

**Meeting on 12 April 2017**  
**Board Room at the Chews Lane National Office**  
**Wellington**

**Attending:**

- Gerry Dance, Cycling Delivery Manager, National Cycling Team, NZTA
- Kirsty Horridge, Network Engineer, Hamilton City
- Tim Hughes, National Traffic and Safety Engineer, NZTA
- Simon Kennett, Senior Project Manager, National Cycling Team, NZTA
- Glenn Bunting, Network Manager, NZTA
- Richard Bean, Senior Engineer, NZTA
- Kathryn King, Walking & Cycling Manager, Auckland Transport
- Ina Stenzel, Principal Specialist – Walking and Cycling, AT
- Steve Dejong, Traffic Engineer, Christchurch City
- Paul Barker, Safe and Sustainable Transport Manager, Wellington
- Glen Koorey – representing IPENZ Transportation group

**Apologies:**

- Wayne Newman, RCA Forum Research & Guidelines Group
- Claire Graham, Senior Specialist – Walking and Cycling, AT
- Nick Marshall, Senior Roading Engineer, Whangarei District
- Susan Lilley, Transportation Planner, Dunedin City
- Clare Cassidy, Planning Engineer, Transport, Tauranga City
- Nathaniel Benefield, Lets Go Project Manager, New Plymouth District
- Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District
- Jodie Lawson, Sustainable Transport Team Leader, Rotorua Lakes
- Marni Ratzel, Team Leader, walking and cycling, AT

**ACTIONS**

- Send a letter to all councils to encourage representation on AMIG - WN
- Advisory speed marking for shared paths and possible advisory speed limit – TH/SK
- Regulatory supplementary sign 'To Cyclists' to be progressed – RB
- CNG will be developed for consultation and ratification. Austroads guides and Christchurch guide will be referenced. Best practice notes and case studies will be referred to AMIG for consideration – TH
- KiwiRail Level Crossing Guidelines to be circulated – GK/GD
- A case study of the key attributes for separators will be developed – SD, IS, TH
- The trial of hook-turn signs will be tried at another site – SD
- A case study on bus stop design on separated cycle routes will be undertaken – PB
- Directional signals update will be provided to the next meeting – SD
- An application for a trial of signal cycling aspects will be developed – RB
- Notes from the making trials easier workshop will be circulated to the group – GD
- A trial of different crossing markings is to be developed – SK

- A further Rule change appears to be needed to make ASBs enforceable – SK
- Rule needs to contain a definition of a shared path – SK/TH

## **AGENDA – MAIN ITEMS**

- 1 Welcome, introductions, apologies and H&S briefing
2. Minutes of 24 November 2016 and actions arising
3. Risk assessment and design guidance for pedestrian/cycle rail crossing
4. Separator trial – Ilam Road
5. Hook turn sign operation
6. Bus stop design on separated cycle routes
7. Directional signals for cycles
8. Signals on shared paths
9. Footpath cycling
10. EVs, E-bikes and low-powered vehicles
11. Short-term cycle-friendly infrastructure trial options
12. RUR Research
13. Other business
  - a. Sharrows
  - b. Conferences
  - c. Enforcement of ASB's
  - d. Shared path marking trial
  - e. Driveway marking trial – Hutt road
  - f. Skid resistance on paths - board walks etc
  - g. Shared path gradient's
  - h. Legality of different facilities by different users
  - i. Levels of service
- 14 Next meeting

## **NOTES**

### **1. Introductions, apologies and emergency briefing**

G Dance welcomed the group and provided the emergency briefing. There were no introductions other than welcoming back Glen Koorey to the group. Glen represents the IPRENZ Transportation Group.

## **2. Actions from last meeting**

- A. Sign and two markings for entrances across cycle paths scheduled to be Gazetted on 13 April.
- B. Noted.
- C. Regulatory supplementary sign 'To Cyclists' yet to be progressed.
- D. Testing not progressed on using word or symbol for cyclists and pedestrians.
- E. Advisory speed markings seeking to alter user behaviour need to be explored further – action to take forward from this meeting.
- F. Noted.
- G. CNG will be developed for consultation and ratification. Austroads guides and Christchurch guide will be referenced. Best practice notes and case studies will be referred to AMIG for consideration.

## **3. Risk assessment and design guidance for pedestrian/cycle rail crossing**

G. Koorey gave a presentation on the new guidance. Questions: how does the guideline fit with TCD part 9; what is the new RCAF working group working on?

## **4. Separator trial – Ilam Road**

S. Dejong gave a presentation on the trial of separators on Ilam Rd. A concrete reinforced raised median was in place. It had a high failure rate, high maintenance costs and high full life costs. Interlocking flexible modular separators were trialled. Issues included poor fit between modules, colour variation and variation between modules on having reflectors. Nevertheless, they are working better than the concrete. Guidelines on the height and colour of separators are needed. These need to be based on research. A case study of the key attributes for separators will be provided.

## **5. Hook turn sign operation**

S. Dejong reported on the trial of the Hook-turn sign. The operation has not met expectations, whether as a result of adjacent land use, the height of the sign or some other, unknown factor, but the monitoring to date has not shown any use of the hook turn. The hook-turn sign will be tried at another site.

## **6. Bus stop design on separated cycle routes**

S. Dejong, I. Stenzel, P. Barker and T. Hughes all presented designs being used in different centres. These revealed no consistent design is in use. Recognition of local context could be the main design variable, but research seems to be needed to explore whether a consistent national design can be agreed upon. A case study on bus stop design on separated cycle routes will be supplied.

## **7. Directional signals for cycles**

An application for a trial has been made to the TCD Steering Group and agreement to a trial has been given. The conditions of the trial and the devices to be used in the trial are still being finalised. An update will be provided to the next meeting.

## **8. Signals on shared paths**

The legal requirement is for three cycle aspects. An application for a trial of signal cycling aspects will be developed.

## **9. Footpath cycling**

S. Kennett presented a report on the research supporting footpath cycling up to 12 years old. If footpath cycling is allowed in all areas where it is not expressly forbidden, there will need to be a sign or marking to designate pedestrian only footpaths.

## **10. EVs, E-bikes and low-powered vehicles**

How e-bikes and low powered vehicles will fit into the picture is still not clear.

## **11. Short-term cycle-friendly infrastructure trial options**

The workshop on making trials easier was noted as relevant to this. Notes from the workshop will be circulated to the group.

## **12. RUR Research**

G. Koorey presented a summary of the proposed changes. Rule 1 would introduce concept of path user and path crossing. A crossing is defined by lines; a texture change or platform does not add to the legal requirement. Rule 2 would redefine "roadway". It was agreed that Rule 1 must include the option to give priority to pedestrian or to cyclist. A trial of different crossing markings is also needed.

## **13. Other business**

- a. Sharrows – more guidance and more public education is needed.
- b. Conferences – noted 2Walk&Cycle scheduled for 2-6 July 2018.
- c. Enforcement of ASB's – controlled by traffic signals, but Police consider these unenforceable. A further Rule change appears to be needed to make ASBs enforceable.
- d. Shared path marking trial – has been completed and results will be reported to TCDSG.
- e. Driveway marking trial on Hutt Road – has produced good results.
- f. Skid resistance on paths - board walks, etc – needs to be appropriate for intended user and fit for purpose.
- g. Shared path gradients - needs to be appropriate for intended user and fit for purpose, but being a pedestrian facility and not a ramp, there is no defined minimum level of service. Warning signs for gradient could be explored further.
- h. Legality of different facilities by different users – lack of definition of a shared path limits what can be done. The Rule needs to contain a definition of a shared path.
- i. Levels of service – this work is being progressed by T. Hughes. AT is working on a Level of Quality Guide

## **14. Next meeting**

Agreed the date of the next meeting would be advised in due course.