**NOTE** All notes in blue are to be replaced with appropriate text.

All notes in red are to be read, memorised, and deleted. Delete this note.

**Temporary Traffic and Parking Changes Report**

Name of Local Board

Street Name(s), Suburb

Subject (reason for resolution)

Report to Traffic Control Committee

**Reporting Officer:** Name, Job title (*This has to be internal AT staff. For projects started internally this person will usually be the Parking Designer or Delivery Team/PM responsible for a project or the engineer responsible if delivery team not involved. For temporary road works, this will be a member of the Road Corridor Requests team.) Include the job title.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date:** XXXXXXX  Please turn on spelling and grammar checking before using this template.  Delete this text box when done.  Go to the File tab (blue tab in the upper left corner of the doc), click on Options (left-hand side, bottom of the list), then click on Proofing (left-hand side, third item down) and make sure that the last two boxes (Hide spelling errors and Hide grammar errors) are not ticked. Save and close. | **Report ID number:** |
| **Operating:** (from date to date) | **Internal cost code:** WBS or cost code |
| **Date Resolved:** (Delete this R&S team to fill in) | **Sign Check:** (Delete this P&E to fill in if required) |

1. **Recommendation**

The Traffic Control Committee resolves:

(Please refer to the Resolution and Approval Guidebook for examples of how to draft the resolutions). Section 1.10 of the guidebook sets out resolutions that only the TCC can pass.

1. TCC recommendations start here.
2. Signs for [this restriction] [these restrictions] may be erected up to **25 hours before each start date and time as specified**.
3. The work contractor will only request enforcement of the abovementioned controls if there is an infringement which is physically affecting their ability to safely undertake the work described (this clause is only used for construction loading zones; delete this clause for events or if there are no loading zones being proposed).
4. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw, to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this resolution are **suspended** for the time this resolution is operational.
5. **Executive Summary**

Give a concise overview of any essential information the committee needs to make a decision. Briefly set out the elements of the proposal and why it is required. Try to keep this section to less than half a page.

1. **Strategic Context**

Auckland Transport is both the road controlling authority for the Auckland transport system and the organisation responsible for public transport management in Auckland. Its purpose is to contribute to an effective, efficient, and safe Auckland land transport system in the public interest. Auckland Transport establishes traffic controls and other facilities in pursuit of that purpose.

The Traffic Control Committee has been delegated powers by the Auckland Transport Board to enable it to make: resolutions under bylaws made by, or deemed to have been made by, Auckland Transport; resolutions under Auckland Council bylaws delegated to Auckland Transport; and certain other traffic control-related decisions.  The matters for consideration in this report fall within scope of the Traffic Control Committee’s delegated authority.

1. **Consultation Summary**

Summarise any main themes or issues from the consultation and how these were responded to.

A fuller description of the consultation of who was consulted, the methodology and a more detailed review of the feedback and how this was responded to is set out in the consultation section of the appendix.

1. **Signatures and Approvals**

*(Explanatory Note: The Reporting Officer of any report is responsible for starting the workflow process (including uploading the files to the Reports – Review and Sign-off library) and tracking the progress of the review.)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name and title of signatory | Signature | Date |
| Consultant / Author: | Remove this row if the report has been drafted in house.  (Name)  Position  Consultancy firm |  |  |
| Delivered by: | (Name)  Position  Division - Department  (person responsible for delivering the project – delete this row if delivery team is not involved) |  |  |
| Recommended by: | (Name)  Position  Division - Department  (person responsible for proposing design – this is generally the engineer) |  |  |
| Verified by: | Anthony Herath  Senior Resolution Technician  Transport Controls |  |  |
| Approved by: | (Name)  Traffic Engineering Team Leader  If a project includes a bus route on any of the streets in the proposal area, include Adrian Grant in the signatory table.  If these don’t apply, delete the appropriate row(s).  (By area)  Network Management |  |  |
| Approved by: | Adrian Grant  Infrastructure Lead – Minor Capex  AT Metro Infrastructure Specification |  |  |
| Approved by: | Garry Brown  Parking Compliance Area Manager  Parking Services |  |  |
|  | | | |
| Recommendations  Resolved by:  Traffic Control Committee | Name  …………………………  Chairperson  Traffic Control Committee | Signature | Date Resolved |
|  |  |

**Appendix**

1. **Background**
   1. **How the matter arose**

Describe what has brought the road/area to Auckland Transport’s attention. Public request/comment, resource consent, significant issues i.e. crashes, complaints/queries, internal review, etc.

* 1. **Location**

This section of road is classified as a District Arterial / Regional Arterial / Collector / Local Road (use appropriate and delete others) and is situated between (insert appropriate) Street Name and (insert appropriate) Street Name in the (insert appropriate) Local Board area.

This road / Street Name is in a predominantly commercial / industrial / retail / residential area. Describe the road location i.e. if the road is a cul-de-sac this must be stated in the report, if the width of the road is an issue then the width of the carriage way must be stated (and shown on the drawing), if the lane layout is being amended the new lane widths must be stated (and shown on the drawing). See section 2.10.4.2 in the resolution guidebook for any other pertinent information that should be included in this section.

AADT should be documented in the report if it is obtainable. It is acceptable to use engineering judgement to estimate the AADT. If the road is within a parking zone this should be stated.

1. **Issues and Options** 
   1. **Proposal**

It is proposed to (briefly outline your proposal) as shown on the attached drawing(s) # XXXXX, Rev X dated XX/XX/XXXX.

*(If there are nearby traffic controls that do not appeared to be covered by a resolution and were in operation for a period before the creation of* ***AT****, include a brief statement to this effect. If the existing restrictions are reasonable and appropriate then capture them in this resolution.*

*But if you find the existing traffic controls needs to be changed or rescinded then follow the normal resolution procedure with consultation to make the appropriate changes.)*

* 1. **Alternatives**

Include a Do Nothing option.

Explain in an analytic manner the alternate solutions that were considered besides the proposal as a solution to the issue and why those were not chosen. For example if you are proposing No Stopping At All Times (NSAAT) restrictions for an issue then explain why it is more suitable than other parking restrictions such as (No Stopping At Certain Hours (NSACH), time restricted parking, or clearway, etc.

* 1. **Local Board Transport spokesperson (if appropriate)**

The Local Board is contacted via the Elected Member Relationship Team. You need to state whether the Local Board was consulted, who responded to the consultation—Board member(s) or the transport spokesperson? Did the Local Board support, object to, or make no comment on the proposal?

If the Local Board makes no comment on the proposal this should be described in the report as being that “the Local Board raised no objection to the proposal.”

Any options the Local Board suggest are evaluated in section 7.2 Alternatives.

If the Local Board has any specific comments (particularly where they have concerns) on the proposal, you will need to work with the EMRM to see if the issues can be resolved. If you are unable to satisfactorily resolve the concerns of the Local Board you will need to be very clear in section 7.5 Analysis why you are advising that AT continues with the proposal.

***Explanatory Note:***

*Consultation is required with Local Boards in all cases except possibly urgent safety situations and resolutions for controls that have been in place and operating since before the creation of Auckland Transport. (Please delete)*

* 1. **Consultation**

Consultation on the proposal was undertaken with the following **internal** parties

If any road in the proposal is identified as an overdimension or overweight route or is a Collector or Arterial or has 3 or more lanes in a single direction, you must consult RCA via the email: [TruckConsult@at.govt.nz](mailto:TruckConsult@at.govt.nz).

A “No Response” from RCA is not acceptable. You must obtain a response and report that response.

Delete this box.

Finance (setting fees and charges) Click here to choose

Parking Compliance Click here to choose

Parking Design and Solutions Click here to choose

AT Metro Click here to choose

Road Safety Engineering Click here to choose

Traffic Engineering Click here to choose

Walking & Cycling Click here to choose

ATOC Click here to choose

Road Corridor Access Click here to choose

(If a party is not consulted, give the explanation why it was not required)

Consultation with AT Metro is required on all proposals on a bus route. Consultation is to be sent to the following email address: [MetroBusFeedback@at.govt.nz](mailto:MetroBusFeedback@aucklandtransport.govt.nz) – delete this box when the consultation is finished.

Describe the nature of the consultation – emails, team presentations, face to face meetings etc.

Consultation on the proposal was undertaken with the following **external** parties

Affected residents/property owners Click here to choose

Affected businesses Click here to choose

Affected road users (where impact extends beyond immediate area) Click here to choose

Affected community groups Click here to choose

Public transport operators Click here to choose

Emergency services Click here to choose

Business association Click here to choose

Police Click here to choose

(If a party is not consulted, give the explanation why it was not required)

Set out what affected business or community groups were consulted (i.e. Heart of the City, Cycle Action Auckland, etc.). Consult road users in situations where the users most affected cannot be easily identified (i.e. bus lane, off street car parks etc.). Describe the nature of the consultation – letters, public meetings, site meetings, face to face meetings, onsite signs, website, etc. Include the numbers of letters sent out and numbers of responses received. Also include the number of responses in support of, opposed to, and had no comment on the proposal.

* 1. **Analysis**

Set out any themes from the responses and any changes made to the proposal as a result of them. Explain any objections and your responses to the objections (be brief). It is expected that there will always be a close out to any consultation where feedback was received explaining what has been changed or why changes have not been made. Describe how your response was communicated back to the respondent(s) to discuss their points? Were there any further comments after your response(s) were communicated back to them?

It should be clear what your professional opinion is (supported by your technical evidence) to defend the implementation of the proposal.

Explain your reasoning if it isn’t clear why your proposal is favoured if there is negative consultation feedback – particularly if the opposition is from the Local Board.

A road safety audit will often be appropriate. Note the conclusions from a safety audit if undertaken or explain why a road safety audit was not considered necessary in this case.