

**Meeting at 9:00 on 6 November 2015**  
Boardroom, NZTA National Office  
Victoria Street, Wellington

**Attending:**

- Gerry Dance Principal Advisor Cycling, National Cycling Team, NZTA
- Tim Hughes National Traffic and Safety Engineer, NZTA
- Glen Koorey Civil and Natural Resources Engineering School, Cant.
- Sandi Morris Transportation Planner, Palmerston North City
- Nathaniel Benefield Lets Go Project Manager, New Plymouth District
- Susan Lilley Transportation Planner, Dunedin City
- Ina Stenzel Principal Specialist – Walking and Cycling, AT
- Kathryn King Walking & Cycling Manager, Auckland Transport
- Steve Dejong Traffic Engineer, Christchurch City
- Paul Barker Safe and Sustainable Transport Manager, Wellington
- Simon Kennett Senior Project Manager, National Cycling Team, NZTA
- Wayne Newman RCA Forum Research & Guidelines Group (secretary)

**Apologies:**

- Dougal List National Manager Cycling, NZTA
- Clare Cassidy Planning Engineer, Transport, Tauranga City
- Carl Whittleston Lets Go Project Manager, New Plymouth District
- Claire Sharland Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District
- Glenn Bunting Network Manager, NZTA
- Richard Bean Senior Engineer, NZTA
- Kirsty Horridge Network Engineer, Hamilton City

## AGENDA

1. Introductions, apologies and emergency briefing
2. Actions arising from last meeting
3. Updates
  - Cycling design guidelines
  - Sharrow usage guidelines
  - Pavement markings trials
  - TCD Manual review
4. Cycling rules change
  - Rule for using sharrows
  - Definition of roadway
  - Definition of 2-way cycle lane (cycle path or lane?)
5. Intersections
  - Right of way for SBF through intersections
6. Signage
  - National use of CCC cycling signage manual
  - Consistent 'share the road' signage
  - Exceptions for cyclists – turns, entry, etc
7. Cycle lanes/paths and bus stops
  - Priority for pedestrians crossing to stops
  - Belisha beacon requirements at crossings
  - Tactile paving
8. Rural cycling safety improvements
9. NZPost devices on footpaths
10. Research project and trial ideas
11. General Business/Workshop
12. Next meeting

## ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING

- All** To circulate feedback on draft sharrow guidance note by 13 November.
- To provide comment on proposed RUR changes by end of month.
- Paul** To liaise with Gerry on an urban 2-1 lane trial proposal.
- Wayne** To approach Whangarei, Rotorua and Hutt re. involvement in AMIG.  
To maintain liaison between AMIG and the Shared Footpaths working group.

## **1. Introductions and apologies**

Introductions and apologies were taken. Nathaniel Benefield was welcomed and the contribution of Carl Whittleston acknowledged. Thanks were recorded for Paul Barker and Wellington City Council for organising a fascinating and very successful study tour of active mode project locations around the region, and to Gerry Dance and the NZTA Cycling Team for arranging catering for both days. Inclusion of Simon Cager from Hutt City on the study tour was welcomed and extension of invitations to other RCAs with active cycling programmes, such as Hutt City, Whangarei District and Rotorua District, was suggested.

**Action: WN to approach Whangarei, Rotorua and Hutt.**

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

Completed actions from the 9 July 2015 meeting were noted.

## **3. Updates**

### **(a) Draft national cycling design guidelines**

Jeanette Ward joined the meeting to report on this item. The draft framework is expected to be available early in 2016. Concurrent reviews of TCD Manual Part 4 and Part 5, and of the CNRPG will need to progress before the framework can be developed significantly further.

The intent is that the framework will hold a facility description, legal considerations, alternative approaches, design detail, local rules and best practice. To achieve this it will cite Part 4 and 5, CNRPG, documents such as the Christchurch Cycling Signage Manual, guidance notes on shared paths, sharrows and more, and case studies. The NZ Supplement to Austroads will be absorbed by the reviews of Parts 4 and 5 and CNRPG.

### **(b) Draft Sharrow best practice guidance note**

The draft document prepared by Flow Transportation Specialists had been circulated prior to the meeting. The draft raises the question of what the defined meaning of the marking will be, because the function remains unclear. The trialled marking was not intended to be a traffic calming measure and its location within the traffic lane was directed towards motorists, so the marking cannot be used to provide directional or locational guidance to cyclists.

The RUR meaning of a sharrow marking will need to be clear and concise, but the guidance will need to be specific on appropriate and inappropriate situations for usage of sharrows, to avoid their use as an easy alternative to losing on-street parking. A matrix of situations where use is or is not appropriate would be the clearest means of providing guidance.

**Action: ALL members to circulate feedback on draft sharrow guidance note by 13 November.**

### **(c) Pavement markings trials**

Kathryn King reported that use of pavement markings within the Beach Road project was approved by the TCDSG, but the result has been unsatisfactory and supplementary aids will be added to the trial. A red-edged reproduction of the sign marked on the pavement has lacked clarity of meaning and caused user confusion. The markings have been used as positioning indicators, but the

pavement design has obscured desire lines and led to the cycle path becoming *de facto* a shared path.

The group recorded its concern at the reported requirement for the pavement marking to duplicate the sign in having a red edge, which AMIG previously agreed should not be incorporated into a trial design for symbols marked on, or incorporated into, the pavement in place of signs to inform users of shared path transitions. It remains possible that less subtle pavement markings will be needed to indicate transitions and paths.

#### **(d) TCD Manual review**

The design guidelines gap analysis identified potential quick-wins able to be addressed within available budgets and of these, 16 related to Part 4 of the TCD Manual – Intersections, and 12 related to Part 5 – Between intersections. Opus is currently progressing the review of these.

### **4. Cycling rules change**

Simon Kennett led a discussion on the proposed first, second and third tranches of changes circulated prior to the meeting. The first tranche are seen as readily achievable.

- *Amend RUR 2.7 to specifically allow drivers to encroach on a flush median when overtaking a cyclist, pedestrian or rider of a mobility device (when it is safe to do so).*

This would be in line with 2.9, but more consistent with the purpose of a flush median than crossing double-yellow lines. Will the change inhibit the ability to remove flush medians for cycle lanes? How will 2.7 and 2.9 apply where cyclists have been instructed to take the lane by a sharrow marking?

- *Amend RUR 4.1 by adding new clauses (4.1 (4) and 4.1 (5)) which will support TCD rule 11.4 (5).*  
*4.1(4) A driver, cyclist or pedestrian approaching or entering a section of roadway, cycle path or shared path controlled by a stop sign, installed where the cycle path or shared path crosses the roadway, must –*  
*(a) stop before entering the path of any possible vehicle or pedestrian flow at such a position as to be able to ascertain whether the way is clear to proceed; and*  
*(b) give way to any vehicles or pedestrians that are not controlled by a stop sign and that are approaching or crossing the intersection.*

*4.1(5) A driver, cyclist or pedestrian approaching or entering a section of roadway, cycle path or shared path controlled by a give way sign, installed where the cycle path or shared path crosses the roadway, must give way to any vehicles or pedestrians that are approaching or crossing the intersection and are not controlled by a stop sign or give way sign.*

The amendments provide only for signs, while the comments consider markings and signals as potential alternatives. Should the choice of wording be able to accommodate future trials of markings or signals?

- *Amend RUR 2.3 (4). MOT is unclear about the purpose of the proposed amendment and asked if it is about cars overtaking on the left.*

This problem was clearly identified as deserving higher priority: vehicles drive in the lane as they approach their intended turn, and stop in the lane waiting to execute the turn, rather than crossing the lane to execute their turn. Deletion of 2.3(4)(b) would allow vehicles to cross the lanes while still ensuring the lanes retained their intended purpose.

- *Adopt the sharrow as an approved road marking.*

Defining the legal meaning and purpose of the marking is necessary.

- *Amend the 'Land Transport Rule Vehicle Lighting 2004, Rule 32005' to require that front and rear bicycle lights be visible from 200m.*

While all lights available in NZ currently pass this standard easily with fresh batteries, many lights are inadequate once the batteries are tired and the present 100m standard is insufficient for cyclist safety.

- *Amend the RUR 11.12 - Lighting and reflector requirements for cyclists - to require that bicycle lights be used between sunset and sunrise (and any other time when the 'Hours of Darkness' definition applies).*

Having bicycles adopt daylight lights is unlikely to be successful, but having lights on during twilight would be a significant safety improvement and easier to enforce. The issue is the definition of 'Hours of Darkness', which is not between sunset and sunrise.

The Second Tranche comprises issues that require more time to achieve, so work on these needs to begin now to achieve a rule change by mid-2017. 'Roadway' needs to be defined in a way that recognises multiple lanes and paths within the transport corridors before changes can be made to intersection requirements. Cyclists passing on the left or between queues of stationary vehicles needs to be considered in terms of defining safe behaviour. Cyclists proceeding straight ahead from a left-turn lane are likely to be safer than the lane changes currently caused by RUR 2.4. Requiring mandatory use of alternative facilities where they are present is likely to reduce LoS for cyclists and pedestrian users of shared paths, and potentially increase risks for both groups, for little benefit.

The Third Tranche comprises a number of significant policy issues, including minimum passing gaps, HCV under-run panels, definitions and standards for new forms of mobility device, and regulation of where they can be used. In many cases a trial of potential solutions would be a logical approach, but this would be illegal under the existing RUR.

**Action: ALL members to circulate comments on proposed changes by end of November.**

## **5. Intersections**

The critical areas for any facility will be at intersections and this remains the most critical area for policy direction and design guidance for engineers,

developers, planners and implementation of the UCP. Many potential trials of innovative interventions are dependent on a RUR change, however. However, providing right of way to any person proceeding straight ahead from a separated cycleway or path (not roadway) across a side road is a common law issue, not the RUR, so it can be overridden by signs for a trial. Eventually it will require the definition of roadway to be changed.

Trials of a cycling Barnes dance can be undertaken within the current RUR. These might test phasing separate crossings for cyclists before or after pedestrians, or mixed crossings.

## **6. Signage**

### **(a) National use of CCC cycling signage manual**

Austrroads has adopted the manual as a model of current national best practice for NZ, so no further action is required.

### **(b) Consistent "Share the road" signage**

Gerry Dance led a discussion on the variety of signs now employed. In many cases the intended purpose or desired response is unclear and whether they are advisory or warning signs is uncertain. In situations where cyclists constitute a hazard or would be at greater risk, it would be preferable to use supplementary signage with PW35 to indicate the specific hazard, such as 'touring', 'training', 'crossing', 'school' or 'next X Km'. Where the signs are only advisory, use of a bike+person symbol and appropriate wording should be consistent at least within any one region, but still needs to meet national standards for advisory signage. Will a sharrow marking have the meaning of "share the road" intended by such signs?

### **(c) Exceptions for cyclists**

Kathryn King had sought clarification of the process for signing exemptions for cyclists from posted restrictions, such as prohibitions on turning or entering. Paul Barker explained that this must be done by the relevant traffic resolution or bylaw to have legal effect, and must then be signed.

## **7. Cycle lanes/paths and bus stops**

### **(a) Pedestrian crossings to stops**

Ina Stenzel led a discussion of the means to signal priority for pedestrians crossing a cycle lane or path to access public transport. It was agreed that this is best achieved by marking a zebra crossing, which might be proportionate to the lane width as in the example seen in yesterday's study tour on Victoria St. A zebra crossing must then have a black and white pole (and Belisha Beacon circle) within 2m of the crossing, but only where it crosses a roadway. If a shared path runs behind a bus stop, for example, this is not a roadway and the crossing would not require a black and white pole.

### **(b) Tactile paving**

Steve Dejong led a discussion on the need for tactile ground surface indicators at the entrance and exit points for a cycle path from the roadway, in response to CCS requests. RTS 14 2.1 requires all new pedestrian facilities to comply and 2.2 requires that TGSI should be prioritised for installation in areas of high pedestrian activity and where footpaths shared with cyclists change from shared

to separated, if they are at a common level and lack visual context. 3.2.4 requires TGSI to indicate a road crossing. Could the addition of TGSI at a road access not intended for pedestrians lead to confusion? Use of identical TGSI for both pedestrian and cycling facilities could increase the hazard for visually impaired pedestrians. For a cyclist only crossing located so that it may be inadvertently crossed by a vision impaired person, then green warning tiles are recommended.

## **8. Rural cycle safety improvements**

Gerry Dance reported on the outcome of the Opus managed trial on Roto o Rangī Rd, Waipa District. This road has up to 1000 vehicles and up to 100 cyclists per day, but proved not to be ideal for trials. The geometry and environment made the road more naturally a 100kph zone rather than a 60kph zone and it had a history of local opposition to cyclists using it. The trial was abandoned after one driver simply stopped in the middle of the "2-1" lane in response to an on-coming vehicle and there was minimal observance of the reduced speed limit after nightfall.

It was agreed that further trials are merited, but in a lower speed environment and potentially in an urban setting. Paul Barker proposed Massey Rd on the coast road around Pt Halswell from Shelley Bay to Scorching Bay on Miramar Peninsula for a "2-1" lane trial.

**Action: Paul and Gerry to liaise on a trial proposal.**

## **9. NZPost devices on footpaths**

Nathaniel Benefield reported on NZPost use of motorised devices on footpaths within New Plymouth. NZPost claims it has a blanket exemption, whereas NZTA has classed three and four-wheeled devices as motorcycles for the purposes of delivering mail and granted individual exemption to each vehicle. The group noted that a working group on shared footpaths has been established by the RCA Forum, Trafinz and SASTA, and will have CCS and LSA involvement. It was agreed that close liaison between this group and AMIG will be beneficial, given the potential overlap in the ToR for the two groups. Minutes from meetings of each group should be circulated to the other.

**Action: WN to maintain liaison between the two working groups.**

## **10. Research projects and trial ideas**

The sharrow trials identified a need for trials of markings that provide directional and locational guidance to cyclists, in particular for navigating through a roundabout. Trials of appropriate transition treatments between separated and shared lanes and alternative pavement markings are still needed, too. It was agreed that all authorities be invited to participate in proposed trials. Research is required on demand modelling, LoS measures, perceived v actual safety, minimum overtaking distances and margins, safety improvements for HCV, and surfacing LoS for different modes.

## **11. General business**

Sandi Morris noted that a discussion document on CoPTTM provisions for cycling infrastructure was currently out for feedback.

## **12. Next meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting is confirmed for 25 February 2016 in Christchurch and will include of a short study tour during the day. To facilitate this, the meeting would need to continue past 3.30, when these meetings had traditionally finished to allow opportunity for those attending to have reasonable return flights.

Meeting will be at Christchurch City Council offices at 53 Hereford Street in Room M2.06 on the second floor.

A midday study tour will attempt to inspect some or all of the following:

- Tuam St separated cycleway
- Colombo St "Copenhagen-style" kerb-separated lanes
- Colombo/Lichfield pedestrian countdown timers
- New Bus Interchange featuring bike parking, bikes on buses, and signalised entrance
- South Hagley Park shared path and Hospital Corner signals
- "Spark Bikes" public bikeshare scheme bike-station
- Matai St cycleway and signalised crossing into Hagley Park

### Actions summary

1. **WN to approach Whangarei, Rotorua and Hutt. (Item 1)**
2. **ALL members to circulate feedback on draft sharrow guidance note by 13 November. (Item 3d)**
3. **ALL members to circulate comments on proposed changes by end of November. (Item 4)**
4. **Paul and Gerry to liaise on a trial proposal. (Item 8)**
5. **WN to maintain liaison between the working groups. (Item 9)**