the 60 km/h limit anyway I would suggest a more realistic limit would be in the 70 to 80 km/h range.</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) 80 km/h is unnecessarily slow along this stretch of road. Speed limit should remain at 100 km/h</p> <p>18) The speed limit should remain at 80 km/h</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
1076	Individual submitter	<p>1) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of I and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>4) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of I and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>5) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of I and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>7) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of I and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>8) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of I and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>9) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of I and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>10) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of I and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not</p>

		<p>concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>11) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of Nelson and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>13) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of Nelson and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>14) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of Nelson and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>15) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of Nelson and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>16) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of Nelson and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>17) Having been a Nelson long truck driver for most of my life plus the fact that Nelson relies mainly on trucking to move freight in and out of Nelson and a lot of other concerned drivers would like to see NZTA spend our RUC's on improving the road where there are issues instead of waving the Safety banner and saying 80kms will save lives. Biggest thing I see and it's NZ wide is people not concentrating on the road, to many distractions with technology. NZTA needs to spend money instead of frustrating the majority of motorists by implementing changes in open road speed. Spend money sensibly on the Blenheim to Nelson State Highway. One of the most ridiculous unsafe changes I have seen was a turn barrier installed at Glenduan/ state hwy6 turn off 40meters long and hardly wide enough to accommodate a car just to spend end of year money. Come on NZTA stand up and make us proud by spending money making roads safer instead of hiding behind smoke and mirrors and waving the 80km banner. I have no issue what so ever with the present speed limit and consider myself a very experienced driver on this State Highway</p> <p>18) Yes I agree here with speed decreased to 80kms because it is becoming quite a domestic housing built up area with more vehicles having to enter and exit state highway side roads and most of this is already 80kms</p> <p>19) Yes I agree here with speed decreased to 80kms because it is becoming quite a domestic housing built up area with more vehicles having to enter and exit state highway side roads</p>
1077	Individual submitter	I oppose this proposal. I have travelled this road for many years, this will cause more problems with traffic flow and create driver frustration.
1078	Individual submitter	<p>1) the main factor is we don't have a proper driving licence all learners should go on a skid pad and learn basic car control</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p>

		<p>9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
1079	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment  4) No Comment  5) No Comment  7) No Comment  8) No Comment  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) No Comment  17) No Comment  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
1080	Individual submitter	<p>I strongly support the school zone speed limits, and ask that all be set at 40km/h in all cases during the appropriate times. That, and a proper enforcement of the 20km/h limit when passing a school bus.</p> <p>I am totally against a blanket implementation of 80km/h from Blenheim to Nelson. Such a limit causes many drivers to switch off and no longer concentrate on driving. It will add more than 9 minutes to the travel time. Start enforcing a ban on cell phone usage and drug testing properly..</p> <p>Move to thirs party vehicle insurance.</p> <p>30 years at the Fire Services, inattention, not driving to all of the conditions, impaired or agressive driving are the real killers.</p>
1081	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's a straight safe piece of road no need to change current limit  4) The current speed limit through this stretch of highway is perfectly fine as it is  5) This could be acceptable  7) No need to change speed through here it's a very safe bit of road  8) You will need to add a decent passing lane if you are to reduce the speed limit through here as canvas town offers the only passing opportunity for a while and frustrated drivers caused by slow drivers are what's causing half of the accidents you are trying to reduce. So in lowering the speed limit you will in turn frustrate more people and inevitably cause more accidents  9) Current speed limit within capabilities of road. Leave as is  10) This makes sense as long as sign posted adequately  11) Good road no need to change current limit  13) This road has had massive amounts of money spent on improvements. Makes no sense to lower speed limit as long as corners have speed recommendations posted the open road speed limit should remain  14) 60 is far too slow for this road. It has plenty of places for slow vehicles to allow others to pass safely. I do however think it would benefit from a speed reduction to 80kph  15) No need to reduce limit here there are lower speed zones in place for the areas that require them  16) No problem with this suggestion  17) 100 kph is a completely acceptable speed for this road no need to change</p>

		<p>18) 80 kph is fine It's a state highway you have already reduced it from 100 80 works just fine</p> <p>19) 100 is well within the acceptable limitations of this road</p>
1082	Individual submitter	<p>1) No Comment</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) Yes leave it at 100km/h and make the edge of road wide so any traffic from side rds can merge with traffic.</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) Do not make it 80km/h its putting a bandage on nz roads ...go to Germany or Australia and find out what good roads are.</p> <p>10) Put a two way bridge in at pelorus and straighten out rd this is long over dew.</p> <p>11) Keep it at 100 there's no need to change it.</p> <p>13) Don't change speed change the training process of drivers go to Germany and they train for over 40 hours with a instructor do there know how to drive on rds like nz.</p> <p>14) Keep it at 100.</p> <p>15) Keep it at 100.</p> <p>16) This is more sensible.</p> <p>17) Leave it at 100km/h</p> <p>18) No leave it at 80</p> <p>19) Get the southern link completed ...Nelson is growing faster we need motorways.</p>
1083	Individual submitter	<p>1) I support safer road systems with lower speeds</p> <p>4) No Comment</p> <p>5) No Comment</p> <p>7) No Comment</p> <p>8) No Comment</p> <p>9) No comment</p> <p>10) I support safer road systems with lower speeds</p> <p>11) No Comment</p> <p>13) No Comment</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) I support safer road systems with lower speeds</p>
1084	Individual submitter	<p>1) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>4) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>5) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>7) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>8) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>9) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p>

		<p>10) No Comment</p> <p>11) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>13) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>14) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>15) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>16) This make sense</p> <p>17) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) There's is nothing wrong with 100 km/h speed limit, we need to improve driver training, and make obtaining a licence harder, the speed limit is a guide not a target, conditions change so, so should your speed, ie some weather conditions are not suitable to do 100 km/h, where on a fine day it's safe to do 100km/h this should be up to the driver to make that decision, and if they are not capable of making that decision they should not have a licence.</p>
1085	Individual submitter	<p>1) Leave the speed limit at 100kmh to make for more efficient travelling and create more pull over bays for vehicles not able to travel the required speed</p> <p>4) Make more area for passing and pull over bays for slow vehicles and leave at 100kmh</p> <p>5) Current speed limit is fine and safe</p> <p>7) This section of road has alot of possible pull over spots that could be made into legal slow vehicle lanes to make travelling safer for those travelling the speed limit, this would also reduce the amount of crashes that occur when passing</p> <p>8) The road is safe for a vehicle to travel at 100kmh, if you do not think so improve the standards of the road and make it safe to travel at more than 80kmh</p> <p>9) Changing the speed limit will not decrease the amount of crashes and could also cause more as people will pass in irresponsible places when they are frustrated at another road use travelling 60kmh</p> <p>10) Leave at 60 all times through out the year to provide a safe road crossing for tourists</p> <p>11) Safe piece of road to travel at 100 kmh</p> <p>13) Provide more slow vehicle bays to stop irresponsible passing and to lower crash rate</p> <p>14) No Comment</p> <p>15) No Comment</p> <p>16) No Comment</p> <p>17) No Comment</p> <p>18) No Comment</p> <p>19) No Comment</p>
1086	Individual submitter	<p>1) It's straight bit of road, with two intersections, one which has had a major upgrade an the other which is very wide and has very clear visibility</p> <p>4) All of the road is in very good condition with no reduced speed corners. I think instead of lower the speed limit, passing lanes should be installed to lower frustration of driver behind slow vehicles</p> <p>5) That's fair enough, the area has built up and reguraly see kids around, but potentially will no longer need the stop out of Queen Charlotte drive?</p> <p>7) Very good condition road with no reduced speed corners. Perhaps put reduced speed corners for unexperienced drivers, but also more passing lanes</p> <p>8) Agree with the variable school, but no need for 80</p> <p>9) Once again, no reduced speed corners. Perhaps put in some reduced speed corners for unexperienced drivers, and maybe one of the "traffic behind you? Pull over" signs at pelorus</p> <p>10) I think that's fair</p> <p>11) I think the corners coming out pelorus could be reduced to 80, but after that 100 is fine</p> <p>13) That's fair</p> <p>14) I think 80 would be more reasonable</p> <p>15) Fair</p>

		<p>16) Fair  17) No need  18) Fair  19) No need</p>
1087	Individual submitter	<p>1) That's a good start  4) Very Good  5) That's not needed, since 70 is safe  7) Very good  8) New Proposal is good  9) No comment  10) No Comment  11) No Comment  13) No Comment  14) No Comment  15) No Comment  16) Very Good  17) Very important to protect cyclists  18) No Comment  19) No Comment</p>
1088	Individual submitter	<p>Nelson –Blenheim speed limit reduction... Should apply to ALL of NZ... as happened in the late 1970's.  If we are serious about the Climate Crisis as individuals and as a nation this is our truly biggest chance to make a difference to actively all together do something positive for the planet for our children and grand-children at every level. It is a total win-win for New Zealand.  Climate crisis: 11,000 scientists warn of 'untold suffering ...  Search domain <a href="http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/nov/05/climate-crisis-11000-scientists-warn-of-untold-suffering">www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/nov/05/climate-crisis-11000-scientists-warn-of-untold-suffering</a>  3 days agoThe world's people face "untold suffering due to the climate crisis" unless there are major transformations to global society, according to a stark warning from more than 11,000 scientists.  We all can FIRSTLY and EASILY contribute to reducing our carbon emissions and reducing by HALF the costs and lives by accepting to go from 100k to 80k all over New Zealand not only Nelson-Blenheim corridor.  I am sharing with you this critical subject with Nic Smith being at the front of a petition against the proposal of NZTA to reduce the speed limit from 100k to 80 k on the Nelson-Blenheim HW 6.  Kind Regards  Concerned citizen from Nelson  (The reason I don't want my name mentioned is the virulence of the people who are against the reduction of the speed "target")</p> <p>Nelson –Blenheim speed limit reduction... Should apply to ALL of NZ... as happened in the late 1970's.  Important FACTS: A drop of 100k to 80 K for 2 years in the 1970's (Oil shock) in ALL of NZ and the road deaths were halved (Current 2018 cost of road carnage nearly \$ 6 BILLIONS A YEAR therefore saving \$3 Billions) and FUEL USAGE was also HALVED (We are in a Climate Crisis and this is what WE ALL CAN DO NOW to reduce carbon pollution)...plus its better on the wallet, saving money for the next electric car! Plus growing numbers of foreign tourists, buses, trucks, cars and campervans on our already very busy roads!  Let's all slow down and be grateful for all the people (ambulance, medics, doctors, police, firemen, helicopter team, later on physiotherapists etc) who have to work on these horrific scenes of carnage, screams, blood, with endless unforgettable trauma to the people left alive and to them the rescue teams.  Please inform the population, play over and over this podcast, check these links and let us start enjoying a more positive comfortable relaxed speed which RESPECTS ALL LIFE, PEOPLE, and PLANET.  Written off: The true cost of road deaths   RNZ - <a href="http://rnz.co.nz">rnz.co.nz</a>  blocked:::https://duckduckgo.com/?q=insight radio nz written off the real cost+site:www.rnz.co.nz&amp;t=ffab&amp;atb=v57-1https://www.rnz.co.nz/national/programmes/insight/audio/2018710924/written-off-the-true-cost-of-road-deaths  Social cost is a figure that looks at how a serious crash impacts the driver and their family. It includes loss of life or reduction in the quality of life and the loss of the ability to work or be employed.  Medical costs, legal costs, and damage to vehicles are also factored in. Add in non-injury crashes, and the social cost rises to \$5.6bn.  DRAG  The power needed to push an object through air increases as the cube of the velocity. A car cruising on a highway at 80 km/h may require only 10 horsepower (7.5 kW) to overcome aerodynamic drag, but that same car at 100 km/h requires 20 hp (15 kW). Therefore fuel consumption is doubled.  <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drag_%28physics%29">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drag_%28physics%29</a></p>

		<p><b>REDUCE SPEED LIMIT</b></p> <p>The agency's online risk assessment tool, Mega Maps, uses a range of factors such as road width and stereotype, shoulder width, roadside hazards and alignment to calculate the safe and appropriate travel speed.</p> <p>Mega Maps suggests only 5 percent of the open road should have the current 100 kilometre an hour speed limit, and in most cases a speed of 60-80 km/h should apply.</p> <p>For most urban areas, Mega Maps suggests the safe and appropriate speed would be 30-40 km/h</p> <p>The Mega Maps tool is used by NZTA and councils as a guide for deciding on new speed limits.</p> <p><a href="https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/391246/speed-limits-too-high-on-most-roads-nzta-estimates">https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/391246/speed-limits-too-high-on-most-roads-nzta-estimates</a></p> <p>The next oil shock? - New Zealand Parliament</p> <p>Search domain <a href="http://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/research-papers/document/00PLEco10041/the-next-oil-shock">www.parliament.nz/en/pb/research-papers/document/00PLEco10041/the-next-oil-shock</a><a href="https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/research-papers/document/00PLEco10041/the-next-oil-shock">https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/research-papers/document/00PLEco10041/the-next-oil-shock</a></p> <p>New Zealand is heavily dependent on oil imports and will remain so for the foreseeable future. While there is potential to substantially increase domestic production, domestic oil production cannot insulate New Zealand from global oil price shocks because New Zealand pays the world price for goods like oil.</p>
1089	Individual submitter	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>For the selfish need of Stephanie Drewery and her 7,000 petitioners ( Nelson Weekly 16th October 2019 ) to save 9 minutes which they could use to think with gratitude for all the people (ambulance, medics, doctors, police, firemen, helicopter, later on physiotherapists etc etc) who have to work on theses horrific scenes of carnage, screams, blood, with endless unforgettable trauma to the people left alive and to them the rescue teams, all because theses selfish drivers are willing to kill at least 2 persons and maim 10 others a year because of their selfish sense of security driving their BIG whatever they drive! (Between 2008 and 2018, 20 people died and 92 seriously injured).</p> <p>Did you know that a drop of 100k to 80 K for 2 years in the 1980's in NZ the road deaths was halved ( current cost of road carnage \$ 6 billions a year therefore saving \$3 Billions) and fuel usage was also halved ( did you know we are in a climate crisis?)?</p> <p>Please have a listen to this podcast and please don't bow down to theses selfish people.</p> <p>Written off: The true cost of road deaths   RNZ - <a href="http://rnz.co.nz">rnz.co.nz</a></p> <p>Search domain <a href="http://www.rnz.co.nz/national/programmes/insight/audio/2018710924/written-off-the-true-cost-of-road-deaths">www.rnz.co.nz/national/programmes/insight/audio/2018710924/written-off-the-true-cost-of-road-deaths</a><a href="https://www.rnz.co.nz/national/programmes/insight/audio/2018710924/written-off-the-true-cost-of-road-deaths">https://www.rnz.co.nz/national/programmes/insight/audio/2018710924/written-off-the-true-cost-of-road-deaths</a></p> <p>Social cost is a figure that looks at how a serious crash impacts the driver and their family. It includes loss of life or reduction in the quality of life and the loss of the ability to work or be employed. Medical costs, legal costs, and damage to vehicles are also factored in. Add in non-injury crashes, and the social cost rises to \$5.6bn.</p>
1090	Individual submitter	<p>1) I agree  4) I agree  5) I agree  7) I agree  8) I agree  9) I agree  10) I would prefer 50 k all the time with more and more foreign tourists with cars camper-vans  11) I agree  13) I agree  14) I agree  15) I agree  16) 60 k many driveways it is a rural very busy section of road and 40 for school  17) I agree  18) I agree  19) 50 k as we are in the TOWN of NELSON</p>
1091	Marlborough Chamber of	<p>The Marlborough Chamber of Commerce (MCOC) has considered this request for consultation for SH6 Blenheim to Nelson Proposed Speed Limits. MCOC is a not for profit membership organisation that has 350 businesses as its members representing a wide range of industry sectors. It is a non political organisation thus effectively crosses over the political divide. We strongly believe that the region's infrastructure and its facilities are the framework which enables business to deliver their products and services efficiently and effectively. It is the chambers role to advocate and lobby on behalf of business to ensure that the decisions made by both central and local government allow for this infrastructure to be delivered sensibly and in an acceptable fashion.</p>

	Commercere	<p>The Chamber and our membership fully support increased safety in our road network.</p> <p>Safer roading infrastructure</p> <p>The Chamber acknowledges the relationship between speed and the outcomes from crash events, however we find it difficult to understand why some improved engineering solutions are not being considered alongside this consultation. Investing into safer roading infrastructure has the added benefit of bringing economic benefit to the region.</p> <p>Context</p> <p>This section of State Highway is a major commercial/trade route. We have observed our community and membership voicing serious concerns about the proposed blanket reduction in speed limits. This has included a public petition approaching 15,000 signatures calling for the stop to proposed reduction in speed limits. In addition to the wider community our commercial operators have also voiced serious concerns adding their voices to the strong community opposition to what is been proposed.</p> <p>The Marlborough Chamber of Commerce is looking to NZTA to respond to these public concerns and to reflect on a consultation process that does not meet the communities expectations for proposed changes of this magnitude. To have a large section of the community taking to a petition is a reflection on the level of confidence in the formal consultation process and something NZTA should take into consideration.</p> <p>Reliability of information</p> <p>The Chamber takes the view that information provided in the consultation document does not accurately reflect the extent of impact of the proposed changes and has the potential to skew submissions.</p> <p>The Chamber questions the claim in the consultation document that the route will only take 9 additional minutes travel time with the new speed limits in place. Members that have trailed the route have reported times considerably longer. It's not just about increased time. This is a major trade route for Marlborough and we all rely on our commercial transport operators that have multiple movements per day on this road. With rig optimisation, driver hours and other variables; for some it may be the difference between economically operating under their current structure, and increases to rates or non-viability.</p> <p>Based on the degree to which Marlborough is serviced out of Nelson there is likely to be unexpected economic consequences that will increase the cost of goods and services between the two regional hubs.</p> <p>Marlborough has already been impacted by reduced air services with increased costs. Adding an additional costs to our road transport and goods and services is a further unfair penalty for both Marlborough and Nelson/Tasman. Given the NZTA's directive "to promote an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable transport system", The Chamber takes the view that a blanket speed reduction is not consistent with this directive given the irreparable impact this will have on our commercial operators to maintain business operations.</p> <p>Also to note that there are concerns that have been raised around response times for emergency services and the potential loss of life and property due to additional time to attend fires, crashes, and other emergency events.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Chamber strongly opposes a blanket speed reduction as proposed. Of course safety is a priority. But it is entirely reasonable to suggest that the safety improvements should come about by investment in driver training and roading infrastructure, both of which would give an economic payback, and could be better afforded by stimulating and supporting business in the regions, rather than imposing less economic operating conditions.</p> <p>Furthermore, in discussion with our membership it is believed that extra travel time and slow speeds are likely to increase fatigue, inattention and crash events resulting from diverted attention. The Chamber would rather see additional effort go into rest areas, and stopping bays and other safe roading infrastructure. It's also important that additional slow vehicle bays are constructed to assist heavy vehicles, tourists and other vehicles wanting to let others pass. Roadside barriers have had the effect of limiting the opportunities for drivers to safety stop out of the roadway.</p> <p>Given the justification of tourists being one of the main groups justifying this speed reduction, the Chamber is advocating better alignment with international road signage conventions along with better education prior to driving on NZ roads.</p>
1092	Individual submitter	<p>I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80kms per hour (and less in specified areas as per your map information) on the open road between Rai Valley and Nelson</p> <p>I travel this road daily for work and have seen some horrendous actions by vehicles on this road, not to mention the numerous accidents (fatal or not) that have occurred there.</p> <p>I leave around 6am and return at the end of business hours from Rai Valley to Nelson.</p> <p>I travelled at 80kms in the 100km areas which is totally safe and the time taken is hardly compromised. I admit that often I travel at 80kms and this is totally fine in areas along the stretch between Rai and the Whangamoas. At times when I see vehicles approaching from the rear I increase my speeds so as not to 'annoy' them and be within the speed limit, however in saying that most of the highway should be controlled by less than 100kms.</p> <p>Unfamiliar vehicles travelling this road are not aware of what is around the next corner, be it a slow truck hauling from a logging site or an exit from a property, or any other potential hazard. This has shown by the numerous vehicles on the sides of the road after failing to negotiate even a slight corner or on a straight. Nearly every other week this happens and I am neither shocked nor surprised. Evne those familiar with the road should heed to the speed limit, as driving complacently is a bad habit.</p> <p>Some trucks are not doing the 90kms that they are supposed to be doing, with a lot of them are doing 100kms. The majority of trucks travelling this road with those familiar pulling over in area up the Rai saddle, and between that and Kokorua Road so there is generally no hold up (abeit that 'impatient driver who needs to be past for reasons unknown to others).</p> <p>There are often cyclist travelling along this highway and the road is not adequate enough to cope wth a cyclist being passed by a truck or car with room left for oncoming vehicles so this is a consideration that needs to be looked at.</p> <p>The problem with the reducing of the speed limit will be the 'policing' of it. I travel the road from Richmond to Murchison and this speed limit was reduced to 80kms in places, this being sufficient. Those that wish to speed will do so, there is no stopping them unless of course they are caught or come amuck. Those with 'E roads' in their vehicles will be the ones who will maintain the speed limit and have to otherwise consequences occur - those without will be left to thier own devices and will of course speed no matter what (either to be caught by a randomly and not often seen</p>

		<p>patrolling police vehicle or not).</p> <p>I think that the reduction of speed on that area was warranted, as I feel that the reduction on the State Highway from Picton to Nelson is also greatly warranted.</p> <p>I see several problems.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The conditions of the roads need to be of a high standard to cope with whatever speed limit is set.</li> <li>2. Signage would need to be visible along many points to 'remind the driver' of the limits.</li> <li>3. The policing of the limits</li> </ol> <p>I probably havent stated a lot here, other than I totally agree with the reductions in all areas, especially around Rai through to Nelson, including the reduction around the schools in Rai and Hira&gt;</p> <p>The current signage for the reduction (80kms) into Hira could be brought back along the straight this side (currently located just before Lud Valley Road as most vehicles dont reduce speed until well after)</p>
1093	Link to the petition on NZTA reducing speed limits on our highways.	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Please find attached a petition in response to the proposed changes to the speed limits along the route from Nelson to Blenheim on SH6</p> <p><a href="http://chng.it/dy7xMQkL">http://chng.it/dy7xMQkL</a> -the petiton</p> <p><a href="https://click.e.change.org/f/a/wdku-hViEznbuCFUC5PdKg~/AANj1QA~/RgRfrOvSP4QeAWH0dHBzOi8vd3d3LmNoYW5nZS5vcmcvcC9uenRhLXN0b3AtdGhlLWxvY2FsLW56dGEtbnVIZGxlc3NseS1yZWY1Y2luZy10aGUtc3BIZWQtbGltXRzLW9uLW91ci1oaWdod2F5cy9kYXNoYm9hcmQ_Y3NfdGs9JmRvd25sb2FkPWQ1YzdjZml3LTg3ZWYtNDVINC1hOTdLTBiMzNiZmViNmE3ZiZ1dG1fY2FtcGFpZ249MmExMjNmYjhiZWE0NDA4MGI0NDIjZWQ1ZTU0MTA0ZmYmdXRtX21lZGI1bT1lbWVpZCZ1dG1fc291cmNlPjNpZ25hdHVyZmVhZG93b2ZpbmlzaGVkX3N1Y2Nlc3MmdXRtX3Rlcm09Y3NwY0IKACTSZsp3Zpmf1ldbWlsZXNvZmZvb2RjYXRlcmluZ0BnbWFpbC5jb21YBAAAAAI~">https://click.e.change.org/f/a/wdku-hViEznbuCFUC5PdKg~/AANj1QA~/RgRfrOvSP4QeAWH0dHBzOi8vd3d3LmNoYW5nZS5vcmcvcC9uenRhLXN0b3AtdGhlLWxvY2FsLW56dGEtbnVIZGxlc3NseS1yZWY1Y2luZy10aGUtc3BIZWQtbGltXRzLW9uLW91ci1oaWdod2F5cy9kYXNoYm9hcmQ_Y3NfdGs9JmRvd25sb2FkPWQ1YzdjZml3LTg3ZWYtNDVINC1hOTdLTBiMzNiZmViNmE3ZiZ1dG1fY2FtcGFpZ249MmExMjNmYjhiZWE0NDA4MGI0NDIjZWQ1ZTU0MTA0ZmYmdXRtX21lZGI1bT1lbWVpZCZ1dG1fc291cmNlPjNpZ25hdHVyZmVhZG93b2ZpbmlzaGVkX3N1Y2Nlc3MmdXRtX3Rlcm09Y3NwY0IKACTSZsp3Zpmf1ldbWlsZXNvZmZvb2RjYXRlcmluZ0BnbWFpbC5jb21YBAAAAAI~</a></p> <p>The link above goes to the list of signatories in agreement with the petition</p> <p>Regards Stephanie Drewery</p>
1094	Thompson Property Group	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am very much apposed to this proposal as it is not at all thought out and a knee jerk reaction to a few accidents. There are many areas where 100kph speed limit is perfectly safe and appropriate. Speed is more appropriately determined by weather and road conditions at the time and the drivers concentration.</p> <p>I have been driving for 60 years and have travelled this section of road numerous times and can't recall seeing any accidents but have heard of a number of accidents on the Wangamoa which is the slowest and twisty part of the trip.</p> <p>I believe that this is just another excuse to catch and fine frustrated motorists for speeding.</p>
1095	Individual submitter	<p>1: Why 80, between Rai &amp; Belheim this will make the accident rate worse! 2: 600,000kms approx I have driven on SH6 and never had a acciden! Over 45 years. 3: 80 from Rai to Nelson would be ok. Rai to Belnheim should be 90 WHY piss off all the truckers who are trying there best and would be most affected. 4: I'm all for the safety aroudn schools and crossings these areas should be policed more! 5: Cell phones are a major problem. \$80 fines should be \$400! 6: Rai saddle improvement is amazing , good work! 7: Mill Gully to Kokorua Road is the worst part now with high accident rate, single car, low speed crashes. This area needs attention, that is cut corivers back. 8: I dont think you will listen to those of us most affected!</p>
1096	Individual submitter	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to voice my support, concerns and recommendations for the proposed speed limit changes between Blenheim and Nelson. I would very much appreciate your time reading my feedback, and hope you take my points on board.</p> <p>A little background about me and my position:</p> <p>I live in Havelock and work in Nelson. I have driven SH6 between these two towns every week day for the past three years and have seen my fair share of dangerous driving and excessive speeds. In the last few months, I have had some very near misses, too close for comfort.</p> <p>My parents once operated a towing company, so I have seen the horrific consequences of car accidents and the fragility of life. My father is now a volunteer fire fighter and regularly attends accidents on SH6. It is always in the back of my mind that any day, I could be involved in an accident that my father has to attend. I consider myself a good driver, as most New Zealanders probably do. I not only focus on the quality of my own driving, but always pay attention to the other vehicles coming towards me or approaching from behind.</p> <p>With the above being said, I do not entirely agree with a blanket speed reduction to 80km on this stretch of road. Below I outline why.</p> <p>Key areas of concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pelorus Bridge</li> </ul> <p>I agree with reducing the speed limit here. But I also believe there needs to be better signage in this area. In the last year, on two separate occasions, I have been approaching the bridge from the Havelock side. Having the right of way, I have driven onto the bridge and a truck has given way to me on the give way side, as he/she should according to the give way signage. However, upon exiting the bridge and turning the corner, a car behind the stationary truck, has pulled out to pass the truck, heading toward me on my side of the road on a blind corner. I believe that because the car behind the truck cannot see the bridge or may have not seen the single give way sign, they have thought the truck was pulling over to let them pass, however, this could have cost me my life.</p>

These two incidents have occurred at low speed due to poor visibility and lack of signage. My recommendation here would be for larger give way signage, a mirror on the Nelson end of the bridge so that give way traffic can see any vehicles on the bridge, and perhaps a camera. In summer time, this area is extremely busy as you will be well aware. More defined pull over areas on both sides of the bridge would be good for tourists and trucks.

- Rai Saddle & Whangamo

I think an 80km speed reduction in these two areas would be good. In most parts of these areas, it is not possible to do 80km due to the sharp and windy nature of the roads, however, there are areas of these roads where 60km is too slow and holds up a lot of traffic. I have found that signage stating "HIGH CRASH RATE, slow down" has worked well when I have travelled north of Wellington. It always makes me check my speed. Perhaps this type of

sign would work well in these two locations. The most dangerous driving I see in these locations over the past 3 years has actually not been due to speed, but more drivers cutting blind corners. I tend to keep as far left on the roads as possible as have had some near misses with campervans, cars, trucks and motorbikes cutting corners. The major concern for me being the driver on the receiving end, is that there is nowhere to go if I have to swerve to avoid another vehicle. It would be great if there were wider shoulders, more barriers, thicker centerlines, and more pull over bays with signage encouraging slow vehicles to pull over and let traffic pass. I also think that introducing more dedicated passing lanes on straight areas of road would help ease frustrations of being stuck in long ques of slow traffic that doesn't pull over.

- Rocks & Trees

Falling rocks, slips, road working gravel and falling trees/leaves is always a problem on this road. I recently purchased a new, safer car for my commutes. However, in the first month of driving it, stone chips and scratches were starting to show. I know this is somewhat to be expected, however it is disappointing when it could be avoided. In Europe, I noticed that most rock faces and cliffs have safety mesh on them to prevent loose rocks from falling onto the road. Regular road sweeping would also be great! Another concern is the number of large trees so close to the road. High winds are prevalent in the Top of the South and trees often fall onto the road. This stops traffic, uses valuable volunteer services time, costs money, causes road damage and is a hazard for oncoming traffic, particularly in hours of darkness. If trees were kept well pruned and at a distance away from the road of at least their own height, the risk would be avoided, plus it would save time and money for those who have to deal with the fallen trees. Another issue with trees so close to the road is the shading. The road is incredibly icy in winter and there are parts of the road that don't see any sunshine at all. Large, close trees don't help this fact. At "golden hour" the repetitive flashing of sun light through trees is also very dangerous and distracting.

- Road condition and maintenance

It seems that every summer, in the peak of the tourist season, the majority of this stretch of road gets resurfaced. Perhaps it is a strategic move to slow down the summer traffic, however, most drivers get frustrated and make poor decisions. The road condition at the moment is SHOCKING! There are rough patches of worn road where it is easy to lose control, water pools in the rain, large pot holes damage tires and alignment and changes in surface material from gritty to smooth is easy to lose control on. For a state highway, I believe the condition of the road surface is absolutely unacceptable. It has caused car damage and crashes. The patchwork nature of repairs is also uncomfortable to drive on, it causes bumpy uneven areas of the road. If the road was resurfaced thoroughly in long stretches, it would be much more enjoyable and safer to drive on.

- Surface flooding

This is a major problem around the winding corners and long straights after the Pelorus Bridge and before Rai Valley. Cars often aquaplane and slide out of their lane. The road needs to be banked or sloped in such a way that water runs off to the sides and away from the road. Last week, I was driving at approximately 90km in the rain on the Havelock side of the Pelorus bridge (heading toward havelock). A car coming towards me, approaching a sweeping corner, looked to be exceeding 100km. When the car got to the corner, it lost control on the wet road and slid towards me. I was slowing my car and managed to just avoid the sliding car by a fraction of space. I was as far to the left as possible without going into the adjacent culvert. Speed was definitely a factor here, although from my judgement, the car looked to be well in excess of the legal speed limit, so I am not sure a lower speed limit would have made any difference for this driver. Driving to the conditions is so important and many drivers do not understand. If there were more convicting road billboards that made people think about their driving, perhaps they would slow down. Or when wet, there could be flashing signs on at-risk corners that flash when cars approach too fast for the conditions. I definitely understand the intention of reducing the speed limit, however there are so many drivers that have no regard for the existing limits, I don't believe they will care for an even lower one.

I support lowering the speed limits and increasing signage at Pelorus Bridge, Rai Saddle and Whangamo. However, the longer, straighter roads between are often the only places to let other traffic pass and feel safe to drive at 100km speeds. I do wonder if you have ever driven the entire road from Blenheim to Nelson at 80km. I wonder how you would feel doing so every day. I believe an 80km speed limit on the longer, straight stretches of road would cause longer lines of unpassable traffic. Traffic behind will get impatient and make poor decisions putting others' lives at risk. I see this situation almost every day when slow vehicles hold up lines of traffic.

If you have read all the above points, it is very much appreciated! Driving this road every day gives me a lot of time to think about what could be better. To finish, I have listed a few slogans for billboards that I think would resonate with kiwi drivers. I have found New Zealand drivers are often too "proud" to pull aside and let traffic pass and instead, will speed up and drive erratically. Road billboards should be short and sweet, but impactful. The current billboards along this stretch of road are confusing, busy, hard to read, meaningless and distracting! Most of the billboards only make sense if the driver has seen the associated TV advert. Tourists will not understand and most Kiwi's ignore them. Some billboard slogans I believe might have more impact are listed below:

- High Crash Rate, Reduce Speed

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take it easy</li> <li>• Are you a safe driver?</li> <li>• Keep Left</li> <li>• Pull over, let them pass</li> <li>• Be seen, drive with lights</li> <li>• Cutting corners costs lives</li> <li>• Drive to the conditions</li> <li>• Your family wants you home tonight</li> <li>• Too proud to pull over? Just chill.</li> </ul>
1097	Road Transport Forum (RTF)	<p>The Road Transport Forum (RTF) is the national body representing the road freight transport industry. We endorse the submission of our constituent associations NZ Trucking Association and the Road Transport Association. In addition, we wish to make the following points.</p> <p>1. There is a clear Government objective to reduce speeds across large tranches of roads and highways in New Zealand. The road freight industry recognises that some sections of highway may require speed reduction to improve safety, however we believe the initial position taken by NZTA should be to invest in better design of our roads and an improvement of quality, driver experience and road speed conditions. Reducing speed is a crude way of dealing with a complex issue. It won't have the desired impact.</p> <p>Below are the crash statistic comparisons for the Kapiti Expressway north of Wellington. The first example presents the data for crashes on the new road, the second on the old highway that is still in use and the third on the old highway when it was SH1. This demonstrates better design and engineering of roads leads to fewer accidents, injuries and deaths. It's worth noting that the speed limit on the former SH1 both today and in 2015 and 2016 was between 60km-80km per hour and the new expressway is 100km per hour from start to finish. Lower speeds don't equal lower accidents. Better quality roads do.</p> <p>Kāpiti expressway (Mackays to Peka Peka), March 2017 - February 2019  0 fatal crashes - 1 serious injury crash and 8 minor injury crashes</p> <p>Old State Highway 1 route, March 2017 - February 2019  0 fatal crashes - 3 serious injury crashes and 12 minor injury crashes</p> <p>Old State Highway 1 route, 2015 and 2016  1 fatal crash - 7 serious injury crashes -26 minor injury crashes</p> <p>2. The blanket approach to speed reduction on SH6 will slow down the people and the productivity of the Nelson and Marlborough regions. This totals 114km of highway transporting foods and goods between hugely productive sectors in the New Zealand economy. Getting these goods to market is vital to their value and to the livelihoods of thousands of farmers, growers and workers in both regions. We would like to make the offer to NZTA officials to spend some time travelling with road freight operators in the region, who could explain to them the additional time and cost that will be added if there is a wholesale speed reduction on this route. We are also of the view that additional trucks will have to be run on the route by some operators as they will not be able to complete their current runs in the longer times that speed reduction will bring. You are welcome to contact me to set up opportunities to travel with trucking operators to see the issue from their perspective.</p> <p>3. We have investigated the 20 fatal crashes cited by NZTA from 2009 to 2018 as justification of a speed limit reduction on the route. None of these were caused by excessive speed. Our contention is there is no justification for reducing speed on this route and that the move is driven by ideology rather than evidence. Indeed, our understanding is that this road was not even identified by the Safer Journeys Risk Assessment Tool ("Mega Maps") as being a road that required speed reduction. It would be good for NZTA to provide commentary on this point for our members and the public. If this is correct, how has this speed reduction been justified?</p> <p>4. Given that the touted benefit of the new approach to Safer Journeys was the engagement and consultation functionality, we contend that there should be a public hearing on the speed changes proposed on this route to allow verbal public submissions and for full evidence to be presented by NZTA and examined with full transparency by communities and businesses who use this road and be negatively impacted by the proposed changes. We would be happy to verbally submit on hearings into this matter.</p> <p>Lastly, please don't slow these regions down, invest in better quality roads to improve the safety of all motorists.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Nick Leggett  Chief Executive</p>
1098	Individual submitter	<p>I support many of the proposed reductions in speed that are outlined in the brochure, particularly for the drive between Nelson and Hira School and including the variable speed limits around the school. This has been my work commute since 1995 when I joined the teaching team at Hira School.</p>

		<p>I'm keen to see the reduction of speed to 80 kmh over this stretch of SH6 between Nelson and Hira and then continuing on from Hira over the Whangamoia Saddle. The highway has become busier with trucks, often travelling beyond 90 kmh, and campervans, and there are many more cyclists. It's not a wide road and there are many deep ditches alongside it. There are very few places where drivers can overtake safely, and I frequently find that I catch-up with these cars when I reach Nelson so there is little to be gained. I'm particularly supportive of the slower speeds around the intersections along this stretch. We often have a teacher travelling on the school bus route at 2.45 pm taking children home to the Glen. Turning in and out of the Glen Road is particularly tricky, especially for the school bus.</p> <p>I have also had one of my worst "near misses" on my way home when a car pulling out of the Glen Road just didn't see me. Neither the other driver or myself could believe that I managed to avoid being hit that day.</p> <p>There are probably improvements that could be made to the highway that would make it safer e.g. a passing lane into town, more barriers, and more pull off areas etc. Because I've driven this stretch of road so many times, I know where I can pull off safely to let speeding cars past. Perhaps these areas could be indicated ahead and signposted for the slower drivers, especially for campervans etc.</p> <p>We frequently travel through the Lewis Pass and have greatly appreciated the reduction in speed to 80 kmh and we feel that the Whangamoia are similarly suited to an 80 kmh limit. You have identified the main spots e.g. Pelorus Bridge area that require care and lower speeds.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit my opinions.</p>
1099	Individual submitter	<p>I have a couple of questions that I hope that you can help with.</p> <p>Are dynamic speed limits (ie limits that change real-time according to traffic, road or weather conditions) still too expensive, or is there some other reason not to use them?</p> <p>I have some doubts over the table "Extra travel time if new speeds are adopted". For example the Whangamoia to Atawhai section shows an increase of only 26 seconds. There are currently long sections of straight 100km/hr road, and my calculations indicate a greater time difference. Can you please explain how the figures were calculated</p>
1100	Individual submitter	<p>I am writing this email submission in opposition to the current blanket speed reduction proposal NZTA have put forward for the section of State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson. Although, I am strongly in favour of making roads safer and reducing the ever-increasing road toll; and I am not objecting to all proposed speed limit reductions, but I am in favour of making objective and evidence-based decisions; not using overzealous and loaded messages when promoting a campaign such as this.</p> <p>The deaths occurring on our roads are tragic and need to be reduced, but I do not believe it is fair to apportion deaths to a campaign in which they do not clearly belong. To state "20 people lost their lives" on this stretch of road is a factual statement, but it is not representative of this project campaign, where NZTA are promoting and requesting consultation that relates solely to speed reduction to improve the road safety. As this is the case, the number of deaths that have occurred as a direct result of speed along this section of road should also be stated, to avoid implying all 20 deaths are a result of speed as this is not the case.</p> <p>With regards to evidence-based decision making, it appears that the MegaMaps desktop tool has been the driving force behind the speed limit reduction for the section of SH6 being consulted on. I understand that MegaMaps is used for theoretically assessing the safe and appropriate speed for the State Highway Roading Networks. when reviewing and analysing the speed reduction campaign data, it appears to be one-sided and a 'broad-brushed' approach to safety. It is not clear if NZTA Officers have robustly discussed the implications of a blanket speed reduction against other safety improvements, such as engineered solutions. For example, there does not appear to be any readily available information on what would be required (i.e. Engineered solutions and their associated costs) to bring these sections of the network up to an appropriate standard that MegaMaps would compute the safe and appropriate speed to be a 100km/h speed limit and for the current speed limit to remain in place.</p> <p>I am very aware of the comments and concerns from members of the public who are opposing the blanket speed reduction as a significant (being the only proposed) safety improvement to save lives. The points being raised around travel time/trip efficiencies/frustrated drivers, lack of passing opportunities and general engineered solutions; as well as maintenance of the network are all very real concerns that should all be given adequate consideration in looking at safety improvements for this section of the SH6 Network. As mentioned above, without robust evidence supporting NZTA's speed reduction safety improvement project, where all other aspects have been considered I cannot support this proposal.</p>
1101	Individual submitter	<p>I am writing regarding the formal consultation on new speed limit proposals.</p> <p>I am against speed limit reductions on the open road as I believe it unnecessarily complicates driving on the open road. With proper driver training it is know that, while the open road speed limit is 100, you should drive to the conditions at all times. People with adequate training and common sense realize that you can't drive in hilly or winding areas at 100km, and we have the speed guides on corners to assist with this. I believe that it is more dangerous to give drivers the additional distraction of having to constantly check their speedometers to ensure that they aren't driving over 80km. It also leads to people missing road speed signs when they change so frequently, and sets an inconsistent precedent for open road driving in New Zealand. If there is an issue with unsafe driving on the open road consider introducing open road driver training instead.</p> <p>There are few areas where I would support a speed reduction.</p>

		<p>north-east of Allisdair St to 150m south-west of Atawhai Cres north due to heavy school traffic. A small area in the 1745m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira to 440m north-east of Allisdair St, Atawhai range. Specifically the turn off to Glenhaven Road as it is dangerous. I don't believe the entire 1745m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira to 440m north-east of Allisdair St, Atawhai section needs a speed reduction as there is really no reason to do so.</p>
1102	Individual submitter	<p>Speed Consultation on Blenheim-Nelson Highway</p> <p>In New Zealand there is an agenda being followed with speed that seems single-mindedly focussing on speed reduction with no thought to the productivity of our economy. As an owner of a small business in New Zealand I strongly reject that speeds should be driven down in a widespread manner in the somewhat hopeful stance that this is the best way to reduce injuries. Accidents are never caused by speed alone, it is a mix of at least several factors such as distraction, tiredness, reduced capability from substance use, driving outside the capability of the vehicle, driving outside the skills of the driver, pitchy and undulating road surfaces, anti- camber corners, inconsiderate other drivers, etc. If we focus mainly on speed to reduce accidents, the road system will grind to a halt and everyone will mutiny.</p> <p>When I started driving in the 1960s the maximum speed limit was basically the same – 60 mph, and we were in cars with VASTLY poorer stopping performance, almost no safety features (not even belts). Does it make any sense to have lower limits than 60 years later with so much safer cars? And much less gravel road..</p> <p>The speed limit is not the biggest or only safety influence, it is a mix of many other things. I think the current policy makers are simply taking the easy way out for these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- speed is easy to measure</li> <li>- they think it is acceptable to make a system that delivers a ridiculous number of fines each year as the main tool (which must mean it is not working!).</li> <li>- the policy makers are not business people, and their calls do not reflect the critical importance that the road system has to businesses. It is the life-blood of any economy and ALL our businesses (which by the way pay all the taxes that fund the whole public service!) need this to work better - not much worse – which is where these speed limits are going</li> </ul> <p>This idea that speed maximums will continue to be driven down and down is simply untenable. I believe a better approach could deliver a more productive road system, AND improved safety.</p> <p>Here is some analysis around the topic: Over recent years the approach has been severely punitive on any speed that is slightly over the stated limit, but not paying equal attention to the inconsiderate drivers that create huge queues of traffic and do not let people pass easily and safely. As an aside, and example I have a very simple but innovative idea that could dramatically improve the safety of passing which is a necessity on our roads. It is simply this – the person in front is always to be responsible for ensuring a passing move is executed when another driver comes close behind, on open roads / highways. I can elaborate more, but this would revolutionise passing. And this is my point that so much better than just sinking speed limits everywhere is to understand and enable better traffic flow, higher road productivity, and so less contention between vehicles - not the opposite! There are many, many things we have not tried because of our single-minded fixation on speed reduction. Any single limit is a huge compromise – it cannot be appropriate for all occasions. Fine weather and low traffic density, absence of pedestrians and cyclists etc would allow a faster driving speed that is suitably safe. The converse conditions means a lower speed would be better for safe travel.</p> <p>Here is an interesting challenge which is worth evaluating: If you were denied using speed limits as a tool, how would you then improve safety? This is a perfectly valid approach, and I think will yield some really valuable insights and approaches.</p> <p>So a single limit will never work well. This leads a number of approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- set it at the likely maximum, and instruct drivers to lower speeds as appropriate</li> <li>- set it for the worst conditions, and suffer the lower road throughput at all times.</li> <li>- or something in between.</li> </ul> <p>The critical point here is – how much credit do you give our motorists for common sense, and what are the implications of each approach? : I feel those of you administering the regulations will not want to give any credit to any motorists for sense and the ability to judge for themselves suitable speeds under varying conditions. But in fact millions of good decisions are made every day, among the few bad ones. Should we all be treated as the lowest common denominator?</p> <p>And there is a lot more to this than 'set a speed and all comply'.</p> <p>When setting a speed, (or in fact creating any law) if it is not widely held to be reasonable by the public, it will not be respected. So the effect is not simply 'set it lower, and all speeds will be lower'. The effect is that some will drive slower and some will not. Now this is actually a lot worse a situation than the high limit, when it is on the single lane, poor quality roads that almost universally cover our country, with very few passing opportunities. Even worse, the draconian speed enforcement means that drivers dare not use a much safer burst of speed to pass, in case they get caught.</p>

There are already many examples of this in recent times, and I can categorically state I see much worse driving situations when huge queues build because of slow driving, and passing is discouraged by every means.

Further, in considering speed and injuries, you need to recognise that limits have zero effect on the worst offenders creating the most risk of injury. So another dynamic is – should you disadvantage all the compliant people by dropping the limit and having them follow it, when others don't?

This really plays into the case for setting a higher limit and helping people use sound judgement, so people choose 'their view of safe' and when conditions are ideal, the roads can be much more productive.

Now you also should look at how other countries work, and there are many great examples in Europe. It is VERY noticeable that in Germany, where people are given no limit on speed quite a bit, they are universally respectful of the limits when they are lower.

Sure these are very different road environments, but the same principle can work. We set limits that when enforced creates millions of punitive fines, and offenders out of almost every citizen.

Other regimes give credit and are returned respect by their population.

I long for New Zealand to move away from a society where 'traffic cops' are the way drivers see the law enforcement staff, to much more like Europe where if you see law enforcement people on the road they are almost certainly helping someone in real need of attention. Their roading network looks after itself very well without the punitive methods. To move toward this needs a vast change of approach.

#### Dumbed-Down

One of my biggest concerns is the 'lowest common denominator' approach to maximum speeds and other aspects of road safety management. The overly dumbed-down approach to our roads in general leaves no impression the driver is expected to be responsible for judgements on anything. This is not a good approach.

We have traffic lights on short one-way road works which ensures road productivity takes a huge reduction, when there are already thousands of 1-way bridges where actually we DO manage to figure a way to not run into each other! We have been doing this since the dawn of time, why go all over-the-top now on a few.

Similarly a couple of permanent 1-way bridges have lights on them, that are simply a waste of money and traveller's time.

Another example of lowest common denominator – lower speed limits apply all the 24 hours, but often aimed at a much smaller peak load issue. This is a massive hit on road productivity for maybe 30 minutes a day of common-sense needed if the limit were left higher.

#### 110k limit

To be even-handed I should comment on this. In my view of overall road-system productivity being the issue, I cannot get excited about a puny few km of super expensive highway around Tauranga getting a tiny 10kph adjustment. I think it is token.

Sorry, but it's just a triviality - meaningless unless it applies to more of New Zealand. I am much more interested in improving the lot across all of NZ. And this needs science and innovation and original thought, not more of the same as we have been doing.

Universities and innovators should be applied to figure new ways for our particular situation to more efficiently deliver the improvements to roading in a way that we can afford to apply widely, not just a few km.

NZ companies can put rockets in space competitively, many companies (like mine) can deliver world leading products globally in spite of being furthest from the market. Why should we not come up with some world innovations in building a higher performing road network? I am convinced there is far too little real science in our road management.

And as a private enterprise whose taxes fund these activities, efficiencies must be a key part of the approaches. I do not propose a hugely increased portion of taxes allocated to roading, but looking at ways to deliver more for less. With the low percentage of fluoro-vested people I see daily around road works actually engaged in delivering useful output, fortunately there is huge room for improvement.

#### Conclusion

This speed consultation IS a great initiative, as it helps you see how many people are unhappy with this continual lowering of speed limits, and who will likely join the non-compliant.

I am concerned though that insufficient people will state clearly enough their objection for you to value it, or that you will ignore it as it does not fit your view of the road scene. (Or you have already decided to do it, you are just giving consultation lip-service).

I have this time managed to find a way to enter this over-view analysis – but the default request to answer a question on each of the individual speed change areas is a poor way to collect inputs such as I have wanted to say.

I am sure a very significant part of New Zealand feels as I do that our direction needs re-calibrating- but I am also certain this consultation will only show a very low proportion of those people on this survey. How do you weight the responses you receive against the current NZTA policy position, given this low representation?

In areas where private enterprise has full control of their destiny, New Zealand often punches above its weight, by virtue of the extreme work ethic, and dogged persistence present in its innovative and scientific self-funded companies.

Sure it is a challenge to harness this type of performance in our regulatory bodies and delivery of infrastructure, but I implore you to find out how to get there. It must harness the best of our

		<p>innovative capabilities, and break with a lot of existing concepts. Let's start with putting a hold on the sinking-lid on speed limits, and invest in some new thinking.</p> <p>Nzers and the Right to Determine our Future Roothing Environment</p> <p>I also wish to point out that the current policy on roading being pursued has almost no reference to the wishes of everyday NZers. Over the years there have been initiatives by various state entities and state employees to formulate and implement policy. In some respects this policy is influenced by government ministers elected by the voters, which is a pretty remote form of input. There are a few business roading forums who I suspect have some opportunity to influence ministers. But I fear that almost all the weight of influence is with the state entities who are not elected, and can operate agenda – such as this speed related one – almost with impunity of what New Zealanders wish.</p> <p>For example Switzerland as a country has a very strong process to ensure irrespective of who is in power in the state entities, key decisions are decided by referenda, thus making sure the people themselves get what they want, not what state service employees want them to have. It's a worthwhile concept – would you dare to propose a wide public input on the core of your policies? And a mechanism that transparently ensured public preferences were upheld? I contend if this was the case, your roading environment would look very different from what you are currently pursuing.</p>
1103	Individual submitter	<p>I generally oppose the reduction in posted speeds on SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim. There are built-up areas where a speed reduction is a sensible idea, but I do not support the wholesale reduction of speed over the entire journey between Nelson and Blenheim, particularly on 'open road' sections of the highway. In my opinion, a significant contributing factor to driving issues on this route is the almost complete lack of passing opportunities. Where there are long straights with clear sight distance, these tend to already be in areas with lowered speed limits. Consequently, it is common to spend significant portions of the journey held back by slow, heavy vehicles; or campervans, vehicles towing trailers, boats, caravans or horse floats and the like. To improve the performance of this route, provision of more frequent passing opportunities should be prioritised. Lowering speed limits over the whole journey will compound the frustration (and potentially risk-taking) of drivers caused by slow vehicles, rather than resolve it. I support localised speed reductions at school zones, townships and at problem localities where there are road features that differ markedly from the general speed environment, such as at the approaches to Pelorus Bridge. I support an 80km/h speed limit extension between Atawhai Crescent and the Trafalgar Street roundabout.</p>
1104	Local Issues Group Nelson Branch National Council of Women NZ	<p>Organisation: Local Issues Group Nelson Branch National Council of Women NZ This submission has been prepared following discussion between members of the Nelson Local Issues Group Nelson NCWNZ. Members reflect the wider community in having a range of ages, socio-economic and educational backgrounds. Our members reflect the range of views that are being voiced by the general public. Some react to the proposed changes to the maximum speed negatively, 'No Way', while others respond with a clear, 'Yes', this is the way to go. We do have some consensus on the need to lower speed limits around schools and urban areas, but not on the reduction from 100km per hour to 80km per hour on the open road. The following points, not in any particular order, were made during our discussions and represent the views of 'the average woman in the community'.</p> <p>Points raised against the reduction to 80km The time given – to only increase the journey time by 9 mins – is an unrealistic assessment of the extra time taken. Most accidents are because of driver error - the focus should be on improved driver skills and behaviour. A lower speed, when it is not necessary, is going to result in aggressive drivers passing in inappropriate places. The cost to transport firms – longer hours for drivers – could require a change to the rules that govern their employment, eg the hours worked and the number of breaks, leading to higher costs for these firms. Driver education is difficult and hard to deliver. Drivers on mind altering substances 24/7 do not make anything safe. The road from the Whangamoia north, except for the urban areas, has been sufficiently upgraded for the maximum speed to remain at 100km per hour remembering that it is 'drive to conditions.' Points for the change. I agree with the change to 80km for the hilly areas; the flats and straighter parts of the hilly areas could remain at 100km. The proposed plan will make for a safer route, but it will not work until driving standards improve and drivers obey the rules of the road and show courtesy to others. I support 80km through any townships from the Whangamoia range north that are currently without reduced speeds. I noticed when driving to Christchurch last Labour weekend that there are more road stretches with 80km signs and more pull off areas, even though the road itself has been upgraded since the Kaikoura earthquake. I thought that was an improvement. The trauma and physical costs of injuries to a road accident victim damage their lives and are a financial burden on the country. Reducing the maximum speed would lower the impact on crash victims and their families. Nelson/Marlborough has a high percentage of older people. Reducing the speed limit would lengthen the time that they could continue driving safely. This road is used by many tourists unfamiliar with our standard of roading and a lower limit would be beneficial.</p>

		<p>There are many camper vans on this route most of which have a speed limit of 90km. 90km is comfortable on straight stretches but not on always on windy sections. Slower camper vans can cause other drivers to become impatient.</p> <p>Measures we endorse to reduce the road toll.</p> <p>More time, money and effort should be put into increasing the number of passing lanes.</p> <p>More safety barriers. The use of barriers on the section of road between Paekakariki in the Wellington area and Pukerua Bay has proved successful.</p> <p>More police patrols on the Blenheim to Nelson route.</p> <p>More and better driver education – skills, as well as emphasis on courtesy and what it means for drivers to share the road.</p> <p>Better driver training – professional training for all drivers.</p> <p>A greater use of rumble strips.</p> <p>Changing driver attitudes. Many drivers have a mentality that they must get from one point to another in the quickest time possible. NZ drivers need to accept that it is acceptable to have someone in front of them on the road.</p> <p>As passing lanes require time to build and a significant amount of land space and engineering, passing bays and stopping bays can be an excellent alternative. They need to be long enough for a H/B truck or caravan.</p>
1105	Individual submitter	<p>Thank goodness I chose to start my business in Blenheim and not in Nelson. The sudden imposition of these new restrictions will be very painful for Nelson businesses.</p> <p>Why not start by halving the proposed changes to speed, or halving the stretch of road subject to them and see if that makes a noticeable difference to the accident rate?</p> <p>My guess is that it won't. It is a difficult stretch of road and drivers are often weary after a day spent at either end of the journey: accidents will happen irrespective of the speed limits.</p>
1106	Individual submitter	<p>Consultation on SH 6 Blenheim to Nelson Proposed Speed Changes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. My submission is primarily opposed to many of the changes. Whilst I don't disagree that slower speeds should lessen the impact and improve outcomes from accidents, I find it hard to support the proposal in its entirety when Government and NZTA are not spending more of the fuel taxes to firstly improve the roads.</li> <li>2. Drivers have had to put up for years with huge under-spending on our roads whilst the number of vehicles (and fuel taxes paid) has risen dramatically. Those fuel taxes have regularly been diverted elsewhere to the detriment of NZ roadways. Compound this with that much greater traffic flows, increases in truck movements and their bigger sizes then is it no wonder accident rates still rise. Spend the money on improving the driving experience.</li> <li>3. NZTA's last 10-year plan would seem to have been poorly designed or executed, or both. The 2020-30 plan will not work either if its primary focus is on lowering speed. We need a greater amount of money spent on road changes at the same time. You might start with lowered speed limits but it must be quickly followed up with work on road improvements otherwise there could be just a continuation of problems.</li> <li>4. Upgrading roads to cope, without changing speed limits, could be done with more/better use of signage, wider carriage ways, more passing lanes and pull-over areas, barriers separating opposing traffic, better design of junctions entering and leaving the SH. These are the things that need urgent exploration and action.</li> <li>5. I note that the large proportion of the 19 proposed speed changes are going to affect parts of SH6 that are on the Blenheim side of the Whangamoas. Whilst it has been reported that the proposed changes will only add 5-10 minutes onto a journey between Nelson and Blenheim, I'd put it to you that all off the extra time will be incurred by those going between Blenheim and Havelock or to Pelorus Bridge or Rai Valley. The time will hardly be affecting drivers in Nelson as much as those in Marlborough. A lot of people transit parts of SH6 between Blenheim and Rai Valley for daily work and they are the ones who these changes will affect most.</li> <li>6. I have travelled the road between Blenheim and Nelson for work and pleasure purposes on a regular basis for many years now. In my experience cyclists have been few and far between. I'd be surprised if speed on the road by cars has caused them as much worry as the large trucks. More work on the road shoulders would be of better assistance for cyclists I'd suggest.</li> <li>7. So, reviewing your 19 proposed changes I have the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am fully in favour of #8 where it is proposed to decrease speeds with a variable school limit around Canvastown school.</li> <li>• The proposals for no change to # 3, 6, 12 &amp; 16 are appropriate for these school zones as well.</li> <li>• Changes proposed in #1 &amp; 5 are logical and rational because they remove confusion and smooth the interchange when travelling these parts of SH6. I support this.</li> <li>• I am totally opposed however to the proposals to reduce the current 100km limit to 80 km/h as suggested in # 4, 7, 9, 11, 13 &amp; 15. From my recollection of driving this road often, I feel that these pieces of SH 6 still support having the current limits. There are places where slower drivers and some vehicles with trailers can move over for vehicles following to pass safely. At 80 kms the efficiency of traffic flows would be impaired for all drivers. I'm thinking how difficult and ineffective it would be to use the purpose-built passing lanes when going up to on those Rai and Whangamoas saddles.</li> <li>• At Pelorus Bridge, item #10, I would suggest that 60 km should be more like 70km. Alternatively the Dec/Jan 100/50 limit could be extended another 3 months into summer. Usually in winter the road can be travelled safely because there is seldom anyone moving in this area apart from the vehicles on the SH6 thoroughfare</li> <li>• The most impractical proposal is #14 where the limit going up the Whangamoas saddle from Blenheim would be 60 km. Sure once over the saddle going down into Hira (&amp; coming back up from</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

		<p>Nelson) would not justify a speed limit over 60 km but the southern part of SH 6 from the Collins Valley has to stay 100 km if traffic flow for trucks and cars is to be efficiently and effectively managed. I can only support a reduced speed limit for the Nelson side of the Whangamoia saddle crossing. Again, though much of this part of SH 6 has had little spent on improving the roadway apart from reseals. Many of the corners are quite tight for heavy transport to manoeuvre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # 17-19 do not appear to need changing. I would not like to have any of this lengthy part of SH 6 change below 80 km but that's a matter for comment more by Nelson residents.</li> </ul> <p>8. In summary I believe safer speeds need to be complimented by the roadways also being upgraded at the same time. We could do with more passing lanes or 'slow driver' lanes in places like along the straight roads in Collins Valley, or departing Canvastown. With the increasing number of truck vehicles on SH 6 there needs to be more places for them to let cars pass other than at the top of the two saddles.</p> <p>9. Slower speeds may imply safer journeys but so will simple things like more signage to remind slow drivers to let others pass, greater opportunities for drivers to pull over into slower speed lanes and improved access with junctions on and off SH 6. Please do not reduce speed limits and then walk away without pressing for these other urgent necessities.</p>
1107	Nelson Transport Strategy Group Inc.	<p>SUBMISSION to the NZ Transport Agency Speed Review Nelson to Blenheim November 2019 From: The Nelson Transport Strategy Group, (NELSUST) Inc.</p> <p>PUBLIC INFORMATION STATEMENT: We are happy that our submission is included in reports available to the public.</p> <p>INFORMATION ABOUT NELSUST: We are an incorporated society of 300 people who have wider sustainability interests as well as transport strategy. This submission is the result of committee consultation.</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION We are pleased with the new prioritisation of safety over speed. Many commentators suggesting high speeds should be maintained without roading improvements appear to be basing their opinions on false assumptions. They have clearly not read or internalised your Mythbusting Speed webpages.</p> <p>2. OUR SUBMISSION</p> <p>2.1 Lower Speeds = Lower Emissions - Aerodynamic drag goes up with the cube of speed: A little bit slower means a lot less fuel needed to get somewhere. In this time of climate crisis we should be driving slower to lower emissions even if for no other reason. We would support lowering the maximum speed for this reason alone.</p> <p>2.2 Modern Cars Safer only for Occupants - some people claim that newer cars are safer and so they should be allowed to travel at higher speeds. The problem is that they are no safer for the people they crash into. A cyclist getting smashed into by a 5 star safety rated car at 100kph is just as dead as someone being smashed into by an old 1 star car.</p> <p>2.3 No Shoulder to Road: Lower Max. Speed is Appropriate - We submit that where there is no shoulder to the road, it is dangerous for cyclists on 100kph roads as few drivers wait behind cyclists until it is safe to cross the centreline to pass. The 1.5m space to cyclists guide is just that and in our experience, not often observed. Our convenor has recently cycled from Cape Reinga back to Nelson on the back roads of the Tour of Aotearoa route. He found that he could count on the fingers of one hand, the number of drivers who waited behind until it was safe to cross the centreline, necessary to give 1.5m clearance. Squeezing past with less than 1/2 a metre clearance into the face of oncoming traffic is common practice. Until the 1.5m cycle clearance guideline becomes law and driver behaviour changes, it is simply too dangerous to have no shoulders to roads and maintain a 100kph limit. And there is an additional benefit of having this shoulder space in that it increases tolerance for people not driving straight down the road: it is safer for everyone. We submit that any road that has no shoulder where a cyclist can cycle on the verge side of the road edge marking should not have a speed limit greater than 80kph. And that this shoulder space should be at least 1m wide.</p> <p>2.4 Avoid Counterintuitive Speed Changes - We think it is counterintuitive for speeds to increase as you are coming into a town and do not agree with a higher speed limit between Clifton Terrace and Nelson. Speeds should consistently drop down as you get closer to town centres.</p> <p>2.5 Clifton Terrace to Nelson Speed - Because of the above reasoning, whatever speed is deemed safe past Clifton Terrace should be maintained into town. However because there is a good protected path cycleway from Clifton Terrace into Nelson, we would be happy with a 70 or 80kph speed limit from Clifton Terrace all the way into Nelson.</p> <p>3. CONCLUSION</p> <p>3.1 We agree with all of the proposed changes, with the exception of the section from Atawhai Crescent to Trafalgar Street in Nelson. We submit that this should not be higher than the speed around Clifton terrace and we are happy that this be 70 or 80kph.</p>

		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit on this issue.</p> <p>(End of Submission)</p>
1108	Crombie Lockwood (this appears to be a personal submission)	<p>I object to reduction of the speed limits as proposed – there are long straight sections of this road that pose no danger and as there are limited passing lanes – it would be impossible not to break the law when behind slow moving traffic and passing. This is forcing otherwise law abiding drivers to transgress the law simply so they can resume travel at 80!</p> <p>More passing lanes, more cameras / policing and better signage to highlight danger spots.</p> <p>Those who drive irresponsibly and cause the accidents will continue to do so – having a sign reducing the limit wont remove idiots!</p>
1109	Individual submitter	<p>NMH Public Health Service Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nelson Marlborough Health (Nelson Marlborough District Health Board) (NMH) is a key organisation involved in the health and wellbeing of the people within Te Tau Ihu. NMH appreciates the opportunity to comment from a public health perspective on the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) SH6 Blenheim to Nelson Safety Improvements.</li> <li>2. NMH makes this submission in recognition of its responsibilities to improve, promote and protect the health of people and communities under the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 and the Health Act 1956.</li> <li>3. Given that NMH staff regularly travel this road to undertake activities within the community and at the various NMH facilities situated across Nelson and Blenheim, this submission also incorporates the views of staff on road safety along this route.</li> </ol> <p>General support</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. NMH supports the proposed speed limit reductions. NMH continues to advocate that the legal speed limit is based on the road type rather than having the same open road speed limit for all roads. This submission follows our earlier submission on the safety improvements in March 2019.</li> <li>5. Road crashes and injuries have major impact on people and communities. The average 2018 social cost is estimated at \$5.07 million per fatal crash, \$525,600 per serious crash, \$29,900 per minor crash, this includes estimated cost of loss of life and life quality, loss of output, medical cost, property damage costs and legal and court costs incurred.<sup>1</sup></li> <li>6. Speed affects the likelihood and the severity of its consequences. Small reductions in impact speeds greatly increase the chances of surviving a crash. World Health Organisation states that an increase of 1 km/h in mean vehicle speed results in an increase of 4-5% of fatal crashes. <sup>2</sup> The Ministry of Transport's Safer Journey report <sup>3</sup> states that there is a 10% probability of death for car drivers in frontal impact collisions travelling at 70km limit compared with 30% probability for car drivers travelling at 95km/h and 50% probability for drivers travelling at 105 km/h.</li> <li>7. NMH is supportive of the objectives of the Ministry of Transport's Safer Journey Strategy to improve the roads so that each type of road has recognisable and distinctive set of self-explaining features such as signage, lane width, road markings and speed limits. This will encourage people to travel at speeds that best fit the design and function of the road.</li> </ol> <p>1 <a href="https://www.transport.govt.nz/mot-resources/road-safety-resources/roadcrashstatistics/social-cost-of-road-crashes-and-injuries/report-overview/">https://www.transport.govt.nz/mot-resources/road-safety-resources/roadcrashstatistics/social-cost-of-road-crashes-and-injuries/report-overview/</a>  2 <a href="http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/254760/1/WHO-NMH-NVI-17.7-eng.pdf?ua=1">http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/254760/1/WHO-NMH-NVI-17.7-eng.pdf?ua=1</a>  3 <a href="http://www.saferjourneys.govt.nz/assets/Safer-journeys-files/SaferJourneyStrategy.pdf">http://www.saferjourneys.govt.nz/assets/Safer-journeys-files/SaferJourneyStrategy.pdf</a> page 19</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Speed also has adverse effects on levels of environmental and noise pollution, and the "liveability" of urban areas<sup>4</sup> • Lower vehicle speeds and volumes lead to reduced noise, vibration and emissions in the environment. Residents in neighbourhoods with good street environments tend to walk and cycle more, take public transport more and drive less than comparable households in other areas<sup>5</sup> which has environmental impacts.</li> <li>9. NZ is the third worst OECD country for road deaths of those aged 0-14 years. Maori children showed a disproportionately high rate of injury from motor vehicle traffic crashes, and Pacific Island children had the highest rate of non fatal injuries as pedestrians.<sup>6</sup> In order to make our streets safer for those who are the most vulnerable in our communities, we must reduce road speeds.</li> </ol> <p>Specific Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. NMH supports the proposed speed limit changes in all areas as indicated within the consultation document.</li> </ol>

		<p>11. NMH is particularly pleased that the speeds will be reduced around Clifton Terrace School as this was highlighted as an area of concern in our earlier submission this year.</p> <p>12. NMH encourages NZTA to continue its infrastructure improvements in high risk spots on SH6 especially in regards to the installation of passing lanes and median barriers .</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>13. NMH strongly supports NZTA's goal of improving safety on State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson and thanks NZTA for the opportunity to comment on existing issues from both a public and staff safety point of view.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Peter Bramley Chief Executive Peter.bramley@nmdhb.govt.nz</p> <p>4 <a href="http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/254760/1/WHO-NMH-NVI-17.7-eng.pdf?ua=1">http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/254760/1/WHO-NMH-NVI-17.7-eng.pdf?ua=1</a> 5 <a href="https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/use-rfi1es/transpo-rt-dat-a/Traffic%20Ca1ming.pdf">https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/use-rfi1es/transpo-rt-dat-a/Traffic%20Ca1ming.pdf</a> 6</p> <p><a href="http://www.moh.govt.nz/notebook/nbbooks.nsf/0/05ED778EE1B2C6D6CC257F4C007A77\$9fCi le/ /Safe kids%20Aotearoa%20Databook%20CIP%20NZ%20and%20Prevention%20Strategies.pdf">http://www.moh.govt.nz/notebook/nbbooks.nsf/0/05ED778EE1B2C6D6CC257F4C007A77\$9fCi le/ /Safe kids%20Aotearoa%20Databook%20CIP%20NZ%20and%20Prevention%20Strategies.pdf</a></p>
1110	Individual submitter	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the proposed Speed Limit changes on State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson.</p> <p>We are recent arrivals in Nelson, having moved here 4 years ago from other parts of New Zealand. We reside in Marybank, and travel this road regularly, particularly the section from Nelson to Hira, which we travel both ways twice a day on most days.</p> <p>We are astounded by the huge disparity between confidence and competence we regularly witness on this, and other regional highways in the Nelson Area.</p> <p>We fully support all of the proposed speed limit changes in zones 1-3 ,5-6 inclusive, zone 8 and zone 10 respectively. We fully support all of the proposed speed limit changes in zones 12-19 inclusive. Reductions from 100km/h to 80km/h in Zones 4,7, 9 and 11 appear to us ,on the surface, to be an over-reaction, as these sections are well-formed, relatively straight-forward sections of road. However, we are not in possession of the accident statistics for these sections of road in particular, to make a more informed submission.</p> <p>Other factors which need to be considered include:</p> <p>Zone 14: Intersection of Teal Valley Road and State Highway 6: Vehicles turning onto or off Teal Valley road, or pedestrians crossing between Teal Valley Road and Ross Road, take their life in their hands each time they do so because of the lack of visibility of vehicles travelling north on State Highway 6 from the South. Reducing the speed limit to 60 in this zone as proposed will be a significant improvement.</p> <p>Zone 16: The section immediately outside Hira School needs either (a) a turning bay for traffic turning right off State Highway 6 into the School, or, failing that, (b) a pull-off area on the eastern side of the highway for school-bound vehicles to wait to safely turn right into the school. There is insufficient space and visibility (to other vehicles approaching from the north) for cars to safely wait within the current narrow median strip to turn right into the school, even with the proposed variable school zone in place.</p> <p>Zone 17: The intersection of Cable Bay Road and State Highway 6. This intersection needs a turning lane for traffic turning left from State Highway 6 onto Cable Bay Road. Because there is no view of the intersection for vehicles travelling east from Nelson until the last moments, it is unsafe for turning vehicles to slow down to turn, as they risk getting tailgated by another vehicle travelling in the same direction.</p> <p>Zone 17: The Intersection of Glen Road and State Highway 6. This is a blind bend for vehicles travelling east from Nelson, and there isn't sufficient time at 100km/h for vehicles travelling east from Nelson to see and respond to vehicles turning right off Glen Road across their path, and more particularly, vehicles turning right from Glen Road onto State Highway 6 cannot see vehicles travelling</p>

		<p>east on the state Highway until it is too late. This is even worse for cyclists. This intersection needs more than a speed limit change; it needs to be moved to a site with better visibility, but at least a speed limit reduction would "lessen the mess".</p> <p>Zone 18: This is a built-up residential area, housing the only school in Atawhai and a lot of children walking or cycling to and from school. Apart from immediately outside the school, the foot/cycle path is in immediate proximity to the State highway, with no physical barrier between. at 80km/h, we do not feel safe with our child walking or cycling this path. The proposed reduction to 60km/h is in keeping with the residential and school status of this zone; however, there also needs to be a protective barrier between the footpath/cycleway and the highway, particularly the section between Sybil Way and Marybank Road.</p>
1111	Individual submitter	<p>Further to my online opposition, I wish to add the current speed limit of 100km on the open road means slow traffic moves at approx 85km so reducing the speed limit to 80km would inevitably mean slow traffic will travel at approx 70k. The danger of this is the same as current speed limits - not enough passing lanes. Also the Tragiiies on this stretch of road have been minised due to the recent major road works / reclaimed land on the hills. How we can be disgrassing our driving when most countries have higher open road limitis is not accptable.</p>
1112	Individual submitter	<p>oppose the following proposed speed ch,rnges on SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson in the following locations as per the proposal docun1ent: location 1,4,7,9,11,13,14,15,17,18 and 19. These areas should remain with the cu1Teni speed lirnii.</p> <p>I have no opposition to Location 2,3,5,6,8,10,12,and 16 as reducing speeds in the vicinity of schools is a sensible move.</p> <p>This stretch of road has had a high proportion of accidents attributed to passing rnanoevures going wrong. Reducing the speed to 80 km/hr will not result in all the traffic travelling at the same speed. Consideration should be given to adding additional slow traffic lanes to allow faster vehicles the ability to pass. Heavy vehicles take a lot longer to increase speed especially on an uphill gradient and regardless of reducing the speeds to 80km/hr cars will still attempt to pass the trucks even if the speed limits are the same as a car and a truck travel at different speeds as a result of the difference in their ability to safely negotiate a road this includes the vehicles ability to power out of corners and travel up and down gradients. An example of this would be a corner with a recommended speed of 60km/hr a truck and trailer would start to decrease their speed from 80km/hr at least 100-200 meters before a car would start to even consider slowing down. The truck would also negotiate the corner at 10 km/hr below the posted speed limit so they would be at 50 km/hr. Coming out of the corner a truck would take longer to then increase speed back to 80 km/hr. Slowing the speed limit to 80km/hr will not result in all traffic is travelling at the same speed. This is of particular importance since 8% of the deaths and serious injuries were attributed to passing on this stretch of road. Therefore additional areas need to be considered for slow moving traffic, these do not need to be passing lanes but rather slow traffic lanes.</p> <p>The proposed 80km/hr will have significant impacts and increased costs on everyone, the cost of living will increase for the wider community as it will now cost more to transport goods by reducing the speed as the trucks will not be able to complete as many loads in a day. A driver will no longer get three loads to Nelson and back they will only be able to achieve two within their hours.</p> <p>We would like to see the RUC that we pay put into the maintenance and improvement of the roads, lowering the speed limit is a poor way to deal with the failings of the roading infrastructure in this country.</p>
1113	Individual submitter	<p>SH6 Blenheim to Nelson review consultation</p> <p>I oppose the following proposed speed changes on SH6 between Blenheim and Nelson in the following locations as per the proposal ciocume11t: location 1,1,7,9,11,13,14,15,17)g and 19. These areas should remain with the current speed limit</p> <p>I have no opposition to Location 2,3,5,6,8,10,12,and 16 as reducing speeds in the vicinity of schools is a sensible move.</p> <p>This stretch of road has had a high proportion of accidents attributed to passing manoeuvres going wrong. Reducing the speed to 80 km/hr will not result in all the traffic travelling at the same speed. Consideration should be given to adding additional slow traffic lanes to allow faster vehicles the ability to pass. Heavy vehicles take a lot longer to increase speed especially on an uphill gradient and regardless of reducing the speeds to 80km/hr cars will still attempt to pass the trucks even if the speed limits are the same as a car and a truck travel at different speeds as a result of the difference in their ability to safely negotiate a road this includes the vehicles ability to power out of corners and travel up and down gradients. An example of this would be a corner with a recommended speed of 60km/hr a truck and trailer would start to decrease their speed from 80km/hr at least 100-200 meters before a car would start to even consider slowing down. The truck would also negotiate the corner at 10 km/hr below the posted speed limit so they would be at 50 km/hr. Coming out of the corner a truck would take longer to then increase speed back to 80 km/hr. Slowing the speed limit to 80km/hr will not result in all traffic is travelling at the same speed. This is of particular importance since 8% of the deaths and serious injuries were attributed to passing on this stretch of road. Therefore additional areas need to be considered for slow moving traffic, these do not need to be passing lanes but rather slow traffic lanes.</p> <p>The proposed 80km/hr will have significant impacts and increased costs on everyone, the cost of living will increase for the wider community as it will now cost more to transport goods by reducing the speed as the trucks will not be able to complete as many loads in a day. A driver will no longer get three loads to Nelson and back they will only be able to achieve two within their hours.</p> <p>We would like to see the RUC that we pay put into the maintenance and improvement of the roads, lowering the speed limit is a poor way to deal with the failings of the roading infrastructure in this country.</p>
1114	Individual submitter	<p>1: Havelocke township should have a speed restriction of 30kph - trucks &amp; cars travelling at 50kph through this built up area is very dangerous. 2: I travel from Nelson and Blenheim and return weekly and would encourage you to consider the risk the very slow drivers put on other drivers. I am opposed to the reduction of speed limits on the current 100kph you will make it more frustrating for the regular drivers who are safe drivers. The slow traffic as i see on a regular bases will not give any opportunity for the regular drivers to pass. for example it is not unknown which i experienced last Thurs and 3 campervans following eachother closely &amp; 15 vehicles behind of which i was one. These SLOW drivers (drive 60kph in an 80kph &amp; 80kph in a 100kph zone) NEVER pull over into the slow bays which are designed for these drivers. i find truck drivers are most courteous of all but have NEVER had a camper van pull over. Need more signs like on the way to Muchison "Be Considerate - slow drivers pull over" or words to that affect. These frustrating drivers need road signs to prompt them to pull over. 3: The massive roading spend on the Rai Saddle</p>

		<p>to address ONE tight corner has caused drivers to be more fearful travelling down the Nelson side, it is ridiculous, was safer before. The road surface broke up soon after the project was completed causing more broken windscreens. i have witnessed huge squads of road workers when the resealing occurs &amp; then leave with speed restrictions of 50kph when the road is still covered in loose chip. The road surface should be cleaned up properly, this is a situation when the speed should be 30kph until road surface safe. We have 2 broken windscreens from vehicles passing in the opposite directions, extremely frustrating. 4: On the whole, i witness good driving on the Nelson to Blenheim route as it is just made worse with the campervans so it would be most unfair to penalise the general population of road users for a far. i would debate the time differences you have pointed out, slow drivers have cost me 12-15 minutes &amp; i stay which the speed limits. This would be seen as another revenue gathering exercise and penalising good drivers. Did you know that the TDC reception staff did not know that the closing date for these submissions is the 12th Nov, told my husband it was 1st November &amp; that he had missed out.</p>
1115	<p>The Road Transport Association of New Zealand Inc. (RTANZ) and NZ Trucking Association Inc.</p>	<p>The Road Transport Association of New Zealand Inc. (RTANZ) and NZ Trucking Association Inc., have both agreed to complete a combined submission on the Safe Network Programme – SH6 Blenheim to Nelson Speed Review.</p> <p>Our attached combined submission, is based on behalf of our combined membership comments, regarding the notification of the SH6 speed changes sent to us.</p> <p>The Transport Sector within the Nelson Marlborough Regions, agree that there is a need for a Safe System Approach, however we do not support a “Blanket Approach “ to the speed changes across this route in the name of Road Safety.</p> <p>03. Nelson and Blenheim’s Challenges</p> <p>We concur with the information contained in this section and will summarise it below.</p> <p>Blanket Speed Changes to State Highway 6 Nelson to Blenheim</p> <p>The blanket approach from NZTA is focusing on mostly on two speed changes (reducing speeds from 100kph to 80kph, from 80kph to 60kph, with one reduction from 70kph to 50kph). Its vision is to reduce serious injuries, even though many road users, both commercial and private, do not fully agree with the process. The ramifications of these decisions will create other consequences, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Lowering the speeds to a limit that has no differentiation will cause extreme frustration between heavy and light vehicles travelling the same directions;</li> <li>b. These limits need to be complied with, however past evidence has shown, that without a large police presence this will not happen, which will lead to a negative attitude towards the road policing units;</li> <li>c. Without the policing support comes speed cameras being installed in areas to catch those speeding. This will result in infringement revenue gathering, creating frustrations and anxiety towards drivers;</li> <li>d. Regional transport and local businesses will be severely impacted, reducing the number of trips per day, increasing costs, and resulting in a loss of employment;</li> <li>e. The cost of transported goods will rise, impacting the general population, from additional freight charges when extra heavy vehicles are needed to maintain their delivery schedules.</li> </ul> <p>Speed Limit Changes</p> <p>The RTANZ and NZ Trucking have looked at all the factors, including the documented statistics, for the 20 fatal crashes across this section of roading from 2009 to 2018. None of these accidents, which were used in the NZTA proposal, were caused by excessive speeds. Reducing speed limits will not stop crashes resulting from excess alcohol, fatigue, the use of cell phones, or otherwise being distracted at the wheel. Too often we are advised that due to these fatal road crashes, there is a need to lower the speed. RTANZ and NZ Trucking have no issues with putting speed restrictions around identified black spots. We fully support the lowering of speed limits around school zones or built up areas but see no strong need for any changes to the open road section of this state highway.</p> <p>Road Safety</p> <p>There is an expectation that SH6 will be maintained and repaired throughout its lifetime, with unmanned worksite speed limits may not being adhered to, due to the extra time already taken to meet schedule times slots. There is already evidence that drivers of light vehicles are showing their frustration towards roadside workers, who are charged with the responsibility of keeping our road in good shape. Having travelled through the Hundalees with 60kph restrictions, seeing light vehicles abusing heavy truck drivers, passing on bends cutting trucks off, I have seen the frustrations that have already been created by a bad decision process. There is a need for more training and education,</p> <p>5</p>

changes in attitudes, continuous upskilling and testing on a regular basis, such as at every licence renewal period of 10 years, to increase and improve driver behaviour.

#### Information process

The reasons given for such a blanket change is misleading and needs to be challenged. We constantly hear that residents are complaining about the increased speeds past their homes, heavy trucks speeding through local towns, and that pedestrians and cyclists are always at risk. We are advised that the changes will have little or no impact on travelling times, which is not the case. Members are making multiple trips per day in the course of their business, and they are advising that it will take another two hours overall of driving time to do the same business. This creates the possibility of increased costs of goods and services, with some businesses not being able to continue to run a viable operation.

#### Freight

Increased travel times and poor reliability have a severe impact on the freight industry. The return service along this route performs a significant function in the national freight and logistics sector, which will directly affect productivity and distribution of freight to the rest of New Zealand and internationally. Network congestion creates substantial increases in costs to these businesses that are ultimately borne by all consumers. Freight within these two regions is expected to grow substantially over the next 30-years with projections of the wine and fruit industry doubling. In some industrial areas, freight movements make up much of the travel proportion on local roads, especially the logging industry. Freight kilometres travelled within the two regions is expected to grow by almost 85 per cent over the same 30-year period. RTANZ and NZ Trucking, both acknowledge the significant costs that these issues impose on not only the sector (our members), but ultimately both at a regional and national economy level. The loss of productivity would obviously have a major impact on employment and the regional economy. Overall congestion will worsen through both the morning and evening peak travel periods, and as these periods get progressively longer, they will encroach more and more into travel time, which will further impede freight movements.

#### Walking & Cycling

While this may be an aspirational goal for each region, we feel that the biggest gains in the sector would be around completing the planned network including connections to other public transport options. The largest gains are achieved where walking and cycling can be fostered at a local regional community level, where opportunities exist between residences and places of work, schools, training and employment, shopping and services. It is unrealistic to expect that people would commute across town, unless they had a much safer route available, which means that an independent corridor would be required.

#### 04. Addressing Nelson and Blenheim SH6 Challenges

##### Overall

We have looked at the complete route and are voicing our strong opposition to the blanket approach to speed changes, on the grounds that there will be greater problems created, through driver frustrations, increased traffic congestion, people taking more than normal risks, fatigued drivers becoming more erratic – all contributing factors to accidents. Regardless of whether the speed is 6

100kph or 80kph, passing speeds are increased to ensure the manoeuvrability and frustrated drivers put others at risk. The RTANZ and NZ Trucking both supports NZTA in a Rollover Prevention Training Presentation to our heavy vehicle drivers. To date we have completed over 100 courses and within the Nelson, Marlborough, and Christchurch Regions trained some 3,700 drivers. Those drivers have not had a rollover, including three drivers diverted to the course through the courts. This training is free for any road transport operator throughout New Zealand and is a proven methodology to change bad cultures and driving habits.

Both the RTANZ and NZ Trucking have looked at every speed change point. We support some of the changes, have given advice on other points, and absolutely disagree to support others. We have utilised the same chart to ensure clarity as to how we see possible changes.

RTANZ and NZ Trucking Agree and Disagree Recommendations to Speed changes  
 SHW 6 Blenheim to Nelson November 2019  
 SH6 Blenheim to Nelson Existing  
 speed limit  
 (km/h)  
 Proposed  
 speed limit  
 (km/hr)  
 Agree Disagree

1 400m west of Severne St, Blenheim to  
 335m west of Jacksons Rd, Woodbourne  
 100 80 Agree

2 335m west of Jacksons Rd, Woodbourne to  
 130m east of SH6/SH63 Intersection,  
 Renwick  
 80 80 (no  
 change)  
 Agree

3 130m east of SH6/SH63 Intersection to  
 250m north of Gee St, Renwick  
 50 with a  
 40-school  
 zone  
 advisory  
 50 with a 40-  
 school zone  
 advisory  
 Agree

4 250m north of Gee St, Renwick to 240m  
 south of Queen Charlotte Dr, Havelock  
 100 80 Strongly  
 Disagree

4a Should be 80km/h from Renwick to Mahers Road then 100km/hr Havelock

5 240m south of Queen Charlotte Dr to 60m  
 south of Kavenagh Pl, Havelock  
 70 50 Agree

6 60m south of Kavenagh Pl to 300m northwest of Clive St, Havelock  
 50 (with a  
 40-school  
 zone  
 advisory)  
 50 (with a 40-  
 school zone  
 advisory)  
 Agree

7 300m north-west of Clive St, Havelock to  
 100m west of Wakamarina Rd,  
 Canvastown  
 100 80 Strongly  
 Disagree

7a Should still be 100km/hr from Havelock to Canvastown

8 100m west of Wakamarina Rd to 260m west of Tapps Rd, Canvastown  
 100 80 with a 60-school zone  
 Strongly Disagree  
 8a Should be 80km/h from Wakamarina Road (with a 40km/h variable speed past the Canvastown School zone to approximately 200m past the school Nelson side during school start and finish times) then return to 100km/hr

9 260m west of Tapps Rd, Canvastown to 320m south of Pelorus Bridge  
 100 80 Strongly Disagree  
 7  
 9a Should be 100km/hr from Canvastown to the Pelorus Bridge  
 10 320m south to 320m north-east of Pelorus Bridge  
 100/50 in Dec/Jan  
 60 Strongly Disagree  
 10a Agree with a proposed change to 60km/hr from existing 100km/hr for December /January

11 320m north-east of Pelorus Bridge to 210m north of Hills Rd, Rai Valley  
 100 80 Strongly Disagree  
 11a Should still be 100km/hr from Pelorus Bridge to Rai Valley

12 210m north of Hills Rd to 180m north of Bryants Rd, Rai Valley  
 60 with a 40-school zone advisory  
 60 with a 40-school zone advisory (no change)  
 Agree

13 180m north of Bryants Rd, Rai Valley to 770m north-east of Whangamoia Saddle Summit  
 100 80 Strongly Disagree  
 13a Should be 100km/hr from Rai Valley to Whangamoia

14 770m north-east of Whangamoia Saddle Summit to 280m north of Teal Valley Rd  
 100 60 Strongly Disagree  
 14a Should be 80km/hr from Whangamoia to Hira

15 280m north of Teal Valley Rd to 90m south of Lud Valley Rd, Hira

		<p>100 80 Strongly Disagree</p> <p>16 90m south of Lud Valley Rd to 45m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira</p> <p>80 80 with a 60 variable speed limit around the school</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>17 45m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira to 440m north-east of Allisdair St, Atawhai</p> <p>100 80 Strongly Disagree</p> <p>17a Should be 100km/hr from Hira to Todd Bush Road</p> <p>18 440m north-east of Allisdair St to 150m south-west of Atawhai Cres north, Atawhai</p> <p>80 60 Strongly Disagree</p> <p>18a Should be 80km from Todd Bush Road to Atawhai Crescent</p> <p>19 150m south-west of Atawhai Cres north, Atawhai to 250m north-east of Trafalgar St, Nelson</p> <p>100 80 Agree</p> <p>8</p> <p>On behalf of the RTANZ and NZ Trucking, we thank you for the opportunity to submit our proposal, on the recommendation for speed changes on SH6 Nelson to Blenheim.</p>
1116	Individual submitter	<p>I disagree with the proposal to reduce the current 100kpm sections of 80kph for the following reasons: A: Most vehicles are new safer than they have ever been. B: There are currently too few passing lanes. C: People will do silly things trying to overtake trucks. D: The roads are in good condition. E: Most of the accidents are caused by stupid driver doing stupid things and this will continue.</p>
1117	Individual submitter	<p>I am writing in opposition to the LTSA's plan to reduce the speed limit on SH6.</p> <p>I have driven that road for over 34 years and for about 20 of those years nearly every second weekend. I know the road very well and 100km/h on most of that road is not a dangerous speed. For most of the road someone driving properly at 100km/h will have no more accidents than someone driving at 80km/h.</p> <p>The 100km/h speed limit is not the problem and reducing the general speed limit on that road to 80 km/h is a big step backwards.</p> <p>While there may be more accidents on the road than 10 years ago (I understand the numbers are actually not much different), there is a lot more traffic and so percentage wise actually much fewer accidents per 1000 vehicles.</p> <p>The problem that is causing accidents is not the speed limit, but people's poor driving. Most crashes are due to:-</p> <p>Extremely poor driver overtaking due to driver frustration at the lack of passing opportunities and passing lanes and drivers not pulling over if they have large numbers of vehicles behind them.</p> <p>Driving at speeds well in excess of the road limit (so the road limit has no bearing on that)</p> <p>Driving while under drug and alcohol effects.</p> <p>Poor and dangerous passing due to lack of passing opportunities is the biggest issue I believe. With more traffic on the road, straights you could previously pass on are often full of cars &amp; trucks coming the other way. A lower speed limit doesn't fix dangerous passing, probably makes it worse.</p> <p>Millions were spent on the new Rai Saddle and it is dangerous. The Nelson side is the worst part. It is all off camber and passing lanes run out too soon. From the Nelson side the slow vehicle lane is a joke, very few slow vehicles actually pull over and use it which leads to more frustration. It needs to be a bloody passing lane. Whoever signed off that job design is near on incompetent. Sorry to say but very poor result for all the millions spent.</p>

		<p>A long term view for the improvement of the road needs to be taken. A speed limit drop is short term thinking. Money needs to be invested in improving the road with more passing lanes and longer passing lanes. Maybe a speed limit of 90Km/h in the left lane of passing lanes. NZ drivers are notorious for driving at 75km/h with large queue behind then speeding up to 110km/h on the passing lane and slowing down again after the lane.</p> <p>There needs to be:-</p> <p>more driver education. We get a licence at 16/17 and that's it. Continuing education is required in most other walks of life and businesses, but driving.....no.</p> <p>An instant fine for driving below the speed limit and having more than 8 vehicles behind you.</p> <p>Cars are much safer these days and artificially low open road speed limits lead to complacency and lack of care and attention by drivers.</p> <p>Good law requires acceptance by the public that it is good law otherwise they will not obey the law and so becomes ineffective. Clearly over 13,000 objections to lowering the SH 6 road limit is pretty clear evidence that the LTSA policy is the wrong answer. It is clear it is a mis-guided directive from anti car Associate Minister Julia Ann Genter.</p> <p>I do agree that a speed reduction in the canvastown school zone is warranted.</p> <p>I do not agree with other speed limit reductions on SH 6 or other NZ rural and SH roads.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my submission.</p>
1118	Individual submitter	<p>I have driven Havelock to Blenheim to work for 18 years and from my present address (close to Pelorus Bridge) either to Blenheim or to Rai Valley for another 18 years</p> <p>My suggestion is that the speed in the current 100km/h zones is dropped to 90km/h so that the speed of the truck and car traffic is consistent.</p> <p>There is a need for regularly spaced passing lane as there are frequently vehicles travelling at considerably slower than 100km/h (60 or 70km/h is not unusual). The oncoming traffic is frequent enough to make overtaking risky. Impatient drivers regularly overtake whole convoys inspite of the risk. Drivers will be more patient if they know that there is an opportunity to pass coming up.</p> <p>The oneway bridge is an obvious problem..... maybe traffic lights that use a trigger based system.</p> <p>It would be interesting to know the accident statistics for the road. Is it mostly locals or tourists, 1 car or more. Are there more accidents in the spots where cell phone coverage restarts? Is there any consistency in the causes of accidents.</p> <p>The school zones need to be standardized and enforced for the times when students are vulnerable.</p>
1119	2T17 Consulting Limited	<p>On behalf of 2T17 Consulting Limited.</p> <p>2T17 directors and employees regularly travel between Nelson and Blenheim and back again at least once per week and sometimes twice. This travel is undertaken to support our main client Nelson Marlborough DHB.</p>

		<p>We generally oppose the blanket approach that NZTA has taken to reduce speed limits on this road. There are four reasons for our opposition:  a general reduction in speed limit will result in a reduction in productivity for our business and our clients.  The blanket nature of the proposed changes rather than targeting the dangerous parts of the road is counter-productive.  The arbitrary nature of the changes that appear to lack either insight or imagination.  NZTA is focused on the wrong things. It should work on the proven three "E's"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We do not accept the delay projected by NZTA of 9 minutes due to the reductions of speed limits. A simple back of the envelope calculation shows that reducing the speed limit by 20% should increase the time taken by 25% assuming we always drive at the speed limit. If the current trip takes 1 hour 45 minutes then the trip time should increase by 26 minutes. Now we drive some sections no faster than the proposed new speed limits e.g. up and down the Whangamoia saddle and also around Rai Valley. Let's be generous toward the NZTA view and assume that for 30 km over the 117 km trip, there is no decrease in speed. Then applying a 25% increase in time over 87 km results in 19.5 minutes, more that double what NZTA estimates. To get the NZTA estimate, I need to assume that I am not decreasing speed for 77 km out of the 117 km. This is the same as saying that the decrease in speed limit would only slow drivers down between Havelock and Blenheim and leave all other speeds unchanged. This is an implausible claim.</li> </ol> <p>And since the extra time estimate is implausible, then we do not accept that the changes will have a minimal affect on productivity. A typical trip to Blenheim leaves Nelson at 8 am arrives at Wairau hospital at 9:45 giving us approximately 5 hours work before we leave again at 3 pm arriving back in Nelson at approximately 4:45 pm. Our conservative estimate is that we will lose 19.5 minutes each way leading to a loss of 39 minutes for this typical one day trip to Blenheim. These extra 39 minutes mean that we will have to leave Nelson earlier and come back later or further reduce the work we can do while in Blenheim. Assuming we visit Blenheim 50 times per year, then this change will reduce the productivity of each worker by 32.5 hours over the year.</p> <p>2T17 is a small company but if you generalise that loss across DHB employees (15 people per day for 50 weeks) you get 2400 hours lost per year which is 1.2 additional DHB employees every year in perpetuity. This is a significant loss of productivity for the DHB and for taxpayers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. We all agree that there are some dangerous spots on the road including Okaramio, Pelorus Bridge, Canvastown school and the Whangamoia saddle but instead of targeting these areas, NZTA's approach seem to be to reduce the overall speed of relatively safe parts of the road. Indeed, it was reported that NZTA's own model suggested that Havelock to Renwick should be left at 100 km/h. This blanket approach undermines the credibility of the argument that the speed reductions are safety focused. Instead they give the impression of NZTA taking short cuts to make the job easier and a lack of imagination.</li> </ol> <p>Notwithstanding, we do support some speed reductions. We would support reductions around Canvastown school, Pelorus Bridge and around Okaramio.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The speed reduction of 80 km/h over most of the route seems arbitrary. While it is true that the lower the speed the less the damage in the event of a crash, by that argument the speed limit should be 0 km/h or maybe 5 km/h (the same as walking). Obviously, the new limit has to be balanced against having a practical speed limit that does not reduce productivity too much. Therefore, I think the burden is on NZTA to demonstrate why the limit should be 80 km/h rather than say 70 km/h or 95 km/h and so on. This is especially true where the proposal is reported to go against NZTA's speed model.</li> </ol> <p>If NZTA's trip time increase is wrong as we argue above, then that would suggest that the compromise speed should be higher than 80 km/h especially over the areas that there appears to be no argument for the lower speed limit except "its safer". That kind of response exposes NZTA's apparent lack of insight and imagination when it comes to solutions to the high crash rate between Nelson and Blenheim.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The biggest risk is that by applying a "fix" to the problem that is unproven namely a blanket reduction in the speed limit, it will relieve NZTA from putting in place proven solutions namely Engineering, Education and Enforcement - the three E's. These have been proven around the world to reduce deaths and harm yet NZTA seems to be out of ideas in these areas. Again, this proposed "fix" smells of lack of imagination and understanding.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
1120	Bicycle Nelson Bays	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed speed reductions along State Highway 6.</p> <p>Bicycle Nelson Bays SUPPORTS the proposed speed limit reductions for State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson, with the addition of the extension of the 60 kph zone between Dodson's Valley Road and the roundabout at the intersection of Trafalgar Street. The reasons for our support for the speed reduction, including for the full section within Nelson city, include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a large an growing group of road cyclists who cycle between Nelson/Richmond and the top of Whangamoia hill or beyond. There are areas of poor road-side shoulders and a reduced average speed would allow traffic more time to react and avoid cycles. Our experience shows that the majority of vehicles pass extremely closely to on-road cyclists, and so reducing the average speed of the traffic would reduce the risk to cyclists.</li> <li>2. Where there are highways with no shoulders where people can bike, speed limits need to be lower to improve safety, unless the 1.5m recommendation for passing a cyclist become law. Clearly this recommendation is regularly flouted by vehicle drivers 'pushing past' people on bikes where the road narrows, instead of slowing briefly until reaching a safer passing site. The majority of SH6 has no adquate shoulder for cyclists to safely bike on.</li> </ol>

		<p>3. A well known local road cyclist was struck and killed recently at the intersection of SH6 and the Glen road. Lower traffic speeds would have allowed more reaction/avoidance time on a corner with poor sight lines around the adjacent corner.</p> <p>4. A vehicle travelling from Blenheim crosses the city boundary just before Clifton Terrace. The built-up area continues from that point all the way to Trafalgar Street, and includes pedestrians crossing the road to access the estuary, busy intersections, children travelling to school by bike, and many other vulnerable users of the road space, and areas alongside the highway. These are all users of the road corridor that are due to it being part of Nelson city. If it was truly open road, there would be much lower numbers of these road corridor users. As well as on-road cyclists, there are a wide range of everyday cyclists, people on e-bikes and the highest level of cycling activity anywhere in New Zealand [NZ Census]. The increasing volume of cycle traffic is such that the previous open road speed should be reduced to enable all road users, including people on bikes, to use the highway and the adjacent corridor in safety. This includes an increasing proportion of older cyclists with the ageing population.</p> <p>5. We have noted that since the speed limit reduction on the Appleby highway SH60 there have been no fatalities on that area of highway. Bicycle Nelson Bays considers that the increase in safety for all road users is a strong reason for supporting the proposed reductions. We would hope to see a similar reduction in fatalities along SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim. Most of us are both car drivers as well as riding bikes and we support the speed reduction to increase safety for all travel modes.</p> <p>6. We are also aware that a large number of vehicle drivers do not support the reduction in speed limits along that stretch of highway. Generally, their arguments echo the 'myths' that have been objectively addressed by the NZTA. It would appear that their thoughts are more concerned with their own perceived convenience, and not the safety of more vulnerable road users who have the right to use the road corridor in safety.</p> <p>7. We particularly note the argument by opponents of the speed reduction that cars are safer. Late model cars are generally safer for those inside the vehicle and those who are wealthy enough to purchase a new vehicle with all the safety features, but there is still a large proportion of older vehicles on our roads. Even the safest vehicle is no safer if it should hit a person on a bike. Only a reduction in speed to allow for sufficient reaction and avoidance time would increase safety for bike riders.</p> <p>For all these reasons we seek a permanent reduction in speed limits along SH6, including an extension of the proposed 60kmh zone for the full extent of the built-up area from Clifton Terrace to the roundabout at the intersection of Trafalgar Street.</p> <p>Bicycle Nelson Bays November 2019</p>
1121	Individual submitter	<p>Just wanted to share my view on speed consultation. All for lower speeds around schools during school times. But keep 100kph speed in place. The money from fuels that is received in the areas should be put back into the roads in their areas NOT be spent helping North Island road projects. Use the funds in their collected areas for their road improvements.</p>
1122	Individual submitter	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide my feedback. I support proposed speed restrictions through the townships (e.g. Havelock) and on the winding portions of the Whangamoas, but do NOT support the proposed 80km/per hour restriction on the long stretches of open road. I feel this will create instances of bad and dangerous driving. I do not think an 80km limit on the long stretches of open road is warranted. It is a state highway and our main route between our two main centres. I would rather you investigate other options to improve safety – passing lanes, median barriers, crash rails, etc.</p>
1123	Individual submitter	<p>I have been driving for about 50 years now and have made the return trip to Blenheim on countless occasions without incident on any of them. Not only do I find the proposal to lower the speed limit for the whole trip to 80 kph illogical but am deeply concerned with the ramification of such proposal. I am the sort of person that normally accepts changes as “what will be will be” and accordingly I don’t make submissions. But now I find myself compelled to make a submission on this ludicrous proposal. I generally enjoy driving this route and as with any road trip a big part of the enjoyment is arriving safely, un-stress AND in good time. I fear that if this proposal proceeds I would be one of a large number that not only loathe driving to Blenheim but will feel more at risk of an accident. I trust you will consider the following thoughts along with other submitters and objectors (including petition signers) very seriously.</p> <p>Although I accept that by pure physics the outcome of accidents and the seriousness of injuries can be adversely affected by speed, I don’t believe the major cause of accidents is speed alone, and that the underlying cause of most accidents are other factors such as driver inattention/distraction, driver error/incompetence, slow drivers causing impatience and impairment to other drivers. I’m also aware that suicide is becoming a factor in road deaths and I know that one recent death on this road was most likely due to suicide. I believe that accident, injury, and death rates throughout the country are far more likely to be reduced by addressing driver education, driver training and driving licencing standards. On a recent trip to Blenheim in my small truck (loaded), myself, and the unloaded log truck behind me were both slowed down by two cars on the Whangamoas Saddle. Although one pulled over to let us pass before the top, the other continued to do battle with the hill in front of us, not only driving very slowly but breaking at any slight hint of a corner. Aside from the frustration, it really concerned me that people with so little driving ability and confidence should be out on the open road (presumably legally). In contrast, while driving the return trip, I slowly caught up to a car with L plate. Although I was sure it was the learner behind the wheel, I had no concerns about their driving and was impressed that the parents/instructor had brought them out onto a bit of real NZ road to better facilitate the learning of good driving skills. Such experiences should be a part of all new drivers learning experiences.</p>

		<p>I've spoken to many people that like myself believe in the concept of comfortable open road driving speed. A comfortable driving speed is a speed that's within the law, within the driving abilities whereby they are in full control of the vehicle but most importantly, the driver is focused and enjoying the job at hand. For all the people I spoke to, a 100 kph is a comfortable driving speed for most open road conditions and 80 kph was most definitely not. I freely admit that if I'm stuck behind slow traffic (or an open section of road that has recently been reduced to 80 kph) I become distracted, lose focus, often become frustrated ( and sometimes annoyed) and over all feel that my driving ability is impaired all because I'm forced to drive well below my comfortable driving speed for the road and the conditions. If a large sections of open road, such as Nelson to Blenheim, where to become 80 kph, I would personally feel that I would be at a greater risk of having an accident and many I have talked to share this view. If this whole stretch reduction is approved I fear it will set a trend and more and more large section of actually good NZ highways will end up with an 80 kph speed limit. I fear that this will lead to a gradual but definite decline in the overall standard of driving in the country which is alarming because that standard is already pretty low (hence the high proportion of accidents). I feel that reducing speed limits is catering to the slow, incompetent and unconfident drivers and give them licence to drive slower and push their limited abilities even less and ultimately their driving abilities will become even worse. Average drivers that are already prone to distractions such as mobile phones, texting, talking and eating are more likely to become distracted and less defensive and more at risk of accidents particularly as they don't have the handling skills to get themselves out in some unexpected situations. I even feel that the better drivers that enjoyed driving and embraced the skill, challenge and enjoyment of driving are more likely to become disengaged, disenchanting and more at risk of accidents.</p> <p>Also, of concern, are up and coming learner drivers, unless the system changes, they will have limited opportunity to learn handling skills and enjoy the experience of driving.</p> <p>According to reports, the speed reduction will only add 9 minutes to the trip.... (yeah right!). Even if this postulation was reached by driving the route (which I doubt) it is already inaccurate as it would have done without the 80 kph limit and this reduction will create different factors and patterns that will in turn create even slower times which will create more congestion. By increasing the time to travel a given section of road, particularly a larger and busy section, this will automatically increase the number of vehicles on that stretch of road at any given time increasing the likelihood of congestion and an increase in line ups which are not likely to dissipate due to a reduce ability that an 80 kph limit and a long line up will create. I have already noticed with all the reduced areas that a lot of the "slowies" are now driving 60-70 kph and the line ups are becoming more frequent and more sprawled out with a greater increase in fluctuating speeds. I put this down to competent drivers being bored and distracted, and consequently the only defensive driving skill left in play is "don't hit the slowie in front".</p> <p>In a recent article, NZTA representative Jim Harland, quoted many hazards to try to justify the speed reduction from Renwick to Havelock, they are all hazards that good defensive driving habits would negate but of real concern to me is the quoting of intersections and driveways as I believe this would become a greater risk if the speed is lowered. Since the wholesale introduction of 80 kph limits in the Tasman district and particularly around Appleby, I have noticed a mark increased in vehicle line-ups and subsequently an increase in vehicles waiting to get out of driveways and particularly longer ques at intersections. Often, the gaps between vehicles is bigger than it should be but not big enough to safely enter and there is a very real likelihood that the driver of the trailing vehicle is distracted.</p> <p>I'm not an economist and have no idea of the degree but am acutely aware that there will be a significantly economic costs to both regions and that there will also be a significant social cost. This will be particularly pertinent to employees (from reps, distributors and courier drivers up to big rig drivers) and their employers. I can envisage a lot of unnecessary stress being created not just financially but to miss deadlines, miss ferries, reduce family/ relaxation time, etc. This in itself can create extra risks on the road. Stress drivers are not good drivers!</p> <p>In conclusion and in anticipation of the increasing population in the region and on the road, the district is better off investing on creating an extra lane for the slowies. Better still whatever revenues collected out of speeding and or under speeding on this stretch of road should go towards opening an extra lane on our roads.</p>
1124	Individual submitter	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>The speed limit should remain at 100km/h on the main areas between Blenheim to Havelock with a reduction to 50km/h in the Havelock township. The same 100km/h to Rai Valley with a reduction to 50km/h at Pelorus Bridge. Reduce to 50km/h through Rai Valley township. Remain with 100km/h through to Teal Valley, then reduce to 80 km/h to Hira. Keep the 80km/h through the Cable Bay area and from there on keep as existing to Nelson. Through the Whangamoia and Teal Valley areas use recommend speeds on corners that warrant them. More passing lanes would be necessary to avoid frustrated drivers from taking undue risks. Reduced speed limits to 40km/h through any school areas when school pupils are arriving or leaving. To reduce the speed to 80km/h the entire trip to Nelson would cause frustrated drivers to take unnecessary risks and put lives in danger.</p>
1125	Individual submitter	<p>I wish to submit my opposition to the proposed lowering of the speed limit in open areas between settlements on the Blenheim to Nelson road.</p> <p>Some great work has gone into improving this road over the years to reduce the travel time between the two main population areas at the top of the South Island, promoting tourism, commerce and logistics.</p> <p>Mass speed reductions would have an impact on all of these, including increased fuel costs, less time to conduct business on either side of the hill and increased pollution with cars being on the road for a longer period of time.</p> <p>The move could actually increase the danger of reckless driving due to impatient drivers taking more risks to overtake cars they deem to be travelling too slow on this particular road.</p> <p>I'm supportive of lowering the speed limit in built up areas such as townships as well as the addition of more passing lanes where possible.</p>

1126	Individual submitter	<p>With regard to SH6 Blenheim to Nelson the consultation asks ‘are there any other factors that we should consider when making our decision?’</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>There is the added frustration caused to motorists by lowering the speed limit, in light of the fact very many will have travelled the road countless times before, without incident. Thus, given that they will likely be driving an as good or better vehicle than in the past, and that the road itself will not likely be less safe than it was before, it will seem not only slow, but outright counterintuitive. And damn annoying.</p> <p>There is the fact that the road is not the problem, nor the speed limit. Tens of thousands of people use it every year without any issue and in fact really enjoy the drive. When you go ruining it with sluggish speeds and peace destroying rumble strips, all you succeed in doing is taking the enjoyment from the drive. What happens is you ruin another piece of what is good about NZ. And worst of all, you pander to those who cannot drive which in turn further diminishes their awareness on the road and in the longer run makes them need more speed reductions and rumble strips and who knows what else to compensate for their inability to drive.</p> <p>Schools should have a variable speed zone as this is logical but not a permanent speed reduction as reduced speed when few or no people are about is pointless.</p> <p>And more specifically:</p> <p>There is no need for an intersection speed zone at Rapaura intersection. This intersection couldn’t have more room on the SH6 part or better visibility at the end of Rapaura Road if it tried. Totally unnecessary.</p> <p>Safety barriers in the middle and side barriers Renwick to Blenheim is beyond belief really. This is a perfectly straight section of road. It does not need barriers. It also does not need rumble strips. Need I say it again....this is a perfectly straight section of road!</p>
1127	Individual submitter	<p>Are there any other factors that we should consider when making our decision regarding the proposed changes.</p> <p>I agree with the proposed changes, reasons being:-</p> <p>The stretch of road between Nelson and Blenheim is often windy and undulating meaning that the stopping distance of vehicles can be greater than the field of vision. Should there be any obstruction, slow-moving vehicle, livestock, etc. just over the crest of a hill or around a bend, then vehicles travelling at speed would be unable to stop in time.</p> <p>The above is exacerbated by the fact the road is mainly narrow with no shoulder, leaving no room for error. Drivers are human, they get distracted, and this road is often shared with large trucks, i.e. reduced space on the road between passing vehicles.</p> <p>The road is not designed for the current speed capacity of both cars and trucks - and nor are drivers sufficiently well-trained in advanced defensive driving.</p> <p>The attitudes of drivers can be worrying: the desire to be free to drive as fast as possible irrespective of the driving conditions (road, weather, heavy traffic, etc.) and without due regard to safety; also the desire of many to “tail-gate”.</p> <p>Reducing the speed limits will improve safety of all users of this road.</p> <p>Reduced speed limits will also decrease fuel consumption and therefore emissions!</p>
1128	Individual submitter	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed speed reductions along State Highway 6.</p> <p>I support the proposed speed limit reductions for State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson, with the addition of the extension of the 60 kmph zone between Dodson’s Valley Road and the roundabout at the intersection of Trafalgar Street.</p> <p>The reasons for my support for the speed reduction, including for the full section within Nelson city, include:</p> <p>Increased safety and lowered risk for all road users, particularly cyclists who are more vulnerable because of large sections of poor road-side shoulders for cyclists</p> <p>A local road cyclist was struck and killed recently at the intersection of SH6 and the Glen road. Lower traffic speeds would have allowed more reaction/avoidance time on a corner with poor sight lines around the adjacent corner.</p> <p>Vehicles travelling from Blenheim cross the city boundary just before Clifton Terrace. The built-up area continues from that point all the way to Trafalgar Street, and includes pedestrians crossing the road to access the estuary, busy intersections, children travelling to school by bike, and many other vulnerable users of the road space, and areas alongside the highway. These are all users of the road corridor that are due to it being part of Nelson city. If it was truly open road, there would be much lower numbers of these road corridor users. The road speed should be reduced to enable all road users, including people on bikes, to use the highway and the adjacent corridor in safety. This includes an increasing proportion of older cyclists with the ageing population.</p> <p>I am aware that a large number of vehicle drivers do not support the reduction in speed limits along that stretch of highway. Generally, their arguments echo the ‘myths’ that have been objectively addressed by the NZTA. It would appear that their thoughts are more concerned with their own perceived convenience, and not the safety of more vulnerable road users who have the right to use the road corridor in safety.</p> <p>I particularly note the argument by opponents of the speed reduction that cars are safer. Late model cars are generally safer for those inside the vehicle and those who are wealthy enough to purchase a new vehicle with all the safety features, but there is still a large proportion of older vehicles on our roads. Even the safest vehicle is no safer if it should hit a person on a bike. Only a reduction in speed to allow for sufficient reaction and avoidance time would increase safety for bike riders.</p>

		For all these reasons I seek a permanent reduction in speed limits along SH6, including an extension of the proposed 60kmh zone for the full extent of the built-up area from Clifton Terrace to the roundabout at the intersection of Trafalgar Street.
1129	Individual submitter	To whom it may concern. I do not support the dropping of SH6 100kmph zones to 80kmph. I do support lowering speeds outside schools during pick-up and drop-off times.
1130	Individual submitter	I do not support proposed drop from 100kmh to 80kmh speed limit on SH6 between Blenheim to Nelson. I do support speed restrictions outside of schools on the highway during drop off and pick up times. What is needed on the Highway are more overtaking lanes which are lacking.
1131	Individual submitter	<p>I believe the NZTA proposal to apply new speed limits between Blenheim and Nelson, as publicised, is a mistaken, though commendable, endeavour to improve safety on that road. Safety is a state of mind of a road user, not a state of enforcement. These measures are not improving road safety, they are aimed at reducing injury severity, leaving the road safety as poor as before if not worse.</p> <p>Here I will discuss why I consider the journey-time increase has been represented in a misleading fashion and so will not have the minimal effect implied. I will look at the impact queueing will have and the correspondingly greater detrimental effect that may be the outcome (increasing the likelihood of accidents albeit of a less severe nature). Arising from the previous points, freight and services transport will inevitably be affected adversely. After I give my qualifications and experience indicating why I believe my position is worthy of consideration, I have placed my conclusions.</p> <p>Journey time. At present the journey time between Blenheim and Nelson is, to round figures, 90 minutes. NZTA has intimated that the time would increase by 9 minutes or so and suggests this is trivial. It is not the actual time that needs to be considered so much as the percentage of journey time. In this case, the suggested increase will be 10%. I believe this is an underestimate but I have not had time to perform adequate research.</p> <p>On the NZTA website, under the mythbusting banner, specimen times are given for 10km and 4 km journeys. In each case, the first time quoted is based simply on the distance being covered at an average speed of 100kph and 50 kph respectively. As such, the times quoted are correct, 6 minutes and 4 mins 48 secs resp. Then there is a column Maximum speed (time) after. In that column is quoted a range of times and the inference is that a slower speed limit is in force. In both instances it is inappropriate to quote a range in this way.</p> <p>If a slower limit is in force, the journey cannot be completed faster than the speed limit and therefore only one outcome should be quoted in each case. The given speeds for the lower limits are wrong and in each case represent speeds above the inferred limit. At 80 kph the 10km journey cannot be completed in less than 7 mins 30 secs and 4 km at 40 kph cannot be completed in less than 6 minutes. By my rough estimation we will be expecting an increased journey time not of 10% but over 15%.</p> <p>Queueing. Already the queues behind slower vehicles along this route are noticeable. In part, this is because many NZ drivers travel too close to the leading vehicles and so cannot see the opportunities to pass that are presented. However, being in a queue is not a safe place to be, particularly at close distances (well below reaction distances e.g. 2 second rule).</p> <p>Because more traffic will be travelling at the limit or in longer queues, passing opportunities will be less and those that do present will be less effective and commensurate less safe. If the limit is being observed, then passing will not occur and the potential queue will be even greater and hence the danger of "rear end shunts" increases enormously.</p> <p>This was found to be the case when the UK introduced lower limits on its motorway system for fuel-saving purposes and in a very short time raised the lower limit to reduce queueing. In queues, drivers tend to reduce their attention to the vehicle immediately in front, their thinking slows (because they are driving in accord with the vehicle in front and not driving their own journey) and hence reaction to the unexpected takes longer.</p> <p>In the same way, passing opportunities are seen later and potential hazards (school crossings etc.) are equally appreciated late, even to the point of being recognised after the hazard is passed. ("Was that a school back there?") This means there will need to be more and longer passing places, effective dual-carriageway and improved sight-lines if lower limits are emplaced and the knock-on cost of improved roading and the whole issue of effective enforcement and that cost.</p> <p>Effects on freight and services. While reducing speeds may have a marginal effect on overall fuel consumption and associated costs, note must be taken of the significant increase in costs associated with other aspects of the journey. Whereas a company may have supported one trip each way per day at a certain cost in fuel, wear and tear, maintenance schedules, road charges, wages, goods/personnel carried etc. then even a 10% journey time increase represents one complete journey at the "old" rate. (9 minute time increase times 10 journeys adds up to 90 minutes - the old journey time.)</p>

		<p>This will more than exceed any fuel savings by the need to pay for the overheads due to the additional time on the road. Connexions to other services (Picton ferries, bus or train links) will also be impacted with the associated extra overheads introduced (changed schedules, potential reduced custom as a result). I believe the impact will be greater than outlined by NZTA but I have not been able to complete this study.</p> <p>Experience and qualifications. I served for thirty years in the Surrey Constabulary (in the UK) and was a first-class trained motorcyclist and car-driver. I was trained as an Accident Investigation Officer and as such was accepted by UK courts as an expert witness in accident reconstruction and road safety. I operated on some of the busiest roads in the UK (the M25 London Orbital motorway) and attended in various roles some of the most significant accidents on the roading networks of my area (including the December 1984 M25 accident which is still considered one of the worst - both in scale and fatality - to have occurred on that road).</p> <p>My first-class qualifications placed me in the top echelon of all Police drivers and I was an assessor for the Institute of Advanced Motorists. (The minimum standard of Police driving then acceptable was significantly higher than the general driving standards of the public.)</p> <p>Conclusion. In the time available I have not been able to quantify many of my observations, nor have I been able to deal to each heading in greater depth. Some of the other "mythbusting" comments on the NZTA website are equally open to interpretational challenge.</p> <p>It is certain that reducing speed reduces the severity of many injuries but so, too, does improved driver training and improved roading. Early on the website the International Transport Forum study (2018) is cited but in a restricted sense, for the same document argues also for increased speed limits and the issues surrounding enforcement. Drivers will happily (generally) observe reasonable speed limits and such enforcement is seen as fair. Perceived unreasonable limits are less well observed and enforcement is seen as antagonistic and unwelcome.</p> <p>The majority of road-safety studies, including NZTA's own comments, indicate that there is a vital need to improve driver education. This is a viewpoint which I can exemplify by my own experience and "dash-cam" footage. I consider inappropriate speed limits will lead to some stretches of this highway becoming potentially more dangerous (particularly travelling east from Hira to Rai Valley) and while some of the additional measures may ameliorate these outcomes, they will do nothing whatsoever to improve behaviour. This means that road users will travel other highways with no improvement in their road skills and so require still more enforcement measures in other places to compensate for their overall lack of education and ability.</p> <p>I believe far more conversation needs to be held. I attended the opportunity to look at the presentation in the Blenheim Conference Centre. It was not obvious that this extent of speed limit changes and additional measures was being proposed. I quote from the website, "... speeds along this route feel too high to be safe." I don't consider "feel" to be an adequate driver of strategy. If more people "felt" it was too fast, they would be driving more slowly - to reiterate, limits are not a target. If they are too low, drivers make them a target.</p>
1132	Individual submitter	<p>I do not support the dropping of SH6 100kmph zones to 80kmph. I do support lowering speeds outside schools during pick-up and drop-off times.</p>
1133	Individual submitter	<p>We as a family travel reasonably regularly on this road &amp; also for business to wineries in Blenheim etc. I find the current speed limit satisfactory ;- although to slow it down more I fell will lead to more accidents due to unsafe passing manoeuvres to make up time. At a minimum passing lanes should be put in on this road as it is heavily relied on by cars and also heavy trucks between centers. We have no rail transport here in the top of the south so good roading is vitally important. Realistically the road needs a MAJOR upgrade as it is carrying a huge amount of extra traffic compared with 10 years - 20 years ago ;- which was when the Whangamoia upgrade was done on the Blenheim side. This is the cause of the statistically high number of accidents on this road ;- &amp; lowering the speed will not fix this. NZTA needs to UPGRADE the road including the Nelson side of the Whangamoia( I understand base planning &amp; design work already done) &amp; install passing lanes to make this road safer. Central Government must pitch in &amp; assist with getting this road up to standard before more fatal accidents occur.</p>
1134	Nelson Forests	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the above document. Nelson Forests Limited manages 80,000 hectares of plantation forest in the Nelson, Tasman and Marlborough regions, and we operate a large sawmill near State Highway 6 in Marlborough. From forests in the top of the south, we have an annual sustainable harvest of 1,200,000 tonnes. The sawmill has resource consent to process 500,000 tonnes of log per annum, (currently processing 85,000 tonnes per annum). State Highway 6 between Nelson and Blenheim is used to transport logs and lumber to customers and to the ports of Nelson and Marlborough. Currently, we transport 80 loads of logs each week on State Highway 6, on the stretch between Blenheim and Nelson. This is a lot less than we have previously carted and wi ll again in the future,</p>

as our use of the State Highway for log transport is dependent on the location of our harvesting crews. We currently transport 25 truck and trailer loads of lumber from the sawmill each week on this network.

Within our business, we directly employ 110 staff, and have a contract workforce of over 500 people. 65 staff use State Highway 6 between Nelson and Blenheim every day of the working week to access our sawmill adjacent to the Wairau River at Kaituna. Our forestry operational staff also travel on this network daily during the working week.

As a business, we rely on the safe and efficient transport of our products and staff/ contractors on State Highway 6. We do recognise that it is a complex issue to manage the road; ensure safety, provide for the efficient transport of people and products, which affects productivity, maintain the road, have appropriate signage, correct road design and the policing required to protect the travelling public from those who choose not to obey the road rules.

In particular, please note the following:

We have previously made comment on the discussion paper and informal feedback on the need for:

1. Slow vehicle pullover lanes
2. Passing lanes

There is scarcity of both on this 115 kilometre stretch of road. There are also many opportunities to incorporate both into the current road design. It is unfortunate that the recent road improvements over the Rai Saddle failed to provide a slow vehicle pullover lane.

To make the road "safer" there is the need to support a variety of road improvements. Lowering speed limits in places is sensible, but there are other tools that also need to be employed. The proposed approach of a blanket lowering of the speed limit is not sensible, and will lead to frustration, decreased productivity and potentially increased safety issues.

Concerning the current proposal, Nelson Forests Limited (NFL) does not support all of the proposed speed restrictions for the following reasons:

1. The majority of people who drive this road are law abiding and drive to the conditions of the road. The proposed speed restrictions essentially penalise these drivers to address an issue that only relates to a few.
2. The transport of product will become less efficient and regional / national productivity will decrease.

It is noted that the proposed speed restrictions are calculated to add 9 minutes to the overall journey; however, this is based on "perfect" driving conditions. No account is made of maintenance works etc. and their effects on traffic flows.

This will have a direct impact on our productivity in the forest, where logs are stored before transport. The log storage areas (on landings) have a maximum safe amount of stock that can be held before production must cease. The uplift of logs is dependent on an efficient road network. Every delay or increase in cartage time will have a direct effect on harvesting crews and their productivity. It is not a case of simply building larger storage areas to offset delay in uplift, as topography is the limiting constraint.

3. The option to decrease the speed limit is "cheap" compared to other options, such as providing slow vehicle lanes and passing lanes. There needs to be a mix of all road improvements. Simply restricting speed limits will add to driver frustration and based on human behaviour, poor choices will result.
4. The proposed decrease in speed is not warranted for long stretches of the road, such as between Havelock and Renwick, or through the majority of the Rai Valley, or to the north of Nelson (from Marybank to Hira).

With regards to the proposed speed limits for the different stretches of State Highway 6, please note our following submissions:

Location	Existing speed limit	km/h Proposed speed limit	km/h submission
1 400 m west Severne St Blenheim to 335 m west of Jacksons Road, Woodbourne	100	80	Oppose the proposed change
Do not change the current speed			
2 335 m west of Jacksons Road, Woodbourne to 130 m east of SH6/SH63 intersection, Renwick	80	No change	Agree
3 130 m east of SH6/SH63 intersection, Renwick to 250 m north of gee St, Renwick	50&40	No change	Agree
4 250 m north of gee St, Renwick to 240 m south of Queen Charlotte Drive, Havelock	100	80	Oppose the proposed change
Do not change the current speed			
5 240 m south of Queen Charlotte Drive, Havelock to 60 m south of Kavenagh Pl, Havelock	70	50	Agree
6 60 m south of Kavenagh Pl, Havelock to 300 m north-west of Clive St, Havelock	50 & 40	No change	Agree
7 300 m north-west of Clive St, Havelock to 100m west of Wakamarina Rd, Canvastown	100	80	Oppose the proposed change
Do not change the current speed			
8 100m west of Wakamarina Rd, Canvastown to 260 m west of Tapps Rd, Canvastown	100	80 & 60	Agree
9 260 m west of Tapps Rd, Canvastown to 320 m south of Pelorus Bridge	100	80	Oppose the proposed change
Do not change the current speed			
10 320 m south to 320 m north-east of Pelorus Bridge	100/50		
Dec/Jan	60	Oppose the proposed change	Change the speed to 80 kph
11 320 m north-east of Pelorus Bridge to 210 m north of Hills Rd, Rai Valley	100	80	Oppose the proposed change
Do not change the current speed			

		<p>12 210 m north of Hills Rd, Rai Valley to 180 m north of Bryants Rd, Rai Valley 60 &amp; 40 No change Agree</p> <p>13 180 m north of Bryants Rd, Rai Valley to 770 m north-east of Whangamoia Saddle summit 100 80 Oppose the proposed change Do not change the current speed</p> <p>14 770 m north-east of Whangamoia Saddle summit to 280 m north of Teal Valley Rd 100 60 Oppose the proposed change Do not change the current speed</p> <p>15 280 m north of Teal Valley Rd to 90 m south of Luci Valley Road, Hira 100 80 Oppose the proposed change Do not change the current speed</p> <p>16 90 m south of Lud Valley Road, Hira to 45 m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira 80 80 &amp; 60 Agree</p> <p>17 45 m south of Cable Bay Rd, Hira to 440 m north-east of Allisdair St, Marybank 100 80 Oppose the proposed change Do not change the current speed</p> <p>18 440 m north-east of Allisdair St, to 150 m south-west of Atawhai Cres north, Atawhai 80 60 Oppose the proposed change Do not change the current speed</p> <p>19 150 m south-west of Atawhai Cres north, Atawhai to 250 m north-east of Trafalgar St, Nelson 100 80 Oppose the proposed change Do not change the current speed</p> <p>In summary, a general lowering of the speed limit on State Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson is not an acceptable to solution to our business. It is one tool, with application to a limited number of areas. Other safety improvements (as outlines above) need to be implemented before a broad scale lowering of speed limits across the top of the south. In general, Nelson Forests Limited for the reasons given in our submission, does not support the proposed lowered speed restrictions as outlined in public consultation paper.</p>
1135	Individual submitter	<p>Having driven this road many times, for more years than I can remember, both in my job, and privately, the only problems on this road are the inconsiderate drivers that would not take any notice of posted speed signs anyway. The recent road improvements have certainly made the drive easier, if drivers drive to the conditions, there is no problem with it, particularly in “modern” vehicles. As far as reducing the road speed from Rai Township to Renwick, apart from the builtup areas, is ridiculous because the road is a perfectly wide surface and is a very easy drive for anyone with a modicum of intelligence, and driving ability.</p> <p>If the suggested road speed reductions are put into place, I am afraid there will be more road rage created, and accidents caused, by “super-careful” drivers driving at even lower speeds and thereby generating frustration in other drivers attempting to get past them to meet appropriate time deadlines.</p> <p>The bottom line as far as I am concerned – “Do Not Change the Current Speed Limits”, if you do it is the dumbest Bureaucratic “big brother” idea I have seen in years, coming from a warm office in a City like “Wellington”!</p>
1136	Individual submitter	<p>I am a frequent user of state Highway 6 between Blenheim and Nelson. I can assure you that this is a very good road. I think it is ok to travel at 100km in most areas between the towns Renwick to Havelock, Havelock to Pelorus Bridge, Pelorus Bridge to Rai Valley. In each of these sections of highway there are number of long straights. The average speed between Blenheim and Nelson is well below the 100km anyway if you drive normally.</p> <p>You have got to travel slow around the bends on the 2 hills and that slows the trip down somewhat.</p> <p>I think if you change it to an 80km speed limit, it will be just as dangerous as going 100km as there will still be cars passing and traffic line ups. It is not a trip for sightseeing And what’s more if you go to sleep on the road, slow driving can bring about drivers fatigue.</p> <p>It is not a trip for sightseeing, there should be nothing to watch but the road</p>
1137	Individual submitter	<p>I would like to register my strong opposition to the proposed reduction of the 100 km/h speed limit down to 80 km/h between Blenheim and Nelson.(Not including around schools, to which I have no opposition to further reductions if deemed necessary)</p> <p>I don’t believe such a reduction is necessary; the road is perfectly safe if driven to the conditions. The problems are the result of a few incompetents who should not be behind the wheel to begin with, without undergoing a serious driving skills upgrade. Of course accidents can happen to the best drivers, however reducing the speed limit only adds to the problem, frustration and losing patience is a major factor in otherwise good and responsible drivers taking unnecessary risks. Long stretches of open road and being limited to 80 km/h is a recipe for road rage and its associated consequences.</p>

		<p>The actions of a few should not punish the majority. Money should be invested in driver education and additional passing lanes. To help pay for this much heavier fines should be introduced to curtail those using devices whilst driving.</p> <p>Leave the speed limit as it is.</p>
1138	Individual submitter	<p>I am 100% making roads safer. I have been driving from Canvastown to Nelson weekly round trip for 62 years. I have been a professional driver most of my working life, cars and motorcycles since I was 15 yrs old, all other licences except passneters services since 18yrs old. The solution: Raise the driving standard. Lowering the speed limit from 100km to 80km is not the answer because that is not the problem. the only thing that amazes me is that te road toll is not far worse that it is. The major problem I see is cares passing when they shouldnt. It is very rarely I do round trip and not see at least once horrendous overtaking manoeuvre on yellow lines, blind corners, rodiculous short distances. By lowering the speed limit I beleve it would make drivers impatient and more drivers would be overtaking cars and trucks alot of accidents are casused by alochol, drugs, medical events, suicide and fleeing drivers, unlicenced drivers, slow drivers, speeding up on passing lanes and cars in front not using indicators. Drivers who insist drigin less then the speed limit 100km=80km , 8km=70km, 70km=60km ertc... They do not move over, do not use rear view mirrors , insecure laods on trailers, foreigners not used to our roads and road rules. People not concentrating, not wearing seatbelts, using mobile phones and in a years time the possibility of decriminalizing dope smoking. The stopping ares like the colling valled are not caused by slow drivers. Maybe rename them passing areas. All these new speed signs would be more confusing and distracting and cause more problems. I believe defensive driving courses should be compulsory. Have knowledge and respected people like Greg Murphy giving driving / instruction / advice. Have an advance driver license incentive reduced Insureance costs . Great idea are the digital signs, Havelock Rai Valley Hira etc....</p>
1139	Individual submitter	<p>Thank-you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed speed limit changes on SH6 from Blenheim to Nelson. I'd like to make some general comments about speed limits, which I trust you can pass on for national-level consideration. Comments specific to the SH6 proposal are prefaced with [SH6].</p> <p>1. Principle: Don't have the speed limit on a stretch of road change unnecessarily Chopping and changing the limit can be confusing, and it can be easy as a driver to miss the limit change, or forget what the current limit is.</p> <p>2. Principle: Points where the speed limit changes should be obvious; otherwise it needs extra signage. In general, a significant change in road environment triggers an expectation of speed limit change--and so drivers are alert for signs indicating the new limit. The typical example is entering and leaving a small town. A marked change in terrain can make drivers adjust their speed, but it is often not so obvious.</p> <p>Driving through the Lewis pass is now quite confusing with the regular 80kph zones. It is easy to miss the end of the 80kph section. The 80kph sections have 80kph signs posted every km or so, which is both good and bad. It is *good* as a reminder of the lower limit. However, I think the regularity has a *negative* in that it is easy to miss the return to 100kph. Often on that road I have missed noticing the 100kph sign, and so I have been trying to be extra alert for them. Despite that effort, on a recent trip driving north we were in the 80kph zone south of Murchison. I noticed a truck start to tailgate me, and I realised that I must have missed seeing the return to 100kph. I was torn between risking getting a speeding ticket if the limit was actually still 80kph, or being the annoying slow driver travelling 80 in a 100k zone. Eventually the truck &amp; trailer overtook me! In hindsight I realised there hadn't been any more 80kph signs, so that was an indication that it was back to 100kph. However, the uncertainty was there and there was no way for me to determine the limit that applied at that point on the road. This can</p>

be an issue anywhere--it is not uncommon to be stuck behind people whom I think haven't noticed the speed limit increase.

I think bigger, and perhaps different shaped 100kph signs would help highlight the change back to the higher speed, rather than it just being another round sign that at a glance looks like another 80kph reminder sign. Clearer road markings when the limit changes would be good, too. Even a colour coded system could help highlight the change (e.g. red/green/blue across the whole lane, with a consistent colour for different speeds across the whole country).

[SH6] The lower limit through Atawhai is \*not obvious\* from road-width & environment.

I think the present 80kph is fine, and making it continuous 80kph from Nelson to Cable Bay Road would be better.

[SH6] Again at Pelorus there isn't a clear "township" for drivers to expect a slower limit. If changing to 60kph, then clear signage is necessary for both entering and leaving the 60kph zone.

3. Be consistent with speed limits and road-types, as much as possible. It is helpful when limits go up and down, for the high and low limits to be the same. Lewis pass at 100/80/100/80/100/etc. is good in this regard--if each slow section had a different limit it would be harder to remember.

[SH6] This proposal is good in this regard in that it is mostly 80/60/80

4. Make more use of 90kph.

Trucks and vehicles towing trailers are a major frustration for other road users with their lower 90kph limit. Safe opportunities to pass are rare on many NZ roads, and the speed limit differential makes every truck and towing vehicle a nuisance to car drivers. 90kph (or 80kph) limits reduce this frustration and the temptation to make a risky passing manoeuvre.

[SH6] I suggest a 90kph limit instead of 80kph for all the sections between Blenheim and the Whangamoas. This would address the speed-differential issue just discussed, while not impacting travel times so much. Most of those sections of road are a comfortable drive at 90kph.

5. More passing opportunities & education

Passing slow vehicles on hills and windy sections is usually not safe; and on the straights the slow vehicles often speed up to 90-100kph, which makes passing more difficult and risky. I would love to see a nationwide strategy to encourage passing opportunities in slower speed zones, such as through towns. Often you'll be following a truck or slow tourist vehicle with no opportunity to pass, and then come to a 50kph town. This would be the ideal time to overtake, but there are islands and "no passing" signs, and busy town that make passing unsafe; and

		<p>there's "no reason" to pass when the "slow" vehicle is now travelling at the limit (50kph). On return to the open road there is often no chance to pass and so you continue to be stuck behind the slow vehicle.</p> <p>A solution could be to construct a double-lane in the small towns, or a wider section just before the return to 100kph. Here slow vehicles can travel on the left without stopping and let traffic from behind get past. This would need education and good signage, too, because often the drivers of slow vehicles don't seem to realise.</p> <p>Another example is at road works, especially with a stop-go section. When I'm travelling with a trailer and have to stop for road-works I signal drivers behind to pass me if it is safe for them to do so. This sort of behaviour could be encouraged.</p> <p>There have been some good initiatives in recent years with more pull-over areas and signs saying "Let traffic pass". More of these would be good, but also some adjustments: in some places the pull-over area is too soon after the sign, so that by the time the slow driver comprehends the sign it is too late for them to pull over. There is also at least one place on the Lewis pass road where there is a sign but no safe pull-over place provided! That undoes the benefit of those signs--they should always precede a safe pull-over place.</p> <p>Thank-you for the opportunity to give input on these roading issues. I hope these comments have been helpful.</p>
1140	Individual submitter	<p>Re Speed Limits Dear Sir , I have viewed your public consultation document and have concerns about the way this survey has been conducted. While you may say you have done the best to get public input ,you have failed badly to engage the public. Rather than use your directed manner of reply to achieve your results ,I reply as below. At the public markets I attend most are unaware of the consultation document and its intent. When I went into the Marlborough council I had to ask for a copy of you Public Consultation document ,it was not on prominent display.</p> <p>While there are plenty of advertisements about making the roads safer , it has been noticeably lacking on saying we are going to drop the speed limit to 80kph and lower.</p> <p>So its questionable whether your consultation document is genuine in its seeking of public comment or engineered to achieve away of justifying a preconceived conclusion via lack of input.</p> <p>There is a misuse of information with the schools and their desire for safer roads . Articles in the paper show clearly that the schools are interested in ways of making it safer around schools ,not that they wanted a low speed limit all the way from Blenheim to Nelson.</p> <p>Consultation documents like this one , directing the public to make multiple time consuming suggestions typically result in the public being put off from being involved.</p> <p>This is the second consultation document about speed that I have written to. It is noticeable that the question that must be simply asked is ; "Do you agree to dropping the present speed limit to 80kph and even lower in certain sections of the trip between Nelson and Blenheim" is missing .</p> <p>Instead a disingenuous method to engineer a lack of response and a directed result has been used.</p> <p>Addressing the simple question should the speed limit be dropped to 80kph which is lower than the speeds in the 1960s which was 55mph [approx.89kph] when the mechanical standard of tyres/brakes and other technical assistance was very poor , my answer is "NO".</p>

Should the speeds remain as they are "YES" .

Should extra provision be made around schools ,the answer is "YES". What can be done for schools;  
More signals like those at Fairhall school . Some mild rumble sections across the road before entering the school zone to bring drivers notice into focus with the signs would be a good start.

Having driven this section of road many times I know how low the visual presentation of schools are when coming upon them ,after travelling through the rural sections of the road preceding them.

Your own data shows that fatals per 10,000 vehicles is dropping .Other surveys show the same. While any death is a tragedy to achieve a zero fatality rate is an unrealistic goal and excessive actions would have to be taken .

The excessive actions to achieve this will loose public support ,will loose good will with the police ,and make many citizens criminals when they start regularly breaking these low unwarranted speed limits.

The dropping of the speed limit does not magically stop those who are exceeding 100kph and having an accident to suddenly obeying the 80kph limit .

Accidents within the present limits are usually caused by other issues like tiredness.

Travelling at low speeds does create boredom ,which on a recent trip on the Nelson /Blenheim trialing your speed limits , I noticed . It will also create frustration ,lack of attention ,long ques of traffic and bad decisions because of it .

The NZLTA trumpeted so called success stories like zero tolerance periods for exceeding 100kph when there was a drop in accidents ,and then went silent when on another zero tolerance period the accidents increased.

Its not about the narrow vision of continuously dropping speed limits ,so matter what , fatal accidents will not happen .That speed limit is closer to zero ,but more about driver training and getting the travelling public using those roads on board.

The modern vehicle has amazing technical features that were not around when I got a license in the 1960s . However knowing the limits of the modern vehicle , is best learnt on a safe area when getting your license ,not on the open road irrespective of speed limits ,when your first mistake becomes your last .

The last time a change was made comparable to this was when ; give way to the left was changed to give way to the right turning traffic . It took many years before common sense prevailed and could be changed back to give way to left turning traffic , without those who made the change been red faced. Is this to be a repeat experience of poor decision making.

If you insist on ramming through this change you will create a feeling of the public against the police , there will also be excessiveness in traffic police actions to try to justify your change . The public will take to warning each other of traffic offers lurking in the bushes somewhere to help nullify this.

The opposite of getting the travelling public on board.

The narrowness of thinking and excessiveness off traffic policing has been exhibited on two recent occasions .

1 ] In Christchurch on the port hills when a traffic officer issued a ticket for a driver using common sense when passing cyclists . The stress that that member of public had to go through to get the charge dropped for that appalling decision is unacceptable and destroys public support.

2] Handing out approx 288 speeding tickets to drivers passing a Blenheim school. It was on a long weekend with many visitors ,the signage around the school is poor. Instead of a program of advising reminding drivers of the rules around schools ,a punitive approach was used. Do 288 drivers not care about school children ,that would be a wrong conclusion .

It does mean that that busy area should looked at if so many drivers are getting it wrong.

There are already examples of what to do on busy roads in the Marlborough area.That is a tunnel under the road as is the case by the airport. This would be the best way of protecting students than your punitive negative approach.

		Finally if you insist pushing this change through ,then to keep the goodwill to the police ,all traffic police cars should be identified , with possibly a double yellow line over the middle of the car ,so police ,as against traffic police, doing their duties do not loose public goodwill.
1141	Individual submitter	Frequency of travelling Hira - Nelson City (240 times per year) Hira - French Pass turn off Ria Valley (45 return times per year) Nelson -Blenheim (Business - 15 return per year) I believe reducing the speed as proposed is the wrong approach. It will increase frustation and have little effect on number of accidents. There are two main reasons for the accidents. 1: The road is not suitable for the volume of traffic. NZTA have reviewed the road & tried to improve corners & passing lanes more than twice in the last 30 years and still it remains in a similar condition. Whanaga north side & Rai Saddle have changed. The Whangaihao was an improement. The Rai Saddle is very debatable as to improved. Ther are very few overtaking lanes, very few passing bays, very poor shoulder area for slow vechiles to pull over. Clearly the volume of traffic has increased... reducing the speed is a cheaco easy option with poor results. 10year stats are approx 20 fatalities & 100 + near fatalities. 5 of those occured between Tui Glen Road & Bay View Road Attawhini it was a passing lane. The passing land no longer exisits. Solution - Improve the road - width & corners, train drivrs how to drive on a open road. Youth & Old !!! The Frieght truck drivers are to comenneded
1142	Individual submitter	I travel this road from the glen to the french pass turn off (We have a hourse in the sounds) 45+ (return) times a year. I travel to Belnheim at least 10 times a year for work. I DISAGREE with the proposal to lower the speed limit. My Reason being that lowering the speed would cause frustration leading to drivers taking unneccessary risks. From my experience in driving this road for the last 30+ years & find that the inexperienced drivers will drive will under the limit causing other drivers to take risks. There is a lack of passing lanes and many drivers will not pull over to let the cuild up of traffic go. truck drivers are great as they ususally pull over and let the traffic go when they are able. I believe that the road requires to be made safer by taking some of the dangerous corners off and making more passing lanes. I myself was involved in an accident on the Whangamoas where an inexperienced tourist took that cornet too fast and wrote off both vechiles luckily without fatality. i feel this couls have been avoided by more education of tourists driving NZ roads. I feel that to lower the spee would frustrate drivers and not achieve the answer you require.
1143	Onus Constructi on Managem ent	<p>With respect to your current review into the speed limits on State Highway 6 between Nelson &amp; Blenheim, my how the worm has turned.</p> <p>It seems just like yesterday your organisation had it's head stuck in the sand with its continuing ignorance of the people of Nelson with respect to lowering the speed limit through Atawhai. It appears that the head remains stuck in the sand.</p> <p>The proposed changes will do very little to lower the road toll and accidents.</p> <p>If your organisation was open and honest it would provide the accident statics for the road that idenfiy where the incidents took place.</p> <p>These would officially inform all what we know that most of incidents happen on the sections of the road where you can't travel at 100km anyhow. I.e the Whangamoas and the Rai Saddle.</p> <p>You can change the law all you like but for those that speed through there now they will continue to do so in the future.</p> <p>What is required for your organisation to invest in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Proper road maintenance. Why is we have patches upon patches right across this road network</li> <li>· Road improvements section of this road have no shoulder at all. In some cases any manoeuvring room that there is has been eliminated by so call safety barriers.</li> <li>· Passing lanes the provision of proper passing lanes rather than ones that are not much more than stopping bays.</li> <li>· Filling of Open trenches to the road sides, these should be lined with filter cloth and fill with vehicle trapping loose metal.</li> <li>· Decent design. The recently "upgraded" section over the Rai Saddle is just another accident waiting to happen. How long before a truck rolls on the new 75km bend. Not long at all.</li> </ul> <p>A totally unnecessary bend – an avoidable accident waiting to happen here</p> <p>When approaching from the Nelson side to this bend the exiting passing lane finishes the road narrows for</p> <p>approximately 150 meters or so before widening out to wide shoulder for slower vehicles – if this is what it is supposed to be who would know where is the signs for those who don't know the</p>

		<p>road .</p> <p>For the sake of a few thousand more the passing lane could have been continued but no what did we get another bottle neck and accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>This is a lack of funding or a lack of intelligence?</p> <p>Reducing the speed limit will not only encourage those who to drive at 10kms an below the speed to continue this practice but increase the frustration of those who cannot pass due to the god given right of those who choose to travel at slow speed (and good on them for making that choice but their arrogance won't let pull over and let us pass ( I personally prefer to drive to the conditions) meaning we will see an increase of risks being taken by frustrated drivers who would otherwise be good drivers.</p> <p>Where are the proper passing bays?</p> <p>Where is the signage?</p> <p>Where is the driver education?</p> <p>Where is the proper road improvements and investment.</p> <p>This proposal is nothing more than a sham for lack of investment year in, year out.</p> <p>Your modelling tools are nothing but tools that have a predetermined output that to achieve an outcome that is designed to achieve very little in road safety but make up for a lack of foresight, investment and intelligence.</p> <p>I call on all those involve in this sham to resign! Hang your heads in your shame.</p> <p>All would agree one accident is one to many but this proposal will not prevent deaths or accidents, my conscious will be clear will yours or political masters ?</p> <p>Do the right thing fix the road!</p>
1144	Individual submitter	<p>I wish to comment on the proposed speed limit changes to SH6 between Nelson and Blenheim.</p> <p>The vast majority of the road users on this section of highway are against this change, as I also am. The argument that reducing the speed limit by 20% makes the highway safer follows along the logic that all speed reductions are safest approach and should be adopted with the obvious conclusion that reducing the limit to zero means we will have no deaths and no road users in order to save lives. A sensible action obviously.</p> <p>The vast majority of the reduction in road deaths over recent decades has come from the increased safety design of modern vehicles and the increasing incorporated safety technology, not from reductions in speed limits. This will continue to improve as the latest improvements of the higher end vehicles trickle down into the lower cost level vehicles.</p>

Reducing speed limits is equivalent to putting a Band-Aid on a life threatening injury, being a major inconvenience on the vast majority of road users that can transit this highway safely every year to save how many lives? Of the average of 2 deaths per year over the last 10 years, will this action save even 1 per year, I do not believe so. Many of the accidents involving fatalities and serious injuries involved speeds greater than the current speed limits, with the AA Research Foundation finding approximately 50% of fatal accidents involved extreme or reckless behaviour, so slowing and inconveniencing the law abiding drivers will have no effect whatsoever on these type of accidents.

Bearing in mind that many western countries have a speed limit greater 100 kmh, or have in the recent past increased their limit to above 100kmh, I question why NZTA wishes to move NZ back into the dark ages. The vast majority of driving NZers do not want this action and possibly supports my belief that the “some people told us that speeds along this route feel too high to be safe,” that NZTA consulted, are either not the driving public or are not safe themselves to travel this highway at those speeds.

The fact that NZTA states that the extra time required to travel this highway would be approximately 9 minutes, as opposed to the mathematical difference of 16-17 minutes for this distance at the suggested new limits, indicates that reasonable sections of this highway are already travelled at reduced speeds and indeed, in many places the speeds proposed by these new suggested speed limits, meaning that for the most part the sections that are safe to travel at 100kmh, are the only sections of highway where the speed limit induced reductions will actually be physically achieved, making the changes completely counterproductive.

The highlighted statistic that 19 of the 20 deaths and the majority of the injuries occurred on the 100kmh sections of the road is a very weak attempt to sway public opinion by aggrandising the figures towards NZTA’s agenda. With only 3 small settlements on 110 kilometres of highway, it is fairly obvious that the open road section will be at least 95% of the distance and statistically correct to have 95% of the deaths.

As an added issue, reducing the speed limit increases the number of vehicles on the road at any one time and in this case potentially increasing the numbers by 20%, due to the 20% reduction in speeds. Accidents involving head on and sideways collisions are most prominent in the fatal and serious injury accidents and increasing the number of oncoming vehicles that any vehicle making a transit of this highway passes will increase the chances of this type of accident. Hardly a sensible move with a head on collision at 80kmh having a very similar outcome to one at 100kmh.

Drivers travelling at what they consider is the correct and appropriate speed for the section of road they are travelling, will be more attentive and awake, whereas drivers slowed below what they consider is sensible and reasonable speeds become bored and sleepy, adding to dangers of travelling in artificially slowed travel.

While prevention of death and serious injury is a noble cause on our roads, there are many other ways of achieving this that have not had any action. For instance Police chases have caused on average 7 deaths per year over the last 10 years and every chase involves danger to the general public, who have nothing to do with the chase. Many of these chases start from a very minor infringement or suspected offence, but NZ police have a “have to get their man regardless” mindset that creates carnage and serious incident in many cases. If NZ instituted the Queensland policy of Police chases, our death toll from chases would most likely be the same as theirs since the introduction of their policy in 2014...zero. The revenue at all costs policy of traffic policing results in a significant number of needless fatal and serious injury accidents and significant cost in repairing or replacing vehicles.

The statistics show a marked increase in the road deaths since the recent low of 2013 and this is easily accounted for when the actions of the last National Government’s immigration policy allowed 400,000 new immigrants into NZ, many who had no driving history before arriving in NZ or came from countries with very poor driving standards. One hopes that as these people are assimilated into NZ society, the driving standards of most will increase to a more average NZ level, reducing the risks they add to other road users. The large increase in tourism in the last decade, particularly from Asia and more specifically China, with many of these drivers very inexperienced or of a hopelessly inadequate skill level being let lose by the hire car/motorhome industry in large

		<p>numbers on NZ roads adds to our worsening death and injury toll. On a per capita and also on total kilometres travelled basis, our road deaths have not spiked at all, but the long standing steady reduction merely became stationary, rather than reducing year on year as before. The numbers are up, but so are our road users and quick fixes are not going to work on this one and never have. The NZ police policy of actively policing speeding down to 4kmh over the limit on holiday weekends and occasional periods came in with much fanfare and advertising earlier this decade and disappeared without a trace after the road toll went up and many of those over-policed weekends had some very high road tolls showing that over emphasising speeds in relation to accidents is very misleading and targeting the wrong areas to become yet another failed quick fix.</p> <p>On a numbers basis the Waikato has the highest number of fatal and serious injury accidents at 17% of the total, so logic would determine that to reduce the speed limits of that area will do the most good, but conversely it will raise the most resistance due to population and so NZTA is tackling the quieter easier country roads first. The average of 2 deaths per year over 10 years on Highway 6 is only a very small part of NZ's road toll and there are many roads with a far higher level, but are not being targeted. This is a part of a general agenda by NZTA of reducing NZ speed limits country wide, often by stealth, where it can and the fact that the Highway 6 &amp; 7 speed limit reductions brought in during the period of Highway 1's closure in the Kaikoura area have never been lifted and no review after the reopening of Highway 1 was ever published, as it was stated would take place. The traffic numbers on those sections of the highways have plummeted with the reopening of Highway 1, but the restrictions are still in place.</p> <p>In conclusion I believe this action of reducing speed limits is a wholly inadequate knee jerk reaction to a recently increased NZ road toll, initially being proposed in areas with relatively low traffic numbers, hence low numbers of objections, in an effort to start reducing NZs overall speed limit. This is going to incur huge costs to the country in lost time and do little to improve the problem. The improvement of open road intersections with decent merging lanes to allow incoming vehicles the time and space to safely enter the highway will cost money and take time, but will make a significant difference to the fatal and serious intersection accidents caused by the law abiding drivers, because the accidents caused by non-law abiding drivers will not be affected one bit by any speed limit changes and are irrelevant when speed limits are being considered.</p> <p>Do not meddle with what contributes little to nothing, concentrate and fix the areas that actually cause the accidents in the first place, rather than make a wholly inadequate misdirected attempt to reduce the damage of the event.</p>
1145	Butt Drilling	<p>I write to you regarding the proposed speed reductions from Blenheim to Nelson.</p> <p>Our company is a regular traveler on this road, and I feel reducing the speed will only make things worse.</p> <p>We operate heavy vehicles on this road and find that as there are very few parts of it to let cars past there are always people prepared to make stupid risks to pass.</p> <p>By putting a slower speed limit in place is going to put more cars on this stretch of road at any given time making the problem worse.</p> <p>I can understand a desperate need to cut the road toll on this stretch of road, but I would have to ask about some of the data that you are offering. How many people that were killed were under the influence of drugs or alcohol , and how many were speeding?</p> <p>These people are still going to carry on with this sort of habit and reducing the speed in machines that are designed to be driven at 100km is not going to help.</p> <p>My thoughts on a fix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Put in passing lanes in both directions every 3-4 kilometers( don't need to be enormous structures just to let slower vehicles to move over)</li> <li>• Put a crash fence up the center of the road ( not on the sides like seems the norm, this will stop the high impact crashes)</li> <li>• Install Speed slowing signs at schools as required along this route (i.e. Canvastown school) like Fairhall School.</li> </ul> <p>I thank you in anticipation for considering my reasoning.</p> <p>Butt Drilling Ltd www.buttdrilling.co.nz</p>
1146	Individual submitter	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I do NOT agree with a speed reduction.</p>

		<p>You have a 50 kmph through Renwick (Fine)  You have a 50 kmph through Havelock (Fine).  You have a lower speed limit through Rai Valley perhaps should be 50kmph.  Where explain to me are you going to do 100kmph through the Hills. apart from a few straight places.  PLEASE spend money on the roads put in passing lanes. NEVER say there is no money for roads to a South Islander when millions are spent on Auckland and North of and waikato as well. we are also part of New Zealand.  Remember back in the 70's when we had 800 plus killed on our roads annually. We have still not learnt to fix the roads.  To Lower the speed limits is like going back to car less days and how long did that last.????  FIX THE ROADS, that is a big part of the problem.</p>
1147	Individual submitter	<p>We live in Nelson and have been driving to and from teh Waikawa Marioa in Marlbouough for the last 25 years. WE DO NOT SUPPORT a blanket speed limit of 80km/he because there are a number of sections where 100km is APPROPRIATE. Our response is : Locations: 1,2,3,5,6,10,12,13,19 - we agree with the proposed changes and suggest trailing them. Locations: 14 - keep it at whatever 15-13 become. Locations: 4,7,8,9,11,15 to 18 - DO NOT AGREE BUT if it is changed then more passing lanes are required and the speed limit in the lanes be 100km/hr</p>
1148	Individual submitter	<p>We have been travelling to and from Picton for the last 25 years. WE DO NOT SUPPORT a blanket speed limit of 80km/he because there are several sections of the road where 100km is both SAFE and APPROPRIATE. We wouls like to highlight the following: Locations: 1,2,3,5,6,10,12,13,19 - we agree with the proposed changes and suggest trailing them. Locations: 14 - keep it at whatever 15-13 become. Locations: 4,7,8,9,11,15 to 18 - DO NOT AGREE BUT if it is changed then more passing lanes are required and the speed limit in the lanes be 100km/hr</p>
1149	Individual submitter	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed speed limits on State Highway 6 between blenheim and Nelson.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that some people have commented in a negative way in local community newspapers in Nelson regarding the proposed changes. I suspect those who have expressed a negative view to proposed speed limits between Blenheim and Nelson have not yet experienced a car smash, particularly in the Whangamoia hill area. I speak from experience.</p> <p>In 1976, between the Kokorua turn-off and the foot of the Nelson side of the Rai Saddle, my father was driving to Havelock, when he approached a right hand curve. A car coming from Rai Valley came around the corner too fast and crossed into my fathers lane and crashed head-on with my fathers vehicle.</p> <p>In 1981, on a drive to Blenheim, I was a front seat passenger in the car driven by my father. We had crossed the Whangamoia hill and were at the base of it (where the section of new road by-passes it completely) We went into a sweeping left-hand curve to approach the next corner which was a right-hand curve. As we did so, a car coming from Rai Valley, came around the corner too fast and crossed into my fathers lane. The other car hit us head-on. My father spent months in hospital and still has a disability today.</p> <p>In short, I am in complete agreement with the NZTA, proposing new speed limits between Blenheim and Nelson. As you say in your document, the extra travel time from Blenheim to Nelson is only 9 minutes. 9 minutes is nothing when the risk of collision, and injury or death is reduced.</p> <p>Another risk on New Zealand roads in general nowadays, is the flood of foreign drivers who drive hire cars or camper vans. Many of them come from countries where driving on the right-hand side of the road is normal. When they tour New Zealand, moments of inattention see them drift back onto the right-hand side of our roads -with the resulting disaster we have heard of from time to time.</p> <p>In closing, I feel there should be a greater Police presence on New Zealand roads. On the occasional drive from Nelson to Motueka, I have had journeys when I have not seen a Police car for the entire trip. Aggressive ticketing would, I feel, sharpen the driving skills of motorists on New Zealand roads.</p> <p>I do hope your proposed speed limits between Blenheim and Nelson are adopted.</p>