


## **Inquiry into e-mobility safety and use in Queensland**

<b>Submission No:</b>	1043
<b>Submitted by:</b>	
<b>Publication:</b>	Making the submission public but withholding your name
<b>Attachments:</b>	See attachment
<b>Submitter Comments:</b>	

Dear Chair and Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment into the *Inquiry into e-mobility safety and use in Queensland*. I note that the terms of reference (ToR) of the inquiry are:

*That the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee inquire into and report to the Legislative Assembly no later than 30 March 2026 on:*

- 1. Benefits of e-mobility (including both Personal Mobility Devices (PMDs), such as e-scooters and e-skateboards, as well as e-bikes) for Queensland;*
- 2. Safety issues associated with e-mobility use, including increasing crashes, injuries, fatalities, and community concerns;*
- 3. Issues associated with e-mobility ownership, such as risk of fire, storage and disposal of lithium batteries used in emobility, and any consideration of mitigants or controls;*
- 4. Suitability of current regulatory frameworks for PMDs and ebikes, informed by approaches in Australia and internationally;*
- 5. Effectiveness of current enforcement approaches and powers to address dangerous riding behaviours and the use of illegal devices;*
- 6. Gaps between Commonwealth and Queensland laws that allow illegal devices to be imported and used;*
- 7. Communication and education about device requirements, rules, and consequences for unsafe use; and*
- 8. Broad stakeholder perspectives, including from community members, road user groups, disability advocates, health and trauma experts, academia, the e-mobility industry, and all levels of government.*

My response to the terms of reference and inquiry is below:

Para.

1. I reside in Brisbane's inner city in a small apartment and have chosen not to own a private motor vehicle. This decision supports a more local lifestyle and enables me to take advantage of public and active transport options. However, this choice is not without challenges, as Brisbane's inner core remains highly car-dependent. To bridge the gaps between public transport services, particularly for short errands, I have purchased an e-scooter that is limited to 25 km/h.
2. I have reviewed the submissions published on the inquiry website as at 19 June 2025, and I note that many appear not to be written by regular users of personal mobility devices. I hope this is taken into account to ensure a balanced understanding of both user and non-user perspectives.

3. In response to Point 1 of the Terms of Reference, e-scooters and e-bikes are an increasingly important part of the transport mix in our cities and towns. These devices improve accessibility for people who may be unable to ride a conventional bicycle, particularly in hilly areas or over longer distances. In regional areas, e-bikes have supported the growth of bicycle tourism. In urban settings, e-scooters offer quick and convenient access across short distances and help to ease pressure on congested road networks.
4. The continued growth of e-mobility depends heavily on the availability of safe and protected cycling infrastructure. Just as internet users are limited by the quality of external networks, e-mobility users are constrained by gaps in the active transport network, which are beyond their control.
5. I personally use my e-scooter for short errands such as going to the supermarket. While I prefer to walk, this is not always practical during Brisbane's hot summer months. The e-scooter gives me a level of mobility and convenience that is not easily provided by other modes of transport. I know many others in a similar position who rely on e-scooters and e-bikes for local trips. These devices offer meaningful benefits to individuals while reducing reliance on private cars and helping to lower traffic congestion.
6. In response to Point 2 of the Terms of Reference, I acknowledge that there are some safety and amenity concerns, such as shared e-scooters being left on footpaths. However, these issues can be addressed through well-designed infrastructure, such as dedicated scooter parking bays within former car parking spaces. Incentives could be offered to users who park in these locations. A combination of regulatory and incentive-based approaches is likely to be the most effective. This issue is not unique to Brisbane and has also been observed in other cities such as Hobart, where narrow CBD footpaths increase the impact of poorly parked devices.
7. While I acknowledge that serious injuries have occurred, the number of incidents involving personal mobility devices remains very low compared to those involving private motor vehicles. I do not support the proposal for mandatory full-face helmets for e-scooter riders. This suggestion, promoted by groups such as RACQ, would significantly reduce the practicality of e-scooters for short local trips. Personally, I am not comfortable leaving a helmet locked to my scooter and must carry it with me in shops, which is manageable. However, requiring bulkier helmets would deter many users and undermine the benefits of e-scooters as a quick and flexible option for short journeys.
8. I also challenge RACQ's proposal for seated hire scooters. From a safety perspective, these devices are less visible to drivers. According to Austroads and the Australian Standards, driver sightlines are typically measured from 1.1 metres above ground level. Seated scooters are unlikely to meet this requirement consistently. If RACQ is aware of standard driver sight distances, this omission raises concerns about the accuracy and rigour of their broader arguments.
9. If groups such as RACQ succeed in influencing policy to restrict or redesign e-scooter use in ways that serve car drivers rather than e-scooter users, then it would be fair and reasonable to apply the same level of scrutiny to the safety of private motor vehicles. Given their

contribution to road trauma, perhaps it is time to consider full-face helmets for car drivers as well.

10. While I am not an expert in fire safety or battery storage, I support the inclusion of secure e-mobility storage in apartment developments across Queensland. Planning schemes should require at least one lockable, fire-rated storage facility per dwelling, with access to a power point for charging. It is often difficult to find a secure area with charging access in strata buildings. Although scooter fires have received media attention, these events are rare and comparable to the risks associated with other battery-powered devices, including electric cars.
11. I do not have experience with regulatory frameworks.
12. In my view, current enforcement approaches are generally effective. There should be consistent enforcement across all transport modes. For example, while e-scooter speed limits should be enforced, so too should infringements by drivers, such as vehicles blocking bike lanes or footpaths, and breaches of the one metre minimum passing distance rule. Helmet laws should apply to on-road use only. On footpaths, a 12 km/h speed limit should be sufficient to allow safe use without requiring helmets. I expect technology will continue to evolve and support better regulation over time.
13. I have no detailed comments on the illegal importation of devices, other than to state that all pathways for unsafe or non-compliant imports should be closed. Devices should be legal and meet Australian safety standards.
14. I have no comment on Point 8 of the Terms of Reference.
15. I trust that the Committee will ensure a fair and balanced analysis that accounts for the perspectives of both users and non-users of e-mobility devices. I also note that many users of hire e-scooters, particularly tourists and visitors, are unlikely to be aware of or respond to this inquiry.
16. I would like to highlight that public inquiries are often structured in ways that favour older individuals and established lobby groups, who are more likely to be aware of such processes and have the time to participate. These groups are also more likely to hold negative views about personal mobility devices. In contrast, younger generations who are regular users of e-scooters may be unaware of the inquiry or its potential impact. The relatively small number of pro-e-scooter submissions should not be interpreted as a lack of support. Rather, they are likely to represent a broader user base that lacks formal advocacy or representation.
17. I thank the Committee for considering my submission. I would be happy to elaborate on any points raised or provide further data to support my position if required.
18. Thank you.