

Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

Report To: UDS Implementation Committee (UDSIC)
Subject: UDS Review / Update – draft analysis
Reference in Action Plan: 6.31.4 (Page 132)
Report Author: Implementation Manager
Report Date: 17 November 2008

1. Purpose

This report provides interim information to the UDSIC regarding a gaps analysis of the UDS and the Action Plan to be finalised by February 2009 in order to inform any further review and update of the UDS in 2009.

2. Background

At the September meeting of the UDSIC, a report from the Implementation Manager was presented which outlined the known constraints around timing of the UDS review committed to under action 6.31.4 on page 132 of the Action Plan:

The commencement [sic] review of the Strategy will occur in 2010 or at the direction of the Strategy partners, when there is a substantial change affecting the assumptions that underlie the strategy.

During the discussion on the report a number of points were raised regarding:

- The timing of the review in relation to the next local authority elections and the RPS PC1 process.
- The growth of districts beyond the UDS boundary
- The need for more research and analysis as a means of ensuring that there was a solid technical basis for review

Ultimately the UDSIC resolved that the a gaps analysis be carried out with interim information to be provided in November 2008, and the full report to be provided in February 2009 in order to inform the terms of reference for updating the UDS in 2009/2010.

3. Analysis

A full scale review and rewriting of the Urban Development Strategy which would involve significant consultation with constituent communities and relevant stakeholders is likely to be both unnecessary and potentially destabilising. There remains significant community support and political buy-in to the UDS and there is little need to revisit the general thrust of the strategy. Furthermore, while the RPS is being updated with Proposed Change No.1, any full-scale review would send entirely the wrong signals to submitters and the hearings panel. It is not the intention of the partners to change course only 18 months into implementation.

However, given the knowledge about how the partnership works most effectively, over the last 18 months, there are both strategic matters that would it would be productive to address and significant gaps in the Action Plan that it would be useful to focus on and close.

A top level analysis of the areas where it would be fruitful to focus attention in any update of the Strategy and Action Plan are as follows:

- **Boundary** – We need to be clear about the principles on which the UDS boundary is set and adjusted. Is transport the logical principle – are there others, what effect might these have?
- **Demographics** – We have commissioned some updated demographics from Statistics New Zealand. How are these fed into the implementation of the strategy and how should changing demographic projections be dealt with in a robust and durable manner?
- **Timeframe** – 35 years to 2041 was a reasonably long period of time when the UDS was adopted. However it is rapidly being overtaken by other planning cycles, such as transport’s 30 year horizon which already gets us to 2038. How and when should the timeframe be adjusted to ensure the UDS remains the overarching growth management strategy for the sub-region?
- **Stakeholder Engagement** – Engagement with some stakeholders has been below expectations often owing to confusion over whose engagement should take precedence – i.e. at a UDS level or an individual partner level. Clarity here would be very helpful indeed.
- **Tangata Whenua Engagement** – We must understand why this has failed thus far, and how this important input can be achieved. Growth Management in the sub-region should not be done in isolation from Tangata Whenua.
- **Action Plan Typology** – The Action Plan is not constructed in a particularly helpful typology for implementation. Following more than a year of implementing the UDS – how can we better adjust the typology to better manage clarity of implementation? (see below discussion)
- **Action Plan Priorities** – The Action Plan’s Top Twenty Actions is not necessarily a concise description of the priority actions for UDS implementation. This should be refined and articulated more clearly.
- **Action Plan Categories and Actions** – The categories contained in the action plan are not necessarily the appropriate organising principles for action. ‘A good example of a category missing from the Action Plan with consequent actions arising out of it is ‘Ageing’. Furthermore there are many actions that are less actions and more ambitions. We should challenge ourselves to be realistic as well as more explicit about what needs to happen and how in order to achieve the UDS vision.

4. Action Plan Typology

The UDS Action Plan contains 182 actions that are listed in the following typology:

ID	Subject	Action	Lead Agency	Support Agencies	Cost	Tools	Link	Timing
6.4.4.4	Housing (inc. Housing Affordability)	Monitor supply and demand of affordable housing at local and regional levels.	HNZ	CCC, SDC, WDC	Low	LTCCP, Housing Strategy (CCC)	6.6, 6.32	2007

There is little description or context included with the action, outputs are non-specific, accountabilities (especially in the example given) are not explicitly bought into and timeframes are estimated by year at best. Furthermore, as with the above example, many actions are simply out of date, having been superseded by changing policy.

A more robust typology for each action is suggested, perhaps in line with that adopted by Smart Growth in the Bay of Plenty. The Smart Growth Action Plan separates action by subject as does the UDS, but then separates actions into specific projects (with robust deliverable timeframes and accountabilities) and ongoing behaviours and approaches which require more fundamental organisational re-alignment. Greater context for each action is provided to allow a wider group of users to understand what is intended by each action.

Such clarity would immeasurably help UDS implementation progress, particularly when it comes to engaging with key stakeholders and agencies beyond the core partnership.

5. RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 *That the report on the UDS Review / Update be received.*
- 7.2 *That a final report on Gaps in the UDS and Action Plan be presented to the February 2009 meeting of the UDSIC.*
- 7.3 *That a draft Terms of Reference for updating the UDS and Action Plan be presented to the April 2009 meeting of the UDSIC*

James Caygill
Implementation Manager