

Submitter		SH1 L Phillips Rd to Pūhoi Speed Review Submissions
Note about blocked-out text: Unless submitted by an organisation, we do not publish comments that identify individual submitters.		
1	Individual submitter	Yes, get the road fixed instead of decreasing the speed limit.
2	Individual submitter	Reducing the speed limit on the free route in the name of safety is a cynical tactic to 'encourage' motorists to use the tolled road.
3	Individual submitter	Yes apply common sense. Leave the limits as they are. Traffic density regulates speed.
4	Individual submitter	Please enforce with speed cameras as too many drivers will ignore the limits
5	Individual submitter	No. I support the speed limit proposal.
6	Individual submitter	The current average speeds you have calculated on SH1 between Pūhoi & Warkworth will improve once the high number of lorries and holidaymakers that clog the highway use the motorway when it opens. Then we will finally be able to travel at a decent speed, and it won't take so long to get home from Auckland. We are looking forward to this, as that in itself will make the road safer. I don't agree with the speed reduction to 80km, it is very frustrating where you have already the reduced speed - the old Albany highway from Albany to Silverdale and East Coast Bays road from Long Bay to Silverdale, which makes for a slow journey. Agree with speed reductions at intersections and proposed roundabout in Warkworth. Are you going to increase the motorway speed from Silverdale to Warkworth to 110km like in Tauranga?
7	Individual submitter	Yes. Stop lying and using this as a justification to push people to the new toll road. All of your surveys are always set up to get the answer you want and I'm calling bullshit. Stop wasting the millions and millions of dollars you rape of motorists each year!
8	Individual submitter	<p>Submission Speed restriction SH1</p> <p>The primary task of NZTA and AT Auckland Transport is to provide an efficient, effective and safe road network (Land Transport Act)</p> <p>Clearly traffic accidents need to be minimized. However it is trivial to point out that reducing speed reduces accident impact. The mandate of NZTA is not to impose speed restrictions, but to provide a safe road network. Sadly SH1 over the years was not maintained to keep up with increasing traffic demand. State Highway No1 literally is the arterial route to connect to New Zealand's Northland. Actually it should provide a fast and safe link.</p> <p>The actual traffic speeds on the Pūhoi to Sheepworld stretch assessed by NZTA is some 82 km/h. This alone raises the question why additional speed restrictions are needed, if the travelling speed is that (s)low already?</p> <p>Furthermore with the opening of the Motorway extension a majority (heavy vehicle traffic in particular) is predictably moving away from the existing SH1. Traffic volumes on the old SH1 will significantly drop, and automatically make it safer to use then. So the need to further reduce speed is not proven under the parameters of less traffic after opening of the motorway.</p> <p>In comparison: how many serious accidents have happened on the "old SH 1 sector from Orewa-Waiwera-Pūhoi" since the "tunnels" were opened. This gives NZTA and its planners reliable data of the upcoming situation on the Pūhoi – Warkworth stretch. And subsequently does not constitute any justification for further speed reductions.</p> <p>Lastly if the proposed toll of the new motorway is implemented then motorists need to have a meaningful toll free alternative. Introducing speed reductions will increase transit times then even further and does not constitute a meaningful alternative then any more.</p>

		<p>In summary: Further speed reduction renders the SH1 more towards a back-country road. and finally: if drivers cannot navigate safely at the present speeds (100 km/h) it's either about road maintenance (ruts, braking slip, etc ) or we seriously need to discuss driver re-assessment.</p> <p><b>s 9(2)(a)</b></p> <p>(Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,</p> <p>thanks for the opportunity to (again) provide feedback on the proposed speed restrictions.</p> <p>Unfortunately the online form does not allow for any documents to be attached; therefore please find a more detailed reply attached. Please forward to the traffic engineer, who is in charge of this project.</p> <p>If you wish to discuss any of the aspects raised, feel free to contact me by mail.</p> <p>Best regards <b>s</b></p>
9	Individual submitter	<p>Reducing traffic accidents is paramount. But it is naive to simply set up speed restrictions. It is NZTA / AT's mandate to provide for a safe roading network; sadly the maintenance of the SH1 has not kept up with the increased demand. Here NZTA / AT fail to deliver a first-world standard. For further aspects please see my separate submission (emailed to auckland.speed.reviews@nzta.govt.nz) Best regards</p>
10	Individual submitter	<p>Oh come on!</p> <p>How long do you want it to take to go anywhere?These speeds are ridiculously slow!Why not just make "Flintstones Feet Conversions" mandatory? Are you guys just bored and trying to justify your jobs or something?</p> <p>This isn't a democracy anymore,we are being dictated to by a hugs and cuddles communist party.Why even pretend these speed limit proposals are up for discussion?You will just do what you have made up your mind already to do.</p> <p>Heres a novel idea...How about teaching people who cant drive to their limits better drivers instead of dumbing down the entire population for the sake of a few?But that is this Governments way isn't it.Make failure so hard because even idiots are given Cereal Packet Degrees.Stop wasting our money on these pretend open discussion reviews and then at least you're not hiding behind this mask of democracy while brandishing the "hammer and sickle".</p>
11	Individual submitter	<p>There is no reason to lower the cspeed ober entire section between puhoi to Warkwork. On slower speed rds people who have to travel to the speed limited are harrassed by mthe majority of traffic traveling at a more realisrtic speed for the road and the minimal enforcement by police is ineffective. The variable reduce speeds at intersections are a joke - when you slow down you are almost re ended and then the waiting traffic are frustrated as they hacve to waite longer for traffic to pass so that they can pull out. Trucks then need a long distance to get back up to speed.</p>
12	Individual submitter	(NO COMMENT)
13	Individual submitter	<p>The current average speeds cannot be used as an accurate representation of what the public feels to be a safe speed in the area. It takes one person to slow the flow of traffic, affecting the speed of countless other people, which will affect the average speed that is being used for the decision making.</p> <p>The conditions of the roads should be improved to match the current speed limits, not the other way around. With the fact that newer vehicles are alot safer than they where, it raises the question as to what has changed to increased road toll deaths and injuries.</p>
14	Individual submitter	<p>By reducing the speed limit you penalise the majority of drivers for whom existing speed limits do not pose unreasonable risk. The few people who cause injury and fatality on our roads at</p>

		existing speed limits usually do so primarily because of factors like driver error (crossing the centre line, following too closely, loss of vehicle control) or lack of vehicle roadworthiness (poor tyres, brakes, illumination). Speed will ALWAYS be a contributing factor in any road collision but I believe it is seldom the root cause. Your effort would be better received in ensuring drivers: wore seatbelts, are sober, use headlights (this one is a huge problem - seldom policed), followed appropriately, had ongoing holistic driver education and more vigilant vehicle roadworthiness inspections. I suspect if you proceed with lowering speed limits that majority of drivers, for whom the current limit is justified, will become frustrated with the lower speed required even during ideal weather conditions. Frustration is itself dangerous, more drivers will take greater risks in overtaking slower vehicles. Why can't you better educate drivers and entrust them with driving to the conditions? We'd all be better for it in the long run.
15	Individual submitter	I agree with the proposals north of Warkworth. I disagree with the proposal of 80kmh from South Warkworth to Puhoi. The road is suitable for 100kmh especially considering the reduced traffic volume post completion of the motorway.
16	Individual submitter	<p>Hello NZTA,</p> <p>I can understand the proposal to drop the speed limit on the Warkworth to Puhoi SH1, because during the day because you can only do an average of 80kmh anyway, because it is so busy, unfortunately when the new motorway is open and there is not so many cars on this road NZTA will still leave this road at 80kmh, which makes no sense.</p> <p>Also how is anyone meant to overtake slow moving vehicles up the likes of 'the viaduct' when the speed limit is 80kmh?</p> <p>Surveys done overseas show that dropping the speed limit by 10kmh, drops the average speed of vehicles by 3.9kmh.</p> <p>If when the speed limit is 100kmh, the current average speed is therefore 82kmh, do the sums of dropping the speed limit by 20kmh and then tell the public the truth if NZTA want to get positive feedback about their proposal.</p> <p>Regards  <span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s 9(2)(a)</span>  <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">[REDACTED]</span></p>
17	Individual submitter	(NO COMMENT)
18	Individual submitter	Excellent idea. Will save lives.
19	Individual submitter	(NO COMMENT)
20	Individual submitter	I agree with all the proposed speed limit changes.
21	Individual submitter	I oppose the speed limit the road should be built to accommodate the traffic at highway speeds it s no use creating a bottle neck at the end of the extension.
22	Individual submitter	Having driven that road on a daily basis for over 3 years in just about every conceivable weather, traffic and time my personal observation is that decreasing the limit will likely cause the opposite effect of road safety. All the crashes I have observed over the period of daily commute through that stretch of road has been because of frustration , distraction from monotony or road hypnosis. Getting stuck behind traffic without any chances of passing creates frustration and a sense of desparation. I have observed cars pass on double yellow lines because they'd just had enough. I have observed many drivers gingerly observing the scenery and corssing the centre line. I have observed being stuck behind trucks and other cars on many an evening drive to find people either hypnotised to sleep by the tail lights gently swaying in front of them or to a sense of slow reaction where they almost rear end the vehicle in front of them for no apparent reason. Roads are meant for driving and alertness. A speed that keeps its drivers alert instead of lulling them into a false sense of security also minimises travel time and therefore risk. It also contributes to road capacity and encourages development in the area.
23	Individual submitter	Along some sections of this road (South of Warkworth to Puhoi), 100km/h speed is perfectly suitable. Reducing the limit because of windy road doesn't make sense - some bends/curves are not even safe at 80km/h, so would you reduce the limit on entire length of road to 40km/h? Reduction of speed limit due to crashes is also not justified properly - how many of the crashes occurred as a result of vehicles being driven at more than 80km/h?
24	Bike Auckland	Bike Auckland supports the proposed speed limit changes.

25	Individual submitter	Thank you for your reply. I have been travelling the above highway for 24 years and in that time have never considered the speed limit to be excessive. I am definitely opposed to dropping the speed limit. There will always be drink and drug drivers but I can not see why the majority of drivers need to curtail their speed to accommodate illegal road users whom I suspect are the main cause of accidents. Thank you for my say
26	Individual submitter	I agree with lowering limits, particularly since the new SH1 will provide a high speed safe alternative. This current area is a death trap.
27	Individual submitter	As for the speed limit on the other stretch of road, fine, go for it.
28	Individual submitter	<p>Hi, firstly the highway photograph included with this info sheet, appears to be of the highway north of the southern Waitaraire bridge, and not of any part of the length subject to this proposal.</p> <p>Secondly, I feel that the majority of the highway between Warkworth and Puhoi can be driven safely at 100 mph with the exception of the hill south of windy ridge. If a lowering of the speed limit has to be impacted, then the safer speed of 90 could be appropriate. I agree that Schedeway's hill could be limited to the original design speed, 45 mph or 70 mph in today's terms.</p> <p>Lastly, where can I find out what the toll might be set at, when the new construction is to be commissioned and put into use.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to make a comment.</p> <p>Regards, s 9(2)(a)</p>
29	Individual submitter	The existing highway continues to serve for the bulk of northland bound traffic (SH16 excepted). The simple fact that once the motorway opens, the traffic on existing SH1 will be dramatically reduced, will achieve more than perceived aims of the speed restriction. Police already manage the existing speed limits and can also respond to "bad driving etiquette". On a fine day assuming good driving skills then there is no problem with existing speed limits - the problems that do arise consistently emanate from poor driving skills. In poor weather conditions then all drivers should be 'driving to the conditions'. Please do not penalise responsible drivers for the 'ignorance of the few'
30	Individual submitter	The prime objective is to get the bulk of traffic to use the new motorway between Puhoi and Warkworth so do not introduce an additional toll to the new motorway. No toll encourages people to use the new motorway which is a safer route. The current SH1 is mostly congested therefore speed is naturally limited. It seems that the focus is on reducing speed limits rather than focusing on the real cause of incidents which is driver behaviour. Changing the speed limits does not reduce accidents. The speed reduction on the stretch of road between Sheep World and Wayby Rd has not reduced accidents. Changing the speed limits does not automatically increase the safety so I don't believe a speed change is warranted.
31	Individual submitter	Happy with proposals north of Warkworth. Much of SH1 south is easily negotiable at 90-100kph and 80 is not going to stop idiots. Unfortunately many will break the 80 limit, often without realising it. 90 would be more acceptable to our many good drivers and the limit would be observed more readily.
32	Individual submitter	leave the damn speed limits as they are on what will be the old statehighway 1 north/south between orewa and warkworth..there will be very little traffic on it once the new motorway is up and running. regards s 9(2)(a)
33	Individual submitter	1. Reduced traffic flow once the motorway extension opens. Why change something that is not broke and will get better without any action? 2. We already have problems with motorists who consistantly drive at 20KPH under the limit even when there is no traffic. The proposal will reduce the average speed on the road from 80KPH down to 60KPH. 3. Change your culture. Motorists bad, cyclists and pedestrians good is not the doctrine for healthy communications.
34	Individual submitter	80km/h rather than 100km/h is one thing, but 60km/h is a joke! This is State Highway 1 not some little road.

35	Individual submitter	one of the most dangerous spots along this road are the placement of overtaking lanes at schollum access way - yet this isn't mentioned? the answer seems to be to just reduce the speed. With the new highway, less traffic will eventually be on this road - we oppose the speed reduction however would appreciate revisiting the hill and section of road I have mentioned above.
36	Individual submitter	It seems obvious that part of the reason to reduce the speed on the Existing 100km/h area on SH1 between Warkworth south and Puhoi Road - from 60m south of McKinney Road, Warkworth to 350m north of Puhoi Road - reduce from 100km/h to 80km/h - is to provide a disincentive to use this road, and instead for drivers to use the proposed toll road. I disagree that the speed reduction for this stretch of road is necessary. In fact with the new motorway open there will be far less traffic and risk on this existing road. I disagree that the speed reduction is warranted. If it was warranted, then the reduction in speed would have occurred many years ago. As I say this speed reduction is not based on much more than a not so subtle attempt to divert traffic only a toll road.
37	Individual submitter	3. Question (consultation form asks one question only): Are there any other factors that we should consider when making our decision regarding the proposed speed limit changes on State Highway 1 between L Phillips Road and Puhoi? Agree to the reduction of the speed limit.
38	Individual submitter	I have driven the stretch of SH1 from Warkworth south and north regularly for 35 yrs I personally have no problem with the road speed limit being 100 Kms per hour although would be happy to see speed restrictions in place for duration of motorway development and acknowledge if long term that stretch of road becomes safer as a result of motorists driving slower then I'd agree with the changes you propose.
39	Individual submitter	Don't decrease the speed limit- it needs to remain at 100km/hr. It already takes more than 25minutes to travel from Wellsford to Warkworth on a good day. If you travel closer to Auckland City- for the same distance the travel time is between 10minutes. We are charged Auckland rates but our roads are rural. Uneven roads, pot holes, subpar work on roads repaired.
40	Individual submitter	How about a new study and proposal completed by people that have brain matter.
41	Individual submitter	Whilst a speed limit along the existing SH1 make sense from a safety perspective, there are sections on the puhoi to south warkworth that already are overtaking areas, and these could remain 100kph to enable faster traffic to safely overtake slower moving vehicles. These dual carriageway sections would be dangerous at 80kph in that overtaking will be more difficult to achieve without exceeding the limit, and could lead to tailbacks along the road. A more nuanced variable limit along the road would be more optimum.
42	Individual submitter	100kph is a perfectly safe speed , please consider road maintenance. Your math is very incorrect with travel time aswell.
43	Individual submitter	We need to focus on driver training and awareness, Dome Valley has taught us that reducing the limit to 80kph still results in accidents and road deaths. We already have signage to advise people to slow down and accidents still occur so I don't believe reducing the limit to 80kph will do anything other than target those of us that currently drive safely and to the conditions every day on that stretch of road, if people can't take notice of signs now they aren't going to at all. Target driver safety and defensive driving, that creates drivers who will respect all roads they drive on, reducing our road accident and death statistics.
44	Individual submitter	Speed limit changes are sensible as proposed however the existing SH1 from Puhoi to Warkworth should revert to 100 km/h once construction is completed
45	Individual submitter	It is harder to drive slower and it is boring and causes drivers to get distracted. It is not safe to drive slow.
46	Individual submitter	Keep it at 100ks per hour it is not a dangerous road
47	Individual submitter	Reducing the speed limits will significantly reduce travel times. The new motorway will remove significant traffic from these roads, which are safe now at existing speeds. This is essentially an effort to increase government income from traffic fines. I strongly oppose any changes.
48	Individual submitter	I contend that the reduction of 20km/h from 100km/h to 80km/h in Phase 1 is excessive in these circumstances. I believe that, if a reduction of the 100km/h speed limit is to be contemplated, then the reduction should be to 90km/h. This would be more reasonable and appropriate for these sections of road. When the new motorway is built, there will much less traffic on the section from Puhoi to Warkworth so either 100 or 90km/h should be applied. Application of the Road Code, plus driver education, plus minor road improvements, will reduce road traffic

		accidents. I suspect that the 60km/h limit in Phase 2 should be 70km/h and this will be the speed that traffic will travel at, as per similar situations, and the distances should be reduced by 100m. Drivers don't comply with speed restrictions which they can see are too low and for longer lengths of road than is necessary.
49	Individual submitter	I am TOTALLY OPPOSED to the reduction in road speeds as proposed. With the opening of the Puhoi to Warkworth motorway extension the traffic movements in this area will be reduced. The current posted speed limit for the area is 100 km/hr. Current recorded speed for the area already well below the posted speed limits. with traffic travelling slightly below or above your proposed speed limits of 80 km/hr. Pretty much all you are doing is changing posted speed limit signs for the sake of changing signs
50	Individual submitter	Make the roads safer by spraying moss and fixing uneven surfaces, dont drop the speed limit It is already low enough and we already have too much traffic congestion because of it.
51	Individual submitter	Warkworth south to Puhoi is perfectly acceptable at 100km/h limit. Crash statistics are not high, and will drop when the motorway opens anyway. Lowering the limit will not improve people's driving, which is the cause of crashes anyway. The road is not at fault, nor is the speed limit. Stop wasting public money on pointless speed reviews, and leave the road as it is.
52	Individual submitter	Safety and travel time
53	Individual submitter	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission. With the opening of the new motorway extension, I can see the logic in adjusting the speed limits in the proposed area north of Warkworth, especially around the area of the motorway access roundabout. However, I can see no mention of how far back along the new motorway itself the speed limit will be reduced. This is equally important especially where motorists are accustomed to having driven at 100kph for some considerable time (an hour from CBD?) and are then expected to adjust to driving at 60kph. You also make no specific mention of the impact that the new Matakana link road will have on this same area. It's not even on your map (yet the new motorway is), and yet you state that consideration has been given? However I do not understand the rationale for reducing the speed limit between McKinney Road and Puhoi, which I find to be an interesting and generally safe road to drive. It does have one serious hazard (where northbound vehicles turn right into Schollum Access Road – from an overtaking lane and on a bend!) This hazard will still exist no matter what the speed limit in force). True there are hills and bends, but these make the case for driver concentration and are clearly signed with advisory speed limits. My reasons for objecting to a speed limit decrease on this stretch are:: 1) "More than 23,000 vehicles travel the route each day with vehicle numbers increasing." This volume will be significantly reduced once the new motorway is open. The impact on the old SH1 between Puhoi and Orewa is testament to that. 2) Removal of most of the heavy traffic from SH1 will improve the general flow and make the road significantly safer. You should impose a weight/size limit on the existing road forcing big vehicles on to the new motorway. 3) The new motorway now provides a viable alternative route should SH1 (south of Warkworth) be closed for whatever reason. SH1 provides the same for when the motorway is closed. 4) Regarding "Making the road safer for pedestrians and cyclists", well SH1 is already a restricted limit as it passes near to Puhoi, and through Warkworth there is a 60kph limit, multiple traffic lights and pedestrian crossings. And on SH1 south of Warkworth: a. In the past 6 years I can only remember seeing cyclists on two occasions, and never a pedestrian b. If this were truly an issue, then why is the limit not being assessed SH1 in its entirety between Whangarei and Wellington? In fact, if it is truly speed doing the killing why do we have a 100kph limit of any road in the country? c. What are you proposing for SH1 north of Sheepworld to protect these other road users? d. Why are you not proposing footpaths and cyclelanes? Rather than impose a speed limit on this stretch, I would suggest improvements would be seen if</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the on/off ramp just south of Warkworth were to be implemented. It will happen eventually, so do it now whilst the equipment is there.</li> <li>• Re-instate the overtaking lanes currently restricted for motorway construction access</li> <li>• Consider making variable speed limit signs available for use when the new motorway is closed thus forcing drivers down to 80kph. This would help mitigate any issues created by a temporary increase in traffic volume.</li> </ul> <p>By all means review the situation in a couple of years, but I feel that you are trying to resolve a problem that we've already spent multiple millions of dollars fixing by constructing a new road. With regards your mention of poor driving behavior, this is an issue that should not be used as a reason for reducing speed limits. Lowering limits will not stop people doing stupid things, like phone distractions (hand-free or otherwise), animated conversations with passengers, driving at unsafe speeds (irrespective of speed limits), applying</p>

		makeup etc.. You need to look at this issue separately, and the solution is not simply legislation. Hopefully most of these drivers will opt to use the new motorway instead.
54	Individual submitter	Many drivers travel at 80 in this 100 Koh area. If you reduce the speed to 80 those drivers will travel at 70 or 60kph making the road dangerously unsafe
55	One Warkworth Business Association	One Warkworth strongly supports the new Motorway and its extension to Te Hana. Although long overdue, once open this section of Motorway will greatly improve both the safety and the efficiency for users of the roading network north of Puhoi. The proposed toll is quite simply a regional tax targeted on Warkworth (and surrounds) and Northland residents and businesses. The failure to roll-out a fair and equitable tolling regime across New Zealand has resulted in a situation where the Northern Auckland and Northland businesses and communities are being unfairly targeted in terms of tolling. If the toll results in greater usage of the existing SH1 than modeled, then this will not result in resolving the current issues with the Hill Street Intersection. It remains unclear what the total toll between Silverdale and Warkworth will now be. One WW does not support the proposed slower speed limit on the existing SH1 when the Motorway opens. It is unclear why, when vehicle numbers are expected to decrease, that a lower speed limit is required. One WW does not support the proposed slower speed limit on the existing SH1 when the Motorway opens. It is unclear why, when vehicle numbers are expected to decrease, that a lower speed limit is required.
56	Individual submitter	Making a toll road and then lowering the speed limit for the route around and saying it's for "safety" is BS, with less trucks and other traffic the alternative route will already see reduced crash numbers so there is no reason to make any other changes. All your doing is trying to force people to pay the toll and take the faster route by slowing down the alternative, good for business but makes you look very greedy.
57	Individual submitter	I object to the reduction from 100 to 80km/h between Puhoi and Warkworth. The reason given is safety, but after the new motorway is opened there will be less traffic on the road and fewer trucks so will be much safer. I suspect the real reason for this is to "encourage" people to use the new motorway and pay the new toll. For someone like myself who lives in Warkworth, that is 2 tolls each way from here to Orewa and back.
58	Individual submitter	<p>SH1 Speed Review</p> <p>In principle I am in agreement with most of the speed review proposal but only as part of a program to address problems on this stretch of road.</p> <p>But there is a problem with the information presented. Since the speed review won't significantly change average speeds, the main cause of serious crashes on this section of road (head-on) will not materially change. That will only change if volumes drop dramatically?data suggests to 5,000 vpd or less.</p> <p>This leads to the following conclusion?either the road needs safety improvements or the traffic needs to be directed elsewhere. Either this section should be upgraded in a similar fashion to the current Dome safety project or as much traffic as possible moved onto P2W (once it opens). But concurrently with this consultation is a consultation on the tolling of P2W (and W2W). If it goes ahead, it will have the effect of substantially reducing the number of vehicles using the new safe road. The 5,000 vpd target would not be met.</p> <p>Although safety is the key message in this consultation, the NZTA would be seen as somewhat two- faced if it focuses on safety (speed reduction) and concurrently takes actions that have the effect of undermining that safety message in favour of money (tolling).</p> <p>I propose that ?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The speed review proceeds, and</li> <li>• Either tolling is abandoned for P2W or the existing SH1 has immediate safety improvements similar to the Dome</li> </ul> <p>Perry Road Intersection Speed Zone</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, I do not support further lowering the "slow" speed at the Intersection Speed Zone south of Perry Road. This area is mostly straight, relatively wide and has good visibility. The consultation document provides no reason (let alone evidence) to support a change here.</p> <p>Further, I understood that this zone to be a temporary traffic management tool to facilitate the construction of P2W, and that it will no longer be needed once it opens. This consultation</p>

		<p>appears to make the zone a permanent fixture.</p> <p>This should be compared to the section between L Phillips Road and Hudson Road where the consultation document refers only to the permanent speeds (100kph) despite there being long-standing temporary speeds (60 and 70kph).</p> <p>Or is the Perry Road Intersection Speed Zone intended to be permanent?</p>
59	Individual submitter	Remove the portions of the passing lanes which make left hand bends up-hill.
60	Individual submitter	<p>I object to a reduction in the speed limit as proposed as I believe it is not based on truth. If you are so keen on reducing the road death toll and want to reduce the speed limit for safety reasons why aren't you doing it now? Why wait until the motorway is open and fewer people will be using this stretch of SH1? What is the true reason you want to reduce the speed limit please?</p>
61	Individual submitter	Really good idea
62	Individual submitter	<p>With less traffic on the existing road from Puhoi to Warkworth, (once the new motorway is opened) there should be no need to reduce the speed limit as less traffic will make it safer and those in a hurry will be using the new motorway.</p> <p>Schedewys Hill is the most dangerous area that has accidents due to people's frustration with heavy traffic (which will now be using the new motorway).</p> <p>This means that there will be no need to make journeys slower and take longer on the existing state highway once the new motorway opens.</p> <p><b>s 9(2)(a)</b></p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██</p> <p>████████████████████</p>
63	Individual submitter	<p>We are responding to the request for feedback to tolling on the proposed Puhoi to Warkworth motorway and to the changes to the speed limit on the existing State Highway 1 between Puhoi and Warkworth together as they are clearly linked.</p> <p>Reducing the speed on the existing State Highway 1 at this time would encourage travellers to use the new motorway when it is complete as the time to travel this route would be legally reduced.</p> <p>At the Board of Inquiry for the Puhoi to Warkworth motorway it was promoted that using the new motorway would save travellers 8 minutes. This assumed existing speed limits. Eight minutes saving would not justify paying a toll to a lot of road users, particularly when they would have to back track into Warkworth and travel a greater distance.</p> <p>This might considerably change if their travel time on the existing State Highway 1 increased because the speed limit was reduced, so we see this as a stealth move to coerce motorists into using the motorway.</p> <p>When the motorway is constructed the amount of traffic, especially trucks, using the existing State Highway 1 will reduce, so the route will become safer for those who wish to use it. The reduction in speed limit cannot be justified on that basis.</p> <p>Your promotion of the speed limit reduction indicates that the average travel times are currently just above the speed limits that you are suggesting so reducing the speed to 80 kph for a significant length of the road would not change the situation except to give enforcement a legitimate excuse for revenue collection.</p> <p>Whilst we all recognise that speed kills, if this was the rationale for lowering speed limits along this stretch of highway then NZTA ought to be mooted a 70 kph limit (or lower) to achieve a safer travel outcome.</p> <p>For the reasons cited above we do not support changing the speed limits.</p>



		<p>On the issues of the road toll we see no reason why we should have to pay an additional \$2.30 each way to use the new motorway.</p> <p>Again, at the Board of Inquiry it was made clear that a decision to toll the new route had not been made. However, the promotional material put out with this consultation indicates that the decision to toll had already been made.</p> <p>"Tolling Report..... It informed our recommendation to toll and the decision to proceed with public consultation"</p> <p>So, this consultation is not actually consultation as there is no discussion involved. At best, it can only be called informing the public to gauge the public's opinion on a decision already taken.</p> <p>We do not support tolling: it will be discourage the use of a safer highway. We are of the opinion that the new motorway will not have the volumes of traffic that NZTA are anticipating. This in turn would then mean that all the stress that we have endured as stakeholders in the Puhoi to Warkworth project process would have been for nought.</p> <p>Furthermore, the reduced traffic volumes would mean that the cost to execute the tolling would not provide sufficient revenue to justify putting it in place.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p>
64	Individual submitter	Improving the road, not reducing speed limits will reduce accidents. We need honest research, not biased rubbish
65	Individual submitter	Keep it 100kph it's stupid changing it. It still have crashes and all that keep it as it is its normally holiday makers that crash. People should learn how to drive properly.
66	Individual submitter	We support this proposal. although the timing is a bit weird rolling it out together with the tolling one - it's as if you want to make SH1 slower on purpose to make the tolled option more appealing.
67	Individual submitter	There should be more passing lanes on this road. The speed limit should be raised to 100 kph from 80 kph on passing lanes (existing and future).
68	Individual submitter	I would agree to the changes as detailed - phase 1 & 2. Once the motorway to Warkworth is completed I would like to see the old State Highway 1 become a 80km/h road from WW to the tunnels. A much safer speed.
69	Individual submitter	There will be a significant drop in traffic once the new motorway is completed so why drop the speed with a much lower volume of vehicles. Leave the speed limits as they are.
70	Individual submitter	As for the speed limit being reduced on the current SH1. If it is unsafe do it now. However its hard to think the road will be less safe with a massive reduction in traffic on it. Its obvious this idea is just to make the toll road a faster/more desirable option
71	Individual submitter	I think it's a stupid change to make to such a piece of road that has no issues and according to the average speeds, is being driven on safely. 60km/h speed limit on a highway quality piece of road will feel slow and it will make the road so much more congested and probably more dangerous with people getting impatient.
72	Individual submitter	I would prefer further speed reductions on this stretch of road - reduction to 60kmh. It is an excellent stretch of road for cycling and i would love to ride it! Also would encourage more traffic to use the new motorway with anticipated better safety outcomes.
73	Individual submitter	The speed limits are fine as they are and should not be reduced. If you want to make the roads safer then more emphasis should be given to driver training.
74	Individual submitter	Reducing the speed on this vital commute route will INCREASE accidents as passing lanes will turn into race courses. We are slowed enough by all the trucks as it is which are often the reason of accidents as drivers get impatient and take chances. Dropping the speed to 80kph will only increase this. This is absolutely ridiculous and insane.
75	Individual submitter	I agree that the speed limit should be reduced to no more than 80km from warkworth to puhoi along the current sh1. This should be done asap.
76	Individual submitter	I oppose the planned decision to lower the speed limit between Sheepworld and Puhoi. Currently with the major roadworks between Sheepworld and Warkworth (by the way you have spelt this incorrectly above = Wakeworth...great proof reading) the current speed limit is 70 kph

		<p>decreasing to 60kph and will undoubtedly remain in place until the new Puhoi-Warkworth Motorway is opened. However once that motorway is opened the traffic volumes should decrease significantly leading to increased safety simply from that point of view. If the speed limit still needs to be decreased from the safety point of view then clearly that portion of road is NOT a "free and SAFE alternative for people who don't want to pay the toll" as you have argued elsewhere in your reason for tolling the new motorway. With less traffic your estimated increased travel times are going to be wildly inaccurate (and even now average times are only average..if you travel outside of peak times then with the previous speed limit of 100kph Sheepworld to Warkworth North and current 100kph Warkworth to Puhoi the time difference will be much greater. You are also condemning those travelling South who cannot pay the \$5 toll that will be needed on the combined Warkworth -Orewa motorway (I note NO southbound exit off the new motorway so its "all or nothing" ) to significantly increased travel time. Is this a ploy to force people to take the new highway which will almost certainly be tolled?</p>
77	Individual submitter	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>Yes, I agree with the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80k on this road. I am a Warkworth resident and have travelled the road for years.</p> <p>I could write a few pages about this but I won't other than to say it should be done NOW. In fact it should have been done a long time ago. Why on earth wait until the new section is open and reduces the traffic volume by 50% or whatever percentage it will be. Make it safer by doing it now.</p> <p>The road is safe but the speed limit of 100k makes it extremely unsafe – in particular at side roads and where the passing lanes end.</p> <p>If it was 80k then the heavy volumes of traffic would be travelling at perhaps 90k. With the limit at 100k people now travel at 110k plus.</p> <p>There have over the years been many fatalities and hundreds of injuries – with costs into the millions of dollars.</p> <p>A lot of this could have been avoided if authorities had used common sense. Just look at the reduction in vehicle crashes in the Dome Valley since the limit was reduced to 80k.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p>
78	Individual submitter	<p>I believe you are indicating a speed reduction is required to ensure your new motorway gets increased usage with the new toll suggested so that you can make more money from the toll. That probably sounds cynical but it's very realistic!</p>
79	Individual submitter	<p>Your speed calculation is all wrong, you can not use the average speed in a 100kph area vers a maximum speed limit in a 80kph. Warkworth to Puhoi needs to remain at a 100kph limit to allow for overtaking slow trucks. This road will still have high traffic usage because you are tolling the new motorway. If you really want to save lives make the motorway free!!! , like all the other roads in Auckland</p>
80	Individual submitter	<p>#KEEPIT100 If you can't drive 100 catch the bus #KEEPIT100 This is a state highway not a residential road.</p>
81	Individual submitter	<p>I support the proposed reductions in speed limits for this road and encourage the NZTA to implement them as sson as possible. Additionally, I would like the NZTA to consider a 60 km/h speed limit between Mahurangi West Road and 200m north of Schollum Access Road. A lower speed limit would highlight to road users that this short section of highway has a tortuous alignment and steep grades and that low speeds are appropriate.</p>
82	Individual submitter	<p>I do not support the lowering of the speed limits</p>
83	Individual submitter	<p>I support the speed limit changes, and urge that they be implemented immediately. Other factors include the need for further upgrades to the existing road. It will continue to kill and maim even after the new motorway is opened. Please do urgently the Kaipara Flats Road</p>

		intersection as mentioned in your consultation document, but also continue with small upgrades to prevent death and serious injury in the event of small mistakes (which you also acknowledge in your consultation document). Roadside guard rails, wider road shoulders, wire and post centre line dividers etc. will all help to reduce DSI and associated human misery. Please continue with safety upgrades to the existing road as well as reducing speed limits!
84	Individual submitter	Get your heads out of your arse and educate people on driving not change the speed limit and give the power crazy highway patrol officers more revinue gathering areas
85	Individual submitter	I don't think you're proposed changes will reduce the road toll it all comes down to a few fools that will still drive dangerously. As far as having an other Toll is ridiculous people will not be able to afford to go to work work in Auckland .I have a son and Daughter in law that travel from Matakana to Auckland each day it would uneconomical for them to do this. Two more unemployed for the government to support. Get real.
86	Individual submitter	There are several dangerous bends (eg Shadoways Hill hairpin bend) which presumably will be subject to additional speed restrictions as currently designated. I presume this will continue to be the case.
87	Individual submitter	I think the speed limits for SH1 between Puhoi and Sheepworld should remain unchanged. If you lower the speed limits too much, it polarizes people to either comply and zone out from all that is happening around them, or infuriate them into taking ridiculous chances to get past the zombified plodders!  Leave the speed limits alone!
88	Individual submitter	Please leave the speed limit as it currently stands at 100km per hour.
89	Individual submitter	If the average existing speed is about 80 Kph why change the current posted speed limit there are non peak time conditions when it is safe to travel at 100kph so as far as I can see just an excuse for more revenue collecting
90	Individual submitter	Please enforce the current speed limits. Lowering them will not help anyone if it is only adding 10seconds to the journey
91	Individual submitter	Re State Highway 1 Not the New Motorway. From Warkworth to Puhio I have been driving this road from the 1960's it has always been a 100Kln road. There is only Shedaways Hill which requires one to slow down. As the rest of road is very safe at 100Klns.. The only Reason to make it 80 Klns is more reveune. No other reason . The Motorway from Warkworth to Silverdale should not be tolled, unless you toll all Motorways including Freeways. As we the North who live in the poorer part of the Country are subsidising all other Motorways and Freeways. Also our Petrol is allso the dearist in the North Island. So we would be paying double.
92	Individual submitter	"Any other factors?" This is the most cynical consultative process I have ever come across. I oppose any suggestion to change any speed limit on State Highway 1 between L Phillips Road and Puhoi. Watch what happens when many drivers slow from a 100km/h zone to an 80km/h zone. Many reach for their smartphones or are distracted by other activities around them. Maintaining a 100km/h maintains alertness. I reject outright that lowering speed limits improves safety. Also, lowering speed limits encourages ribbon development once administration of the road is handed to Auckland Council.
93	Individual submitter	Algies Bay
94	Individual submitter	Strongly support the speed reduction plans
95	Individual submitter	the amount of slower drivers that speed up at passing lanes and vehicles/ trucks on uphill passing lanes holding up traffic- these vehicles travel at reasonable speed on the flat but slow on uphills- lower speed limits reduce the opportunity to pass these safely. will force drivers into desparate passing manouvres to get past the slower moving traffic
96	Individual submitter	The data being used is flawed by the fact that there is construction happening and has been for some time, so the average speed has been artificially altered. Prior to the construction work, there was very few who went lower than 90-100kph on the vast majority of the road, as signposted. With the increased construction traffic on the road, the limit is lowered naturally and it can at times affect the length of a trip by 10 minutes due to trucks trying to overtake each other, or traffic management. Outside of these times, the road flows well and there is nothing wrong with the current speed limit and the road is in good enough condition to withstand these speeds from an attentive driver. Reduce the speed where needed with localised signs to keep the construction workers safe,but do not permanently lower the speed limits

97	Individual submitter	Leave as is. I travel this road daily often slower due to traffic. But when conditions and traffic volume permit 100 km/he is fine.
98	Individual submitter	<p>1: We agree with the proposed new speed restrictions on State Highway 12 the alternate route.</p> <p>2: We agree that the new Ara Tuhono-Puhi to Warkworth Motorway be a toll road at the rate to be decided to ensure revenue is sufficient for a meaningful contribution to the road coast.</p> <p>3: If travelling south on new motorway, this proposal does not allow one to exit to Waiwera &amp; then onto the scenic route down to coast to Orewa. One would have to drive to Orewa &amp; then backtrack north to Waiwera. Therefore we would like to see a southbound exit from the new motorway which would allow traffic to go by Waiwera to assist business in the area &amp; to take advantage of the scenic route to Orewa.</p>
99	Individual submitter	I support all your proposed speed reductions. also, please keep in mind that less speed means less burned fuel which results in less CO2 emissions. Low hanging fruit on the way to a carbon neutral world.
100	Individual submitter	I agree with all the changes you outline above. This part of the current SH1 will later become a "tourist highway" so the safer it can be the better for us all.
101	Individual submitter	<p>Concerning the old State Highway regulations the adjustments of speed at intersections will be required but interfering with the speed of the full highway is unnecessary, as I have found it quite safe &amp; adequate for travelling with good traffic flow. To reduce it could make it unsafe particularly at overtaking lanes.</p> <p>The omission of a north on ramp &amp; south off ramp at Puhoi is at best shortsighted and bureaucratic. Folk who live in Puhoi, Waiwera, Hatfields &amp; surrounds should be allowed the same facility &amp; access as others without the need to travel around in great circles to go north. Even if a reduced toll was implemented, through overall it would make little difference, now would be the opportunity to do the construction while equipment is on site. This will also cater for continuing, progressing, building &amp; development in the area. Please rethink urgently.</p>
102	Individual submitter	The spacing of traffic getting into/out of the Grange shopping area is becoming more challenging and difficult, is there a way to space out the traffic light phasing to give a bit more safe access? Generally support the proposed speed changes in the consultation document.
103	Individual submitter	The proposed new speed limits between Warkworth and Puhoi will have a far bigger impact on travel times once the new highway is completed. People traveling from and to Auckland, especially those living near the road (like myself) will have to negotiate the new on-ramp, off-ramp and intersections at Puhoi, which will add significantly to the travel time. The current average speed will increase significantly after the new highway is used due to less congestion. The reasoning used for this proposal does not make sense, the agenda here seems to be to force users away from the alternative route on to the new proposed toll road.
104	Individual submitter	Re the proposed speed limits on the for mentioned road. I think the speed restrictions should start on the new NX 2 motorway 2 km before it ends at the new round about north of warkworth. Two km before the end of NX 2 the limit should reduce to 80 km/h ....at 1 km before the end of the NX 2 the speed should be reduced to 60 km/h. This way the traffic will approach the round about at a safe exit speed. North of the new round about the speed should be 60 km/h until the sheep world road. From there the limit should be 75 km/h till Way be station cross roads. This would achieve a better flow and avoid drivers having to change their speeds all the time as proposed under the current proposed plan .
105	Individual submitter	The existing 100km/h area on SH1 between Warkworth south and Puhoi Road should remain at 100km/h. Reason: The road currently operates at 100km/h and must therefore be safe, resilient and reliable.
106	Individual submitter	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>I have looked closely at the twin proposals for tolling on the Puhoi to Warkworth motorway and speed limits on State Highway 1.</p> <p>There seems to be a logical lacuna, and I strongly suspect that it is linked to the need to make the PPP toll road attractive.</p> <p>If there is less traffic on SH1, it should be more safe, not less. Hence there should be no need to cut the speed to make it safer.</p>

		<p>However, cutting the speed will lengthen the time of the road trip on SH1 and make the toll road comparatively more attractive.</p> <p>I am very familiar with similar tactics on toll roads in Australia and the UK.</p> <p>If you can convince me there are genuine safety reasons, rather than commercial ones, I would be happy to read the analysis and reconsider.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
107	Individual submitter	If it was considered unsafe then the road would have been 80kph 30 years ago but when it wants to be introduced at the same time as tolling just looks like revenue gathering.
108	Individual submitter	The significant decrease in traffic using that road once the motorway is put in.
109	Individual submitter	Reducing speeds creates further traffic during the day- it is already bad enough! Consider road licensing and not changing speed. The reason people crash is because they can't drive properly and speed regardless of what the speed limits are
110	Individual submitter	The area north of Warkworth is already 80km so proposing to change this section of road to remain 80 until the town centre is good idea. Changing road south of Warkworth town to puhoi to 80km not agreeable. If this is to be the free route to Auckland then it is used by commuters who can't afford to pay \$9.80 a day for the pleasure of driving on the congested motorway.
111	Individual submitter	Honey center to puhoi should be 100km and do everything else you have planned please im begging you
112	Individual submitter	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>At no point on the existing Puhoi to Warkworth road (which will become the alternative free route) should the speed limit be reduced to lower than 80km/hour.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>s</p>
113	Individual submitter	Dont agree on either of your proposal
114	Individual submitter	<p>I fully support the proposed speed reductions on State Highway 1 between Pohoi and the Dome Valley, Warkworth.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p>
115	Northland Regional Council	<p>Date: 15 June 2020</p> <p>A submission by: The Northland Regional Transport Committee</p> <p>On: The Ara Tuhono – Puhoi to Warkworth Tolling Proposal and the Speed Limit Review – Making the Existing SH1 Safer.</p> <p>Contact Address:</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Northland Regional Council          Private Bag 9021          Whangarei Mail Centre 0148          Telephone number: 09 470 1200          Email address: info@nrc.govt.nz</p> <p>Introduction          Northland's Regional Transport Committee (RTC) is grateful for the opportunity to submit on the Ara Tuhono – Puhoi to Warkworth Tolling Proposal and the Speed Limit Review – Making the existing SH1 safer          State Highway 1 from Auckland through Northland carries the very life blood that the region so</p>

desperately requires for its very survival. Over time, the condition of this highway has gradually fallen into a state of decline to the point that it is no longer seen as safe or fit for purpose. Northlands economy is based around the safe and reliable transportation of forestry, agricultural product and tourists. It is therefore imperative that the infrastructure for the conveyance of the above, both inter and intra regionally, can provide sufficient confidence to encourage future economic growth in all sectors.

The RTC's submission is made in the interests of reducing deaths and serious injuries on this stretch of State Highway 1. In addition, providing a more resilient and reliable journey will assist in promoting a growing regional economy whilst ensuring the sustainable management of Northland's natural and physical resources and the social, and cultural wellbeing of its people and communities.

#### Ara Tuhono - Puhoi to Warkworth Construction.

The RTC supports the construction of the section of State Highway 1 between Puhoi and Warkworth to ensure "safe, resilient and reliable travel".

This support is based predominantly around Northlands historical requests and support for the upgrading and expanding of this stretch of State Highway 1. Over the years, there have been numerous investigations, studies and business cases undertaken in regards this project with no actual physical works being undertaken.

The RTC notes that Waka Kotahi-NZ Transport Agency has also applied for a Notice of Requirement to enable the construction, operation and maintenance of a new four lane State Highway from Warkworth to Te Hana.

The RTC therefore applauds and supports Waka Kotahi-NZTA for taking the initiative and commencing with this project following on from the Puhoi to Warkworth construction project.

#### Ara Tuhono - Puhoi to Warkworth Tolling

Whilst the RTC supports the construction of the section of State Highway 1 between Puhoi and Warkworth, we do have a number of concerns with regard to the proposal to toll this project and would request that these concerns be addressed as part of the consultation process.

These concerns are: -

1. State Highway 1 between the Silverdale and Puhoi is already tolled. The proposal for tolling of the Puhoi to Warkworth section will result in Northlanders having to pay twice for using this road, which is the region's main connection to Auckland and the rest of New Zealand.
2. No other state highway in New Zealand has more than one toll, yet the lifeline to arguably New Zealand's lowest socio economic regions is to be tolled twice? The RTC can see no justifiable reason for this decision.
3. We believe that of all the projects that Waka Kotahi-NZTA are constructing in the upper north island, only roads in the Northland to Auckland corridor are being tolled.
4. One of the key considerations in the approved Waka Kotahi-NZTA Programme Business Case for this project was the disadvantage that Northland has compared with other regions in the Upper North Island. The PBC sets out to reduce this deficiency by improving travel times so that they are comparable with Auckland to Hamilton.
5. By tolling the road to Northland, this will disproportionately affect the Northland economy compared to other regions. This is contrary to the Government's position on surge regions and support for economic development.

6. There are a number of major highway projects that have been undertaken recently that have no tolling at all. These include: -


- a. SH1 Auckland to Hamilton;
- b. SH1 Hamilton to Cambridge;
- c. SH2 Tauranga to Te Puke;
- d. Transmission Gully, north of Wellington

The RTC questions why the above projects were not tolled yet the Northland bound one is.

7. Despite the new Transmission Gully project being considered as a road suitable for tolling, Waka Kotahi-NZTA announced last year it would not be tolled. The rationale indicated that,

"Tolling the road would likely result in more drivers choosing to use the coastal route, which would compromise the safety, environmental and access benefits the road would deliver".

The only alternative to the tolled route for Northlanders will be a dangerous road with a

		<p>lowered Level of Service, and an appalling safety record.</p> <p>8. We note with interest that Waka Kotahi-NZTA are also consulting on the proposal for the lowering of speed limits for the current State Highway 1 section of road that will be bypassed. "We want to make State Highway 1 between L Phillips Road (near SheepWorld) and Puhoi safer for everyone who uses this road. One of the best things we can do to prevent people from dying or being seriously injured on this road is reduce speed limits to make them safe and right for the road."</p> <p>9. Again, with the tolling proposal for this new section of SH1 only Northland drivers will be required to pay two tolls to use a section of a Nationally Strategic Highway and will be the only major State Highway project with tolls in New Zealand.</p> <p>10. The additional costs incurred by freight operators to accommodate for the above, will be passed on to the consumer.</p> <p>11. At a time when the Government is guiding regions toward greater economic development and greater regional productivity, double tolling the state highway into Northland hardly serves as incentive for new business to move to the region or existing business to flourish.</p> <p>12. The RTC is also concerned that the increase in travel costs could have a negative impact on tourists visiting the region. Tourism plays a major part in the region's economy.</p> <p>13. There is also an issue with the lack of connection to Orewa from the new Highway at Puhoi. For Northlanders to get to or from Orewa they will be required to travel to the southern Orewa access and pay two tolls, which seems a completely unfair financial burden. The only alternative will be to use the 26km old SH1 route from Warkworth.</p> <p>14. There are ongoing concerns that the remainder of SH1 to Whangarei and Northlands interior will also be tolled in order to expedite further construction projects. We believe there is an equity issue here. Is it fair that Northlanders will have to pay up to 3 or more sets of tolls to get to and from Auckland while the rest of New Zealand get their new roads for nothing?</p> <p>15. The RTC request NZTA to consider the feasibility of introducing a "One Payment" toll for both sections instead of having to pay twice per direction travelled.</p> <p>Recommendation: The RTC requests that Waka Kotahi-NZTA reconsider the tolling of the State Highway 1 between Puhoi and Warkworth taking into consideration what has been stated above.</p> <p>Speed Review – Making the Existing SH1 Safer The RTC supports, in principle, any initiatives that will increase safety on this section of SH1, and in particular we support reducing the speed limit on this section of road to what is safe and appropriate. The RTC does however request that these speed reductions in no way hinders future investments in the maintenance, construction and need to "engineer up" the existing SH1 to ensure the resilience, reliability or smooth flow of traffic on this section of state highway is maintained.</p> <p>Conclusion We thank Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency for the opportunity to comment on the Ara Tuhono – Puhoi to Warkworth Tolling Proposal and the Speed Limit Review – Making the existing SH1 safer. We would welcome the opportunity to be able to speak to our submission.</p> <p>Signed on behalf of Northland Regional Transport Committee</p> <p><b>s 9(2)(a)</b>   Dated: 15 June 2020</p>
116	Sheepworld	<p>Re: Review of speed limit on SH1 (L.Phillips Road to junction of motorway extension north of Warkworth)</p> <p>At Sheepworld we see this stretch of road and what happens on it every single day. We drive it ourselves many times a day. No-one is better equipped to comment on what goes on on this stretch of road than us. It's extremely dangerous, as the accident and death toll sadly testify.</p>

		<p>Reducing the speed limit is an obvious must, but is only part of the solution. Hopefully the long overdue changes to the lanes, turning bays and other traffic-calming enhancements currently under construction will also help. To carry out these works and not reduce speeds would be a waste of money and yet more lives.</p> <p>Once the motorway to Auckland is completed, it will be a big challenge to get northbound traffic that has been travelling at high speeds on the motorway to adapt to the SH1 conditions through the Dome Valley. Therefore permitted speeds must be reduced from the point that motorway will join the existing SH1 in order to calm traffic speeds and driver behaviour as early as possible before arriving at the Dome Valley.</p> <p>Furthermore, as this stretch of road will have central barriers (thereby making overtaking impossible), leaving the speed limit at 100 kms per hour would encourage dangerous tailgating from faster vehicles behind naturally slower traffic.</p> <p>Sheepworld</p>
117	Individual submitter	<p>The Proposed reduction in road speed on this section of roadway suggests that NZTA is using cynical practices to impose subtle pressure upon the public to use a Tolled Motorway. The introduction of the motorway will reduce traffic volume on this section of roadway dramatically, and that reduction in traffic volume will directly reduce relative risk to road users without the need for introduction of speed reductions. If in fact there was justification to reduce road speed limits then that justification would exist now, during period of maximum traffic volumes, and not following opening of the warkworth/puhi motorway. This process and the justifications proposed are seriously flawed in basic logic and there is strong suggestion that funding priorities drive decision making practices within NZTA rather than road safety. Reduced traffic volumes will alter the traffic risk profiles on this roadway, and as no evidence has been gathered by NZTA relating to that risk profile, and no quantification of traffic volumes on that roadway can occur until post 2021, then decisions relation to roadway speed can only be guesswork by NZTA. Change of roadway speed limits should not be made using guesswork and unsubstantiated information.</p>
118	Individual submitter	I support all reduced speed limit proposals
119	Individual submitter	Yes, no proposed off ramp southbound on new highway forcing the majority of travelers to still use the present SH1. Reduction to current speed should only occur when there is another viable 100 mph alternative
120	NZ Heavy Haulage Association	<p>This submission is made on behalf of NZ Heavy Haulage Association members that transport large oversize freight items in this area. The oversize industry performs a critical role in the NZ economy in the transport of large items that are used in construction, development, manufacture, harvesting and tourism sectors. In addition, members of the industry are involved in the relocation and recycling of houses, school classrooms and commercial buildings as well as new transportable homes. There are two points relating to the speed limit change that we wish to make, and may not have been considered. The first relates to the fact that many of the members of the oversize transport industry travel at off-peak times. It appears that the proposed speed limits are determined by the average speed, which by default means that there are many periods of the day when traffic is lighter and travel can be undertaken safely at higher speeds. We put to the Transport Agency whether there is a way that during peak times that speeds are slowed down, and at night (or other off-peak times) that there is a way to resume current speed limits. This would improve the efficiency of freight that travels during off-peak times. The second point is a practical one, and this is in terms of the speed limit change points. Often threshold-type treatments are used to indicate that there is a major speed limit change. Oversize freight loads will have to travel on the current SH1 route even after the new motorway is opened. This is due to that road likely becoming a Toll Road, and oversize loads are not usually permitted to travel on Tolled Roads (VDAM Rule, Schedule 8). So therefore the current SH1 route needs to be preserved as an oversize route - including the dimensions available for travel. Therefore as per the Association's Design Specification, we require any threshold treatment or speed signs to be designed and installed with 11.5m width separation between them. We welcome any inquiries about the points that we have made.</p>



121	Individual submitter	I am generally supportive of this move. Will it be monitored with safety cameras to ensure compliance? As a cyclist as well as a motorist I think reducing the speed will make this road safer.
122	Individual submitter	Roadside lights could help with visibility but probably aren't necessary, more cats eyes on the road would be good for night driving, can't remember if there's a passing lane there but if there is it's quite dangerous because people always speed on them
123	Individual submitter	Please go ahead with the speed reduction. And consider putting speed cameras along the SHwys, it would be a great idea. This has proven to be an excellent measure for reducing bad driving/speed, plus it is profitable, so you can maintain the roads and the system.
124	Individual submitter	With the bulk of the traffic using the new road why reduce the speed at all in the old SH1. This will just cause frustration leading to rash decisions.
125	Individual submitter	Multiple changing speed zones distracts drivers away from the main task of driving and often places the police lay in wait for lazy tickets further distracting drivers. These areas had less carnage with less rules and far less safe vehicles travelling on them. Spend the money instead on making a driver licence system where it's a privilege to drive not a right and get rid of the idiots who think more rules make things safer.
126	Individual submitter	I'm completely in favour of all speed reductions, not only because of safety, but also because of pollution - higher speeds mean more fuel burned. The climate crisis is looming. Let's do what we can to reduce its effects.
127	Individual submitter	The proposed change will significantly reduce the utility of the road in avoiding the proposed toll road. Essentially, motorists are being disincentivised to use the current un-tolled road that has been paid for by tax payers and presumably maintained as part of the Auckland regional fuel excise. As such the asset is being devalued and motorists 'funnelled' to the proposed toll road (highway extension) which is itself a targeted tax impacting north Auckland residents, many of whom work in Silverdale, Albany and the CBD. This proposed 'funneling' of motorists and devaluation of the roads utility should not proceed. I will be required to make a choice of a much slower but serviceable existing road (due to this decision) or an expensive but faster tolled motorway which is both unfair and unreasonable.
128	Individual submitter	There are sections of this route that are safe to drive at 80-100 kph. Several corners are already sign posted at <100kph. With ongoing pavement repairs and sealing there is no need to lower the entire route to 80 kph. Drivers should have the choice to adjust speed to suit conditions.
129	Individual submitter	I agree with the proposed speed limit changes.
130	Individual submitter	I definitely support the lowering of the speed limits as proposed.
131	Individual submitter	I am against the reduction to speed limits as proposed. If enforced, this would mean that the journey from Orewa through to Warkworth would not exceed 80km at any point on State Highway 1. There is no need to formally reduce the speed as your survey demonstrates that the current average speed is already approximately 80km.
132	Individual submitter	We need to focus on driver training and awareness, Dome Valley has taught us that reducing the limit to 80kph still results in accidents and road deaths. We already have signage to advise people to slow down and accidents still occur so I don't believe reducing the limit to 80kph will do anything other than target those of us that currently drive safely and to the conditions every day on that stretch of road, if people can't take notice of signs now they aren't going to at all. Target driver safety and defensive driving, that creates drivers who will respect all roads they drive on, reducing our road accident and death statistics.
133	Individual submitter	I agree with the speed reductions
134	Individual submitter	During this Lockdown period, 21 people died from the virus and THIRTEEN died on our almost empty roads. Clearly this was not as a result of tourists driving on the wrong side of the road. Consideration should also be made to enforcement otherwise you will be wasting your efforts.
135	Individual submitter	Regarding the proposed reduction to the speed limit on this piece of road  Given the current speed is a 100kmph with the traffic volume using the road at present does removing 90% of that traffic to the new road not improve the safety or is the real reason for the reduction to encourage more people to use the toll road considering this is the only tolled road into or out of Auckland it could be quite a cash cow with a captive customer base given that people from Brenderwyn south need to use the road to get to work places or better shopping or even to visit friends or hospital appointments . I think i can see your logic

		Cheers <b>s</b>
136	Individual submitter	<p>We have studied these and fully agree with these as stated i.e. SH1 L Phillips Road to Puhoi.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p><b>s 9(2)(a)</b></p> <p>Warkworth.</p>
137	Individual submitter	<p>Dear NZTA,.</p> <p>Who is the absolute idiot who thought up this proposal..??? I am totally opposed to this suggestion for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a very good road that can easily be travelled at speeds up to 100kph</li> <li>2. When traffic volumes are low an 80kph limit will only cause people to get frustrated and as a result they will exceed the limit or dangerously overtake vehicles that are doing 80kph – thus causing crashes.</li> <li>3. When traffic volumes are high the traffic travels slower as a result but clears quickly when volumes drop.</li> <li>4. If the limit is changed to 80kph the Police will focus on the road as a revenue source and frustrate the public further.</li> <li>5. Generally the traffic on this road is “well behaved” with few infringement issues.</li> <li>6. In your brochure it is stated:- “One of the best things we can do to prevent people from dying or being seriously injured on this road is reducing speed limits to make them safe and right for the road.” This is nothing but “spin-doctoring”. Although there have been some fatal/serious injury crashes on this road – the road DOES NOT have a history of regular crashes to justify the above statement.</li> <li>7. This change is designed to force people off this road on to the new Puhoi to Warkworth motorway – whenever that will be finished - after totally frustrating the public for the period before the opening.</li> <li>8. The current speed limit is “RIGHT” for this road.</li> <li>9. The proposal to change the 70kph limit to 60kph at the entrance to the motorway site south of Perry Road is not warranted. Motorway project vehicles have turning lanes in both directions. After passing this area many times there have only been truck movements to/from the motorway site on a couple occasions. Again – totally designed to frustrate and penalise the motoring public.</li> </ol> <p><b>s 9(2)(a)</b></p>
138	Road Transport Forum	<p>15 June 2020</p> <p>Road Transport Forum NZ response to public consultations by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency in the Warkworth area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ara Tuhono – Puhoi to Warkworth motorway – tolling proposal</li> <li>• Speed review State Highway 1 between L Phillips Road and Puhoi</li> </ul> <p>Part 1: Ara Tuhono – Puhoi to Warkworth motorway – tolling proposal Representation</p> <p>Road Transport Forum New Zealand (RTF) is made up of several regional trucking associations for which the Forum provides unified national representation. The Forum members include Road Transport Assn’s NZ, National Road Carriers, and NZ Trucking Assn. The affiliated representation of the Forum is some 3,000 individual road transport companies which in turn operate 16-18,000 trucks involved in commercial road freight transport as well as companies that provide services allied to road freight transport.</p> <p>The Forum is the peak body and authoritative voice of New Zealand’s road freight transport industry which employs 32,868 people (2.0% of the workforce), and has a gross annual turnover in the order of \$6 billion.</p> <p>RTF members are predominately involved in the operation of commercial freight transport services both urban and inter-regional. These services are entirely based on the deployment of trucks both as single units for urban delivery and as multi- unit combinations that may have one</p>

or more trailers supporting rural or inter- regional transport.  
According to Ministry of Transport research (National Freight Demands Study 2018) road freight transport accounts for 93% of the total tonnes of freight moved in New Zealand with some 5% of the country's total freight moved within the Northland/Auckland provincial area.

Introductory comments

RTF received the briefing papers and background explanations to the above consultations in mid-May 2020 and we offer the following comments.

We note also a number of our member associations and representatives of those organisations have also received the same information and invitation to comment. As we are a national organisation, our comments are from a national perspective.

The proposal to toll the new route

The recent commentary around roading public and private partnerships (PPPs) in New Zealand may impact road users' confidence in the NZTA completing this project on time and on budget. Furthermore, private enterprises such as road builders and independent project management enterprises are more likely to be concerned about their obligations to their shareholders than ensuring a legacy

road that will continue to be reliable at hand-over of what is ostensibly a public asset back to the Crown.

We see considerable risk in the proposed project approach, including the tolling value applicable for heavy vehicles cited in the discussion document. The initial toll for trucks and heavy vehicles is proposed to be set at \$4.80 at the early pre- construction stage, but RTF is not confident the whole-of-life 25-year scenario will still have this cost set at the same level. There are simply too many unknowns to give unbridled support for the concept.

A number of papers on efficacy of tolling in a contract to build and operate model from across the international road funding spectrum also fail to provide confidence that the tolling option in a New Zealand project context gives the best outcome. In a number of publicised cases the relevant government agencies have had to take the projects back, or micromanage the maintenance, often before the build, operate, and maintain service agreement period with the original contractor is completed.

Of equal concern is the misdistribution of toll revenues a point highlighted by USA research but by no means unique to the States.

"Recently American Transportation Research Institute (ATRI) TruckingResearch.org documented the collection and distribution of \$14.7 billion in U.S. toll revenue, representing 82 percent of U.S. toll collections. The research sheds light on many questions about tolling, including how much toll revenue is generated versus reinvested in toll facilities, and contrasts truck-generated toll revenue versus truck utilization of toll roads.

"To better understand tolling, researchers collected public financial data from Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports (CAFR) published by toll systems, and attempted to standardize financial comparisons across systems. Key metrics included toll facility charges by user type, toll facility expenditures and toll revenue diversion to non-toll entities.

"ATRI's research found that the 21 major toll systems analysed collected more than \$14.7 billion in revenue with nearly 50 percent of toll revenue diverted to other uses. In addition, toll revenue increased more than 72 percent over the last decade compared to inflation growth of just 16.9 percent.

"The report includes a first-of-its-kind data analysis to better understand the relationship between interstate commerce and toll road utilization. Through an analysis of truck GPS data, the researchers were able to quantify toll revenue impacts on local truck activity versus interstate commerce.

"It is clear from this research that highway funding mechanisms that return our tax investments to highways are far superior to tolling," said Darren Hawkins, YRC Worldwide Chief Executive Officer. "We need greater oversight and transparency to ensure that the billions of dollars paid by our industry goes back into the roads and bridges that generate the revenue."

What is also troubling about the tolling of the 18 .5km Ara Tuhono – Puhoi to Warkworth motorway is this is expected to be one of many tolls on this route. The

NZTA's media release points out there will be separate tolls for each section of motorway. This approach will be an anathema to commercial transport operators and result in unnecessary administration burdens for businesses. We believe NZTA must consider an alternative approach

that has lower front-end administration costs, alleviating the proposition of successive tolls for travelling relatively short distances.

The principle of tolls being introduced in a New Zealand context has been postulated on the premise to accelerate the start of relatively important projects that would otherwise not be started. In this context the toll option may well have merit, and the RTF is open to the idea of tolls on new roads.

However, in the present-day context the whole tolling concept is open to question, while the Government's policy is to fund marginal rail services via the National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) with road-user funds generated from Fuel Excise Duty (FED) and Road User Charges (RUC). This approach undermines the proposition validating the use of tolling for infrastructure improvements especially in an environment where both RUCs and FED are under a back drop of yearly increases.

In a broader overview, we have the Government continuing to argue the economic benefits of rail investment and financially committing to the developing the Northland rail route to this end. The addition of tolls on the road route, particularly the proposition of multiple tolls between Auckland and Whangarei, could be viewed as an overt plan to influence road freight activity by adding additional costs to freight shippers, thereby inflating the economic attractiveness of the Northport proposal and Northland rail development economic argument.

RTF is opposed to tolling in an environment where the final whole-of-route costs for the Auckland to Whangarei highway are buried in a fragmented road investment approach. We are not even cautiously optimistic about the PPP approach, or about the performance of contractors who are left to internally manage quality control of the infrastructure. The Transmission Gully project and the contentious issues that have arisen over this primary route, with many media comments alluding to substandard construction techniques or substandard materials, doesn't bode well for other projects. The continual rehabilitation of the Kapiti Expressway is another example of problematic construction and material deficiencies that still haven't been entirely resolved some three years later.

While the PPP model offers some opportunities for civil construction enterprises, when it all goes bad the road users pick up the tab both directly and indirectly. Directly, because the charges and tolls remain, and indirectly via the productivity losses due to travel time delays negotiating never ending repairs, which cannot ever be recovered.

In summary, the RTF is opposed to the current proposition of tolls being considered for this route's development.

#### Part 2: Speed limit review proposals:

##### Phase 1 - Speed limit Proposal State Highway 1 between L Phillips Road and Puhoi

The speed limit review phase 1 perhaps has some merit, but the publicity and consultation document around this change states the community engagement comments alluded to poor driver behaviours and excess speeds. The intro to this document states speed is a determinant in the severity of the outcome in any crash, which is pretty self-evident. There is no doubt that this route is heavily trafficked and the nine-year history of crashes and fatalities also documented in the speed change publicity is high. However, we cannot entirely ignore the fact that the route is demanding with narrow shoulders and poor visibility. For many years, NZTA supported the notion of self-explaining roads, that is, a concept where the environmental and infrastructure limitations would provide cues to drivers on appropriate speed management on constrained networks. The idea that speed kills stated by the safety advocacy purists is presented without context when in fact, we know that inattention and errant driver behaviour are the primary causes of most crashes.

We are not convinced lowering speed limits will reduce actual crashes, although if drivers are being speed-compliant the severity will be reduced, but even that's a big assumption. The speed reduction approach is driven by the Government's reluctance to invest in properly rehabilitating problem sections of the network. The L Phillips Road and Puhoi existing SH1 presents a conundrum in some respects because assuming the new road is completed as planned, the traffic displacement will reduce on the existing road and consequently reduce the likelihood of accidents. This point does take the emphasis off expending substantial amounts of money on the existing road.

Given the evidence that the current road traffic speed patterns are relatively close to the proposed phase 1 speed reductions, the net impact on travel times should be minor, which the

		<p>discussion paper places in the region of 10 seconds for the 15 km journey. We note the discussion paper uses the average speeds for comparison purposes. This is an interesting approach as averages, even with a lot of data, can still be open to distortion by a cluster of high or low readings. We would have thought the median traffic speed might have been useful, along with 75th percentile, for the discussion.</p> <p>The biggest variation in recalibrating the speeds is at the construction interface site access points, using variable speed signs reducing the speed to 60km/h from current ambient speeds of 75/84km/h which presently sits within the 100km/h zone, and moderated by 70km/h variable speed signs. No doubt the increase in traffic movements at these node points warrants some form of speed management and the use of variable signs is an acceptable solution because the speed defaults back to the proposed 80km/h when they are not active. What is interesting about the speed data averages for the Puhoi/Warkworth site and the Perry Road intersection is the wide range of current speeds which fall within an average range of 75 to 84km/h. We thought the data sets would have been a little more precise.</p> <p><b>Phase 2 speed limit proposal</b></p> <p>It is hard to confidently judge the merit or otherwise of the phase 2 speed reduction to 60km/h from Hudson Road to Kaipara Flat Road, but it appears reasonably clear that the interface (roundabout) between the existing SH1 and the new motorway requires some consideration of speed to improve the safety at that connection/ transition point. Interestingly, the map in the discussion paper shows the speed limit from McKinney Road through to Hudson Road is already an existing 60km/h zone, so the phase 2 proposal is an extension of that speed limit.</p> <p>One of the concerns with roundabouts is the ability for trucks and multi-unit truck trailer combinations to be able to negotiate these safely. Frequently, for drainage purposes, roundabouts employ super elevations or cross fall gradients in the lane pathways and the changes in gradient can disturb the trajectory of the combination vehicles to the point that rollover becomes inevitable. This new road is likely to be used by significant numbers of heavy vehicles and NZTA should consider a heavy vehicle dynamic stability assessment as part of the roundabout design criteria.</p> <p>Overall, speed compliance will remain an ongoing issue for drivers. If drivers remain sceptical about the speed changes or simply ignore the safety objectives the speed reductions are expected to produce, the crash profile reductions will not be realised. The self-explaining roads principle is still an important part of picture influencing driver behaviour and driver compliance. The speed reductions proposed for the existing SH1 route sit in a unique context in that this route will become very much a secondary route, with most traffic preferring the new motorway route. That in itself will reduce the traffic loadings compared to the present day and will in turn, significantly reduce the likelihood of crashes occurring at the present rate. Post 2021, attributing improved safety and crash reduction outcomes would almost point toward the speed changes producing a false positive because the risk profile of the existing SH1 will have been moderated by the new route. Clearly drivers already have elected to travel at less than the current posted speed of 100km/h so reposting the speed at the current averages of around 80km/h is likely to have travel times remain relatively consistent with today, a point the discussion paper already confirms.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p>
139	Individual submitter	<p>Once the new bypass is up and running, the volume of traffic on the current SH1 will reduce to nominal - most of the traffic currently using this road will be using the new road. I can see that with the current level of traffic, speed restrictions may be useful, but when the traffic volume reduces, the dangers inherent with high traffic volumes also reduce to insignificance, so why impose further speed restrictions? Imposing such restrictions will likely end up as the road from Orewa to Puhoi has. Formerly 100km/hr as SH1, once the toll road was introduced, the speed limit on the old SH1 was reduced to 80km/hr - on a nearly empty road. Of course any competent driver will know that low limit is unnecessary on an almost unused road and likely exceed it safely. So the road becomes an opportunity for any traffic officer who has not made the required three tickets per hour to up the score. That appears to be the only rational explanation for the restrictions being imposed on a very quiet road, or perhaps it is to persuade drivers to take the toll road instead! The 'nanny state' impositions of NZTA are becoming ever wide</p>

		ranging and restrictive. The speed restrictions to come into effect in Rodney on the 30th June are typical and affect me personally. Despite the assurances there are only seconds involved I have measured my times this last week, just from curiosity. It will take me three minutes on average longer to travel, that is three minutes each way. Not much really is it. But if you look at the bigger picture, that is six minutes per day, 30 minutes per 5 day week, 24 hours per 48 week year. 24 hours, three full working days I will waste every year, three working days I will have to make up for. Thank you. Consider working three days without pay per year just to suit politically correctness motivated dictators. Until you publish the number of crashes and true cause of crashes, eg drunk/drugged/fell asleep/no licence etc. no thinking person will believe you. Speed restrictions will not affect the drivers who habitually ignore them. If you really want to improve road safety, make the standards required to pass a driving test much higher than they are now.
140	Individual submitter	I support the proposed speed limit changes
141	Individual submitter	Hi there,  I think the current speed limits should remain in place. Any slower and driver's will get impatient and start taking risks to overtake. Do NOT lower them.  Regards s [REDACTED] 9(2) [REDACTED]
142	Individual submitter	(NO COMMENT)
143	Individual submitter	Phase 1 100k to 80k NO State Highway 1 Alternate Route Phase 1 70k to 60k NO State Highway 1 Alternate Route  Phase 1 100k to 80k NO Puhoi to Warkworth Motorway Phase 2 100k to 60k NO Puhoi to Warkworth Motorway  Thanks s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
144	Individual submitter	NO PLEASE DO NOT ALTER THE SPEED LIMITS THANKS
145	Individual submitter	I think the new proposed speed limits are ok, this is quite a narrow road however and maybe it needs to be 70 all the way especially on the passing lanes, quite dangerous.
146	Individual submitter	We agree that this stretch of road should have 80 Km/hr
147	Individual submitter	This seems completely ridiculous to me, where is the logic?? You state the average speeds now and they are approx the 80km/h limit you are proposing, so what exactly are you trying to prove? By decreasing the speed limit, all you will accomplish is dropping the average speed by the same. This is State Highway 1 believe it or not and the lifeline to Northland. You will choke the whole region and give the Highway Patrols plenty of revenue between 8pm and 5am when the road is completely ok for the 100km/h limit that has been there for the last 40 years. Or is this your aim? Is this a secret agreement with NZ Police?
148	Individual submitter	I'm happy with the proposal. As a local in Mahurangi West, I support the reduction to 80kmh Puhoi to McKinney Road. One suggestion is to have extra and digital signage out during summer and long weekends, to let holiday makers know of the reduction. Personal experience is they often travel over 100kmh on the passing lanes (when it's not gridlock) and may not be aware of the 80kmh limit if the signage isn't obvious. The reduction will be a slight inconvenience as I drive this road daily but prefer to save some lives! Can't give a suggestion on the Hudson Road proposal as drive through there infrequently but makes sense to reduce the limit there too.
149	Individual submitter	No way! It's slow as it is,...
150	Individual submitter	I think we should consider the reduced amount of vehicles and trucks that are going to be travelling the current SH1 when the New Motorway will be completed. The current speed limit is at 100km/h most of the journey. Why hasn't this been reduced to 80km/h now to make it safer? Why wait when there is less traffic on current SH1 to reduce the speed? Surely it would be safer to reduce the speed now instead of reducing when there is less vehicle? If the speed limit stays

		at the current speed on the current SH1 when the new motorway is completed, would it be more secure than now?
151	Individual submitter	It's not the "speed" the problem; but how we are monitoring, if we would have a modern way of controlling the speed, there's no reason to change the speed limit; have said that, people that are caught driving over the effect of alcohol should have a more severe consequence. I don't agree with any change of in speed limit in this area, but, we should consider change in many of very small roads in NZ that has 100km as speed limit, and there's no condition to drive int these more than 60kms.
152	Individual submitter	<p>Dear Madam/Sir</p> <p>My wife and I strongly object to the reduction of the existing speeds on the above section of Highway when the new Puhoi to Warkworth section of the SH1 Motorway (NX2) has been constructed and opened for use to the public.</p> <p>In our opinion this is just a cynical way of encouraging public and commercial drivers to use the new section of SH1 motorway which in all likelihood will be tolled.</p> <p>If the new tolls are reasonably priced surely most people will want to use the new section of the SH1 motorway.</p> <p>Could you please record 2 votes objecting to the proposed reduced speed limits on the "Alternative Route".</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p>
153	Individual submitter	Once new motorway is opened traffic density will deminish and the need to have slower speeds will be gone. Maintenance to keep road road worthy would help !!!! Keep it 100
154	Individual submitter	When the new Puhoi to Warkworth motorway opens the traffic on the old State Highway One will be reduced, this reduced traffic volume will mean that the road will be safer, and there will not be any requirement to lower the speed limit from what it is at present.
155	Individual submitter	No it should not be lowered - it's a highway it shed be 100 the whole way!!!
156	Individual submitter	major events at the A&P showgrounds
157	Individual submitter	I oppose a reduction in the speed limit for SH1 from the Jonsonville tunnels north to Warkworth. It seems that NZTA are introducing this initiative only to try and force people to pay a toll on the new motorway by making driving on the old SH1 too hard and slow. There are sections of this road where there is minimal or no side rods and trying to maintain 80km/hr down the Puhuehue viaduct section (travelling in either direction) and in the passing lanes (when fully reinstated) will be nigh well impossible. The Puhoi junction needs to have lower speed limits and the north entrance to the honey centre (which may not continue in this location I might add as the land is not leased not owned by the centre needs work The short section of hill and overtaking lane after the Mahurangi East turnoff heading north is often problematic as it is very short and with tight bends. Perhaps this passing lane should be removed. The portion of road by the Kaipara Flats junction needs to integrated with the motorway junction and a speed limit reduction as cars come off the motorway is needed. There also needs to be southern Warkworth connection to the Puhoi-Warkworth motorway to allow heavy vehicle access to avoid this type of traffic having to pass through local streets which are often poorly designed and in poor condition (partly due to ground conditions)
158	Individual submitter	with the motorway going in why drop the speed only the locals will use it and if you toll the motorway every 2nd car will use the old road ... why can't you think before you lay this on us .. you could lower the speed with the speed signs that you put in to slow traffic around the works sites .
159	Individual submitter	Don't slow the country down. Vehicles have gotten safer over the years as technology has advanced. 100km/h is a perfectly safe speed to drive. So is 200km/h with properly designed/built roads. Things making roads unsafe are distracted and inexperienced drivers. Poorly made/planned roads Frustrated people trying to get passed slow drivers. Fix the real problems
160	Individual submitter	There should not be a blanket reduction in speeds along this road. are there spots that could use a reduction? Yes. But stop being lazy and address those specific spots accordingly.

161	Individual submitter	(NO COMMENT)
162	NZ Police	<p>Hi Andy</p> <p>As discussed this Consultation document has been reviewed by Inspector Scott Webb, Inspector Pete Jones, Acting Senior Sergeant Brett Campbell-Howard and myself and we support the proposed changes.</p> <p>Salient points:</p> <p>It will take an estimated 10 seconds more and 27 seconds more when a small stretch is reduced to 60km/h where the new Motorway intersects with SH 1 north of Warkworth.</p> <p>This is a high risk stretch of road in our area with 13 fatal crashes between 2009-2018 and 209 crashes.</p> <p>This is also a challenging stretch to enforce speed, due to the narrow and windy roads so any reduction would be of value in terms of safety.</p> <p>Regards</p>
163	Individual submitter	If you need to limit the speed you should just do it! But then you should not make the P2W a toll road as that would be HIPPOCRITICAL and more dangerous to travellers. As you should be encouraging us to use the new safer road, not creating financial barriers for which we are already contributing to the Auckland Regional Fuel Tax. That is money before safety.
164	Individual submitter	I think the proposed changes to the speed limit between puhoi and warkworth are coming too early and is based on too many assumptions. This should be re-visited after the motorway opens so real traffic volumes and accident rates can be assessed. Otherwise it appears to be about revenue earning with the tolls off the new motorway as the speed limit wasn't reduced prior to this. It doesn't make sense to reduce the speed when there will be much lower volumes of traffic therefore much safer-similar to hundreds of roads in NZ.
165	Individual submitter	I visited your charade last year. It was 100% obvious you had decided on this reduction then. You ignorantly quote 22000 vehicles per day: are you not aware there is a motorway being built at this moment???? I don't know why I am wasting my time doing this submission. Democracy is STUFFED in this country. The only reason for YOU to reduce the speed limit Puhoi to Warkworth on a road that YOU considered safe enough to be SH1 90 years, and 100kph for some 50 years is to use it (the decrease) as a source of revenue for YOU. CORRUPTION.
166	Individual submitter	I oppose the reduced speed limits on the existing State Highway 1, As a regular driver (20 plus years, both ways 5 days a week, South of Warkworth) of The existing State Highway 1 that has areas which have a mixture of straights and curves, a mix of surfaces and road condition, and where there could be hazards around the corner such as cyclists, slow tractor, truck. I have never been involved in any sort of accident on this road, even in the past when all of State Highway 1 South of Warkworth had a speed limit of 100kph. You state Current Average Speed 75 – 84km/h, this takes in consideration all the curves, a mix of surfaces and road condition and shows that drivers adjust their driving to suit the road conditions anyway. It's called "Drive to the Conditions" Speed Limit does Not need to be lowered.
167	Individual submitter	I think the current 80 kph is very adequate and should not be reduced at all. You say that safety is the main reason for reducing it, then if that is the case why isn't it being reduced now. The fact that there will be far fewer vehicles using the old highway will in itself make it safer. The road is a bit windy in places but most corners a car can go comfortably round at 80kph without any danger at all. I say that 60kph is ridiculously low when there is really no current problem at 80kph with all the traffic including heavy trucks. Once the trucks go on the new motorway I can only imagine how safe it will be without reducing the speed limit. I live at the South end of Warkworth and the decision I will eventually have to make is do I want to drive two kms north to get on the new motorway and pay tolls or just go on the old route with virtually no traffic. Depending on how much any tolls would be I think the old route minus all of the traffic may be a better bet so keep the current speed limit of 80kms as no one is going to crawl along at 60kms and if we continue to do 80kms risk getting a ticket on a current state highway. Common sense should prevail.



168	Individual submitter	Wire fence in centre of road from Christine Place should surely allow 100 km immediately, particularly with the long hill to follow. As there will be turn-off lanes at L.Phillips Rd, these will allow traffic to proceed unimpeded. 60km from ipara Flats Rd is rather slow..
169	Individual submitter	I do not support the proposed reduction in the speed limit.
170	Individual submitter	(NO COMMENT)
171	Individual submitter	The speed limit should not be reduced as 100km is not too fast for most of the road and reducing the speed limit would make travel on the road a lot slower in the times when there is little traffic and the conditions are good. The new motorway will reduce the traffic on this road which will make it safer without the need for lowering the speed limit. I think it should remain as it is now.
172	Individual submitter	Lowering the speed to make travel time even longer on the alternative route under the guise of safety is not in the best interest of the public. The Public is not as ignorant as you'd like to believe. This is a blatant effort to force support for use of the toll road that we've been taxed for already. There will be far less traffic on the free route so why would there need to be a reduction in speed? Why not reduce the road to 50km then - or ban cars altogether? The major safety issue is AT's inability to build safe roads, easy example is the Wellsford golf course section that wasn't even finished for 24 hours and developed pot holes. Lower speed limits isn't the answer, better quality work is.
173	Individual submitter	No. I support the proposed speed limit changes.
174	Individual submitter	There is zero evidence that reducing speed limits reduces mortality and morbidity on the roads. What does happen though is the traffic police have easy pickings in low speed limit areas. Many more people will be ticketed. Some of those will suffer financial hardship. Some will accumulate too many points and lose their licences, and subsequently their jobs. If they are the family breadwinner their whole family will suffer. Proposing to repeat a failed safety policy that penalises some of societies disadvantaged is morally repugnant. I hope you are all hanging your heads in shame.
175	Individual submitter	I am all for reducing the speed limit in order to save lives.
176	Individual submitter	Two factors come to mind. Firstly, the failure to maintain the roads in this error by NZTA should not be used as an excuse to lower the speed limit. Secondly, there is no real justification to lower the speed limit as traffic generally behaves to the conditions in this area. How about NZTA consider the needs of all road users rather than just cyclists and walkers.
177	Individual submitter	(NO COMMENT)
178	Individual submitter	If the junction/roundabout north of Warkworth worth warrants a 60Km limit then why not the Puhoi south heading on ramp etc. Not sure why 80 Km limit is necessary up Pouhuehue Hill, windy Ridge and Puhoi. If the trucks stay on the motorway the route should be a lot safer. 60Km limit needs to be further south of McKinney Road as that just junction has limited sightlines for turning cars at that intersection.
179	Individual submitter	No - I'm happy with the proposals for both phases, and they have my full support.
180	Individual submitter	The section of road where the new roundabout is being constructed up to Sheepworld and is proposed to reduce from 100km/hr to 80km/hr has not been operating at 100km/hr for a very long time and won't be for a very long time given the extensive roadworks in the area associated with the motorway and the Dome Valley median barrier/power works. What affect will the Phase 1 speed limit change have other than on Traffic Management Plans? I agree with the proposed Phase 2 speed limit once the roundabout has been constructed. Regarding the existing State Highway between Puhoi and Warkworth, as your information suggests the current average speed is 75-84 km/hr. With the new motorway being constructed, this should remove a substantial amount of traffic therefore enabling a safer road by default, with vehicles continuing to drive at a similar operating speed. Speed limits are not targets, and no changes are proposed to the road itself other than reducing traffic volume and removing current construction hazards. The only thing that will increase is the number of potential speeding tickets being issued. I do not agree with the Phase 1 speed limit change in this area.
181	Individual submitter	This will only serve to cause a bottleneck, and frustrated drivers to overtake, especially if the new motorway is going to be tolled more people with take the old highway. Also if you are

		spending money to to this proposal you could at least spell the name right it is Warkworth not wakeworth!!!!!!!
182	Individual submitter	We have been travelling north for 40 years and the only problem was the dome valley with accidents from speeding, yes sure leave the dome valley at a lower speed but with the new motorway opening there will not be as much traffic on state highway one, you just want to lower the speed limit on the whole entire state highway so everyone will use the tolled motorway, take state highway one back to 100kms as it use to be, it was never dangerous when we used it for all those years, just another money making racket as far as I am concerned.
183	Individual submitter	<p>I don't want to see the road reduced from 100km/h to 80 km/h along the existing SH1. The traffic volumes will be drastically reduced upon completion of the toll road and if the highway is safe currently at 100km/h then it will be far safer when the toll road is installed. Locals travelling from Warkworth to Puhoi and back will only be inconvenienced using a road we currently use daily for no justifiable safety reasons as there is no south bound exit to Puhoi. The number of fatalities on that stretch of highway with current volumes is nowhere near the level in Dome valley. That's the area requiring lower speed limits rather than having traffic officers sitting on the current SH1 dishing out tickets for drivers exceeding 80 km/h on a road that currently is safe at 100km/h. Inattention and impairment kill more than driving 100 vs 80.</p> <p>--</p> <p>Kind Regards s 9(2)(a)</p>
184	Individual submitter	<p>Dear NZTA</p> <p>We would like to applaud the review of the speed limits on the existing SH1 between Puhoi and Warkworth.</p> <p>The only problem is it is 20 years too late. So many lives have been lost or damaged because of NZTA's lack of care and attention to this obviously dangerous stretch of road.</p> <p>In fact, the Friday afternoon we moved to Puhoi about 7 years ago, SH1 was closed both ways just north of the Puhoi turnoff while the dead and injured were helicoptered out.</p> <p>Our family and pets were stuck in our moving truck and cars for hours on end with stress levels going through the roof.</p> <p>I have always had serious concerns about the design of this road, with overtaking lanes starting just before sharp bends being one outstandingly dangerous feature.</p> <p>Subsequent to becoming Puhoi residents we lobbied for the ridiculous 100km/hr speed limit at the Puhoi Road intersection to be lowered. Two years later it finally was, and yet it is still a heart-in-the-mouth process turning out.</p> <p>So why, why, would you choose to leave this change to the speed limits until the eve of traffic being significantly lowered, instead of when it was killing people?</p> <p>Kind regards s 9(2)(a)</p>
185	Individual submitter	No issue with the idea of reduced speed limited for this road, I travel it twice a day and it is dangerous. You also need to put measures in place to prevent the use of passing lanes at peak times (Fridays, Saturdays and long weekends. Vehicles overtaking when traffic is already congested ending up with queues at the end of the passing lane trying to merge back to single lanes.
186	Individual submitter	Totally agree with all reductions in speed.
187	Individual submitter	I disagree with the phase 1 proposal "Existing 100km/h area?on SH1 between Warkworth south and?Puhoi?Road -?from?60m south of McKinney Road, Warkworth to 350m north of?Puhoi?Road – reduce from 100km/h to 80km/h". I believe that NZTA's assertion that these changes will impact my drive time by 10 seconds is disingenuous. Comparing current average drive times to future speed limits is not "comparing apples to apples". I am appalled that such a poorly constructed supporting argument has formed a major piece of the NZTA's analysis. Average drive times are impacted by many factors, the two most obvious of which are the impact of weather and the impact of holiday/ rush hour traffic. The impacts these factors have on the computation of the average drive time are largely independent of the speed limit. The

		driving time for the many drivers who use this part of SH1 outside the typical "heavy traffic" periods will be significantly impacted by a reduction in the speed limit from 100km/h to 80 km/hr. I am therefore against this proposal. That said, I am comfortable with the change occurring after the new motorway is opened. Dropping the speed limit to 80 km/hr at this time does not impact drive time for those who wish to 'make good time', as they can use the new motorway. A speed fall for SH1 at this time is consistent with the changes that occurred to SH1 when the Johnston Hill piece of the motorway was opened.
188	Individual submitter	I disagree with the reduced speed limit from 100 to 80km / hour. It is clear that the average speed of drivers suggests they are adjusting speeds to the conditions. I am happy with speeds being reduced to 60 or 70km/hr for construction site entry points. I feel this speed reduction is not safety related and is design to slow traffic on the road to increase the travel time for when the new motorway is opens. In other words it is revenue driven, not safety.
189	Individual submitter	Perhaps if the AT buses went at the speed limit instead of between 40 & 45km/hr it wouldn't cause the pent up frustration in most drivers. Same goes for overloaded trucks/truck & trailers who cannot maintain speeds even close to 80km/hr. Generally traffic flows at a fair/consistent speed unless held up by either slow bus or slow truck and this does cause frustration. I do not agree with speed reductions on this road.
190	Individual submitter	I want the speed limit to stay at 100 km/h from Warkworth to Puhoi. The volumes of traffic will be drastically reduced when the toll road opens and with the current speed limit ,which is safely 100km/h, then the reduction in traffic volumes will more than make that stretch of highway far safer.
191	Individual submitter	I AGREE TO A REDUCTION IN SPEED LIMIT AS PER THE PROPOSED CHANGES.
192	Individual submitter	I fully support the proposed changes which I hope you have the balls to implement. When are you going to change the speed limit between Helensville and Kaukapakapa which is a worse road than your SH1 proposals?
193	Individual submitter	I agree with the proposed reduced speed limits, but these need to be adequately controlled with speed cameras and illuminated vehicle speed indicators. Reduced traffic on the old SH1 will encourage and facilitate speed. This needs to be controlled and managed.
194	Individual submitter	There is no need to impose lower speed limits on this section of SH1. Your own figures show the average speed is at the level proposed, BUT in light traffic or in the middle of the night, the road is safe for the present 100kmph limit. To impose an 80kmph limit when there is no other traffic, is just Revenue gathering. Strongly against lowering the speed limit
195	Individual submitter	I don't agree with the proposed speed limits as there are limited passing lanes, a lot of trucks holding traffic back and impatient drivers which is understandable as you can be stuck behind slow drivers or trucks until you get closer to wellsford . Maybe when the new motorway is opened and there is less traffic using that road then drop the speed limit. Regards s 9(2)(a) Sent from my iPhone
196	Individual submitter	No
197	Individual submitter	(1) This road is already speed limited in certain sections.ie already the speed limit settings are aligned with the different road conditions. Driving this road feels very safe and my concern is that further and unnecessary speed restrictions will frustrate drivers and lead to dangerous overtaking and undertaking when motorists arrive at those sections carrying a higher speed limit.If this stretch of road required further adjustment to speed limits as proposed then why has it not been regulated for already. Furthermore, when there is less traffic on the existing road with the advent of the new road there will surely be a good case for INCREASING the speed limits on the existing road;less traffic equates to less hazards....surely !!!!. It seem incongruous that speed limiting is being proposed at the very time the new road nears completion...can I respectfully suggest that the speed limiting is specifically designed to "frustrate motorists and push them to use the new possibly-tolled road" thereby generating revenue for government whist regional fuel tax and the existing toll gates south of the Johnstone Hill tunnel remain in effect. Net net under the guise of "safer roads" the existing road is unnecessarily speed limited to bolster government revenue (via the tolled road)

198	Individual submitter	The increased time estimate does not factor in those drivers aiming for 10kms under the limit holding up traffic behind them, and causing traffic back ups.
199	Individual submitter	When the Puhoi-Warkworth extension to the Northern Motorway was proposed, locals were promised that the existing former State Highway 1 section would remain a viable alternative route. What is proposed is a breach of that promise - a slippery slope to becoming an urban road, rather than remaining a limited access open road. I am opposed to any suggestion that the existing speed limits be lowered. The road is fit for purpose as a limited access road. The road should remain a limited access road and development adjacent to the road should be opposed.
200	Individual submitter	Agree with all speed reductions. This whole road also needs a dedicated bike lane as it is treacherous for any tourist/ recreational cyclist at present. This would encourage safer driving. Provision of this could easily be incorporated at this stage.
201	Individual submitter	We would agree with the speed restrictions. Wondering why the speed would be 60 near the honey centre?
202	Individual submitter	I support the proposals as set out in the consultation document.
203	Individual submitter	Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road maps absolute sense. To make it even safer and reduce the amount of traffic on the old state highway 1 the new road should be toll free. If safety is the main priority then the aim should be to reduce the speed limit on the old state highway 1 and reduce the traffic volume
204	Individual submitter	<p>Nine reasons for lowering the speed limit on the existing Puhoi to Warkworth SH 1 to 60 km/h</p> <p>I have spent my summer holidays in Whangateau since 1998. I know both the old SH 17 and the new SH 1. I am s 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and elsewhere. This submission accompanies my submission in favour of a \$6 toll on the new motorway, as these two decisions are complementary and support each other.</p> <p>This submission supports a lower and uniform speed limit on the existing Puhoi to Warkworth SH 1. Here are nine reasons.</p> <p>First reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>Austroroads has recommended 70 km/h as the maximum safe speed limit where there is the possibility of a head on collision. If we lower the speed limit to 80 km/h, and achieve an average speed of 10% above this, or 88 km/h, the road will still be unsafe. The poor safety of this road was a major reason for building the new motorway. At 80 km/h we are unlikely to achieve the desired safety improvements.</p> <p>The fact that people are used to the 100 km/h road and that it is quite wide (although with sharp curves and hills) also point to likely higher speeds.</p> <p>Second reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>In February 2020 the New Zealand government signed the Stockholm Declaration on Road Safety. Here is a chance to put our words into action. To halve road traffic deaths between 2020 and 2030, as we have pledged, when much of the rest of the road network remains as is, will require major safety improvements on the roads where we are making changes.</p> <p>Third reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>It will allow space on the road for construction of a separated, protected cycleway. As a cycleway is now planned between the Auckland CBD and Albany, a cycleway on the existing SH1 here could form part of an Auckland-wide cycle network. The road is sure to see more cyclists in any event, with the opening of the motorway, the rise in popularity of cycling, and the population growth in the area. This could raise safety issues. The Stockholm Declaration requires us to “set targets to reduce fatalities and serious injuries, in line with this commitment, for all groups of road users and especially vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists and</p>

		<p>motorcyclists and users of public transport.”</p> <p>Fourth reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>The consultation document states the current statistics (1.3 fatalities and 4.5 serious injuries per year) but doesn't say what the target is with a lowered speed limit. A lower speed limit makes possible a target of zero road deaths in 5 years and more than halving serious injuries on the road, which is unlikely to be achieved at 80 km/h.</p> <p>Fifth reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>A constant speed is easier to observe and safer than limits that change in space and time, as is currently proposed.</p> <p>Sixth reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>Waka Kotahi is a Vision Zero organization. 80 km/h on this road is not Vision Zero.</p> <p>Seventh reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>It would encourage more use of the motorway, which will be faster and also safer. It will also raise more money (assuming the motorway is tolled) which will help pay for the motorway.</p> <p>Eighth reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>It's known that nearly all of our existing speed limits are too high and need to be reduced for safety. We have to start somewhere. This road, with the opportunity provided by the new motorway, is a great place to start.</p> <p>Ninth reason in favour of 60 km/h</p> <p>Congestion is expected to ease when the motorway opens. Thus average speeds may not decrease as much as expected under a lowering from 100 to 80 km/h. This would work against the hoped-for safety improvements. Therefore, a lower speed limit is needed to achieve the safety improvements that justified the construction of the motorway.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p>
205	Individual submitter	No I am happy with the proposed changes
206	Warkworth Area Liasion Group	I agree with changing the speed limit to 80kph on the understanding that the lanes widths will also be reduced to match the desired speed environment and also so that safety for cyclists and pedestrians can be improved.
207	Individual submitter	I agree with the new speed limits proposed for State Highway One, why cant they be implemented sooner as we all know this is a notoriously dangerous road.
208	Individual submitter	Keep it very simple - one speed limit of 80 kph, except through Warkworth town limits.
209	Individual submitter	<p>The proposed speed restrictions are not necessary as the road itself is very safe , as all the accidents and deaths the main cause is speed but it is a speed over the limit and people trying to pass on corners , Speed kills but it is what that driver is trying to do . By reducing it people will take more chances to pass , I have travelled that road for the last 45 years and never have seen anyone have an issue but the slow drivers are the big problem .</p> <p>Regards s 9(2)(a)</p>
210	Individual submitter	Speed limits are acceptable.

211	Individual submitter	Supportive of speed lowering to 80kph particularly around access to Cowan Bay Road. This is a very bad intersection for turning into from north and would welcome intersection improvements.
212	Individual submitter	One of the worst problems on this stretch of road are the constantly changing speed limits. (Mainly through roadworks ) less change =less confusion =greater compliance
213	Individual submitter	The speed limit is fine at 100kms, we have to suffer because people cant drive
214	Individual submitter	I do no support the speed limit lowering.
215	Individual submitter	Put speed cameras so people area not temped to ignore speed limit and drive fast as its part of motorway. Have adequate led or solar lighting for night driving.
216	Individual submitter	100k
217	Individual submitter	Speed limit on a freeway should not be lower than 80km - speed reductions approaching a roundabout are all that is required
218	Individual submitter	Lowng the speed limit will not make the roads safer, the average driver already drives slower in the area. The issue is educating drivers and improving the condition of the roads.
219	Individual submitter	Puhoi
220	Individual submitter	Make the roads safer and don't lower the speed limit!
221	Individual submitter	Once the new motorway is completed the speed limit on the current SH1 portions can be reduced demand to 50kph to further reduce risk of accident, injury, and death. Until then the SH1 portions under discussion here should be maintained for suitable safety at 100kph.
222	Individual submitter	Leave the speed limit at 100 for the entire length of the road. People do NOT want this lowering of limits, differing limits along a single stretch of road is confusing, frustrating and stupid.
223	Individual submitter	The problem is you've decided to toll the new motorway. This means that for those of us that can't afford the toll we will have to use the existing road. The existing road will now be slower than it was previously making my commute lengthier. In short this isn't fair, either don't toll the new motorway allowing me to use a much safer and faster road or allow us to continue to use the existing road unchanged.
224	Individual submitter	Leave this at the current speed limit, there is not an issue with it, you don't even know how much traffic is going to be on it with the new highway. I've used that road for work and personal since I've started to drive which is 2001. I've driven a variety of vehicles for both personally and for work and no issues through there. Majority of people are fine driving through this area
225	Individual submitter	I agree with tolls on the new highway and a speed limit on the roads as well. I look forward to be able to drive on this new highway. I was also hoping you would be able to finish the next stage soon, as I am in the elder age group. As a family we have driven on the old road for over 30 years and as years have passed it has become less joyful to drive. Good luck in finishing this lovely highway s 9(2)(a) .
226	Individual submitter	Reducing the speed limit is a terrible idea and will only cause more cases of road rage, unsafe overtaking and add a massive amount of travel time to what is already a safe enough road. This road is not hard to drive safely at 100kmph on, and anyone going around the sharp corners is capable of slowing to a safe speed to do so - which is normally less than 80kmph anyway. I think that for those of us who take this road every day, it is greedy and self serving for the council/nzta to reduce the speed limit in an attempt to get more people to take the new highway - especially when you're wanting more money from that too. If the new road is tolled I will not be taking it as it's too expensive to use daily. Think about the public who will be using this road twice, if not more, a day. We don't need to reduce the speed limit, but what we do need is REGULAR maintenance of state highway 1 to repair the copious amounts of potholes.
227	Individual submitter	I note you have stated that the changes from 100km/hr to 80 km/hr would increase travel times by only 10 sec (from "current operating speed"). Cynically you have NOT stated how much longer it would be under the current 100 km/hr limit. What is the current operating speed??? I note you don't say. If the current speed limit is too high why is it only now that NZTA is considering lowering the limit - how incompetent is this organisation and its CEO and how much blood lies on their hands?? Or is it really the case that NZTA wants to boost numbers on the toll road so is making it less desirable for motorists to use the existing road - because the actual delay from the changes will be excessively more than the stated 10 seconds. What they are

		really worried about is that the time saving from using the new toll way will not be significant enough for a lot of motorists to want to spend the money. Also, surely, the speed limits can stay as they are in view of the fact that traffic volumes will be down by over 60% on this stretch of existing highway once the toll road starts operation.
228	Individual submitter	Keep the speed 100 It's immoral to reduce the speed and then force a new toll on new motorway. You should build a better road!! Traffic numbers will only increase
229	NZ Automobile Association	<p><b>**FILE WITH PICTURES ATTACHED**</b></p> <p>Puhoi-Warkworth Proposed Speed Reduction</p> <p>I used to drive this road weekly; now less frequently but still several times a year. I think I can say I know the road well.</p> <p>A slower speed on any road will always be a safer speed, but not necessarily an appropriate one. . Two vehicles colliding at 80 don't give you good odds on surviving. If you want to achieve a meaningful reduction, why not 50 k/h? Clearly, efficiency of the transport network is a factor.</p> <p>A blanket speed reduction is inappropriate for this entire stretch of road.</p> <p>No information has been given as to the cause of the crashes and DSIs. Where are the crashes happening? Loss of control on bends in general? In specific locations? Inattention can result in a totally random distribution of crashes, but if crashes are localised, there may be an engineering reason.</p> <p>One section stands out for its poor engineering design – around Schedewys Hill! In this one section, a reduction to 80 km/hr would appear to be necessary to compensate for poor engineering.</p> <p>Overall, 80 km/h from Schollum Access Road south to a point south of the Hungry Creek bridge would seem to be appropriate.</p> <p>However, 80 k/h on long straight sections of road with good line-of-sight such as Windy Ridge and the Pohuehue Viaduct, with its passing lanes, is neither self-explaining or appropriate. These two sections in particular have the potential to become prime "fishing holes" for speed cameras.</p> <p>SEE PHOTOS AND COMMENTS BELOW</p>
230	Individual submitter	I live North of Warkworth and travel to Silverdale every day to go to work. If the new Motorway is tolled, I will have to continue using state highway 1. Traveling in traffic from Dome valley I can sometimes get stuck behind a truck all the way to the passing lane between The Honey Center and Cowan road. The speed limit at this passing lane should remain at 100kph to pass trucks and other slow-moving vehicles. There has always been accidents on the road from Puhoi to Warkworth. There will be a lot less traffic when the new motorway is built, so why change the speed limit now. I am against changing this speed limit.
231	Individual submitter	I am in favour of the speed changes, it can't remain at 100km/h between Warkworth and Puhoi. But I feel that the intersection with Moir Hill Road is dangerous at the moment and even when data suggests that people are driving past at 80ish kms anyway. When heading south on SH1 and turning in to Moir Hill Road we have had several near head ons while people heading north veer across yellow lines, can we have some thought on division structures/posts? When we head north on to SH1 out of Moir Hill Road I heard that we were supposed to have a slip lane so we could get up to speed. That would be excellent, otherwise you have to go foot to the floor to avoid being rear ended. What is happening in that regard? And the bus stop structure at the metalled layby within Moir Hill Road has been completely demolished once by a vehicle heading north on SH1 but not making the corner, exiting the SH, going over the island and straight through the bus stop. And several other vehicles have also left the road there and come very close to the bus stop. Can we please have thought on how to protect from vehicles exiting the road when they didn't mean to? Several children sit at that bus stop and it scares me to think what if that accident happened whilst they were waiting there? They wouldn't be alive anymore

		is the answer. When I sometimes sit there and wait with the children I constantly watch the road in readiness to move, in case vehicles leave the road. It feels like its just a matter of time.
232	Individual submitter	<p>Extension of 80km speed limited north of Puhoi to 1km (or more) north of Mahurangi West Road (actually all the way to Warkworth is better as there are many hazards along the whole stretch)</p> <p>SH1 north of Puhoi has been subject to a lot of accidents, including fatal accidents. The road winds and therefore does not offer great visibility nor time to react when traffic is moving at 100km</p> <p>It has side roads coming onto it (such as Mahurangi West Road) at which the immediate transition from slower paced driving to SH1 100km driving must be made</p> <p>Some of the traffic coming from the north down the hill past Mahurangi West Road is likely to be above speed limit and the slight curve in SH1 and the lie of the land does not help with visibility into Mahurangi West Road</p> <p>From the South the right hand turn into Mahurangi West Road was created following a fatal accident a couple of decades ago. As far as I know it was unable to meet desired road safety standards. Good idea to have it but a lower limit would at least provide some mitigation for the design limitations at this site.</p> <p>With ever more residential development more traffic is turning on and off SH1 at Mahurangi West Road</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p>
233	Individual submitter	No, please change it today to 80km and change the speed on Sandspit Rd and sharp Rd to 80km at the same time, thanks
234	Individual submitter	No, I think the speed limit change to 60km/hr is okay, but also 70km/hr would work. My request is please please if you could include 2 sets of signs signalling the change. It is so easy to miss these change in speed signs, they are very small. A second set 40m further along the road would help drivers who miss the first sign and who want to be doing the correct speed at the correct time. Thanks
235	Individual submitter	No, I agree with your proposed speeds in the locations specified.
236	Individual submitter	Yes. A toll on the new motorway will ensure heavy use of the old SH1 as motorists will choose to avoid the toll cost. The old road will be safer to use and there will be, therefore, fewer accidents, injuries and deaths if there is no toll. The two issues interlink.
237	Individual submitter	Allowance for new bus stops on existing routes, e.g.several bus stops for route 995 between Hibiscus Coast Bus Station and Warkworth (currently 0 bus stops)
238	Individual submitter	Keep it 100. Don't ruin any other roads.
239	Individual submitter	<p>Dear Madam/Sir</p> <p>My wife and I strongly object to the reduction of the existing speeds on the above section of Highway when the new Puhoi to Warkworth section of the SH1 Motorway (NX2) has been constructed and opened for use to the public.</p> <p>In our opinion this is just a cynical way of encouraging public and commercial drivers to use the new section of SH1 motorway which in all likelihood will be tolled.</p> <p>If the new tolls are reasonably priced surely most people will want to use the new section of the SH1 motorway.</p> <p>Could you please record 2 votes objecting to the proposed reduced speed limits on the "Alternative Route".</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>s 9(2)(a)</p>
240	Individual submitter	The fact that you are pouring millions of dollars into making the roads safer and easier for people to drive on - blows my mind that you want to drop the speed limit, but improve the road ??? Why don't you try fixing the joke you call a 'state highway' in this country before you drop the speed limits. & maybe further educate people how to drive if 'poor driver behavior' is such an issue. Police the issues as well as speed?



241	Individual submitter	The sections of road on the autobahn in Germany that have no speed limits are the parts which also have the lowest crash records. This have been proven internationally. Reducing the speed limit won't change things, driver education needs to be enforced from the beginning and more emphasis on safe driving rather than lower speed limits.
242	Individual submitter	The issue isn't speed but following distances, slow drivers and not enough passing spots in congested traffic. Therefore I don't think the speed should be altered.
243	Individual submitter	I think you should not decrease the speed limit but increase police presence or cameras. Half the problem is the people speeding.
244	Individual submitter	The speed limit should remain at 100kmh. There have been very few accidents and/or deaths on this stretch of road over the past ten years. With the Motorway going through it will reduce this number to an almost negligible number. Also reducing the speed limit will not reduce accidents as accidents have happened with speeds well in excess of 100kmh.
245	Individual submitter	Phase 1 Puhoi to WW. This section should not be reduced to 80km/h. This is too low. I travel this road at least twice a day (for the last 20 years) and my average speed is well over 80k. The only reason why the current average speed is considered to be low is because of the high volume of traffic on the road, and the many slow moving heavy trucks. With the majority of this traffic using the motorway when it is opened, average traffic speeds will increase on the current SH1 from those at present because of the fewer vehicles (and trucks). To now suggest that speeds need to be reduced to make the road safer is an insult, because if NZTA thought the current speed is too high then the consultation to reduce speeds should have been done at least a decade ago. This proposed reduction has nothing to do with traffic safety but is a tool to leverage drivers to use the new motorway and pay the toll for using it. I suggest lowering the limit to 90 km/h which is a practical speed limit and thus wont be a gold mine for traffic speed cameras.
246	Individual submitter	(NO COMMENT)
247	Individual submitter	Whilst I understand that you wish to make the roads safer from someone who commutes daily from Kaiwaka to Silverdale my first thought would be improve the surface. It is terrible in places and I am constantly advising of areas that need attention. It takes me an hour and a half to get to work, changing the lane speed to 80kph may not have much of an affect in the journey time but it will mean that those drivers who already hold up traffic by travelling 20-40kph below posted speed will be even slower. Whilst more of us just berate them and wait fir safe passing places there are many who cannot wait and pass in dangerous places putting both themselves and other road users at risk. The speed limit is not high despite what many people would say. Uk roads are narrower and yet the speed limit is higher. France have flexible speeds on some roads with a lower one coming into force if it is raining and visibility is poor. I have been trying to get spray suppression systems on trucks as the amount of water they displace reduces visibility to zero and if you don't know the road this makes for added danger. If the road speed is already 80kph on average why is there a need to post it? At my travel times I do get to drive at 100kph for some stretches and I think a posted speed reduction may well increase my travel time far more than 10 seconds Better surfacing, clearer road markings as the repainted ones are often less visible than the patches where they have been removed, spray suppression and better driver training would help make things safer
248	Individual submitter	Cant think of anything but I think 80 is great, I would make that THE speed for all our road apart from motorway systems. We dont need 100kms on our country roads, dangerous! I turn off the highway to Mangawahi just out of Dome valley, All those roads should be 80kms, thats my top speed, am continously pulling over to let the speedsters pass, that in itself can be fraught so yeh, 80 pls
249	Individual submitter	No good idea
250	Individual submitter	I Support speed reductions as proposed.
251	Individual submitter	Disagree this jas already been decreased over the years divers should be allowed to use their judgement and drive to the conditions
252	Individual submitter	Very clear signage is required. It is very confusing especially for out of towners who do not use the road often to know the speed limited in the different zones. More than one sign is required. Speed cameras slow people down.
253	Individual submitter	The speed limit should be no less than 80km. And 80km should only be imposed for small sections of known dangerous road. 60km is far too slow for a State Highway. As a resident north

		of Warkworth a 60km limit would be frustrating and unnecessary and with a toll now suggested on the new motorway, reducing the SH speed limit to a crawl could be seen a cynical move to frustrate users of the free SH route thereby pushing people into the new motorway and toll.
254	Individual submitter	I travel 1000kms a week on this section of road the biggest consideration is the mere fact that the roading condition, lack of areas to pass the ever increasing numbers of trucks, weekend getaway asians doing 60kmh and braking for every corner along with tourists travelling north. Dont blame speed when it is not the major factor, you can decrease speed as much as you like this will inevitably lead to dangerous passing manouvers because the road is not fit for modern purposes either make it fit for purpose or close it, except for local traffic but get off the band wagon of blaming speed its an untrue statement you'd bebetter off with a statement of wake up, stay left and maintain the posted speed
255	Individual submitter	While reducing the open road speed limit from 100 kph in areas where an increase in traffic, development, and accidents occur is hard to argue with I find it odd that heavy vehicles have a 10 kph less speed limit in a 100 kph area, but can travel at the same speed as all other traffic in other areas. Surely in a 80 kph area the heavy vehicles should be restricted to say 70 kph, otherwise it makes no sense in a lower limit at all in any area.
256	Individual submitter	I support the proposal generally, except the reduction of the limit for the existing 100km/h area? on SH1 between Warkworth south and ?Puhoi?Road -?from?60m south of McKinney Road, Warkworth to 350m north of?Puhoi?Road – reduce from 100km/h to 80km/h.? The limit for this area should stay at 100km. While average speeds are 75/85Km/hr some sections safely support speeds in excess of that (e.g. the passing lane), particularly when traffic is light, and intersection speed zones will apply in risky areas. Driver responsibility for good driving behaviour is the key and good signage helps. Signage on this road is already extensive. Most users are familiar with the impact of the motorway construction works and average speeds are already around 80Km/hr or less in many sections. It is not evident that restricting speed on sections where motorists can safely exceed 80Km/hr will provide any benefit to motorists or improvement in road safety over this section.
257	Individual submitter	Yes, leave it alone... for godsake. If people can't drive 100km then get educated. Anything lower is just getting stupid. If the current average speed is as you say, then you don't have a problem, the ones that can drive, drive at 100km when they can, the others dawdle.. But the traffic is not always going at 80, at night when traffic's light its easy to clip along at 100, BTW there is no difficult corners..
258	Individual submitter	Your map of Intersection Speed Zones shows the car turning right from the side road into the vehicle lane; shouldn't it be turning into the flush median then filtering into the vehicle lane Also plenty of vehicle signalling should be demonstrated!!!
259	Individual submitter	Yes, try and think like other forward thinking country's its not even built yet and you want to slow it down, Stop taking backwards steps.
260	Individual submitter	Fix the Road so that the speed doesn't need to be reduced.