

**GREATER CHRISTCHURCH URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**FRIDAY 9 MARCH 2012**

**AT 10.30AM**

**IN THE YMCA CONFERENCE ROOM,  
10 HEREFORD STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

**Committee:**

**UDS Independent Chair**

Bill Wasley.

**Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (TBC)**

Roger Sutton (TBC).

**Christchurch City Council**

Mayor Bob Parker, Councillors Sue Wells and Claudia Reid.

**Environment Canterbury**

Commissioners Tom Lambie, Peter Skelton and Rex Williams.

**Selwyn District Council**

Mayor Kelvin Coe, Councillors Lindsay Philips and Malcolm Lyall.

**Waimakariri District Council**

Mayor David Ayers, Councillors Jim Gerard and Dan Gordon.

**Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu**

Mike Sang, Mark Solomon (TBC), Wally Stone (TBC).

**UDS Implementation Manager**

Keith Tallentire

Telephone: 941 8590

**Committee Adviser**

Rachael Brown

Telephone: 941-5249

**INDEX**

<b>ITEM NO</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO</b>
1.	<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
2.	<b>CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES: MEETING OF 19 DECEMBER 2011</b>	
3.	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
4.	<b>UDS BI- MONTHLY IMPLEMENTATION REPORT</b>	
5.	<b>UDS ACTION PLAN AND RECOVERY PROGRAMMES</b>	
6.	<b>PRESENTATION: GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION MODEL</b>	
7.	<b>RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC:</b>	

**GREATER CHRISTCHURCH UDS IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE 9.3.2012**

**1. APOLOGIES**

Mayor Bob Parker and Mark Solomon.

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES: MEETING OF 19 DECEMBER 2011**

Attached.

**3. MATTERS ARISING**

**CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

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

**Held in Committee Room 1, Second Floor,  
Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch  
on Monday 19 December 2011 at 1.30pm.**

**PRESENT:** Bill Wasley (Chairperson), Mayor David Ayers, Commissioner Peter Skelton, Councillors Jim Gerard, Malcolm Lyall, Lindsay Philips and Sue Wells and Mike Sang (Ngai Tahu)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Keith Tallentire and Diane Turner (CERA) and Mark Yaxley (NZTA)

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received and accepted from Mayors Kelvin Coe and Bob Parker, Commissioners Tom Lambie and Rex Williams, Councillors Dan Gordon and Claudia Reid and Jim Harland NZTA.

**2. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

It was **resolved** that the Minutes of the previous meeting of 31 October 2011, as circulated, be taken as read and confirmed.

**3. UDS BI-MONTHLY IMPLEMENTATION REPORT**

In the discussion that followed comment was made in respect of:

- The legal opinion that had been obtained, as to the rights of the partner territorial authority to not accept Private Plan Changes. It was strongly suggested that the partner Territorial Authorities make use of this mechanism.

It was **resolved** that the Bi-Monthly report of the Independent Chair and IMG Chair be received.

**4. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO UDS GOVERNANCE, MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

Bill Bayfield advised that since the report was written, Ngai Tahu had suggested that its representation be increased to two members.

For reference purposes, as a significant matter, it was noted member authorities must be careful in the selection process that they do not choose a representative that is representative of any holding company or other organisation associated with land development in the UDS area.

Mark Yaxley advised that in the Appendix 1 Diagram showing on the right hand side the Chief Executives Advisory Group, the NZTA should show the Regional Director.

It was **resolved** that the UDSIC endorses and recommends to the UDS partners, the proposed amendments to the UDS governance, management and technical framework which involves the addition of CERA and Ngai Tahu representation, to the range of UDS implementation structures.

**5. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

It was **resolved** on the motion of Councillor Malcolm Lyall, seconded by Councillor Sue Wells, that the resolution to exclude the public set out in the agenda be confirmed, and that Keith Tallentire and Diane Turner (CERA) be permitted to remain.

**4. UDS BI-MONTHLY IMPLEMENTATION REPORT**

Attached.

**Report To:** UDS Implementation Committee (UDSIC)  
**Subject:** Bi-Monthly Implementation Report  
**Report Author:** Independent Chair and Implementation Manager  
**Meeting Date:** 9 March 2012

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

This report provides an update to the UDSIC on UDS implementation activities in addition to those which are the subject of separate reports.

## **2. IMPLEMENTATION**

### **2.1 UDS Implementation Manager**

Keith Tallentire commenced Implementation Manager duties in January 2012 following a secondment to CERA between October and December.

The focus of his work to date has been on establishing a UDS governance and management schedule for 2012 and integrating this with the proposed local governance framework being developed by CERA to inform recovery programme work.

### **2.2 Local Governance Framework for Recovery**

The December meeting of UDSIC considered a proposed CERA local governance framework to inform recovery programme development and recommended that Councils endorse the proposal. Following individual Council meetings in February this endorsement has now occurred and it is now awaiting final approval from the Minister.

### **2.3 Amendments to UDSIC Representation**

The December UDSIC also considered and resolved to make amendments to UDSIC representation. This included the addition of CERA Chief Executive as an observer and an additional representative for TRONT. Following a hui and a subsequent TRONT governance meeting, Mark Solomon and Wally Stone have been nominated as the TRONT representatives. Arrangements are now in place for these nominees to be ratified by each Council in line with LGA2002 requirements for joint committees.

## **2.4 Give Effect To Seminar: Regional Policy Statement**

A seminar was held on 14 February 2012 for planning and resource consents staff from UDS Councils and NZTA. The seminar was held to update staff on issues regarding the implementation of Chapters 12A and 22 of the Regional Policy Statement. It comprised an overview of the chapters, legal implications, examples of implementation projects, and the relationship with LTMA processes and funding.

Around 70 staff attended the meeting and initial feedback suggests it was very well received. The Planning Managers subgroup of IMG are considering undertaking further briefings (such as consultant planners and developers) and producing practice notes to ensure consistent interpretation of Chapters 12A and 22 across the UDS Councils now they have been made operative.

## **2.5 Housing Land Availability**

In recent months, and in conjunction with CERA, Councils have been collating and coordinating information on residential land availability. This has included data on land recently rezoned, the progression of subdivision and resource consents, and applications (lodged or pre-lodgement) for further rezoning. Summary information has been communicated by individual Councils to their respective elected representatives.

In the view of UDS IMG staff there is now no shortage of land available for housing and no infrastructure constraints to development in the short term. The release of sections will be more governed by the capacity and capability of the development community. Work is now underway to make this information available to the public online in a readily accessible manner so people relocating can make informed decisions regarding their future.

## **2.6 Communications**

The Communications subgroup of UDS IMG has re-established a bi-monthly meeting schedule and now includes a representative from CERA. An initial focus has been to re-instigate a bi-monthly electronic UDS newsletter and refresh the UDS website, [www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz](http://www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz).

It is intended that the website refresh and the first 2012 newsletter occur simultaneously in early March. The newsletter key messages include the UDS relationship to recovery planning, an update on RPS Chapters 12A and 22 now being operative, and an item on housing land availability. This latter message was also stated within a UDS media statement released on 24 February, included as **Attachment A** to this report.

## **2.7 Monitoring and Data Sharing**

A Monitoring subgroup of UDS IMG is also to be re-established shortly. It will focus on the monitoring requirements outlined in the RPS Chapter 12A, principally relating to residential and business land availability and demographic projections. Much of the housing land availability work outlined in section 2.5 above will contribute to these monitoring requirements.

Staff resourcing and a lead agency for the subgroup is still to be confirmed. UDS IMG also recognise the need for a wider monitoring and data sharing arrangement to aid

recovery however this is best considered by the new CERA local governance framework.

## 2.8 UDSIC Meetings: Structure and Processes

UDSIC meetings are scheduled bi-monthly during 2012 and will follow on directly from CERA Advisory Committee meetings.

Agendas will be circulated electronically five working days ahead of each meeting to allow time for reading and to enable representatives to liaise where necessary with colleagues and staff from parent organisations. Referral of matters back to individual partner governance for consideration, will also be accommodated where the need arises.

## 2.9 Risk profile

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

Nature of Risk	Probability <sup>1</sup>	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	The new Implementation Manager is now in post.
Failing to successfully implement, in a form intended by the UDS partners, the growth management strategy through the Regional Policy Statement.	1 (1)	10	Chapters 12A and 22 now made operative through use of earthquake recovery legislation.
Private Plan changes undermining RPS and UDS	3(3)	3-9	Having operative RPS reduces the significant threat to establishing the settlement pattern sought through the UDS
Inconsistent communications/ Lack of alignment	3(3)	3	
Lack of Government Engagement and alignment	2(2)	5	Relationship with CERA evolving in a positive manner.

<sup>1</sup> Rankings for both Probability and Impact are between 1 = low and 10 = high; Bracketed is previous ranking

## **2.10 Productivity Commission Housing Affordability draft report**

A UDS Partnership submission was prepared on the above report, focussing principally on the growth management and urban planning aspects of the report. The submission is included as **Attachment B** to this report. Separate but aligned submissions were also submitted by Christchurch City Council and Waimakariri District Council. A key thrust of the UDS Partnership submission was the view that the recommendations in the draft report seemed unbalanced and biased towards the release of land for housing and a less constrained planning regime.

Similar submissions were also made on behalf of LGNZ and also other growth management initiatives including SmartGrowth (Bay of Plenty) and FutureProof (Waikato).

As the 10 February deadline for submissions was before this first meeting of UDSIC in 2012, the submission was authorised through the delegation arrangements of the Independent Chair. UDSIC is therefore now asked to ratify this submission.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**It is recommended that UDSIC:**

- a. Note the bi-monthly report of the Independent Chair and Implementation Manager**
- b. Ratify the UDS Partnership submission to the Productivity Commission's Housing Affordability draft report**

***Bill Wasley - Independent Chair***

***Keith Tallentire – Implementation Manager***

## **Plenty of land available for rebuild**

Land rezoned in the Greater Christchurch area during the last 18 months will in time provide sections for more than 20,000 new homes, says Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Independent Chair Bill Wasley.

“Our best indication from developers is that up to 6600 greenfield sections are expected to be released on the market during the next two years, a number likely to exceed the demand from Red Zone households looking to relocate and build new homes.

“These sections are throughout Christchurch and in the Selwyn and Waimakariri districts.”

His comments follow concerns there is insufficient residential zoned land available within Greater Christchurch for displaced homeowners on which to rebuild.

“Under the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS), work has been underway for more than five years to manage urban development in the Christchurch City and Waimakariri and Selwyn districts.

“There are currently more than 600 sections available in Christchurch, the majority in the south-west greenfield developments of Wigram Skies, Aidanfield and Yaldhurst.”

He says by the end of next year, the city will have up to 3173 additional sections available, the majority being located in the south west and Belfast areas, the two areas identified in the UDS as best able to accommodate future urban growth and development.

It is also expected an additional 220 sections will be coming on stream from urban renewal developments within the city and based on recent trends a further 300 sections will be available for infill housing.

Mr Wasley says within the next two years he expects there will also be more than 2100 sections available for homeowners to build in the Waimakariri District, 900 of these in Kaiapoi, and almost 1300 sections in the Selwyn District of which 550 will be in Rolleston and 380 in Lincoln.

“Given this availability, and data from Statistics NZ that suggests about 9000 people have left the Christchurch area since February 2011, it is unlikely there would need to be more greenfield land made available than that already identified for development through to 2041.

“By that time it is projected Christchurch will have accommodated growth for more than 53,000 new households in greenfields and existing communities, Selwyn a further 12,000 and Waimakariri close to 10,000, a total of around 75,000 new homes.”

He says the local authorities and CERA are working closely with developers to encourage a timely release of sections on the market to meet demand.

One of the challenges is ensuring local authorities are able to provide the necessary infrastructure in time to meet the needs for new housing, particularly in respect to greenfield development, which Christchurch City Council Strategy and Planning General Manager Mike Theelen says the Councils are addressing.

“There should be no problems with infrastructure meeting short term demand. Councils, CERA and developers are carefully looking at the timing and location for new infrastructure beyond that, particularly where no infrastructure has been previously planned,” he says.

”In some other instances this may involve accelerating the delivery of what has already been programmed.”

Mr Wasley says one area still to be addressed is the provision of housing for those relocating to Christchurch to work on the rebuild and temporary accommodation for residents while their houses are being repaired or rebuilt.

He says clearly there is a need to closely monitor the situation but the focus should now be on getting the land already zoned to market for the building of new homes to begin and making this information more readily available to the public so they can make informed decisions about their future.

**Greater Christchurch** **Urban  
Development  
Strategy**

**Submission by the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Partnership  
on the New Zealand Productivity Commission's *Housing Affordability Inquiry draft  
report (December 2011)***

**10 February 2012**

To:

Inquiry into Housing Affordability  
New Zealand Productivity Commission  
PO Box 8036  
The Terrace  
WELLINGTON

Name of Submitter:

**Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Partnership**  
c/o Bill Wasley: Independent Chair

Address for further contact:

Keith Tallentire  
UDS Implementation Manager  
DDI (03) 941 8590  
Mobile 027 205 3772  
Email [ktallentire@greaterchristchurch.org.nz](mailto:ktallentire@greaterchristchurch.org.nz)  
Web [www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz](http://www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz)

c/o Christchurch City Council  
Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch  
PO Box 73012, Christchurch, 8154

Submission:

This is the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) Partnership's submission on the New Zealand Productivity Commission's *Housing Affordability Inquiry draft report (December 2011)*. The content of the submission follows overleaf.

Submissions from individual UDS Partners are also being made and may cover more specific issues relating to their territorial areas or functions.

The UDS Partnership would welcome the opportunity for further discussion with the Commission ahead of a final report being presented to Government.

Signed:



---

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 Partnership (“the UDS Partnership”). The Strategy is overseen by the Implementation Committee (“the UDSIC”), a joint committee comprising Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Te Rūnunga o Ngāi Tahu and the New Zealand Transport Agency. Further representation from the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) is currently being ratified by Council committees.

The Strategy outlines a 35 year growth management and implementation plan for the Greater Christchurch sub-region<sup>1</sup> and is recognised within the CERA *Draft Recovery Strategy for greater Christchurch* as providing a strong basis for developing recovery programmes and plans.

The Productivity Commission is to be congratulated on attempting to identify and evaluate the factors affecting the affordability of housing, an issue which is core to the UDS and which Councils and communities have been seeking to address, particularly in recent years.

Submissions from individual UDS Partners are also being made and reiterate some of the comments made herein as well as covering more specific issues relating to their territorial areas or functions. This submission is intended to provide a strategic response, principally in relation to housing affordability as it impacts, and is impacted by, growth management objectives.

## Greater Christchurch and the UDS

Greater Christchurch is the largest urbanised area in the South Island. Historically, 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 a growth management strategy.

The UDS was developed and adopted by the partner councils (Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council, Banks Peninsula District Council<sup>2</sup>, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council) and Transit New Zealand (now the New Zealand Transport Agency, NZTA) 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 Prime Minister in July 2007. The Strategy has now been the foundation for sub-regional planning over three electoral cycles.

### *Strategy focus*

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 a vibrant inner city and suburban centres surrounded by thriving rural communities and towns. Part of this vision is the implementation of an integrated planning process for growth management supported by the efficient and sustainable delivery of new infrastructure.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> The Greater Christchurch sub-region covers the eastern parts of Waimakariri and Selwyn District Councils and the metropolitan area of Christchurch City Council, including the Lyttelton Harbour Basin.

<sup>2</sup> In March 2006 Banks Peninsula District Council merged with Christchurch City Council.

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 Greater Christchurch, the UDS is predicated on the following key outcomes, an increase in the greenfields suburban density from around 10 households per hectare to 15 households per hectare; and future residential intensification within the existing city urban area being accommodated at densities of 30 households per hectare or higher.

### **The UDS and Earthquake Recovery**

The Canterbury earthquakes of 2010 and 2011, and the continuing aftershock sequence, represent a major challenge to the future planning and well-being of the sub-region. Nevertheless, the tenets of the UDS remain fundamentally unchallenged and have provided a strong basis for both the CERA *Draft Recovery Strategy for greater Christchurch* and the Christchurch City Council draft *Central City Plan*.

Clearly the timing and sequencing of development and infrastructure provision may need to be reviewed, however the 35 year provision for growth identified within the UDS provides the appropriate long term settlement pattern within which more immediate recovery planning can occur. A robust monitoring and review framework can then identify the need for any further action in what is, and will be for some time yet, an inherently uncertain environment.

Recovery planning will need to accommodate:

- Government decisions regarding the suitability of land for residential rebuild over the medium term;
- the consequent need for and/or desire of people to relocate within the sub-region;
- the anticipated influx of a temporary workforce to aid recovery; and
- opportunities to support economic recovery, including business growth and relocation.

Work is underway by CERA, in conjunction with UDS Partners to address such matters as part of the ongoing development of recovery programmes and recovery plans. Whilst the significant physical damage and upheaval of communities resulting from the series of earthquakes is a very difficult circumstance to be faced with it does provide an opportunity to instigate positive change faster than may otherwise have been possible.

The Commission's draft report does not focus extensively on this matter however other commentators and sectoral groups have seen the events in Canterbury as a means to promote a more *laissez-faire* approach to urban planning and have identified this a solution to current housing affordability issues.

### **Other Government Initiatives**

The UDS Partnership has previously made submissions on a number of recent Government initiatives which impact directly and indirectly on housing affordability matters, in particular:

- the National Infrastructure Plan (2009)
- Building Competitive Cities: Reform of the urban and infrastructure planning system (2010)

It is trusted that Government consideration of the final report from the Productivity Commission will aim to appropriately balance the need to improve the affordability of housing with associated objectives of creating sustainable communities, enabling integrated and efficient infrastructure planning, and undertaking RMA reforms to streamline the legislative framework which underpins part of this debate.

This submission now comments upon the findings and recommendations contained in the chapter headings of the Commission's draft report identified in bold type below:

- **The housing affordability inquiry**
- **The New Zealand housing scene**
- Macroeconomic factors
- Housing affordability: distribution and trends
- **Population and demographic change**
- The role of taxation
- **Urban planning and housing affordability**
- **Charging for infrastructure**
- Building regulations and affordability
- The performance of the building industry
- **Where housing affordability bites**
- Rural Māori housing

### **The housing affordability inquiry**

The Commission's scope covers both rental and owner-occupied housing. Whilst home ownership is desirable and has been linked to leading to greater engagement of householders in the local community, the overriding issue is one of ensuring sufficient, secure, high quality and affordable accommodation across all tenure types.

The historic and current aspiration for home ownership reflects the cultural bias towards such a tenure type (as in many but certainly not all OECD countries, *cf.* Fig 2.11 p20, NZ housing scene) and is linked to New Zealand's higher percentage of investment in housing compared to other assets as part of household investment portfolios – a love affair with home ownership and investment if you like. Given the arguably structural changes in the housing market over the last decade, an important question that the Commission has only partially addressed is the extent to which housing affordability is best tackled by measures which aim to make home ownership more achievable or alternatively through measures which enhance the supply, quality and desirability of other tenure types.

Whilst the UDS Partnership supports the Commission's statement that "opportunities for improving housing outcomes are likely to be found through small contributions in many places, rather than in any single large 'solution'" (Overview, p4) the recommendations of the draft report seem somewhat unbalanced and, perhaps understandably, orientated to those measures which might appear easiest to implement.

Housing affordability is particularly acute in the lower two income quintiles (who spend a much higher proportion of their income on housing costs) and in the under-40 age group (which has seen the sharpest fall-offs in home ownership) and so a greater focus on such wider measures may also align more closely with changing aspirations or attitudes within these groups.

### **The New Zealand housing scene**

The demand side reasons for the rapid real house price appreciation over the last decade are many and varied, however, interestingly the findings of the Commission's draft report confirm that the housing market supply side response potentially exacerbates the situation regarding housing affordability. The

report (*cf* Fig 2.14 and 2.15 p24-25) highlights that new houses are increasingly in top quartile values compared to the existing stock and the average size of new homes has grown rapidly in recent decades.

It is accepted that few first-home buyers buy such a new home, and part of the reason for higher comparable values is as a result of higher mandatory housing specifications. However, if there is an objective to reduce the entry costs of home ownership then focusing on measures to increase the supply of new housing without addressing this current mismatch in demand and supply sub-markets is a particularly 'long game' as it relies on the churn of households deciding to 'trade up' to then free up existing stock priced closer to levels at which the target section of the market can afford.

Adding to the inertia of the situation is the supply responsiveness of housing investment. The Commission's draft report cites New Zealand as being around average across OECD countries (*cf.* Fig 2.7 Estimates of long-run price elasticity of new housing). Whilst land use and planning regulations contribute to determining supply responsiveness the reported small scale and fragmented nature of the building industry will also be fundamental. Bringing new housing to the market once appropriate zoning is established relies primarily on the capacity and capability of the development and construction sectors.

### **Population and demographic change**

As the Commission's report states, population growth and demographic change are significant contributors to household formation, tenure choice and thus housing demand. Given the regional variation in such important housing demand drivers it would seem appropriate that the some of the solutions to address the adequate supply of housing (quantum, housing type and location) are also best determined at a regional or sub-regional level.

As part of the development and implementation of the UDS, Statistics NZ were commissioned to establish demographic projections through to 2041 to aid land use planning and future service delivery. These have recently been reviewed and remodelled to incorporate a range of earthquake recovery scenarios ('rapid' recovery to 'slow' recovery). The UDS Partnership would agree with the Sapere Research Group's premise (outlined in the Commission's report *cf.* p57 Box 6 Impact of the Canterbury earthquakes on household projections) that population growth will eventually return to its pre-earthquake trajectory, the main uncertainty being the length of the lag period during which growth is subdued.

Greater Christchurch has a higher proportion of its population aged 65 and over compared to the New Zealand average, with a higher level of home ownership in that group. It is also noteworthy that it has a higher percentage of the population with household income below \$20,000 and a lower percentage over \$70,000.

The UDS demographic data confirms that profound ageing of Greater Christchurch's population is underway with population aged under 60 years to increase by only around 10% over the 35 years to 2041, compared with 100% for the over 60's. Major changes in household composition are also expected. In the longer term little more than 1 in 4 households will include children and 1 in 3 is likely to contain just one person.

These demographic changes have significant implications for household-to-dwelling match, both among the existing housing stock and the future provision of new housing. The comments made above regarding the current specifications for the majority of new housing provision would suggest that these changes are not being sufficiently factored into decision-making within the building industry and so reduces the opportunity for such ageing households to 'trade-down' from larger family houses to release equity and in so doing recirculate this more affordable existing housing stock. It also raises other factors discussed below.

## Urban planning and housing affordability

The impact of urban planning on housing affordability is a hotly contested matter and the reports and submission citations referred to in the Commission's report bear witness to that. No doubt there is some truth in many of the assertions made, however there are also clearly misunderstandings or deliberate misrepresentations being made in relation to growth management. The conclusion that there is "*a strong prima facie case that urban planning principles prevailing in New Zealand's growing urban areas, particularly Auckland, have a significant influence on the prices of both new and existing houses*" is unfortunate. Such a strong finding of a causal relationship is not made in other chapters which arguably it could and should be and the growth management approaches across New Zealand are quite different so an apparent reliance on the Auckland experience in drawing this conclusion is somewhat short-sighted.

The UDS Partners had until recently been preparing to give evidence in the Environment Court regarding the merits of a growth management approach which was translated into a proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Evidence from Tim Hazledine, Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Auckland, and Marcus Spiller, Director of SGS Economics & Planning in Melbourne, provide useful summaries of the costs and benefits of such an approach. Importantly, neither see the tool of metropolitan urban limits as creating an injurious increase in housing prices so long as they provide for the sufficient land to meet future anticipated demand for a range of housing types. So the Commission should perhaps be less concerned about growth management strategies and urban planning principles *per se*, but focus more closely on the land provision within these processes. The Greater Christchurch UDS identifies land within its urban limit sufficient for 35 years of anticipated growth. It balances the need for higher densities and urban intensification with a pragmatic appreciation of the need to allow a level of further greenfield development to deliver an appropriate range of housing choices. This is very different scenario to that currently exhibited in the Auckland model.

The key consideration here then is surely the adequate provision for a range of housing types and locations to seek to accommodate consumer preferences whilst balancing this with wider community outcomes.

The wider well-being and fiscal objectives of councils requires them to consider the most sustainable manner for growth to occur. Intensification in areas with sufficient infrastructure capacity will have clear financial efficiencies and can help increase the performance and vitality of existing (neighbourhood) centres. In Greater Christchurch this is not a scenario of poorly designed, low amenity, high density apartments but a move to modern townhouse developments which still allow for a degree of light and space but better align with the increasing market segment for households without children. The fact that the building industry is "geared up to build low density housing" (cf p89) should not be a justification for discounting this provision and should be a vital concern for the work of the Productivity Partnership to address.

On the other side of the coin, a significant oversupply of greenfield land requiring servicing is likely to result in the inefficient provision and operation of infrastructure. If housing demand is spread thinly over a large number of greenfield areas Councils could potentially face the up-front construction costs for an unnecessarily large number of infrastructure projects, higher debt costs through slower repayment from development contributions for each infrastructure project, and more operational costs. This inefficiency would also relate to slower community formation and the associated slower provision of facilities and services for each area until it reaches the critical mass necessary to support such services and facilities. It would seem counterproductive if measures to improve housing affordability were not cognisant of the wider costs which fall on households, including council rates, and the objective of efficiently building properly functioning communities not just houses. The Commission's report touches on such matters (cf p93 Flow-on effects) but does not make any recommendation further to its Finding 7.3, presumably seeing this as beyond the scope of the inquiry.

Growth management strategies can therefore provide a balanced solution to addressing housing land supply whilst ensuring efficient infrastructure planning (including community facilities). It provides a higher degree of certainty to investment, so reducing the transaction costs of development that are often evidenced through protracted adversarial challenges within RMA processes. And often overlooked is the unstabilising impact on nearby rural productive land uses caused by speculative land purchases on the urban fringe. Hazledine and Spiller identify the issue of externalities (positive and negative) within the housing market, particularly the 'unpriced externalities of suburban expansion', as a fundamental rationale for strategies which seek a more 'welfare maximising and sustainable pattern of settlement'.

The UDS Partnership recognises that other statements and recommendations within the Commission's report try to emphasize the wider picture within this debate, however it is concerned that these messages will be lost through the primary focus on the supposed shortcomings of local authorities, as just one contributor to housing outcomes, and the need for them to adopt a less constrained planning environment.

### **Charging for infrastructure**

Without going into the detail of development contributions the UDS Partnership is keen that the full costs of growth are borne by the developments that require additional capacity, be that in the 'three waters' infrastructure, roading or other needs such as community facilities. The alternative scenario that these costs are borne by the general ratepayer through increases in council rates amounts to an unnecessary subsidy to development.

Whilst the UDS Partnership would welcome updated Best Practice Guidelines to Development Contributions it does not agree that development contributions should be limited to 'major items'. The UDS Partnership would also wish to see further details regarding the proposed statutory status, reporting and auditing mechanisms to be able to provide a view on these areas but would see some merit in their application.

### **Where housing affordability bites**

In the view of the UDS Partnership, this chapter of the Commission's report is perhaps the least well developed and yet is perhaps increasingly the most important area for Government action. Like many other countries, the NZ housing market has arguably undergone a structural change in recent decades that will mean measures to increase housing affordability need to be much broader than simply private home ownership models. This is heightened by radical demographic change that is now underway and the changing aspirations and lifestyles of younger generations.

The Commission's report identifies some of the weaknesses of the current NZ social, community and rental housing sectors and highlights experience from overseas that could be considered here. However, these observations are not brought through with any vigour into the report's findings and recommendations.

Encouraging more institutional investment in the rental sector, establishing a strong 'third sector' for intermediate housing sub-markets and substantially expanding the range and availability of home ownership assistance programmes would help create more diverse housing provision to match the range of demand and affordability constraints of households.

Furthermore, fundamental change in this area could meet associated objectives regarding improving housing quality and household health.

## Summary of main submission points

To summarise, the UDS Partnership makes the following key points:

- The issue of housing affordability within the greater Christchurch area is of concern to the UDS Partnership, particularly due to the profound demographic changes that are occurring now and over the coming decades.
- The recommendations in the draft report seem unbalanced, particularly given the Commission's view that "opportunities for improving housing outcomes are likely to be found through small contributions in many places, rather than in any single large 'solution'".
- The bias towards recommendations regarding the release of land for housing and a 'less constrained' planning regime pose potentially significant and unnecessary costs (both financial and well-being) for local councils and their communities.
- The finding (F7.1) that "the prevailing principles and practice of urban planning have a negative influence on housing affordability in our faster-growing cities" is not substantiated by the evidence cited within the draft report and is not supported by the UDS Partnership.
- The chapter on urban planning and housing affordability is too focussed on the Auckland experience in drawing its conclusions and recommendations and would benefit from a much wider analysis.
- The UDS Partnership would welcome updated Best Practice Guidelines to Development Contributions but does not agree that development contributions should be limited to 'major items' as this would be a subsidy to development and would place an additional financial burden on the general ratepayer.
- The UDS Partnership would like to see more directive recommendations within the draft report to wider measures to increase housing affordability (not simply private home ownership) particularly in relation to encouraging more institutional investment in the rental sector, establishing a strong 'third sector' for intermediate housing sub-markets and substantially expanding the range and availability of home ownership assistance programmes.
- The UDS Partnership would welcome the opportunity for further discussion with the Commission ahead of a final report being presented to Government.

**5. UDS ACTION PLAN AND RECOVERY PROGRAMMES**

Attached.

**Report To:** UDS Implementation Committee (UDSIC)  
**Subject:** UDS Action Plan and Recovery Programmes  
**Report Author(s):** UDS Implementation Manager  
**Report Date:** 9 March 2011

---

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

To review and prioritise actions contained in the UDS Action Plan based on their relevance to recovery planning.

**2. BACKGROUND**

In mid-2010 the detailed 2007 UDS Action Plan was reviewed to ensure that it was up-to-date, consistent with council strategies and changing legislation, and reflected significant developments since 2007. Changes were also made where actions had been completed, to provide better clarity of direction, and to allow greater flexibility regarding the mechanism of how actions might best be delivered.

Twelve priority actions were identified in the 2010 Update as being (not in any ranked order):

<b>Priority Actions</b>
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.
2. Collaboratively manage the water resource across the sub-region through the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.
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.
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
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.
6. Ensure Transport Planning is undertaken in a timely and integrated fashion with land-use planning

<b>Priority Actions</b>
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.
8. Undertake strategic land-use studies to clarify the potential for business land use in identified parts of Greater Christchurch
9. Work with Central Government to identify and source required additional funding to deliver significant initiatives.
10. Monitor and assess actions undertaken as part of the Strategy to the impacts of longer-term social, economic and environmental change.
11. Make operative and then give effect to RPS PC1.
12. Identify and report to partner councils on partially funded/unfunded actions in Action Plan prior to 3 yearly LTCCP.

### **3. RECOVERY PLANNING**

The draft Recovery Strategy outlines six recovery programme areas for which detailed programmes will be developed and where necessary formal recovery plans produced. These six areas are: Leadership and Integration; Economic; Social; Cultural; Built; Natural Environment. It also confirms the importance of existing strategies and plans as source documents for determining recovery directions and priorities.

To aid development of these programmes the UDS Action Plan 2010 has now been further reviewed to identify which UDS actions are most relevant to recovery and to seek integration of these actions within recovery programme development. This work has been undertaken by UDS IMG. Priority reflects both the importance of the issue and the 'window of opportunity' presented by the earthquakes.

It is important to communicate these UDS actions early to ensure appropriate consideration as part of recovery programme discussion and development. It is not intended however that this convey any further financial obligations on Councils at this stage. Further reporting will occur through the CERA Advisory Committee in due course as such programmes are shaped and resourcing matters can be considered by CEAG and respective Councils then. It is also possible that with such discussion the most appropriate implementation agencies may differ to that within the UDS Action Plan.

Attachments A and B separate those that have been assessed as being of high or medium priority with those that are considered to be a lower priority. The attachments reproduce the UDS Action Plan 2010 text unaltered and then add additional columns, firstly to identify the priority for recovery, secondly to identify the most relevant recovery programmes for each action, and thirdly to add further comment to clarify the recovery aspect of the action. Attachment A also groups the actions within six cross-cutting topic areas.

This report seeks endorsement of this UDS IMG prioritisation so that this information can be presented to CERA who are responsible for the coordination and integration of recovery programmes to support the Recovery Strategy.

#### **4. UDS PRIORITIES SEPARATE FROM RECOVERY**

Attachments A and B highlight in yellow the twelve UDS 2010 priority actions outlined in section 2 of this report. Ten of the twelve are also considered to be priorities for recovery (all but one being a high priority). Two of the twelve fall into the low priority category for recovery purposes.

Clearly recovery matters are foremost in much of the current activity of UDS Partners. However, there are a number of UDS Actions for which, although less related to recovery, implementation timescales are still important. The main issue for is potentially one of resourcing, both of staff time and direct financial implications.

By way of example, a number of UDS actions considered to be a lower priority for recovery relate to rural residential development. This reflects the focus on land availability for recovery being more orientated towards urban residential developments and also the commentary in Attachment B which reports that some of these actions are already being progressed by Councils (i.e. WDC Residential Development Plan, SDC Plan Change 17: Rural Residential Activities). Nevertheless, a key aspect of the UDS and RPS Chapter 12A is a consolidated settlement pattern, of which a rural residential policy provisions are a key contributor.

Additionally, Priority Action 2 from the 2010 Update outlined in section 2 above refers to the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS). Significant progress has been made on implementing this strategy through the establishment of Zone Committees, targets and undertaking further investigations. Whilst implementation of this Strategy is crucial to the future well-being of the region (and so is captured within the UDS Action Plan) it may require relatively little if any support or intervention as part of recovery for it to be successful.

As it becomes clearer which of the high and medium prioritised UDS actions are to be advanced through recovery planning, and what resource that might entail, it is intended a further report would be presented to this Committee on a recommended course of action regarding the implementation of the UDS actions separate from recovery.

#### **5. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**It is recommended that UDSIC:**

- a. Agree the UDS IMG prioritisation of the actions within the UDS Action Plan as set out in Attachments A and B to this report**
- b. Agree that this UDS action prioritisation for recovery is presented to CERA for its consideration, feedback and input into recovery programme development.**
- c. Agree that UDS Partner staff represented on the CERA Strategic Group and/or the UDS Implementation Management Group work with CERA to promote and refine these UDS actions as part of the ongoing collaborative work to develop recovery programmes.**
- d. Note that a further report will be presented to the UDSIC on a recommended course of action regarding the implementation of the UDS actions separate from recovery set out in Attachment B to this report.**

UDS ACTION PLAN 2010 - PRIORITISED FOR RECOVERY PROGRAMME INTEGRATION

Subject	Action	Priority for Recovery	Relevant Recovery Theme(s)	Comment	General Topic Grouping
Freshwater Estuary and Coast	Put in place integrated approaches to freshwater management including integrated catchment management plans across all asset management areas, and in greenfield and intensification area planning.	High	Built; Natural Environment		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Freshwater Estuary and Coast	Promote good practise outlined in the Erosion and Sediment Control Guide	Medium	Built	BAU approach	Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Freshwater Estuary and Coast	Agree how the impacts of coastal hazards (including climate change) will be managed	High	Built; Natural Environment		Hazard management related work
Freshwater Estuary and Coast	Raise awareness, engage and support the community to identify and address surface water management issues, including the promotion of good land management practises and <i>Low Impact Urban Design</i> to maintain and improve water quality.	Medium	Built; Natural Environment	Focus on implementing good practice and less on raising awareness	Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Freshwater Estuary and Coast	Complete and implement the City Coastal Management Plan	Medium	Natural Environment	Sea defence issues particularly relevant	Hazard management related work
Landscapes	Establish a consistent cross boundary approach to identify, protect and manage landscape values.	Medium	Natural Environment		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Natural Hazards and Climate Change	Ensure planning and strategy documents reflect Civil Defence Emergency Management planning and NZ Government advice on climate change response including green house gas emissions reduction.	High	Built; Natural Environment		Hazard management related work
Natural Hazards and Climate Change	Manage existing and future development in areas at risk from coastal flooding, flooding, earthquake risk, natural coastal processes and inland migration of coastal ecosystems.	High	Built; Leadership and integration; Natural Environment		Hazard management related work
Stormwater	Prioritise and improve treatment of existing discharges targeting priority areas including discharges from landuse over the unconfined aquifer.	Medium	Built; Natural Environment		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Stormwater	Upgrade stormwater treatment systems to ensure capacity exists to cope with the increased volumes as a result of population growth without compromising quality.	High	Built; Natural Environment		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Wastewater	Consider long-term directions for wastewater treatment and disposal where approaching capacity.	High	Built; Natural Environment		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Wastewater	Continue infrastructure investment to reduce sewer overflows into stormwater and river systems.	High	Built; Natural Environment		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Water Supply	Undertake comprehensive conservation measures to reduce water use across the city.	Medium	Natural Environment	To aid infrastructure capacity constraints	Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Waste Minimisation	Consider options for requiring the recovery of resources from the waste stream, including construction and demolition materials.	High	Built; Natural Environment		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Waste Minimisation	Forward planning is completed for future waste facilities so they are located and managed in a sustainable way.	Medium	Built; Natural Environment		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Healthy Communities	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.	High	Built; Leadership and integration; Social	Needs leadership from CDHB and the mechanism may differ	Linking social outcomes with development and associated changes in service provision
Healthy Communities	Work with the Canterbury Clinical Initiative to plan for equitable distribution of primary care services across Greater Christchurch.	Medium	Built; Social		Linking social outcomes with development and associated changes in service provision
Healthy Communities	Use Health Impact Assessments and Health Promotion through Sustainable Transport and Environmental Design to promote the health and wellbeing of communities when plans are being developed.	Medium	Built; Social		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Healthy Communities	Continue the Clean Heat Programme to improve air quality in Christchurch, Kaiapoi and Rangiora.	Medium	Natural Environment	Mechanism may differ	Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Education & Information	Investigate the potential for shared community and school facilities.	Medium	Built; Social		Linking social outcomes with development and associated changes in service provision
Education & Information	Ensure planning for and/or provision of additional and expanded education facilities and libraries to meet growth demands in affected areas growth and intensification areas.	High	Built; Social		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Education & Information	Promote and support tertiary education institutions to support economic development strategy actions.	High	Economic; Social		Addressing the sectoral needs of the economy to aid recovery
Education & Information	Develop a Greater Christchurch skills strategy that forecasts future labour skills needs and identifies the means to meet those needs.	High	Economic; Social		Addressing the sectoral needs of the economy to aid recovery
Housing	Support improvements to existing older housing stock while ensuring heritage and character values are protected where necessary.	Medium	Built; Cultural		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Housing	Investigate opportunities to upgrade relocate and expand social housing stock as central city and centres grow.	High	Built; Social		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Housing	Identify and evaluate means to promote the long term stability of the rental sector, e.g. encouraging institutional investment into the rental market.	High	Built; Economic; Social		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure

UDS ACTION PLAN 2010 - PRIORITISED FOR RECOVERY PROGRAMME INTEGRATION

Housing	Encourage non-bank investment in mortgage products, including longer term ones, to foster medium density and/or affordable housing.	Medium	Built; Economic; Social		Addressing the sectoral needs of the economy to aid recovery
Housing	Investigate drivers of housing supply and demand in the aggregate and with regard to housing type	High	Built	Especially relating to temporary workforce	Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Public Open Space	Prepare policy and plans that provide standards and guidelines for public open space provision in urban and rural areas that meet the needs of increasing populations and urban intensification.	Medium	Built; Natural Environment		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Public Open Space	Identify and prioritise areas, where land can be acquired for parks where there is a shortage within Greater Christchurch.	Medium	Built; Natural Environment	Possible surplus now in some areas	Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Leisure, Recreation and Sport	Ensure there is a range of equitably distributed high quality public recreation provision across Greater Christchurch.	Medium	Built; Cultural		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Leisure, Recreation and Sport	Ensure active and passive recreational and leisure provision to meet the future urban growth needs of the region.	Medium	Built; Cultural		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Leisure, Recreation and Sport	Ensure appropriate planning and engagement across the sub-region involving strategic recreation provision.	High	Built; Cultural		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Tangata Whenua	Investigate the development of housing on MR873 land adjoining Woodend through the preparation, consultation and adoption of an agreed Outline Development Plan for that area.	High	Built; Cultural	Especially to support RZ displaced maori	Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Culture & Heritage	Manage growth in a way that recognises and enhances the value of the historical character of our built environment.	Medium	Built; Cultural		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Culture & Heritage	Develop regulatory and non-regulatory measures to recognise the importance of and encourage the retention of groups of heritage and character buildings	Medium	Built; Cultural		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Culture & Heritage	Adopt clear policies and align incentives to assist in identifying the balance between cost-effectiveness, Building Code compliance and protection of the heritage fabric and value.	High	Built; Cultural		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Culture & Heritage	Demonstrate leadership and model best practice in heritage protection	Medium	Built; Cultural		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Culture & Heritage	Improved identification and protection of historic heritage	Medium	Built; Cultural		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Urban Design	Work collaboratively with strategy partners to develop a consistent urban design approach to ensure all greenfield development conforms with the principles of good urban design.	Medium	Built		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Urban Design	Ensure Outline Development Plans for are prepared for intensification and greenfield areas at a neighbourhood scale, and provision is made for a variety of uses based on the principles of good urban design.	High	Built		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Urban Design	Prepare Structure Plans for Key Activity Centres based on the principles of good urban design.	High	Built	Link to CCC Suburban Centres work	Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Urban Design	Carry out independent design reviews of significant new developments to ensure that they conform with the principles of good urban design.	Medium	Built		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Urban Design	Prepare appropriate design policies and procedures to promote the inclusion of Low Impact Urban Design and Development (LIUDD) features in new developments.	Medium	Built		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Greenfield and Rural Residential	Implement consistent approaches to outline development plans for all Greenfield growth pockets.	Medium	Built		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Urban Revitalisation, Central City and Intensification	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	High	Built; Economic; Leadership and integration		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Urban Revitalisation, Central City and Intensification	Complete implementation of Stage II of the Central City Revitalisation Strategy and develop and implement Stage III	High	Built		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Urban Revitalisation, Central City and Intensification	Develop a programme of adaptive reuse of buildings to foster the retention of character and heritage buildings.	Medium	Built; Cultural; Economic		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Urban Revitalisation, Central City and Intensification	Prepare Neighbourhood Regeneration Plans in areas where revitalisation opportunities exist and where greater diversity of housing is needed,	High	Built; Social		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Urban Revitalisation, Central City and Intensification	Develop a brownfield redevelopment programme to foster regeneration on certain large derelict or vacant sites.	High	Built; Economic; Leadership and integration		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Key Activity Centres	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.	High	Built; Economic; Leadership and integration	Including potential smaller centres in some areas	Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Key Activity Centres	Define through Master Plans the purpose and role of each activity centre and direct public investment including investigating opportunities for integrating public facilities.	High	Built; Economic		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure

**UDS ACTION PLAN 2010 - PRIORITISED FOR RECOVERY PROGRAMME INTEGRATION**

Key Activity Centres	Investigate the use of suburban Public Transport interchanges and corridors to reinforce activity centres.	High	Built; Economic		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Industrial & Commercial Land	Develop a commercial study and implementation plan to provide adequate and appropriately located land for retailing, and office based activities	High	Built; Economic		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Industrial & Commercial Land	Prepare an industrial management plan to provide the infrastructure needed to guide industrial development.	Medium	Built; Economic		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Industrial & Commercial Land	Develop an office distribution plan that supports the Central City and provides direction to the location of all types of office activity and works to retain and attract business.	High	Built; Economic		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Industrial & Commercial Land	Prepare neighbourhood and/or area plans to ensure new, changing and/or expanded industrial areas are developed in an integrated way.	Medium	Built; Economic		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Industrial & Commercial Land	Undertake strategic land-use studies to clarify the potential for business land use in identified parts of Greater Christchurch	High	Built; Economic; Leadership and integration		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Transport	Ensure Transport Planning is undertaken in a timely and integrated fashion with land-use planning	High	Built; Leadership and integration		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Transport	Develop the 2011-2041 Canterbury RLTS to support the adopted Strategy.	High	Built	Especially a sub-region 'one network' plan	Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Transport	Develop the 2012 -22 Canterbury RLTP to implement the UDS transport projects that support achievement of RLTS.	High	Built		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Transport	Implement the Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Management Strategy and Action Plan.	Medium	Built		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Transport	Reinforce reverse sensitivity boundaries for the Christchurch International Airport, Lyttelton Port and other strategic transport corridors.	High	Built		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
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	High	Built; Economic		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Transport	Ensure the protection of existing transport corridors for potential future use.	High	Built; Economic		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Transport	Better manage parking in the Central City and Key Activity Centres by reviewing parking management options and implementing parking management studies.	Medium	Built; Economic		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Economic Development	Implement regional and city specific economic development strategies, ensuring optimal coordination between districts to achieve maximum benefits.	High	Economic; Leadership and integration	Including aggregates supply strategy	Addressing the sectoral needs of the economy to aid recovery
Economic Development	Assist relevant organisations to promote Greater Christchurch nationally and internationally for business retention, development and attraction.	High	Economic		Addressing the sectoral needs of the economy to aid recovery
Economic Development	Work with businesses to encourage locational preferences that achieve agglomeration economies especially in the central city.	High	Economic	Including iwi commercial coinvestment	Addressing the sectoral needs of the economy to aid recovery
Energy & Telecommunications	Develop and implement sustainable energy strategies that promote demand-side energy efficiency measures for domestic and commercial users	Medium	Built; Economic		Minimising resource and infrastructure impacts of the earthquakes and integrating enhancement opportunities
Energy & Telecommunications	Ensure the coordinated provision of high functioning telecommunications infrastructure equitably across the sub-region.	Medium	Built; Economic		Addressing the sectoral needs of the economy to aid recovery
Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Maintain a sub-regional joint committee (UDSIC), at a governance level involving partner councils	High	Leadership and integration	Linked to CERA Advisory Committee	Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
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.	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ratify a Memorandum of Agreement.	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Define and agree on the programme and resources to implement the Strategy and Action Plan including ongoing administration and review to give effect to MOA.	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
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	Medium	Leadership and integration		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure

**UDS ACTION PLAN 2010 - PRIORITISED FOR RECOVERY PROGRAMME INTEGRATION**

Central Government Engagement and Commitment	Coordinate engagement with central government and advocate on behalf of Greater Christchurch to ensure that national policy and legislation meets local needs and provides a framework for local action.	High	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Central Government Engagement and Commitment	Ensure NZTA's 10-year plan (National Land Transport Programme) reflects the Strategy objectives.	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Central Government Engagement and Commitment	Develop and implement an annual briefing and engagement programme for central government including key Ministers and advisers.	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Central Government Engagement and Commitment	Brief Greater Christchurch MP's on implementation progress and issues of relevance	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Central Government Engagement and Commitment	Work with Central Government to identify and source required additional funding to deliver significant initiatives	High	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Central Government Engagement and Commitment	Ensure briefing documents are kept up to date and are available for submission to relevant officials and elected representatives	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
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.	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Integrating Policy, Planning and Funding	Make operative and then give effect to RPS PC1.	High	Built; Leadership and integration	Operative so consistent implementation	Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Integrating Policy, Planning and Funding	Develop consistent approaches to policy and plan preparation including considering alignment and consistency with this Strategy and its Implementation Plan.	Medium	Built; Leadership and integration		Strategic planning to ensure quality development in appropriate locations supported by necessary infrastructure
Integrating Policy, Planning and Funding	Align LTCCPs and Annual Plans to ensure the provision of network infrastructure supports the preferred sub-regional settlement pattern, including staging and sequencing.	High	Built; Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Integrating Policy, Planning and Funding	Ensure that development contribution policies support achieving the sub-regional settlement pattern, including staging and timing.	Medium	Built; Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Resourcing Actions	Establish the capital needed to support large scale sub-regional infrastructure.	High	Built; Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Resourcing Actions	Identify the costs of growth, in particular network infrastructure costs.	High	Built; Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Resourcing Actions	Implement financial/development contributions and incentives policies for growth related expenditure – particular attention needs to be paid to sub-regional alignment across the partnership.	Medium	Built; Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Resourcing Actions	Identify and report to partner councils on partially funded/unfunded actions in Action Plan prior to 3 yearly LTCCP.	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Resourcing Actions	Agree an implementation funding formula between the Council partners.	Medium	Leadership and integration	Including now with CERA/Government	Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Monitoring and Review	Maintain the integrity of the strategy through regular update and review.	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Monitoring and Review	Develop an integrated programme to monitor demographic, social data and growth management drivers across Greater Christchurch.	High	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding
Monitoring and Review	Monitor progress on implementing the UDS Action Plan	Medium	Leadership and integration		Ensuring effective local governance and links with Government to define priorities, sequencing and funding

**UDS ACTION PLAN 2010 - PRIORITISED FOR RECOVERY PROGRAMME INTEGRATION**

Subject	Action	Priority for Recovery	Relevant Recovery Theme(s)	Comment
Biodiversity and Ecosystems	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.	Low	Natural Environment	
Biodiversity and Ecosystems	Identify and prioritise sites, habitats and species requiring conservation and enhancement through both regulatory controls and conservation measures.	Low	Natural Environment	
Biodiversity and Ecosystems	Develop, implement and maintain programmes to promote awareness, education and promotion of important ecological resources and programmes for initiatives.	Low	Cultural; Natural Environment	
Biodiversity and Ecosystems	Identify and implement opportunities for funding ecological initiatives on private land, including sponsorship, grants, partnerships, and purchase.	Low	Natural Environment	
Freshwater Estuary and Coast	Collaboratively manage the water resource across the sub-region through the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.	Low	Economic; Leadership and integration; Natural Environment	
Landscapes	Adjust district specific policies and programmes arising from Action 1 to better promote and manage landscape values.	Low	Natural Environment	
Landscapes	Raise awareness, engage and support the community to identify and address landscape issues.	Low	Cultural; Natural Environment	
Natural Hazards and Climate Change	Assist communities to understand and respond to the effects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.	Low	Natural Environment; Social	Recovery focus more on strategic planning than community response and adaptation
Stormwater	Ensure Christchurch International Airport has effective stormwater protection plans and programmes.	Low	Natural Environment	
Water Supply	Develop education programmes to engage the community in sustainable water supply initiatives, including households and urban and rural business and commercial sectors.	Low	Natural Environment; Social	Recovery focus more on strategic planning than educational programmes
Water Supply	A Risk Management Plan is put in place to self determine future water quality.	Low	Natural Environment	
Waste Minimisation	Continue to work collaboratively across the region on waste minimisation initiatives	Low	Natural Environment	
Healthy Communities	Review the profiles/outcomes of GC Health Plan to prioritise every 3 to 5 years.	Low	Social	
Housing	Publish sustainable and energy efficient housing design guides specific for Canterbury and incorporate these in planning provision and building controls.	Low	Built	
Public Open Space	Develop and implement policy and programmes to promote community, landowner and Māori engagement and partnership in open space initiatives	Low	Cultural; Natural Environment	
Public Open Space	Prepare a policy to help facilitate public use of unformed legal roads and waterway margins for recreation, amenity and access.	Low	Built; Cultural; Natural Environment	
Public Open Space	Initiate a co-ordinated approach to the identification, planning provision and maintenance of regional strategic open spaces including regional parks.	Low	Built; Cultural; Natural Environment	
Tangata Whenua	Improve and maintain Tangata Whenua contact database for consultation on RMA processes and LGA for land and significant bodies of water. .	Low	Cultural	
Tangata Whenua	Develop partnerships with Ngai Tahu to explore sustainable use and enhancement of biodiversity, particularly Ki Uta Ki Tai and 2025 Ngai Tahu	Low	Cultural; Natural Environment	
Culture & Heritage	Communicate and engage with the public regarding the role and value of our built heritage and character in terms of both its historical value and also its role in the development of the city into the future.	Low	Built; Cultural	Recovery focus more on strategic planning than community engagement
Greenfield and Rural Residential	Develop a collaborative and consistent approach across Councils to the preparation of outline development plans for all identified greenfield growth pockets.	Low	Built	ODP Guidance already produced
Greenfield and Rural Residential	Develop a rural residential zoning policy and assessment criteria for use by all the Strategy partners.	Low	Built	Recovery focus more on urban residential developments
Greenfield and Rural Residential	Reflect in the City and District Plans the preferred locations for rural residential lots.	Low	Built	Work already progressing by SDC and WDC
Greenfield and Rural Residential	Investigate the provision of rural residential within Christchurch boundaries.	Low	Built	
Transport	Develop a Network Plan for the Roads of National Significance (RoNs).	Low	Built	Network Plan already produced

**UDS ACTION PLAN 2010 - PRIORITISED FOR RECOVERY PROGRAMME INTEGRATION**

Energy & Telecommunications	Implement energy efficiency measures to reduce energy use by partner agencies	Low	Leadership and integration	
Energy & Telecommunications	Investigate opportunities to encourage and reduce barriers to adopting micro-generation.	Low	Built; Economic	
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).	Low	Leadership and integration	Action more specific to UDS implementation than recovery
Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Develop and update Partner Agency communications strategies to maintain high levels of awareness of the UDS and growth management issues in the community.	Low	Leadership and integration	Action more specific to UDS implementation than recovery
Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Develop and update UDS communications to maintain awareness of the UDS Partnership and Strategy implementation.	Low	Leadership and integration	Action more specific to UDS implementation than recovery
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	Low	Leadership and integration	Action more specific to UDS implementation than recovery
Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Ensure that Statements of Intent of partner council owned enterprises are aligned to reflect the strategic directions and outcomes of this Strategy.	Low	Leadership and integration	Action more specific to UDS implementation than recovery
Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Establish a health sub-group reporting to the Implementation Management Group and set formal links to monitor health issues.	Low	Leadership and integration	Requires review in light of emerging recovery governance and management arrangements
Governance, Collaboration, Partnership and Community Engagement	Establish a culture and heritage sub-group of the IMG to enhance information sharing and sub-regional knowledge of culture and heritage	Low	Leadership and integration	Requires review in light of emerging recovery governance and management arrangements
Resourcing Actions	Develop a position on the efficient and equitable funding for regional recreation resources.	Low	Cultural	

**GREATER CHRISTCHURCH UDS IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE 9.3.2012**

**6. PRESENTATION: GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION MODEL**

A verbal presentation will be made to the committee.

**7. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

Attached.

FRIDAY 9 MARCH 2012

COUNCIL

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.*

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely items 8.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED	REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER	GROUND(S) UNDER SECTION 48(1) FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION
8. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES: MEETING OF 19 DECEMBER 2011	) GOOD REASON TO ) WITHHOLD EXISTS ) UNDER SECTION 7	SECTION 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

**Item 8 Prevent damage to public interest (Section 7(2)(c)(ii))**

**Chairman's Recommendation:** That the foregoing motion be adopted.

**Note**

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

- “(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):
- (a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
  - (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”