

# Summary of submissions

Taieri Mouth Road Speed Limit Proposal consultation

## Overview

- Consultation on the proposed Taieri Mouth Road speed limit changes was undertaken from 2 March 2026 to 13 April 2026.
- Submitters were asked to choose 1 of 3 Options:
  - Option 1 – speed limit reduction on the entire length of Taieri Mouth Road
  - Option 2 – speed limit reduction on part of Taieri Mouth Road
  - Option 3 – status quo
- A total of 238 submissions were received.
- Nine submitters indicated that they wished to speak to their submission at a hearing.
- Individual submissions accounted for approximately 97% of total submissions.

## Submitter characteristics

Most submissions were received from individual members of the public, with a smaller number of submissions from organisations, groups, and the local Community Board.

Table 1. Submissions received and hearing speakers by submitter type

Submitter Type	Submissions received	Speakers at hearings
Community Board	1	1
Organisations and groups	6	3
Individuals	231	5
<b>Total submissions</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>9</b>

### Individuals compared to organisations and groups

There is a notable difference in preferences between individual submitters and organisations and groups.

Most organisations and groups supported a reduction in the speed limit, with the majority favouring Option 1 (speed reduction along the full length of the road). In contrast, individual submitters were more likely to support retaining the current speed limit (Option 3).

Table 2. Variation in option preferences by submitter type

Submitter Type	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Community Board	0%	100%	0%
Organisations and groups	83%	17%	0%
Individuals	32%	11%	57%

*Note: Organisations and groups percentages are based on a small number of submissions (n=6).*

Table 3. Preferred options of the Community Board and organisations and groups

Community Board + Organisations and groups	Preference	Speaking at hearing
Kuri Bush residents (36 signatories – group submission)	Option 1	Yes
Saddle Hill Community Board	Option 2	Yes
Te Whatu Ora	Option 1	Yes
Te Rūnaka o Ōtākou	Option 1	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Option 2	No
NZ Sea Lion Trust	Option 1	No
Hato Hone St John	Option 1	No

## Speed limit preference

Submitters were asked to indicate their preference of the three options presented in the table below.

Overall, the largest proportion of submitters supported retaining the current speed limit (Option 3), with 56% of responses.

A smaller proportion (33%) supported reducing the speed limit along the full length of the road (Option 1), while 11% supported a partial reduction (Option 2).

While most submitters supported retaining the current speed limit, a notable proportion (44% of submitters) supported some form of speed reduction, either across the full corridor or part of the road.

Table 4. Submitter preferences for speed limit options on Taieri Mouth Road

Option	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Option 1 – speed limit reduction on the entire length of Taieri Mouth Road	78	33%
Option 2 – speed limit reduction on part of Taieri Mouth Road	27	11%
Option 3 – retain current speed limit (status quo)	133	56%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Location of submitters

Submitter preferences varied by location, with notable differences between communities along the road and the wider Dunedin area.

Please note, the classification of location is based solely on the addresses used in the submission form to identify trends. It's likely that some submitters may be owners rather than occupiers or vice versa and that groups and organisations operate across a much broader area.

Submitters from Taieri Mouth (including Taieri Beach) were most likely to support retaining the current speed limit (Option 3), with 71% selecting this option and relatively low support for a full reduction (16%).

In contrast, submitters from Dunedin City showed a more even distribution of views, with a greater proportion supporting a full speed limit reduction (Option 1 – 49%) compared to retaining the current speed limit (Option 3 – 42%).

Submitters from Brighton also showed a preference for retaining the current speed limit (58%), although there was a smaller proportion supporting a full speed limit reduction (Option 1 – 37%)

Feedback from Kuri Bush was more evenly distributed across all three options, with similar levels of support for Option 1 (29%) and Option 2 (29%), and a slightly higher proportion supporting retaining the current speed limit (43%).

Submissions from outside the Dunedin City Council and Clutha District boundaries were small in number and showed varied preferences, meaning no strong conclusions can be drawn from these groups.

Overall, these results indicate that preferences vary across communities, with stronger support for retaining the current speed limit among Taieri Mouth submitters, and more support for reduction emerging from the wider Dunedin City area.

Table 5. Option preference by location

Location	Within DCC boundary	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Total
<b>Within Dunedin City Council boundary</b>					
<b>Brighton</b>	Yes	37%	5%	58%	19
<b>Dunedin City</b>	Yes	49%	9%	42%	81
<b>Kuri Bush</b>	Yes	29%	29%	43%	21
<b>Subtotal (Within DCC)</b>	—	—	—	—	<b>121</b>
<b>Outside Dunedin City Council boundary</b>					
<b>Taieri Mouth</b>	No	16%	13%	71%	87
<b>Clutha</b>	No	25%	0%	75%	4
<b>Outside Dunedin and Clutha</b>	No	60%	0%	40%	5
<b>Subtotal (Outside DCC)</b>	—	—	—	—	<b>96</b>
<b>Unknown location</b>	Unknown	32%	9%	59%	21
<b>Total</b>	—	<b>33%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>238</b>

*Note: location was determined by address entered in the submission form. Those who did not enter an address are grouped under unknown location.*

## Analysis of themes

The written comments in submissions were coded into themes for analysis.

Submissions were often assigned to multiple themes; therefore, percentages do not total 100%.

### Opposition to speed limit reductions (Option 3)

The most common reasons cited by submitters opposing a speed limit reduction are summarised in Table 6.

Table 6. Top themes for opposition to speed limit reduction

Common Themes	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
It's safe to drive 100 km/h	72	30%
Lowering the speed limit will make it more unsafe (due to driver frustration)	31	13%
Install warning signs instead	23	10%
Concern about increased travel times if speed limit was reduced	18	8%
Improve vegetation management to improve safety instead	18	8%
Increase the number of pull over lanes instead	18	8%
Better maintain the road surface instead	17	7%
Cost benefit analysis incorrect	6	3%

*Note: Number of responses indicates the number of submissions that commented on a given theme (out of 238 total submissions).*

The most cited theme among submitters opposing a reduction in the speed limit was the view that the road is currently safe to drive at 100 km/h (72 submitters, 30%).

Submitters expressing this view often noted that the posted speed limit represents a maximum rather than a target speed, and that drivers can adjust their speed to suit road conditions. Some submissions highlighted that regular users of the road are familiar with its layout and can travel safely at the existing speed, while other road users may choose to travel at lower speeds.

A further key theme was concern that lowering the speed limit may result in reduced safety outcomes (31 submitters, 13%). These submitters suggested that lower speed limits could lead to increased driver frustration and more frequent or risky overtaking behaviour.

Many submitters who opposed a reduction in the speed limit suggested alternative approaches to improving road safety, rather than lowering the posted speed. These included:

- Better maintain the road surface instead (17 submitters)
- install warning signs instead (23 submitters)
- improve vegetation management, particularly near driveways (18 submitters)

- increase number of pull over lanes instead (18 submitters)

These submissions generally indicated a preference for targeted infrastructure or maintenance improvements over regulatory changes.

Concerns regarding travel time were also raised (18 submissions, 8%), with submitters noting that a lower speed limit would increase journey times for those commuting between Taieri Mouth and Dunedin. A small number of submissions (6 submitters, 3%) also questioned the accuracy of the cost-benefit analysis, particularly in relation to predicted travel time impacts.

Some submitters attributed safety concerns to factors other than the posted speed limit, including road condition, heavy vehicle use, and driver behaviour. These submissions suggested that improvements in driver awareness, training, or compliance would have a greater impact on safety outcomes than reducing the speed limit.

Additional concerns raised by submitters included the likelihood of low compliance with a reduced speed limit and the practical challenges associated with enforcement in a rural setting. Some submissions also noted the impact of heavy vehicles, particularly logging trucks, on road condition and safety.

While these themes were most commonly raised by submitters opposing a speed limit reduction, some of the factors identified (such as road condition, visibility, pull over lanes, and traffic mix) were also referenced by submitters supporting a reduction, although these were generally used to support different conclusions.

### **Support for a speed limit reduction along the full length of Taieri Mouth Road (Option 1)**

Submitters supporting a speed limit reduction most commonly cited concerns that the road is not safe to operate at 100 km/h. A significant number of submitters also indicated general support for the reasons outlined in the speed reduction proposal, including improved safety outcomes and reduced crash severity.

Other commonly raised themes included safety for vulnerable road users, particularly cyclists and pedestrians, protection of wildlife such as sea lions, and concerns about interactions with heavy vehicles. Some submitters also supported increased enforcement measures or longer-term infrastructure improvements, such as a future cycle lane, to improve safety along the corridor.

Table 7. Top themes supporting a speed limit reduction

Common themes	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Road not safe at 100 km/h	59	25%
Support reasons outlined in speed reduction proposal	26	11%
Safety for wildlife (including sea lions)	21	9%
Safety concerns for cyclists	19	8%
Future bike lane along Taieri Mouth Road	4	2%
Request for speed cameras / increased enforcement	3	1%

*Note: Number of responses indicates the number of submissions that commented on a given theme (out of 238 total submissions).*

### **Support for a speed limit reduction along part of Taieri Mouth Road (Option 2)**

Submitters supporting Option 2 (27 submissions, 11%) did not generally oppose speed reductions in principle but instead favoured a site-specific and proportionate approach. The key themes raised by Option 2 submitters align with broader themes identified in submissions, particularly those relating to residential access, limited sightlines, and road geometry in specific areas.

Option 2 submitters described the option as a pragmatic compromise, balancing safety concerns in higher-risk areas with the need to maintain reasonable travel times along the remainder of the route. Some submitters mentioned supporting Kuri Bush residents desire to feel safe. Emergency services organisations also noted that any speed reduction would reduce response times to the Taieri Mouth area.

Overall, feedback supporting Option 2 reflects a clear preference for targeted intervention, rather than applying a corridor-wide speed limit reduction.

### **Support for a speed limit reduction through Kuri Bush only**

A subset of submitters expressed support for a speed limit reduction limited to the Kuri Bush area only.

Approximately 18 submitters supported a reduced speed limit through Kuri Bush only, citing residential access, limited sightlines, and road geometry, while opposing wider reductions under Options 1 and 2.

Several of these submitters noted that their preferred option was not fully reflected in the consultation choices. Some considered Option 2 to extend beyond the area where a lower speed limit was necessary. As a result, some submitters who supported a Kuri Bush-only reduction ultimately selected Option 3 (status quo), despite expressing support for a more localised change.

Overall, these submissions reflect support for a targeted, site-specific approach to speed management, rather than a corridor-wide speed limit reduction.