

# Stephen Timms



## Presentation

Framework for Strategic Assessment

## Biography

Stephen Timms is an experienced urban planner that has spent most of his career leading collaborative multi-agency and multi-disciplinary teams on large scale urban regeneration and infrastructure projects in Australia, the UK and New Zealand. Stephen was part of the New Zealand government's efforts to assist in the recovery of Christchurch, following the devastating earthquakes of 2010-2011. This included involvement in the emergency management response, and subsequently leading the preparation of the greater Christchurch Land Use Recovery Plan and a range of other plans and strategies. Stephen's particular interests include community engagement, health and wellbeing and disaster risk reduction. Stephen previously worked on a range of urban regeneration projects in the UK, which included preparing or assisting with Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessments.

## Abstract

Health in All Policies is a way of working that aims to ensure health, wellbeing, sustainability and equity issues are explicitly addressed in the policy and plan making process. These principles have underpinned much of the work undertaken in Canterbury and Christchurch, both prior to and following the devastating series of earthquakes that began in 2010. The methodological rigour required to assess impacts across the four sustainability pillars (social, environmental, economic and cultural) and take account of future generations provides an effective foundation for the assessment of impacts and opportunities for a wide range of activities. A robust methodology has now been adapted and used for five formal strategic assessments, on a range of resource use and recovery (spatial) plans and strategies in Canterbury, including a regional water management strategy, the new 'blueprint' to guide rebuilding of central Christchurch, a spatial plan for recovery and regeneration of the greater Christchurch sub-region, and other specific area plans. These demonstrate the versatility and flexibility of the framework first developed for Sustainability Appraisal by Sadler and Ward in 2008. Each used a selection of assessment criteria reflecting plan objectives, existing plans and strategies and knowledge of the local population, with additional community health and wellbeing factors incorporated.

The flexibility to determine appropriate criteria has emerged as a particular strength of the approach. Those involved in writing the recovery plans and strategies (urban planners and other experts) have lauded the approach as bringing them closer to the community they are planning for and highlighting matters early in the process that may have otherwise been missed. These strategic assessments have added enormous value to the earthquake recovery process in greater Christchurch, but is a tool for developing plans and strategies that would be useful in all contexts.

# Integrated Assessment in Canterbury – A planners perspective

Stephen Timms

With contributions from Martin Ward

# What's in a name?

- Impact Assessment; Integrated Assessment; Sustainability Assessment; Strategic Environmental Appraisal; Regulatory Impact Statement; Section 32 analysis; “Health in All Policies approach”...?
- Sustainability Appraisal recognised as having clear ‘four pillar’ foundation
- Integrated Assessment used as generic label
- Sustainability Appraisal is the foundation



# What is Integrated Assessment?

- *A formal approach used to predict the potential effects of a policy, with particular attention paid to impacts on health and wellbeing; in addition to social, economic, cultural and environmental*
- Based on evidence, focused on outcomes and includes input from a range of sectors.
- Inform early iterations of plan making, with a focus on implementation
- A collaborative multi-agency approach, with particular support from the Community & Public Health division of the Canterbury District Health Board.



# IA roll call:

1. Sustainability Appraisal of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS), 2009

**Local Government Act, Environment Canterbury**

2. Wellbeing Assessment of the Castle Plaza Development Plan Amendment, 2011

**City of Marion (Adelaide) and South Australia Department of Health**

3. Sustainability and Wellbeing Assessment of the Draft Christchurch Central City Plan, 2012

**CERA, Christchurch City Council & CDHB**

4. Integrated Assessment of the Draft Land Use Recovery Plan, 2013

**Recovery Strategy, Environment Canterbury & CDHB**

5. Wellbeing Impact Assessment of the Draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, 2014

**Recovery Strategy, Environment Canterbury, Port of Lyttelton & CDHB**

6. Integrated Assessment of the Draft Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan, 2015

**Recovery Strategy, Waimakariri District Council & CDHB**





# Health in All Policies (HiAP)

- Formally established collaborative for policy making and planning, bringing together all sectors that impact health and wellbeing in Canterbury.
- Community centred with a focus on health and wellbeing outcomes.
- “Healthy Christchurch” – over 200 charter signatories (Gov’t, NGO’s etc.)
- Joint work programmes and focus on capacity building and sharing.



# Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act



- Established Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)
- Extraordinary powers to Minister for CER – Hon Gerry Brownlee
- Recovery Strategy required
- Series of recovery plans to be developed
- Impact Assessment to be used







# The framework approach

- Developed for New Zealand application by Barry Sadler and Martin Ward.
- Sustainability Appraisal involves baseline tests relating to four pillars (social, economic, environmental, cultural) in contrast to other impact assessment approaches .
- A sustainability test is undertaken against both:
  - a *top line* of objectives/targets/norms to aim for, and
  - a *bottom line* of key thresholds (base minima) or warning signs to avoid.



# Equity considerations

- Equity considerations are fundamental to sustainability
- Intergenerational equity
  - maintaining future development options and opportunities requires that the next generation receive a stock of assets (resource potentials, created wealth, human capabilities) that is at least equivalent to our own, taking into account population growth
- Intra-generational equity
  - improving the wellbeing of all people, particularly the vulnerable and disadvantaged requires prioritising a greater share of resources.



# Basic approach

- Provisional work by a small specialist assessment team to:
  - Identify capital assets in four asset sets (pillars)
  - Develop assessment criteria to be used (existing plans and strategies and other objectives)
  - Agree scale (e.g. -1 to +3)
  - Compose preliminary scale descriptors and scale steps
  - Organise workshops





# Basic approach

- Intensive workshops include subject specialists to review preliminary work and:
  - Agree capital asset sets and criteria elements
  - Amend/confirm assessment criteria and scale descriptors
  - Set top & bottom lines
  - ‘Score’ the project/plan options
- One, two or three workshops have been used



# Appropriate participation

- A compositional bias will introduce a content and outcome bias
- The most helpful participants are likely to be busy
- Need to understand equity issues (and the social determinants of health and wellbeing)
- And 'speak' for future generations
- Need an understanding of resource (capital) asset management and the notion of capital substitution
- Tangata whenua must be involved
- A small cohort have already been 'trained' but are showing participant fatigue





**Part One: Integrated Assessment**

An integrated assessment tool was used to evaluate how well the early draft met identified sustainability and well-being criteria. This was to ensure the focus was on health and wellbeing of people, present and future. The process helped to identify potential links and gaps, to see if the Plan was meeting its objectives and to make specific recommendations for improvements.

**Part Two: Follow up workshop and analysis**

Part Two reviewed how much the Plan had changed as a result of the Part One assessment and identified what was still missing. Analyses compiled by CDHB compared the recommendations from the assessment and the content of the Plan. Further recommendations for improvements were made.

**Part Three: Final analysis**

Part Three involved an analysis by staff to examine which recommendations from Parts One and Two had been incorporated into Plan. It draws on the recommendations identified in Table 1 and listed what had not been taken up in the content and recommendations.

2013

February

March

April

May

June

July

**Consultation with targeted stakeholders**


Draft Preliminary Plan prepared

**Draft Preliminary Plan released for comment**

Drafting of Plan continues in response to consultation and assessment

Draft Preliminary Plan prepared

**Draft Plan for sign off by partners for the Minister**

Guiding Principles	Criterion	Description	Small negative impact	Neutral impact	Small Positive impact	Moderate positive impact	Strong positive impact	
			-1	0	+1	+2	+3	
Support a balance between walking, cycling, public transport and driving	12	Public transport modes future-proofed	PT corridors able to cater for light rail or future transport systems	The plan takes light rail or future transport systems off the planning horizon	Light rail or future transport systems not addressed in the plan	Principal transport corridors provide for light rail or future transport systems	Light rail or future transport system proposed 	Light rail or future transport system proposed and funding sources identified



**Table 1 – Summary of recommendations from all parts of the assessment**

Part One
<p><b>TRANSPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include public and active transport plans for all developments and centres</li> <li>Ensure employment centres are accessible via a full mix of transport modes</li> <li>Ensure land use patterns are integrated with transport infrastructure</li> <li>Protect key corridors for future public transport</li> </ul>
<p><b>IMPLEMENTATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation using broad community involvement.</li> <li>Community, partners and stakeholders involved in monitoring/ implementation.</li> <li>Use SMART indicators</li> <li>Need clear objectives that drive actions</li> <li>Leadership – clear decision making lines.</li> <li>Consider agency or group targeted to facilitate change.</li> <li>Delegate decision-making to appropriate scale</li> </ul>
<p><b>HAZARDS AND ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explicit links to RPS on avoidance of natural hazards including planned retreat</li> <li>Acknowledge climate change and flooding</li> <li>Create green services - green roofs, walls, stormwater, buildings, natural corridors</li> <li>Integrate with the Natural Environment Recovery Programme (NERP)</li> <li>Provide context of the natural environment and reference existing strategies</li> <li>Explicitly protect aquifer recharge area</li> <li>Explicit links with CWMS Implementation Programmes</li> <li>Protect groundwater for drinking water refer to drinking water standards</li> <li>Acknowledge the potential for land use to affect water quality</li> <li>Minimise impacts on the environment to strengthen whakapapa</li> <li>Maintaining and securing productive land</li> <li>Ngāi Tahu involved at the top level for natural resources</li> </ul>
<p><b>REBUILDING AND BUILDING COMMUNITIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enable development in existing communities and how red zone community relocated.</li> <li>Equity of accessibility a focus here for existing and new communities</li> <li>Strong centres-based policies in plans - local and key activity centres.</li> <li>Local retail included in new subdivisions.</li> <li>Strengthen the use of suburb master plans.</li> <li>Incentivise and encourage mixed-use developments.</li> <li>Health and social services in new developments</li> <li>Direct agencies to ensure social services provided in all communities.</li> <li>Encourage the mix of mode use in retail areas to encourage interaction with the street.</li> <li>Synchronise land use with community development.</li> <li>Provide people with quality connections to the built environment where can express their interests</li> <li>Create a sense of belonging and identity and provide for community diversity</li> <li>Provide spaces for communities to gather.</li> <li>Use surplus Crown land for social services including educational.</li> </ul>
<p><b>LOCATION AND QUALITY OF DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDINGS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target the quality design of buildings and standards and a systems approach to urban design.</li> <li>Develop incentives necessary to improve more concentrated redevelopment of existing areas.</li> <li>Integrate and design of the public space</li> <li>Health and wellbeing aspects to design should be central to building design and performance.</li> <li>Integrate existing with new land-use and be clear about how to achieve this.</li> <li>Guidance and incentives are put in place to encourage high energy rating rebuilding.</li> <li>Dedicated development agency with a focus on brownfield development</li> <li>Provide a business tsar to champion business needs</li> <li>Remove resource consent compliance costs for red zone businesses.</li> <li>Brownfields development more explicitly supported through range of non-regulatory mechanisms</li> <li>Use existing infrastructure over building new</li> <li>Land availability lined up with market needs – staging and sequencing</li> <li>High level zoning for business - industrial (all), office (all) and other.</li> <li>Name all Māori reserves</li> <li>Draw on and use local people and products</li> <li>Review criteria for a floating zone and see if it can be extended to other areas and types.</li> </ul>
<p><b>HOUSING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maximise the range of housing types and for elderly</li> <li>Subdivision covenants allow for a range of house sizes and types</li> <li>Partner to deliver social housing and residential care services</li> <li>Warrant of fitness scheme for rental housing</li> <li>Prepare affordable housing policies for new developments.</li> <li>Housing meets current short term to be reused in the future</li> <li>Reuse building houses for workers eg affordable housing.</li> </ul>

Part Two
<p><b>TRANSPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific requirements for active transport</li> <li>Refer to all transport documents \ strategies</li> </ul>
<p><b>IMPLEMENTATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase emphasis on collaboration and community participation in implementation</li> <li>Strengthen way to work with industry and developers</li> <li>Firm commitment for active community involvement</li> <li>Take a long-term sustainable view to manage growth - Whakatauki</li> <li>Strengthen information on monitoring and reporting progress</li> <li>Leadership for implementation</li> <li>Institutional change monitoring and data sharing</li> <li>Ensure cultural and Māori concepts are included in the Plan and engage fully with Ngāi Tahu as a partner</li> </ul>
<p><b>HAZARDS AND ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline plan for flood management</li> <li>Natural green spaces and cover and access to green spaces and cover</li> <li>Maximise sustainable opportunities</li> <li>Improved and enhanced natural ecosystem health and biodiversity</li> <li>Advanced surface water management, including water harvesting and stormwater management</li> <li>Protect waterways for a variety of values</li> <li>Protection of quality and quantity of groundwater</li> </ul>
<p><b>REBUILDING AND BUILDING COMMUNITIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build communities and the concept of villages is visible</li> <li>Ensure health and social services</li> <li>are equitably located</li> <li>Social services are placed in new subdivision or centre developments.</li> <li>Clarify the role and function and scale of centres</li> </ul>
<p><b>LOCATION AND QUALITY OF DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDINGS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on vulnerable populations</li> <li>Development and financial contributions reviewed to how best utilised</li> <li>Specifics on OIC expiry – clarify responses to transitional processes for change.</li> <li>Infrastructure is a community asset - ensure it is built to a high standard.</li> <li>Lyttelton Port and town recovery issues added</li> <li>Toolbox for sustainable housing</li> <li>Evaluate the housing parks</li> <li>Insurance impediments to redevelopment especially multiple ownership</li> <li>Protect rural productive land and manage rural residential</li> </ul>
<p><b>HOUSING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality and repair of existing and new housing</li> <li>Warrant of fitness scheme for rental housing.</li> <li>Include toolbox for sustainable housing</li> <li>Ensure transitional housing available locally for people awaiting a rebuild</li> <li>Minimum standards for temporary homes as may become more permanent housing stock.</li> </ul>

Part Three
<p><b>TRANSPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrate active and public transport into new development and local retail centres</li> </ul>
<p><b>IMPLEMENTATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure community participation in monitoring and review of implementation</li> <li>Ensure wide range of community representation on the Strategic Implementation Forum</li> <li>Land use change part of annual monitoring and reporting</li> </ul>
<p><b>HAZARDS AND ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address the implications of hazard and managed retreat from identified areas – this is not included and no explanation has been provided</li> <li>Ensure natural green spaces and cover (green roofs, stormwater, buildings, natural corridors)</li> </ul>
<p><b>REBUILDING AND BUILDING COMMUNITIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on building communities and urban villages– difficult but not included in actions</li> </ul>
<p><b>LOCATION AND QUALITY OF DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDINGS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider more mechanisms/ tools for intensification rather than regulatory mechanisms</li> <li>Clearly direct staging and sequencing of Greenfield land</li> <li>Review tenure issues to support intensification and multiple ownership</li> </ul>
<p><b>HOUSING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transitional housing is not well developed</li> <li>Outline ways to integrate greater housing density into inner urban areas that are semi occupied or of poor quality to use existing infrastructure</li> <li>Ensure quality and repair of existing and new housing</li> </ul>

**Description of table:**

Table 1 shows the list of recommendations for improvements to the Plan at each stage- Parts One, Two and Three.

Part One resulted in a long list of suggestions for improvements to the early draft of the Plan. The number of recommendations reduced significantly by Part Two (Preliminary Draft) and even further by Part Three.

While Table 1 does not show the extent to which each recommendation was incorporated into the Plan (for example some assessment participants may prefer the Plan to go further still, and some recommendations were not taken up but the reasons why were visible in the Plan), it does show that to a large extent, the draft Land Use Recovery Plan has addressed the concerns identified through the integrated assessment process.



# IA was a success because:

- Early in the process so planners open to new ideas and not ‘defending’ their work.
- Plan writers involved and also provided with written recommendations
- Used pre-established criteria to enable a range of experts to meaningfully contribute to discussions and build consensus.
- Efficient way of testing early ideas (time/resourcing/budgets)
- Useful in defending challenges (legal, political, community)





# Lessons

- Allow lead in time
- Preparation and communication with partners and participants critical
- Good facilitator for workshops needed
- Planning is inherently political
- Need a 'champion' and very clear governance and decision making
- Collaboration and consensus building requires good relationships (time/effort)





# Lessons

- Further understanding of the base methodology needed
- Promotion and capacity building needed
- Feedback loops, monitoring and evaluation still needed
- Independent evaluations are very useful



# Legacy

- Positive, participative approach
- Now more robust and transparent ‘testing’ of plans
- Saves time/money/resources (esp. post disaster)
- Collaborative multi-agency planning processes preferred approach
- Tangata whenua involvement now the norm
- Contributes to better plans for the health and wellbeing of the community





EVERYTHING IS GOING TO BE ALRIGHT



Contact:

[mrstephentimms@gmail.com](mailto:mrstephentimms@gmail.com)

Ph. (Aus) 0497 471 182

- Further reading:

<http://www.cph.co.nz/Files/EvaluationIAofLURP.pdf>

Special acknowledgements:

- Martin Ward, Jane Murray, Geraldine McGettigan; Dr Jackson Green; Dr Anna Stevenson.

