

**MINUTES: Thursday, 7 April 2022 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM.
Majestic 5.02 and Microsoft Teams Meeting Conference**

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

Attending

- Glenn Bunting, Manager Network Safety, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Niki Carling, Safe & Sustainable Journeys Manager, Rotorua Lakes District
- Serena Chia, Emerging Professional, Multimodal, NZTA
- Gerry Dance, Team Leader Multi-Modal, NZTA
- Gemma Dioni, Senior Transportation Engineer, Christchurch City
- Twan van Duivenbooden, Principal Specialist Active & Shared Modes Design, AT
- Mark Edwards, Multi-modal Senior Advisor, NZTA
- Mike van Enter, Senior Transportation Engineer, Tasman District Council
- Hilary Fowler, Senior Transport Planner/Engineer, Wellington City
- Simon Kennett, Principal Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Glen Koorey, Director, ViaStrada, representing Transportation Group NZ
- Chris Lai, Activities Manager – Transport, Palmerston North City
- Nick Marshall, Team-leader Road Safety & Traffic Engineering, Northland Transport Alliance
- Malcolm McAulay, Senior Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Wayne Newman, (secretary)
- Eynon Phillips, Strategic Transport Engineer, Hastings District
- Mitra Prasad, AT
- Bill Rice, Senior Transport Engineer, Nelson City
- Clare Scott, Transport Planner, Active Modes, Tasman District
- Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District
- Erik Teekman, Principal Adviser Walking & Cycling, NZTA
- James Wratt, Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA

Apologies

- Steve Dejong, Senior Engineer, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Tony Mills, Senior Transport Engineer, Napier
- Ian Martin, Principal Advisor – Road Safety, Transport Engineering & Road Safety, Dunedin City

Guests

- Joe Hewitt, City Insights Manager, Wellington City (3.2 only)

A G E N D A

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES

3.1 Review the use of Sharrows - Simon Kennett

3.2 Bike Network Plan – Wellington – Joe Hewitt

3.3 Recommended width of one-way separated cycleways - Simon Kennett

3.4 Speed Control Devices Study preliminary results – Glen Koorey

4. UPDATES

4.1 TCD Steering Group report

4.2 CNG

- Draft quick-build cycleway research note
- Draft guidance on separated cycleways at intersections
- Draft guidance on rural cycling provision
- Draft guidance on cycling and lighting
- Draft guidance on cycle facilities on hills

4.3 PNG

4.4 TCD trials - PNCC Innovating Streets project going permanent

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1 Forthcoming planned multi-modal webinars

NOTES

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES

Gerry Dance welcomed members and introduced Elizabeth Stacey and Mitra Prasad to the group. The apologies of Tony Mills, Steve Dejong and Ian Martin were noted. The draft agenda was confirmed.

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes of the meeting on 3 February 2022 were confirmed without change.

3.1 REVIEW THE USE OF SHARROWS

Simon Kennett raised the possibility of expanding the guidance for marking sharrows to recommend their use on moderately busy roads where speeds are low on the approach to a single-lane roundabout. This was in response to the coronial inquest into the fatal collision at the Te Rapa Road, Sunshine Avenue and Bryant Road roundabout, and the lack of guidance in the Guide, which has relied on speed differential to avoid the sharrow becoming a cheap first response solution in place of providing separated facilities. The marking is now being used where no feasible alternative is available, such as on the approach to tunnels or roundabouts, where the traffic volume and speed environment would suggest they should not be.

Subsequent to the collision, the cycle lane at Te Rapa Road was remarked and a cycle bypass was later installed, but usage data shows that it is not being used. Similarly, in Blenheim at the intersection of SH6 and Westwood Avenue the configuration of the roundabout means that cyclists use the bypass travelling south but remained in the traffic lane travelling north rather than use the bypass. Use of sharrows at these locations would require changes to the Guide.

Discussion identified that speed management was an essential corollary for any wider use of the marking, but there were numerous examples where it had been used effectively with lowered speeds. Simon will discuss possible draft changes with Mark Edwards and Steve Dejong with a view to presenting these to the next AMIG on 26 May.

3.2 BIKE NETWORK PLAN – WELLINGTON – PANEKE PŌNEKE

Gerry Dance welcomed Joe Hewitt to the meeting. Joe reported that the adoption of the Wellington Bike Network Plan had proceeded very smoothly, building on the strategic vision within “First to Zero”, “Planning for Growth” and “Let’s Get Wellington Moving”. The result was a budget of \$226 million to deliver 166km of bike network over 10 years. At present 151,000 residents (32,000 students) live within 500m of the planned network of 74km of primary, and 92km of secondary, corridors. Of this, 23km is already in place and 33km is included within “LGWM” projects, leaving 110km still to be created.

A mix of approaches will be used to deliver this. Interim changes made through Innovating Streets types of initiatives can be subsequently approved as permanent. These can be fast and adaptable, but are better suited to mid-block interventions, rather than intersections. Corridor improvements, renewals and upgrades will be used to provide for multi-modal use. The real challenge will be to deliver a connected network through coordination of multiple projects across a city with few easy alternatives to the major routes due to difficult topography.

3.3 RECOMMENDED WIDTH OF ONE-WAY SEPARATED CYCLEWAYS

Simon Kennett explained that Austroads AGRD Part 6A Fig. 5.5 provides guidance on path widths with a 75/25 directional split, but based on the Australian speed limit for e-bikes of 25kmph whereas NZ has no such limit and e-bikes easily and frequently travel at 40kmph. Research by Via Strada found an average speed difference of 5kmph on the flat and 8kmph on a gradient, giving greater potential for overtaking.

Making changes to the guidance would affect a number of tables. Simon reported that current thinking was to delete references to “ideal” and “tolerable” minimum widths and specify the minimum width (with a lesser minimum for isolated sections only). For 2-way paths the draft guidance suggested a minimum of 3.0m up to 500 cyclists per hour, 3.5m up to 800 cyclists per hour and 4.0m over 800 cyclists per hour (with isolated sections of 2.5m, 3.0 and 3.5m respectively).

In response the discussion queried the value of 0.5m to provide adequate overtaking space and suggested 3.0m for up to 500 cyclists (with isolated sections of 2.6m) and

4.0m over 800 cyclists (with isolated sections left at 2.6m), but also proposed retaining the ability to create a much narrower facility where cyclist numbers are less than 100.

For 1-way paths the draft guidance was for 1.8m minimum at less than 150 cyclists (1.6m absolute minimum) increasing to 2.4m (1.8m absolute minimum) up to 500 cyclists and 2.6m (2.4m absolute minimum) over 500 cyclists. Again, the discussion queried the effective useable space gained and proposed a minimum of 3.0m for over 500 cyclists and 2.0m for less than 500 cyclists, with sections that were too narrow for safe overtaking able to be marked as such.

It was agreed that further refinements would be made and circulated for discussion at the next AMIG meeting.

3.4 SPEED CONTROL DEVICES STUDY PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Glen Koorey reported on research designed to assess the effect of devices on cyclist speeds. Average speed and average change in speed were assessed for the six main types of existing treatments: bumps, bypass, chicane, maze, chicane and curve, bollard, and rumble strip. The effects were speed reductions of 2kmph to 12kmph. The approach speed of the path proved to be critical, while the length of maze layout in some cases reduced cyclist speeds below the minimum required to maintain stability (8kmph up to 12kmph for older cyclists). As tight maze designs had already been shown to be distracting and unsafe at rail crossings, use of chicanes was recommended instead.

4.1 TCD STEERING GROUP REPORT

Mark Edwards reported on the draft coloured surfaces TAN. This will form part of the TCD Manual, which identified a need to insert landing pages within the PNG, CNG and PTDG giving quick links to the Manual. These have been drafted and were being finalised. Cases studies on colour perception were also needed to support the TAN.

Glenn Bunting reported on other matters from the Steering Group meeting. “Accessible Streets” was expected to go to Cabinet in May or June. The draft changes to CoPTTM were out for consultation. Bilingual traffic signs would possibly be included in the package to be opened for consultation in August 2022, with an expectation that these would be required for all new traffic signs from March 2023. This would have implications for both signage and current guidance. The space available for conveying information on any sign would be halved by the need to duplicate it, while every affected sign would need to be amended within PNG and CNG within next twelve months. This particularly affects the new national cycling wayfinding signage, now likely to be superseded within a year of publication.

4.2 CNG UPDATE

Glen Koorey reported on current work in progress for CNG. A draft quick-build cycleway research note should be ready for the next AMIG meeting, reviewing what had been used and how well it had worked, potentially to inform future CNG work. New draft guidance on separated cycleways at intersections follows a major overhaul of this guidance to remove references to completed trials and possible interventions or

solutions that are not yet legal, and adding extra detail and new diagrams. Draft guidance on rural cycling provision was expected to be ready for the next AMIG meeting. Draft guidance on lighting for cycling infrastructure should also be ready for the next meeting. Finally, work on the effects of gradient suggests that consideration of the effects of gradient needs to be more consistently addressed in the guidance, recognising difference between uphill and downhill sections of paths, the need for passing width for e-bikes and also greater width for 'wobble' going uphill. Draft guidance on cycle facilities on hills should also be ready to present to the next AMIG meeting.

4.3 PNG UPDATE

James Wratt reported current activities include work on sections on intersections and supporting infrastructure that can be expected to be added to the PNG in draft form within the next few months.

4.4 TCD TRIALS UPDATE

Chris Lai reported on the recent decision by Palmerston North City Council to make an Innovating Streets cycleway project a permanent facility. The planter boxes used for the temporary cycleway design would be replaced with an alternative more suitable for permanent infrastructure.

5.1 FORTHCOMING PLANNED MULTI-MODAL WEBINARS

Glen Koorey reported on preparations for the first webinar for 2022, possibly on 25 May, that would offer an overview of all of the available guides. This was likely to be followed by webinars on PNG and on crossings. Feedback would set the content of later offerings. For the present the webinar format would be retained as the preferred delivery mechanism.

Meeting closed: 12:00

Next meeting: 26 May 2022