Resolution/Approval Review checklist

If using an external consultant to prepare the report and plan, the AT reporting officer is responsible for the items in blue and the consultant is responsible for the remainder.

Item numbers with a star (and in red) will result in a rejection of the report and/or plan if the item is not correct. Item numbers without the star risk rejection either during review or by the TCC. All items should be checked to avoid delays during the review or TCC process.

Report

Title Page and Document Info

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Is the report on the most recent version of the template? |  |
| 2\* | Is it the correct template for the type of resolution/approval? |  |
| 3 | Is the Local Board name(s) correct? |  |
| 4 | Are all the affected Local Boards listed? |  |
| 5 | Are all street names spelt correctly, including the correct “Road”, “Street”, “Drive”, “Avenue”, etc? |  |
| 6 | 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(s) should include the phrase “and surrounding streets”. |  |
| 7 | Is the suburb correct? |  |
| 8 | 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 ones. The remainder can be described with a blanket term, e.g., “and pedestrian facilities”. |  |
| 9\* | Is the reporting officer an AT staff member? |  |
| 10 | Is the reporting officer’s title included? |  |
| 11\* | Is there a resolution ID? |  |
| 12\* | Has the ID been confirmed against Transport Controls’ ID tracking tool? |  |
| 13\* | Is the same (and correct) resolution ID at the bottom of each page? Check the footer on the first two pages to make sure the entire document is correct. |  |
| 14 | Are all the text boxes deleted? |  |
| 15 | Are all the notes in red deleted? |  |
| 16\* | Are the page numbers consistent for the whole document? There can’t be any blank pages or gaps in page numbering. |  |
| 17\* | Is there a cost code shown? A cost code is preferred, but the WBS is acceptable. |  |

Recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 18\* | Is each recommendation associated with the correct decision maker? Resolution recommendations are in the first TCC section and approval recommendations are in the second Manager’s section. |  |
| 19\* | Do the recommendations include everything that is proposed or should be proposed? |  |
| 20\* | If this is a combined report, are recommendations for resolution and approval both included? |  |
| 21\* | Do the labels in the recommendations exactly match the labels in the plan? |  |
| 22\* | Is each label unique? There should be one label per control (for those controls that use labels). There should not be any repeated label numbers and no gaps in the label numbering. |  |
| 23\* | Do the street names in the recommendations exactly match the street names in the plan? |  |
| 24\* | Are the street names spelt correctly, including the correct “Street”, “Road”, “Avenue”, “Drive”, etc? |  |
| 25\* | Does the drawing number exactly match the drawing number in the plan? (Including correct sheet number, if relevant.) |  |
| 26 | Is the important information—recommendation type, street name(s), label(s), operating time conditions (where applicable)—in bold type? |  |
| 27\* | 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. all can apply the restriction during certain times of the day) |  |
| 28\* | Do the time and day restrictions match the information shown in the plan? |  |
| 29\* | 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. all can limit the restriction to certain classes of vehicle or activity) |  |
| 30\* | Do the class of vehicle/activity restrictions match the information detailed in the plan? |  |
| 31\* | Have all potential conflicts between two (or more) recommendations been avoided? I.e., there is no overlap in operating time conditions, etc. |  |
| 32\* | Are the revocation and effective date clauses included? |  |
| 33\* | If any recommendations are removing/rescinding a restriction or control, is the proper effective date clause for the rescission included? |  |
| 34\* | Does the effective date clause for the removed/rescinded control(s) reference the proper clause(s)? (It should read “when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in (pursuant number/numbers) in this resolution are removed”) |  |
| 35\* | Does the remaining effective date clause reference the proper clause(s)? (It should read “when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in (pursuant numbers) in this resolution are in place”) |  |
| 36 | If any recommendations are removing/rescinding a restriction or control, does the clause reference any condition under which the original control operated (i.e., at all times)? The rescission clause does not need to and should not specify any conditions. For example, the last line of the clause removing a bus stop should read “forming part of the resolution is **rescinded** as a parking place in the form of a **bus stop**.” There is no need to specify anything else; you’re removing it. |  |
| 37\* | For a parking zone, is the savings clause included *and cover all* controls that need to be maintained in the zone?? |  |
| 38\* | Does the parking zone recommendation include the proper revocation clause (i.e., does it correctly reference the savings clause)? |  |
| 39\* | Do the recommendations reference the correct AT bylaw, or LGA74 section and TCD clause? |  |
| 40\* | If included, does the recommendation for mobility parking reference clauses 19 and 20 of the AT traffic bylaws? If the area is Council property, does the recommendation for disabled parking reference both clause 9 and 10 of the Auckland Council traffic bylaws? |  |
| 41\* | If a special vehicle lane is 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. |  |
| 42 | Do the recommendations avoid using ‘P’ for a label? |  |
| 43 | Do rescinded/removed labels begin with ‘R’? (Rescinded or removed controls use the label of the control with an ‘R’ as the first element of the label, e.g., ‘RA1’ is rescinding a NSAAT control.) |  |
| 44\* | Do Council car parks and Council roads use Council recommendations referencing the correct clauses in the Council Bylaw? |  |
| 45\* | If the proposal is *not* on the road reserve, does AT have the delegated authority to resolve the proposed controls? |  |
| 46\* | If so, are the correct bylaws being referenced? |  |
| 47\* | 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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 48 | Does the executive summary give a brief overview of the appendix and show what is needed for a TCC decision? (It should be a proper summary and not something cut and pasted from the appendix) |  |

Strategic Context

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 49\* | Does the report refer to the correct Instrument of Delegation? (There may be more than one) |  |
| 50\* | If the standard Instrument of Delegation does not apply (i.e., it’s a non-AT road), is the appropriate delegation document referenced? The information should include title of document, date of approval, who approved the document and the authority under which they could delegate the authority to us to resolve. |  |
| 51\* | If this is a combined report, is the appropriate approval authority included? Generally, this will be the Traffic Engineering Manager. |  |
| 52\* | Is the decision maker (gen. Traffic Engineering Manager) consistent throughout the report (title block, IoD, and recommendations)? |  |

Consultation Summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 53 | Are all the important themes from the consultation and how they were dealt with included? (This should be a summary of a more detailed description in the appendix – it should not be a cut and paste ) |  |
| 54 | Were there any additional comments after close out and is this mentioned in the report? |  |

Signatures and Approvals

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 55\* | If there are recommendations to be resolved and to be approved, are both TCC and delegated authority signatures included? |  |
| 56\* | Is the team leader from the team that initiated the resolution in the signatory table? |  |
| 57\* | If any of the streets are on a bus route, has AT Metro been included in the signatories? |  |
| 58\* | If there are cycle facilities (cycle lane, cycle path, or shared path) being resolved, has Walking & Cycling been included in the signatories? |  |

Background

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 59 | Is the road hierarchy and Local Board area included? |  |
| 60\* | Is the road a cul-de-sac, over-dimension route or over-weight route and is this shown in the report? |  |
| 61 | Is the road a narrow road (6.5m or less in width) and is this mentioned in the report? |  |
| 62 | Is the road within a parking zone and is this mentioned in the report? |  |
| 63 | Are traffic counts included? |  |

Issues and Options

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 64 | Has the preferred approach of not referring to specific dimension and lengths in the proposal description been followed or if they are referred to here are they consistent with the drawing? |  |
| 65 | Does the proposal include a reference to the drawing? |  |
| 66 | Does the drawing number in the report match the drawing number in the plan? |  |
| 67 | Are there any nearby traffic controls and do they need to be included in the report? (If they predate AT and there is no identifiable resolution for them, they should be captured in the report with a clear statement that an engineering evaluation finds them reasonable and appropriate as is. |  |
| 68 | 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.) |  |
| 69 | Is an analysis of each option discussed? |  |
| 70 | Does the Options section include a do-nothing option? |  |
| 71 | Is there an analysis of all options resulting from Local Board comments? |  |
| 72 | Is there an analysis of all substantive comments from the consultation? |  |
| 73 | Does the Local Board consultation state who responded to the consultation? (Local Board or transport spokesperson for the Board) |  |
| 74 | Is the LB’s response given? (support, object to, or raised no objection) |  |
| 75 | Does the report mention how the author’s response was communicated back to the Board? |  |
| 76 | Does the report discuss if the Board have any further comments? |  |
| 77 | Does the internal consultation show a result for all affected parties? |  |
| 78 | Does the report justify why a particular internal group was not consulted for any parties that were skipped? |  |
| 79 | Does the report state how the internal parties were consulted? |  |
| 80 | Does the external consultation show a yes/no result for all affected parties? |  |
| 81 | Does the report justify why a particular external group was not consulted? |  |
| 82 | Does the report state the name of the business/community group that was consulted (e.g., Heart of the City / Bike Auckland / Taxi Federation, etc)? |  |
| 83 | Does the external consultation show the numbers? How many letters were sent (people consulted), how many responses received, how many in support, how many opposed, and how many were neutral. |  |
| 84\* | If there was a bus shelter being proposed, does the report show that we meet the LGA, section 339 requirements for consultation? In other words, did the consultation letter to a property owner affected by a bus shelter clearly state their rights pertaining to the shelter? |  |
| 85 | If a tree, building or infrastructure element affects the location of a control, is this discussed? |  |

Analysis

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 86 | Are the themes, patterns, trends, critical or substantive feedback shown? |  |
| 87 | Does the report include a response to the feedback? |  |
| 88 | Does the report show how the response was communicated back to the objector/commenter? |  |
| 89 | Does the report mention if there were any further comments to the author’s response? |  |
| 90 | Is there a clear reference to how the consultation was closed out? (via letter, email, phone call, etc) |  |
| 91 | If it has been longer than six months since the consultation close out, has the public been notified of the delay? |  |
| 92 | If a road safety audit was performed, is the result of the road safety audit included? |  |

Style

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 93 | Is the line spacing consistent throughout the report? |  |
| 94 | Are the margins consistent throughout the report? |  |
| 95 | Is the font ad font size consistent throughout the report? |  |
| 96 | Is the spelling and grammar correct? |  |

Plan

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 97\* | Is there a North arrow or compass point? |  |
| 98 | Does the North arrow/compass point generally point upwards? |  |
| 99 | Is the legend specific to the project/sheet? A generic legend should not be used. |  |
| 100\* | 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 information and drawing number? |  |
| 101\* | 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) |  |
| 102\* | Does the plan include property boundaries (grey), property addresses (grey), driveways (green), kerb lines (black, although new and removed kerb line should be in blue and red, respectively), road markings (in their proper colours), and the appropriate notes? |  |
| 103 | Is there a note stating that measurements are rounded to the nearest 0.5m? |  |
| 104 | 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? |  |
| 105 | Does the plan *avoid* showing: 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. |  |
| 106 | If any or more of the abovementioned infrastructure elements, tree, building, etc affects the location of a control, is the element shown? |  |
| 107 | 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.) |  |
| 108\* | Does the plan label rescinded controls? Controls that are completely covered by the implementation of a new control are covered under the standard revocation clause. Controls not covered under the clause must be formally rescinded/removed. |  |
| 109\* | Does the plan show *all* controls in the vicinity of the proposal? Whether or not the proposal/recommendation includes those controls, the plans must show everything. |  |
| 110\* | Are the resolution labels correct? |  |
| 111\* | Do the labels have the correct measurement? |  |
| 112 | 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) |  |
| 113 | Are the labels shown in every sheet they appear in? |  |
| 114\* | Are the Points of Intersection shown? |  |
| 115 | Are any conditions that apply to a parking restriction shown? Generally, the parking sign itself isn’t shown, but the details of the control should still be included in the plan. |  |
| 116\* | Do the conditions of the restriction match the conditions laid out in the recommendations? |  |
| 117 | Is the preferred approach of not showing parking control signs and repeater symbols followed? |  |
| 118 | Are traffic control signs (Stop and Give Way) shown? |  |
| 119\* | Do the running measurements add up correctly? |  |
| 120 | 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 needs to reflect the same curve as how the control was measured. |  |
| 121 | If there is a bus stop, is the stop to ATCOP standards? It is preferable to make bus stops ATCOP-compliant where it’s convenient to do so. |  |
| 122 | Are the special vehicle lane symbols shown according to ATCOP standards? |  |
| 123 | Are the special vehicle lane repeater symbols shown in the proper locations? It’s best not to show the repeaters, but the plan is acceptable with them as long as the proper note is added to the plan. |  |
| 124\* | Does the special vehicle lane start and end at the appropriate point in the markings? |  |
| 125 | Is the plan uncluttered and simple enough for a lay person to read? 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.) |  |
| 126\* | Most resolution controls, like parking restrictions, require a length. Most approvals do not. Have the *appropriate* measurements been provided? |  |
| 127 | Have all unnecessary measurements (such as ATCOP-compliant flush medians, turn lanes, and lane widths) been avoided? |  |
| 128 | Do the join lines match? |  |
| 129 | Do the join lines avoid obscuring or interfering with the resolution information? |  |
| 130 | Is the plan scaled up high enough that all information is readable when printed as A4? |  |
| 131 | Does the plan show only legal information and *not* construction information? Construction information is irrelevant to a judge who’s trying to determine the legality of a control. |  |