**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**

The space between “Name of” and “Local” is another drop-down menu to choose a second LB name, if needed.

**Name of Local Board**

Street Name(s), Suburb

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.

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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date Approved:** (Delete this TCC Secretary to fill in) | **Approval ID: XXXXX** |
| **Internal cost code:** WBS or cost code | |

1. **Recommendations**

The Traffic Operations Manager, in accordance with their delegated authority, and being of the opinion that these controls are a justified limitation on the right to freedom of movement on roads which will not unduly impede vehicular traffic using the road, approves:

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.

(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 resolutions or decisions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw or other Road Controlling Authority power, to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls approved in this report are revoked.
3. The traffic controls, restrictions and/or prohibitions approved in this report are approved from the date the decision was made. Each control, restriction or prohibition takes effect and may be enforced either immediately or, if dependent on a traffic control device, once the traffic control devices prescribed for it under the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 are installed.
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. **Governance 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 | Date of Review Approval |
| 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) |  |
| Verified by: | Anthony Herath  Senior Resolutions Specialist  Transport Controls |  |
| Approved by: | (Name)  Traffic Engineering Team Leader (By area)  If a project includes a bus route or a school bus route on any of the streets in the proposal area, is near a transport station or could be used by a bus driver on the way to and from their route or to divert from their route, include Metro in the signatory table.  If these don’t apply, delete the appropriate row(s).  Network Management |  |
| Approved by: | Stuart McAlpine  Infrastructure Operations Specialist – Bus  Infrastructure Specifications |  |
|  | | |
| Recommendations  Approved by:  Delegated Authority | ………….………….………  Traffic Operations Manager  Network Management | Date Approved |
|  |

# Appendix

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

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

Identify the issue and the broad goal for the solution. What do you hope to achieve? For example, if the problem is pedestrians are at risk, then the broad goal is to improve pedestrian safety.

* 1. **Location**

The road / subject area is situated between (insert appropriate) Street Name and (insert appropriate) Street Name in the Name of Local Board area.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Road Name** | **Road Classification** | **AADT** (vpd) | **Additional Designation(s)** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

This area is predominantly commercial / industrial / retail / residential in nature. Describe the relevant road geometry and conditions, 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, if the lane layout is being amended the new lane widths must be stated. See section 2.10.4.2 in the resolution guidebook for any other pertinent information that should be included in this section.

If the road is within a parking zone this should be stated.

Any studies or data, like crash data, that were used to identify the problem or a potential solution are also included here. State what study was conducted or data gathered, the results of the study/data and the conclusion that was drawn from the study/data.

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 include them in this resolution.*

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

*If you reference an existing resolution (i.e., to explain why some controls in the plan are not being resolved in this report), use the following format for your language: The \*describe the controls or the road, e.g., the existing Give Way and NSAAT controls or the existing controls on Airedale Street\* were approved by the Traffic Control Committee on \*date\* under resolution ID #\*ID\*.*

* 1. **Strategic alignment**
     1. **Design standards**

State if the proposed 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.

* + 1. **Safety**

State how the proposal aligns with AT’s commitment to Vision Zero.

A road safety audit will often, but not always, be appropriate. If a road safety audit was undertaken, note the conclusions from the audit. Or explain why a road safety audit was not considered necessary in this case.

* 1. **Alternatives**

You would have identified the broad goal for the solution in section 6.1, but that would still likely be a set of possible specific solutions. There are several methods that could be used to achieve your broad goal and each one should be an option discussed here with the final option being the proposal and why it was progressed over all the other options. Each option should describe the potential design, the engineering assessment of that option and why it was or was not progressed.

Following the pedestrian example from 6.1, you would discuss the various ways the pedestrian safety could be improved (traffic calming, pedestrian facilities, diverting pedestrians to a safer crossing area, etc). Even within the categories of traffic calming or pedestrian facilities, there are a variety of solutions and it should be shown why the one chosen was preferred over the other possible designs, e.g., why choose a pedestrian crossing over a pedestrian signal.

It is acceptable to cite costs or standards as part of your justification. For instance, if the Transport Design Manual requires a raised pedestrian crossing in a particular area, that can be used as the justification for proposing a raised crossing and not a flush crossing or a crossing with traffic islands, etc. It won’t provide a justification for preferring a crossing over a pedestrian signal, but those are why warrants were developed.

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

The Choose an item. Local Board were Choose an item. on Click or tap to enter a date..

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?

For developer-driven reports, the developer or their representative will consult most Local Boards or their transport spokesperson directly. Change this paragraph accordingly.

Please note that Rodney are not consulted. Orakei and Upper Harbour will be consulted through our Engagement Hub team.

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 7.6 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**

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).

Delete this box.

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

Parking Design and Solutions Click here to choose

Metro Services 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.

Describe the nature of the consultation – emails, team presentations, face to face meetings etc. Include the dates. Analysis of the feedback does not go here; it’s properly done in the Analysis section.

Choose an item. the following **external** parties:

Affected residents/property owners Click here to choose

Affected businesses Click here to choose

Affected community groups, schools, etc Click here to choose

Other affected road users Click here to choose

Public transport operators Click here to choose

Business association Click here to choose

Fire and ambulance services 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, Bike 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 dates of consultation. Include the numbers of letters/packages sent out and the 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.

Show the date of your most recent communication with the external parties if you have exceeded the consultation period by six months or more. Include a brief summary of the contents of that communication.

* 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).

If the Local Board have any comments on the proposal, those comments must be discussed here.

* 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 and when was the consultation closed out? Give a brief summary of what was in the close out materials. In particular, did you include a revised proposal and any explanation for why a comment was or was not incorporated into the proposal? Did any team have anything to add after the close out? For Local Board and external consultation: when was the external consultation closed out? How was it closed out? Give a brief summary of what was in the close out materials. In particular, did you include a revised proposal and any explanation for why a comment was or was not incorporated into the proposal? Did the Board or any customer have anything to add after the close out?