

| Rolleston | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Burnham School Road (100km to 60km) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 27% travel through the area but do not live locally 23.1% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 15.6% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.8% Strongly support 8.1% Slightly support 11.4% Neutral 7.6% Slightly oppose 41.1% Strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safer for cyclists, schools, and Pines site access Environmental benefits (less litter blowing off trailers) Lower speeds reduce crash risk <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear evidence for change Speed reduction too drastic for rural environment Unnecessary and unjustified at this time |
| Brookside Road (100km to 60km) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 27.6% travel through the area but do not live locally 26.6% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 12.3% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.4% Strongly support 7.2% Slightly support 13.1% Neutral 9.1% Slightly oppose 41.2% Strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning ahead for growth Safer for schools General preference for lower speeds to reduce risks <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear evidence of crashes Speed change is too drastic, staged or smaller reductions preferred Concerns on wasted spending |
| Edwards Road (100km to 60km) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 28.7% travel through the area but do not live locally 26.9% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 12.7% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28.5% Strongly support 5.9% Slightly support 12.9% Neutral 7.8% Slightly oppose 44.7% Strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phased reduction in anticipation of future development as the area urbanises. Gravel road naturally limits speed, making 60 km/h reasonable. Reducing to 80 km/h instead of 100 km/h. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of safety issues or accidents, so no change is needed. Dropping from 100km/h to 60 km/h is excessive and |

| Rolleston | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| | | | <p>suggest a more gradual or variable approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the financial cost and time impact of implementing the change, especially given recent rate increases. |
| Dunns Crossing Road (80km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 31.6% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 28.3% travel through the area but do not live locally 16% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34.0% strongly support 6.9% slightly support 10.3% neutral 7.7% slightly oppose 40.9% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 km/h is a safer speed for this road. Planned development makes a lower limit sensible. Slower speeds will protect residents as the area grows. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No accident data supports a change. The current limit is fine as is. Better enforcement is needed, not lower speeds. |
| Goulds Road (80km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 31.1% use the road for recreation or visiting family and friends. 26.8% travel through the area but do not live locally. 14.7% use the road for commuting to work or education. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 37.2% strongly support 5.6% slightly support 9% Neutral 8.6% slightly oppose 39.3% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety should come first. Increased residential growth makes lower speeds necessary. New housing and facilities justify a 50 km/h limit. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No crash data supports a change. A gradual reduction to 60 km/h would be more reasonable. Poor driving habits are the issue—better enforcement is needed. |
| Lincoln Rolleston Road (60km/h to 50km/h) <i>from a point generally 60m South-East of Lowes Road to a point generally 1780m</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 28.5% use the road for recreation or visiting family and friends. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.2% strongly support 7% slightly support 6.5% Neutral 7.8% slightly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower speeds will improve safety as residential development increases. |

| Rolleston | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| <i>South East of Lowes Road.</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 20.8% travel through the area but do not live locally 19.7% use the road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 47.3% strongly oppose the change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The road layout supports a 60 km/h limit due to limited driveway access. A growing, built-up area justifies slower speeds. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There's no crash data to justify a change. The current speed limit is appropriate and should remain. Unsafe driving is the issue, not the speed limit—better enforcement is needed. |
| Lincoln Rolleston Road (80km/h to 50km/h) <i>from a point generally 1780m Southeast of Lowes Road to a point generally 60m North-East of Selwyn Road</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 29.3% use the road for recreation or visiting family and friends. 22.5% travel through the area but do not live locally 20.1% use the road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.5% strongly support 5.7% slightly support 5.7% are neutral 5.7% slightly oppose 51.2% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower speeds will improve safety as residential development increases. A 60 km/h limit would be more appropriate than 50 km/h. The area is getting busier, so reducing speed makes sense. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a change. The reduction is too drastic; 70 or 80 km/h would be better. Poor driving is the issue, not speed—enforce existing laws instead. |
| Selwyn Road 1 (60km/h to 50km/h) <i>from a point generally 80m Southwest of East Maddisons Road to a point 80m South of Lincoln Rolleston Road.</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 29.8% use the road for recreation or visiting family and friends. 23.6% travel through the area but do not live locally 18.6% use the road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.1% strongly support 6.1% slightly support 7.7% are neutral 6.5% slightly oppose 48.3% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new high school nearby makes a lower speed limit essential. Residential development on one side supports reducing the speed. Even a small speed reduction can lead to fewer injury crashes. |

| Rolleston | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| | | | Those opposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a change. This road is a main thoroughfare and should remain at a higher speed. Reducing speed will delay emergency services and increase commute times. |
| Selwyn Road 2 (80km/h to 50km/h) <i>from a point generally 80m South of Lincoln Rolleston Road to a point 130m Northeast of Lincoln Rolleston Road.</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 29.1% use the road for recreation or visiting family and friends. 26.6% travel through the area but do not live locally 17.9% use the road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32.50% strongly support 6.25% slightly support 5.42% are neutral 6.25% slightly oppose 49.58% strongly oppose | Those in support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new high school nearby makes a lower speed limit a logical choice. Residential development supports reducing the speed limit. A small reduction in speed can help reduce injury crashes. Those opposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. Lowering the speed will increase congestion and frustrate drivers. This road is a main corridor and should maintain a higher speed for traffic flow. |
| Selwyn Road 3 (80km/h to 50km/h) <i>from a point generally 80m Southwest of East Maddisons Road to a point 80m South-West of Goulds Road.</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 30.7% use the road for recreation or visiting family and friends. 25.8% travel through the area but do not live locally 17.2% use the road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32.46% strongly support 7.46% slightly support 3.95% are neutral 6.58% slightly oppose 49.56% strongly oppose | Those in support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development supports reducing the speed limit. A small reduction in speed can help reduce injury crashes. 60 km/h is a fair compromise for safety and traffic flow. Those opposed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. |

| Rolleston | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This road is a main corridor and should maintain a higher speed. Reducing speed will increase congestion and waste taxpayer money. |
| <p>Selwyn Road 4 (100km/h to 50km/h)</p> <p><i>from a point generally 80m Southwest of Goulds Road to a point 460m South-West of Goulds Road.</i></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 31.4% use the road for recreation or visiting family and friends. 26.6% travel through the area but do not live locally 17.6% use the road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30.04% strongly support 5.15% slightly support 4.29% are neutral 4.72% slightly oppose 55.36% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential development and the nearby high school support lowering the speed limit. A reduction to 60 km/h is reasonable given the changing road environment. Lower speeds can reduce injury crashes and improve safety. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. A single drop from 100 to 50 km/h is too drastic and should be phased. This road is a main corridor and should maintain a higher speed for traffic flow. |
| Springston Rolleston Road (60km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 31.5% use the road for recreation or visiting family and friends. 23.1% travel through the area but do not live locally 19.1% use the road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.3% strongly support 7.6% slightly support 7.6% are neutral 6.3% slightly oppose 47% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new high school and nearby development support lowering the speed limit. Lower speeds improve safety and reduce noise in residential areas. A reduction to 50 km/h is reasonable given the road conditions and traffic volume. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. Reducing speed will increase congestion and waste taxpayer money. |

| Rolleston | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|------------------|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single drop to 50 km/h is too drastic; a phased reduction would be better. |

| Northern Rolleston | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Walkers Road (100km to 60km) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 23.1% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 27% travel through the area but do not live locally 15.6% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.51% strongly support 6.56% slightly support 7.10% are neutral 8.20% slightly oppose 48.63% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 km/h is too fast; reducing the speed improves safety. High traffic volume and turning movements justify a lower limit. A reduction is needed due to increasing development and road use. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. A drop to 60 km/h is excessive; 70 or 80 km/h would be more reasonable. This road is rural and functions as a key corridor, so higher speeds should remain. |
| Two Chain Road (100km/h to 60km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 30% travel through the area but do not live locally 26.4% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 14.6% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30.05% strongly support 4.92% slightly support 6.01% are neutral 8.74% slightly oppose 50.27% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic volume and turning movements justify a lower speed limit. Road conditions and development support reducing the speed. Safety improvements are needed as traffic increases. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. A drop to 60 km/h is excessive; 70 or 80 km/h |

| Northern Rolleston | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| | | | <p>would be more reasonable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a rural and industrial access road, so higher speeds should remain. |
| Runners Road (100km/h to 60km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 31.6% travel through the area but do not live locally 28.3% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 12.7% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.94% strongly support 7.34% slightly support 9.60% are neutral 5.65% slightly oppose 47.46% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 km/h is too fast for a dead-end road; reducing the speed improves safety. A reduction to 80 km/h is more appropriate given the limited destinations. Lower speeds are justified due to the nature of traffic and road use. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. This is a rural road with minimal development, so higher speeds should remain. A single drop to 60 km/h is excessive and should be phased or reconsidered. |
| Maddisons Road (80km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 29.6% travel through the area but do not live locally 27.9% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 15.4% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.71% strongly support 6.29% slightly support 8.00% are neutral 5.71% slightly oppose 50.29% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reduction to 60 km/h would be supported for safety. Lower speeds are reasonable given the road's usage. Reducing speed could help manage future traffic growth. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a rural road and should remain at a higher speed. There is no need for a reduction; 80 or 100 km/h is more appropriate. Lowering the speed will increase congestion and waste resources. |

| Northern Rolleston | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Wards Road (100km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 30.1% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 29.6% travel through the area but do not live locally 14.8% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.31% strongly support 6.90% slightly support 4.60% are neutral 9.77% slightly oppose 49.43% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 km/h would be a safer and more appropriate speed for this section. A gradual reduction in speed would help manage traffic better. Lower speeds are justified based on current road usage. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a rural road and should remain at a higher speed. A drop to 50 km/h is excessive and unnecessary. Reducing speed will waste time and resources without clear benefits. |
| Railway Road (100km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 32.1% travel through the area but do not live locally 28.9% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 13.5% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.2% strongly support 3.7% slightly support 7.9% are neutral 6.3% slightly oppose 52.6% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 km/h is too fast; most drivers already travel slower. This road serves few businesses, so a reduction is reasonable. Safety and road condition justify lowering the speed. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a rural road and should remain at a higher speed. A drop to 50 km/h is excessive and unnecessary. Reducing speed will waste resources without improving safety. |

| Lincoln | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Birches Road 1 (80km/h to 50km/h) <i>from a point generally 90m South-West of</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 28.2% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 38.3% strongly support 5% slightly support 6.6% are neutral | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birchs Road has high crash rates and more traffic from new |

| Lincoln | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| <i>Benashet Drive to Tancreds Road.</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 20.9% use this road for commuting to work or education 20.9% travel through the area but do not live locally | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.8% slightly oppose 46.1% strongly oppose | <p>developments, so lower speeds are needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reduction to 60 km/h would improve safety near intersections and residential areas. The proposed limits match actual road conditions and are reasonable. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. This is a rural road and lowering the speed to 50 km/h is excessive. Speed is not the issue - intersections and road design need improvement instead. |
| Boundary Road (80km/h to 50kmh) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 32.2% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 22.8% travel through the area but do not live locally 17.3% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33.52% strongly support 5.59% slightly support 6.15% are neutral 6.15% slightly oppose 48.60% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering the speed would improve safety near busy intersections and residential areas. The proposed limits align well with current road conditions. A reduction to 60 or 70 km/h would be more appropriate than 50 km/h. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. This is a rural road and lowering the speed to 50 km/h is excessive. Speed is not the issue—road design and intersections need improvement instead. |
| Edward Street (80km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 32.2% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 37.21% strongly support 6.40% slightly support 9.88% are neutral | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering the speed would improve safety near busy intersections and residential areas. |

| Lincoln | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| | 2. 22.1% travel through the area but do not live locally 3. 18.1% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.49% slightly oppose 43.02% strongly oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed limits match actual road conditions and are reasonable. A reduction to 60 km/h would align with nearby road changes and improve consistency. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no crash data to justify a speed limit change. This is a rural road and lowering the speed to 50 km/h is excessive. Improving road design is more effective than changing speed limits. |
| Ellesmere Road (80km/h to 60km/h) | 1. 30% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 2. 23.5% travel through the area but do not live locally 3. 19.7% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 38.73% strongly support 5.20% slightly support 5.20% are neutral 6.94% slightly oppose 43.93% strongly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering the speed will improve safety at intersections and access to local amenities. The proposed limits match actual road conditions and are reasonable. Extending the limit to Tancred's Road would help manage dangerous bends. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no need for a change; the current limits are fine. Speed is not the issue - road conditions and driver behaviour are the problems. Lowering the speed will make commutes longer and confuse drivers. |
| Gerald Street 50km/h to 40km/h) | 1. 31.5% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 2. 19.3% travel through the area but do not live locally | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40.6% strongly support 6% slightly support 4.9% are neutral 4.9% slightly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering the speed will make the town centre safer and more pleasant for pedestrians. |

| Lincoln | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| | 3. 17.2% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 43.4% strongly oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed limits reflect actual traffic conditions and should have been implemented earlier. A reduction to 30 km/h would be even better for pedestrian safety. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no need for a change; the current limits are fine. 40 km/h is too slow and will frustrate drivers. Changing the speed limit is a waste of money and won't improve safety. |
| Springs Road (100km/h to 50km/h) | 1. 33.8% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 2. 22.3% travel through the area but do not live locally 3. 17.5% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33.7% strongly support 5.4% slightly support 7.6% are neutral 3.2% slightly oppose 50% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering the speed is reasonable given upcoming residential development. Safety concerns near schools and retirement villages justify a reduction. A phased reduction from 100 to 80 km/h, then to 50 km/h, would be more effective. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a rural road and should remain at 100 km/h until development is complete. A drop to 50 km/h is excessive and will frustrate drivers. Changing the speed limit is unnecessary and won't improve safety. |

| Prebbleton | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| <p>Birchs Road (60km/h to 50km/h)</p> <p><i>from a point generally 80m South of Ledleys Road to a point generally 100m South of Trices Road.</i></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 32.1% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 2. 21.9% travel through the area but do not live locally 3. 20.7% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28.4% strongly support • 5.8% slightly support • 4.6% are neutral • 8.7% slightly oppose • 52.3% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower speeds improve safety in residential and high-pedestrian areas. • Reducing speed discourages shortcut traffic through local streets. • Proposed limits match current road use and growing development. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No crash history justifies a change. • Too many speed changes confuse drivers. • Rural roads should keep higher limits for efficiency. |
| <p>Hamptons Road (80km/h to 60km/h)</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 31.4% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 2. 22.7% travel through the area but do not live locally 3. 20.2% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26.8% strongly support • 8.5% slightly support • 7.4% are neutral • 5.7% slightly oppose • 51.4% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower speeds are safer near new subdivisions and reduce noise for nearby residents. • Slower limits help manage growing traffic volumes and future-proof urban development. • Speed reductions make it easier and safer for people walking, biking, or crossing roads. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current limits are fine; there's no crash history or safety issue to justify change. • Lowering speeds on rural or feeder roads will frustrate drivers and reduce efficiency. • Speed changes are unnecessary and costly, with better results from road upgrades and intersection improvements. |

| Tai Tapu | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Old Tai Tapu Road (80km/h to 60km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 37.6% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 30% travel through the area but do not live locally 10% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31.4% strongly support 5.8% slightly support 7.5% are neutral 9.3% slightly oppose 45.9% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High pedestrian and cyclist use makes lower speeds safer. Curves, poor lighting, and venue traffic increase risk. Most drivers already travel below 80 km/h. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crash data doesn't justify a change. Minimal speed impact doesn't warrant the cost. A targeted reduction is better than a blanket limit. |

| Leeston | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Station Street (60km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 29.8% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 28.5% travel through the area but do not live locally 16.1% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25.1% strongly support 9% slightly support 18.1% are neutral 6.2% slightly oppose 41.2% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering the speed will improve safety near homes, blind corners, and heavy vehicle routes. The area is transitioning to urban use, with more families and future development. Speeding near intersections and curves is a concern, especially for children and pedestrians. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crash data doesn't support a change; the road is already low-risk. Drivers already travel near the proposed limit, making the change unnecessary. The cost of implementation is |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | unjustified and better spent elsewhere. |
| Leeston Dunsandel Road (100km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 32.2% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 26.5% travel through the area but do not live locally 14.1% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22.7% strongly support 5.5% slightly support 11.7% are neutral 5.5% slightly oppose 54.4% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 50 km/h limit is appropriate for a growing residential area and near schools. Future subdivisions and intersections will require lower speeds for safety. A staged reduction (e.g. 100 → 80 → 50) would improve safety as development progresses. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A direct drop from 100 to 50 km/h is too drastic and unjustified. The area still feels rural, and crash data doesn't support a full reduction. Lower limits will frustrate commuters and add unnecessary costs. |

| Burnham | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Telegraph Road (100km/h to 80km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 32.1% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 30.1% travel through the area but do not live locally 17.3% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.3% strongly support 7.1% slightly support 5.8% are neutral 3.2% slightly oppose 60.3% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80 km/h is safer for rural roads with slow-moving vehicles and farm activity. Lower speeds help reduce risks at intersections and with mixed traffic types. Some support a moderate reduction or variable speed zone based on conditions. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The road is rural, straight, and low-risk—no change is needed. Crash data doesn't justify a reduction; most incidents occur at SH1 junctions. Speed changes are seen as unnecessary |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | bureaucracy and a waste of money. |
| Two Chain Road (100km/h to 80km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 34.7% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 28.3% travel through the area but do not live locally 14.4% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.7% strongly support 7% slightly support 7.6% are neutral 3.8% slightly oppose 57.6% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80 km/h is safer for rural roads with slow-moving vehicles and farm traffic. A moderate reduction or variable speed zone could improve safety without overreaching. One submitter expressed clear support for the proposed change. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No crash history or road changes justify a speed reduction. The area is rural and suited to the current open road limit. The proposal is seen as unnecessary bureaucracy and a waste of ratepayer money. |
| Reynolds Road (100km/h to 80km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 32% travel through the area but do not live locally 29.7% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 14.2% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.2% strongly support 8.3% slightly support 7.7% are neutral 5.1% slightly oppose 55.4% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The road has sharp corners at both ends, making a speed reduction reasonable. Improvement in safety. Lower speeds are safer for rural roads with mixed traffic like tractors and livestock. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One minor crash in five years doesn't justify a change. The road is rural, straight, and already safe - no need to reduce speed. The change is seen as unnecessary and a waste of ratepayer money. |
| Burdons Road (100km/h to 80km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 32.3% travel through the area but do not live locally 32.3% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 14.7% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.3% strongly support 9% slightly support 6.4% are neutral 5.1% slightly oppose 55.8% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharp corners at both ends of the road make a lower speed limit more appropriate. Reduced speeds improve safety for rural roads shared with tractors and livestock. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A speed reduction supports safer driving behaviour in mixed-use rural environments. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crash data shows no safety issue—only one minor crash in five years. • The road is straight and rural, and drivers already adjust to the conditions. • The proposal is unnecessary and a poor use of public funds. |
|--|--|--|--|

| Darfield | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Kimberley Road (60km/h to 50km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 29.9% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 2. 25.7% travel through the area but do not live locally 3. 13.1% use this road for commuting to work or education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26.9% strongly support • 9.2% slightly support • 17.7% are neutral • 5.2% slightly oppose • 40.7% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A speed reduction is supported to improve safety near residential areas and busy corners. • Lower speeds may help protect cyclists and pedestrians using the road. • Gradual reduction from 60 to 50 km/h is seen as a reasonable safety measure. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No crash data supports the change, it is unnecessary. • The road is short, and a 10 km/h reduction is unlikely to improve safety. • Waste of ratepayer money with no clear benefit. |

| West Melton | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Location | How road is used (top usage) | Level of support | Top themes |
| Halkett Road (80km/h to 60km/h) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 28.2% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends 2. 23.9% travel through the area but do not live locally | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% strongly support • 8% slightly support • 10.4% are neutral • 6.3% slightly oppose | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speed reduction makes sense with new housing developments and increased traffic. • Lower limits improve safety for cyclists, |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | <p>3. 14.5% use this road for commuting to work or education</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45% strongly oppose the change | <p>pedestrians, and local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the reduced limit further to cover busy intersections and townships. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No crash history or safety data supports the change. New subdivisions were approved without speed changes - retrospective limits seem unjustified. Seen as unnecessary, costly, and disruptive without measurable safety benefits. |
| <p>Weedons Ross Road (80km/h to 60km/h)</p> | <p>1. 29.4% use this road for recreation or to visit family and friends</p> <p>2. 21.7% travel through the area but do not live locally</p> <p>3. 17.4% use this road for commuting to work or education</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.1% strongly support 7.6% slightly support 8.2% are neutral 6% slightly oppose 48.9% strongly oppose the change | <p>Those in support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speed reduction makes sense due to growing residential developments and increased traffic. Lower limits improve safety near busy intersections and areas with cyclists. Target reductions or variable speed zones based on time and traffic. <p>Those opposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No crash history or safety data supports the change, this is unjustified. New subdivisions were approved without speed changes; retrospective limits are inappropriate. Unnecessary, disruptive, and a poor use of ratepayer funds with no proven benefit. |