Land Transport Rule: Regulatory Systems Rule Amendment (RSRA) 2025

Summary of Submissions Report

8 August 2025

NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY
WAKA KOTAHI

Te Kāwanatanga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Government

Contents

Background

The Land Transport Rule: Regulatory Systems Rule Amendment (RSRA) 2025 contains small or discrete amendments to Land Transport Rules which alone do not warrant a separate rule change process.

A total of **41** proposals were included in the RSRA consultation. Five are not recommended to proceed at this stage.

The Proposed Amendment Rule (the RSRA) assists in achieving strategic objectives for transport:

- It is expected to encourage economic development by clarifying the Rules and simplifying legislation, in turn reducing compliance and enforcement costs (without negatively affecting safety); and
- The proposed Rule is not expected to have a direct or negative impact on improving access and mobility, protecting and promoting public health and safety, or ensuring environmental sustainability.

The RSRA is not expected to result in material implementation costs. This is in keeping within the intended scope of RSRA to cover only smaller scale and discrete regulatory changes.

The RSRA is consistent with New Zealand's land transport international obligations. Where relevant, consideration was given to safety requirements in other jurisdictions. International standards for vehicles were considered in developing the proposed amendments.

In line with RSRA's purpose and scale, a key criterion for proposals included in the RSRA is that they do not require a Regulatory Impact Assessment. As a result, proposals are scoped using high level desktop assessments rather than detailed policy analysis or economic modelling, including cost benefit analysis.

Consultation

NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA) sought feedback on the RSRA proposals to ensure the Rule development process considered the views of those affected by the proposed changes, supporting a sound and robust regulatory system.

When assessing the proposals we asked submitters to consider and comment on the following questions:

- Tell us any benefit(s) these proposals give to you and your business
- Will the Rule be clearer or easier to understand?
- Is there an immediate compliance cost to you or your business?
- If so, do you consider this to be unreasonable, and why?
- Is 3 months from when the Rule comes into effect enough time to comply with the proposals?
- If 3 months is not enough, can you suggest another timeframe, and why?
- Do these proposals improve or hinder your compliance with other Land Transport Rules?

Public consultation on the RSRA proposals ran for six weeks from Tuesday 22 April 2025 to Tuesday 3 June 2025.

NZTA received 75 submissions from individuals, businesses and organisations, which came from the following submitter groups:

Submitter Groups	
Individual	67
Business	8
↳*Transport industry organisation*	7
Total submissions	**75**

In addition to written submissions, NZTA undertook further targeted consultation through two workshops with some submitters who provided feedback on proposals for changes to the *Heavy-vehicle Brakes 2006* and *Vehicle Dimensions and Mass 2016* rules. These sessions aimed to clarify comments and resolve matters raised by these submitters during the public consultation.

The consultation made 41 proposals to amend the following Land Transport Rules:

- Glazing Windscreen Wipe and Wash and Mirrors 1999
- Heavy Vehicles Brakes 2006
- Heavy Vehicles 2004
- Light-Vehicle Brakes 2002
- Vehicle Dimensions and Mass 2016
- Vehicle Standards Compliance 2002
- Steering Systems 2001
- Driver Licensing 1999
- Traffic Control Devices 2004

Submitters could either complete an online form/survey or email in their responses. We received 66 online survey entries and 11 email submissions. Four submitters completed the online survey and provided additional comment via email.

Submitters were not required to provide comment on every proposal. The number of submissions received per Rule were as follows:

Land Transport Rule	Number of submissions
Glazing Windscreen Wipe and Wash and Mirrors 1999	3
Heavy Vehicles Brakes 2006	6
Heavy Vehicles 2004	2
Light-Vehicle Brakes 2002	65
Vehicle Dimensions and Mass 2016	3
Vehicle Standards Compliance 2002	3
Steering Systems 2001	5
Driver Licensing 1999	4
Traffic Control Devices 2004	6

Analysis of Submissions by Land Transport Rule

Land Transport Rule: Glazing Windscreen Wipe and Wash and Mirrors 1999

The Glazing Rule establishes minimum safety levels for vehicle glazing and sets out requirements for windscreen wipe systems and rear-view mirrors.

Proposal 1	To require LE (motor tricycles) class vehicles with windscreens to maintain their manufacturer-fitted wash system.

Summary of submitter views

Three submissions were received on proposal 1. Two submitters were in favour of the proposal. They stated that original equipment manufacturer (OEM)-fitted equipment should be maintained in operational condition throughout the life of the vehicle to maintain rider visibility and safety, and the proposed change is a proportionate and appropriate clarification.

One submitter opposed the proposal but did not provide reasons for their position.

Analysis

NZTA has considered the comments on this proposal and agrees that the proposal sets out an appropriate requirement for windscreen wipe systems and aligns with the purpose of the Glazing Rule in ensuring minimum safety levels for vehicle glazing.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 1 as consulted on.

Land Transport Rule: Heavy Vehicle Brakes 2006

The Heavy Vehicle Brakes Rule sets out requirements to ensure that heavy vehicles and heavy-vehicle combinations over 3500kg gross vehicle mass (GVM) can brake safely and maintain balanced brake performance under any legal load condition.

Proposal 2	To amend clause 1.2(4)(b) to include dynamic testing under 6.1(2) as a means of validating non-towing vehicle service brake compliance.

Summary of submitter views

Two submissions were received on proposal 2, both in favour. One submitter stated they supported the proposal because it will create a consistent brake testing regime across heavy vehicles, and ensure a non-towing vehicle has appropriate vehicle braking performance in the event it is to be modified for towing use.

The second submitter viewed the proposed change as a practical alignment to established industry practices. They supported recognising dynamic testing as a valid compliance pathway that will enhance consistency for certifiers. They suggested that this be reflected in updates to the Vehicle Inspection Requirements Manual (VIRM), if the proposal is implemented.

Analysis

NZTA has considered the feedback on this proposal and agrees with the submissions. The proposed change will reduce ambiguity and improve compliance. As is our standard practice, the VIRM will be updated to reflect all amendments enacted via the RSRA.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 2 as consulted on.

Proposal 3	To amend clause 2.3(1) to permit driver-controlled brake force distribution adjustment (proportioning) between certain prime movers and towed medium weight trailers (TC Class).

Summary of submitter views

Five submissions were received on proposal 3. One submitter supported the proposal, stating the change would uphold safety and reduce unnecessary compliance burdens.

Four submitters opposed the proposal. They noted that the draft Rule amendment does not clearly specify that the requirement would only apply to TC class trailers, which could lead to misinterpretation and broader application than intended.

- *"The consultation document refers to TC Class trailers however, the draft [R]ule makes no specific reference to the particular Class of trailers that this new requirement applies to and therefore, this change could be interpreted to apply to all trailers regardless of weight"*
- *"The proposal in the discussion document states the rule amendment is to affect only Class TC trailers. The wording of replacement clause 2.3(1) does not limit the use of towing vehicles with adjustable proportioning devices to only tow Class TC trailers."*

Two submitters raised a concern with the proposed clause 2.3(1C), which would require any adjustable device to be sealed to prevent modification. This requirement may not be able to be met for some American style pick-up trucks that have built in controllers, as these devices cannot be sealed or locked in one position. These vehicles would therefore still have to apply for exemptions under the amended Rule.

One submitter noted that the proposal was intended to enable gain control fitted for electric brakes when using a factory fitted brake controller in American pickup trucks. They questioned whether this exemption would also apply to smaller pick-up trucks which are classed as light vehicles but also can tow heavy trailers with electric brakes.

NZTA undertook further targeted engagement via a workshop with submitters on this proposal to better understand their concerns with the proposal as drafted.

Analysis

After considering submissions received on this proposal, NZTA acknowledges that the draft Rule may not fully achieve the intent of providing clear and simple exemption path for certain prime movers and towed TC class trailers. The lack of specificity and the sealing requirements introduce confusion and implementation challenges that would require further policy work to resolve.

Recommendation

NZTA does not recommend progressing with proposal 3 as part of the RSRA 2025.

Proposal 4	Updating the Heavy Vehicle Brakes Rule by inserting section 2.7 to require anti-lock braking systems (ABS) for heavy vehicles first registered or modified from three months from when the Proposed Amendment Rule comes into effect.

Summary of submitter views

Five submissions were received on proposal 4. Three submitters opposed the proposal, stating that further work is required to understand how many vehicles are likely to be affected by the requirements, and how the changes align with the requirements of the jurisdictions New Zealand imports its vehicles. Submitters noted that requiring all vehicles of Class MD3, MD4, ME, NB, NC, TC or TD first registered or modified in New Zealand after the enactment date to be fitted with ABS would be a significant change to

the status quo. Submitters also suggested an impact assessment should be undertaken before a decision is made to implement this change.

Two submitters raised concerns about the wording of the draft Rule stating when the new requirement would come into force. The draft Rule reads: “three months from when this Rule comes into effect”. Submitters said this could be interpreted as three months after the original Heavy Vehicle Brakes Rule came into force on 1 March 2007, rather than three months after the 2025 Rule is made (the intended interpretation). The first interpretation would require all affected vehicles registered or modified in New Zealand since June 2007 that do not currently have ABS systems to be retrofitted, which was not the policy intent.

Clause 2.7(2) of the draft Rule would require vehicles that have been modified “in such a way that may affect compliance with this Rule” to be fitted with an ABS system. Submitters queried the extent of modification that would trigger this requirement. One submitter supported the proposal in principle but considered that the definition of “modified” in the draft Rule was too broad and could lead to vehicles that had only minor modifications being captured, creating undue compliance requirements.

- *“We endorse the requirement for ABS (or EBS) in newly registered or materially modified vehicles. However, the current definition of “modified” is overly broad and risks capturing minor alterations unrelated to braking.”*

Submitters noted that a blanket requirement for TC class trailers and cranes would not be appropriate, as there are no feasible retrofitting options for some of these vehicles.

- *“There is currently no commercially available ABS system for an electric braked trailer. This would prevent certification of electric braked TC trailers in dedicated combination.”*
- *“Many crane models particularly Rough Terrain, City, Pick-and-Carry, and Articulated Cranes are not equipped with ABS as standard… Although some aftermarket ABS kits (e.g., Wabco systems) exist, they may not be legally compliant or technically feasible due to incompatibilities with the vehicle’s architecture, cost constraints, and lack of manufacturer integration support.”*

NZTA undertook further targeted engagement via a workshop with submitters on this proposal to better understand their concerns with the proposal as drafted.

Analysis

NZTA acknowledges that the draft Rule could be interpreted in a way that does not align with the policy intent, which is not to impose retroactive requirements for in service vehicles unless those vehicles are modified in a way which affects compliance from three months after the amendment is made.

NZTA also acknowledge the concerns raised by submitters regarding the lack of clarity about the extent of modifications that would trigger ABS requirements. The policy intent was that minor modifications and those that do not affect the braking system would not be captured. Modifications that require brake recertification would trigger the requirement to install an ABS system. The draft Rule has been drafted to state “modified in such a way that may affect compliance with this Rule” to carve out minor or irrelevant modifications and ensure they are not captured.

We agree that further policy work is needed to understand the full impact of the proposed change, particularly on specific vehicle classes and retrofit feasibility.

Recommendation

NZTA does not recommend progressing with proposal 4 as part of RSRA 2025.

Proposal 5	Amend clause 7.1(4)(c)(ii) to ensure towing vehicles have ABS functionality.

Summary of submitter views

Four submissions were received on proposal 5. Three submitters opposed it. These submitters noted the proposed amendment represents a significant change to the current requirements under the Heavy Vehicle Brakes Rule, which only require load proportioning brakes to be fitted to Class TD trailers and

balanced brake performance in the laden to GVM state for Class TC trailers. Submitters noted a significant number of new and used imported TC class trailers are fitted with electric or hydraulic foundation brakes, and there are no ABS systems currently available in New Zealand for these types of brakes. The proposal would require all TC and TD trailers with these brake types registered or materially modified three months after the Rule amendment is made to be retrofitted with entirely new braking systems, potentially imposing significant compliance costs on industry.

One submitter supported the proposal, considering it to be a proportionate enhancement to fleet safety.

NZTA undertook further targeted engagement via a workshop with submitters on this proposal to better understand their concerns with the proposal as drafted.

Analysis

NZTA agrees with submitters that more policy work is required on this proposal to ensure it is a proportional change balancing safety gains with feasibility of implementation.

Recommendation

NZTA does not recommend progressing with proposal 5 as part of RSRA 2025.

Proposal 6	Amend clause 7.2 to improve inter-vehicle compatibility and performance when vehicles of differing levels of brake technology are used in combination.

Summary of submitter views

Four submissions were received on proposal 6. Three submitters opposed the proposal. One submitter supported the proposal, describing it as a constructive step towards improved inter-vehicle safety. They agreed that the proposal would help to reduce jack-knifing incidents caused by vehicles with differing levels of braking technology operating in combination.

One submitter supported the principle of having electrical redundancy in the braking system but was concerned that the drafting of the draft Rule may unintentionally limit the requirement. It could be interpreted as only applying to the relatively small number of heavy vehicles registered or modified three months from when the new Rule comes into effect and would not apply to the in-service fleet. They suggested NZTA revise the drafting of clause 7.2(7)(a) and 7.2(7)(b) to be clearer that the requirement applies to all relevant vehicles from the commencement date.

Three submitters opposed the proposal. These submitters raised concerns that some older ABS and EBS systems do not support back-up power supply functionality. These would require significant upgrades to ensure compliance with the Rule amendment. Additionally, some systems do not support utilising a back-up power supply when used in multi-volt applications where a 24-volt trailer is towed with a 12-volt truck (or vice versa). These submitters requested more information on the number of vehicles likely to be affected by the proposal, impact on the service industry and the costs for any consequential upgrades.

NZTA undertook further targeted engagement via a workshop with submitters on this proposal to better understand their concerns with the proposal as drafted.

Analysis

NZTA acknowledges that the drafting of clause 7.2(7)(a) and 7.2(7)(b) could be interpreted as the requirements only applying to heavy vehicles registered or modified in New Zealand three months after the Rule comes into effect, rather than applying to all relevant vehicles registered or modified in New Zealand at any point after the commencement date of three months after the Rule comes into effect.

We agree with submitters that more policy work is required to assess implementation and clarify scope.

Recommendation

NZTA does not recommend progressing with proposal 6 as part of RSRA 2025.

Proposal 7	Amend clause 7.5 to ensure heavy vehicles have anti-lock braking system (ABS) functionality.

Summary of submitter views

Three submissions were received on proposal 7. One submitter supported the proposal in principle, subject to clarification of scope around the extent of modifications that would trigger the requirement for ABS functionality. As with proposals 4, 5, and 6, submitters were concerned the drafting of the draft Rule does not align with the policy intent.

One submitter noted that the drafting of clause 7.5(2)(c) outlines brake force requirements for military trailers, Class TC vehicles, logging vehicles and heavy haulage trailers first registered in New Zealand three months from when the amended Rule comes into effect “even if ABS is not fitted”. This conflicts with the new clause 2.7, which would require those above vehicles to have ABS.

NZTA undertook further targeted engagement via a workshop with submitters on this proposal to better understand their concerns with the proposal as drafted.

Analysis

NZTA acknowledges that there are drafting inconsistencies and agrees with submitters that further policy work is required to ensure the proposed amendment reflects the intended scope and compliance expectations.

Recommendation

NZTA does not recommend progressing with proposal 7 as part of RSRA 2025.

Proposal 8	To add the definition of electronically controlled braking system (EBS) in Part 2 of the Rule.

Summary of submitter views

Two submissions were received on proposal 8, both in favour. The Motor Industry Association considers the amendment a timely clarification that improves the Heavy Vehicle Brake Rule’s interpretability.

Analysis

NZTA has considered the feedback on this proposal and agrees it is important to ensure terminologies in the rule are well defined and easy to interpret for all land transport rule users. The change also reduces uncertainty and gives an objective interpretation for the users of the rule to aid compliance.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 8 as consulted on.

Proposal 9	To amend Schedule 5 to improve readability and reduce repetition.

Summary of submitter views

Two submissions were received on proposal 9, both in favour. Submissions noted the proposal’s streamlined terminology will improve clarity and usability of the Heavy Vehicle Brakes Rule.

Analysis

NZTA has considered the feedback on this proposal and agrees with submissions. Improving how readable the Heavy Vehicle Brakes Rule is will increase its comprehension and subsequently improve compliance. Ensuring the Heavy Vehicle Brakes Rule is unambiguous will increase efficiency by reducing the need for more guidance and operational documents to clarify it.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 9 as consulted on.

Land Transport Rule: Heavy Vehicles 2004

The Heavy Vehicle Rule sets out requirements and standards for heavy vehicle safety. It applies to vehicles with a gross vehicle mass (GVM) of more than 3500kg.

Proposal 10	To correct an error in the drafting of the Heavy Vehicles Rule by updating clause 1.2(4) to remove references to clauses 4.7(2A) & 4.8(3A) and 4.8(4A).

Summary of submitter views

Two submissions were received on proposal 10, both in favour. One submitter noted the proposal would restore accurate cross-referencing and ensure appropriate regulatory oversight.

One submitter expressed conditional support for the proposal but requested a transition period of six months before the proposed change comes into force, noting the drafting error has been in force for two decades. The transitional period would enable operators to meet their new compliance requirements and avoid affected vehicles being unjustifiably placed out of service.

Analysis

NZTA has considered the feedback on this proposal and agrees that the proposal ensures appropriate oversight. It is good regulatory stewardship practice to correct errors in a land transport rule.

NZTA has considered the suggestion to consider a transition period to support Heavy Vehicle Rule users to comply. Operators can apply for a short period of exemption until they are able to meet the new compliance requirements.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 10 as consulted on.

Land Transport Rule: Light Vehicle Brakes 2002

The Light Vehicle Brakes Rule specifies the types of brakes that must be fitted in most types of light vehicle, and the requirements for those brakes.

Proposal 11	Remove the requirement for enduro/or trial motorcycles to have an anti-lock braking system or combined braking systems unless they are being used for sanctioned competition; and remove the definition of sanctioned competition.

Summary of submitter views

Sixty-five submissions were received on proposal 11, all in favour. Most submitters noted that anti-lock braking systems are inappropriate for use in off road environments and may compromise safety on loose surfaces where locking brakes reduce braking time:

- *"I support the removal of both of these [R]ules, ABS can be a contributing factor to causing accidents on this type of vehicle as they are primarily used on loose surfaces and the ABS can cause the brakes to disengage when most required."*
- *"Most anti-lock braking systems are not fit for use in off road environments. They add to the weight and cost of the vehicle, a significant disadvantage."*

One submitter said that Enduro type motorcycles are a very small proportion of registered motorcycles, and they are bought and used by enthusiasts who tend to be skilled riders. The anti-lock brake systems do not reduce accident rates for these riders.

Submitters also noted Enduro type motorcycles are predominantly used off road and generally only used for short distances on the roading network to get from one off road area/trail to another. The proposal would remove disproportionate compliance requirements for a small and specialised motorcycle class and bring the Light Vehicle Brakes Rule in line with international norms, allowing greater choice in the NZ market as ABS systems are not required on these vehicles in other jurisdictions.

- *"The removal of this requirement will return to the situation in place prior to cl 2.7(8) being applied. There is no evidence this rule reduced injury or death for riders of these motorcycles."*
- *"Currently these motorcycles are not produced with ABS, as most of them are from European manufacturers and they are exempt in that market… they are a tiny percentage of all motorcycles so surely should follow the European regulations and exempt them from the onerous ABS requirements which essentially eliminates their use entirely."*

Analysis

NZTA has considered the feedback on this proposal and agrees that the proposal removes disproportionate compliance requirements for small and specialised motorcycles. It is important to bring the Light Vehicle Brakes Rule into line with international norms and practices. This ensures standardisation and certainty for those who want to bring those types of bikes into New Zealand.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 11 as consulted on.

Land Transport Rule: Vehicle Dimensions and Mass 2016 (VDAM Rule)

The VDAM Rule covers the requirements for dimension and mass limits to enable vehicles, heavy truck and trailer combinations, to be operated on New Zealand's roads.

Proposal 12	To update the VDAM Rule to change the swept path requirements for mobile cranes and include a definition of a power crane.

Summary of submitter views

Three submissions were received on proposal 12. All submitters supported proposal 12 in principle, noting it would reduce compliance burdens for industry by exempting some mobile cranes from individual swept path assessments. Two submitters sought clarification on the terminology used in the proposal, pointing out that the term 'power crane' is not defined in existing legislation and is not recognised within the New Zealand crane industry. They were concerned the use of 'power crane' in the legislation would create confusion among enforcement officers and certifiers and increase compliance uncertainty. One submitter proposed amending the proposal to refer to 'mobile cranes', as this term is well understood by industry and is used in existing legislation:

- *"While CANZ supports efforts to streamline compliance, success depends on precise language and clearly defined technical criteria. Replacing "power crane" with "mobile crane" and aligning*

terminology across legislation will ensure clarity, enforceability, and consistency with industry norms."

One submitter suggested power cranes be exempted from needing inspection and certification, provided they meet the low speed turning performance requirements of clause 6.28(2)(b). While most power cranes currently meet the performance requirements, trends suggest specialist equipment vehicles are increasing in size and future cranes may not. They contended that exempting 6.28(2)(b) compliant cranes would ensure the crane industry avoids unnecessary compliance costs for most of its vehicles, while ensuring cranes with larger road space requirements are still safely managed.

NZTA undertook further targeted engagement via a workshop with submitters on this proposal to better understand their concerns and resolve matters raised during the public consultation.

Analysis

NZTA has considered this feedback and acknowledges the concerns raised about the use of the term 'power cranes'. We agree with the suggestion to use mobile cranes rather than power cranes, as this terminology is better understood by industry and its use is consistent with existing land transport legislation (a definition for mobile cranes already exists in the VDAM Rule).

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with an amended proposal 12, using 'mobile crane' rather than 'power crane'.

Proposal 13	To require NZTA to consider additional factors when issuing an overdimension permit. These include the safety of the vehicle, safety of road users and durability of roads and bridges.

Summary of submitter views

Three submissions were received on proposal 13. All submitters supported proposal 13 either fully or in principle. One submitter noted that including safety and infrastructure durability in permit assessments ensures decisions reflect a fuller risk profile. Transporting New Zealand conditionally supported proposal 13, on the proviso that NZTA engage with the NZ Heavy Haulage Association (the key industry group representing overdimension vehicle operators) to ensure the permit revocation process is transparent and fair.

One submitter noted withholding a permit from an operator can have a significant impact on the commercial viability of that operator's business. It is therefore critical that the grounds upon which NZTA may withhold a permit from an operator are clearly understood.

The NZ Heavy Haulage Association endorsed the ability for the Director of Land Transport to consider a range of factors when issuing an overdimension permit but questioned whether inserting the wording of clause 5.2(1) (criteria for issuing a permit for overweight vehicles) into the existing permitting requirements for overdimension vehicles is the most appropriate way to achieve this objective.

NZ Heavy Haulage Association recommended several changes to the proposed drafting:

- 6.50(1)(a) safety of the vehicle: in their view, the term 'safety of the vehicle' is too broad and does not set bounds for the standard to be used. They suggest the assessment of the safety of a vehicle should be targeted towards its road worthiness, this can be measured by the compliance requirements for a vehicle's Certificate of Fitness. They propose amending the wording of this sub clause to 'roadworthiness of the vehicle'.
- 6.50(1)(b) safety of road users: this term was also considered to be too broad. The NZ Heavy Haulage Association recommended the Director of Land Transport instead have the ability to

consider the 'general compliance of the vehicle', ascertained by the operator's compliance history with commercial road user requirements.
- 6.50(1)(c) Durability of roads and bridges: the NZ Heavy Haulage Association considers this requirement to be more relevant to the risks associated with overweight vehicles than overdimension vehicles. They recommend deleting this sub-clause.

NZTA undertook further targeted engagement via a workshop with submitters on this proposal to better understand their concerns and resolve matters raised during the public consultation.

Analysis

NZTA agrees the wording in clause 6.50(1) of the draft Rule should mirror the drafting used in clause 5.2 of the VDAM Rule, which outlines the criteria for Mass permits. This alignment ensures consistency in how reasons for declining permits are expressed across related rules.

NZTA is of the view that the drafting of subclauses 6.50(1)(a), 6.50(1)(b), and 6.50(1A)(d) enable the Director of Land Transport to have regard to the roadworthiness of a vehicle and the operator's compliance history when issuing overdimension permits.

NZTA agree that the damage caused by non-compliant overdimension vehicles is different to the damage risks posed by non-compliant overweight vehicles. However, NZTA considers that overdimension vehicles can still pose significant damage to roadside furniture and associated infrastructure (i.e. tunnels and bridges). As such, NZTA considers it is appropriate to retain clause 6.50(1A)(a), which enables the Director of Land Transport to have regard to the suitability of the route. This clause adequately captures infrastructure considerations, such as roadside infrastructure and property and provides an appropriate safeguard.

The use of clause 6.50(1A)(a) to assess the suitability of a route can be expanded in regulatory guidance material to consider roadside infrastructure, property etc.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 13 as consulted on.

Proposal 14	Aligning overdimension permit revocations with overweight powers in the VDAM Rule.

Summary of submitter views

Four submissions were received on proposal 14. Two submissions supported the proposal and a third stated they support it in principle. These submitters stated the changes would ensure a consistent and enforceable permitting regime, which is necessary to mitigate the risk of overdimension vehicles causing damage to roading infrastructure.

- *"[V]ehicles and their loads should not cause unplanned damage to the road network, roadside furniture or associated infrastructure. Such damage can create delays, frustration, and unplanned cost to other road users therefore it is important this risk is managed."*

One submitter opposed the proposal, stating the risks posed by overweight and overdimension vehicles are fundamentally different. Overdimension permits concern special movement (e.g. width, height, and swept paths), whereas overweight permits concern structural loading and roading infrastructure wear and damage. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to align the permitting regimes. This submitter proposed an alternative approach to overdimension permitting reform, maintaining separate regimes, defining overdimension revocation triggers and avoiding standardised conditions that ignore crane-specific design and operational factors.

One submission supported the proposal in principle but noted that there have been cases where conditions have been placed on permits that are out of date or not relevant to the specific route of the load. They expressed concern about the potential for the Director of Land Transport to revoke a permit for

non-compliance involving a condition that is irrelevant to a specific load and requested the development of operational policy assessing the gravity of instances of non-compliance.

NZTA undertook further targeted engagement via a workshop with submitters on this proposal to better understand their concerns and resolve matters raised during the public consultation.

Analysis

NZTA acknowledges the concerns raised about the proposal to align two different permitting regimes with disparate risks. However, while overdimension vehicles do not cause damage to the road network the way overweight vehicles do, overdimension vehicles have caused significant damage to roadside furniture and associated infrastructure (i.e. tunnels and bridges), compromising public safety and imparting costs on road controlling authorities. The requirement to comply with the specific conditions of the permit would ensure that the unique risks and functionalities of overdimension and overweight vehicles are accounted for when permit revocation is being considered.

We acknowledge that there may be occasions where permit conditions are not relevant/appropriate for a particular trip, and operators may have concerns regarding the ability for the Director of Land Transport to revoke their permit for non-compliance with any of the permit's conditions. Operational policy or guidance covering the gravity of non-compliance that may lead to the revocation of a permit may assuage these concerns.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 14 as consulted on.

Land Transport Rule: Vehicle Standards Compliance 2002 (VSC Rule)

The VSC Rule implements the Director of Land Transport's control under the Land Transport Act over the entry of vehicles into, and operation of vehicles in, the land transport system.

The VSC Rule sets out standards and safety requirements for lighting equipment that is fitted to a vehicle (including a pedal cycle), to allow the vehicle to be operated safely and not endanger the safety of other road users.

Proposal 15	To update the VSC Rule to require inspecting organisations to notify NZTA of any material change in circumstances, such as changes in address, name, ownership, person in charge.

Summary of submitter views

Three submissions were received on proposal 15, all in favour. Submitters noted specifying the types of changes that must be reported would enhance regulatory oversight and ensure continuity of appointment conditions. The proposal will support the integrity of the inspection system. One submitter supported the proposal, stating vehicle ownership can be changed too easily under current settings.

Analysis

NZTA has considered this feedback and agrees with the submitters. This proposal will bring interpretation of the VSC Rule in line with what was intended and reduce risk of unsafely modified vehicles operating on the roading network.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 15 as consulted on.

Proposal 16	To update the VSC Rule to clarify specialist certification requirements still apply for both light and heavy vehicles even if an in-service certification is mistakenly issued.

Summary of submitter views

Two submissions were received on proposal 16, both in favour. Submitters said the proposal would preserve the integrity of the low volume vehicle certification regime and remove any ambiguity that may undermine safety compliance.

Analysis

NZTA has considered this feedback and agrees with the submissions. Concerns had been raised that the wording of clause 7.5(1)(a) of the VSC Rule could be interpreted as meaning that if a Warrant of Fitness was issued without noticing uncertified modifications, the vehicle would no longer require Low Volume Vehicle certification. This proposal will bring interpretation of the VSC Rule in line with what was intended and reduce the risk of unsafely modified vehicles operating on the roading network, increasing the integrity of the regulatory regime. It will also reduce the need to produce guidance material to clarify requirements.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 16 as consulted on.

Proposal 17	To amend clause 9.8 of the VSC Rule to ensure that the information NZTA uses when setting Certificate of Fitness can relate to vehicle safety.

Summary of submitters

Two submissions were received on proposal 17. One submitter fully supported the proposal, which they said would enable the inclusion of broader safety evidence when setting Certificate of Fitness (CoF) inspection intervals.

One submitter supported the proposal in principle but suggested a narrowed scope for clause 9.8(3)(a) (information from previous inspection of a vehicle to be provided). They requested the scope to be narrowed to information produced during previous inspections while the vehicle has been presented for a CoF over the last two years.

- *"Transporting New Zealand is aware of issues arising when NZTA has requested that operators provide all maintenance and "inspection" records. This request has been problematic because there is no clearly defined scope. Therefore, this lack of clarity exposes the operator to risk of accusations that not all records have been provided. Greater clarity, fairness and transparency are required to ensure the system has integrity."*

Analysis

NZTA has considered this feedback and acknowledges concerns about the scope of information in clause 9.8(3). We consider the current wording is appropriate, and we will provide guidance to clarify that assessors should focus on relevant safety information, such as recent CoF inspection records. A well-defined scope will help ensure the requirement is applied consistently and fairly.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 17 as consulted on.

Land Transport Rule: Steering Systems 2001

The Steering Systems Rule covers the design, construction and maintenance of steering systems in motor vehicles

Proposal 18	Updating the Steering Systems Rule to reference approved international standards and adding complying with an approved standard as an alternative compliance method. This aligns with European, American, Japanese and Australian standards.

Summary of submitter views

Five submissions were received on proposal 18, all in favour. Submitters supported the proposal as it would future proof the Steering Systems Rule to allow for emerging technologies that have been approved in other jurisdictions to be adopted in the New Zealand market.

- *"Referencing international standards enables the safe adoption of emerging technologies without regulatory lag."*

Analysis

NZTA has considered this feedback and agrees with the submissions. Proactively amending land transport rules is good regulatory stewardship practice which can improve early adoption and efficiency in the New Zealand land transport system.

With the fast pace of technology and innovation, the transport landscape is ever evolving, and a modern regulator needs to not only be reactive but anticipatory in its regulation.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 18 as consulted on.

Land Transport Rule: Driver Licensing 1999

The Driver Licensing Rule specifies the requirements for obtaining and renewing a driver licence or licence endorsement in New Zealand. It also specifies the requirements for driver licensing service providers.

Proposal 19	Replace references to the 'Immigration Act 1987', the 'Department of Labour (Immigration)' and the 'Electoral Enrolment Centre of New Zealand Post Limited' with references to the 'Immigration Act 2009', the 'Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment' and the 'Electoral Commission'.

Summary of submitter views

Four submissions were received on proposal 19, all in favour. Submitters supported the proposal because they believe updating statutory references ensures the Driver Licensing Rule remains accurate and current. It brings it in line with all NZ legislation.

Analysis

NZTA acknowledges the importance of updating statutory references as part of its regulatory stewardship objective to ensure all its transport legislation are fit-for purpose and up to date. We must ensure any change in other legislation that has editorial implication for our land transport rules are updated accordingly.

Recommendation

NZTA recommends proceeding with proposal 19 as consulted on.

Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices Rule 2004 (TCD Rule)

The TCD Rule specifies requirements for the design, construction, installation, operation and maintenance of Traffic Control Devices. It sets out the functions and responsibilities of road controlling authorities providing TCDs to control traffic.

Summary of submitter views

Six submissions were received on the Traffic Control Devices Rule proposals. One submitter expressed generalised support for all the TCD Rule proposals. They believe the proposed changes would make it easier for road controlling authorities to implement signs/markings/signals more widely without the need for trials. They considered the proposals will improve compliance with other land transport rules by clarifying the obligations of different road users, such as motorists in relation to pedestrians and cyclists. This will aid pedestrians and cyclists in making manoeuvres/movements that are in line with traffic rules.

The following table outlines submissions received on each individual proposal, NZTA feedback where submissions disagreed with proposals or made suggestions and NZTA's recommendation.

Proposal	Proposed amendment	Summary of submissions (and NZTA response)	NZTA Recommendation
20	Clarifying that road controlling authorities may use: – Green surface texture/coloured surfacing for cycling infrastructure, and red surface texture/coloured surfacing where an RCA considers there is a high crash risk.	One submission was received, which proposed amendments to clarify references to colours and textures. Their submission also recommended clarifying whether red surfacing could be used for any high crash risk situations or only those associated with special vehicle lanes. NZTA acknowledges that rewording clause 5.4(9)(a) will provide clarity and certainty to road users.	Proceed with proposal 20 as consulted on, with drafting amendments to provide additional clarity and certainty for road controlling authorities and road users.
21	Inserting 'than' into 8.2(11)(b) and change '.' To a '- 'in W14.10.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal but asked for clarity regarding the nature of change intended for R5-9 in the draft Rule. NZTA has considered this feedback. R5-9 was referenced in the consultation document in error.	Proceed with proposal 21 as consulted on.
22	Adding the 'Advanced contra-flow cycle facility' sign to Schedule 1.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 22 as consulted on.
23	Adding the 'pass safely pedestrians' sign to Schedule 1.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 23 as consulted on.
24	Adding the 'No right turn, Part time (flashing)' sign to Schedule 1.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 24 as consulted on.
25	Adding the 'Pedestrian – kuia and tamaiti with marae' supplementary sign to Schedule 1.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 25 as consulted on.

Proposal	Proposed amendment	Summary of submissions (and NZTA response)	NZTA Recommendation
26	Removing reference to give way plates in sign R2-3 'Give Way Roundabout'.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 26 as consulted on.
27	Allowing 'curve supplementary advisory speed' sign under the 'hump' sign be used together.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the intent but recommended amending the title and description of sign W12-3.2 to clarify that it may be used in relation to humps, in addition to curves. NZTA has considered this feedback and agrees with the submitter. The proposed Rule will proceed as consulted, with minor drafting change to the title and the description of W12-3.2 to explicitly include 'hump or platform'. This ensures the Rule clearly reflects the sign's intended use.	Proceed with proposal 27 as consulted on, with changes suggested in submission.
28	Including a new Intersection Speed Zone specific sign suite that includes W11-2, W11-3, W11-4, W11-5 type signs	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 28 as consulted on.
29	Removing 'Feeling sleepy, Take a break' sign from Schedule 1	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 29 as consulted on.
30	Clarifying that traffic control devices only need to 'conform substantially' with those prescribed in schedules (which is currently mentioned in Schedule 1).	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal, but suggested "conform substantially" should be more clearly defined to avoid ambiguity or legal disputes. The submitter proposed allowing deviations from specified dimensions by a set percentage, to provide clearer guidance. NZTA has considered this feedback. The requirement for traffic control devices to 'conform substantially' with those prescribed in schedules already exists within Schedule 1 of the TCD Rule. The proposal increases consistency between Schedules 1 (Signs) and 2 (Markings). While the suggestion to define permissive tolerances has merit, it would require broader policy consideration and may be addressed in a future rule change process.	Proceed with proposal 30 as consulted on.
31	Adding 'Goods Vehicle Lane' signs to both Schedule 1 and 2.	Four submissions were received on this proposal. One submitter supported the proposal, but noted it states to "Add 'Goods Vehicle Lane' signs to both Schedule 1 and 2." Schedule 2 refers	Proceed with proposal 31 as consulted on.

Proposal	Proposed amendment	Summary of submissions (and NZTA response)	NZTA Recommendation
		to markings, not signs, so the proposal should add 'Goods Vehicle Lane' markings to Schedule 2 and signs to Schedule 1. Three submitters felt that the vehicle illustrated on the Goods Vehicle Lane sign appears similar to a bus and could confuse the public, and suggested the image be changed to one that more clearly resembles a truck. NZTA has considered the feedback received. The Goods Vehicle Lane signage was gazetted in 2022. This proposal does not change the existing gazetted signage, rather seeks to incorporate it into Schedule 1 and 2 of the Rule. For this reason, suggestions relating to the design of the sign are considered out of scope. NZTA acknowledges that Schedule 1 covers signs while Schedule 2 covers markings. The wording of the consultation document may have caused confusion, however the draft Rule appropriately prescribes both the signs and the associated goods vehicle lane markings.	
32	Adding 'Tourist Arrow' to Schedule 2.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal but noted that Condition 2 refers to "80km/h roads and above", while Condition 3 refers to "roads with speed limits less than 70km/h". Therefore, it is unclear what the requirements are for a tourist arrow on a road that has a speed limit of 70 km/h. NZTA has considered the feedback and agrees with the submitter that the Rule is unclear on the requirements for tourist arrow markings used on roads with 70 km/h speed limit. To address this, we will amend Condition 2 to state "70km/h" rather than "80km/h".	Proceed with proposal 32 as consulted on, with changes suggested in submission.
33	Adding the 'Shared path behavioural and cycle detector loop' signs.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 33 as consulted on.
34	Adding 'Pedestrian Crossing (New Format and (Interim Format)) to Schedule 2.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter agreed in principle with the proposal and suggested it should be made clear that the interim format is only permissible for existing crossings	Proceed with proposal 34 as consulted on with changes suggested in submission.

Proposal	Proposed amendment	Summary of submissions (and NZTA response)	NZTA Recommendation
		until such a time as the road is resurfaced. NZTA has considered the feedback provided and agree with the submitter the limitations on use of the interim format should be clearer. We will update the Rule to state pedestrian crossings installed or remarked after the Rule comes into force "must" be marked in accordance with M1-1.3 in Schedule 2.	
35	Requiring that bus stop markings must be at least 2.5 metres wide. Amend M3-2 and M3-2A to require that bus stop markings must be at least 2.5 metres wide.	Two submissions were received on this proposal. Both agree in principle with the proposal and suggested changing the wording from "preferred" to "minimum" width for consistency and clarity. NZTA has considered the feedback and agrees with the submitters that the Rule should state 2.5 metres is the minimum width for bus stop markings rather than the preferred width, as this is more in line with the policy intent.	Proceed with proposal 35 as consulted on with changes suggested in submission.
36	Requiring that both 'STOP' markings and 'GIVE WAY' symbol markings are white and reflectorised.	Two submissions were received on this proposal, both in favour. One submitter suggests providing additional guidance for road controlling authorities to clarify the change to ensure consistency in its implementation. The submitter felt the Rule could be interpreted as allowing road controlling authorities to select any colour for a marking if the Rule does not specifically state what colour may be used for it. They suggest amending Schedule 2 to specify that markings be reflectorised white unless otherwise stated. NZTA has considered the feedback provided and agrees that the draft Rule could be misinterpreted in a way that is inconsistent with policy intent. To address this, NZTA will add a clarifying note to the preamble of Schedule 2 stating "all markings must be reflectorised white unless otherwise specified in this Schedule or in Part 1 of this Rule".	Proceed with proposal 36 as consulted on, with one change to add a note to the preamble to Schedule 2.
37	Clarifying in Schedule 2 that children need to wait behind hold line, but if tactile pavers are installed, they need to wait behind the tactile pavers.	One submission was received on this proposal. They supported the proposal in principle but recommended changing "children" to "pedestrians" to clarify that the requirement applies to all pedestrians.	Proceed with proposal 37 as consulted on, with changes suggested in submissions.

Proposal	Proposed amendment	Summary of submissions (and NZTA response)	NZTA Recommendation
		NZTA has considered this feedback and agrees that the requirement should be changed to refer to all pedestrians rather than only children, as children are not the only pedestrians using school crossing points. NZTA will correct a drafting error, removing clause 8.4(6A) and replacing it with an explanatory note in Schedule 2 to clarify pedestrian positioning. The note will state that pedestrians should wait behind the tactile warning indicators, and that pedestrian hold lines may be omitted if tactile warning indicators are installed.	
38	Adding a marking similar to the picture below to Schedule 2, tiled “Yellow diagonal no parking marking”.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter did not support the proposal, stating that existing markings such as those provided for in s12.2(1) of the TCD Rule and s6.10 of the Road User Rule are sufficient for the intended purpose. The submitter also suggested that consequential amendments to the Road User Rule may be required if the proposal were adopted. NZTA has considered this feedback. The proposed amendment was requested by road controlling authorities, who have expressed the existing markings are not as effective or cost efficient as the yellow diagonal no parking marking. We agree with the road controlling authorities that revising the TCD Rule so these markings are compliant will allow them to better enforce no parking zones. Road controlling authorities may continue to use the existing compliant signage and markings where they consider it appropriate to do so. Clause 6.4(1)(a) of the Road User Rule requires drivers to observe no stopping notices, signs, and marks. On this basis, no consequential amendments to the Road User Rule are required.	Proceed with proposal 38 as consulted on.
39	Removing the marking below from Schedule 2.	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 39 as consulted on.

Proposal	Proposed amendment	Summary of submissions (and NZTA response)	NZTA Recommendation
40	Including the directional cycle signals in Schedule 3.	One submission was received on this proposal, stating in principle support. While noting that trials had been conducted using the directional cycle signals, they raised a concern that the small size of the cycle symbol and the arrows used for the signal displays could lead to the displays intended for cyclists only to be interpreted to also apply to other road users. NZTA has considered the feedback and does not believe it is likely that the directional cycle signals will be misinterpreted by other road users due to their size. A key focus for the directional cycle signals trial which recommended the signals be added to the TCD Rule was how cyclists and motorists interpreted the signals.	Proceed with proposal 40 as consulted on.
41	Adding Matariki to the definition of “Public holiday”	One submission was received on this proposal. The submitter supported the proposal.	Proceed with proposal 41 as consulted on.

Miscellaneous

One submitter suggested that NZTA should introduce a consistent and harmonised definition of "mobile crane" across land transport rules, including various crane types (all terrain cranes, city cranes, rough terrain cranes etc).

The intent of the RSRA is to progress small or discrete amendments to individual land transport rules. This proposal would require undertaking a review of and amendments to the whole set of land transport rules. NZTA have determined this proposal to be out of scope.

Limitations

The online survey did not require submitters to state which proposal within a Rule they were providing feedback on. While most submissions received via the survey related to rules with a single proposal, where feedback was provided for a Rule with multiple proposals, NZTA has assigned it to the most relevant proposal.