

NZTA – Lane Improvement Rule Consultation, March 2026

Please tell us some information about you:

Your name

Your email

Are you submitting:

Individually

On behalf of a business or organisation

Please tell us the name of the business or organisation

The following questions seek your feedback on each proposal. For each proposal, we ask if you agree with the change, the assessment of impacts, and if there are any practical, safety, or accessibility issues that we should consider if the proposal goes ahead.

Proposal 1

Do you agree with allowing children aged 12 years and under to ride bikes on footpaths?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

We support on the proviso that, for the safety of pedestrians, children riding bicycles are required to:

1. give way to pedestrians, and
2. ride slowly past pedestrians, as some pedestrians (particularly the elderly) are unsteady on their feet and may be startled by a bike suddenly appearing beside them.

Are there any other impacts that need to be considered (such as safety, accessibility, and compliance) if the proposal is implemented?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

1. If the rule is implemented, it should be supported by an education campaign reminding parents to actively supervise their young children, as many children ride well ahead of their caregivers and may not look out for residents exiting driveways, and sight line obstructions can make it difficult for motorists exiting driveways to clearly see adequate distances of footpath. (See comments below re parking on berms).
2. Where there are high numbers of pedestrians and young cyclists sharing facilities, e.g., in close proximity to schools, the risks of harm to each are likely to be increased by the proposed change. We ask that the government consider increased funding support for the construction of shared paths in such areas if the change is implemented, to help reduce this risk.
3. If implemented, we would ask that it be made clear whether there is a lower age limit differentiating as to when children must be supervised and when then they may ride independently or if it is intended that all children under 12 must be supervised.

Proposal 2

Do you agree with introducing a minimum passing distance when drivers overtake other road users (such as cyclists, horse riders, and micro-mobility users)?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

We support this proposal however, we believe there should be one standard distance - to reduce the possibility of confusion for the public - and that this should be well publicised.

Are there any other impacts that need to be considered (such as safety, accessibility, and compliance) if the proposal is implemented?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

In our experience, it is likely motorists will have difficulty judging the difference between 1m and 1.5m. We recommend that 1.5m is the default distance to ensure motorists give a wide gap.

Proposal 3

Do you agree with allowing e-scooters to be used in cycle lanes?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

We support this proposal, on the proviso that e-scooter riders are required to wear helmets just like cyclists, given increasing injury statistics (Refer to ACC <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/587590/e-scooter-injuries-on-the-rise-young-people-most-affected>)

Are there any other impacts that need to be considered (such as safety, accessibility, and compliance) if the proposal is implemented?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

Refer further to ACC data <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/587590/e-scooter-injuries-on-the-rise-young-people-most-affected>

Proposal 4

Do you support requiring drivers to give way to buses leaving bus stops on roads with speed limits of 60 km/h or less?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

Yes, we support this, as this will help buses to better meet timetabling requirements.

Are there any other impacts that need to be considered (such as safety, accessibility, and compliance) if the proposal is implemented?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

As with the passing gap requirement above, this change will need to be well publicised to ensure drivers are aware of the new requirements.

Proposal 5

Do you agree with the proposal to clarify that signage is not required for berm parking rules to be enforceable?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

Yes, we support this, subject to the caveats in the following answer.

Are there any other impacts that need to be considered (such as safety, accessibility, and compliance) if the proposal is implemented?

Yes

No

Not sure

Please explain your answer or provide any relevant examples or evidence.

We support ensuring there is clarity in the Road User Rule that nothing in that Rule or Traffic Control Devices Rule means that signage is required in order to enforce a local authority's bylaws or parking controls.

However, compliance with parking bylaws without signage relies on motorists being familiar with parking restrictions councils make from time to time through Council resolution.

Therefore, we recommend that the rules encourage (not require) local authorities to particularly focus on signage by exception, where council does not want berm parking for safety reasons.

This is particularly important in considering how this change may interact with Proposal 1, as berm parking has the potential to obscure sightlines for both cyclists riding on footpaths and motorists exiting driveways.

If you're happy with your answers, click submit to end your survey. Submitted 19 March 2026