

## **MINUTES: SHARED FOOTPATHS WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**Thursday 17 August 2017 – 9.30 am**

**Boardroom, Wellington Museum, Queen’s Wharf, 3 Jervois Quay**

### **Present**

Kirsty Horridge	Hamilton City Council
Dr Lynley Hood	Visual Impairment Charitable Trust Aotearoa
Sarah Eames	Office for Seniors, MSD
Iain McAuley	System Design & Delivery, NZTA
Anna Blomquist	Wellington City Council, SASTA
Kate Bevin	Greater Wellington Regional Council
Ellen Blake	Living Streets Aotearoa
Sue McAuley	Nelson City Council (SASTA)
Patrick Morgan	Cycling Action Network
Carina Duke	Blind Foundation
Michael Voss	Waitaki District Council
Wayne Newman	RCA Forum Research & Guidelines Steering Group
Bridget Burdett	Traffic Design Group Limited
Paul Dickey	Office for Disability Issues

### **Apologies**

Amy Evanson	Office for Disability Issues (retired from group)
Phillipa Townsend	Office for Seniors, MSD (retired from group)
Lisa Beech	Alzheimers NZ (retired from group)
Amanda Banks	CCS Disability Issues, Waikato
Gerry Dance	System Design & Delivery, NZTA
Simon Kennett	System Design & Delivery, NZTA
Jenny Long	Auckland Transport
Trish Rudolph	NZ Transport Agency
Gerri Pomeroy	CCS Disability Action Waikato
Philippa Fletcher	Alzheimers NZ
Michael Harrison	Chairman
Alan Court	GM, Transport & Logistics, NZ Post
Heather Agnew	NZ Post
Andrew Knight	NZ Post

## **A g e n d a**

1. Welcome, introductions, apologies and H&S briefing
2. Minutes of 11 April 2017 and actions arising
3. Current guidance and direction for the use of footpaths
  - Role and purpose of working group
  - Accessibility and decision-making in transport – B. Burdett
4. Provision of facilities for pedestrians and wheeled devices
  - Shared path design at dual crossings – C. Duke
5. Research with regard to footpaths and provision for pedestrians
  - Shared footpaths – what does “good” look like?
6. Trials or projects for use of footpaths by multiple modes
  - Update on Paxster trials – A. Court, H. Agnew, A. Knight
7. Priorities for changes to rules affecting footpaths
  - Priority for pedestrians (and cyclists) over turning vehicles
  - Rules for operating in a shared footpath
8. Other business
9. Next meeting dates

## **Actions**

**Action 1:** A poster summary guide of the guidance, evidence and tools available to councils for supporting the various decisions they make for investments in active transport. (BB)

**Action 2:** Concerns regarding helmet-mounted cycle lights and giving way to alighting passengers from buses stopped at floating bus stops to be referred to AMIG. (WN)

**Action 3:** NZ Post to be invited to present an update to the next meeting. (WN)

**Action 4:** Support for an integrated approach to priority for both pedestrians and cyclists over turning traffic at intersections to be reported to AMIG. (WN)

**Action 5:** Date in the last week of October and place of the next meeting to be confirmed and circulated. (WN)

## NOTES

### 1. Welcome, introductions, apologies and H&S briefing

---

W. Newman opened the meeting. Each attendee gave a brief introduction of themselves and the organisation they represented. New attendees Anna Blomquist, Sarah Eames, Iain McAuley and Paul Dickey were welcomed and the apologies were noted. Late apologies due to the storm closing flights into Wellington airport included Michael Harrison and the team from NZ Post. The departures from the group of Phillipa Townsend, Amy Evanson and Lisa Beech were noted.

### 2. Minutes of meeting on 11 April 2017 and actions arising

---

The minutes of the meeting on 11 April 2017 (circulated with the Agenda) were approved as a true and proper record.

Actions from the last meeting:

1. Review of publicly available guidance and other documents from the United Kingdom, Canada, European countries, Australia and New Zealand and gaps analysis has been completed. Action: to be circulated (*Wayne*)

2. All members to use individual contacts to advance policy engagement between health and transport on the determinants of health, expand connections (especially with potential research investors), and increase awareness of the working group and issues being addressed.

Open

3. Stage 2 and Stage 3 research reports to be circulated (*Wayne*)

4. Forum leadership provide clarity on the next processes arising from the WG meeting discussions. (*Wayne*)

5. The link to minutes of meetings recorded on the Forum Web Page is resent to the WG members. (*Wayne*)

6. The power point slides from presentations to be circulated. (*Gerry*)

7. The review of regulatory tools to be circulated. (*Wayne*)

The meeting agreed that actions 1- 5 and 7 were completed.

### 3. Current guidance and direction for the use of footpaths

---

The tasks and issues before the Working Group were discussed. The role of the Group in delivering on the vision statement and objectives of the Road Controlling Authorities Forum “*to assist road-controlling authorities to make informed decisions*” was recognised.

The November 2016 and April 2017 meetings failed to “*actively contribute to reaching sector consensus on the design, provision or use of footpaths shared by multiple mobility modes*”.

The meeting noted that the Addendum to the report on Footpath Cycling Options Research recently circulated has supported the group's interpretation of the pedestrian and cyclist injury data. Concern was expressed that the recommendations of the Transport and Industrial Relations Committee to the government regarding the petition of Joanne Clendon would not reflect this later report.

Discussion to resolve the role and purpose of the working group noted the issues that remain unresolved. Pedestrian injuries needed to be considered, but the issue for footpaths was equally about accessibility and safety. While separation is recognised as best practice, there remain extensive networks of footpath that will not be widened and which the Select Committee decision would make shared infrastructure.

Initiatives to create shared zones by removing the footpath entirely, while retaining all facilities for cars to move and park, appeared to distribute the relative loss of amenity and facility of use inequitably between motorists and pedestrians. Where parking had been removed it has not invariably delivered the commercial downturn for adjacent retail and business premises that is commonly cited by opponents.

Footpaths cannot be considered entirely in isolation from the use of the road space and potential reallocation of that space. Councils need data on the value of kerb-side parking and the effect of reallocation in order to be able to assess the full benefits and costs of shared facilities, separated facilities or special vehicle lanes.

These assessments need to better reflect of the objective of transport and access, to provide for the capability for well-being of each user, and councils need leadership and support for this.

The meeting agreed that councils needed an equivalent to the Cycling Network Guidelines for shared footpaths, providing learnings and case studies of effective processes and interventions.

- **Accessibility and transport decision-making**

B. Burdett spoke to the need to encourage more effective investment logic mapping in investment decisions for active mobility. The critical gap is not a lack of guidelines or tools, but a lack of audits and monitoring to understand the outcomes, rather than the outputs. There is a need for a feedback loop to identify failure. Poor design decisions seem to follow poor community engagement, which often reflects a poor understanding of the economic benefits from making accessibility easier.

The meeting agreed that measuring participation, and having effective metrics for this, was critical to be able to identify the function being met by investment decisions and activities undertaken by road controlling authorities, and for them to be able to create better business cases.

**Action:** A poster summary guide of the guidance, evidence and tools available to councils for supporting the various decisions they make for investments in active transport. (BB)

#### **4. Provision of facilities for pedestrians and wheeled devices**

---

C. Duke presented a survey of shared path designs, in particular for dual crossings that showed continuing issues with the shared path entry and exit points for cyclists and for road crossings with separated facilities, and the appropriate installation of TGSIs. Dual crossings where the pedestrians are not using the installed facilities in the way they were intended by the designers is a design issue and not a pedestrian

behavioural issue, but it continues to be the pedestrian who is audited to have been in the wrong.

The examples show a confusing variety of design approaches and too often excessively complex outcomes. High, narrow separators for cycle lanes result in waste bins blocking these lanes. Floating bus stops directing cycle traffic onto the footpath create sudden shared paths and the approach for the cyclists has been designed so that they do not need to slow down to enter the shared spaces.

Dual direction cycle lanes and footpaths that become shared spaces at each corner, inconsistent design and illogical layouts make crossing roads and using the network unnecessarily confusing for people with visual or cognitive disabilities. If safety audits do not pick up these faults, accessibility audits need to be undertaken.

## **5. Research with regard to footpaths and provision for pedestrians**

---

The meeting discussed the effect of the new lux requirements for cycles and the use of helmet-mounted lights. These very bright high lights cannot be dimmed and tend to dazzle any approaching person, whether pedestrian or motorist, when placed on the helmet. The degree of movement resulting from head-wobble for helmet-mounted lights also makes these lights extremely confusing. The high-lux lights should be fitted to the cycle and helmet-mounted lights, if fitted, should be at the old lower-lux brightness.

The meeting also discussed floating-island bus stops where passengers step almost directly into a vehicle lane with cycle traffic passing at over 20 kph. This continues to confuse, startle or terrify passengers who are elderly or who have visual, hearing or cognitive disabilities. Better design might slow cyclists, but the key issue is a regulatory change to require vehicle traffic to give way at bus stops.

**Action:** Concerns regarding helmet-mounted cycle lights and giving way to alighting passengers from buses stopped at floating bus stops to be referred to AMIG. (WN)

## **6. Trials or projects for use of footpaths by multiple modes**

---

NZ Post has been progressing the introduction of new Paxster mail delivery vehicles for local deliveries in areas suitable for their use. An update on the Paxster trials from NZ Post had to be deferred as A. Court, H. Agnew and A. Knight were prevented from attending by the weather.

K. Horridge reported on the progress of the approved use of the Paxster by NZ Post around Hamilton. HCC has worked closely with both NZ Post and CCS Disability Action and has undertaken counts of footpath users, both with and without a visible mobility aid. It is a condition of the approval that there is no observed reduction in footpath usage, in particular by those with a disability.

The meeting noted that the most frequently observed conflict involving Paxsters on footpaths is between these and waste bins. There would be merit in having the mail delivery and waste collection days better coordinated to avoid or minimise this conflict.

**Action:** NZ Post to be invited to present an update to the next meeting. (WN)

## 7. Priorities for changes to rules affecting footpaths

---

- **Priority for pedestrians (and cyclists) over turning vehicles**

Living Streets Aotearoa is petitioning to have pedestrian priority over turning traffic at intersections. At the November meeting the working group supported giving pedestrians priority over turning traffic in accord with the priority in many North American and European jurisdictions, but noted that it would reverse the current priority for motorists on the roadway here and would need to be a highly publicised national change to avoid increasing the risk for pedestrians. S. Kennett presented an update on the Rule review to the April meeting. The review is seeking to improve safety for cyclists by giving cyclists proceeding straight ahead priority over turning traffic at intersections.

The meeting agreed that it would be logical to give pedestrian priority over turning traffic at intersections at the same time as part of the same highly publicised national Rule change. A localised trial of pedestrian priority over turning traffic at intersections, as recommended by the review, cannot be undertaken and would be likely to result in driver confusion and increased risk for pedestrians.

**Action:** Support for an integrated approach to priority for both pedestrians and cyclists over turning traffic at intersections to be reported to AMIG. (WN)

- **Rules for operating in a shared footpath**

The meeting noted the AMIG meeting in July 2017 considered and approved the Austroads behaviour markings for shared paths. Although the markings are not as clear in their message as might be wished for in places and could suggest less desirable behaviour (the cyclist appears to be shouting at the pedestrian), these markings have been installed by Nelson City and Christchurch City and it was agreed that a consistent national approach should be encouraged.

## 8. Other business

---

No items of other business were raised.

## 9. Future meeting dates

---

The meeting agreed that the group should convene again in the last week of October, after Labour Day.

**Action:** Date in the last week of October and place of the next meeting to be confirmed and circulated. (WN)

Meeting closed at 3.30 pm.