

**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, 4 February 2021 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM.  
Microsoft Teams Meeting**

**Attending**

- Michael Bridge, Activity Manager Active Transport, Palmerston North City
- Glenn Bunting, Manager Network Safety, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Simon Cager, Senior Project Engineer, Hutt City
- Gerry Dance, Team Leader Multi Modal, NZTA
- Steve Dejong, Senior Engineer, Regulatory Services, NZTA
- Twan van Duivenbooden, Principal Specialist Active & Shared Modes Design, AT
- Hilary Fowler, Transport Planner/Engineer, Wellington 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
- Wayne Newman, (secretary)
- Eynon Phillips, Strategic Transport Engineer, Hastings District
- Hjarne Poulsen, Transportation Team Leader, Dunedin City
- Kelera Qaranigio, Network Engineer, Hamilton City
- Bill Rice, Senior Transport Engineer, Nelson City
- James Wratt, Multi-modal Advisor, NZTA

**Apologies**

- Niki Carling, Safe & Sustainable Journeys Manager, Rotorua Lakes District
- Mike van Enter, Senior Transportation Engineer, Tasman District Council
- Karen Hay, Cycle Plan Implementation Team Leader, Tauranga City
- Claire Sharland, Asset Manager Transportation, Taupo District
- Erik Teekman, Principal Adviser Walking & Cycling, NZTA

## A G E N D A

- 1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES**
- 2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**  
Actions from the meeting on 3 December 2020
- 3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES**
  - 3.1 Shared-path behaviour marking trials
  - 3.2 Rural cycling – counting cyclists
  - 3.3 Crossings
    - a. Pedestrian Crossing Facility Selection Advice Note
    - b. Use of red surface at Zebra crossings
  - 3.4 Coloured surfaces
- 4. UPDATES**
  - 4.1 CNG and PNG update tasks report
  - 4.2 TCD Steering Group report
  - 4.3 Regulatory progress update
  - 4.4 Ramp platform design in Building Code
  - 4.5 Designing streets for the 21<sup>st</sup> century
  - 4.6 Review of CoPTTM
  - 4.7 Use of planter boxes as separators
- 5. OTHER BUSINESS**
  - 5.1 Examples of less than best practice or excellence
  - 5.2 2021 AMIG final meeting – date and place

## NOTES

### **1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES**

Gerry Dance welcomed the group to the first AMIG meeting of 2021. The apologies of were noted. The agenda was confirmed, with added items for CoPTTM and use of planter boxes as separators. Gerry reported that the latest re-structuring of the Agency had just taken effect and he, Simon Kennett and James Wratt were now in the Safe & Sustainable Standards section of Programme & Standards in Transport Services.

### **2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

Twan van Duivenbooden clarified that AT preferred a separation of 600mm but did not consider the 150mm grooved thermoplastic delineator should be used where sufficient space was available for preferred treatments. The minutes from the meeting on 3 December 2020 were confirmed as amended.

### **3. TRIAL REPORTS and ISSUES**

#### **3.1 Shared-path behaviour marking trials**

Simon Kennett summarised the background to the work on designs for improved markings, including the review and research undertaken by Maggie Trotter on potential options, before reporting on test results from trials of possible options to the present VicRoads/Austroroads markings.

An alternative to “Warn when approaching” was not field-tested.

An alternative “Keep left” marking was tested and was not as effective with just a single white centre line. A double yellow centre line delivered an improvement in observed behaviour.

Three alternatives to “Move off the path when stopped” were developed but not tested. None was favoured without substantial re-design. Use of an octagonal “stop” outline was queried as inappropriate and the use of side-on text was thought likely to be hard to read, especially for a longer message. The absence of a path and use of only a pedestrian in the alternative marking, whereas the Austroads marking shows both a pedestrian and dismounted cyclist, was also thought to dilute the message.

Two alternatives to “Control your dog” were also not tested, but a marking with both person and dog walking in the same direction was preferred to that with the dog in profile.

Tests of potential markings to slow cyclists approaching a conflict zone were inconclusive. A “Swedish ladder” of white lines with steadily diminishing gaps between them, painted for 21m before the identified hazard, had little effect on behaviour and was potentially a distraction at a point where all of the cyclist’s attention needed to be on their surroundings.

Adding red bars to the “Slow” roundel appeared to deliver slight benefits when increased from five to six bars. The shorter marking was unlikely to be sufficient to cause the impression of going faster, intended to slow the cyclist, while any “rumble strip” effect would be too brief and too slight to be effective. Ensuring that the reason for the marking was visible was agreed to be essential.

Simon also noted the testing of alternative tactile delineator options in place of a Copenhagen kerb had led to the extruded thermoplastic grooved profile being recommended for use where no other option was available for separation. It was noted that initial concerns that the Copenhagen kerb might be a permanent trip hazard might have been overstated, as the issue appeared to be one of new infrastructure familiarity rather than the Copenhagen kerb *per se*.

### **3.2 Rural cycling – counting cyclists**

Glen Koorey reported on work being done to develop CNG material specifically for rural routes. The challenge is to deliver a response commensurate with the levels of usage and actual risk. This requires an understanding of both. A simple method is simply to drive over the route, note the distance and count the numbers of vehicles and cyclists travelling in each direction over that distance. A moving observer template will be developed that can offer a means of calculating the risk of a vehicle encountering a cyclist and the likelihood that an approaching vehicle would also be present. This could then highlight locations where the potential for conflict would be unacceptable.

Eynon Phillips noted that safety barriers posed a risk on rural routes, with the specified height for these increasing the hazard of a cyclist falling over the top. The complicating factor is that anything added above the height of the safety barrier would be at greater risk of penetrating a vehicle’s windscreen.

Michael Bridge queried the guidance on maintaining an acceptable level of service for cyclists in the shoulder surface. This extended beyond following the published guidance for ATP installation to ensuring that reseals were given enough traffic on the shoulder to bed-in the chips.

### **3.3 Crossings**

#### **a. Pedestrian Crossing Facility Selection Advice Note**

Glen Koorey noted that a substantial guidance document had resulted from an initial 'look' at courtesy crossings and the draft was expected to be put up on the PNG site for group testing and feedback by 16 March.

#### **b. Use of red surface at Zebra crossings**

Simon Kennett presented the favoured layout for use of red at zebra crossings, explaining that use under the white bars had diminished the contrast for some pedestrians with vision impairment (especially when the red fades to pink) and caused confusion for intellectually disabled pedestrians. There was also concern that using red on the ramps would accelerate wear of the surface colour, while fading of the red would diminish the visibility of the white ramp markings.

It was agreed that guidance would require a minimum gap of 0.5m between the limit line (for at level crossings) or hump ramp marking (for platform crossings) and the red block. The red block at an at level Zebra crossing would be about 3m and about 2m before a zebra on a platform. The images would be finalised to reflect the new gazetted widths for zebra bars and the guidance would then be published in the PNG.

### **3.4 Coloured surfaces**

Simon Kennett reported on the need for national guidance on the use of colour. G26 Apple Green may be used to highlight a special vehicle lane, whether Bus, Transit or Cycle, or a cycling facility at potential conflict points (including crossing, merging or waiting zones) but must not be otherwise used in general traffic lanes (except under a Sharrow). Red may be used to highlight a transition zone on a roadway (usually at the threshold of a reduced speed limit zone) or where there is high potential for interaction or conflict with pedestrians, such as a bus stop bypass or uncontrolled crossing. For a school zone threshold, the red would need to be marked "School".

It was agreed that this guidance should be circulated in a Technical Note, as well as being published within the PNG and CNG, to ensure the widest possible awareness of the principles for compliant use of coloured surfaces.

## **4. UPDATES**

### **4.1 CNG and PNG update tasks report**

Glen Koorey reported on progress with development of the PNG, which was being readied for launch at the 2WalkandCycle Conference on 16-19 March, and noted that the majority of CNG tasks had now been completed. He noted that the two guides would be cross-referenced as appropriate.

### **4.2 TCD Steering Group report**

Steve Dejong reported on a range of matters. A thumbnail image has been added to the signage specifications to aid searching, and the priority now is to have the obsolete MOTSAM codes not shown in order to encourage usage of the appropriate TCD Rule reference codes. Part 5 of the TCD Manual is being converted to HTML from PDF and this is expected to be completed by Easter.

The new 600/600mm spacing for zebra crossings has pulled into focus the appropriate treatment for a crossing on a separated cycle facility, where the new marking would obscure the crossing. It was agreed that there is precedent for using standard signs or markings at a reduced scale on cycle facilities, but the Rule specifically excludes zebra crossings in permitting this and having only the

zebra bars without the required signs and markings in some form would be non-compliant and could only proceed with a Rule change.

Use of the ramp marking on a roadway in the absence of any ramp has been reported. This usage would engender disregard for the marking, with a consequent increase in the risk of a motorist being surprised by a subsequent encounter with a ramp. A ramp marking cannot be used where no ramp is present. Work is also progressing on the supplementary signage to be used with the marking.

#### **4.3 Regulatory progress update**

Glenn Bunting reported that the new Minister had confirmed that Accessible Streets was still expected to be a part of the programme, ending prolonged uncertainty since the election.

#### **4.4 Ramp platform design in Building Code**

Simon Kennett reported that the Agency had commissioned Ben Frost to work on this, with the object of getting recognition of these types of structure recognised within the Building Code.

#### **4.5 Designing streets for the 21<sup>st</sup> century**

Glen Koorey reported that there were eight registered for the Christchurch course on 1-2 March, which would follow the same format as the previous course in Wellington, and further registrations were welcome through [registrations@viastrada.nz](mailto:registrations@viastrada.nz) with courses also planned for Auckland (8-9 April) and Wellington (19-20 April).

#### **4.6 Review of CoPTTM**

Hilary Fowler raised the review and confirmed that AMIG concerns had been submitted. It was noted that most issues, such as signs placed in or too near to cycle lanes, were the results of poor implementation and alternative solutions were available.

#### **4.7 Use of planter boxes as separators**

Chris Lai presented a blue 1.5x0.3x0.4m planter box as a potential separator. He confirmed that it could be pushed sideways by a person and this was identified as the primary detractor with these found elsewhere; they tend to be nudged into the cycle lane by vehicles parking. Difficulties in maintaining the planter boxes, whether to maintain plants or just to keep them free of litter, were also noted. The blue colour would be indistinct in lower light and need reflective tape.

Meeting closed: 12.10 pm