



Land Transport: Traffic Control Devices (Kura School signs) Amendment 2021

Summary of Submissions Report

Copyright information

Copyright ©. This copyright work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence. In essence, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and abide by the other licence terms. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Disclaimer

Waka Kotahi has endeavoured to ensure material in this document is technically accurate and reflects legal requirements. However, the document does not override governing legislation. Waka Kotahi does not accept liability for any consequences arising from the use of this document. If the user of this document is unsure whether the material is correct, they should refer directly to the relevant legislation and contact Waka Kotahi.

More information

Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Published: April 2022

ISBN: 978-0-473-62029-5

If you have further queries, call our contact centre on 0800 699 000 or email us at rules@nzta.govt.nz

This document is available on Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency's website at www.nzta.govt.nz

CONTENTS

Background	4
Consultation Process	4
Overview of feedback for and against bilingual traffic signs	5
Analysis by Question	
Question 1	6
Question 2	8
Question 3	10
Question 4	10
Question 5	11
Question 6	11
Question 7	12
Question 8	12
Question 9	12
Question 10	13
Question 11	13
Question 12	13
Other submissions relating to the wider programme of work	14

Background

Despite te reo Māori being the indigenous language of Aotearoa New Zealand, there are a very small number of traffic signs that combine both te reo Māori and English text (i.e., bilingual traffic signs). Waka Kotahi, with support from Te Manatū Waka, is undertaking a programme of work to enable the use of te reo Māori on traffic signs in Aotearoa New Zealand. He Tohu Huarahi Bilingual Traffic Signs programme forms part of the Waka Kotahi contribution to Maihi Karauna, the Crown's strategy for te reo Māori revitalisation 2019–2023. Maihi Karauna is aimed at ensuring there are everyday opportunities for New Zealanders to engage with and use te reo Māori.

This programme of work is progressing in two phases:

- Phase 1: identify, consider, and enable a prioritised selection of bilingual signs by the end of 2023.
- Phase 2: undertake a process to consider and, where appropriate, implement the rest of the signs from 2024.

Enabling bilingual traffic signs requires amending the Land Transport Rule: Transport Control Devices 2004 (the TCD Rule).

In Phase 1, Waka Kotahi identified an opportunity to implement bilingual 'Kura School' signs ahead of the rest of the prioritised selection. The proposed Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2022 (the proposed Speed Rule) will mandate lower speed limits around schools. Waka Kotahi estimates around 1,000 new school speed limit signs will be implemented on the roading network before July 2024, and another 3,000 before 2028. This is a significant opportunity to see more te reo Māori on traffic signs across Aotearoa New Zealand within the next few years and leverages the investment that Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs) will need to make for new speed limit signs.

Consultation process

The consultation on the proposed 'Kura School' signs was conducted from 4 November 2021 to 17 December 2021. The consultation documents (Overview of Proposed Amendments, Draft Proposed Rule) is available on the Waka Kotahi website: <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/about-us/consultations/archive/kura-school-traffic-signs-consultation/>.

Waka Kotahi received 564 responses from a range of stakeholders via email and the online survey platform Survey Monkey:

Category of respondents	Number of respondents
Individuals	549
Schools and kindergartens	13
Industry Associations	2
Local government and RCAs	9
Central government departments or agencies	4

Social media was also used to promote the consultation (Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn). Over 680 comments were received, and although not treated as submissions, the feedback showed positive engagement with the 'Kura School' signs proposal and indicated similar levels of support for the design preference signalled through the consultation process.

The consultation presented 12 questions relating to the 'Kura School' signs. Six of the questions sought feedback on:

- design elements of the 'Kura School' signs,
- the benefits or impacts of the signs, and
- the proposed timing to enable the signs at the same time as the proposed Speed Rule changes.

The remaining six questions sought feedback on the removal of three warning signs, the removal of the school zone option for the symbolic warning – active flashing light sign, and some other minor or consequential changes to the TCD Rule.

Overview of feedback for and against bilingual traffic signs

In addition to receiving feedback on the specific questions asked, most respondents also provided their views on whether they perceived bilingual signs in general as a positive or negative change. Although there was no specific question asked on the merits of bilingual signs, an overview of respondents' main points has been provided below.

Around 90% of respondents supported the introduction of bilingual traffic signs. Reasons provided in support of bilingual traffic signs included:

- Bilingual signs would be a positive step forward in normalising the everyday use of te reo Māori. The revival of te reo Māori has many positive social and cultural impacts for Māori
- The signs will provide the mana te reo Māori should be accorded as New Zealand's official indigenous language
- The signs could provide educational opportunities to enhance learning of te reo Māori
- The signs support the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Under 10% of respondents did not support the implementation of bilingual signs. The main reasons included:

- Road signs were not the place for bilingual text as they would become more complex and difficult to comprehend if they were made bilingual for English speakers, especially tourists who are not familiar with te reo Māori
- The costs of implementation were too great for the signs, for little apparent benefit.

Waka Kotahi does not agree that bilingual traffic signs compromise road user safety. Research of jurisdictions with bilingual traffic signs demonstrates there is no increase in the number of deaths or serious injuries (DSIs) on the road. As long as traffic signs are well designed, it has been found that drivers are able to adapt and identify their preferred language quickly enough for dual languages to not pose a substantive safety risk. This is also true for foreign drivers as they are often familiar with English traffic signs. Research by Waka Kotahi that discusses these findings is available on the Waka Kotahi website here: [Research Note 005 Bilingual traffic signage – a research note | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency \(nzta.govt.nz\)](https://www.nzta.govt.nz/research/research-note-005-bilingual-traffic-signage-a-research-note/).

Bilingual traffic signs will be rolled out over time as the existing signs become due for replacement or, as is the case with the 'Kura School' signs, will be replaced in conjunction with other rule changes where appropriate. Submissions from 90% of respondents supported the Waka Kotahi position that there are distinct social, cultural and safety benefits that come from bilingual signs. Waka Kotahi considers that the relatively small investment associated with bilingual signs is justified in light of the social, cultural and safety benefits they create.

ANALYSIS BY QUESTION

Question 1: Do you have any feedback on the proposed design of the new 'Kura School' traffic sign?

A total of 367 respondents provided feedback on this question.

This question focused on whether respondents had any feedback about the design of 'Kura School' sign:

- 67% supported the sign as proposed
- 16% made alternative suggestions regarding some sign design elements
- 17% did not support the proposed design.

Most respondents that fully supported the proposed design did not offer any substantive reasons for being in favour of the proposed design. Instead, most commented that enabling bilingual signs was a positive change. An example of this reasoning can be found in the submission from Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori which stated:

'The proposed design helps to promote visibility of Reo Māori, it raises awareness of Reo Māori, and by incorporating one word 'Kura' it makes Reo Māori more accessible to the general population.'

Some respondents who were not in support of the proposal were concerned the design of the sign causing visual clutter, which would make the sign hard to understand. Visual clutter is not considered to be an issue for the 'Kura School' sign. The sign is a relatively simple translation that meets the current network design criteria. The removal of the word *zone* for some signs helps to mitigate the total amount of text on the signs. The issue of visual clutter will continue be considered as part of future bilingual signs programme of work.

Respondents also noted the signs should be in sentence case as opposed to full capitals. Respondents justified a change to sentence case by observing that this form is more readable than the capital case, and therefore should be more effective for people with visual impairments and people generally. The 'Kura School' signs are classified as a warning sign. Capital case is used on this category of signs to enhance safety, and its use aligns with international standards and best practice. According to current standards, capital case is attention grabbing and thus better communicates warning messaging. Waka Kotahi is of the view that the 'Kura School' sign message is simple enough that readability of the sign is not compromised when presented in capital case. Differences in case might be used in the future, but for the purposes of this sign capital case will continue to be used.

Suggested amendments to the proposed design

There were a variety of suggested changes to the proposed design. None of these suggested changes were widely held among the majority of respondents. The main themes are outlined below along with Waka Kotahi's assessment of them but none of suggestions will be used for the 'Kura School' sign.

'School' above 'Kura' or in a prime position

Many of the 17% of respondents who were against the proposed design did concede that if the 'Kura School' signs proposal was to proceed, then the English translation should be given prominence. This would mean that 'School' should either be at the top of the sign, in bold, or both.

Safety enhancement was the most common justification for this design change. Waka Kotahi research has found that it would not take road users long to recognise a new sign and comprehend the translation they were most proficient in, as long as there was some sort of differentiation between the languages. Long term road observations revealed there were no negative effects on road user experience in terms of deaths and serious injuries (DSIs) for bilingual traffic signs, even if the less spoken language was placed in a position of primacy (O'Donnell & Trotter 2021). Therefore, having 'Kura' on top of 'School' is unlikely to significantly effect safety.

Te Puni Kōkiri recommends that where te reo Māori and English text cannot be displayed as equal (e.g., typeface, font size) then te reo Māori should be more prominent. Many respondents who supported the proposed design, stated that te reo Māori should be given a position of prominence as it enhances the position of te reo Māori as a language and promotes language equality. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori stated that *'....by affording the word 'KURA' prominence within the sign this recognises the value of Reo Māori...'* Given that te reo Māori is used less than English throughout Aotearoa New Zealand, Waka Kotahi is of the view that it needs to be promoted if it is to achieve equality with English in New Zealand.

Creating a te reo Māori font as a means of differentiation

Respondents noted that Waka Kotahi could consider commissioning an indigenous designer to create a te reo Māori font that could be used as a form of differentiation across the transport network and would promote language equity. While this suggestion provides for consistent differentiation and for language equality, it cannot be implemented in the 'Kura School' projects timeframe. Creating a new font that can be used on traffic safety signs requires rigorous testing to ensure that it reaches international safety standards set out by the Vienna Convention of Road Signs and Signals, which can take years. Key Māori stakeholders will also have to be consulted to design a font that gives sufficient mana to te reo Māori.

Waka Kotahi believes that the 'Kura School' signs will have the most positive impact if they are widely dispersed across the network as soon as possible and this can be achieved by aligning with the speed rule changes. Therefore, the consultation and testing that is required to create a new transport font cannot be undertaken in the timeframe of the 'Kura School' amendment. A te reo Māori specific font will be considered as an option for differentiation for bilingual traffic signs for future work.

Not differentiating the languages at all

Some submissions argued that differentiation was unnecessary. Waka Kotahi research has shown that differentiation is necessary to assist drivers finding and comprehending their preferred language, so it is therefore crucial to differentiate the languages for safety.¹

Grammatical forms of differentiation, such as bullet points, brackets, or a dash

Various respondents suggested grammatical forms of differentiation, such as bullet points, brackets, or a dash which could be used to distinguish 'Kura' from 'School.' These options would represent a departure from common traffic signage grammar, which could result in greater initial confusion for road users. These suggestions could also represent greater visual complexity that is likely to result in longer reading comprehension times. Therefore, these forms of differentiation will not be used.

Differentiation of languages by colour

Differentiating languages by colour can be difficult due to how colours are used in existing signage (i.e. one colour may not be available across all signs given existing use of colour for text or background) and because road users with colour-blindness require contrast difference. Waka Kotahi considers that differentiation by colour of text is not necessary for the 'Kura School' signs as

¹ O'Donnell & Trotter, 2010.

bold achieves the differential outcomes we are seeking. The potential use of colour to differentiate languages will however be considered for future signs.

Changing the background colour of the sign as it fades over time

A few respondents wanted to change the background colour of the sign as they said it faded overtime. The black on fluro-yellow background colour scheme is consistent with the family of traffic warning signs that is accepted by the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals and will therefore not be changed as was outlined in the consultation document. The reflective materials that must be used for signs manufacture are tested against premature failure, and old signs that do not meet the required colour and reflectivity performance should be replaced by RCAs.

Only displaying 'Kura' on the sign

A number of respondents suggested that 'Kura' could be used by itself as it is a simple translation that people would easily pick up and comprehend. Waka Kotahi has approached the development of the Kura School signs on the basis that both languages must be represented on the signs. Waka Kotahi will consider whether it may be appropriate for some signs to display only te reo Māori language as part of future work.

Using an underline to differentiate 'Kura' and 'School'

Initial consultation indicated that there was an issue of lines being used on the road network to separate out ideas. This means that if a line were to be used to delineate the difference in a language this may result in confusion about which words and phrases were a translation, and which were a different idea or phrase. Therefore, Waka Kotahi does not consider this option an appropriate way to differentiate the languages.

Question 2: Do you have any feedback on the use of italics or bold to differentiate te reo Māori from English?

A total of 388 respondents provided feedback on this question.

The consultation document outlined bold and italic options to differentiate te reo Māori from English for the 'Kura School' sign as shown below.

Option in <i>Italics</i>	Option in Bold
	

Waka Kotahi stated in the consultation document that italics were the preferred form of differentiation. This was, firstly, because italics distinguished the languages slightly better than bold

and was therefore a safer form of differentiation.² Secondly, italics would enable language differentiation on traffic signs that have English in the bold typeface already (for example destination signs). However, the feedback suggested that this preference needed to be rethought. Bold was the overwhelmingly preferred option by respondents. 63% of respondents were in favour of bold, 14% were in favour of Italics, and 23% of the respondents were in favour of another form of differentiation. The number of respondents who supported bold and the reasons they gave were enough to overturn the Waka Kotahi rationale that favoured italics.

Reasons for Bold

One of the most convincing arguments for bold came from Te Mātāwai, which stated:

'Te Mātāwai advocates for the use of bold to differentiate te reo Māori from English. Historically the use of italics creates the impression that the content of the italicised text is outside the norm which is not appropriate for the indigenous language of New Zealand. Instead, we recommend the use of Bold as it has a higher prioritising effect, more clearly delineates at a glance and viewers are more likely to attend first to bold text than standard text. This approach feels consistent with the official and indigenous status given to te reo Māori. This approach is also consistent with the Te Puni Kōkiri Bilingual Signage guide for best practice which recommends against the use of italics to differentiate English from Māori.'

The overall purpose of He Tohu Huarahi Bilingual Traffic Signs programme is to provide an opportunity for more New Zealanders to interact with te reo Māori every day, and to provide a platform for te reo Māori to grow in use. If te reo Māori is presented in a way that renders it foreign looking then this undermines the purpose of the initiative. Many respondents also pointed out that bold presented the best chance of people paying attention to the te reo Māori portion of the sign and is therefore best from an educational standpoint.

Respondents also pointed out that italics is not suitable for the reading impaired (for example those with dyslexia) as italics compresses the text together. While this concern can be mitigated by widening the italicised text, there has been no testing done on whether this actually improves the readability of the signs for those who are reading impaired. Therefore, bold may be interpreted as better for the reading impaired, and the system should be designed to better suit those who are disadvantaged to create a safer system overall.

Reasons for italics

One prevailing idea from respondents who were for italics was that if Kura was to be in bold then it would negatively affect English from a language equity standpoint. There is no evidence that English will be negatively affected as a language if the te reo Māori text is presented in bold given the dominance that English has as a language in New Zealand.

Some respondents who supported italics also made the point that the italics typeface was better from a language differentiation standpoint and was therefore safer. Our consultation document concluded that comprehension times would not be significantly altered if the form of differentiation used was either bold or italic, as both differentiated the te reo Māori and English text and people could still easily comprehend their preferred language quickly. Therefore, while italics increases differentiation, italics is not necessarily safer than the bold typeface in any significant way.

Conclusion

Consultation revealed a strong preference for using bold typeface for the Kura School distinction. It has the overwhelming support of respondents and is the best typeface to correctly promote and value te reo Māori from a cultural point of view. The position of Waka Kotahi is that bold is a safe form of differentiation for Kura School signs, and it is safer than italics for road users with dyslexia and other visual impairments. Therefore, Waka Kotahi will use bold typeface to differentiate te reo Māori from English text for all of the proposed Kura School signs.

Technical constraints have meant that the bold 'Kura' design that was consulted, which used the Modified Transport Series E font, cannot be manufactured in capital case and it has not been proven as safe to use on the New Zealand transport network. We are proposing to use a new type of bold distinction for the 'Kura School' signs by using a capitals case version of 'Kura' in Transport Series E, in conjunction with 'School' in Transport Series D as indicated below.



While this distinction is now one of font size not typeface, it still has boldening effects that are enough to differentiate the two languages. This distinction renders 'Kura' as noticeably bolder than the 'School' so is therefore still in keeping with the design principles for preferring bold that were taken from the submissions in the consultation. This new version further improves on the safety factor of the sign by making the English text more legible text compared to the current sign which currently uses Transport Series C. A single step of differentiation between the two languages will also provide for greater consistency among other traffic warning signs when considered in the future.

Question 3: In your opinion, which of the two options (italic or bold) seems clearer to read and quicker to understand?

A total of 555 respondents provided feedback on this question.

Respondents using Survey Monkey were required to select a preference from the two options:³

- 84% of respondents were in support of bold
- 16% of respondents were in support of italic.

The levels of support for these options need to be considered within the context of some respondents indicating alternative preferences to differentiate in feedback provided to other questions. However, Waka Kotahi considers that the responses to this question reinforce the position taken in Question 2 to proceed with the bold option rather than italics to differentiate the languages.

Question 4: What benefits or impacts would these changes have on you and your organisation?

A total of 275 respondents provided feedback on this question.

Respondents described many positive impacts that could come from the proposed 'Kura School' signs. One of the most prevalent and positive impacts brought up by respondents was that the signs would contribute towards the normalisation of te reo Māori in the everyday context. Respondents signalled that the new signs give mana to te reo Māori as New Zealand's official language. Some also pointed out that the signs can help tamariki feel more included in their school environment.

³ Only 9 of the 18 submissions received via email provided feedback on this question as it was not a requirement to state a preference.

Many respondents thought the signs would have positive consequences for New Zealand by enhancing our national identity as a te reo Māori speaking multi-cultural country. Many respondents believed that the changes would promote road user safety for te reo Māori speakers. They stated the signs were clear in English, but also gave people who primarily speak te reo Māori a sign that they would be able to read and comprehend with ease. These changes could therefore have positive road safety outcomes.

Negative responses to this question were rare. One respondent considered that the 'Kura School' signs were tokenistic and did not uplift te reo Māori in the right way. Waka Kotahi has received feedback from and worked with a variety of government partners to ensure that the 'Kura School' signs are appropriately designed. This project is a first step in a wider network of signs that will be implemented over the next few years, and the end goal is for the New Zealand land transport network to be completely bilingual.

A small number of local councils and RCAs were concerned about costs of implementation. The 'Kura School' signs, like the rest of the prioritised package, will be rolled out over time as existing signs on the network are replaced or new signs are needing to be introduced onto the network.

Question 5: Do you support our proposed approach to align the timing of the Kura School sign with the proposed Speed Rule changes?

A total of 272 respondents provided feedback on this question.

The majority of respondents supported aligning the timing of the 'Kura School' signs implementation with changes being made through the proposed Speed Rule. Many commended the timing as a cost-saving measure that made practical sense. Sector participants (e.g. RCAs) and major industry associations (e.g. New Zealand Automobile Association (NZAA)) were in support of the proposed timing. Some respondents were hesitant about the alignment of timing as it delays with one rule change may negatively impact the other. However, Waka Kotahi believes that the alignment of timing leverages the investment that RCAs will need to make for new speed limit signs.

Following consideration of the feedback received, we have assessed the extent to which the two rule changes need to be aligned. Only the R1-6.2 Kura School permanent speed limit sign (discussed in Question 6 below) needs to be aligned with the proposed Speed Rule changes as it cannot be used prior to that rule coming into force. It is therefore possible for all other proposed changes to be introduced separately from the proposed Speed Rule changes.

We consider that decoupling the two rule changes in this way is consistent with the overarching implementation objectives of alignment between SOSL and Kura School signs:

- it still leverages the investment that RCAs will need to make for new permanent speed limit signs, and
- it offers all of the other Kura School signs the earliest opportunity to be introduced onto the network.

Question 6: Do you have any feedback on the proposed design of the new permanent Kura School speed traffic sign?

A total of 140 respondents provided feedback on this question.

The majority of responses did not respond to this question and instead reiterated points from previous questions or about bilingual signs in general. The NZAA provided one of the only substantive responses to this question stating:

'We support the proposal that the sign will not use the smaller 600mm minimum diameter and will instead have a 750mm minimum diameter with 900mm option for rural schools. We also support the flexibility of providing 30, 40 and 60km/h options for the speed limits. However, we are of the view that in many cases, variable (rather than permanent) limits around schools will be most appropriate. Wherever possible these variable speed limits should be accompanied by flashing electronic signs, particularly in rural settings, where travel speeds are likely to be higher – to help ensure motorists are aware of the reduced speed limits and therefore assist with reducing vehicle speeds.'

The NZAA supported the design of the new permanent Kura School speed traffic sign. However, it had reservations about the possibility it could be used in favour of the flashing electronic sign. This concern is noted and will be addressed at the implementation stage.

Question 7: Do you have any feedback on the proposed removal of “School Zone” from existing traffic signs?

A total of 177 respondents provided feedback on this question.

The majority of respondents did not support the removal of 'School Zone', however the wording of this question may have caused confusion as respondents believed that the 'School Zone' signs would be removed completely. Only the reference to 'School Zone' is being removed, but the signs will remain in the TCD Rule and would instead display 'Kura School' on them. For this reason, Waka Kotahi has treated the majority of unfavourable responses to this question with caution.

Of the respondents who were against the removal of the word 'Zone', one suggested that zone implies an 'area' of activity rather than a single location. Waka Kotahi considers that the word 'School' is all that is necessary to convey to drivers that the area contains a school and that there is a risk of children on the road. The 'Kura School' signs will be present at the approaches to schools and guidance for effective sign use will be provided to RCAs in the new Aotearoa Speed Management Guide.

There were still many submissions that supported the removal of 'School Zone'. Most of these respondents agreed that the word 'Zone' is superfluous and is not crucial for the safety performance of the sign. Most respondents who were in favour of removal stated that the Kura School sign still addressed the key warning messages that 'there is a school' and 'you need to slow down'. Te Taura Whiri i te reo Māori are of the opinion that the inclusion of the word 'Kura' makes the sign safer for te reo Māori speakers, while not diminishing the overall safety messaging stating:

'...The use of the word 'Kura' helps to promote the visibility and use of Reo Māori in accordance with existing Crown commitments for revitalisation of Reo Māori. The removal of the word 'Zone' does not diminish the clarity of the message as it provides little additional information, it also provides the opportunity for Reo Māori to be used without any real adjustments to the ratio of symbols and words within the sign.'

Waka Kotahi has drawn the same conclusions as the above statement. No changes to the Waka Kotahi proposal have been made based on the feedback to this question.

Question 8: Do you have any feedback on the proposed changes to the two existing variable speed limit signs?

A total of 57 respondents provided feedback on this question.

No substantive feedback was received beyond acknowledgement that the proposed changes were clear and good from a road safety perspective. Therefore, there are no changes to the Waka Kotahi proposal based on the feedback to this question.

Question 9: Do you have any feedback on the Kura School supplementary plate being used in conjunction with the two pedestrian crossing and children warning signs used for schools?

A total of 108 respondents provided feedback on this question.

The only substantive feedback received for this question were concerns regarding visual clutter. The conjunctive use of these signs with the supplementary 'Kura School' sign is no more complex than what is on the network currently. Therefore, there are no changes to the Waka Kotahi proposal based on the feedback to this question.

Question 10: Do you have any feedback on the proposed removal of the three warning signs?

A total of 69 respondents provided feedback on this question.

The majority of respondents did not support this proposal, however our assessment of the submissions indicates that this was due to a misunderstanding of what is being proposed. These respondents thought that the three warning signs were going to be removed completely and no equivalent bilingual traffic signs would be made available. Equivalent signs will be made available, so feedback received on this question has not changed the Waka Kotahi proposal.

Question 11: Do you have any feedback on the removal of the school zone option for the symbolic warning – active flashing light sign?

A total of 96 respondents provided feedback on this question.

The majority of respondents did not support this proposal, however our assessment of the submissions indicates that this was due to a misunderstanding of what is being proposed. These respondents thought that the option of having symbolic flashing warning signs would be removed entirely. However, the proposal is to only remove this particular option and other flashing light options would still be available. Therefore, there are no changes to the Waka Kotahi proposal based on the feedback to this question.

Question 12: Do you have any feedback on the other minor or consequential changes proposed for the TCD Rule?

A total of 25 respondents provided feedback on this question.

No substantive feedback was received for this question. Therefore, there are no changes to the Waka Kotahi proposal based on the feedback to this question.

Other submissions regarding wider programme of work

As part of its submission, Iā Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand indicated some potential opportunities to streamline te reo Māori on future traffic signs stating:

'Once the text style and format, display style, and sign colour features such as borders have been determined for this particular sign (which interestingly seems to cover all three purposes or functions e.g., Regulatory, Warning and Advisory as set out on page 6), it should be relatively easy to provide in the body of the Rule a provision that enables specified characteristics for bilingual signs that can be used where appropriate, without the necessity of going through a formal consultation process.'

There is a vast range of traffic signs, with unique specifications or features set in Schedule 1 of the TCD Rule at an individual sign level, sign family level (e.g. destination signs) and sign category level (e.g. warning category of signs). This makes it difficult to establish a specific set of design rules or principles for bilingual signs generally, and in this respect the Kura School signs are not setting a precedent for how future bilingual traffic signs will be designed.

Consistency and uniformity are important factors for effective traffic signage, and these are recognised in the objectives of the TCD Rule. So, while not setting a precedent, some of the design decisions Waka Kotahi has taken on the 'Kura School' could form the basis of or help inform design principles (e.g. te reo Māori in a prime position, using a bolder font instead of italics for te reo Māori as a form of differentiation). As part of our design decision on the proposed Kura School signs, the requirement for design consistency with other warning category signs to be considered in the future was a factor Waka Kotahi took on board.

Consultation is an important step in the process of changes to transport rules. The opportunities for streamlining consultation and decision-making processes indicated by Iā Ara Aotearoa Transporting New Zealand have been noted and may be considered as part of future work for the programme.