

**GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT
STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

MONDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2011

AT 1.30PM

**IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY
58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

Committee:

UDS Independent Chair
Bill Wasley.

Christchurch City Council
Mayor Bob Parker, Councillors Sue Wells and Chrissie Williams/Claudia Reid.

Environment Canterbury
Commissioners Tom Lambie and Rex Williams

Selwyn District Council
Mayor Kelvin Coe, Councillors Lindsay Philps and Malcolm Lyall.

Waimakariri District Council
Mayor David Ayers, Councillors Jim Gerard and Dan Gordon.

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
Mark Solomon.

Interim Implementation Manager
Keith Tallentire
Telephone: 941-8590

Committee Adviser
Warren Brixton
Telephone: 941-8439
Fax: 941-8920

INDEX

PAGE NO	ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
	1.	APOLOGIES
	2.	RECEIVE PREVIOUS MINUTES: MEETING OF 30 AUGUST 2010
	3.	MATTERS ARISING
	4.	UDS IMPLEMENTATION REPORT
	5.	UDS ACTION PLAN
	6.	INTEGRATION OF UDS PARTNER TRANSPORT PLANNING FOR 2011 AND BEYOND
	7.	CANTERBURY (DARFIELD) EARTHQUAKE

CATERING

A light luncheon will be available at 1pm
Car parking available at the Crowne Plaza – Kilmore Street Entrance

**GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT
STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

MONDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2011

AT 1.30PM

**IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY
58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

Committee:

UDS Independent Chair
Bill Wasley.

Christchurch City Council
Mayor Bob Parker, Councillors Sue Wells and Chrissie Williams/Claudia Reid.

Environment Canterbury
Sir Kerry Burke, Councillors Alec Neill and Eugenie Sage.

Selwyn District Council
Mayor Kelvin Coe, Councillors Lindsay Philps and Malcolm Lyall.

Waimakariri District Council
Mayor David Ayers, Councillors Jim Gerard and Dan Gordon.

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
Mark Solomon.

Interim Implementation Manager
Keith Tallentire
Telephone: 941-8590

Committee Adviser
Warren Brixton
Telephone: 941-8439
Fax: 941-8920

INDEX

PAGE NO	ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
	1.	APOLOGIES
	2.	RECEIVE PREVIOUS MINUTES: MEETING OF 30 AUGUST 2010
	3.	MATTERS ARISING
	4.	UDS IMPLEMENTATION REPORT
	5.	UDS ACTION PLAN
	6.	INTEGRATION OF UDS PARTNER TRANSPORT PLANNING FOR 2011 AND BEYOND
	7.	CANTERBURY (DARFIELD) EARTHQUAKE

CATERING

A light luncheon will be available at 1pm
Car parking available at the Crowne Plaza – Kilmore Street Entrance

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Jim Gerard and Claudia Reid and Mark Solomon.

2. RECEIVE PREVIOUS MINUTES: MEETING OF 30 AUGUST 2010

Attached.

3. MATTERS ARISING

4. UDS IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

Attached.

5. UDS ACTION PLAN

Attached.

6. INTEGRATION OF UDS PARTNER TRANSPORT PLANNING FOR 2011 AND BEYOND

Attached.

7. CANTERBURY (DARFIELD) EARTHQUAKE

Implications for UDS and Change 1
Recovery in WDC/SDC and CCC (incl. Central City)
Temporary Housing
Orders in Council (OIC)

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION
COMMITTEE**

**Held in the Committee Room No 2, Civic Office,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
on Monday 30 August 2010 at 1pm.**

PRESENT: Bill Wasley (Chairperson),
Mayors Kelvin Coe and Ron Keating (until 3.10 pm), Councillors
David Ayers, Dan Gordon (from 1.55 pm), Malcolm Lyall,
Lindsay Phelps, Sue Wells, Chrissie Williams, and
Commissioner Rex Williams.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mayor
Bob Parker, Commissioner Tom Lambie, and Councillor
Helen Broughton. An apology for lateness was received and
accepted from Councillor Dan Gordon.

	ACTION
<p>1. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES</p> <p>It was resolved that the minutes of the meeting 28 June 2010, as circulated, be taken as read and confirmed, subject to:</p> <p>(i) 7.1 Replace the word “identify” with “identity”.</p>	
<p>2. MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>It was reported that when the Greater Christchurch Metro Strategy Review was considered by the Christchurch City Council, some minor changes were made.</p>	
<p>3. UDS BI-MONTHLY IMPLEMENTATION REPORT</p> <p>The report of the Independent Chair and Implementation Manager provided an update on UDS implementation matters.</p> <p>In speaking to the report, James Caygill pointed to:</p> <p>3.1 RPS PC1 The 22 Briefs of Evidence were not yet available but would be shortly for members to view. The Christchurch City Council has lodged an Appeal to the Court in respect of Judge Jackson’s decision for PC 5 to be heard ahead of PC1.</p> <p>Laurie McCallum added that a careful review of the evidence going to the court was being made, ready to provide rebuttal. It was possible that hearings could commence in April 2011.</p> <p>In the discussion that followed members commented on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to keep the public informed, through the likes of exhibition or charette process. • A paper being prepared for one of the larger Planning conferences. • An awareness programme of what is trying to be achieved for Canterbury people. 	

	ACTION
<p>It was resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The monthly report of the Independent chair and Implementation Manager be received.2. UDSIMG report to the UDSIC in February 2011 with a proposal to hold a conference and undertake an awareness programme on the UDS.3. UDSIC request the Independent Chair and the Implementation Manager to act on matters of UDS importance during the election break, in liaison with Chief Executives and report to UDSIC in 2011 on any significant activity.4. UDSIC request the Independent Chair and the Implementation Manager to brief incoming councils on the UDS as part of the normal induction process following the local government elections in October 2010.5. The next meeting of the UDSIC be held in February 2011 at a venue to be advised.	James Caygill
<p>4. UPDATE ON PLAN CHANGES WITHIN THE UDS AREA</p> <p>Keith Tallentire provided an overview of the proposed Plan Changes being processed by the UDS Partner authorities, both those lodged by the private organisations and those promulgated by the Council's themselves.</p> <p>In the discussion that followed, comment was made in respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How could the "what if" situation be dealt with.• The affect of the new Environment Canterbury legislation. <p>It was resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The information on Plan Change matters within the UDS Sub-region be received.2. The two matters raised by members be considered at the February meeting.	James Caygill
<p>5. UDS ACTION PLAN UPDATE</p> <p>In speaking to the report, James Caygill advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appendix I of the Action Plan has yet to be completed.• Significant work had been done to reach the current point. <p>It was suggested by members that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The process had been a good one.• There was still some gaps in the "achievements".• Transport had been well gone over.• 6.15 Arts Culture & Heritage – this needs to be amended to contain information on the Arts.• 6.21 Transport – the University is doing its own Campus Master Plan which will impact on "Transport". This can be contained in 6.19.2 Key Activity Centres or 6.10 Education.• 6.25 Central Government Engagement and Commitment Actions – in light of current government direction these actions might need to be clarified and then amended if need be.	

	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a direct link with the Christchurch City Council's Strategy – Housing Section and Water Resource Section, which need to be spelt out for the City Council. <p>It was resolved that the report on the UDS Action Plan Update be recommended for adoption by thy Partner Councils.</p>	James Caygill
<p>6. 2010 UDS MONITORING UPDATE</p> <p>Simon Markham in conjunction with his written report, presented a Power-Point presentation of the key findings of 2010 Monitoring Update, which focuses on recent changes in the Greater Christchurch settlement patterns covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More recent patterns of change• Employment• Long Term• Issues/Implementation <p>The Chairman concluded by commenting that it was timely to acknowledge the work carried out.</p> <p>It was resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The report be received.2. The Committee notes the recent changes observed and updated projections and the conclusions from them that the growth model underpinning the UDS and PC1 represent a prudent basis to continue implementation.	
<p>7. CHRISTCHURCH Motorways RoNS NETWORK PLAN</p> <p>Steve Higgs provided a Power-Point presentation in conjunction with his Memorandum covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• National Plan Maps• Purpose• Overall Objective is to provide the NZTA Board with an integrated National Plan for the RoNS• Management Structure• Development Process• Structure• Maps<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Northern Corridor- Western Corridor- Southern Corridor- Public Transport Network- Cycle Network• Next Steps<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Board Endorsement (September)- Further consideration on:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Corridors & Project issue resolution▪ Development Funding Plan▪ Input into next RLTS and RLTP▪ Input into next LTCCP's <p>The National Plan is to be circulated to members.</p>	

ACTION

It was **resolved** that the Presentation be received.

8. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

- The Chairman in closing the meeting acknowledged the work of the UDSIC Member and staff, both past and present.
- The quality of advice and the collaborative work into the RPCS1 continues on, as does its consuming of resources.
- There were a few challenges ahead, such as the Resource Management Act review, but one of the strengths had been having this form of mechanism in place to deal with them.
- He wished those members standing for re election, his best wishes.

The meeting concluded at 3.55 pm.

Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

Report To: UDS Implementation Committee (UDSIC)
Subject: UDS Bi-Monthly Implementation Report
Report Author(s): Independent Chair & Interim Implementation Manager
Report Date: February 2011
Reference to UDS: Effective Governance and Leadership

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report provides an update to the Committee on UDS implementation. The Committee last met on 30th August 2010 so this report covers almost a six month period.

2. IMPLEMENTATION

2.1 Council elections, triennial agreement and UDS reporting arrangements

Local council elections were held in October 2010. The new triennial agreement is to be considered at the Canterbury Mayoral Forum meeting on 28th February.

With a new political term commencing it is an opportune time to review the UDS implementation reporting arrangements with respect to individual partner council meetings. Currently minutes of this joint committee are only formally tabled at the full council meeting of Waimakariri DC. Informal and/or verbal reporting may occur elsewhere.

Both the Independent Chair and the Implementation Manager are available to attend meetings of partner councils and the NZTA board when requested.

2.2 Actions of the Independent Chair between Committee meetings

Between meetings of this Committee, including during the election interregnum, the Independent Chair performed the following actions (using delegated authority where necessary):

- i. Lodged a submission on the MfE *Building Competitive Cities discussion document* (see below).
- ii. Arranged for an interim Implementation Manager to be appointed (see below).
- iii. Visited Mayors Parker, Coe and Ayers following their election (re)appointments.

2.3 UDS Implementation Manager

In November 2010 James Caygill resigned from the Implementation Manager post to take up the role of CEO Christchurch Symphony Orchestra.

To provide continuity ahead of a permanent replacement it was considered that an interim secondment arrangement be sought. Following discussions at CEAG and UDSIMG it was agreed that Keith Tallentire be seconded from Environment Canterbury to the Implementation Manager role for this temporary period.

A recruitment process is about to commence to seek a new Implementation Manager for a three year fixed term.

2.4 UDS Implementation Management Group (UDSIMG)

Since August UDSIMG have continued to meet on a (bi)monthly basis. Topics of discussion have included Change 1 appeals, earthquake response and recovery, progressing the UDS Action Plan, MfE submissions, Implementation Manager arrangements and feedback discussion relating to the work of UDSIMG sub-groups.

Separate items on this agenda cover some of these issues in more detail.

2.5 Canterbury (Darfield) Earthquake

Five days after the last meeting of the UDSIC Canterbury experienced a magnitude 7.1 earthquake. Significant aftershocks continue to be experienced and the Earthquake Recovery process is likely to take a number of years.

A separate presentation item on this agenda covers some of the implications of the earthquake for the UDS and reports on some of the work being undertaken by partner councils and others.

In addition to this council-led recovery work, the Institute of Architects have commenced an exhibition to promote discussion within the community regarding the future of the City in the light of the earthquake. The Exhibition runs from 12 February to 20th March at the Christchurch Art Gallery and finishes with a lecture on 31st March by Ian Athfield who has been the architectural ambassador for the project.

2.6 MfE Building Competitive Cities discussion document (incl. Urban TAG and Infrastructure TAG reports)

Following the completion of reports from both the Urban and Infrastructure Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs), the Ministry for the Environment launched a discussion document entitled *Building Competitive Cities - Reform of the Urban and Infrastructure Planning System* in October 2010. This was accompanied by a technical working paper and the public release of the TAG reports themselves.

The discussion document sought comment on options to address problems facing urban and infrastructure planning in New Zealand, while the technical working paper provided a greater level of detail and evidence about the potential problems identified. The TAG reports represented the consensus views of those two groups and informed the MfE discussion document.

The main options being considered for improvements to the urban planning system include:

- Better recognition of the “urban environment” in the RMA framework (e.g. in the definition of environment, amenity values, and in Part II).
- A proposed National Policy Statement (NPS) on the urban environment including policies for provision of adequate supply of land for growth, housing affordability, and principles for good urban design at a range of scales.
- Strengthening the role of the Auckland spatial plan and extending regional spatial planning outside of Auckland. Spatial plans would be a high level tool to guide growth management, better align land-use and infrastructure investment (including by central government) and streamline the planning framework (e.g. by incorporating the Regional Policy Statement and the Regional Land Transport Strategy).
- Improve planning tools including introducing a national template for local and regional plans, and provide for combined National Policy Statement/ National Environment Standards (NPS/NESS).
- Improve the quality of urban design through creation of a national urban design panel, and establishment of a government architect.
- Improve tools for land assembly, including extending the scope of the Public Works Act (PWA) to enable local authorities to compulsorily acquire and amalgamate land for major urban regeneration projects.

A submission on behalf of the UDS Partnership was prepared with input from officers from partner councils and lodged to meet the December 2010 consultation deadline. The full submission is attached as **Appendix A** to this report. A combined submission was also made on behalf of the respective partnerships of the UDS, SmartGrowth in the Bay of Plenty and FutureProof in the Waikato and this is also included as **Appendix B**.

A further more detailed submission was lodged by Christchurch City Council (see <http://www1.ccc.govt.nz/council/proceedings/2010/december/cnclcover16th/23.reportcouncilorsmareforms.pdf>).

These urban and infrastructure workstreams are part of the wider RMA Phase II reforms to be reported further at the next meeting.

2.7 LGA 2002 Amendment Act 2010

The LGA 2002 Amendment Act 2010 received royal assent on 26 November 2010. The Act makes several amendments to the LGA 2002 with the most significant changes being:

- Focus on Core Business
- Performance Measures for Core Services
- New Requirements including a Financial Strategy
- Simplifying Plans and Consultation Requirements
- Pre-Election Report
- Increased Opportunities for Private Sector Involvement

These are discussed in turn in the briefing note attached as **Appendix C** to this report. It is this Act that renames the Long Term Council and Community Plan (LTCCP) to just the Long Term Plan (LTP) and reduces the requirements for determining and reporting on community outcomes.

These reforms were foreshadowed in the earlier Cabinet Paper ‘Improving Local Government Transparency, Accountability and Fiscal Management’ (April 2009).

2.8 Change 1 to the RPS

Environment Court appeal hearings on the higher-level objectives and policies of Change 1 have now been set down for a seven week period commencing 4th May 2011. The Court has also indicated that hearing time commencing October 2011 for the remaining appeal issues may be available.

Rebuttal evidence from CRC witnesses is due by 25th March following the final filing of evidence from appellants and s274 parties on 25th February.

CRC evidence-in-chief was filed in August 2010, however supplementary evidence to provide a preliminary assessment of the implications of the Canterbury Earthquake for Change 1 was also filed in December.

The Change 1 Project Group (including partner officers and legal counsel) continues to meet to refine the case strategy. Witness preparation days were held on 10th and 11th February and an update will be reported verbally.

2.9 Risk Profile

There are several key risks which affect the implementation of the UDS:

Nature of Risk	Probability ¹	Impact	Comment
Adequate and consistent resourcing in a timely manner. This covers both purely budgetary and staff resourcing. (CEAG to address risk in the first instance)	2(2)	5	Budgets are on track for the remainder of 10/11. Budgets have been adjusted for 11/12 to account for partnership costs of defending Change 1 in the Environment Court
Failing to successfully implement, in a form intended by the UDS partners, the growth management strategy through the Regional Policy Statement.	5 (5)	10	The Change 1 legal team continues to build our case and prepare for Stage 1 hearings on Change 1 in May 2011. Partners should have confidence that this work is progressing well.

¹ Rankings for both Probability and Impact are between 1 = low and 10 = high; Bracketed is previous

Nature of Risk	Probability ¹	Impact	Comment
Private Plan changes undermining RPS and UDS	5(8)	3-9	<p>Private Plan Changes are a significant threat to establishing the land form sought through Change 1.</p> <p>Council-led plan changes implementing elements of Change 1 policy and recent agreement on the hearing time for Christchurch City Plan Change 45 appeal have reduced this risk probability.</p>
Inconsistent communications/ Lack of alignment	3(3)	3	Ongoing work on social marketing and branding will need monitoring for alignment as it matures.
Lack of Government Engagement and alignment	2(2)	5	<p>A consistent approach will need to be adopted in this new triennium to make further progress on significant infrastructure issues.</p> <p>Government support following the Canterbury Earthquake has strengthened this relationship.</p>

2.10 Future Agenda Items

UDSIMG expects the following items to be on the UDSIC agenda in April :

- UDS Bi-monthly Implementation Report
- UDS Action Plan quarterly reporting: 'Enhance Environment theme' actions
- Plan Changes in the UDS area
- UDS community engagement and participation
- Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS)

2.11 UDSIC Meeting Schedule for 2011

The following meeting dates have been circulated to partner Councils for inclusion into diaries and are as follows:

Monday 18th April 2011
Monday 13th June 2011
Monday 15th August 2011
Monday 17th October 2011

The meetings are to be held bi-monthly and generally on the third Monday of the month. It is intended that the venue be rotated around the partner Councils.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 *That the monthly report of the Independent Chair and Interim Implementation Manager be received.***
- 3.2 *That members of the Committee advise the Independent Chair on the most appropriate arrangements for reporting UDS Implementation back to their respective Councils.***
- 3.3 *That the submissions made in respect of the MfE Building Competitive Cities discussion document be confirmed.***

Bill Wasley - Independent Chair

Keith Tallentire – Interim Implementation Manager

TRIM Ref: 11/68296



Submission by the Greater Christchurch Urban
Development Strategy

*Building Competitive Cities: Reform of the Urban and
Infrastructure Planning System*
Discussion Document

December 2010

To:

RM Reform
Ministry for the Environment
PO Box 10362
WELLINGTON 6143

Name of Submitter:

Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Partnership
c/- Bill Wasley: Independent Chair
P O Box 237
CHRISTCHURCH
M. 027 4713006
E. bill@wasleyknell.co.nz

Submission:

This is the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) Partnership's submission on the *Building Competitive Cities: Reform of the urban and infrastructure planning system* discussion document. (Note: The NZTA is a UDS partner but is also part of the Government working party on the RMA stage II discussion paper and as such intends to make representations solely through working group.)

The content of the submission follows overleaf.

The UDS wishes to be heard in support of its submissions. If others make similar submissions the UDS would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at hearing.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bill Wasley', written over a horizontal line.

Bill Wasley
Independent Chair
Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee

Introduction

This submission is presented by the Independent Chair on behalf of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (“the UDS”) the 35 year growth management and implementation plan for the greater Christchurch sub-region¹ and its partners. The UDS is overseen by the Implementation Committee (“the UDSIC”), a joint committee of Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, and the New Zealand Transport Agency.

The government is to be congratulated on addressing the issues raised in the discussion document, many of which Councils and communities have been struggling to tackle with the existing regulatory tool box.

The UDS

Greater Christchurch is the largest urbanised area in the South Island. The greater Christchurch sub-region has grown in a dispersed form leading to a number of negative community outcomes. A desire to more sustainably manage future growth across the sub-region resulted in moves by local government in the sub-region to initiate growth management.

The UDS was developed and adopted by the partner councils (Christchurch City Council, Banks Peninsula District Council², Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, and Transit New Zealand³) between 2004 and 2007. The goal was to prepare an agreed strategy for the Greater Christchurch sub-region to make provision for sustainable urban and rural development for the next 35 years.

The adopted strategy was launched by the then Prime Minister in July 2007.

An important feature of the UDS is to provide a sustainable urban form and protect the peripheral rural communities that lie close to Christchurch City. The vision for Greater Christchurch by the year 2041 is for a vibrant inner city and suburban centres surrounded by thriving rural communities and towns, connected by efficient and sustainable infrastructure. Part of this vision is the implementation of an efficient and integrated planning process for growth management.

Strategy Focus

The UDS supports a fundamental shift in growth management from focusing largely on accommodating low-density suburban residential development in greenfields areas to supporting a compact and balanced urban form that enhances both urban and rural living. It considers the complexity and inter-relationships of issues around land-use, transport, and infrastructure including community facilities, while incorporating social, health, cultural, economic and environmental values.

In order to achieve a sustainable urban footprint for Christchurch, the UDS is predicated on the following key outcomes, an increase in the greenfields suburban density from 10 households per hectare to 15 households per hectare; and moving to a position where 60% of all future residential growth is accommodated within the existing urban form and at densities of 30 households per hectare or higher.

¹ The Greater Christchurch sub-region covers the eastern parts of Waimakariri and Selwyn District Councils and the urban and some rural areas of Christchurch City Council including the Lyttleton Harbour Basin

² In March 2006 Banks Peninsula District Council merged with Christchurch City Council.

³ In August 2008 Transit NZ combined with Land Transport NZ to create a new Crown entity, the NZTA.

Building Competitive Cities discussion document

The urban planning system is the most significant reason why the UDS partnership exists in this sub-region. The UDS recognises that appropriate integrated planning of growth and infrastructure has a strong influence on future urban form.

Generally this submission focuses on the issues and options raised in Chapter 3 of the discussion document, that is those options for change arising from the report of the Urban Technical Advisory Group (UTAG). A complimentary submission has also been prepared by the Christchurch City Council.

Recognition of the urban environment in the RMA framework

The UDS broadly supports the need to recognise the urban environment in the RMA framework. As identified by the advisory group, the problem is not so much that the RMA does not allow consideration of the quality of the urban environment. Both Councils and the Environment Court regularly give consideration to the quality of the urban environment under the RMA. Rather the issue is that neither the RMA, nor any NPS, contains any specific policy direction on the *quality* that should be achieved. As the advisory group's report states, "the RMA's focus on effects (and in particular adverse effects) is not conducive to achieving **optimal** planning and design solutions"⁴. The RMA focuses more on minimising adverse effects, which tends to achieve acceptable design rather than promoting good design.

The UDS partners support the proposed amendments to the definitions of "environment" and "amenity values" options put forward but, to be clear, while of some assistance, these would not in themselves achieve the change in emphasis required to achieve better urban design.

To achieve good (more optimal) design the "minimising of adverse effects" approach often arising under the RMA would have to be changed, at least in terms of design. It is suggested that this would require a very clear statement in the RMA that development must promote good design. Although the current RMA doesn't preclude planning instruments from trying to achieve something more than mediocrity, they face an uphill battle to do so. It would make it much easier for planning instruments to successfully incorporate provisions that ensure good design if the RMA itself clearly stated that development is required to promote good design.

As this would be a statement in the Act that relates to the significance or weight to be given to promoting good design it would be appropriate that this be stated in either s6 or s7. It would appear to justify inclusion in s6 considering the importance being placed at national level on the design of urban areas in building competitive cities. Thus the UDS partners also support the proposals contained in option 2 section 3.1 of the discussion document (page 20).

Greater national direction and clarity

In general, a policy within the NPS requiring planning for urban growth for at least the next 20 years is supported. However, the wording used in the policy needs to be carefully considered. The term "urban growth demands" used in the discussion paper is open to the interpretation that all urban growth demands should be met, irrespective of the environmental consequences of those demands. Furthermore, given that potential for wide interpretation we would not support the notion of being required to "provide an adequate supply of land" for these demands. This would seem to work against good design outcomes.

The UDS Partners do not support the suggested policies targeting housing affordability.

⁴ Report of the Minister for the Environment's Urban Technical Advisory Group (July 2010) para 23

It would, however, be of great assistance if the NPS was more specific in the design outcomes to be achieved in urban areas, clearly indicating the design principles that *do* promote good design, and perhaps those that do not.

Regarding naming, the NPS would be more appropriately renamed as “urban environment” if it is intended to relate principally to urban areas. However, if it is to apply to buildings generally, including that in rural areas, then “built environment” would be appropriate.

Spatial Planning – implementing it for other regions

Although these options are aimed primarily at addressing Auckland, they are equally relevant to other parts of New Zealand (as the discussion document later foreshadows in Option 12). The UDS partners in Greater Christchurch, are currently attempting to achieve better urban outcomes in a more efficient way, including the improved integration of urban growth and infrastructure provision, indeed we appear as a case study in the discussion document on pages 28 and 29).

The existing framework that must be navigated to achieve this integration is cumbersome, repetitive, and costly for all segments of the community. This is very much a consequence of the number of statutes which require a range of processes (sometimes effectively needing to be repeated in part under the different statutes).

It would be most simple if these statutes took stronger account of strategies and policies developed under the auspices of the other acts which we regularly deal with (the RMA, the LGA and the LTMA) such as in s61(2)(i) and s74(2)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act 1991. After all, we consider that for the Greater Christchurch sub-region we are meeting the coordination needs of spatial planning via the UDS under existing statute. We simply feel that this could be made a little easier for us.

If, however, the government elects to pursue spatial planning via legislative amendment it would be much more efficient if self-contained spatial plans could be prepared for urban areas that included all the relevant requirements for regional and district planning, transport planning, and Council and central government infrastructure planning and provision. Such urban spatial plans should be able to be prepared and should only go through one statutory process. Such an approach is not only likely to be less costly and time consuming, but is more likely to maximise integration and is less confusing to the community than multiple documents in multiple processes.

The UDS Partners support the simplification of the planning framework through the inclusion of the RLTS and RPS in the spatial plan but recognise that for regions such as Canterbury, which are unlikely to be geographically identical to the area appropriate for a spatial plan, there will remain a need for these documents outside the area covered by a spatial plan.

The contents of such plans might be deemed to form part of the range of statutory documents required under the various relevant statutes, e.g. district plans, regional policy statements and plans, regional land transport strategies, and LTPs. We support the proposal that subsidiary documents be required to “give effect” to the spatial plan.

In terms of the process for such urban spatial plans the significant RMA component of such plans may justify a similar process to document preparation under that Act. However there may be grounds for limiting appeal rights considering that it would be largely a policy/strategy document and that the Environment Court has generally (although not absolutely) avoided making decisions on infrastructure spending by Councils and central government agencies. Considering the policy/strategy level of the document and the significant infrastructure commitments involved by a number of levels of government, it is suggested that the most appropriate approach is that submissions be considered, and decided through a clearly outlined and mandated consultation process that ensures multi-party engagement in regional

strategic direction-setting and improves Maori participation. Following such a process we consider that the spatial plan be subject to appeal only on points of law.

In terms of central government influence on spatial plans, this should be incorporated in the process of developing, adopting and reviewing the spatial plan. Once this has been done, then further stages of developing government's approach to the spatial plan seem misplaced. Certainly a ministerial certification stage after such a process would seem unnecessary. Central government should be able to provide clear policy direction through GPSs or NPS/NESs. Such statements, if they contain specific policy direction and not just generalised statements, also have the potential to considerably reduce the significant costs regional and district councils (and respective communities) face as each goes through the process of re-inventing and re-litigating the urban growth wheel in its own district or region.

Importantly, the actions of central government agencies should also be consistent with the adopted spatial plan and the priorities and objectives of the plan should be reflected in the agencies' statements of intent.

The UDS partners consider that urban spatial plans with legislative influence should be prepared on a voluntary basis by regions (Option 12(d)), but regional councils should be required to consider preparing a spatial plan if requested by a district council or central government agency.

Improving Tools

We support the desire to improve the effectiveness of the tools available to develop, support and maintain quality urban environments. Suggestions such as national templates for local plans, NPSs, NESs and the combining NPSs and NESs into single documents are all welcome improvements that would support the UDS and provide general support for urban growth planning.

Land Assembly

The UDS partners do not support the suggestion that existing methods and processes for land assembly are adequate. We would prefer that the Public Works Act was extended particularly to amalgamate land for urban regeneration programmes and for the assembly of greenfields development projects, however some form of central government oversight will certainly be necessary. We do not see the need to progress with options 19(b-d). However further consideration of what new tools might be developed (option 20), particularly when considering what sorts of organisational arrangements might be appropriate is welcomed.

Conclusion

Improved legislative alignment and clearer national policy direction in support of quality urban environment outcomes would enable more efficient implementation arrangements to be progressed at the regional and local level. With the emergence of urban growth strategies around the country and the new spatial planning requirements for the Auckland region it is timely that such issues are being discussed and we hope that work on this matter can be swiftly advanced. The UDS partners would therefore welcome the opportunity to contribute further to the development of options supported through this submission.



Combined Submission of Future Proof,
the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy,
and SmartGrowth on

*Building Competitive Cities: Reform of the Urban and
Infrastructure Planning System*
Discussion Document

December 2010

To:

Ministry for the Environment
Resource Management Reform
PO Box 10362
WELLINGTON 6143
rmreform@mfe.govt.nz

Name of Submitter:

Combined submission on behalf of:

- the Future Proof Implementation Committee (“FPIC”),
- the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy partnership (“UDS”), and
- the SmartGrowth Implementation Committee (“SGIC”).

c/- Bill Wasley: Independent Chair of the SGIC, UDS, and the FPIC
P O Box 381
TAURANGA
M. 027 4713006
E. bill@wasleyknell.co.nz

Combined Submission:

This is a combined submission on **‘Building Competitive Cities – Reform of the Urban and Infrastructure Planning System’** discussion document submitted on behalf of the FPIC, UDS and SGIC. The content of the submission follows overleaf.

The SGIC, UDS and the FPIC are also submitting individual submissions on the discussion document.

Signed:



Bill Wasley

Independent Chair

Future Proof Implementation Committee, Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee and the SmartGrowth Implementation Committee

Introduction

This is a combined submission on behalf of the SGIC, FPIC and the UDS partnership. The SGIC, UDS Implementation Committee, and the FPIC are the joint committees appointed under the Local Government Act 2002 that oversee the implementation of the following growth management strategies in New Zealand:

- The SmartGrowth Strategy (the growth management strategy for the western Bay of Plenty sub-region¹);
- The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (the growth management strategy for the Greater Christchurch sub-region²); and
- The Future Proof Strategy (the growth management strategy for the Future Proof sub-region³).

These three growth strategies implement collaborative models for responding to growth management issues. All three take a strategic and integrated approach to long-term planning and growth management.

The detailed background information on the SmartGrowth, UDS and Future Proof strategies is contained in the individual submissions of the SGIC, the UDS



¹ Refers to the administrative areas of the territorial authorities of the Tauranga City Council and the Western Bay of Plenty District Council and the relevant areas of the Bay of Plenty Regional Council.

² Refers to the administrative areas of the territorial authorities of the Christchurch City Council, the Selwyn District Council and the Waimakariri District Council and the relevant areas of the Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury).

³ Refers to the administrative areas of the territorial authorities of Hamilton City Council, Waipa District Council, and Waikato District Council and the relevant areas of the Waikato Regional Council (Environment Waikato).

and the FPIC. The purpose of this submission is to set out the combined position of these three major growth management areas.

This combined submission focuses on the planning and urban design proposals of the Building Competitive Cities Discussion Document (“Discussion Document”) as this area is of most interest to growth strategy implementation. Future Proof, the UDS and SmartGrowth are happy to work with the Ministry for the Environment on some or all of the matters raised in this combined submission.

The Growth Areas

The Future Proof, Greater Christchurch and the western Bay of Plenty sub-regions are the main New Zealand growth areas outside of Auckland. Key facts about these three growth areas are as follows:

- The urban areas of Christchurch, Hamilton and Tauranga are the second, fourth and fifth largest in New Zealand⁴.
- The three sub-regions contain four of the 11 fastest growing territorial authority areas in New Zealand (Selwyn District, Hamilton City, Waimakariri District and Tauranga City).
- All three sub-regions are part of the top six fastest growing regions in New Zealand.
- Greater Christchurch is the largest urbanised area in the South Island.
- The western Bay of Plenty and the Future Proof sub-regions are part of the ‘golden triangle’ made up of Auckland, Waikato and the Bay of Plenty. The golden triangle is expected to contain more than 50% of the nation’s population and total economic activity within the next 20 years.
- All three sub-regions are projected to experience strong population growth over the next 30 to 50 years.
- The combined population of the Future Proof, Greater Christchurch and western Bay of Plenty sub-regions will be over 1.1 million by 2041 (see Table 1 below).
- The three sub-regions all contain one city that dominates the sub-region and region (ie Tauranga in the Bay of Plenty, Hamilton in the Waikato and Christchurch in Canterbury).

⁴ Statistics NZ, Subnational population estimates by main urban area, at 30 June 2010

Table 1: Population of the Three Sub-regions 2006-2041⁵

Sub-region	2006 Population	2041 Population	Population Increase 2006 - 2041
Future Proof	223,500	365,000	141,500
Greater Christchurch	413,500	548,500	135,000
Western Bay of Plenty	150,000	262,400	112,400
Total	787,000	1,175,900	388,900

Common Issues

By virtue of the growth pressures facing the Future Proof, Greater Christchurch and western Bay of Plenty sub-regions, they all have common growth management issues which are directly relevant to the Discussion Document. These issues include:

- High growth rates which create significant demand for infrastructure and services
- A growing population with increasing needs and expectations
- Decentralised patterns of development in the past resulting in adverse effects arising from the location and form of urban growth
- Housing affordability
- The need to provide for a range of housing types
- Achieving quality urban design outcomes
- Making urban intensification a viable and attractive option
- Managing the use of rural land for urban lifestyle activities
- Urban developments leaking into rural areas in order to take advantage of cheap rural land which puts significant pressure on existing settlements and creates demand for infrastructure that was not planned with subsequent funding implications
- An ageing population
- Maintaining the viability of city centres and towns
- Difficulties protecting and enhancing strategic infrastructure corridors
- Higher land costs for purchases that need to be made (eg for reserve and open space purchases and designations)

⁵ Source: Future Proof Growth and Implementation Plan 2009, Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy and Action Plan 2007, SmartGrowth Strategy 2007

- Managing traffic congestion and transport networks
- Funding pressures – particularly for growth-related projects (development contributions only provide a portion of the funding required)
- Recent challenges around development feasibility given the global financial crisis (ie how to make developments viable in a contracted economy)

All three growth management strategies have a common goal of successfully integrating land use, infrastructure and funding. This means taking a long-term planning approach to land use which attempts to ensure that the rate and location of development is integrated with the provision of infrastructure, and associated funding mechanisms. That is why having an agreed long-term strategy, like Future Proof, SmartGrowth and the UDS is so important. These strategies provide the mechanisms for dealing with growth management issues and taking an integrated approach to planning.

Combined Submission on the Building Competitive Cities Discussion Document

General Comment

The Future Proof, SmartGrowth and UDS partners would like to commend the Government on the Building Competitive Cities Discussion Document.

The three sub-regions have significant experience in growth management, long-term planning and urban issues. All three growth management strategies are currently in their implementation phase. We bring a unique perspective given our experience and the nature of the growth areas we represent.

The urban environment is a fundamental part of the Future Proof, SmartGrowth and UDS documents and their approach to implementation. Around 87% of New Zealand's population live in urban areas (cities and towns). Within the Future Proof, western Bay of Plenty and Greater Christchurch sub-regions the vast majority of growth is expected to occur in their three main cities of Hamilton, Tauranga and Christchurch. The urban form of our cities and towns is a key concern for all three sub-regions.

All three sub-regions have seen significant benefits from developing comprehensive growth management strategies. We believe these same benefits and more can be achieved through spatial planning. It is important that spatial planning be anchored in statute otherwise the plans will not have the weight they need to be effectively implemented. We would also note that existing growth strategies provide a solid foundation for developing a spatial plan. While predominantly about land use, Future Proof, SmartGrowth and the UDS all provide a strategic direction for the sub-region and include wider elements such as economic development, environmental, social and cultural matters, and infrastructure.

Submission Points

The three sub-regions share a number of common views on the Discussion Document which are set out below:

1. We support broadening the definitions of “environment” and “amenity values” to include the urban environment and to strengthen the ability of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”) to adequately recognise the urban environment. However, it is our view that while these amendments are useful they may not address the core issue that the RMA focuses on environmental effects and the natural environment.
2. Support making specific references to quality urban environment in sections 6 and / or 7 of the RMA.
3. Support broadening the scope of the National Policy Statement (“NPS”) on urban design. We are not entirely comfortable with the two somewhat narrow matters contained in the Discussion Document. We believe that the focus needs to be on specific urban design outcomes and principles and, if the scope is to be widened, on integrated planning. The issues involved are much more complicated than land supply. We believe the focus should be on aligning land use, infrastructure and funding and the importance of identifying a long-term land use pattern.
4. We support renaming the NPS on urban design.

5. The spatial planning options for Auckland could potentially have implications for the rest of New Zealand. We believe there needs to be a consistent approach throughout the country. All three sub-regions support the spatial planning approach, while acknowledging that current growth strategies should be used as a basis for developing a spatial plan.
6. All three sub-regions support the need to simplify the planning framework by using the spatial plan to incorporate a regional land transport strategy (“RLTS”) and regional policy statement (“RPS”).
7. We support giving the spatial plan statutory influence.
8. Support limiting the appeal rights to a spatial plan to points of law and having a statutorily prescribed consultation process. However, if spatial plans were to become RMA documents⁶ and incorporate an RPS and RLTS, then full appeal rights would be needed. Once a spatial plan is operative, its policies should feed directly into regional and district plans. There should not be a second round of consultation nor should there be appeals on matters of policy already decided under the spatial plan provisions.
9. Support central government influence over the spatial plan. We do not support ministerial certification of a spatial plan. We believe this is an unnecessary step if clear policy direction is provided through a government policy statement (“GPS”), NPS of National Infrastructure Plan.
10. All three sub-regions are of the view that there should be alignment between central government agencies and departments and spatial plans.
11. All three sub-regions support spatial planning being used elsewhere in New Zealand. Future Proof and SmartGrowth are of the view that this should be regional in nature given the wide range of matters to be covered and that it is very difficult to achieve an integrated approach (particularly in terms of infrastructure and transport) if it is only to be applied to a city or

⁶ Note that Future Proof and SmartGrowth have submitted that spatial plans should be RMA documents. The UDS partnership has not specifically raised this or the notion that spatial plan policies could be incorporated directly into regional and district plans.

sub-region. Future Proof and SmartGrowth also believe that spatial planning should be mandatory so that it is undertaken throughout the country. The UDS partnership is of the view that spatial plans should be for urban areas and prepared on a voluntary basis.

12. We support having a national template for local and regional plans and an NPS/NES. We also support providing for the production of a joint NPS/NES.

13. We support better methods and processes for land amalgamation. The option to extend the scope of the Public Works Act is supported but this needs to be considered as part of a wider range of measures in order to encourage urban regeneration projects. In this regard, we would like to see the comprehensive set of recommendations developed as part of the Department of Building and Housing's Urban Taskforce implemented. We agree that new tools for land assembly should be developed.

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

Summary of the 2010 Amendments to the Local Government Act 2002

1. The Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2010 ("the Act") received royal assent on 26 November 2010. The Act makes several amendments to the Local Government Act 2002 ("the LGA"). Below is an outline of the most significant changes.

Focus on Core Business

2. Section 5 inserts new section 11A which requires Councils to have particular regard to the contribution of core services. The core services listed are:
 - network infrastructure;
 - public transport services;
 - solid waste collection and disposal;
 - the avoidance of mitigation of natural hazards; and
 - libraries, museums, reserves, recreational facilities, and other community infrastructure.
3. These core services do not include many of the existing statutory functions of local government (i.e. Resource Management Act 1991 processing of consents, District and Regional Plan administration and dog control etc).

Performance Measures for Core Services

4. One of the most important changes made by the Act is the requirement that the Secretary for Local Government provide regulations that establish rules specifying performance measures for water supply; sewerage treatment/disposal; stormwater; flood protection and the provision of roads and footpaths (Section 42). These performance measures are applicable to all local authorities. The intention is to enable the public to compare the levels of service provided in relation to any of the infrastructure activities above, by different local authorities.
5. The Act also introduces new provisions requiring local authorities to pay a levy to central government to fund the work undertaken by central government in establishing the rules for the performance measures (Section 40). The Secretary may refund the levy, however this only applies where the amount collected exceeds the actual costs (Section 40). The Act also requires Council controlled organisations delivering any of the five infrastructural services mentioned above, to include specific performance measures and targets in their statement of intent (Section 47).
6. The Act has repealed previous sections in the LGA that specify the information requirements for assessment of water and sanitary services (Section 30).

New Requirements including a Financial Strategy

7. Section 18 provides that the Long Term Plan (note that the Long Term Council Community Plan is renamed) is to include a financial strategy for all the years covered by the Long Term Plan. The financial strategy is to include a statement of the factors expected to have a significant impact on the local authority, including population change and expected capital expenditure. A statement of local authorities "*quantified limits on rates, rates increase, and borrowing*" must be included along with an assessment of the ability to provide existing and future levels of service.

8. The new schedule 10 specifies that capital expenditure for each of the five infrastructure services must be given, as well as a statement of service provision and funding impact statement (these requirements also apply to the annual plan).
9. The long-term and annual plan must now include financial statements for the previous year (new clause 13 and 19 Schedule 10). This numerical information "*must be presented in a way that allows the public to compare the information with the numerical information contained in the forecast financial statements for each of the financial years covered by the plan.*"
10. The long-term and annual plan must identify each reserve fund, explain what it is for and the amount expected to be included or removed from the fund (new clause 16 and 21 Schedule 10).
11. Any internal borrowing is to be described in the annual report (new clause 27, Schedule 10).
12. A statement that all statutory requirements have been complied with is also required in the annual report (new clause 34, Schedule 10).

Simplifying Plans and Consultation Requirements

13. The need to consider the views of the public during the "four stages" of a decision have been deleted (Section 78(2)). This simplifies the process significantly.
14. The new Act reduces the requirements for determining and reporting on community outcomes. For example section 4 amends the definition of "community outcomes" by adding a reference to wellbeing "*in the present and for the future*". Section 13 repeals sections 91 and 92 of the LGA which outlines the process for identifying community outcomes and requires Councils to periodically report on the progress made towards these outcomes.
15. Section 55 enables Councils who are already preparing their three yearly reports and carrying out their six yearly reviews of community outcomes under repealed sections 91 and 92 to abandon this process if they so wish.
16. Some decisions can be made more easily (Section 15 repeals s97(1)(c) and (d), and Section 19 amends s102(4)) including amendment to funding and financial policies via the special consultative procedure rather than being restricted to the Long Term Plan) . The requirement to use the special consultative procedure for a change in delivery of a significant activity is removed (Section 12 repeals s88).
17. Requirements for audit of plans are reduced (Section 14 and 20 amends s103 so that only significant amendments to the revenue and financial policy require audit). The requirements for the liability management policy (Section 21) and investment policy (Section 22) are also reduced. Generally accepted accounting practice is not to apply to the funding impact statement (Section 28 amends s111).
18. An intention to dispose of endowment property no longer needs to be included in the long-term plan (section 34 amends s141).
19. Expenses of community boards can now be funded by a targeted rate or general rate (Section 46).

Pre-Election Report

20. Section 17 inserts new section 99A to require the Chief Executive of each Council to provide a pre-election report to "*provide information to promote public discussion about the issues facing the local authority*". The detail of what the report is to include is found in new Part 4 of Schedule 10. Information on the past three years includes: the funding impact statement; a summary balance sheet; and a statement that compares the actual rates, rate increases, borrowing and returns on investments. For the three years after the election, the report must

include: the funding impact statement; a summary balance sheet of forecast financial statements; and planned major projects (Clause 36 of Schedule 10).

21. The Act has amended the LGA to allow Councils with populations less than 20,000 to provide budgeted financial information for the financial year of the election, rather than unaudited estimates in their pre-election report (Clause 37 of Schedule 10).
22. Section 23 of the Act amends section 106 to require a review of the policy on development contributions or financial contribution at least once every three years.
23. Policies on rates remissions and postponement (section 108-110) are required to be reviewed at least every six years (section 102(3)(a)(b)).

Increased Opportunities for Private Sector Involvement

24. The requirement for a funding and financial policy on partnerships with the private sector has been repealed (Section 19 amends s102(2) and Section 24 repeals s107).
25. Sections 32 and 33 of the Act enable contracts relating to the provision of water services to be increased from 15 years to 35 years. However, section 32 provides that a concession or other franchise agreement with non-local government organisations are prohibited, and the sale of existing local government infrastructure to a private partner is also prohibited.

Conclusion

26. Overall there are some fundamental changes affecting local government in this Act. Central government is both trying to free up Councils from some procedural hurdles, but at the same time impose performance measures that Councils need to fund.

For further information please contact Michael Garbett or Victoria Brunton.



Michael Garbett

Direct 03 467 7137

Email michael.garbett@andersonlloyd.co.nz

Mobile 027 668 9752



Victoria Brunton

Direct 03 467 7165

Email victoria.brunton@andersonlloyd.co.nz

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

Report To: UDS Implementation Committee (UDSIC)
Subject: UDS Action Plan Update
Report Author(s): Interim Implementation Manager
Report Date: February 2011
Reference to UDS: Effective Governance and Leadership – Monitoring and Review

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report provides an update on partner council adoption of the UDS Action Plan 2010 Update (“the Action Plan”) and then provides more detail on a proposed work programme in relation to the 12 Priority Actions and those actions attributable to this joint committee (UDSIC).

2. ACTION PLAN ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

2.1 Adoption of the UDS Action Plan 2010 Update

At the last meeting of UDSIC in August 2010 it was resolved that the Action Plan be recommended for adoption by partner councils.

The Christchurch City Council adopted the Action Plan at their full Council meeting on 23rd September 2010.

At the time of writing, the Action Plan was scheduled to be considered for adoption at the following further partner council meetings:

- Selwyn District Council - Council meeting 22nd February 2011
- Waimakariri District Council - Council meeting 1st March 2011
- Environment Canterbury – Council meeting 3rd March 2011

The NZTA Board committed itself to the UDS strategy and are now working at the regional level to implement strategy actions where required.

Subject to and following this adoption process the Action Plan will be printed and published in conjunction with a reformatted UDS strategy companion document.

2.2 UDS Action Plan – reporting progress to UDSIC

Section 6.28 of the Action Plan outlines the monitoring and review arrangements for the Strategy and Action Plan. Action 6.28.3 sets out the mechanism for regular cyclical reporting on implementation progress. Progress on Priority Actions will be reported to UDSIC at every meeting along with a progress report on actions comprising one of the four Action Plan themes (Enhance Environments; Enrich Lifestyles; Encourage Prosperous Economies; and Effective Governance and Leadership). A ‘traffic light’ monitoring system is proposed to be used to help show clearly those actions which are progressing well and those which may require attention.

Action 6.28.1 confirms that the overall integrity of the strategy should be maintained with reviews occurring every 3-5 years (or at the discretion of the strategy partners should there be a substantial change affecting the assumptions that underlie the Strategy).

2.3 UDS Action Plan - Priority Actions and UDSIC Actions

The Action Plan highlights twelve Priority Actions to which UDSIC will pay particular attention. These are reproduced below in Table 1 (Likely commencement dates for actions are shown in brackets)

Priority Actions	Lead Agency	Timing	Action Plan Reference
1. Complete a stock take of ecological data for Greater Christchurch to identify key gaps and needed quality improvements. Develop a plan to rectify deficiencies and improve information accessibility.	CCC	10 years (2014)	6.1.1
2. Collaboratively manage the water resource across the sub-region through the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.	ECan	3 years (2011)	6.2.5
3. Work with CDHB to prioritise health and wellbeing issues that should be addressed in collaboration with local government through a Greater Christchurch Health and Wellbeing Plan.	CCC, SDC, WDC	3 years (2011)	6.9.1
4. Investigate and fund appropriate incentives, financial instruments and institutional arrangements to realise greater levels of higher density residential development with an emphasis on best practice urban design and sustainability	CCC	10 years (2011)	6.18.1
5. Develop a framework for centres that provides a consistent classification framework, defines the role of centres, and the level of Council investment in strategic infrastructure.	CCC, SDC, WDC	3 years (2011)	6.19.1
6. Ensure Transport Planning is undertaken in a timely and integrated fashion with land-use planning	ECan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	Ongoing	6.21.1
7. Investigate, identify and recommend future changes to the public transport, cycling, walking and freight networks that will support the transport outcomes sought from the UDS and RLTS.	UDSIC	3 years (2011)	6.21.7

Priority Actions	Lead Agency	Timing	Action Plan Reference
8. Undertake strategic land-use studies to clarify the potential for business land use in identified parts of Greater Christchurch	ECan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	3 years (2011)	6.20.5
9. Work with Central Government to identify and source required additional funding to deliver significant initiatives.	UDSIC	As required	6.25.5
10. Monitor and assess actions undertaken as part of the Strategy to the impacts of longer-term social, economic and environmental change.	UDSIC	Ongoing	6.26.1
11. Make operative and then give effect to RPS PC1.	ECan	3 years (2011)	6.26.2
12. Identify and report to partner councils on partially funded/unfunded actions in Action Plan prior to 3 yearly LTCCP.	UDSIC	3 years (2011)	6.27.5

Table 1: UDS Action Plan 2010 Update – Priority Actions

In addition to Priority Actions 9, 10 and 12 shown above, UDSIC is also the attributed lead agency for a number of other UDS actions. These are reproduced in full below in Table 2.

UDSIC Action	Subject	Support Agencies	Timing	Action Plan Reference
i. Encourage non-bank investment in mortgage products, including longer term ones, to foster medium density and/or affordable housing.	Housing	Ngai Tahu, Treasury, RBNZ	10 years (2012)	6.11.5
ii. Investigate drivers of housing supply and demand in the aggregate and with regard to housing type	Housing	CCC, SDC, WDC	10 years (2012)	6.11.6
iii. Investigate, identify and recommend future changes to the public transport, cycling, walking and freight networks and facilities that will support the transport outcomes sought from the UDS and RLTS	Transport	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	3 years (2011)	6.21.7
iv. Ensure the protection of existing transport corridors for potential future use.	Transport	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	3 years (2011)	6.21.8
v. Ensure the coordinated provision of high functioning telecommunications infrastructure equitably across the sub-region.	Energy & Telecommunications	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	10 years (2011)	6.23.4
vi. Appoint an Independent Chair to the sub regional joint committee on the recommendation of the Mayors and Regional Chair.	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	Ongoing	6.24.2
vii. Ratify a Memorandum of Agreement.	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	Ongoing	6.24.3

viii. Produce a Strategy Implementation Plan every three years as a basis for detailed growth management through agency planning (preceding the LTCCP).	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	Ongoing	6.24.5
ix. Develop and update UDS communications to maintain awareness of the UDS Partnership and Strategy implementation.	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	Ongoing	6.24.7
x. Develop a community engagement programme that enables interested and /or affected parties to have their say on the UDS and growth management issues	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	3 years (2011)	6.24.8
xi. Maintain a strategy Transport Group of the UDSIMG to coordinate transport planning and funding, to consider and report on the impacts of transport planning for the UDS and identify necessary projects to achieve the objectives of the UDS	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	Ongoing	6.24.12
xii. Work with Central Government to identify and source required additional funding to deliver significant initiatives	Central Government Engagement and Commitment	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA, MOT, Treasury	As required	6.25.5
xiii. Monitor and assess actions undertaken as part of the Strategy to the impacts of longer-term social, economic and environmental change.	Integrating Policy, Planning and Funding	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	Ongoing	6.26.1
xiv. Identify and report to partner councils on partially funded/unfunded actions in Action Plan prior to 3 yearly LTCCP.	Resourcing Actions	-	3 years (2011)	6.27.5
xv. Maintain the integrity of the strategy through regular update and review.	Monitoring and Review	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	3 years (2013)	6.28.1

Table 2: UDS Action Plan 2010 Update – UDSIC Actions

Appendix A reports on progress in implementing the 12 Priority Actions and provides an initial assessment of how these UDSIC actions might be progressed throughout 2011 and beyond.

2.3 UDSIC Work Programme 2011

A proposed work programme for UDSIC meetings during 2011 is set out below. This takes into account the commencement dates for the UDSIC lead actions, the provisional implementation timetabling of these actions in Appendix A, and the role of UDSIC in overseeing implementation of the 12 Priority Actions.

<p>FEBRUARY Priority Action 6 – Transport Planning (briefing) UDSIC Work Programme 2011</p>
--

<p>APRIL</p> <p>Priority Action 2 – Canterbury Water Management Strategy (briefing)</p> <p>Priority Action 6 – Transport Planning (update)</p> <p>UDSIC Action 6.24.8 – Community Engagement</p> <p>Action Plan implementation (Enhance Environments) monitoring report</p> <p>Plan Changes within the UDS area</p>
<p>JUNE</p> <p>Priority Action 4 – Intensification and high density development (briefing)</p> <p>Priority Action 5 – progressing a UDS Centres Framework (IMG report)</p> <p>Priority Action 8 – progressing a Business Land Strategy (IMG report)</p> <p>Action Plan implementation (Enrich Lifestyles) monitoring report</p>
<p>AUGUST</p> <p>Priority Action 11 – Change 1 to the RPS (briefing)</p> <p>Priority Action 12 – ensuring Action Plan funding within LTPs (IMG report)</p> <p>UDSIC Action 6.23.4 – Telecommunications infrastructure (briefing)</p> <p>UDSIC Action 6.26.1 (PA10) – quarterly review of long term change research</p> <p>Action Plan implementation (Encourage Prosperous Economies) monitoring report</p>
<p>OCTOBER</p> <p>Priority Action 3 – progressing a Health and Wellbeing Plan (IMG report)</p> <p>Priority Action 7 – Transport Networks (discussion)</p> <p>Priority Action 9 – Central Government engagement (discussion)</p> <p>UDSIC Action 6.21.8 – Transport Corridors</p> <p>Action Plan implementation (Effective Governance and Leadership) monitoring report</p> <p>Plan Changes within the UDS area</p>

The Independent Chair, in conjunction with CEAG and UDSIMG, will continue to support and coordinate the delivery of UDSIC actions between meetings of the Committee.

Regular agenda items, including the bi-monthly implementation report, together with issues which may arise throughout the year are not included in the above work programme.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1** *That the UDS Action Plan Update report be received.*
- 3.2** *That members of the Committee consider the proposed UDSIC 2011 Work Programme and that either:*
- (a) UDSIC adopt the UDSIC 2011 Work Programme*
- or*
- (b) advise on suggested amendments to be brought back to the next meeting of the Committee for consideration.*

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

UDS ACTION PLAN - TOP 12 PRIORITIES

Priority	Action Plan Reference	Action	Lead Agency	Timing (Start)	Timing (Length)	Cost	Funding	Progress and Next Steps
1	6.1.1	Complete a stock take of ecological data for Greater Christchurch to identify key gaps and needed quality improvements. Develop a plan to rectify deficiencies and improve information accessibility.	CCC	2014	10 years	Medium-high	Unfunded	Ecological Data Management Project business case being formulated by CCC. District Plan Reviews will include updated Ecological Heritage Sites. Ecological Survey desktop assessment completed for Banks Peninsula. Potential coordination role through Regional Biodiversity Strategy.
2	6.2.5	Collaboratively manage the water resource across the sub-region through the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.	ECan	2011	3 years	Low	??	Seven of the ten Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) zone committees and the Regional committee have been established. The remaining three zone committees will be established by May 2011. Development of a draft regional implementation programme and implementation programmes are on track for completion during 2011.
3	6.9.1	Work with CDHB to prioritise health and wellbeing issues that should be addressed in collaboration with local government through a Greater Christchurch Health and Wellbeing Plan.	CCC, SDC, WDC	2011	3 years	Medium	Funded	Production of a City Health Profile is nearing completion. This has involved development of indicators and extensive community consultation and will significantly inform the development of a Health and Wellbeing Plan. UDSIMG have discussed the formation of a health subgroup later in 2011 (Action 6.24.10) to help coordinate UDS/Healthy Christchurch activity. Further engagement on this issue is planned through the UDS Implementation Agency Forum and Rununga Forum.
4	6.18.1	Investigate and fund appropriate incentives, financial instruments and institutional arrangements to realise greater levels of higher density residential development with an emphasis on best practice urban design and sustainability	CCC	2011	10 years	High	Partially funded	Investigations currently underway as part of Central City work programme and resulting from the inaugural CCC Central City Committee meeting in January. A CCC (Jasmax) study entitled 'Exploring New Housing Choices for Changing Lifestyles' has recently been completed to better inform developers, architects and the general public of the wide range of potential housing types that could be used in areas where higher density housing is anticipated under the UDS.
5	6.19.1	Develop a framework for centres that provides a consistent classification framework, defines the role of centres, and the level of Council investment in strategic infrastructure.	CCC, SDC, WDC	2011	3 years	Low	Medium	Work currently underway on individual centres (e.g. Rangiora, etc) but a UDS centres framework is currently not programmed for 2011. UDSIMG will consider how progress on this action might best occur and report back to UDSIC in June.
6	6.21.1	Ensure Transport Planning is undertaken in a timely and integrated fashion with land-use planning	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA		Ongoing		Internal	Coordination of transport planning continues to be managed at officer level through the transport subgroup of UDSIMG. Coordination of consultation and outcomes relating to key strategy documents and plans under review during 2011 (e.g. RPS, RLTS, RPTP, CTP) is underway.
7	6.21.7	Investigate, identify and recommend future changes to the public transport, cycling, walking and freight networks that will support the transport outcomes sought from the UDS and RLTS.	UDSIC	2011	3 years	Low	Unfunded	Consideration of future changes by UDSIC would be best placed towards the end of 2011 in order to be informed by the review of the RLTS.
8	6.20.5	Undertake strategic land-use studies to clarify the potential for business land use in identified parts of Greater Christchurch	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	2011	3 years	Medium	Funded	Work currently underway on individual areas (e.g. NWRA, etc) but a strategic assessment is currently not programmed for 2011. UDSIMG will consider how progress on this action might best occur and report back to UDSIC in June.
9	6.25.5	Work with Central Government to identify and source required additional funding to deliver significant initiatives.	UDSIC		As required	Low	Funded	Consideration of UDSIC role in securing additional funding would be best placed towards the end of 2011 in order to be informed by earthquake recovery reporting and the review of the strategic planning documents.
10	6.26.1	Monitor and assess actions undertaken as part of the Strategy to the impacts of longer-term social, economic and environmental change.	UDSIC		Ongoing	Internal		Assessment of long-term changes should occur in the lead up to the next review of the Strategy. Ongoing monitoring of relevant secondary research will be reported to UDSIC on a quarterly basis commencing in August.
11	6.26.2	Make operative and then give effect to RPS PC1.	Ecan	2011	3 years	High	Funded	Environment Court hearings on Change 1 high-level issues are to take place in May and June with an indication from the Court that the remaining issues may be addressed in October. Council-led plan changes (SDC PC7, CCC PC61, etc) are being progressed to implement strategic policy frameworks in support of Change 1.
12	6.27.5	Identify and report to partner councils on partially funded/unfunded actions in Action Plan prior to 3 yearly LTCCP.	UDSIC	2011	3 years	Medium-high	Funded	Council planning for LTP 2012-22 will commence later in 2011. UDSIMG will coordinate a UDS Action Plan budgeting gap analysis and report back to UDSIC in June.

ACTIONS ATTRIBUTED TO UDSIC FROM UDS ACTION PLAN

ID	Subject	Action	Lead Agency	Support Agencies	Timing (Start)	Timing (length)	Cost	Funding	UDSIC Work Programme
6.11.5	Housing	Encourage non-bank investment in mortgage products, including longer term ones, to foster medium density and/or affordable housing.	UDSIC	Ngai Tahu, Treasury, RBNZ	2012	10 years	Medium	Unfunded	Contribute to relevant Government and/or finance industry consultations. Consider more proactive approach and Government engagement during 2012.
6.11.6	Housing	Investigate drivers of housing supply and demand in the aggregate and with regard to housing type	UDSIC	CCC, SDC, WDC	2012	10 years	Medium	Unfunded	Consider commissioning relevant studies during 2012 to supplement ongoing CCC intensification work programme.
6.21.7	Transport	Investigate, identify and recommend future changes to the public transport, cycling, walking and freight networks and facilities that will support the transport outcomes sought from the UDS and RLTS	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	2011	3 years	Low	Unfunded	Consideration of future changes by UDSIC would be best placed towards the end of 2011 in order to be informed by the review of the RLTS.
6.21.8	Transport	Ensure the protection of existing transport corridors for potential future use.	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	2011	3 years		Internal	UDS Public Transport Corridors study reported to UDSIC in June 2010. Further consideration would be best placed towards the end of 2011 in order to be informed by the review of the RLTS and RPTP.
6.23.4	Energy & Telecommunications	Ensure the coordinated provision of high functioning telecommunications infrastructure equitably across the sub-region.	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	2011	10 years	Medium-high		Government continuing to negotiate with telecomms providers regarding a rural broadband initiative. Consider more proactive approach, Government engagement and coordination with other players (e.g. Enable Networks) later in 2011.
6.24.2	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Appoint an Independent Chair to the sub regional joint committee on the recommendation of the Mayors and Regional Chair.	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA		Ongoing	Low		UDSIC confirmed reappointment in 2010 for a further year (ending 30 April 2011).
6.24.3	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ratify a Memorandum of Agreement.	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA		Ongoing	None		MOA signed on adoption of the 2007 Strategy. Possible consideration of a renewed ratification following recent elections and adoption of Action Plan 2010 Update.
6.24.5	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Produce a Strategy Implementation Plan every three years as a basis for detailed growth management through agency planning (preceding the LTCCP).	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA		Ongoing	Low		UDS Action Plan 2010 Update being considered for adoption in early 2011. Further update and review of strategy likely to commence in 2013 taking into account monitoring of implementation, review of assumptions and assessment of long-term changes affecting UDS outcomes.
6.24.7	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Develop and update UDS communications to maintain awareness of the UDS Partnership and Strategy implementation.	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA		Ongoing	Low	Partially funded	Ongoing coordination through UDSIMG communications subgroup, including production of UDS Newsletter.
6.24.8	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Develop a community engagement programme that enables interested and /or affected parties to have their say on the UDS and growth management issues	UDSIC, UDSIMG	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	2011	3 years	Low	Partially funded	Revitalised engagement and awareness initiative during 2011-12 to be considered by UDSIMG and reported to UDSIC in April, including restructured SPF groupings (implementation agencies, community stakeholders, and local rununga).
6.24.12	Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Maintain a strategy Transport Group of the UDSIMG to coordinate transport planning and funding, to consider and report on the impacts of transport planning for the UDS and identify necessary projects to achieve the objectives of the UDS	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA		Ongoing	Low		Transport subgroup of UDSIMG continues to operate and reviewed and refocussed its ToR in December 2010.
6.25.5	Central Government Engagement and Commitment	Work with Central Government to identify and source required additional funding to deliver significant initiatives	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA, MOT, Treasury		As required	Low	Funded	Consideration of UDSIC role in securing additional funding would be best placed towards the end of 2011 in order to be informed by earthquake recovery reporting and the review of the strategic planning documents.
6.26.1	Integrating Policy, Planning and Funding	Monitor and assess actions undertaken as part of the Strategy to the impacts of longer-term social, economic and environmental change.	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA		Ongoing	Internal		Assessment of long-term changes should occur in the lead up to the next review of the Strategy. Ongoing monitoring of relevant secondary research will be reported to UDSIC on a quarterly basis commencing in August.
6.27.5	Resourcing Actions	Identify and report to partner councils on partially funded/unfunded actions in Action Plan prior to 3 yearly LTCCP.	UDSIC	-	2011	3 years	Medium-high	Funded	Council planning for LTP 2012-22 will commence later in 2011. UDSIMG will coordinate a UDS Action Plan budgeting gap analysis and report back to UDSIC in June.
6.28.1	Monitoring and Review	Maintain the integrity of the strategy through regular update and review.	UDSIC	Ecan, CCC, SDC, WDC, NZTA	2013	3 years	Low	Funded	UDS Action Plan 2010 Update being considered for adoption in early 2011. Further update and review of strategy likely to commence in 2013 taking into account monitoring of implementation, review of assumptions and assessment of long-term changes affecting UDS outcomes.

Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

Report To: UDS Implementation Committee

Meeting Date: February 2011

Subject: Integration of UDS Partner Transport Planning for 2011 and beyond

Report Author: Steve Higgs, Planning and Investment Manager, New Zealand Transport Agency
 Robert Woods, Programme Manager, Environment Canterbury
 Ken Stevenson, Roding Manager, Waimakariri District Council
 Andrew Mazey, Asset Manager, Selwyn District Council
 Rae-Anne Kurusck, Principal Adviser, Christchurch City Council
 Simon Ginn, Network Planning Team Leader, Christchurch City Council

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to update the Implementation Committee on transport activities over the next 12 months and how the partners are working together to provide an integrated approach across the UDS area.

2. BACKGROUND

The next 12 – 24 months represent an important period for the Transportation Group, with the a significant review of the regional transport strategies, which include the Regional Land Transport Strategy, the Regional Land Transport Programme, and the Regional Public Transport Plan. There are also significant District Council initiatives which include the Christchurch Transport Plan, and council initiated and transport related plan changes. This paper describes briefly these initiatives coming up, and how staff across the partner organisations are working together towards the integration of these strategies, plans and programmes to support the UDS.

National Context

The Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding (GPS) is also being released by the Minister of Transport later this year and will set out the Government's funding priorities for the next 3 years. It is anticipated that there are unlikely to be significant changes signalled, thereby retaining significant priority on completing the Roads of National Significance (known as the RoNS).

Key Transport Statements and Policy Documents

THE REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY (RLTS)

The Regional Land Transport Strategy is reviewed every 6 years and has a 30 year planning horizon. It is a key tool for delivering the UDS, as it is one of the reference points the NZTA looks towards in determining priorities for funding across New Zealand. It also therefore underpins the transport funding to support the Proposed Change 1.

The Canterbury Regional Transport Committee (RTC) intends to recommend a new 30 year strategy to the Regional Council in September 2011. The strategy will span the financial years covering the period 2012-42, as this aligns well with the cycles of Regional Land Transport Programmes and future Long Term Plans. It also aligns well with the UDS time horizon and the sequenced land use upon which the Christchurch Transportation Model is based.

The RTC will consider at it's February meeting the proposed strategic direction for transport in the region over the next thirty years. This has been developed by the RLTS working group (a subset of RTC members), and at the time of writing is being "road showed" by the RTC Chair around the Council's of the region as a precursor to it being formally considered by the RTC.

In broad terms, for Greater Christchurch, the strategic approach comprises 'business as usual' approach initially (years 1 to 3) moving towards greater emphasis on local transport investment and solutions to build resilience and enable sustainable development to meet identified long term issues and challenges and support economic growth. A key feature of the approach is a growing emphasis on public transport investment and provision over time.

THE REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT PROGRAMME (RLTP)

This statutory document is required every three years and can be considered the implementation programme for the RLTS. It is developed by the RTC and can be considered Canterbury's funding request to Government for transport grants over the subsequent three years. It's cycles are aligned with Council Long Term Plans so as to provide local government with three years of funding certainty to invest in it's transport needs and align with local invest in transport. It is also the only process where the community is consulted on any state highway investment proposals by the NZTA over the following three years.

The RLTP feeds into the NZTA's National Land Transport Programme and is required to have regard to the Government's GPS (currently being reviewed).

The next RLTP is due for submission to the NZTA in mid-2012, and based on the 2009 process, funding announcements will be made by Government, via the NZTA, in August 2012. This will set out the Government grants to Council's and the NZTA's state highway unit, by activity type, for the period 2012-2015.

THE REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT (RPS)

Transport staff continue to be involved in Change 1 to the RPS through drafting supporting evidence at the Environment Court. Key inputs are to explain to the Court the advantages of managing growth to minimise transport effects, costs and develop transport choice, particularly public transport.

Selwyn District have notified Change 12 to its district plan. It introduces objectives, policies and other methods to implement Change 1 to the RPS and improve integration between land use and transport within the UDS sub region.

THE REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT PLAN (RPTP)

The RPTP is a statutory document the regional council is required to produce and outlines how it intends to give effect to the public transport service components of the RLTS. It is essentially a set of Council policy the regional council adopts in order to guide public transport service delivery, as well as contribute to national objectives set out in statute (Public Transport Management Act). The RPTP is scheduled for completion by December 2011, since it has to be complete as soon as possible after any review of the RLTS, as well as to comply with the PTMA requirement to be reviewed by January 2012.

The RPTP will include a long term Greater Christchurch Network Plan, similar in form to that in the Auckland RPTP. The purpose is to signal a network structure that the Regional Council will move towards through investment over time, as well as inform infrastructure investment by the City Council, NZTA, Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts. For this reason, it will be important for all the partners to work closely together during the development of this document to ensure individual strategic objectives and investment priorities are facilitated and not closed off by the Plan. It should be noted that the Plan is reviewed six-yearly so like many such documents, it's policy is not "cast in stone".

In June 2010 the UDSIC received the "Public Transport Corridors Study" final report, which looked at high capacity public transport options into the future. As a result of this report, the UDSIC then agreed to the RPTP being a vehicle to express the long term public transport vision of the UDS partnership, with a process to be proposed to establish this vision:

It was **resolved** that the UDSIC:

1. Receive the report; and
2. Undertake, should it so wish, a process to establish any collective desired long term vision for these corridors, and
3. Work with the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee to ensure any desired long term vision is appropriately expressed in the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Strategy 2011-41,
4. Ensure the subsequent Canterbury Regional Passenger Transport Plan 2011-21 appropriately gives effect to achieving the desired long term vision for these corridors; and
5. That Robert Woods, as Chair of the Canterbury Regional Transport Group, and James Caygill, as Implementation Manager, provide the UDSIC in the new triennium with a report to establish what the process might look like.

It is now perhaps timely that the UDSIC consider such a process given the number of aligning work programmes this year described in this report. It is recommended that the UDSIMG consider this issue further at it's next meeting and that the Transportation Group Chair report back to the next UDSIC meeting with the outline of a process to establish the UDSIC's desired long term public transport vision for the corridors, that can then be expressed through the RPTP. The approximate timeline for consultation on the draft RPTP is July / August 2011, so there is still some time available to complete the UDS partner process prior to any public consultation.

THE CHRISTCHURCH TRANSPORT PLAN (CTP)

The Christchurch Transport Plan (CTP) is the City Council's means to prioritise its own investment in transport through the next Long Term Plan. It will continue to be developed over the next 6 months to inform the City Council on its direction for the next 30 years. The concepts being developed through this Plan are largely consistent with the Regional Land Transport Strategy and will be the City's implementation of that strategy. The Plan is still being developed with Christchurch City Council, but will be discussed amongst its partners during the second quarter of this year.

The key philosophy sitting behind the Plan is the integration of land use and transport to support urban regeneration, maximising the use of road space to increase the effectiveness of the existing network, and significantly increasing the emphasis on public transport active travel as preferred modes of travel over time.

THE NZTA RoNS NETWORK PLAN

An overview to the RoNS network plan was provided to this committee in August 2010. The RoNS are identified in the (GPS) as the Government's priority for significant funding over the next 10 years. However the NZTA also recognises the importance of integrated planning and the need to maximise opportunities to integrate the RONS with the local transport network. The Network Plan outlines the strategic background, identification of opportunities and risks presented by the RoNS and provides options on how these may be mitigated.

The Network Plan is based on the Urban Development Strategy land use pattern and pulls together a wide number of planning and transport documents. Essentially it builds upon the major Christchurch transport strategies such as Northern Roads Strategic Study (NROSS), Christchurch Rolleston Environs Transport Study (CRETS) as well as the major urban growth studies north and south of Christchurch (eg Belfast and South West Area Plans). The Network Plan was developed over the last 12 months using input from Council staff and discussed through a governance group comprising of UDS representatives. The resultant plan was endorsed by the NZTA planning committee in September.

The Network Plan is intended as a 'living document' to provide a basis for on-going discussion with the regional and local authorities going forward. It is intended that the Network Plan will provide NZTA's input into the Regional Land Transport Strategy and eventually the Regional Land Transport Programme.

INTEGRATING THE PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES

These plans and strategies are being developed through the UDS partnership and are considered to be moving well towards a satisfactory level of integration. The Transport Group is holding a workshop later in February to discuss the alignment of the key strategy documents between the Councils partners and how well aligned they are.

The RLTS and CTP have a similar theme of moving from business as usual toward a future with more prominent public transport and active modes (in simplistic terms). A key question on how these futures are achieved will depend upon the level of comfort of delivery agencies (i.e. the UDS partners) with the strategic approach, the speed of change, and Government funding policy.

UDSIC members will understand and appreciate that in the absence of large diversified funding sources, local government investment in local transport initiatives (i.e. not state highways) can be significantly influenced by the investment decisions central Government makes through the three yearly GPS. Such grants typically make up around 50% of the total revenue Council's invest in transport.

As discussed above, the GPS will be renewed later this year, but indications are that the current direction will remain for the next three years. This will provide time for the RoNS projects to progress in accordance with NZTA's network plan and thereby the Minister's objectives.

It is therefore important that the Regional Land Transport Strategy is as closely aligned to the GPS over the short term to maximise the ability to attract national funding and deliver the short term strategic approach being mooted by the RTC for the next RLTS (i.e. "business as usual").

Beyond the short term it will be important for the UDSIC to understand the funding issues and implications associated with a change in strategic direction over the medium and long term, given the current transport sector funding paradigm in place that relies largely on Government matching funding. Long term plans and associated funding strategies 2015 onwards will need to deal with this if a change in direction is to be implemented.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the UDSIC:

- (a) receives the report, and***
- (b) requests that the UDSIMG consider a process for the UDSIC to work through to establish it's long term vision for public transport on the north and southwest corridors considered in June 2010, and***
- (c) request that the Transportation Group Chair present this process to the next meeting of the UDSIC, for approval and implementation..***