

**Meeting at 9:00 on 25 February 2016**  
Room M2.06, Christchurch City Council  
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

**Attending:**

- Steve Dejong Traffic Engineer, Christchurch City
- Gerry Dance Principal Advisor Cycling, National Cycling Team, NZTA
- Tim Hughes National Traffic and Safety Engineer, NZTA
- Simon Kennett Senior Project Manager, National Cycling Team, NZTA
- Glenn Bunting Network Manager, NZTA
- Glen Koorey Civil and Natural Resources Engineering School, Cant.
- Nathaniel Benefield Lets Go Project Manager, New Plymouth District
- Kylie Huard Senior Transportation Planner, Dunedin City
- Paul Barker Safe and Sustainable Transport Manager, Wellington
- Kathryn King Walking & Cycling Manager, Auckland Transport
- Ina Stenzel Principal Specialist – Walking and Cycling, AT
- Claire Graham Senior Specialist – Walking and Cycling, AT
- Wayne Newman RCA Forum Research & Guidelines Group (secretary)

(Mike Ferigo, Min Brody, Gemma Dioni and Nigel Weston of Christchurch CC joined the meeting at 11.45 to escort the Study Tour after lunch)

**Apologies:**

- Dougal List National Manager Cycling, NZTA
- Susan Lilley Transportation Planner, Dunedin City
- Clare Cassidy Planning Engineer, Transport, Tauranga City
- Claire Sharland Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District
- Jodie Lawson Sustainable Transport Team Leader, Rotorua Lakes
- Richard Bean Senior Engineer, NZTA
- Sandi Morris Transportation Planner, Palmerston North City
- Kirsty Horridge Network Engineer, Hamilton City

## **AGENDA**

- 9.00     **1.**        Introductions, apologies and emergency briefing
- 9.05     **2.**        Actions arising from last meeting
- Feedback on rules review (Item 4)
  - Feedback on sharrows guide (Item 3)
  - Urban 2-1 lane trial ideas
  - Expanding AMIG
- 9.15     **3.**        Updates
- Cycling network and design framework
  - Sharrow usage guidelines
  - Pavement markings trials
  - TCD Manual review
  - Rural cycling safety improvements
- 10.30    **Tea/coffee**
- 10.45    **4.**        Cycling rules change
- First tranche
  - Second tranche
  - Third tranche
- 11.15    **5.**        Signage
- Popular cycling routes signage
  - Consistent 'share the road' signage
  - Shared use paths priority signage
  - Hook turn signage
- 12.00    Lunch**
- 12.30    Study Tour**
- 2.30     **6.**        Intersections
- Cycle Barnes Dance trial
  - Cycle signal trial
- 3.30     **7.**        2016 Work Programme
- 4.00     **8.**        Technical workshop
- Contraflow beside parking
  - Minimum separator widths
- 4.45     **9.**        Other business
- 5.00     **10.**      Next meeting

## ACTIONS

- Gerry – to follow up invitations to Hutt CC, Whangarei DC, Whanganui DC, Napier CC and Gisborne DC to join AMIG, as opportunity arises.
- Wayne – to discuss best means of continuing participation with Glen.
- Gerry – to circulate alert for AMIG to test prototype framework before the launch of interim cycling network design hub.
- Steve – to circulate reviewed CCC pavement marking designs for shared use.
- Claire G. – to circulate reviewed AT pavement marking designs for shared use.
- Kathryn – to circulate report on Grafton Bridge trials and taxi and bus overtaking behaviours.
- ALL – to circulate current signs being used for controlling behavior on shared facilities and any findings on their effectiveness.
- Simon – to review cost-benefit of changing the meaning of recreational device against changing the rule to allow under 12 year olds to ride on footpaths.
- Richard – to amend proposed Hook Turn sign to replace first arrow on curve with a block to clearly indicate a stop before proceeding.
- Kathryn – to begin preparing a proposal for a cyclist Barnes dance.
- Steve – to begin preparing a proposal for a cyclist Barnes dance.
- ALL – to investigate potential sites to undertake trials of cycle signals.
- Tim – to circulate a commentary on the use of schedules with bylaws.
- Tim – to draft amendment for TCD Manual to recommend marking all cycle lanes with double yellow lines beside the kerb.
- Kathryn – to raise with UCP group the possibility of holding future meetings back-to-back with AMIG. (with Paul and Kylie)
- Gerry – to investigate with Dougal (and Kirsty) holding next meeting back to back with UCP group (and in Hamilton).

## **2. ACTIONS ARISING FROM LAST MEETING (6/11/15)**

- (a)** Feedback on the draft sharrow guidance note and proposed RUR changes was incorporated into the respective documents as appropriate.
- (b)** No further investigation has been made on an urban 2-1 lane trial on Massey Rd around Pt Halswell from Shelley Bay to Scorching Bay on Miramar Peninsula.
- (c)**
  - (i)** Invitations have been sent to Hutt City, Whangarei and Rotorua Lakes, Whanganui, Napier and Gisborne. Jodie Lawson (Rotorua Lakes) has accepted. Nelson has been invited to rejoin the group and has accepted.
  - (ii)** ToR, budget and membership are still being resolved for the new Shared Footpaths group, expected to convene in April.

## **3. UPDATES**

### **(a) Cycling network and design framework**

The draft framework is expected to be available in April 2016. Reviews of TCD Manual Part 4 (Intersections) and Part 5 (Mid-block) have been largely done, and the review is now incorporating peer review feedback on CNRPG, which has now been fully reviewed.

The intent is that the framework will be released in a testing phase in late March to allow members to check the functionality of the pages, and then in its interim live phase in April.

### **(b) Sharrow usage guidelines**

The draft Sharrow Best Practice Guidance Note has been amended to reflect feedback and the detailed commentary circulated by Glen Koorey and is out for peer review. The marking is expected to become legal from July or August 2016.

There was further discussion of the graph indicating where the marking might be appropriate. Local topography adds extra complexity, with fast downhill gradients and slower uphill gradients making the difference in speed between cyclist and motorist more important than the traffic speed or volume in some instances. Further work will be done to refine what are acceptable and unacceptable speed differentials.

### **(c) Pavement marking trials**

Use of pavement markings within the Beach Road project was approved by the TCDSG, but the result had been unsatisfactory. A bigger and clearer marking is being developed. The markings have been used as positioning

indicators, but the pavement design has proved too subtle to differentiate paths and obscured desire lines, leading to the cycle path becoming *de facto* a shared path.

The group noted that pavement markings have been trialled in Christchurch for some time and CCC is currently reviewing designs. Steve Dejong offered to circulate the designs.

**(d) TCD Manual review**

Taken under Item 3(a).

**(e) Rural cycling safety improvements**

The final report on the trial on Roto o Rangi Rd, Waipa District, is now being considered. The object was to identify a potentially lower-cost solution for rural roads, without use of colour. This road proved not to be ideal for the trial. The geometry and environment made the road more naturally a 100kph zone rather than a 60kph zone and there was poor observance of the reduced speed limit after nightfall.

The trial raised a number of issues around selecting and marking a road for a “2-1” layout. Removing the edge lines made the road more hazardous in fog and reliance on signage, rather than markings, tended to leave the intended use of the road not immediately intuitive.

A discussion of the use of the instrumented bikes during the trial revealed that 82% of motorists passed the bikes with a gap of greater than 1.5m and the average gap was 2.12m. It was noted that there was strong political opposition from the RTF to any mandatory 1.5m minimum gap. Kathryn reported that a trial on Grafton Bridge had found that taxis and buses were passing cyclists on the narrow bridge too closely and agreed to circulate a report.

**4. CYCLING RULES CHANGES**

The first tranche of changes is expected to be signed-off very soon by the Minister. The second tranche list has been reduced by moving non-regulatory items and trials to separate lists. Of the third tranche, only the minimum passing gap is being investigated currently. Any mandated requirement to fit side safety panels to trucks is also being opposed by the RTF.

There is some uncertainty around regulating the use of lights during twilight, with practical difficulties in defining the time of twilight and in requiring batteries to be changed regularly.

Changing the wheel rim size in the definition of a recreational device as a way to allow children to ride on the footpath was discussed. It was agreed that it

would be better to amend the law to reflect common belief that children up to the age of twelve can ride on a footpath.

## **5. SIGNAGE**

### **(a) Popular cycling route signage**

At the 6 Nov. 2015 meeting the group noted that in situations where cyclists constitute a hazard or would be at greater risk, it would be preferable to use supplementary signage with PW35 to indicate the specific hazard, such as 'touring', 'training', 'crossing', 'school' or 'next X Km'. Where the signs are only advisory, use of a bike+person symbol and appropriate wording should be consistent at least within any one region, but still needs to meet national standards for advisory signage.

The group's decision remained unclear on some details and there was subsequent discussion trying to establish what was decided. It was noted that use of PW35 with supplementary signs had been trialled successfully by CCC and adopting a different sign or introducing a symbol with a person on a bike would deliver low benefits for high costs. It was agreed that PW35 with supplementary signage as appropriate would be the agreed practice.

### **(b) Consistent "share the road" signage**

A statement of policy or good practice for road controlling authorities regarding "share the road" signage is not a priority, but it was noted that all research to date indicates that this signage is not understood to have any meaning.

### **(c) Shared use paths – Pedestrian Priority signage**

AT had raised this issue. It was agreed that signs giving priority to one or the other mode on a shared facility are in use. WCC uses a sign with a pedestrian over the word "Priority" over a bike symbol. The risk with such signage is that it can encourage obstructive behaviour by pedestrians and give rise to a conflict of expectations if it is not clear that "priority" means priority in conflict situations, rather than a licence to unreasonably impede other users.

It was agreed that all members will circulate the current signs in use and any assessments of their effectiveness.

### **(d) Hook Turn signage**

A proposed sign based on a simplified version of a UK hook-turn sign was circulated for comment immediately before Christmas. It has been agreed with Christchurch City for use on separated cycle facilities on the left side of the road, where a hook-turn is the safe way for cyclists to turn right at intersections. Comments were sought by the end of January 2016.

There was further discussion of the message given by the proposed design and it was agreed that refinements were needed to avoid encouraging cyclist behavior that would be hazardous. Replacing the first arrow with a block was agreed as a means to show clearly that a turn in two stages was intended.

## **6. INTERSECTIONS**

### **(a) Bicycle Barnes Dance Trial**

Trials of a cycling Barnes dance can be undertaken within the current RUR. These might test phasing separate crossings for cyclists before or after pedestrians, or mixed crossings. It was agreed that trials of a pure cycling Barnes dance should be undertaken before attempting to introduce vehicles and pedestrians with conflicting movements into the same process, not least because allowing a vehicle to move on a pedestrian signal could create legal difficulties.

AT and CCC will begin to prepare proposals for trials.

### **(b) Cycle Signals Trial**

The meeting noted that separate signals are in use extensively overseas for separate facilities, and there is a need to give different signals to different modes at intersections, but there was concern that the examples showed displays that were too small or inconspicuous and potentially confusing.

It was agreed that having the cyclist signal separated from the motorist signal and placed lower on the pole at the level of the pedestrian crossing signal (which faces on to the footpath) was beneficial.

Further investigation of signal lux levels and appropriate sizes for both signals and displays, as well as potential trial sites, needs to occur.

## **7. 2016 WORK PROGRAMME**

The meeting agreed that the priorities for 2016 must include:

- delineators and separators, including vertical posts and appropriate spacings;
- determining a maximum number of private access crossings of a bike facility or the maximum number of entries off a shared path before the levels of service become unacceptable;
- understanding the priorities at work within intersections;
- resolving the conflict at bus stops to determine whether the pedestrian is crossing a cyclist facility or a cyclist is crossing a pedestrian facility must be a priority; and
- developing guidelines on good practice in designing or adopting shared paths.

## **8. TECHNICAL WORKSHOP**

### **(a) Contraflow beside parking**

The most effective means to sign or mark having bi-directional cycling in a one-way street while retaining parking was discussed. A significant issue is the ability of the driver to see approaching cyclists in pulling out from a car park on the right side of the street. Signage for this situation when used in the UK was found to be generally ineffective and AT proposes to trial marking a cycle symbol on one side of the street and a sharrow on the other.

The meeting noted that every such traffic exception, one-way designation and cycle lane needs to be listed in the schedule to the enabling bylaw and adopted by resolution.

**(b) Minimum separator widths**

The meeting discussed the trade-off between a narrow cycle lane and a narrow separator, and recognised the potential gains in level of service in achieving an extra 20cm for the lane by reducing the separation to 40cm.

**9. OTHER BUSINESS**

(a) The trial in Brisbane of optional cycle helmet use was discussed. It was agreed that public bike hire schemes struggle where helmets must be worn, but 80% of cyclist injuries requiring hospitalisation result from not wearing a helmet.

(b) Allowing a left turn on a red signal for cyclists was discussed. It was noted that in most circumstances the presence of a pedestrian crossing at the controlled intersection would render the option pointless.

(c) Marking of no-stopping double yellow lines beside the kerb in cycle lanes was discussed. While doing so adds \$200,000 to \$300,000 to annual costs, it was recognised that with AT, WCC and CCC already doing this it has become *de facto* standard practice. It was agreed that the TCD Manual be amended to recommend marking double yellow lines against the kerb in cycle lanes.

**10. DATE AND PLACE of NEXT MEETING**

AMIG met four times during 2015. It was agreed that the group will meet four times in 2016. A site visit or study tour element with some meetings will be retained.

As there is some overlap in membership between AMIG and the UCP group, greater effort will be made to coordinate meetings of the two groups where possible.

The next meeting is likely to be in the second half of May and Hamilton was proposed as a venue.

**CLOSE**

The meeting closed at 5.00.