

City of Greater Dandenong

Date: 6 Nov'19

Response to National Transport Commission's issue paper:

Barrier to the safe use of motorised mobility devices: discussion paper

Question 1: Do you agree with aligning the maximum unladen mass with the ATS or is there a more appropriate response to overcome the regulatory barriers identified? Please provide evidence to support your position.

The alignment with the ATS is sensible and improves access to mobility as identified by AustRoads. This will maximise mobility options by increasing options and reduce the risk of accidentally buying a non-compliant device.

Maximum mass limits when fully laden should be included within design criteria at all certifications levels to ensure public infrastructure is able to support MMDs.

The increased safety issues should be addressed by ensuring responsible use of the devices and appropriate braking and turning requirements.

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed pedestrian classification? Is it appropriate that all MMD operators are required to follow the pedestrian road rules? Please provide evidence to support your position.

We agree with classifying MMD users as pedestrians. These devices are allowing pedestrians that would otherwise not be able to access pedestrian spaces due to their mobility restrictions to be able to access pedestrian spaces. Existing road rules apply for pedestrians when on roads that can be extended to MMDs when on roads. The speed restriction implied in this proposal would need to be part of MMD specifications to prevent an MMD from being able to travel over 10km/h.

MMD operators should also be classified as pedestrians and should need to follow the rules when operating the MMD. This should consider the operation of the MMD as the same as their physical self (effectively extension of their body).