



**Report**            **04.446**  
**Date**             27 July 2004  
**File**              TP08/02/06

**Committee**       **Regional Land Transport**  
**Author**           **Günther Wild, Access Planning Analyst**

## **Regional Road Safety Strategy**

### **1. Purpose**

To provide the Committee with an analysis of the submissions received and to recommend to Council to adopt the Regional Road Safety Strategy presented in **attachment 1**.

### **2. Background**

The draft Regional Road Safety Strategy was released for public consultation by the Committee from 24 May 2004 to 5 July 2004. The strategy seeks to continuously improve the level of regional road safety based on a firmly established safety culture. When adopted it will form a chapter of the Regional Land Transport Strategy and as such it has a strategic transport perspective.

### **3. Comment**

#### **3.1 Submissions received**

Fourteen submissions were received from:

- Land Transport Safety Authority (LTSA)
- Upper Hutt City Council (UHCC)
- Wellington City Council (WCC)
- Cycle Aware Wellington (CAW)
- Cycling Health (CH)
- New Zealand Automobile Association, Wairarapa Branch (NZAA)
- Eight members of the public.

Submissions were collated and analysed, with necessary amendments made to the strategy in conjunction with the Road Safety Technical Working Group. A copy of the submissions is collated as a separate document and is enclosed with the order paper.

## 3.2 Analysis of submissions

All submissions were generally supportive of the strategy. Some of the submissions requested minor changes, sought clarification, or suggested additions. Following is a summary of the submitters' points, followed by officer comments in bold.

### 3.2.1 Vision

No submissions requested changes or noted opposition.

### 3.2.2 Objectives

LTSA supported the linkage of objective one to the overall targets and goals, but suggested that objective two and three should also have a greater link to the issues.

#### **Comment**

**The link between objective two and three is already made in Appendix 1: Wellington Region's Road Safety Profile.**

UHCC expressed support for the objectives.

WCC believes the strategy does not provide a clear way forward regarding the role the three "E's" will play in meeting the objectives or how funds will be allocated to these.

#### **Comment**

**The strategy clearly states where each of the key actions falls within the three "E's" of road safety. Further, it is not the role of a strategic document such as the strategy to specify where funds should be allocated. Rather, this is a task for the implementing agencies such as the region's Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs), LTSA and the New Zealand Police.**

Mr Mike Mellor suggested that in objective one, "road crash reduction" should be replaced with "road death and hospitalisation targets".

#### **Comment**

**Regional crash reduction is the primary aim of the strategy and deaths plus hospitalisation data is a key measure of that.**

### 3.2.3 Outcomes

UHCC noted support for the strategy's outcomes and no other submissions requested changes or noted opposition.

### 3.2.4 Targets

LTSA requested that the 2010 regional targets be changed to those set out by the LTSA in the soon to be published 2004/05 New Zealand Road Safety Programme (SAP) as follows:

1. Deaths plus hospitalisations: 240
2. Deaths plus hospitalisations for over 1 day: 150
3. Deaths plus hospitalisations over 3 days: 90

**Comment**

**As the targets suggested in the Draft Regional Road Safety Strategy were based on the national Road Safety to 2010 strategy (RS2010) and made in conjunction with LTSA, it is appropriate they be updated inline with the reviewed targets.**

CAW and CH requested detailed, measurable cycling related targets to be included in the strategy.

**Comment**

**Targets specifically related to cycling safety are comprehensively covered in the Regional Cycling Strategy.**

WCC questioned whether the strategy shows how the region will move from it's current plateau in order to meet the RS2010 targets.

**Comment**

**The strategy clearly outlines in the Action Programme section a series of interventions, including Road Safety Action Plans (RSAPs) and Safety Management Systems (SMSs) that will enable the region to achieve the RS2010 targets.**

MJ Williams believed that the targets need to be "more realistic".

**Comment**

**The targets have been taken directly from the national RS2010 targets. They have been set by New Zealand's experts in the field of road safety and represent realistic targets for both 2004 and 2010.**

### 3.2.5 Action programme

CAW and CH supported the actions and performance measures. However, they want actions guided by the strategy's priorities and tied into the Regional Cycling Strategy, as well as it being made clear that despite low cycling numbers, RCAs should not use this as an excuse for inaction over cycle safety.

**Comment**

**The strategy's key issues guide the action programme. This is a strategic road safety strategy and cycling issues are specifically dealt with in the Regional Cycling Strategy.**

CAW believed that a list of suggested interventions be included after the action programme.

**Comment**

**Specific interventions will be developed by the implementing agencies as they see fit. This is a strategic document, and as such does not seek to**

**outline specific interventions. Some possible interventions are discussed in Appendix 1: Wellington Region's Road Safety Profile.**

WCC requested that the strategy make allowance for RCA's to use their own systems and processes where successful (such as in WCC's) instead of SMSs.

**Comment**

**Agreed. Each RCA should have a documented system for managing safety, which is unique to each authority's needs.**

WCC believed that the strategy does not state how GWRC will assist RCA work.

**Comment**

**The strategy's action programme states that GWRC will facilitate regional education programmes where appropriate (also see comment below regarding GWRC support for RCA funding applications).**

WCC wanted the strategy's indicators to be more explicit.

**Comment**

**The indicators are considered very explicit, recording annual figures on death and hospitalisation data, crash numbers, attitude survey results, perception survey results, education campaign results, and SAP data.**

WCC observed that the strategy does not deal with the need for GWRC to support RCA applications to Transfund for safety improvements.

**Comment**

**Agreed. GWRC will support funding requests, where appropriate.**

MJ Williams believes that agency responsibilities must be clear to ensure accountability.

**Comment**

**The "Responsibility and role" column in the Action Programme section clearly sets out the responsibilities and roles of the agencies involved in implementing the strategy's action programme.**

MJ Williams requested actions "that win over the hearts and minds of the public" must be implemented.

**Comment**

**In principle this is lead by the LTSA at a national level. Locally it is a primary role for Road Safety Co-ordinators (RSC's).**

Mr Mike Mellor requested that "provisions of facilities to enable use of safer modes" should be added to the engineering interventions.

**Comment**

**This intervention has already been covered by the SMS action.**

Mr Mike Mellor requested that “promotion of safer modes” be added to the engineering interventions.

**Comment**

**The “promotion of safer modes” is one option available to those people involved in regional road safety interventions, and as such is covered by the strategy’s statement that “appropriate local education campaigns are undertaken” (p11).**

3.2.6 General comments

LTSA supported the strategy in line with RS2010 and the New Zealand Transport Strategy.

UHCC supported the strategy and noted that UHCC already practices the three “E’s” of road safety and is currently preparing a SMS.

CAW was pleased to see vulnerable road users being made a key issue and believes the strategy will be a good guide for regional RCAs.

CAW believed that the strategy should include an expectation that official bodies mentioned in the strategy will work effectively with road user and community groups.

**Comment**

**There is an expectation that RCAs will work effectively with road user and community groups when implementing the strategy. However, as this is standard best practice, there is no need to explicitly state this in the strategy.**

CAW and CH wanted the strategy to acknowledge and address motor vehicle volumes as a regionally significant issue.

**Comment**

**Whether or not GWRC ‘addresses’ car volumes is an issue best dealt within the RLTS, which is currently being reviewed.**

CAW and Cycling Health suggest that the first reference to the Regional Cycling Strategy should come before Appendix 1: Wellington Region’s Road Safety Profile.

**Comment**

**Agreed. As issues associated cyclists and pedestrians are covered in their own respective strategies, this must be made clear early on in the Regional Road Safety Strategy.**

CAW and CH wanted statistics added to ‘Appendix 1: Wellington Region’s Road Safety Profile’ which show that only  $\frac{1}{3}$  of cyclist/motor vehicle collisions are due to cyclists being at fault.

### **Comment**

**It was identified during the initial issue framing exercise that, given a Regional Cycling Strategy has been developed, which deals specifically with regional cycling issues, it was not pertinent to delve into detailed cycling issues in the Regional Road Safety Strategy.**

WCC supported the strategy, but stated that the WCC casualty rate is decreasing, not “increasing or static trend” as quoted on p6 of the strategy.

### **Comment**

**While WCC’s casualty rate has fallen from 396 in 2001 to 380 in 2003, it is still higher than the 357 casualties recorded in 2000. At this point in time, we would classify the trend displayed as “static”.**

WCC noted that the strategy endorses but does not seek to enhance the role of RSC’s.

### **Comment**

**It is the role of RCAs and the LTSA to resource and enhance this activity at an appropriate level.**

WCC also believed that the strategy did not set out a clear and co-ordinated approach for safety education across the region and needed to be more explicit about the roles of TA’s and GWRC in this area.

### **Comment**

**It is not the role of a strategic document such as the Regional Road Safety Strategy to set out a region wide approach, detailing specific agency roles. This is due to the fact that most education programmes are best delivered at a local level, targeting specific local needs, rather than at a region wide level. The exception to this is regional road safety week, which is facilitated by GWRC with support from the entire region’s TAs and LTSA.**

The NZAA’s Wairarapa Council believed that addressing the identified regional issues would not help road safety in the Wairarapa, and that a focus should be on youthful drivers (suggests five implementation ideas) and city drivers going to the Wairarapa for weekends.

### **Comment**

**While it is agreed that youthful drivers are an issue in the Wairarapa, it is not a significant road safety issue for the region as a whole, and as such has not been included in the strategy. Instead, Wairarapa TAs should respond this local issue in their RSAPs, education programmes and Risk Targeted Patrol Plans (RTPPs).**

MJ Williams stated that analysis in ‘Appendix 1: Wellington Region’s Road Safety Profile’ shows a poor understanding of statistics and exaggerates the crash data.

### **Comment**

**The data used in Appendix 1: Wellington Region’s Road Safety Profile has been obtained directly from LTSA (the national agency responsible for**

collating and analysing crash statistics), and shows an accurate picture of current crash statistics. The statistics have been peer reviewed by the Road Safety Technical Working Group and agreed as an accurate representation of the region's road safety "picture".

MJ Williams also believes that funding agencies must direct the measures adopted in the strategy.

**Comment**

**It is appropriate that RCAs are responsible for network management.**

Mr Mike Mellor requested that mode choice to be added to the strategy as a regionally significant issue

**Comment**

**Issues around mode choice are not primarily a regional road safety issue and are more appropriately dealt within the context of the RLTS, which is currently being reviewed.**

Mr Grant Hardie commented that the strategy is clearly presented, but was disappointed that only "generalised" intentions were given.

**Comment**

**The strategy is a strategic document, and as such only higher level intentions are given. It is for the implementing agencies to decide how best to implement the strategy.**

Mr Grant Hardie also noted that there must be continued construction and maintenance of all roading infrastructure.

**Comment**

**This is implicit in the SMS action.**

Ms Nicky Conroy's submission discussed vulnerable road users in rural areas, with specific focus on the Mangaroa area, and its need for engineering improvements.

**Comment**

**Vulnerable road users are covered in the strategy as well as the Regional Cycling and Pedestrian Strategies. Specific local engineering interventions are outside the scope of a regional strategy and better directed by the local authority involved.**

Ms Joy Lory believed that road safety is an issue caused by drivers not taking into account the principles of the Bible and also stated that drunk or careless drivers who cause death or injury should lose their licenses forever and should have their arms cut off.

**Comment**

**These comments are outside the scope of the Regional Road Safety Strategy.**

C.M Flyger suggested safer car design, restricting teenage access to powerful vehicles, regular re-testing of licence holders and banning of cellular phone use in cars while driving would lead to improved road safety.

**Comment**

**All of these suggestions are outside the scope of the Regional Road Safety Strategy, and are being considered at a national level.**

Mr Andrew Branson's submission suggested possible ways of improving road markings to make roads safer.

**Comment**

**Comments on specific engineering practices in road construction are outside the scope of the Regional Road Safety Strategy.**

Mr Chris Thompson believed the strategy should aim to reduced private car use.

**Comment**

**An objective as broad as reduced private car use and the associated mechanisms outlined are system wide and are more appropriately dealt within the context of the RLTS, which is currently being reviewed.**

Mr Chris Thompson also made general comment on specific local level interventions to improve cycling facilities.

**Comment**

**Specific local level interventions are outside the scope of the Regional Road Safety Strategy and comments are better directed to the local authority involved.**

#### **4. Recommended changes to the Regional Road Safety Strategy**

Given the general support of the strategy vision, objectives and actions the strategy does not need significant revision. The following changes are recommended and are incorporated to the strategy document (**attachment 1**):

- An update of Figure 1 and Table 1 to reflect the latest 2003 TA casualty data released by LTSA (pp iii, 6, 7).
- Minor editing of the New Zealand Police's role and responsibilities (p2).
- The addition of a sentence to the Policy Context section outlining the fact that Regional Cycling and Pedestrian Strategies have recently been developed to respond to the needs of cycling and pedestrian road users (p6).
- An update of the Targets section to reflect the changes made to regional 2004 and 2010 targets, as set by the 2004/05 SAP (p10).



- The replacement of the word “using” with “consistent with” in the *SMSs* action of the Action Programme, in order to recognise the fact that some RCAs use systems similar, but not identical to SMSs (p11).
- The addition of GWRC’s role of supporting (where appropriate) RCA’s seeking of funding for road safety works in the *Adequate RCA Road Safety Funding* action of the Action Programme (p11).
- The replacement of Figure 11 with the correct graph (p18).

## 5. Communication

The strategy will be sent to regional road safety stakeholders, submitters and posted on the GWRC website following Council’s consideration of the strategy.

## 6. Recommendations

*That the Committee recommends Council adopt the Regional Road Safety Strategy provided in **attachment 1**.*

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

Report approved by:

**Günther Wild**  
Access Planning Analyst  
Access Planning

**Joe Hewitt**  
Manager  
Access Planning

**Dave Watson**  
Divisional Manager  
Transport

### Attachment

1. Regional Road Safety Strategy