

Notice of Meeting:

I hereby give notice that an ordinary meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee will be held on:

Date: Thursday 14 May 2020
Time: 1:30pm
Venue: to be held remotely by audio and audio visual link.

Sue Bidrose
Chief Executive Officer

Planning and Environment Committee
SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson	Cr David Benson-Pope	
Deputy Chairperson	Cr Sophie Barker	Cr Steve Walker
Members	Cr Rachel Elder	Cr Christine Garey
	Cr Doug Hall	Mayor Aaron Hawkins
	Cr Carmen Houlahan	Cr Marie Laufiso
	Cr Mike Lord	Cr Jim O'Malley
	Cr Jules Radich	Cr Chris Staynes
	Cr Lee Vandervis	Cr Andrew Whiley
Senior Officer	Sandy Graham (General Manager City Services)	
Governance Support Officer	Jennifer Lapham	

Jennifer Lapham
Governance Support Officer

Telephone: 03 477 4000
Jenny.Lapham@dcc.govt.nz
www.dunedin.govt.nz

Note: Reports and recommendations contained in this agenda are not to be considered as Council policy until adopted.

ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
	PART A REPORTS (Committee has power to decide these matters)	
7	DCC Submission - Accessible Streets	4

PART A REPORTS

DCC SUBMISSION - ACCESSIBLE STREETS

Department: Transport

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1 This report seeks approval of the attached submission (Attachment A) to the Ministry of Transport and Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) on the 'Accessible Streets' rules package.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee:

- a) **Approves** the DCC submission to the Ministry of Transport and Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency on the 'Accessible Streets' rules package.

BACKGROUND

- 2 The Ministry of Transport and Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) are seeking public feedback on the 'Accessible Streets' rules package, that will increase the safety and accessibility of our footpaths and streets and encourage active modes of transport.
- 3 The package proposes a number of new rules to respond to the rise of micro-mobility devices like e-scooters. Rule changes are also proposed to improve the safety and efficiency of active transport modes and buses.
- 4 Accessible Streets proposes new rules that would require anyone riding a device on the footpath to give way to pedestrians, to not exceed a speed limit of 15km/h, and for the device to be no wider than 75cm.
- 5 After consulting with their local community, local authorities would be able to reduce the maximum footpath speed limit and restrict which devices can use areas of footpaths, such as during busy times or in high pedestrian areas. Accessible Streets also proposes that bicycles would be able to use the footpath under these conditions.
- 6 The Government is also seeking feedback on a number of other rule changes aimed at making streets safer for vulnerable users. This includes requiring a minimum overtaking gap when passing vulnerable road users like cyclists, horse riders, or those walking on roads without footpaths. The proposed rule is for a one metre minimum passing gap for vehicles when the speed limit is 60km/h or less and 1.5 metres when the speed limit is over 60km/h.

- 7 Other proposed changes include:
 - a) Allowing e-scooters to use cycle lanes and cycle paths;
 - b) Giving buses priority when existing bus stops on roads with a speed limit of 60km/h or less;
 - c) Clarifying road controlling authority powers in relation to parking on berms;
 - d) Categorising vehicles to reflect changes in technology;
 - e) Improving the safety of people walking, cycling and using micro mobility devices by making several give way rule changes.
- 8 Public consultation for the Accessible Streets rules package is being hosted by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (NZTA). The consultation document, FAQs and further information on how to make a submission can be found on the NZTA website: www.nzta.govt.nz/accessible-streets-consultation.
- 9 The consultation was initially open from 9 March to 22 April 2020. The deadline for the consultation was extended in the light of the national response to COVID-19 to 20 May 2020.

DISCUSSION

- 10 The draft DCC submission supports the 'Accessible Streets' rules package. Staff have reviewed the 'Accessible Streets' rules package and have drafted a DCC submission using the NZTA feedback form (Attachment A). The People's Panel Survey Report on the footpath courtesy zone will be attached to the submission as a supporting document.

OPTIONS

Option One – Submit on the 'Accessible Streets' rules package (recommended option)

Advantages

- Enables the DCC to contribute at a national level on development of rules to improve the safety and accessibility of our footpaths and streets and encourage active modes of transport.

Disadvantages

- There are no identified disadvantages for this option.

Option Two – Do not submit on the 'Accessible Streets' rules package (status quo)

Advantages

- There are no identified advantages for this option.

Disadvantages

- Missed opportunity for the DCC to engage on the development of rules to improve the safety and accessibility of our footpaths and streets and encourage active modes of transport.

NEXT STEPS

- 11 If the Committee approves the submission, it will be sent to NZTA ahead of 20 May 2020.

Signatories

Author:	Tami Sargeant - Team Leader Regulatory Management - Transport Simone Handwerk - Senior Transport Planner
Authoriser:	Nick Sargent - Transport Strategy Manager Jeanine Benson - Group Manager Transport

Attachments

	Title	Page
A	Draft DCC Accessible Streets submission	8

SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS
Fit with purpose of Local Government

This decision enables democratic local decision making and action by, and on behalf of communities and supports the social, environmental, economic and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future.

Fit with strategic framework

	Contributes	Detracts	Not applicable
Social Wellbeing Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economic Development Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environment Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arts and Culture Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3 Waters Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Spatial Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrated Transport Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks and Recreation Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other strategic projects/policies/plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The submission has been developed in line with the goals and objectives of the strategic framework, in particular, the objectives of the Integrated Transport Strategy, the Social Wellbeing Strategy.

Māori Impact Statement

There are no known impacts for tangata whenua.

Sustainability

Sustainability is an underlying principle of the DCC's strategic framework. While there are no specific impacts for sustainability resulting from a decision to approve the draft DCC submission, the proposals note the significant potential for reduced emissions through encouraging modal shift.

10 year plan/Annual Plan / Financial Strategy /Infrastructure Strategy

There are no implications for the 10 year plan.

Financial considerations

There are no financial implications.

Significance

The significance of this decision is considered low in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

Engagement – external

There has been no external engagement.

Engagement - internal

Staff from Transport Strategy and Regulatory Services have contributed to the development of this submission.

Risks: Legal / Health and Safety etc.

There are no known risks.

Conflict of Interest

There are no known conflicts of interest.

Community Boards

Community Boards may be interested in the content of the draft submission.



ACCESSIBLE STREETS CONSULTATION

Submission form

The Ministry of Transport and Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency are proposing a collection of rule changes that we call the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package.

Thank you for taking time to tell us what you think. Please answer as many or as few questions as you choose to answer.

You can find information about these proposals in the Accessible Streets Overview (available at www.nzta.govt.nz/accessible-streets-consultation), which includes the same questions included in this online submission form. You may want to have the Accessible Streets Overview open in a different window or printed alongside you.

Please remember your submission is public information and we will use your submission to help us make the changes to the rules.

Please note that the Transport Agency will publish a summary of submissions. If you do not want your name or any identifying information to be included in anything we publish (including because you believe your comments are commercially sensitive) please indicate this clearly in your submission.

Please note that your submission is also subject to the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA). This means that other people will be able to obtain copies of submissions by making a request under the OIA. If you think there are grounds for your information to be withheld under the OIA, please note this in your submission. We will take your reasons into account and may consult with you when responding to requests under the OIA.

1. Please answer a few questions about yourself

NAME:	<input type="text" value="+++"/>
ORGANISATIONS REPRESENTING:	<input type="text" value="Dunedin City Council"/>
ADDRESS:	<input type="text" value="50 The Octagon, Dunedin 9016"/>
EMAIL:	<input type="text" value="transport@dcc.govt.nz"/>
PHONE:	<input type="text" value="03 477 4000"/>

Proposal 1: Change and re-name the types of devices that used on footpath, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes

Proposal 1A: Pedestrians and powered wheelchair users

2. We are proposing to include people using powered wheelchairs in the pedestrian category. How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

Wheelchairs are essential to the movement of people using them, and this would increase accessibility for people who rely on powered wheelchairs. DCC surveys on e-scooters and our footpath courtesy zone also show support for this.

Proposal 1B: Changing wheeled recreational devices

3. Our proposed change will replace the wheeled recreational device category with two new groups of devices: unpowered transport devices (for example push-scooters, skateboards) and powered transport devices (for example e-scooters, YikeBikes).

We are proposing to include people using powered wheelchairs in the pedestrian category. How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☒ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

It is important to have clear categories that allow users to understand the rules for using vehicles and devices on our transport network. It also supports councils to design and plan infrastructure and regulations accordingly.

4. We're proposing that the new category of powered transport devices will consist of low-powered devices that have been declared by the Transport Agency not to be a motor vehicle.

What steps (if any), do you think the Transport Agency should take before declaring a vehicle not to be a motor vehicle?

We suggest creating a catalogue of all the devices and their category. Clear and easy identification of devices is essential. Education, from a national level, about this identification system is important.

5. If the Transport Agency declares a vehicle to not be a motor vehicle, do you think it should be able to impose conditions?

☒ Yes
☐ No

6. If yes, should the Transport Agency be able to apply conditions regardless of the power output of the device?

☒ Yes
☐ No

What was the reason for your answer? Do you have any other comments?

This would enable the Transport Agency to react to new and emerging technologies in a coherent way across the country. A robust process for imposing these conditions is required to ensure good decision making and reduce the risk of lobbying.

7. We propose to clarify that:

- a) low powered vehicles that have not been declared not to be motor vehicles by the Transport Agency (e.g. hover boards, e-skateboards and other emerging devices) are not allowed on the footpath
- b) these vehicles are also not allowed on the road under current rules, because they do not meet motor vehicle standards and cannot be registered.
- c) if the Transport Agency declares any of these vehicles not to be motor vehicles in the future, they will be classified as powered transport devices and will be permitted on the footpath and the road (along with other paths and cycle lanes).

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

Transition would be easier over time if there was more flexibility. There are a range of vehicles now that do not comply with current rules.

Proposal 1C: Clarifying cycles and e-bikes

8. Child cycles that are not propelled by cranks, such as balance bikes, will be defined as transport devices.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

We support how these categories are defined and that it does not restrict access to users of child cycles on footpath and shared paths.

Proposal 1D: Mobility devices

9. We're proposing that users of mobility devices will have the same level of access as pedestrians, but they will have to give way to pedestrians and wheelchair users.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

Mobility devices should have the same level of access as pedestrians but everyone should give way to other slower users on the footpath, such as kids on balancing bikes, pedestrians, and wheelchairs. We suggest this general rule to all users sharing paths: give way to all other slower users on the same path.

10. Do you think there will be any safety or access-related problems with mobility devices operating in different spaces? Please explain.

Safety or access-related problems could exist and therefore, establish a national framework where mobility devices, transport devices, and cycles on the footpath/ shared path need to meet speed, width and behavioural requirements is important.

11. We intend to review the mobility device category at a later date. What factors do you think we need to consider?

Speed and width for the different types of users. Clear recommendations for users on how to behave sharing footpaths with other users. Education starting at a national level is an essential factor to be taken into account.

Alternative proposal

12. We have outlined an option to not change vehicle definitions. This means we would make changes at a later date instead. Do you prefer this option to our proposal to change vehicle definitions now (see proposals 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D for more details)? Why/why not?

No, vehicle definitions should be explicit and that this should be done as soon as possible. Uncategorised devices should be avoided. Please refer to answers to Questions 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D.

Proposal 2: Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths

13. Our proposed changes will allow mobility devices, transport devices, and cycles on the footpath – provided users meet speed, width and behavioural requirements.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

Clarification of what users are allowed to do, enables a safer environment for all users. This also helps to create a more inclusive system for sharing spaces. This is in line with the Government Policy Statement on Transport and Arataki Version 1.

14. Do you think there should be any other requirements, in addition to speed, width and behaviour?

Those 3 factors are enough. We do emphasize the importance of education and promotion of requirements from a national level if changes are made.

15. We have outlined two alternative options to address cycling on the footpath. These are:

- a) Allow cyclists up to 16 years of age to use the footpath
- b) Continue the status quo, where most cyclists are not allowed to use the footpath.
- c) Neither option.

What option do you prefer instead of allowing cyclists on the footpath?

- ☒ A
- ☐ B
- ☐ C

16. Would you support an age limit for cycling on the footpath? What age would you prefer?

- ☒ Yes, I would support an age limit
- ☐ No, I would not support an age limit

If yes, what age would you prefer?

Young cyclists would be able to build their confidence and then transition to the road when they are ready, noting that age limits would not take into account other factors such as conditions of adjacent roads and ability and confidence of cyclists, so RCAs should have the ability to change the default restriction and permit cyclists of any age to ride on the footpath. Consider a lower age of 12 years old.

17. We propose to allow road controlling authorities to restrict cycle or device use on certain footpaths or areas of footpaths to suit local communities and conditions.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments, including on the proposed process?

It is essential for road controlling authorities to apply a case by case approach depending on the location and condition of footpaths.

18. We envisage that local authorities will make decisions to regulate the use of paths by resolution, rather than by making a bylaw. Do you agree this be specified in the Land Transport Rule: Path and Road Margins 2020 to provide certainty?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

What are the reasons for your answer? Do you have any other comments?

This will provide greater flexibility to respond to and cater for emerging devices in local areas. The Council's Significance and Engagement Policy would be used when making any decision and consultation is an important part of this process.

Alternative proposal

19. We're proposing that road controlling authorities consider and follow certain criteria in addition to their usual resolution processes if they want to restrict devices from using the footpath. These criteria are:

- consider relevant guidance developed by the Transport Agency
- consider any alternative routes or facilities that will no longer be available to the user due to a restriction
- consider any other matter relevant to public safety.

The road controlling authority will need to:

- consult with any party affected by the proposed restriction
- give those parties reasonable time to respond
- take their submissions into account

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about how will this affect you or whether you think the proposed changes are practical?

The DCC currently consults with affected parties on proposed changes to traffic and parking, and speed limits. The DCC supports consultation with affected parties and we welcome further guidance from the NZTA.

20. We have also outlined an option to maintain current footpath rules. Would you prefer this option instead of the proposed framework with speed and width requirements? Why/why not?

We prefer the proposed framework with speed and width requirements as it provides the ability for the Council to develop restrictions based on conditions, needs, demands and particularities of our local community and built environment.

Proposal 2A: Users on the footpath will operate vehicles in a courteous and considerate manner, travel in a way that isn't dangerous and give right of way to pedestrians

21. We propose that pedestrians should always have right of way on the footpath.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

We agree with the proposal to give pedestrians right of way on the footpath as this will ensure vulnerable individuals (young and elderly) are not unduly injured by transport devices wanting to overtake them at speed. Being courteous and giving way will ensure the safety for all users of the footpath. DCC surveys on e-scooters and our footpath courtesy zone also show support for this.

22. This proposal will require footpath users to operate vehicles in a courteous and considerate manner; travel in a way that isn't dangerous; and give way to pedestrians.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☒ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was the reason for your rating? Are there any other requirements we should consider?

There is a large speed differential between pedestrians walking on the footpath and transport devices. Courtesy and consideration are vital to ensuring all users are safe whilst traversing the footpath.

Proposal 2B: Default 15km/h speed limit for vehicles using the footpath

23. We are proposing to set a default speed limit of 15km/h for footpaths.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☒ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What is the reason for your rating? Do you think the proposed speed limit should be higher or lower?

Recommend reducing the speed limit further (10km/h) to reduce the severity of any crashes. This becomes critical where speeds are harder to manage (eg. less pedestrian traffic). It is unclear how users would know how fast they're going without a speedometer and there's no detail on how speeding will be enforced. Responses in our footpath courtesy zone trial were split on whether 15km/h was an

24. Under the proposed changes, road controlling authorities will be able to lower the default speed limit for a footpath or area of footpaths.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☒ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What is the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

It's critical that local councils have the ability to tailor speed limits to suit their specific conditions and in specific areas as a 'one size fits all' approach may not be appropriate.

25. Are there other ways that you can think of to improve footpath safety? Please explain.

There are a few ways to increase safety on footpaths namely, overtaking vehicles to do so on the right hand side only, pedestrians to keep left where possible, transport devices are not allowed to ride 2+ abreast. Could consider that transport devices ride on the right side of the footpath at all times.

Proposal 2C: 750mm width restriction for vehicles that operate on the footpath

26. We are proposing that the width of devices used on the footpath should not exceed 750mm (with the exception of wheelchairs). Do you think this is:

- ☐ Too wide
☒ About right
☐ Too narrow

What is the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

750mm is the standard size for a wheelchair. However, there are a large number of footpaths which are narrow due to site constraints. This means that the 750mm wide devices might push pedestrians on the road or berm when trying to overtake.

27. Do you use a mobility device?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, what is the width of your device? Would the proposed width restriction impact you?

N/A

28. Should a maximum width limit apply to mobility devices?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

What is the reason for your response?

There should be a maximum width criteria to ensure we understand the risks and constraints when undertaking any footpath renewals or construction works.

29. We propose that people who already own a device wider than 750mm could apply for an exemption. We're also considering three alternative approaches to mitigate the impact on existing device owners.

Which is your preferred option?

- ☒ a. Mobility devices purchased before the rule changes would be automatically exempt from the width limit.
☐ b. The Transport Agency could declare certain wider devices to be mobility devices under section 168A of the Land Transport Act and exclude them from width requirements.
☐ c. Apply a separate width limit to mobility devices.

Do you have any comments on these alternatives?

It's good to have a cut off date to ensure everyone knows the rules and aren't unduly affected by the changes.

Proposal 3: Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths

30. We are proposing that a person using a shared path or cycle path must travel:

- a) in a careful and considerate manner
- b) at a speed that is not dangerous to other people on the path
- c) in a way that doesn't interfere with other people using the path.

How much do you agree or disagree with these proposed behavioural requirements?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ I don't know

What is the reason for your rating? Should there be other requirements or rules to use a shared path or cycle path?

In addition to the above three behavioural recommendations, nationally led and developed education and promotion is crucial for behavioural change on shared paths and cycle paths. The use of alert devices (such as bells) for people on bikes or transport devices using shared paths and cycle paths should be a requirement for all transport devices.

31. We propose that all users will need to give way to pedestrians when using a shared path.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☒ I don't know

What is the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

The give way rule as per the road code cannot be applied to shared paths, however it should be a "yield" to other users of shared paths towards pedestrians.

32. We propose that, if a shared path or cycle path is adjacent to a roadway, the speed limit will be the same as the roadway – which is currently the case. If a shared path or cycle path is not located beside or adjacent to a roadway, then our proposed change clarifies that the path has a default speed limit of 50km/h.

How much do you agree or disagree with the proposed speed limits for shared paths and cycle paths?

- ☒ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What is the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments, including on the proposal to allow road controlling authorities to change limits?

50 km/h on a shared path is too high and is not safe or sensible limit and suggest a speed limit of 30km/h.

33. We are proposing that road controlling authorities should be able to declare a path a shared path or a cycle path by making a resolution.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☒ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What is the reason for your rating? What factors should be considered when road controlling authorities make this decision?

Agree with this proposal as it allows for flexibility and network connectivity.

34. Do you think that the Transport Agency should be able to investigate and direct road controlling authorities to comply with the required criteria?

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

What is the reason for your response? Do you have any other comments?

The NZTA should have the ability to investigate but not to require councils to comply with the required criteria. Councils are best placed to understand their local communities based on their needs and requirements.

Proposal 4: Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths

35. We are proposing that devices other than cycles should be allowed to use cycle lanes and/or cycle paths?

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What is the reason for your rating? Should there be any other requirements?

This would give transport and mobility devices more options to get around the city, and the options could be safer in some instances e.g. cycle lane instead of road.

36. We are proposing that road controlling authorities should be able to exclude transport devices from cycle lanes and/or cycle paths?

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What is the reason for your rating? Should there be any other requirements?

Provides councils with discretion to restrict transport devices based on community interests and/or local environment constraints.

Proposal 5: Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night

37. We are proposing that powered transport devices must be fitted with a headlamp, rear facing position light, and be fitted with a reflector (unless the user is wearing reflective material) if they are used at night.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was your reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

This should be safer.

38. Do you think these requirements are practical? For example, if you own a powered transport device, will you be able to purchase and attach a reflector or lights to your device or yourself?

These requirements are practical and align with cycling requirements.

39. Do you think unpowered transport device users should be required to meet the same lighting and reflector requirements as powered transport device users at night time?

This would increase safety, proposed that this should be a recommendation for transport devices and not a requirement.

Proposal 6: Remove barriers to walking, transport device use and cycling through rule changes

Proposal 6A: Allow cycles and transport devices to travel straight ahead from a left turn lane

40. We propose that cyclists and users of transport devices (like skateboards and escooters) should be able to ride straight ahead from a left turn lane at an intersection, when it is safe to do so.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was your reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

We agree in general but note there could be conflicts depending on the traffic layout (eg two exit lanes for turning traffic). Traffic signals need to accommodate for vehicles to turn left and cyclists to travel straight through the left turning lane at the same time; cyclists would need to take the lane, so that they are not being cut off by vehicles; and national education campaigns are needed if this proposal is

Proposal 6B: Allow cycles and transport devices to carefully pass slow-moving vehicles on the left, unless a motor vehicle is indicating a left turn

41. We propose that cyclists and users of transport devices (like skateboards and escooters) should be allowed to 'undertake' slow-moving traffic.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was your reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

This is a common practice already and should be allowed as long it is safe to do so (enough space for them to do so) and as long as cyclists don't undertake any vehicles indicating to turn left. This would enable cyclists and users of transport device to wait for signals to turn green in front of the queue instead of within the queue, which is a safer and healthier place for them. Suggest conflict is minimised

Proposal 6C: Give cycles, transport devices and buses priority over turning traffic when they're travelling through an intersection in a separated lane

42. We propose that turning traffic should give way to buses, cyclists, and users of transport devices travelling straight through an intersection from a separated lane.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was your reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

Support in principle, but have concerns about the safety of buses, cyclists, and users of transport devices as drivers of left turning vehicles may not see them (blind spots) or look for them, particularly at uncontrolled intersections. More detail on how to resolve those challenges would be required to assess the proposed law change.

43. Our proposed change will introduce a list of traffic control devices used to separate lanes from the roadway to help you understand what a separated lane is and if the user has right of way at an intersection. Is such a list necessary?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

What was your reason for your response? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

The list of traffic control devices is important to provide a clear and wide understanding about who has the right of way and to ensure safety of buses, cyclists, and users of transport devices. The list should be advisory only and final decision remains with the RCAs.

44. Should the definition of a separated lane include the distance between the lane and the road?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

What was your reason for your response? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

A degree of flexibility is required to accommodate site specific constraints. A case-by-case analysis is preferred.

Proposal 6D: Give priority to footpath, shared path and cycle path users over turning traffic where the necessary traffic control devices are installed

45. We propose that turning traffic should give way to path users crossing a side road with the proposed minimum markings of two parallel white lines.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☒ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was your reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

Many accidents involving pedestrians in Dunedin relate to turning traffic and changing the rule would give priority to pedestrians.

Additional questions for road controlling authorities

46. Do you think that the proposed minimum markings of two parallel white lines are appropriate? Please explain.

Yes, however speed management measures such as raised platforms or kerb build-outs should be installed on key walking/cycling routes.

47. We are proposing future guidance for additional treatments. Is there any guidance that you would like to see or recommend? Please explain.

Yes, guidance on speed management measures such as raised platforms or kerb build-outs.

Proposal 7: Mandate a minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles passing cycles, transport devices, horses, pedestrians and people using mobility devices on the road

48. We are proposing a mandatory minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles of 1 metre (when the speed limit is 60km/h or less), and 1.5 metres (when the speed limit is over 60km/h) when passing pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, and users of other devices.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☒ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was your reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

Supportive of the principle of introducing a minimum overtaking gap but consider the minimum distance is too small, and suggest a minimum overtaking gap of 1.5m regardless of the speed limit. This would avoid confusion and ensure safety of pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, and users of other devices. a minimum overtaking gap of 1m when the speed limit is 60km/h or less is not enough, particularly at those higher speeds above 30km/h due to the increased likelihood and severity of crashes at those

Proposal 8: Clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berms

49. We are proposing that road controlling authorities should be able to restrict berm parking without the use of signs and instead rely on an online register.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☒ Strongly agree
☐ I don't know

What was your reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

Road controlling authorities should be able to restrict berm parking without the use of signs and instead rely on an on-line register. Recommend that where the road controlling authority resolves to allow berm parking (in particular areas where it is in the best interests of road users) then those areas should be signed.

50. Would it be helpful if information on berm parking restrictions was available in other places, like at a local library, i-SITE, or a local council?

Yes it would be helpful. The DCC currently publishes all of its parking restrictions online.

Proposal 9: Give buses priority when exiting bus stops

51. We propose that road users should give way to indicating buses leaving a signed bus stop on a road with a speed limit of 60km/h or less.

How much do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Strongly agree
- ☐ I don't know

What was your reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments about the proposal?

Priority for buses will reduce travel times and increase punctuality of buses. At the same time delays for vehicles needing to give way is unlikely to be noticeable.

52. Should traffic give way to buses in other situations? For example, when a bus is exiting a bus lane and merging back into traffic lanes?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

In what situations should traffic give way to buses? What was your reason for your response? Do you have any other comments?

Priority for buses will reduce travel times and increase punctuality of buses. At the same time delays for vehicles needing to give way is unlikely to be noticeable. Please note, Dunedin does not have experience with bus lanes currently. Furthermore, consider increasing this to when exiting bus stops.

Thank you for making a submission on the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package.

Visit www.nzta.govt.nz/accessible-streets-consultation for updates or if you have any questions please email us at accessible.streets@nzta.govt.nz