

9 September 2020

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Request for Official Information responded to under the Local Government and Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) – reference: 7386186

I refer to your information request we received on 24 August 2020 for the following:

Subject: RE: RSAG Meeting 19 Aug. – Accessible Streets Submission

[REDACTED] Please forgive this question, but I missed that part of last week's Zoom meeting. I believe that [REDACTED] requested to see the submission.

What is the status of the submission please? Has it been issued to RSAG members as a draft for comment before submitting to the NZTA? Or has the document already been submitted to the NZTA, and this is merely a copy for our information? If it is for our information, may I please ask GM Alison Laws for permission to release the contents to members of my group as a public document?

[REDACTED]

Council response regarding your request

The Kapiti Coast District Council's submission to the New Zealand Transport Agency's Accessible Streets Regulatory Package was lodged on 19 May 2020, during the COVID 19 Alert Level 2 period. The consultation's official closing date was 5pm on Wednesday 20 May 2020.

The RSAG was not approached for comment before the Council's submission was lodged, although I am aware there was interest from individuals within both the RSAG and the CWB Advisory Groups on lodging both individual and group submissions. I can advise you that members of the CWB Advisory Group lodged a group submission and individually, where members had opposing views to the wider group's submission.

A copy of the information you have requested is attached.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Darryn Grant', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Darryn Grant
Acting Group Manager Place and Space
Te Kaihautū Takiwā, Waahi hoki

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="Alison Law"/>
ORGANISATIONS REPRESENTING:	<input type="text" value="Kapiti Coast District Council"/>
ADDRESS:	<input type="text" value="175 Rimu Road Paraparaumu"/>
EMAIL:	<input type="text" value="Alison.Law@kapiticoast.govt.nz"/>
PHONE:	<input type="text" value="04 2964 740"/>

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?

Agree with proposed classification.
With respect to footpaths, priority must remain with pedestrians.

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?

Agree with proposed classification because it gives more clarity and guidance around the definitions and use of wheeled recreational devices (also known as micro mobility).

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?

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?

The clarification around segways remains important to address in light of the fact they have been around for some time (i.e longer than many recent developments in micro mobility) yet their status remains ambiguous because of their high power output. It is relatively easy for the home handyman now to up-rate or build e-bikes with similar or greater power outputs than a

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?

Appears to address issues arising from the development of new wheeled recreational devices and their subsequent classification.

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?

Unpowered transport devices=Strongly agree.
We believe the E-bike is not suitable for use on a footpath, only shared paths cycle paths, cycle lanes or on road.

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?

We are observing mobility scooters traveling at 15+km/hr in town centrr areas that warrant a speed restriction of 5km/hr to be more consistent with pedestrians walking.

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

it is always concerning to observe a mobility scooter traveling in a cycle lane, particularly if it is in the wrong direction, but this now is becoming more common. Speeds of mobility scooters is becoming a concern on shared paths particularly when the shared path transitions into the pedestrianized town center.

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

An informal WOF or health check on mobility scooters over 4-5 years old. Steering and other components wear out depending on the amount of use. Owners should be encouraged to have regular servicing or inspections of their machines, particularly for older models.

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?

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?

Agree with this approach.

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

Essentially Wheeled Recreation Devices should be considered as "guests" on a footpath and they should behave as such. Keep left unless passing and 5km/hr in town centers.

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?

13

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?

Council wants to retain the ability to set rules and regulations that suit local communities.

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 gives a clear and simple path for Councils to adjust their rules and regulations.

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?

So Councils can follow a clear and simple process.

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?

The current footpath rules do not take into account the changes in active mode transportation options and as a society we need to agree how people should behave and use our footpaths.

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?

With respect to footpaths, priority must remain with pedestrians.

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?

Wheeled recreation device users are 'guests' on a footpath and should behave as such. Keep left unless passing and speeds of 5km/hr in town centers.

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?

We agree 15km/hr is an appropriate default limit although individual TLA's may wish to apply their own rules to better suit their local situation. Just how TLA's might enforce any posted limit is another question that should be considered in conjunction with proposal 2b.

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?

Transitional areas from shared paths or footpaths into town centers or other heavily pedestrianized areas are not suitable for 15km/hr speeds by any WRD or mobility scooter. The suggestion that TLA's would want to or even could practically enforce a speed limit needs careful consideration. Share with care is still the most appropriate message.

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

Wheeled recreational devices should be considered as guests on footpaths and should behave as such. Keep left unless passing and speeds should be kept to 5km/hr in town centers. Dogs must be kept on leads.

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?

Under proposal 2, cycles can use the footpath if they ride a cycle no wider than 750mm. We are seeing a slow uptake of adult tricycles and recumbent tricycles as mobility aids in our district that will generally exceed the 750mm dimension suggested for use on footpaths (e.g. these devices can be up to 900mm wide). Even more remarkably, there is one pedal

d h l h i i b h t h i d d h d t h T

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?

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

What is the reason for your response?

Difficult to answer as it is likely that some machines will always exceed maximum width limits for example; powered wheelchairs designed to cross sand. As a rough rule of thumb we have made all bicycle barriers on beach and walkway access points about 900mm wide, accepting that motorbikes will be able to enter but quad bikes and motor vehicles will not.

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?

Options B or C should be able to address any potential issue with wider WRD's. It seems appropriate that TLA's should have some authority to set the limit because of the impact it may have on their existing infrastructure.

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?

We must have paths that are accessible to horse riders on dangerous roads. Road authorities must have the ability to form bridleways, and/or include horse riders on shared paths in rural areas. Horse riders must not be the only legal road user group without access to safe paths.

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?

A shared space is exactly that; shared and therefore the obligation to give way should also be shared. Specific locations will determine who should give way to whom but that should be determined by the users, the same way as pedestrians negotiate their way through a busy shopping center. Why support cyclists having right of way over shared and cycle paths at side streets if they then have to give way to pedestrians every time?

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?

High speed cycle riding belongs on the road. Shared paths are shared, so the maximum speed has to be considered in light of all user groups not just one type. A high speed (50km/hr) cycle path might be considered appropriate if it were one way only. A 50 km/hr default (and even at 30km/hr) still seems too high for an urban shared path.

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?

A resolution allows TLA's more flexibility in influencing the design and use of its active transport assets by its citizens.

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?

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?

We are already seeing other devices used in cycle lanes in an opportunistic manner where it is convenient for the user to do so. This would give that type of existing use legitimacy. Powered transport devices should be required to use cycle lanes where available, rather than footpaths but when they do so, we would recommend they also use helmets.

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?

National guidance would ensure consistency is applied across the regions.

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?

It should be mandatory for scooter riders for example, to use a helmet when traveling in a cycle lane.

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?

Probably not practical as this will vary hugely with the device. E-scooters already come with head lights but retrofitting a tail light or reflector may be problematic. Skateboards and e-skateboards are completely unsuitable for lighting

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?

Its likely that if a powered device were used for commuting then it is not unreasonable to expect it might be used both on and off the road in the course of a journey. Therefore any lighting requirement should be consistent with bicycle lighting requirements.

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?

It can be difficult for cyclists to move into the appropriate lane when traffic has stopped so this seems like a good idea. Perhaps the use of a cycle symbol to indicate the position a cyclist should take could further reinforce this message. Consideration might also be made to allow a cyclist to turn left on a red light, form cycle lane to cycle lane when there is no pedestrian crossing in use

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 already occurring and typical behavior for road cyclists.

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?

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?

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?

National experience in, and broad community understanding of how example 3F operates for both motorists and separated lane users, is required.

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?

Additional questions for road controlling authorities

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

This will likely need a careful introduction to ensure safe integration into our road environment so ensure there are no tragic consequences. Best practice may require additional treatments once experience is gained from design testing.

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

Example 4 C as described in the consultation guidance document as well as national guidance and best practice design standards to ensure the "truck blind spot" concern can be adequately addressed.

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?

The separation for horse riders should be 2m.

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?

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

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?

Overdue if we want to make public transport options a more desirable transport choice.

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?

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