

**MINUTES: Thursday, 17 November 2022 9:00 AM.
Porters Boutique Hotel, 4 Te Aute Road, Havelock North
Microsoft Teams Meeting Conference ID: 896 544 20#**

Present

In Person

- Michael Bridge Service Manager, Active Transport, Palmerston North City
- Daniel Cairncross, City design & place planning, Wellington City
- Niki Carling, Safe& Sustainable Journeys Manager, Rotorua Lakes District
- Bruce Conaghan, Transportation Policy and Planning Manager, Hastings District
- Gerry Dance, Team Leader Multi Modal, Waka Kotahi NZTA
- Twan van Duivenbooden, Principal Specialist Active & Shared Modes Design, AT
- Mark Edwards Multi-modal Senior Advisor, Waka Kotahi NZTA
- Mike van Enter Senior Transportation Engineer, Tasman District Council
- Simon Kennett Principal Multi-modal Advisor, Waka Kotahi NZTA
- Glen Koorey Director, ViaStrada, representing Transportation Group NZ
- Malcolm McAulay, Senior Multi-modal Advisor, Waka Kotahi NZTA
- Wayne Newman (secretary)
- Erik Teekman Principal Adviser Walking & Cycling, Waka Kotahi NZTA
- James Wratt Multi-modal Advisor, Waka Kotahi NZTA
- Honor Young Senior Active & Sustainable Transport Engineer, Hamilton City

By Teams

- Shane Binder Transport Engineer, Waimakariri District
- Sean Christian Cycling Education Adviser, Hamilton City
- Steve Dejong Senior Engineer, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Gemma Dioni Senior Transportation Engineer, Christchurch City
- Rachel Doelman Sustainable Journeys Coordinator, Rotorua Lakes District
- Chris Lai Senior Transportation Planner, Palmerston North City
- Nick Marshall Team Leader-Road Safety & Traffic Engineering, Northland Transport Alliance
- Ian Martin Principal Advisor, Road Safety, Transport Engineering & Road Safety, Dunedin City
- Mitra Prasad Technical Lead – Active Modes, Auckland Transport
- Bill Rice Senior Transport Engineer, Nelson City
- Elizabeth Stacey Road Safety Engineer, Northland Transport Alliance
- Jocelyn Zhang Transport Project Manager, Hutt City

Apologies

- Hilary Fowler Transport Planner/Engineer, Wellington City
- Will Hyde, Senior Transportation Engineer, Tauranga City
- Tony Mills, Senior Rooding Engineer, Napier
- Martin Parkes, Urban Mobility Programme Delivery Lead, HCC
- Eynon Phillips, Strategic Transport Engineer, Hastings District
- Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District

A G E N D A

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES, H&S

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Actions from the meeting on 22 September 2022

3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES

3.1 Smaller signs options for shared paths and cycle paths

- Mark Edwards

3.2 SH3-Featherston St intersection (PN)

- Michael Bridge

3.3 School patrol operation at a dual crossing

- Mike van Enter

3.4 Choosing the right crossing facility

- Nick Marshall

3.5 TTM blockage of footpaths and cycle lanes

- Michael Bridge

3.6 Hump signage

- Gemma Dioni

3.7 Tactile pavers at cycle crossings

- Gemma Dioni

3.8 Designing with separators

- Malcolm McAulay

3.9 Part-time cycle lanes

- Simon Kennett

4. UPDATES

4.1 Updates to Sharrows Guidance

- Simon Kennett

4.2 CNG Updates

- Glen Koorey

4.3 Parking and road safety questionnaire

- Mark Edwards

SUMMARY

- AMIG recommends an amendment to the TCD Rule to permit smaller signs being an available option for shared paths and cycle paths.
- No Zebra crossing may be a Kea crossing. A Zebra crossing may be a School Patrol Crossing Point but does not need flags for this.
- AMIG notes new TTM guidelines require an assessment of all hazards on a site and a solution appropriate to the location, including recognising the consequences from obstructing paths for cyclists and pedestrians.
- AMIG recommends an amendment to the TCD Rule to allow use of markings to alert drivers to a speed hump to negate the need for separate signs and reduce signage clutter.
- AMIG recommends more guidance on tactile paver installation is provided to ensure that any installation avoids creating a hazard for either cyclists or visually impaired pedestrians.
- AMIG does not consider part-time cycle lanes along off-peak parking spaces as an attractive solution for the target group of less confident cyclists.
- AMIG considers operating speeds and speed homogeneity between modes to be critical to safe use of Sharrow markings in a wider range of situations.

NOTES

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES, H&S

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Actions from the meeting on 22 September 2022

3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES

3.1 Smaller signs options for shared paths and cycle paths

Mark Edwards explained that the TCD Rule allows a reduction in the dimensions of markings intended solely for pedestrians and cyclists, but omits similar provision for signage. Such provision is supported by AMIG, subject to very clear guidance being available. Signs needed to be legible to the intended user at their expected speed of approach. Smaller dimensions reduced the size of lettering, and it was recognised that no vision requirements exist for pedestrians or cyclists. Any future requirement for bi-lingual signage would also diminish the ability to have reduced dimensions. Nevertheless, where different modes were moving in parallel, having a clear distinction between similar signs directed at different modes was essential to avoid confusing users. Similarly, full-sized signage on narrow paths can intrude and further reduce the width available for users. Engineering professional judgement should still be required to determine that a reduction in dimension is appropriate.

3.2 SH3-Featherston St intersection (PN) – making it work for all modes

Michael Bridge explained that Featherston St, and by extension the intersection with SH3, was crucial to the city's cycling network plan and also a major challenge, as it carries 13,000-16,000 vpd (while Rangitikei St (SH3) carries about 26,000 vpd) and traverses a zone of 'big-box' and SME commercial operations with frequent and busy vehicle accesses. PNCC wishes to reduce speeds, volumes and freight at the intersection and give priority to PT, cyclists and pedestrians, and is considering how best to proceed.

It was agreed that any decision should support the intention, which would inevitably require reduced efficiency for the intersection for freight and other motorised modes. Potential models for a successful intervention were already in place in other cities and it was agreed that these could be shared to assist the development of appropriate design solutions.

3.3 School patrol operation at a dual crossing

Mike van Enter reported on the response adopted by a school patrol operating on a dual crossing on a raised platform. The crossing was on a 50 km/h street with 17,000 vpd and is used by students from six schools with a combined total roll of 3,091 students. The combined width of the zebra and cycle crossing was 6m and a barrier arm across both was found to be necessary to control students, but the arms tended to break at this length. The response had been to fit hooks to the grab rails on each side of the cycle crossing and attach a temporary barrier to these, so that the cycle crossing was closed throughout the operation of the school patrol and both cyclists and pedestrians crossed on the zebra. There was discussion of the legality of this, but it was recognised to be a pragmatic solution.

3.4 Choosing the right crossing facility

Nick Marshall reported on the frequency of public complaints about courtesy crossings. Most of these complaints centre on the lack of clear priority. While this can be a deliberate design to slow traffic and instil greater driver awareness of pedestrians, clear guidance and sound engineering professional judgement needs to be applied. Courtesy crossings should only be installed in low speed and low volume situations, and should avoid giving either the pedestrian or the motorist any indication of a continuous path. Provision of safe, obvious and step-free crossings should recognise the needs of less confident users, such as children, elderly and those with disability, and ensure the proximity of a safe alternative crossing for a courtesy crossing.

Nick also reported on the opinion of local Police that it was necessary for any Kea crossing on a Zebra crossing to have the Kea crossing flags in place when in operation. Steve Dejong explained that this view is incorrect, in that no Zebra crossing may be a Kea crossing. A Kea crossing is a part-time crossing in operation only when the flags are present, while a Zebra

crossing is a full-time facility. A Zebra crossing cannot be a Kea crossing, but may be a School Patrol Crossing Point and does not need flags for this.

3.5 TTM blockage of footpaths and cycle lanes

Michael Bridge noted the frequent blockage of cycle ways and obstruction of footpaths by TTM signage and cones. Although the rules prohibit this, it is invariably an matter of reacting to a complaint from members of the public and getting it resolved on a case by case basis, and there seems to be a need for better understanding. It was agreed that this is an important issue. The former Code of Practice for TTM had been designed as a guide to best practice but had become interpreted as a standard to be rigidly applied in any situation. The new guidelines required an assessment of all hazards on a site and design of a solution appropriate to the location. This design needs to recognise the consequences for cyclists and pedestrians from obstructing paths. Further advice of this might usefully be provided by the guidelines support team to all users.

3.6 Hump signage

Gemma Dioni raised the current requirement for speed humps to be sign-posted with advisory warning signs to travel at 25km/h, even within 30km/h zones. A possible supplementary sign, although in use in some areas, is not available under the TCD Rule. An alternative sign, "Speed Humps Ahead", possibly with "x km", is to be trialled. It was noted that an amendment to the Rule to allow use of markings to alert drivers to a hump could negate the need for signs and reduce sign clutter.

3.7 Tactile pavers at cycle crossings

Gemma Dioni presented examples of tactile paver installation recommendations from safety auditors that indicate a need for more guidance to ensure that any installation avoids creating a hazard for either cyclists or visually impaired pedestrians, and is designed to direct the visually impaired away from, and safely past, the area of greatest potential risk.

3.8 Designing with separators

Malcolm McAulay asked whether there was a need for an extra layer of design assistance between the provision of guidance and the delivery of infrastructure. It was recognised that different authorities have differing levels of experience in designing for active modes and an informal support network could usefully spread knowledge and experience more evenly.

3.9 Part-time cycle lanes

Simon Kennett presented examples of part-time bus lanes potentially providing part-time cycle lanes along off-peak parking spaces. It was noted that this has been a solution used with varying results overseas. It had been comparatively successful in the UK, where the part-time cycle way was not on designated parking, so there was a measure of uncertainty about the status of the space. In South Australia it was not considered an acceptable solution by cyclists. It was agreed that this is not an attractive solution for the target group of less confident cyclists, and generally increases the hazard to cyclists. Simon agreed to review the issue further and bring back to AMIG, but it is not currently a preferred solution.

4. UPDATES

4.1 Updates to Sharrows Guidance

Simon Kennett reported on the use of the marking in isolated situations where alternatives have not been available, despite this not being recommended in the guide, and the relative success of this use suggests potentially extending the possible use of the marking on both urban and rural roads. It was agreed that operating speeds and speed homogeneity between modes would be critical to safe use in a wider range of situations.

4.2 CNG Updates

Glen Koorey reported on further work done for CNG on cycle wayfinding signage design, path widths, rural cycling, directional cycle signals and cycleway lighting. Guidance on forward sight distances for rural cycling design has been included in CNG. Material in the NZCT Guide was used to inform the draft CNG guidance on rural cycling and gradients (and in some cases the CNG simply refers back to the NZCT Guide). Updated research on the effects of gradient on

powered and unpowered bikes, both uphill and downhill has also been inserted. Path widths appropriate for low volumes and when shared had been updated. Glen also announced a webinar on bus stop planning and design, covering location, planning and design, to be held on 6 December at 11am.

4.3 Parking and road safety questionnaire

Mark Edwards circulated a questionnaire for return by close of 25 November.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1 Bruce Conaghan noted the effect of the widespread use of impermeable surfacing for shared paths was the creation of unacceptable levels of surface water run-off.

5.2 Gerry Dance noted that AMIG had now been active for ten years and proposed that a review of its activities over those years might be an appropriate start to the new year. Gerry circulated the dates for AMIG meetings for 2023:

AMIG Meeting #1 - Thursday 9th February 9-12am

AMIG Meeting #2 - Tuesday 4th April - 9-12am

AMIG Meeting #3 - Thursday 8th June 9-12am

AMIG Meeting #4 - Thursday 3rd August 9-12am

AMIG Meeting #5 - Thursday 7th September

AMIG Meeting #6 - Wednesday 15th Nov to Thursday 16th Nov - meeting 9-12am

Meeting closed: 12:20pm