ROAD CONTROLLING AUTHORITIES FORUM (NZ) INC
Active Modes Infrastructure Group

MINUTES: Thursday, 3 February 2022 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM.
Majestic 7.02 and Microsoft Teams Meeting Conference

All AMIG meetings minutes, summaries and presented material are available at:
- https://nzta.govt.nz/walking-cycling-and-public-transport/active-modes-infrastructure-group/

Attending

- Michael Bridge, Activity Manager Active Transport, Palmerston North City
- David Brown, Traffic and Safety Engineer, New Plymouth
- Glenn Bunting, Manager Network Safety, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Serena Chia, Emerging Professional, Multimodal, NZTA
- Izelda Cruz, Taupo District
- Gerry Dance, Team Leader Multi-Modal, NZTA
- Gemma Dioni, Senior Transportation Engineer, Christchurch City
- Twan van Duivenbooden, Principal Specialist Active & Shared Modes Design, AT
- Mark Edwards, Multi-modal Senior Advisor, NZTA
- Mike van Enter, Senior Transportation Engineer, Tasman District Council
- Hilary Fowler, Senior Transport Planner/Engineer, Wellington City
- Karen Hay, Cycle Plan Implementation Leader, Tauranga City
- Simon Kennett, Principal Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Glen Koorey, Director, ViaStrada, representing Transportation Group NZ
- Chris Lai, Palmerston North City
- Nick Marshall, Team-leader Road Safety & Traffic Engineering, Northland Transport Alliance
- Malcolm McAulay, Senior Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Tony Mills, Senior Transport Engineer, Napier
- Wayne Newman, (secretary)
- Eynon Phillips, Strategic Transport Engineer, Hastings District
- Bill Rice, Senior Transport Engineer, Nelson City
- Clare Scott, Transport Planner, Active Modes, Tasman District
- Erik Teekman, Principal Adviser Walking & Cycling, NZTA
- James Wratt, Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA
- Honor Young, Senior Active & Sustainable Transport Engineer, Hamilton City

Apologies

- Niki Carling, Safe & Sustainable Journeys Manager, Rotorua Lakes District
- Steve Dejong, Senior Engineer, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District

Guests

- Caroline Dumas, Programme Lead ONF, Multimodal, NZTA (3.4)
- Peta Baily Gibson, Principal Advisor, Engagement & Partnerships, NZTA (3.4)

A G E N D A

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING
Actions from the meeting on 18 November 2021

3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES
3.1 Lessons from Quay St and Karangahape Rd ……Twan van Duivenbooden
3.2 Signs/markings to direct scooters to use cycle lanes/paths …….Simon Kennett
3.3 Preferred separation graph review ……Simon Kennett
3.4 One Network Framework ……..Caroline Dumas
3.5 Use of Coloured Surfacing ……..……..Mark Edwards

4. UPDATES
4.1 CNG
4.2 PNG
4.3 TCD trials
4.4 Speed control devices study

5. OTHER BUSINESS
5.1 2022 - AMIG programme
5.2 2022 – Priorities, plans and projects

NOTES

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES
Gerry Dance welcomed members to the first meeting of 2022 and introduced Izelda Cruz and Serena Chia to the group. The apologies of Claire Sharland, Steve Dejong and Niki Carling were noted. The draft agenda was confirmed with the addition of item 3.5.

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING
Minutes of the meeting on 18 November 2021 were confirmed without change.

3.1 LESSONS FROM QUAY ST AND KARANGAHAPE ROAD
Twan van Duivenbooden apologised that his presentation, originally on the agenda for the meeting on 30 September 2021, was no longer quite so topical in reporting works completed last year.

Quay Street
At its western end the separated cycle path debouches into a space conceived as a plaza where pedestrians, cyclists, public transport and motor vehicles have to interact, in response to the high numbers of all modes in motion at this nexus adjacent to Viaduct Harbour. Pedestrians and cyclists need to be allowed to cross at the same time to achieve acceptable delays for other modes.

The cycle path was distinguished from the pedestrian footpath by a visibly different surface and colour. Threshold markings had been moved back onto this surface to be more distinct for both pedestrians and cyclists. Pedestrians

initially used the cycle path interchangeably with the footpath, but this ceased with increased use by cyclists and better familiarity with the layout. The cycle counter showed 22,500 trips during January.

The path's alignment creates a slight conflict at pedestrian crossings along Quay St, as it provides minimal stacking for pedestrians waiting for the signal to stand clear of the cycle path, but in practice both modes seem to have adjusted behaviour to conditions.

High urban design values had been incorporated into the project, with picnic tables and benches inset beside the path, intensive planting on both sides and specially commissioned tactile pavers at the edges to shared spaces. Absence of obvious pedestrian desire lines to or from the benches and tables from across Quay St seems to have avoided pedestrians accessing these via the cycle path. Minimising encroachment and maintaining sight-lines was recognised as a maintenance cost proportionately increased by the scale and style of the planting.

Placement of the cyclist signals at the legal height has provided additional indications that this height is less visible to cyclists.

Karangahape Road
The separated path along K'Rd provided an opportunity to attempt a Dutch-style roundabout configuration at the intersection with Queen St, with cycle slip lanes inserted at the turns. The path is 1.5m wide but feels narrower, in part because the drainage channel reduces the path surface by 250-300mm. There is also a significant crossfall. The kerb to the footpath is 1:3; on the opposite side it is 1:1.

The design provides good separation from the door zone and retains the width of footpath appropriate to the foot traffic, but the crossings design has revealed some weaknesses, with the cyclist signals lost amid the visual clutter on a busy commercial street and pedestrians tending to enter the cycle path to wait to cross. Similarly, better tactile edges and more space for waiting and boarding have been incorporated into the design of bus stops as a result of early lessons learned.

The approach taken is to minimise wherever practical the use of shared paths or space and to differentiate where the pedestrian or the cyclist is expected to be.

3.2 SIGNS/MARKINGS TO GET SCOOTERS TO USE CYCLE LANES/PATHS

Simon Kennett reported increasing pressure on RCAs to move e-scooters, in particular, off footpaths was giving rise to use of unapproved markings and illegal signage. At the moment the approved markings are M2-3 and M2-4 for a pedestrian or a bike. Although a symbol for a foot-powered scooter exists (SU22) this is for signs, not markings. .

Even if a scooter symbol were added to the suite of regulatory markings, this would almost certainly lead to pressure for similar markings to address skateboards or some as-yet unimagined form of personal micro-mobility. As the issue was less about exclusion and more about behaviour appropriate to the chosen path, an extension to the suite of behaviour markings was thought preferable to additional regulatory markings.

The distinction is likely to be appropriate speed. 'Accessible Streets' is likely to set speed limits for footpaths (or permit limits to be set). While a law change would allow the cycle symbol to represent other wheeled mobility devices, it is recognised that law changes are not immediately apparent to all members of the public and some marking to distinguish where small wheeled devices should go might be required.

3.3 PREFERRED SEPARATION GRAPH REVIEW

Simon Kennett noted that the graph for preferred separation dated from a 2000 Danish graph and, although updated in 2012, was now potentially out of date. The mixed traffic component had been lowered from a maximum of 5000vpd at 40km/h to taper from 0vpd/0km/h to a maximum of 2500vpd at 35km/h. This taper appears illogical; the graph implies that mixed traffic would be more appropriate with 1800vpd travelling at 40km/h than at 20kmph.

It was agreed that a revision of Jensen needs to take into account the new speed limits around schools, the speed and traffic volume limits within existing guidance, such as the Sharrow guide and NZ Cycle Trail design guide, and to align with the One Network Framework to be a relevant NZ guide.

3.4 ONE NETWORK FRAMEWORK

Gerry Dance welcomed Caroline Dumas, who explained that the ONRC had also been in place since 2012 and was primarily about road maintenance. As a tool it was less useful for urban networks and too blunt for the shifting emphasis to consideration of place and modal layers of movement in planning.

The ONF seeks to consider place, function and modal layers, with greater emphasis put on movement of freight and persons rather than of vehicles. It offers greater granularity, with 12 categories that reflect the combination of movement and place, and a common language for land use and transport planning. It will be integrated into the processes and tools of the NLTP 2024-27.

The programme of work aims to classify all current networks and identify the data requirements of ONF, then ensure that the ONF is aligned with plans and planning cycles. Identifying and integrating the different modal layers – walking, cycling (and alternative devices), PT and freight – will be the challenge. When this is done, the ONF can be embedded in performance measures, investment planning processes and network standards and guidance.

Once in place the ONF will provide a common language for any professional involved in any aspect of land-use or transport planning, design, investment, delivery or management.

3.5 USE OF COLOURED SURFACING

Mark Edwards presented a summary of a draft TAN on the principles of using coloured surfacing intended to guide where and when colour might be used and facilitate any decision to use it. The guidance would reflect and reinforce the consensus that has developed on the use of green and red with the intention of

achieving consistent use across the network. Feedback was sought on the level of detail and content of the draft.

4.1 CNG UPDATE

Gerry Dance explained the process used to prioritise tasks and record potential work for updating the CNG, such as cyclist signals visibility. Extra granularity has been added to the site with guidance material further subdivided into guides, TANs, design guidance notes and other tools. It is recognised that CNG is now relatively mature as a website and the navigation is less intuitive than the newer PNG. The intention is to take CNG into the same style as PNG with its nine tiles on the 'Overview' page that provide the base for navigating the site.

4.2 PNG UPDATE

James Wratt reminded the meeting that the site is still being completed and the intention is that it will go through the formal ratification process later in 2022 after it has had time to receive feedback on the content, so feedback is wanted.

4.3 TCD UPDATE

Mark Edwards reminded members to provide feedback on the draft principles for use of coloured surfaces, which he will take to the TCD Steering Group this month, and noted that the report on the Dragon's Teeth trials is due on 31 March and data was still being collected.

4.4 SPEED CONTROL DEVICES STUDY

Glen Koorey reported on the selection of sites for field measurements of the effects of path restrictive devices, including chicanes, tight turns and vertical deflection (as well as bollards, which remain less preferred) to achieve safe conditions for cyclists and other path users. Preliminary field measurements reveal that mild treatments do not change observed speeds. Initial results should be able to be presented to the next AMIG meeting.

5.1 2022 - AMIG PROGRAMME

It was agreed that the site visit to Hastings in April would be postponed to the final meeting of the year and the second meeting will be a 3 hour Teams session on 7 April.

5.2 PRIORITIES, PLANS AND PROJECTS

Gerry Dance presented the likely capacity-building programme for the year and asked for input on priorities.

Meeting closed: 12:00 noon