**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.

**Permanent Traffic Control Changes Report**

Name of Local Board

Please delete this text box

Approval reports are still sent to the TCC Secretary for processing. This can be done before or after the approval signature.

Street Name(s), Suburb

Subject (reason for resolution)

Report to Traffic Operations Manager

**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 resource consents and temporary road works, this will be the Transport Controls Administrator.) Include the job title.*

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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date:** XXXXXXX | **Approval ID: XXXXX** |
| **Date Approved:** (Delete this R&S team to fill in) | **Internal cost code:** WBS or cost code |

1. **Recommendation**

The Traffic Operations Manager approves:

(Please refer to the Resolution and Approval Guidebook for examples of how to draft the approvals). Section 1.14 of the guidebook sets out the approvals that could be passed as officer decisions.

1. Manager recommendations start here.
2. That any previous approvals pertaining to traffic controls to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.
3. That this approval will take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in this report are in place.
4. **Executive Summary**

Give a concise overview of any essential information the approver 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 Operations Manager has been delegated powers by the Auckland Transport Chief Executive to make decisions in regard to the nature and location of various traffic controls and traffic control devices that do not require a resolution under traffic bylaws.  The matters for consideration in this report fall within scope of the Traffic Operations Manager’s delegated authority.

1. **Consultation Summary**

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).

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 signatures.)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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  (By area)  Network Management |  |  |
| Approved by: | Adrian Grant  Infrastructure Lead – Minor Capex  AT Metro Infrastructure Specification |  |  |
| Recommendations  Approved by:  Delegated Authority | Name  …………………………  Traffic Operations Manager  Network Management | Signature  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). | Date Approved |
|  |  |

# Appendix

1. **Background**
2. **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 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**
2. **Proposal**

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

State if the proposal design complies with the standards set in the Transport Design Manual (ATCOP standards may be used where the TDM doesn’t cover a specific design) or if the design varies from the standards. If there is a deviation from the standards, show the approval under AT’s set process for obtaining a deviation.

*(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 approval 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 a staggered pedestrian crossing then explain why it is more suitable than other controls such as aligned crossings, no crossing, 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)*

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.

1. **Consultation**

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

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

Design and Standards 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. Analysis of the feedback does not go here; it’s properly done in the Analysis section.

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. Analysis of the feedback does not go here; it’s properly done in the Analysis section.

Consultation on a proposed or relocated **bus shelter** was undertaken with the following externalparties:

Affected residents/property owners Click here to choose

Describe how you consulted with the affected resident/property owner with respect to our statutory obligations under the Local Government Act 1974, clause 339.

1. **Analysis**

This is where you analyse any consultation feedback as well as the proposal.

Set out any themes from the consultation 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 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.

1. **Close Out**

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 the close out for internal, external and Local Board consultations.

Make sure the following questions are answered in your close out discussion. For internal consultations: how was the consultation closed out? Did any team have anything to add after close out? For Local Board and external consultation: when was the external consultation closed out? How was it closed out? Did the Board or any customer have anything to add after the close out? When was the last time you communicated with the Board or the external parties? Remember the TCC’s six-month policy. If you have not had any communication with the Board or the external parties in more than six months, you will need permission from the Transport Controls Team Leader to submit your report to the TCC agenda.

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.