

Meeting at 8:45 on 7 May 2015

Room 6.07, NZTA National Office
Victoria Street, Wellington

Attending:

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| • Carl Whittleston | Lets Go Project Manager, New Plymouth District |
| • Kathryn King | Manager-Community Transport, Auckland Transport |
| • Malcolm McAulay | Senior Walking & Cycling Engineer, AT |
| • Susan Lilley | Transportation Planner, Dunedin City |
| • Claire Sharland | Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District |
| • Richard Bean | Senior Engineer, NZTA |
| • Tim Hughes | National Traffic and Safety Engineer, NZTA [remote] |
| • Steve Dejong | Traffic Engineer, Christchurch City |
| • Paul Barker | Safe and Sustainable Transport Manager, Wellington |
| • Kirsty Horridge | Network Engineer, Hamilton City |
| • Gerry Dance | Principal Advisor, Network Optimisation, NZTA |
| • Glenn Bunting | Network Manager, NZTA |
| • Mark Haseley | Principal Transport Planner, NZTA |
| • Sandy Mills | Senior Transportation Planner, Flow (for AT) |
| • Wayne Newman | RCA Forum Research & Guidelines Group (secretary) |
| • Axel Wilke | Senior Transport Engineer, ViaStrada |
| • Jeanette Ward | Principal Transportation Engineer, Abley [remote-2 only] |

(Tim Hughes and Jeanette Ward attended by video-link from NZTA Christchurch.)

Apologies:

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| • Dougal List | National Manager Cycling, NZTA |
| • Sandi Morris | Transportation Planner, Palmerston North City |
| • Glen Koorey | Civil and Natural Resources Engineering School, Cant. |
| • Clare Cassidy | Planning Engineer, Transport, Tauranga City |

AGENDA and ACTIONS ARISING

- 1.** Introductions, apologies and emergency briefing
- 2.** Draft National cycling design guidelines
ACTION: Members will review the proposed prioritisations for the design guide project and provide feedback to the project team as soon as possible.
- 3.** Shared Pedestrian Cyclist Path signage
ACTION: Auckland Transport will prepare a trial application for the use of symbols marked on, or incorporated into, the pavement in place of signs for the shared path transitions within Stage 2 of the Beach Road facility.
- 4.** Draft National guidelines for Sharrow implementation
ACTION: Flow will provide a proposal to Auckland Transport and the Transport Agency outlining tasks required to complete national best practice guidelines for sharrows.
- 5.** Reports on trial post-implementation surveys
ACTION: 1. Flow will provide the draft summary report to trial RCAs for feedback before the report is finalised and released. 2. AMIG will formally request that Flow reports to AMIG the outcome of the trials and its recommendation, for AMIG to submit the report, conclusions and recommendation to NZTA on receipt.
- 6.** Cost:benefit - LANE vs green background for M2-3
- 7.** RUR amendments progress
ACTION: All members will provide feedback on priorities on the circulated list of all currently known proposed changes to the Road User Rule by 31 May 2015.
- 8.** Intersection research and trials proposals
- 9.** Pavement markings v signs
- 10.** Cyclist crossing trial proposals
- 11.** Cycle signals trial update
- 12.** Pedestrian way-finding signage
- 13.** Motorised pedestrians and pedestrian infrastructure
ACTION: Members will provide feedback on whether they wish to participate in, or nominate someone to be a member of, a working group on mobility devices.
- 14.** General Business
ACTION: 1. NZTA will circulate criteria for standard descriptors for facilities.
2. Tim Hughes will ask NZTA Environment Team for comment on risks from glass additives to green surfacing.
- 15.** Next meeting
9 July 2015 at NZTA National Office, Victoria St, Wellington

1. Introductions and apologies

Introductions and apologies were taken. Axel Wilke, Jeanette Ward and Sandy Mills were welcomed back. Kathryn King was welcomed.

2. Draft national cycling design guidelines

Jeanette Ward and Axel Wilke reported on the progress of this project. The survey of technical stakeholders received 160 responses (46 from urban local authorities and 16 from rural local authorities) with a good coverage of roles. With the report on the survey results to the project steering group on 14 May, Stage 1 will be completed. Stage 2 will extend from May through September.

The survey identified insufficient or inadequate guidance on how to assess demand as the principle planning issue in developing cycle networks [80/160]. Other issues include:

- Insufficient or inadequate wider transport policy to support development of a cycle network [73/160]
- Insufficient or inadequate network planning guidance [57/160]
- Failure to identify target users [57/160]
- Insufficient or inadequate guidance on selecting a route [42/160]

As identifying target users and selecting a route can be considered subsets of assessing demand and network planning, respectively, the survey identified three key planning issues.

Identifying target users [44/160] and assessing demand for the corridor [61/160] were key issues encountered in designing a facility, but the most significant issue remains space allocation, i.e. removal of on-street parking [130/160]. Other issues include legislation too restrictive to allow innovation [49/160] and insufficient or inadequate guidance on:

- intersections [72/160]
- selecting a facility [56/160]
- overall design [46/160]
- mid-block facilities [34/160]

Higher priority gaps to be addressed in planning included cyclists' needs and space allocation, while aligning the Cycling Network and Route Planning Guide with the One Network Road Classification and levels of service were seen as potentially having lower priority. Discussion of this suggested that integrated transport planning would be better achieved by starting from the ONRC. Cyclists' needs and levels of service, as well as the relative benefits of parking or provision for cyclist traffic, would be best addressed through the ONRC. Defining levels of service (in particular for gradient) needs to be progressed in parallel with the design guide.

Higher priority gaps in mid-block design included protected facilities and neighbourhood greenways, while bus/cycle lane design and cycle lane minimum widths were potentially medium priority gaps. Further discussion of this suggested that, while some gaps might be easily and quickly fixed, the consequences of not addressing these might be relatively minor in comparison to others and prioritisation must recognise the scale of consequence. For this reason it was agreed that bus lane design and minimum cycle lane widths have higher priority than neighbourhood greenways.

An issue identified for protected (segregated or separated) facilities that will need to be addressed with higher urgency is the cost-effective design of temporary facilities, as competing developments are likely to mean that many current protected facilities might be temporary.

Higher priority gaps in intersection design included addressing temporal and spatial components in designs, guidance on cycle detection methods, aligning Austroads and TCD Manual dimensions and guidance on vehicle mixing lanes. Clarifying the rules around give-way priorities and where Austroads differed from NZ practice, as in cycle phase extension and cycle lanes in roundabouts were also given potentially higher priority. The discussion recognised limits to how far guidelines could anticipate any change from prevailing laws and regulations, but agreed that guidance on assessing roundabouts and potentially recommending their removal where the levels of service on a corridor are diminished could be included.

The group agreed that there is a need to raise consideration of cycling design into integrated transport planning and there is a need for urgency in the face of a need for design guidance for Urban Cycleway projects from July. There is a need for immediate gap-filers and it may become necessary to set up trials within

programmes and progress aspects of the project in parallel. This would require care to ensure agreed standards for comparable monitoring.

ACTION: members will review the proposed prioritisations for the design guide project and provide feedback to the project team as soon as possible.

3. Shared pedestrian-cyclist path signage

Kathryn King and Axel Wilke explained that the design of the Beach Rd facilities and the signage required for the frequent transition from shared to separate paths had drawn heavy criticism of the signage clutter. Under the current rules, the 400m length of Beach Rd Stage 2 will require 61 signs.

Axel queried the interpretation of a sign as being mounted on a pole and suggested that pavement-mounted signage would be better. Although any sign on a pavement becomes a marking, the group agreed that signs are best suited to giving information to motorists and pavement markings are better suited to the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, and removing signs that are irrelevant for motorists and poles that are a hazard or nuisance to cyclists and pedestrians has potential safety benefits as well as improved urban design outcomes.

Although pavement markings are widely used on shared paths already by many authorities, they provide no regulatory function and are unenforceable. If local authorities are going to take a more responsible attitude towards such facilities, an enforceable regulatory response does need to be supported. It was agreed that there appears to be a good case for a trial of alternatives to the current signs, whether markings or cast or inset symbols, to support an application for a change to the rule, and that good urban design needs to be considered and incorporated into the design and provision of facilities as a matter of course.

ACTION: Auckland Transport will prepare a trial application for the use of symbols marked on, or incorporated into, the pavement in place of signs for the shared path transitions within Stage 2 of the Beach Road facility.

4. Draft national guidelines for sharrows implementation

Sandy Mills reported that the results from the trials and post-implementation surveys have informed the draft guidelines prepared for AT by Flow NZ early in 2014 for implementation of the trials in Auckland. Aspects of the work undertaken to date may be utilised during the preparation of national guidelines, however, additional work will need to be undertaken to incorporate findings and 'lessons learnt' from on road trials and perception surveys. Guidelines will need to be available when the sharrow marking becomes legally available to authorities, which is currently expected to be in 2016.

ACTION: Flow will provide a proposal to Auckland Transport and the Transport Agency outlining tasks required to complete national best practice guidelines for sharrows.

5. Report on trials post-implementation surveys

Sandy Mills reported that the reports from the trials in Auckland, Palmerston North, Wellington, Nelson and Dunedin had been reviewed to produce a single summary report on the trials, perception surveys and post-implementation surveys. This included results from a national survey of its membership made by AA New Zealand.

The data indicates that there was a measurable shift by a significant proportion of cyclists in the trials further to the right in the lane and further from the 'door-zone'. There was, therefore, an observed beneficial effect with no observed negative effect.

Every trial observed reduced vehicle speeds in response to the markings. This is a clear indication that the marking was communicating with its principal target audience, although the trials were not designed to measure whether reduced speeds were only a temporary response to a changed environment. Although an unintended consequence, the reduction was statistically significant and delivers significant potential safety gains.

The perception surveys of the 'sharrows' appear to indicate the public saw the marking as different from the present M2-3 symbol and having a different meaning. Although understanding was mixed, the outcome was generally positive with no negative perception. The results indicate that the two symbols can exist side by side without a need to modify or augment the existing symbol.

It was agreed that Flow NZ be requested to present its conclusions from the trials and its recommendations on introduction of sharrow markings and the need to unlock the existing symbol, for AMIG to formally submit to the Transport Agency.

The draft summary report will be provided to the five trialling authorities for comment and the final summary report will be available once the report is finalised.

ACTIONS:

1. Flow will provide the draft summary report to trial RCAs for feedback before the report is finalised and released.
2. AMIG will formally request that Flow reports to AMIG the outcome of the trials and its recommendation for AMIG to submit report, conclusions and recommendation to NZTA on receipt.

6. Cost: benefit of LANE v green background for M2-3

In light of the report on the post-implementation surveys, there is a clear and significant cost benefit for every authority in not having to modify or augment the M2-3 symbol by retrofitting either LANE or a background to existing symbols.

7. Rule amendments progress

Gerry Dance reported on the dramatic changes in the priority being accorded provision of cycling facilities since the group adopted its work programme in June 2014. As a result, that programme has been overtaken by events and superseded by changed circumstances. Development of cycling design guidance is essential for delivery of the programme of investment in cycling facilities over the next three years. Guidelines on priority issues will be needed within six months.

Against this background it will be necessary to prioritise needs and progress changes to the Rule in several tranches. Programme project proposals are already identifying priorities, such as intersections and separated facility design. Trials of specific design elements will support applications for Rule changes to enable innovative design. It was agreed that priority must be given to changes where delay carries the greatest risk to the programme or the greatest consequences if left unresolved. Gerry Dance confirmed that the concept of a dedicated cycling package of Rule changes had been recommended to the Minister.

ACTION: All members will provide feedback on priorities on the circulated list of all currently known proposed changes to the Road User Rule by 31 May 2015.

8. Intersection research and trials proposals

9. Pavement markings v signs

These items were agreed to have been adequately addressed in prior items.

10. Cyclist crossing trial proposals

Steve Dejong spoke to the previously circulated design for a cycle crossing beside a pedestrian zebra between "Give Way" signs and markings, proposed for Ilam Rd. The object is to accord priority to cyclists and pedestrians at a crossing used by 200 pedestrians per hour. After discussing each proposed component in turn and the potential alternative interventions, it was agreed that the zebra needed to be retained as a recognised marking, but the cycle crossing should be marked as an elephant's feet chequer instead of a solid lane to avoid creating an impression of continuity and priority for cyclists that could put them at risk from entering the road suddenly in front of approaching vehicles. The presence of a double crossing would justify the requirement for vehicles to give way to improve the safety of the crossing.

11. Cycle signals trial update

Steve Dejong explained that the trial application was withdrawn and optically programmable signals will be tested. No decision has yet been made on whether a new trial application might be submitted.

12. Pedestrian way-finding signage

It was agreed that nationally consistent way-finding signage for pedestrians was a lower priority than for cyclists. Guidelines for cyclist way-finding signage have been developed and these recognise that the two users have differing needs from route information and way-finding signage should not be mixed. There is a need, potentially, for guidelines on minimising and managing the proliferation of signs, and to achieve national consistency around the placement of signs in relation to signage for different modes, but this is not a priority at this time.

13. Motorised pedestrians and pedestrian infrastructure

It was agreed that there is a significant overlap in interests between any group established to consider issues around motorised pedestrians, whether on mobility scooters or other devices, and AMIG, because these devices are using the infrastructure used by active modes. For this reason, although a separate working group should consider the problems with these devices and whether design standards or licensing might be needed, it was recognised that close cooperation with AMIG was likely to be needed if guidelines on providing infrastructure suited to motorised pedestrians were developed.

ACTION: members will provide feedback on whether they wish to participate in, or nominate someone to be a member of, a working group on mobility devices.

14. General business

a. Technical review panel for innovative design

Kathryn King raised the idea of having a panel able to act as a sounding board for innovative design ideas, especially during the period of the major programme works over the next three years, as a means of enabling innovation while ensuring best practice.

b. Standardised nomenclature

Carl Whittleston raised the problem of inconsistent terminology being used for paths, tracks, routes, etc being displayed by Googlemaps. Gerry Dance noted that the terminology for facilities across the country was inconsistent and confusing, and gave

little guidance on the likely levels of service that might be encountered. Multiple terms are used for specific types of facility, such as protected, segregated or separated, while the same term is used to describe facilities with widely differing levels of service, such as "primary".

It was agreed that descriptors need to be intuitive and simple, such as 'separated', 'on road' or 'greenway', to define the level of service to be expected and criteria for using standardised descriptors need to be developed and circulated to members as a priority.

ACTION: NZTA will circulate criteria for standardised descriptors for facilities.

c. Environmental effect of green surfacing

Steve DeJong reported that the draft standard for green surfacing has been released and Canterbury University has challenged the environmental effect of the aggregate and glass additives.

ACTION: Tim Hughes will ask NZTA Environment Team for comment on risks from glass additives to green surfacing.

d. Temporary traffic management on shared facilities

Steve also raised a question about changes of legal priority made under CoPTTM, where vehicles can be put onto a shared facility and displace the intended users, with no provision being made for those users. Where are the cyclists and pedestrians supposed to go?

15. Next meeting

The group will convene again at 9.00 am on **9 July 2015** at NZTA National Office, Victoria St, Wellington.