Resolution/Approval Review checklist

Report

Title Block and Document Info

Is the report on the most recent version of the template? Is it the correct template for the type of resolution/approval?

Is the Local Board name correct? If the project crosses LB boundaries, show all the Boards affected.

Is the street name(s) correct? Do they include all streets being resolved in the report? It’s acceptable, when there are too many streets being resolved to fit on one or two lines, to show only the primary street(s). If that is the case, the street name should include the phrase “and surrounding streets”.

Is the suburb correct?

Are all the proposed restrictions and controls represented? If there are too many controls for one or two lines, it’s acceptable to show only the primary one(s).

Is the reporting officer an AT staff member? Is their title included? Is it the correct title according to the org chart?

Is there a resolution ID? Is it the same ID at the bottom of each page? Check the footer on the first two pages to make sure the entire document is correct.

Has the author deleted all the text boxes? Has the author deleted the notes in red?

Are the page numbers consistent for the whole document? There can’t be any blank pages or gaps in page numbering.

Is there a cost code shown? A cost code is preferred, but the WBS is acceptable.

Recommendation

Do the recommendations show the correct approver? The TCC resolves and the manager approves.

Do the recommendations include everything that is proposed or should be proposed? If this is a combined report, are recommendations for resolution and approval both included?

Is the parking place pursuant included? This must be done where there is any parking being resolved in the report.

Do the recommendations match what is in the plan by label and street? Do any of labels repeat the same label or skip labels? Is the drawing number correct? Is the important information, street name(s), and label(s) in bold type?

Are the time and day restrictions included in the recommendation where needed? (bus lane; transit lane; restrictions to the stopping, standing, or parking; clearway; loading zone; pay & display; taxi stand; school bus stop; etc.) Do these match the information detailed in the plan?

Are the class of vehicle/activity restrictions included in the recommendation where needed? (special vehicle lane; shared path; limitations to the stopping, standing, or parking; loading zone; authorised vehicle parking; specified vehicle class parking; etc.) Do these match the information detailed in the plan?

Is there a conflict between two recommendations?

Are the revocation and effective date clauses included?

If any recommendations are removing/rescinding a restriction or control, is the proper effective date clause (for the rescission) included? Does it reference the proper recommendation(s)? (It should also read “when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in (pursuant number) in this resolution are removed”) Does the remaining effective date clause reference the proper recommendation(s)? (It should read “when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in (pursuant numbers) in this resolution are in place”)

For a parking zone, is the savings clause included? Do the recommendations include the proper revocation clause (referencing the savings clause)? Does the revocation clause reference the correct savings clause?

Do the recommendations reference the correct AT bylaw, or LGA74 section and TCD clause? In particular, does the pursuant for mobility parking reference clauses 19 and 20 of the AT bylaws? Does the clause for NSAAT markings show the correct phrase “any vehicle” (not “an vehicle”)?

Is the special vehicle lane on two streets at an intersection? In other words, does it merge or diverge at an intersection? Is each street resolved separately? Special vehicle lanes are assumed to continue through an intersection, but if they merge or diverge on separate approaches to an intersection, they need to be resolved separately for each street.

Is ‘P’ used for a label? (It should not be used.) Are there any other restriction labels that are incorrect or confusing or missing?

Do Council car parks and Council roads use Council pursuants? Do the Council pursuants reference the correct clause(s) in the Auckland Council Traffic Bylaw 2015? (They should do for both.)

Is the proposal on road reserve? If not, does AT have the delegated authority to resolve the proposed controls? If so, are the correct bylaws being referenced? And is the reference to the delegation document included in the Strategic Context?

If the resolution is for a resource consent, does the effective date clause include mention of when the road reserve will be legally vested to Council? (See resolution #13026 for an example of the proper language.)

Executive Summary

Does the executive summary give a brief overview of the appendix and show what is needed for a TCC decision?

Strategic Context

Does the report use the correct Instrument of Delegation? Does the standard IoD apply? If not, does the Terms of Reference reference the appropriate delegation document?

Does the report reference the correct IoD? If the report includes any parking control or other control that has been delegated to the TCC in ATDI 2016/03, the Strategic Context will reference both ATDI 2016/02 and ATDI 2016/03. If there is no parking or control that has been delegated to the TCC in ATDI 2016/03 being resolved, then the report would only reference ATDI 2016/02.

If this is a combined report, is the appropriate approval authority included? Is the approval authority consistent throughout the report (title block, IoD, and recommendations)?

Consultation Summary

Are all the important themes from the consultation included? Was the consultation closed out?

Signatures and Approvals

If there are recommendations to be resolved and to be approved, are both TCC and delegated authority signatures included?

Is the team leader from the team that initiated the resolution included?

If there are bus stops near the proposal, has AT Metro been included in the signatories?

If there is a bus shelter being proposed, is Brendon Main included? Is the Traffic Operations Manager the approver?

Background

Is road hierarchy and Local Board area included? Does the report refer to Local Board or Local Board area? (Local Board area is the correct phrase.)

Is the road a cul-de-sac, over-dimension route or over-weight route? Is the road a narrow road (6.5m or less in width)? Is the road within a parking zone? Is this mentioned in the report? (it should be)

If the road is a Local Road, are traffic counts included?

Issues and Options

Does the proposal show any lengths? (it shouldn’t) Does the proposal include a reference to the drawing? Does the drawing reference match the actual drawing number?

Are there any nearby traffic controls? Do they need to be included in the report? (If they predate AT and there is no existing resolution for them, they should be captured in the report. If an engineering evaluation finds them reasonable and appropriate as is, they should be included in the proposal. If the existing controls need changing or rescinding, the normal procedure for resolutions (including consultation) will need to be followed.)

Does the Options section include all reasonable options? (There is nearly always more than one way to solve a customer request and the options need to reflect what other designs were evaluated.) Does it include an analysis of each option?

Does the Options section include a do-nothing option? Does it include any options based on comments made by the Local Board? Does it include an analysis of each option?

Does the Local Board consultation state who responded to the consultation? Is the LB’s response given? (support, object to, or raised no objection)

If the Local Board had comments, are these addressed in the Analysis section? How was the author’s response communicated back to the Board? Did the Board have any further comments? Does the author discuss this in the report?

Does the internal consultation show a result for all affected parties? Did the consultation skip any parties? Does the report justify why a certain group was not consulted?

Does the report state how the internal parties were consulted?

Does the external consultation show a yes/no result for all affected parties? Did the consultation skip any parties? Does the report justify why a certain group was not consulted? Does the report state the name of the business/community group that was consulted (e.g., Heart of the City / Bicycle Auckland / Taxi Federation / etc)?

Analysis

Are any themes, patterns, trends, or critical feedback shown?

Does the author include a response to the feedback? Does the author show how the response was communicated back to the objector/commenter? Were there any further comments to the author’s response?

Is there a clear reference to how the consultation was closed out?

Was a road safety audit conducted? Is the result of the road safety audit included? If a road safety audit was not conducted, does the report justify why not?

Style

Is the line spacing consistent throughout the report?

Are the margins consistent throughout the report?

Is the font size consistent throughout the report?

Is the spelling and grammar generally good?

Plan

Is there a North arrow or compass point? Does it generally point upwards (it should not be pointing in a downwards direction)?

Has a generic legend been used? (Legends should be specific to that sheet)

Does the title block include resolution ID, street name(s), suburb, Local Board, description of the proposal, logo (AT and/or consultant), date, revision number, preparer’s initials, and drawing number?

Does the drawing number match the information in the report?

Are the colours correct for the existing and proposed controls? (grey for existing and not resolved, black for existing and resolved, blue for proposed/new, and red for removed/rescinded)

Does the plan include property boundaries (grey), property addresses (grey), driveways (green), kerb lines (black, although new and removed kerb lines should be in blue and red, respectively), road markings (in their proper colours), and the appropriate notes?

Is there a note stating that measurements are rounded to the nearest 0.5m?

When traffic control signs or markings are shown, is there a note stating that signs and markings are indicative only and may not reflect final positions?

Does the plan show: infrastructure (pylons, poles, cesspits, etc), trees, hatching, building footprints, impervious surfaces, tactile pavers, etc? It should *not* show any of these elements unless they affect the proposal and were discussed in the report.

Does the plan show repeated measurements for a single control? (It should not. If it is a single control being resolved, only show the measurement in the label, not repeated along the dimension line. If there is more than one control along the dimension line, show all the running measurements.)

Does the plan label rescinded controls? (It should. All controls being removed must be formally rescinded.)

Does the plan show all controls in the vicinity of the proposal? (Whether or not the proposal includes those controls, the plans must show everything.)

Are the resolution labels correct? Do the labels have the correct measurement? Are the labels consecutively numbered for each street? (It’s acceptable if the labels are not consecutively numbered, but it is encouraged that they are) Are the labels shown in every sheet they appear in?

Are the Points of Intersection shown? (It’s acceptable to not show the extended kerb lines, but showing the extended line is preferred)

Are the sign details shown? (Generally, the parking sign itself isn’t shown, but the details of the control should still be included in the plan.) Do the restriction/control/sign details match the recommendations? Traffic control signs should still be shown in the plan.

Do the running measurements add up correctly?

Does the dimension line follow how the control is measured? (If the measurement was taken in a straight line, the dimension line will be straight. However, if the measurement was done around an obstacle, like NSAAT markings around a side island, the dimension line to reflect the same curve as how the control was measured.)

Is there a bus stop nearby? Is it shown in the plan? Is the bus stop to ATCOP standards?

Are the special vehicle lane symbols shown according to ATCOP standards? Are the repeater symbols shown in the proper locations? It’s best not to show the repeaters, but the plan is acceptable with them. Does the length of the control start and end at the appropriate point in the markings?

Is there too much information in the plan? Take out the dimension line numbers where there is only a single control being resolved. If the control follows ATCOP standards, lanes, lengths, and widths don’t need to be shown. (Where the control *doesn’t* follow ATCOP, show the lane widths and other necessary information.)

Most resolution controls, like parking restrictions, require a length. Most approvals do not. Have the appropriate measurements been provided? Are there measurements that should not be shown (such as ATCOP-compliant flush medians, turn lanes, and lane widths)?

Do the join lines match? Do they interfere with the resolution information?

Is the plan scaled up high enough that all information is readable when printed as A4?