

All AMIG meetings minutes, summaries and presented material are available at:  
- <https://nzta.govt.nz/walking-cycling-and-public-transport/active-modes-infrastructure-group/>

**MINUTES: Thursday, 5 August 2021 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM.  
Majestic 7.08 and Microsoft Teams Meeting**

**Attending**

- Michael Bridge, Activity Manager Active Transport, Palmerston North City
- Glenn Bunting, Manager Network Safety, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Niki Carling, Safe& Sustainable Journeys Manager, Rotorua Lakes District
- Twan van Duivenbooden, Principal Specialist Active & Shared Modes Design, AT
- Mike van Enter, Senior Transportation Engineer, Tasman District Council
- Hilary Fowler, Transport Planner/Engineer, Wellington City
- Wayne Gallot, Senior Transportation Engineer, Christchurch City
- Karen Hay, Accessible Streets Implementation Team Leader, Tauranga City
- Will Hyde, Senior Transportation Engineer, Tauranga City
- Simon Kennett, Principal Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Glen Koorey, Director, ViaStrada, representing Transportation Group NZ
- Chris Lai, Senior Transportation Planner, Palmerston North City
- Malcolm McAulay, Senior Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Sandi Morris, Road Safety & Traffic Planning Engineer, Far North District Council
- Wayne Newman, (secretary)
- Eynon Phillips, Strategic Transport Engineer, Hastings District
- Bill Rice, Senior Transport Engineer, Nelson City
- Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District
- Erik Teekman, Principal Adviser Walking & Cycling, NZTA
- James Wratt, Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA

**Apologies**

- Gerry Dance, Team Leader Multi Modal, NZTA
- Steve Dejong, Senior Engineer, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Kelera Qaraniqio, Network Engineer, Hamilton City
- Andy Vuong, Manager, Cycle Plan Implementation, Tauranga City

**Guests**

- Hugh Wilson, Innovating Streets Project Manager, WCC (3.2)
- Georgie Griffiths, Bikes in schools & active modes facilitator, RLC (3.2)

## **A G E N D A**

- 1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES**
- 2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**
- 3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES**
  - 3.1 Pedestrian priority at Zebra with central island
  - 3.2 Innovating Streets Projects
  - 3.3 Visibility Splays Draft Guidance
  - 3.4 Wayfinding Signage Draft Guidance
  - 3.5 Marae Warning Sign
  - 3.6 Traffic Note 29 Rev.2
  - 3.7 Better pavements for walking and cycling
- 4. UPDATES**
  - 4.1 TCD Steering Group report
  - 4.2 CNG and PNG developments
  - 4.3 New AMIG website – James Wratt
- 5. OTHER BUSINESS**
  - 5.1 Final 2021 AMIG meeting – 17-18 November

## **NOTES**

### **1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES**

Wayne Newman welcomed members and guests. The apologies were noted. The loss of Simon Cager from the group and imminent loss of Sandi Morris were noted. The agenda was confirmed.

### **2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes from the meeting on 3 June 2021 were confirmed.

### **3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES**

#### **3.1 Pedestrian priority at Zebra with central island**

Simon Kennett introduced this. Although putting Zebra crossings on platforms is accepted best practice, current platform profiles are uncomfortable for passengers in buses and tend to cause excessive noise from trade or heavy vehicles with loose loads. The preferred solution is use of a “Swedish platform”: approach ramp slope of 1:15 and departure ramp slope of 1:40. Having this difference in profiles on each side makes a central island necessary. Under RUR 10.1(3) the presence of an island creates two separate Zebra crossings.

**10.1** (1) A driver approaching a pedestrian crossing must—

[(a) give way to pedestrians, and to riders of wheeled recreational devices or mobility devices,—

(i) on the pedestrian crossing; or

(ii) obviously waiting to cross it [[and who are not behind a school patrol sign]]; and]

(b) if necessary, slow down and stop the driver's vehicle for that purpose.

(2) A driver approaching a pedestrian crossing must not enter the crossing if the driver's intended passage is blocked by stationary traffic.

(3) For the purposes of this clause, if a pedestrian crossing is interrupted by a raised traffic island, the parts of the crossing that are situated on different sides of that traffic island must be regarded as separate pedestrian crossings.

(4) This clause does not apply to a pedestrian crossing that is for the time being controlled by an enforcement officer.

This becomes a problem where the space available does not permit installation of an island wide enough to provide an adequate pedestrian refuge where a mobility scooter, pushchair or similar longer 'pedestrian' might safely wait before beginning to cross. While a pedestrian might consider a continuous Zebra bounded by a narrow island on one or both sides to be a single crossing and act accordingly, approaching traffic would perceive two separate crossings and expect the user to pause and wait before entering the second crossing. The pedestrian would be entering the second crossing "suddenly" in contravention of RUR 11.5.

The concern is that the current wording of the RUR acts to discourage installation of platform Zebra crossings that are both pedestrian and bus-friendly.

The combination of "waiting" in 10.1(1)(a)(ii) with "suddenly" in 11.5 has created a perverse outcome in shifting priority on Zebra crossings. It was agreed that a change from "waiting" to "intending" might address this issue in an amendment to the RUR. Legal advice would be sought on this and on whether a continuous Zebra on a platform and bounded by a narrow island on one or both sides may be said to be "interrupted".

In the interim, it was agreed that the "Swedish platform" profiles could be installed wherever the location permitted an adequate pedestrian refuge within the central island, while nothing prevented the installation of platforms with symmetrical tapers of 1:15 or 1:20 at narrower locations.

## **3.2 Innovating Streets Projects**

### **a. Wellington**

Hilary Fowler and Hugh Wilson reported on the installation of a 1.3km trial bike lane on Brooklyn Road. This road has over 7,000 ADT and relatively high heavy vehicle traffic. The project delivered positive results and a significant improvement in the perception of safety. WCC is looking at making the lane permanent, and also at the feasibility of connecting it with existing facilities on Victoria Street in Te Aro and extending the lane up to the suburban centre at Brooklyn.

Hugh explained that the consultation process had involved presenting a finalised plan of what was intended and then proactive engagement with identified interested groups on how best to implement this. Hugh noted that a lesson from the project was the need to be very clear about what was being trialled, and also the need to find temporary solutions to often permanent problems.

### **b. Palmerston North**

Chris Lai reported on the creation of a cycle way along Main Street connecting to the Longburn Shared Path and giving access to the Cook Street Cycle Lane. This was a 1.2km separated bike lane placed for most of its length inside the parking lane, created by the use of plastic planter boxes.

Chris noted that, although the project delivered a good increase in cycling use and massive community engagement, and PNCC was looking to make the cycleway a permanent facility, the design had offered numerous challenges. The planter boxes had proved easy to move, turn and tip over, and offered poor visibility after dark. They also hindered commercial deliveries and rubbish collection, while maintaining anything actually planted in the boxes would be costly. The height and profile of separators installed for a permanent facility would need to be reconsidered.

### **c. Hastings**

Eynon Phillips reported on a trial of ways to reduce traffic volumes and speeds outside four local schools, two in Flaxmere and two in Hastings, as a pilot for more general application within the district. The trial involved video tracking of pedestrian movements and surveys of perceptions of barriers to greater walking and cycling to the schools. The latter identified very wide differences in school cultures and in basic skills levels that could provide a foundation for better targeted interventions in the future.

The project was implemented in two phases. The first involved the installation of speed cushions, raised crossings and bollards to achieve lower speeds. The second involved the application of street art in off-road areas and potentially roadway art where the achieved speed was no more than 30kmph, using school logos and value statements, associated with seating areas and planter boxes at locations where the parents waited, met and mingled.

### **d. Rotorua**

Georgie Griffiths reported on a project to address perceived barriers to walking and cycling to Lynmore School. There was a strong perception among the pupils and their parents that it was unsafe to bike or walk. A significant contributor to this was identified as the design of the school drop-off zone, which was essentially a large and congested roundabout in front of the school. The project sought to achieve a safer walking environment through interventions to Larcy Road, Owhatiura Drive and Iles Road.

The approach taken was to invite members of the community to propose solutions and build the design entirely from these ideas, rather than offer any preconceived plan. This was challenging for all involved. Practitioners were cautious about trialling innovations with limited guidance documents while many found public engagement on a blank slate unnerving.

The final design combined corner build-outs, parklets and planters to restrict parking, new courtesy crossings and a trial shared path with alternative drop-off locations. The courtesy crossings were created using white lines, planter boxes and speed cushions. Street art was installed alongside the traffic lanes, but not in the roadway.

The result has been confusion about priority for both pedestrians and motorists, a reduction in average vehicle speeds by 10kmph (Larcy Rd) and an increase of 28.5% in walking or cycling to the school.

## **3.3 Visibility Splays Draft Guidance**

Glen Koorey presented the draft guidance document, explaining the assumptions made for design speeds for footpaths and shared/cycle paths, and for driver position in the design vehicle. A critical determinant of horizontal visibility was the distance between the property boundary and the path. This and the assumed design speed determine the required horizontal visibility. The guidance also addresses vertical visibility and potential mitigation measures.

## **3.4 Wayfinding Signage Draft Guidance**

Glen Koorey presented the draft national Cycle Wayfinding document (an adaptation of the CCC guidance) which summarises the signage approved for use on cycle routes and trails and provides guidance on the selection, installation and

maintenance of signs. A catalogue of recognised or preferred destination pictograms is included.

The guidance uses distance to destination, rather than suggested time. This reflects the previous decision of AMIG that individual fitness and pace are too variable to allow any useful assumption of required travel times. It was agreed that the draft document should explain this decision.

It was also noted that consideration needed to be given to the provision of bi-lingual signage. Providing signage in two languages with any fixed number of destinations or fingerboards would effectively halve the number of signs or destinations able to be displayed in the available space.

### 3.5 Marae Warning Sign

Glenn Bunting presented the W16-11 legal sign for marae, approved on 28 April. This consists of a permanent warning sign that must be used only with a “Marae” supplementary:



### 3.6 Traffic Note 29 – Revision 2

This item was not taken as the clause relating to use of elements of kea crossings at zebra crossings expressly discussed in Traffic Note 29 – Revision 2 (Nov. 2004) at 4.3 was provided in the minutes of the previous meeting.

### 3.7 Better Pavements for Walking and Cycling

Wayne Newman reported on the recent publication in *New Scientist* (issue 3342, 10 July 2021) (<https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg25033421-400-these-streets-arent-made-for-walking-why-sidewalks-need-a-rethink/#ixzz712hUTL6U>) of a report on Swedish research into rubberised asphalt pavements first published in 2016 and noted the consequent sudden increase in interest in the original research report. Unlike local research on the same topic (continuing with a trial in Upper Hutt – InTouch 14, July 2018, [Arotahi.wsp-opus.co.nz/rubberised-cycleways-story/](http://Arotahi.wsp-opus.co.nz/rubberised-cycleways-story/)) which had a focus on waste reduction by recycling used tyre rubber, the Swedish research considered the mitigation of impact injuries through a more absorbent surface. This is consistent with the approach to road safety of using design to reduce the effects of unavoidable human error. Wayne agreed to circulate the research to group members.

## **4. UPDATES**

### **4.1 TCD Steering Group report**

Glenn Bunting reported on the meeting of the Steering Group on 16 June and shared some of the working drafts for potential “school zone” signage. Issues considered included the need for “school zone” and “school zone ends” signs, addition of the W16-4 sign, lack of any legal definition for “zone”, potential requirement for bilingual signs, and the resultant height requirements for all of the likely elements.

Glenn also shared a potential trial sign for a static variable speed limit which dispenses with “school zone” and requires a speed limit of 30kmph during 8.25-9AM and 2.55-3.15PM on “School Days”. The discussion of this noted that it required a driver to know the time with some precision as well as knowing school terms and holidays for various schools, and that the times would be specific to individual schools while the sign would appear superficially the same for motorists. Having the times set to the quarter or half-hour was thought more practical, and extending the duration past 9.00am to recognise that children running late would be at greater risk of running suddenly into the road was recommended (also noting that some schools start later than 9.00am on some days).

Glenn noted that TCD Part 4 was almost out for consultation and that Part 5 was about to be released in HTML format, and invited feedback on the latter.

### **4.2 CNG and PNG developments**

This item was not taken, with Glen Koorey noting that the principal developments to report had been taken under 3.3 and 3.4.

### **4.3 New AMIG website**

James Wratt noted that there was nothing new to report since the last meeting.

## **5. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **5.1 Final 2021 AMIG meeting –17-18 November**

Wayne Newman reported that Eynon Phillips had been looking at potential sites and meeting venues, and Havelock North was currently a leading contender.

### **5.2 Signing Cycle Paths**

Simon Kennett showed a sign replacing the “Bike Only” cycle path sign with a R4-9 cycle lane sign and adding a supplementary “Includes E-Scooters”. The rationale for the change was that the approved sign appears to exclude e-scooters. Nevertheless, it was agreed that the replacement was not legal, and it would be impractical for signs to include representations of everything included within the symbol. E-scooter users need to understand that the cycle symbol does include them. This might be easier to comprehend if the word ‘Only’ were replaced with ‘Path’ on the cycle path sign.

Meeting closed: 12.10 pm