

All AMIG meetings minutes, summaries and presented material are available at:
<https://teams.microsoft.com/#/files/General?threadId=19%3A44cfceba3d7f48e3bd03f6c698d8d847%40thread.tacv2&ctx=channel&context=Summary%2520Mtg%2520Reports&rootfolder=%252Fsites%252FAMIG-ActiveModesInfrastructureGroup-grp365%252FShared%2520Documents%252FGeneral%252FSummary%2520Mtg%2520Reports>

**MINUTES: Thursday, 1 April 2021 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM.
Majestic 6.02 and Microsoft Teams Meeting**

Attending

- Simon Cager, Senior Project Engineer, Hutt City
- Niki Carling, Safe& Sustainable Journeys Manager, Rotorua Lakes District
- Gerry Dance, Team Leader Multi Modal, NZTA
- Steve Dejong, Senior Engineer, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- 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
- Will Hyde, Senior Transportation Engineer, Tauranga City
- Simon Kennett, Principal Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Glen Koorey, Director, ViaStrada, representing Transportation Group NZ
- Chris Lai, Transportation Planner, Palmerston North City
- Malcolm McAulay, Senior Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Tony Mills, Senior Rooding Engineer, Napier
- Sandi Morris, Road Safety & Traffic Planning Engineer, Far North District Council
- Wayne Newman, (secretary)
- Graham Noble, Auckland Transport
- Eynon Phillips, Strategic Transport Engineer, Hastings District
- James Wratt, Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA

Apologies

- Glenn Bunting, Manager Network Safety, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Erik Teekman, Principal Adviser Walking & Cycling, NZTA
- Bill Rice, Senior Transport Engineer, Nelson City

Guests

- Nadine Dodge, Principal Advisor, Transport Strategy, Wellington City
- Keren Love, researcher (Masters student, VUW)
- Lorelei Schmitt, Senior Multi-modal Specialist, NZTA

A G E N D A

- 1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES**
- 2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**
Actions from the meeting on 4 February 2021
- 3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES**
 - 3.1 Selection and use of non-permanent materials for pilot projects
 - 3.2 PT Design Guide, bus-stop bypass and pedestrian crossing design
 - 3.3 Crossings
 - a. Pedestrian Crossing Facility Selection Flowchart
 - b. Draft Technical Advice Note for Zebra Crossing Design
 - 3.4 Separated Cycleways Selection Tool - need to update?
- 4. UPDATES**
 - 4.1 Non-compliant use of bridge-end markers
 - 4.2 Behaviour markings for shared paths
 - 4.3 Rural cycling
 - 4.4 TCD Steering Group report
 - 4.5 Draft TAN for mobility scooters
 - 4.6 2-aspect and directional signals trials
 - 4.7 CNG and PNG
 - 4.8 Tauranga separator example
- 5. OTHER BUSINESS**
 - 5.1 2WalkandCycle highlights (not taken)
 - 5.2 Confirm site visit to Hastings for final 2021 meeting

NOTES

- 1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES**

Gerry Dance welcomed Tony Mills to AMIG. The apologies of were noted. The agenda was confirmed.
- 2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes from the meeting on 4 February 2021 were confirmed.
- 3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES**
 - 3.1 Selection and use of non-permanent materials for pilot projects**

Gerry Dance explained the context of new guidance being developed. Release of Tactical Urbanism Guide and Innovating Streets for People projects identified need. Draft offers guidance on general principles, materials, attachment and relevant other guidance material. Would be circulated for comment within a few weeks.

Discussion of the safety and cost balance, and perceptions of safety, for different materials identified that little real recent relevant research has been done to support decision-making. Feedback from AMIG members on experiences with materials and designs was vital.

Steve Dejong and Simon Kennett clarified the speed requirements for road-art in response to a query from Sandi Morris. RCAs implementing road art should put in place calming devices to achieve speeds below 30kmph, however, the actual speed does not need to be less than 30kmph before commencing a project. If the project, after installation, fails to achieve actual speeds of less than 30kmph then the response would be to add further speed dampeners in order to deliver the reduction, rather than move directly to removing the project.

3.2 PT Design Guide, bus-stop bypass and pedestrian crossing design

Simon Kennett presented several potential bypass designs being considered for the PTDG. Concerns were expressed for several of these. The designs provide for one-way cycle lanes only and need to consider two-way facilities as well. Designs that include having the bus stopping in the cycle lane would be a disincentive to other than the most experienced and fearless cyclists. A design developed by AT using a platform and pseudo-crossing has been superseded and Twan van Duivenbooden noted that the new designs needed to be provided.

Passengers alighting from a bus cannot be expected to alight onto an active traffic lane, so adequate space is required for them to alight with their bags, children, push chair, walker or whatever, gather their thoughts and move off. Providing a single Zebra crossing level with the front door of the bus might address the needs of vision-impaired passengers arriving at the stop to board but would be unrealistic where passengers alight from the rear of the bus.

Although a cycleway is currently distinct from a roadway and crossings may be marked differently, this would not be the case if the law changes and having Zebra crossings with the recommended 600/600 bars and Belisha beacons is impractical. If a tactile edge is thought necessary for the whole length of the cycleway at the bus stop edge, all of the cycleway beside a bus stop is a potential conflict zone and not just the part marked as a crossing.

There is a need to make all users immediately aware of the potential for conflict and to provide both good visibility and speed management. Giving either pedestrians or cyclists a sense of priority or a perception of safety that is not actually present should be avoided. If colour is used, green should not be used; red would indicate the conflict zone. Continuous colour was agreed not to be cost effective. Blocs of red would potentially “flash” their message.

The meeting welcomed Keren Love and Nadine Dodge, who explained that Keren had undertaken a summer research project for Wellington City Council to assess users’ perceptions of safety at eight sites in Wellington. A site in Victoria St was used as a control for comparing perceptions of sites on Crawford Rd, Island Bay, Rongotai Rd, a second Victoria St site and Hutt Rd, with a minimum of 20 users being surveyed for each site.

The research revealed the variety of designs already being used and the level of confusion among users. Placement of shelters was shown to be an issue for visibility. At busier bus stops (such as at Island Bay) this was usually pedestrians stepping out from behind the shelter, but on a busy cycleway (Hutt Rd) the issue was cyclists passing cyclists and seeing vehicles at exits from commercial premises.

The research also showed a preference among users for a clearer indication of the intended priority. Although this tended to be an assumption that a Zebra would give pedestrians priority, there was little suggestion that pedestrians would wait and cross on the Zebra if it were present.

There will be a further revision of the draft designs being proposed for the PTDG to reflect the concerns and comments.

Keren, Nadine and Lorelei left the meeting at the close of item 3.2.

3.3 Crossings

a. Pedestrian Crossing Facility Selection Flowchart

Gerry Dance presented the flowchart and invited feedback. Glen Koorey noted that the flowchart seeks to identify the options available for a given speed and volume context. He explained that the tool is intended to augment the Austroads tool by providing greater detail. It will be added to the PNG.

b. Draft TAN for Zebra crossings design

Gerry Dance explained that a release of a Technical Note was thought appropriate to pull together the latest thoughts regarding bar widths, ramp markings and use of colour. Sandi Morris raised the use of a Kea flag on a Zebra on a platform and it was agreed that this would come to the next AMIG meeting but would not be included in the TAN.

3.4 Separated Cycleways Selection Tool - need to update?

Simon Kennett noted that he had circulated a query to members about use of SCOT. Hilary Fowler commented that, having not previously used it, she had done so and found it useful. Glen Koorey noted that it is now being given a higher profile in the list of tools and guides available on CNG, as well as in training courses.

4. UPDATES

4.1 Non-compliant use of bridge-end markers

Steve Dejong provided a note on this, appended to the minutes.

4.2 Behaviour markings for shared paths

Simon Kennett reported on the further development of these. Different fonts were tested to yield better visibility of the message to give space, but the chosen font was not already in the TCD Rule so the marking will need to be Gazetted. A suite of new markings is being assembled. Three options were being tested for “move to the side” and the meeting agreed that showing the path (as in the original VicRoads marking) made the intended behaviour clearer.

4.3 Rural cycling

Glen Koorey reported that work on this is continuing.

4.4 TCD Steering Group report

Steve Dejong reported that the Omnibus Rule Change has been passed and a number of signs developed by Richard Bean and Mark Edwards will come into full effect from 1 May 2021. He also reported on work being done to convert TCD Part 5 (currently available in PDF) to html to give full navigation to links and noted that TCD Part 4 is due to be released in May for consultation.

4.5 Draft TAN for mobility scooters

Gerry Dance reported on the work being done by John Lieswyn looking specifically at provision for mobility scooters in the design of pedestrian refuges. The limited turning axis for these, combined with the physical frailty or disability of the user, makes a double 90° turn or even a S-bend path inappropriate refuge designs. The minimum guidance will be included in the PNG.

4.6 2-aspect and directional signals trials

Steve Dejong noted that there had been several queries regarding these. New trial sites may be Gazetted, but a complete list of the sites would be needed if members wished to be involved. He also noted that there remains the possibility of the Minister

refusing to approve the device, at which point the signals would need to be removed. As these would still be trials, a minimal level of monitoring and reporting would be expected.

4.7 CNG and PNG updates

Gerry Dance reported that the PNG draft site has a new look and format to make it more intuitive to navigate, and that the CNG site will host the AMIG page, too.

4.8 Tauranga separator example

Glen Koorey presented the design used for a separator on Ngatai Rd in Tauranga. This involved two mountable kerbs laid back to back with a level filled space between them. He noted that the design offered minimal impacts whether hit from either side. Will Hyde confirmed that the design worked well, but had proved irresistible to younger cyclists to ride along.

4.9 ASB enforcement

Simon Kennett raised an additional item. There have been several requests under the OIA over the past year and two recent enquiries from an advocate and from the Police on this topic. The ASB is enforceable: if a vehicle enters the ASB on the red signal it commits the offence of crossing the vehicle limit line on the red signal.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

5.1 2WalkandCycle highlights

Item not taken.

5.2 Confirm site visit to Hastings for final 2021 meeting

Gerry Dance noted that a visit to Hastings had been included on the programme of AMIG meetings for 2020 and the invitation to visit and inspect the exciting range of developments providing for active modes in the region remained open. It would be the first physical meeting of AMIG since February 2020 and the first site visit since Dunedin in 2019.

Gerry proposed two options for dates: 17/18 or 24/25 November. Members would be polled on their preference.

Meeting closed: 12.00 pm