

Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026

Submission No: 1529

Submission By: Greater Brisbane

Publication: Making the submission and your name public

Wednesday 8 April 2026

State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee
Parliament of Queensland
BRISBANE QLD 4000



by email only: SDIWC@parliament.qld.gov.au

To whom it may concern:

Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026

Thank you for the invitation to provide feedback on the draft legislation.

As Brisbane's largest grassroots housing advocacy organisation, we want to express our strong opposition to parts of this legislation and highlight the impacts these changes will have on mode choice and therefore housing choice.

This bill, as drafted, is incongruent with the government's stated ambitions to boost daily physical activity in advance of the Brisbane 2032 Games and with plans for urban intensification to address Queensland's rapidly-worsening housing crisis.

The stated purpose of this bill is admirable — to crack down on the use of illegal electric motorbikes and improve safety for pedestrians. The proliferation of illegal electric motorbikes over the last five years has been widely reported as has the use of electric motor scooters by drivers under the influence of alcohol and not wearing appropriate safety equipment.

Greater Brisbane supports reasonable and moderate regulatory changes that protect pedestrians, require constant pedalling and restrict electric assist in line with EN15194 standards and take dangerous high-powered electric motorcycles off our streets.

Unfortunately, this bill includes some changes that are not reasonable and moderate.

Many ebike and scooter users ride legal devices, obey the road rules and commute using these devices daily with little fanfare or impact on other commuters — but this bill chooses to penalise these riders who are commuting safely and significantly reducing congestion for other road users.

Despite clear representations from transport experts and the government's own department that any regulatory regime needs to draw a distinction between the minority of illegal high-powered electric motorcycles and the majority legal EN15194-compliant ebikes, this bill as drafted fails to do so.

The conventional model for housing growth — the city as a job market — sees transport modeshare, in particular the diversity, frequency and consistency of transport choices between potential jobs and potential homes, as a key driver of housing affordability (through increased choice) and job creation (through agglomeration).

In many of the most dynamic housing and employment markets globally — powerhouses like New York, London, Tokyo and Singapore — a shift away from underutilised private transport (ie cars with only the driver in it) towards physically smaller point-to-point transport like bicycles, scooters and walking in high value neighbourhoods is a key part of unlocking growth in these areas.

Amid a housing crisis driven in large part by the undersupply of housing in high demand areas and a fuel crisis that are exacerbated by a modeshift back to underutilised private transport, it is prima facie ludicrous for the state government to pursue a legislative agenda that penalises commuter cyclists riding safely.

In fact, these changes will make Queensland the world's most burdensome and confusing jurisdiction for people choosing an active alternative to driving. This flies directly in the face of Queensland's aspirations to encourage healthy lifestyles, physical activity and a world-class city in the lead up to the Brisbane 2032 Games.

These changes do nothing to stop retailers selling illegal electric motorbikes "for private property use" while it will have a meaningful impact on the viability of legal commuter ebike retailers like Lug+Carrie and Sparque and rental services like Lime and Neuron and there is a real risk that they may need to withdraw from the Queensland market following these changes. These businesses are diligent about following the law and ensuring their customers do too. This bill makes their business unviable while doing little to reduce the viability of illegal electric motorbike retailers or modification services which proliferate online.

These changes also adversely affect people with mobility issues. Several of our members who are medically unable to use a private motor vehicle and thus unable to get a licence, are reliant on electrically-assisted devices like ebikes to commute, take their children to school and go to the shops. These members have expressed that these changes will have a marked impact on their quality of life, reducing their employment opportunities, making it harder for their children to get to school on time and potentially forcing them to relocate to more expensive housing in higher-demand areas.

Some changes, especially the 10km/h speed limit on shared paths, will in fact make walking less safe for pedestrians since that speed limit is below what an average cyclist needs to maintain control and stability on any bicycle, increasing the risk that a cyclist may lose control and collide with a pedestrian.

If they can't ride on them safely, cyclists will be forced to avoid shared paths altogether, rendering 90% of Brisbane City Council's cycling routes inaccessible to legal ebikes users and forcing cyclists to contend with other road users on dangerous main roads. With electric assist restricted to 25km/h — a limit Greater Brisbane supports — allowing devices to be used on roads up to 60km/h is unlikely to have much impact on average cycle commuters. This change is not a meaningful trade-off for speed restrictions on shared paths.

Despite intending to shift more cycling off shared paths and onto roads, nothing in this bill improves on-road safety for cyclists, imposes new obligations on other road users to give due consideration to cyclists nor encourage changes to streetscapes and road designs that would improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians alike.

Despite positive indications from some local governments that they plan on building out a separated cycling network, the reality is current roll-out is slow and will only get slower as the cost of construction goes up and 2032 Games projects demand more resources. It will take decades at the current rate of roll-out for cycling infrastructure to be built to replace the loss of access to 90% of Brisbane City Council's cycling routes that this bill will cause. As a case in point, the North Brisbane Bikeway Stage 5 is Council's signature cycling project and has been effectively in limbo for three years.

We support Bicycle Queensland's sensible changes to the bill, namely:

1. Adopt a more workable definition of electrically assisted bicycles that permit at minimum devices compliant with EN15194 or the existing Australian Standard.
2. Implement a free and accessible system for post-sale compliance marking for existing legal ebike owners who do not have an EN15194 compliance certificate.
3. Abandoning proposed licensing requirements, speed limit changes and age bans for currently legal devices.

Greater Brisbane goes further and endorses a speed limit of 25km/h on shared paths and footpaths consistent with the legal limit on electric assistance.

We also support the removal on on-street parking and reduction of speed limits to 40km/h day-round for all road users in high-risk areas like near schools, tourist areas and busy retail precincts — a far more impactful change that would improve congestion, reduce fatalities and encourage mode-shift to public and active transport.

Yours sincerely

Travis Jordan, Rob Lucas and Alex Jago | Greater Brisbane
e: [REDACTED] | w: greaterbrisbane.org