Governance for Urban Growth Management:
A Greater Christchurch Case Study

Brendon Harper

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Planning
University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
1 November 2010
Abstract

Although the sustainable development paradigm has continued to grow in acknowledgement and understanding, there remains a disjuncture between its theory and practice. This disjuncture is especially evident in urban growth management, where the implementation of planning theories which promote sustainable urban form, such as smart growth and new urbanism, have failed to deliver the sustainable development outcomes promoted. The governance of the implementation of urban growth management theories has been identified as one, if not the key reason, for this disjuncture. A new approach to urban governance, based upon the principles of integration, futurity and appropriate geographic scales, is required.

The current research utilises a case study approach and qualitative research methods to review how urban growth management processes are provided for in New Zealand, and to explore how new approaches to the governance of urban growth management can be implemented through New Zealand’s planning framework. Primary data was collected through interviewing a range of people who have been deeply involved in the governance of urban growth management in the Greater Christchurch sub-region of the South Island. Content analysis of relevant documents was also undertaken to determine how the current planning framework structures the governance of urban growth management.

The results show that despite recent legislative changes, New Zealand’s current planning framework does not effectively promote the new approach needed for the governance of urban growth management, and that in fact, it acts as more as an inhibitor. It is recognised that central government plays an important role in shaping governance processes at the local government level. From this, specific actions that the New Zealand government should take, are recommended. The lessons and recommendations provided by this research contribute towards addressing the disjuncture between theory and practice, both in terms of ensuring better governance of the implementation of urban growth management, and in the wider respect of implementing the sustainable development paradigm.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Governance for Urban Growth Management

Since the publication of the Brundtland Report in 1987, the concept of sustainable development has become a global paradigm for creating a better future for the world economically, socially and environmentally. The role of urban areas in determining whether sustainable development can be achieved or not is crucial, with the world’s urban population more than doubling since 1950, to the point where it now outnumbers the rural population (UNFPA, 2007). The urban population is expected to double again by 2050, whilst the rural population is expected to remain stagnant (UN DESA, 2010). As a result of the growth over the last sixty years, over fifty percent of the world’s human population now lives on less than three percent of the world’s land area, making cities key loci in the challenge for sustainable development (Earth Institute, 2005).

The built form of cities is a major contributor to their ability to function sustainability (Jabareen, 2006). Contemporary urban growth patterns have resulted in urban areas that are characterised by low densities, highly segregated land uses and design features that promote car dependency – a phenomenon recognised as urban sprawl. Of particular concern in these sprawled cities is the loss of surrounding natural land, as urban development spreads into previously productive or environmentally significant land, as well as increasing concerns about the environmental effects of automobile emissions, particularly in relation to climate change. Managing growth of urban areas through planning processes is recognised as one way that urban sustainability can be improved (Parysek, 2007).
Normative planning movements such as smart growth and new urbanism have provided a theoretical basis for the management of urban growth in order to realise sustainable urban forms. However, the implementation of these theories has not resulted in the sustainable development of urban areas. Pollard (2000) recognises that the way in which these theories are implemented through governance and planning processes has a significant effect on the ability of development outcomes to achieve sustainability. A new approach to governance is recognised as being vital in improving the ability of planning processes to achieve sustainable development of urban areas, as proposed by planning theories. The integration of a wide range of actors and their knowledge within decision-making processes provides for a more holistic understanding of issues, and can help achieve development outcomes better reflective of the principles of sustainable development. A new approach to governance for urban growth management also calls upon more appropriate geographic scales for governance, arguing that traditional abstract political boundaries are often inappropriate for the issues they are dealing with.

1.2 Research Context

Whilst the majority of future urban population growth will be in the developing world, the per-capita rates of resource consumption of developing cities are paled by those in the developed world (Haughton & Hunter, 1994). For this reason, it is critical that the sustainability of cities in the developed world is improved. New Zealand is a developed and highly urbanised country, with more than 85 percent of the population living in urban areas (DPMC, 2003). The population of New Zealand is projected to grow from 4.37 million at present, to almost 5.5 million by 2050, with the vast majority of this growth being in urban areas (Stats NZ, 2007, 2010).

Figure 1.1 shows the location of the main urban areas, including the case study site of Christchurch, within New Zealand. The Greater Christchurch sub-region is the largest urbanised area in the South Island of New Zealand, encompassing 1,426 square kilometres (GCUDS, 2007). With an estimated population of 414,000 in 2006 it is the third largest urban area in New Zealand by population (GCUDS, 2007). The population of the sub-region is projected to grow to over 500,000 by 2026, and to almost 550,000 by 2041 (GCUDS, 2007). Significant growth pressures for residential development on the periphery of the city over the 1990’s, combined with the existing planning practices, resulted in outward expansion of the city. In the early 2000’s the local authorities of the sub-region
recognised that the sprawling pattern of growth was unsustainable, and that planning practices needed to change in order to accommodate the expected growth sustainably.

![Map of New Zealand’s Key Urban Areas, including Christchurch](image)

**Figure 1.1: Map of New Zealand’s Key Urban Areas, including Christchurch**  
(adapted from Google, 2010)

### 1.3 Research Problem

Urban growth management provides the ability to direct the spatial growth of urban areas towards sustainable development. However, it is recognised that traditional governance structures and processes do not adequately provide for the effective implementation of urban growth management processes and that a new approach is needed.

The objective of the current research is to undertake a review of how urban growth management processes are provided for in New Zealand. From this, it aims to make recommendations based upon international literature and case study analysis, as to how the planning framework could be improved to better facilitate sustainable urban growth.
management. To achieve this, it answers three specific research questions, as outlined in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question One</th>
<th>How does New Zealand’s planning framework provide for urban growth management processes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question Two</td>
<td>How have urban growth management processes been governed in the Greater Christchurch sub-region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question Three</td>
<td>What lessons can be learnt from how urban growth management processes have been governed in Greater Christchurch, including lessons for New Zealand’s planning framework for urban growth management?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first research question examines the planning framework for urban growth management in New Zealand. It seeks to find out how urban growth management processes and tools are established within New Zealand. The second question assesses the interpretation of the planning framework in the Greater Christchurch sub-region. It seeks to find out how a new approach to governance of urban growth management can be implemented under New Zealand’s planning framework. Finally, the third question assesses what lessons can be learnt from how urban growth management has been governed in the Greater Christchurch sub-region. It identifies areas where New Zealand’s planning framework can be improved to better facilitate the new approach to governance, needed for sustainable development.

1.4 Thesis Structure

This report is divided into seven chapters, including this introductory chapter. The present chapter identified the nature of the research problem, and in doing this has provided an overview of the breadth of literature outlined and the methodological approach adopted for the current research. The remainder of this thesis is structured to resemble the research process.

Chapter Two, ‘Literature Review’, identifies the theoretical basis for this research, providing an overview and critique of contemporary academic discourse of the subjects of sustainable development, urban growth management and governance. It establishes that urban growth management has an important role in steering the development of urban areas towards more sustainable futures. It also recognises that sustainable development
requires a new approach to how it is governed, and interrogates debates about what a new approach to the governance of urban growth management processes should entail. Chapter Three, ‘Research Methodology,’ describes and justifies the research methodology, including the theoretical framework, research methods and data analysis techniques used in this research. Chapter Four, ‘Planning Framework,’ answers Research Question One by establishing how New Zealand’s planning framework provides for the governance of urban growth management processes. Chapter Five, ‘Practice,’ answers Research Question Two by presenting the results to a case study of urban growth management practice in the Greater Christchurch sub-region. Chapter Six, ‘Lessons,’ answers Research Question Three, by discussing how New Zealand’s planning framework affects the ability of local government to implement a new approach to governance of urban growth management. It identifies and proposes potential responses to the failures of New Zealand’s planning framework to provide for such an approach. The final chapter, ‘Conclusions,’ provides succinct concluding comments to the research. It draws together the key findings of the research, and suggests future research opportunities.
2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter identifies and justifies the theoretical basis for the current research by providing a review of academic discourse surrounding the subjects of sustainable development, urban growth management and governance. The review is intended to inform the current study by exploring research in the relevant fields and by developing a greater understanding of the concepts that form the basis of this research.

The first section of the chapter explores the concept of sustainable development. It outlines the history of the concept and its key principles. It identifies that despite a wide acceptance of the sustainable development paradigm, the realisation of its goals has not occurred. This disjuncture between theory and practice is evident in urban growth management. The second section of the chapter identifies the importance of urban growth and urban form as a development issue that must be at the core of responses to the demand for sustainable development. It explores urban growth management theories, and identifies that despite wide discourse and awareness, the implementation of urban growth management processes has failed to adequately provide the outcomes promised. The third section interrogates issues of governance, in relation to sustainable development, and urban growth management. It identifies the need for a new approach to governance of urban growth management processes in order for sustainable development to be achieved in urban areas. From this it explores arguments for a new approach, specifically research on integrated governance and new concepts of geographic scale. The final section ties the chapter together, and establishes the theoretical basis for the current research.
2.2 Sustainable Development

Sustainable development is a concept that has become ubiquitous and increasingly influential across academic discourse and at all levels of political decision-making over the previous two decades, especially within the developed world. Since the publication of the Brundtland Report in 1987, the concept of sustainable development has become a global paradigm for creating a better future for the world economically, socially and environmentally. This section will outline how the concept emerged and rose to this position. It will then outline how the concept is understood in the context of this thesis. Lastly, it will identify concerns within the literature about the failure of sustainable development to be realised.

2.2.1 History of Sustainable Development

Since the 1960s a widespread recognition of environmental issues of global scale, such as ozone depletion and climate change, has grown (Dresner, 2008a; Vos, 2007). From this, an international environmental movement of scientists, academics, decision-makers and the general public has evolved. The movement has been evidenced in street protests, non-government organisation activity, increased environmental awareness in production and consumption patterns, and the growth of green politics. It has had the effect of directing the attention to the visible increase in the rate and scale of changes to the environment caused by the ever-expanding human population and global economy.

Key moments signalling the mainstreaming of environmental concerns into decision-making include the 1972 Club of Rome report, Limits to Growth, the 1987 United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development report Our Common Future, and the Rio Declaration, signed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992. Limits to Growth is recognised as one of the most significant antecedents to the concept of sustainable development (Basiago, 1995; Vos, 2007; Wheeler & Beatley, 2009). It demonstrated that the rate of growth in resource use and environmental degradation could not continue on its existing path indefinitely without unanticipated consequences that would undermine both economic growth and quality of life (Vos, 2007). As a result of such awareness of environmental issues, the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development was formed in 1983. In 1987 the Commission produced the report Our Common Future, more commonly known as the Brundtland Report. The Brundtland Report is widely regarded as being instrumental in the
advancement of the concept of sustainable development and led to the adoption of sustainable development as a key concept at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (also known as the Earth Summit) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 internationally (Dresner, 2008a; Zovanyi, 2008). The conference saw more than 120 countries recognise sustainable development as the most important economic and environmental policy for the 21st century by signing the Rio Declaration and subsequently adopting Agenda 21. The Rio Declaration consisted of 27 principles intended to provide a framework for sustainable development globally, whilst Agenda 21 provided an action plan for the implementation of sustainable development at national and local levels.

Sustainable development is positioned as an improvement upon traditional development processes, which involved the largely un-restrained growth and advancement of society. The following section will interrogate the concept of sustainable development further, and provide an overview of how sustainable development is understood in the context of this thesis.

### 2.2.2 The Sustainable Development Paradigm

Despite the ubiquity of the term, there is significant contestation over what sustainable development actually means (Breheny, 1991; Dresner, 2008a; Tanguay et al., 2010; Vos, 2007). Numerous understandings and definitions of the concept exist, with the most often cited definition coming from the Brundtland Report, which defines sustainable development as:

> “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”

(WCED, 1987).

However popular, this definition has been widely criticised for being vague and non-operational (for example: Dresner, 2008b and Tanguay et al., 2010). Such ambiguity has also been lauded by others, such as Dresner (2008a), Redclift (1991) and Vos (2007) who regard this as its strength, and recognise that establishing the meaning of sustainable development is not about finding a definition that everyone can agree upon, but rather agreeing upon the values that would underlie any definition.

By assessing sustainable development at this broader level, the concept clearly represents a significant paradigm shift. It is a concept that comprehensively rejects the unrestrained
growth that has been the dominant behaviour of the global socio-economic system since the industrial revolution (Meadows, Randers & Meadows, 2004; Vos, 2007). As a normative theory, it seeks to replace this behaviour with “a new philosophy in which the principles of futurity, equity, global environmentalism and biodiversity guide decision-making” (Basiago, 1995:109).

The sustainable development paradigm recognises that the answer to resource and environmental related issues is not simply a choice between development and conservation, or growth and non-growth (Vos, 2007). In this sense it differs from the concept of sustainability, as it recognises the social need for development alongside the ecological need for environmental sustainability (Dresner, 2008a; Zovanyi, 2008). The apparent paradox of combining environmental sustainability and economic and social development has been identified by sceptics of sustainable development such as Blowers (1992) and Zovanyi (2008:418), who calls the belief in sustainable development a “moronic oxymoron”. Such arguments contend that continued growth and development does not meet the sustainability criteria of being able to continue indefinitely. Despite this, the sustainable development paradigm accepts that a zero growth approach is impossible to implement in a situation where society continues to progress and evolve. Instead it prescribes a holistic and integrative approach to development, integrating these potentially irreconcilable principles (Parysek, 2007).

This integrated and holistic approach is reflected across the literature surveyed, which displayed a wide recognition of three dimensions or pillars of sustainable development; economy, society and environment (Tanguay et al., 2010). These are sometimes referred to as the three ‘E’s’ or economy, equity and ecology (Ayre & Callway, 2005; Vos, 2007). A fourth dimension, cultural, is sometimes also mentioned. Figure 2.1 shows a common visualisation of how the three commonly identified dimensions of sustainable development are inter-related, and how all three must co-exist in a sustainable manner in order for sustainable development to occur. This recognises that sustainable development requires an equitable society, a viable economy and a liveable environment, which as yet, are unobtained goals for the vast majority of the world’s population.

Alongside the integration of environmental, social and economic dimensions, is the principle of futurity (Basiago, 1995; Lafferty, 2004a). Sustainable development recognises that development must not only advance an equitable society, a viable economy and a
liveable environment for present generations, but must have a long-term temporal scale and consider the ability of future generations to achieve those goals also.

![Figure 2.1: Dimensions of Sustainable Development (adapted from Tanguay, et. al., 2010)](image)

Despite the difficulties in finding an exact definition for the term, the principles of a holistic, integrated approach, with a long-term outlook have been broadly accepted as the basis of the sustainable development paradigm. The paradigm has become a powerful framework for viewing economic, social and environmental development. Moving from this acceptance of the concept to its realisation, however, has proved an even greater difficulty.

### 2.2.3 Moving from Paradigm to Realisation

The sustainable development paradigm has been successful in terms of gaining the attention of governments, businesses, community groups and the wider public within the developed world (Blowers, 1992). It has also successfully challenged the long held understanding of nature as being a resource of raw materials for the human economy. However, despite the widespread awareness and acceptance it has found, it has failed to
advance to the realisation of its ideals. The concept quickly sank down the international agenda following the Earth Summit in Rio, 1992, and although strategies have been established at various levels, implementation has been insufficient and inadequate (Dresner, 2008b; Vos, 2007).

Where sustainable development is being implemented, it is largely happening at the local level and being driven by communities and the private sector (Vos, 2007). The lack of implementation of the sustainable development paradigm, at national and international levels, has been identified as a critical failure, because leadership and action are required at these levels to provide support to community and private sector efforts and to give power and momentum to the paradigm (Vos, 2007). Planning and coordination of development is a key role of governments (Parysek, 2007). This is especially so in the case of sustainable development, due to the need for integration of the management of social, economic and environmental dimensions of development, a process which requires involvement of a variety of sectors and actors.

The failure of governance structures and processes to facilitate and implement sustainable development can be explained by a failure to fully accept the need to reprioritise the three dimensions to an equal footing (Basiago, 1995; Dresner, 2008a). Economic development is still given disproportionate weight in decision-making. This means that the majority of the implementation of sustainable development to date has been economic development that happens to advance environmental sustainability as opposed to a shift in governance or decision-making, or in the overall development framework (Lafferty, 2004b). Prevailing economic and political ideologies are still based around trust in the market, which has an obsession with economic growth. For example, governments still use economic indices such as Gross Domestic Product as a measure of their success, as opposed to more holistic indices such as Sustainable Development Indicators proposed by Tanguay et al. (2010). The political reality of giving economy primacy in development precludes implementation of sustainable development.

The above section has outlined the history and concept of sustainable development, and outlined the failure of the concept to move from paradigm to realisation. It shows that despite the widespread acceptance of the sustainable development paradigm, progress towards achieving its goals has been lacking. By adopting a critical approach this thesis aims to interrogate issues related to realising the ideals of sustainable development, and
contribute to the knowledge surrounding this. It seeks to contribute towards the knowledge about closing the gap between theory and practice within urban growth management.

The following section introduces urban environments as crucial spaces in the challenge of achieving sustainable development. It focuses on the process of urban growth as a crucial area where the sustainable development paradigm must be implemented in order to advance progress towards its overall goals. It discusses how contemporary urban growth patterns fail to satisfy the principles of sustainable development and how urban growth management and planning theories have attempted to respond to such a challenge. It also addresses the disjuncture between theory and practice within urban growth management.

2.3 Urban Growth

Urban growth is an increase in the population of an urban area (UNFPA, 2007). It occurs through two main processes; urbanisation (rural to urban migration) and internal population growth. Whilst urban growth has occurred since human settlement was first established, it has accelerated significantly over the previous century. Whilst just 13 percent of the global population was urbanised in 1900, this has increased to the point where, in 2008 the urban population outnumbered the rural population for the first time (Cities Alliance, 2007; Delic & Kincl, 2008; UNFPA, 2007). Not only did the urban share of the population increase dramatically over the last century, but it occurred alongside a rapid increase in the total population. The global urban population will continue to grow for the foreseeable future, with almost 5 billion people, or two-thirds of the population, predicted to be living in urban areas by 2030, compared to 3.3 billion and half as of 2008 (Delic & Kincl, 2008; UNFPA, 2007). The majority of this growth is predicted to occur in small to medium sized cities with populations under 500,000 (UNFPA, 2007). Whilst the developing world has the highest urban growth rates, urban areas in the developed world are continuing to grow also, and they are inherently more unsustainable, especially in terms of per-capita resource use (Haughton & Hunter, 1994).

With over half of the global population, and thus a significant majority of global resource consumption and pollutant and waste production, being located on less than three percent of earths’ land surface, urban areas present perhaps the most important loci for the challenge of sustainable development (Breheny, 1992; Earth Institute, 2005; Lunday, 2003). Breheny (1992) identified that as far back as the Rio Summit, there was a growing realisation that the sustainable development debate had an urban focus, stating;
“The world’s cities are the major consumers of natural resources and the major producers of pollution and waste. Thus, if cities can be designed and managed in such a way that resource use and pollution are reduced, then a major contribution to the solution of the global problem can be achieved.”

2.3.1 Urban Form and Sustainability

The importance of cities in meeting the challenge of sustainability is recognised by the breadth of literature on sustainable cities and sustainable urban development (for example, Breheny (1992b), Jabareen (2006) and Newton (2000)). Within this literature, the significance of how urban growth is accommodated spatially is widely recognised (Jabareen, 2006; Jenks, Burton & Williams, 1996; Lunday, 2003; Newton, 2000; UNFPA, 2007). Newton (2000:53) found in an empirical study of urban form that “urban form does matter” in terms of the sustainability of cities. Similarly, Lunday (2003:169) expresses the link between physical urban form and sustainability by stating; “form is function”. The form and direction of future urban growth, as well as the way in which land is divided, utilised and organised are all critical for economic growth, quality of life and environmental viability (Lunday, 2003). Thus, the rate of urban growth and where and how such growth is accommodated spatially has significant implications for the potential of urban growth to achieve sustainable development (UNFPA, 2007). Urbanisation and urban growth have the potential to be positive processes in terms of environmental, economic and social sustainability (UNFPA, 2007). However, the way in which the processes are currently occurring does not promote sustainable development.

Concerns about the nature of urban growth and development patterns existed prior to the development of contemporary urban growth patterns. Thomas Malthus’ (1798) An Essay on the Principle of Population, Ebenezer Howard’s (1902) Garden Cities of To-morrow and Lewis Mumford’s (1938) The Culture of Cities criticised rapid population growth and urbanisation during and following the industrial revolution. These arguments reflect a perspective that today could arguably resemble sustainable development. Further advancement in technology and the rapid growth of urban areas that occurred during the twentieth century resulted in patterns of development, and urban forms commonly referred to as suburbanisation, or urban sprawl. These development patterns are widely recognised as failing to achieve sustainable development and the problems associated with such growth patterns and their unsustainable nature are widely recognised across the literature surveyed (Breheny, 1992; Brueckner, 2000; Duany & Plater-Zyberk, 2008; Jenks, Burton & Williams, 1996).
Suburbanisation offers individuals the attainment of the cultural aspiration of the ‘suburban dream’, to live in a low-density environment with a stand-alone house and a garden (Parysek, 2007; UNFPA, 2007). Achieving this dream was made possible by a number of factors, including rising affluence and a revolution in transportation, with widespread ownership of motor vehicles, making decentralised living possible (Holcombe, 2001; UNFPA, 2007). A widespread reliance of planning regimes on the market to allocate land use saw the suburban ideal give way to the urban sprawl phenomenon (UNFPA, 2007).

Urban sprawl is the excessive spatial growth of cities, commonly recognised as urban areas growing in size faster than population growth, or low-density outward expansion (Brueckner, 2000). Although space taken up by urban areas has been increasing faster than the urban population itself for two centuries, urban sprawl, understood as contemporary urban growth patterns, began following the Second World War (UNFPA, 2007). Between 2000 and 2030 the urban population is expected to increase by 72 percent (UNFPA, 2007). If this growth is accommodated spatially under contemporary growth patterns, urban areas will be expected to increase in size by 175 percent (UNFPA, 2007).

Whilst suburbanisation or urban sprawl is desirable from an individual perspective, it is widely recognised as an unfavourable growth pattern from a societal perspective (Brueckner, 2000; Holcombe, 2001; Parysek, 2007; UNFPA, 2007). The nature of suburban sprawl, characterised by low densities and segregated land uses, is inherently unsustainable and fails to meet the principles of sustainable development. The problems created by urban sprawl were identified soon after the process began in earnest following the Second World War. Jacobs (1961), being one of the first, focussed primarily on the social and economic costs of sprawl. Over time, as environmental awareness grew and the concept of sustainable development arose, criticism of the sprawl pattern of urban growth grew to encompass the environmental costs of the process. Today urban sprawl is criticised for a number of reasons, spanning the three dimensions of sustainable development identified earlier; social, economic and environmental.

Perhaps one of the most criticised aspects of urban sprawl in relation to spatial growth, and an area where it fails to meet the liveable environment principal of sustainable development, is the loss of productive farmland, open space and ecologically significant areas, that occurs when urban areas expand outwards (Brueckner, 2000; Holcombe, 2001; Jabareen, 2006; Parysek, 2007; UNFPA, 2007). Brueckner, (2000), Holcombe, (2001),
Parysek (2007) and Jabereen (2006) also identify sprawl to be environmentally unsustainable due to increased transport emissions and air pollution that result from the dependency on private motor vehicle transport, created by segregation of land uses. These concerns have risen significantly over the past two decades as concerns about climate change have risen. Urban sprawl patterns of development also fail to promote a viable economy due to the additional costs they impose on authorities, in construction and maintenance of infrastructure, and additional costs to households due to owning and operating (often multiple) motor vehicles (Holcombe, 2001; Parysek, 2007). Lastly, it is recognised that sprawl patterns fail to promote an equitable society, as they reduce social interaction, lead to inner city decline, cause marginalisation by class and ethnicity and limit access to cultural, social and entertainment services and facilities due to the segregation of land uses and creation of car dependency (Brueckner, 2000; Holcombe, 2001; Parysek, 2007).

As could be expected there is some scepticism and outright disagreement with arguments against sprawl. Holcombe (2001) argued that studies on the costs and benefits of sprawl have been summarised and show that there is little factual basis for many claims. He stated that evidence that sprawl has a significant negative effect on society, economy and environment is limited. He argues that, given such disagreement exists, and finding consensus on political and regulatory responses to sprawl is problematic, market-based approaches are the best approach to be taken. It has been widely identified, however, that urban sprawl occurs due to the allocation of land being governed by competition in the market. For cities to grow spatially, land must be bought for development at a price that is set by the market. If land is successfully bought for urban development in the market place, it means that the land is worth more in urban use than in agricultural use. Brueckner (2000) and Parysek (2007) identify this as a market failure due to the failure to allocate resources in a socially desirable manner and the externalities it creates; the costs identified above that it places on society as a whole. It also represents a failure of society and planning structures in particular to address market externalities.

The need to manage urban growth was one of the primary reasons for the emergence of the planning profession (Couch, Leontidou & Arnstberg, 2007; Dierwechter, 2008). Recognition of the negative social, economic and environmental consequences of sprawl and the failure of the market and planning regimes to address the drivers and impacts of
these consequences led to the development of planning and public-policy responses collectively known as urban growth management (Janssen-Jansen, 2005).

2.3.2 Urban Growth Management

Urban growth management initiatives arose as a response to the urban sprawl pattern of development, and aim to guide where development should and should not occur, and in some cases also guide the pace of growth (Benfield, Terris & Vorsanger, 2001a). There are a wide range of normative models and theories of urban growth management that attempt to eliminate growth patterns detrimental to the public interest. Dierwechter (2008) found that these are often largely context specific, constituted by the geographic, political and historic context of the place in question. However, many of these theories incorporate the ideals of sustainable development. Like sustainable development, urban growth management recognises the fault with a zero or no growth philosophy and realises that growth will continue to occur regardless. As a result it seeks to steer urban growth patterns towards outcomes that better meet the needs of society through balancing economic, social and environmental needs (Dierwechter, 2008; Parysek, 2007).

A wide range of planning tools and regulations have been used by authorities in varying contexts as part of urban growth management measures. These include, but are not limited to; urban growth boundaries that define clear limits as to the areas that can be developed; targeted provision of infrastructure, services and funding by authorities to make certain areas more attractive for development than others; strict zoning ordinances to prevent development in particular areas, and; requirements for comprehensive, integrated plans at local level of government (Benfield, Terris & Vorsanger, 2001a; Dierwechter, 2008; Parysek, 2007). Each of these growth management tools has a significant range of academic discourse related to them, however, of more relevance to the present research are the theories and principles that inform decisions to choose such tools, and the structures and processes to implement them by. The most dominant contemporary theories or to do this are the smart growth and new urbanism movements.

Smart Growth

By the 1990s urban growth management theories in the United States had expanded to include sustainable development and sustainability issues under the ‘smart growth’ banner (Dierwechter, 2008; Zovanyi, 2008). Smart growth is more of a movement of planning theorists and practitioners than a concrete theory of urban growth management. This means
that a definition for smart growth remains elusive. This is reflected in the fact that the smart growth movement has captured a large part of the urban growth management agenda in the United States, to the extent where it can now be hard to distinguish smart growth from other facets of urban growth management, especially when it intersects with sustainable development and regionalism (Dierwechter, 2008). Because of this, the exact features that distinguish smart growth from sprawl vary from place to place (Benfield, Terris & Vorsanger, 2001b).

Whilst it might be hard to pinpoint where the concept begins and finishes, an overarching goal of the smart growth movement arises from academic literature and smart growth practices evaluated. This is the aim of achieving balanced socio-economic development through renewal of existing urban areas and controlled spatial expansion where necessary, whilst reducing car dependency, enabling infrastructure and service provision to be more affordable and efficient, and increasing living conditions and quality of life (Parysek, 2007; Zovanyi, 2004). To achieve these goals there are a number of planning or regulatory actions and policies that shape the smart growth movement. These include; mixing land uses; designing compact neighbourhoods; planning walkable communities; providing housing choice; fostering community identity and sense of place; preserving open space, farmland and critical environmental areas; directing development towards existing communities; providing transportation choice, including public transportation; making development decisions predictable, fair and cost-effective, and; encouraging community and stakeholder participation in development decisions (Benfield, Terris & Vorsanger, 2001a; Dierwechter, 2008; Zovanyi, 2004).

**New Urbanism**

To some, such as Dierwechter (2008), the most comprehensive expression of the principles of smart growth is the movement known as new urbanism. Others, such as Parysek (2007) acknowledge the similarities between the two, but recognise the distinctions, that New Urbanism is more normative, more practical in attitude, and more implementation orientated.

Like the smart growth movement, new urbanism has emerged over the last two decades in response to the problems related with sprawl. It too seeks to address the social, economic and environmental costs of contemporary urban growth patterns, although through a more thorough focus on urban form and design (Benfield, Terris & Vorsanger, 2001a;
Dierwechter, 2008). It offers an architectural and design philosophy that promotes a neo-traditional neighbourhood design, incorporating many of the concepts of built form and community, as emphasised by Jacobs (1961), whilst attempting to integrate components of modern life (Benfield, Terris & Vorsanger, 2001a; Lunday, 2003). New urbanism seeks to place urban form and design at the same level of other planning theories and attempts to make it influence planning practice more so than it does presently (Dierwechter, 2008). It also suggests normative design solutions to the problems resulting from sprawl, promoting densities that provide for the efficient provision of infrastructure, including public transport and mixed land-uses that enable diverse, walkable neighbourhoods. Ultimately, new urbanism promotes a return to the urban forms that were built prior to the advent of urban sprawl (Benfield, Terris & Vorsanger, 2001a; Dierwechter, 2008).

A central new urbanist critique of contemporary urban growth processes is that current planning regulations need to be restructured. New urbanists argue that sprawl is not merely a product of the market, but of how the state and non-state actors actively shape development patterns through planning processes and regulations. This is reflected in the Charter of the New Urbanism which promotes the “[r]estructuring of public policy and development practices to support physical solutions to the problems related to urban sprawl” (Congress for the New Urbanism, 2001). Despite the multi-level focus of the new urbanism movement, much of the implementation, and thus understandably focus and criticism, has been on isolated private-sector developments at neighbourhood and site levels (Wheeler, 2002).

2.3.3 Critique of Urban Growth Management

Whilst there has been significant enthusiasm for urban growth management, there has also been much controversy and critique. Libertarian and freedom arguments despise growth management as an attack on the suburban dream and individual choice (O'Toole, 2004). These arguments are largely rejected within the sustainable development paradigm, on the basis that sustainable development requires intervention in market-led development processes and accepts that there needs to be a change in lifestyles. The more substantive criticism of urban growth management is that despite both smart growth and new urbanist principles being adopted in developments, they have largely failed to achieve results that address the challenge of sustainable development, and that urban growth is continuing to develop in the form of urban sprawl (Parysek, 2007). Many of the critiques or failures of
urban growth management can be recognised as failures of implementation, with most being focussed on single developments as opposed to the regional scale proposed. This reflects Vos’ (2007) finding that most implementation of sustainable development paradigm is occurring at the local level. This is seen to be due to the single area focus of implementation, and the failure for the concepts to be applied at the regional level (Wheeler, 2002).

Growth management is criticised for failing to achieve economic dimension of sustainable development. The cost of public transportation infrastructure is criticised by O’Toole (2004) who calculated that in Portland, Oregon, perhaps the most oft-cited example of successful urban growth management, light rail infrastructure provision costs 25 times more per passenger mile than provision of highways. Similarly, it has been argued that urban growth boundaries in Portland have contributed to rapidly rising housing costs, reducing housing affordability from one of the highest in the country to one of the lowest (Holcombe, 2001; O’Toole, 2004).

This is also one of the main arguments of those who highlight the inability of growth management to achieve the social dimension of sustainable development. The reduction in housing affordability excludes the poor and minority groups, from the most popular and desirable housing and travel options (single family homes and private automobile transport). Similarly new urbanist developments, such as the often cited Poundbury, United Kingdom, and Seaside, United States, have been criticised for failing to include an adequate mix of housing types, and thus socio-economic diversity (Grant, 2005). Pollard (2000) argues that smart growth and new urbanism preserves the good life for those who can afford it, whilst denying it to those who cannot. This is particularly so due to the reliance upon the profit motivated private sector in driving development.

The failures of urban growth management to achieve the economic and social dimensions of sustainable development are also reflected in questionable environmental outcomes. For example, O’Toole (2004) reports that no reduction of car use has been evidenced in Portland, and rather, that over the 1990’s per capita driving actually increased. Grant (2005) and Newman (2008) found that much of the implementation of new urbanism has been occurring on greenfield sites, as developers lead its implementation, building and marketing what they call ‘new urbanist’ developments. They found that this was a failure of planning authorities to own and lead the implementation of new urbanism, rather than a
failure of new urbanism itself. However, where development has been directed to brownfield or urban sites there is often a trade-off between the protection of rural open space at the expense of urban open space, as urban open space is consumed by infill and brownfield development. Brueckner (2000) found that urban growth boundaries alone could not provide for positive environmental outcomes. Whilst growth boundaries cause development to be contained within certain limits, often the densities obtained through infill and brownfield development are not high enough to provide adequate demand for public transport, and often led to increased congestion. The key lesson from this was the need for wider policy and planning tools to be implemented to support the growth boundaries, including policy action to address the market and planning failures that contribute towards urban sprawl in the first place (Brueckner, 2000).

Whilst many critiques show a failure of urban growth management movements to achieve their stated goals in relation to all three dimensions of sustainable development, it is clear that fault does not necessarily lie with the theories themselves, but with their implementation. Thompson-Fawcett and Bond (2003) attribute many of the identified failures of new urbanism to the uncritical manner in which the concept has been adapted into policy and implementation. They show, through the use of three case studies, that the area of theory that is most consistently not achieved in new urbanist developments are process criteria, as opposed to criteria related to the physical structure.

Whilst particular principles of urban growth management are not to be dismissed, critiques of urban growth management highlight that how the implementation process is governed has an even greater influence on the ability to achieve sustainable development. Pollard (2000) argued that despite the popular support smart growth has received, it has proven difficult to make real progress in terms of changing deeply entrenched governance structures and processes that are necessary to implement the normative development that smart growth and new urbanism prescribe. This is confirmed by Gow (2000), who, in an evaluation of urban growth management in the United States, found that governance structures, and decision-making and implementation processes are more critical to the success of urban growth management than particular policies or actions. The importance of governance to achieving sustainable development is also recognised by Parysek (2007) and Blanes (2008).
This section has provided an example of an area of development that has failed to achieve sustainable outcomes despite the adaption of the sustainable development paradigm through urban growth management theories and processes. It explained the urban growth phenomenon, and how urban development poses a key and crucial opportunity for the implementation of sustainable development. It also described how contemporary urban growth patterns, commonly known as urban sprawl are an unsustainable development pattern. It then outlined the major theories within the urban growth management movement that attempt to address the unsustainable nature of contemporary urban growth, and outlined the critiques of these theories. Finally, it presented arguments that attribute the identified disjuncture between urban growth management theory and practice in achieving sustainable development to how their implementation is governed. The following section will interrogate the issue of governance further. It will outline trends and arguments in governance discourses and explore discourses of governance for sustainable development. It will also identify discussions within governance discourses about how to address the disjuncture between theory and practice and the role of the governance within it.

2.4 Governance

Governance is a social process formed by a set of decision-making measures, taken by individuals and public and private institutions with power in relation to the issues being dealt with (Lemos & Agrawal, 2009). Its object is to steer communities away from socially undesirable outcomes (such as urban sprawl) and towards socially desirable outcomes (such as sustainable urban form) (Delmas & Young, 2009; Graham, Amos & T., 2003; Lafferty, 2004a; Parysek, 2007). The way in which governance processes are structured and operate can have a significant effect on how successful the outcomes of decision-making are in terms of achieving their goals (Lafferty, 2004a, 2004b). Governance has the potential to align economy, society and environment, to achieve sustainable development. Thus, how governance processes and planning frameworks for urban growth management are structured and operate can have a significant effect on whether or not sustainable development outcomes can be met. Meadowcroft et. al. (2005) recognised the importance of this, identifying governance as the fourth dimension to the concept of sustainable development. They used the concept of the ‘prism’ of sustainable development (Figure 2.2) to highlight the significance of governance in shaping outcomes for the economy, society and the environment, and to symbolise the relevance of governance for sustainable development.
Discourses of governance for sustainable development are as multifaceted and complex as the notion of sustainable development itself. However, it is clear from analysis of these discourses that traditional governance processes have failed to promote sustainable development. New approaches to governance are required in order to address the significant challenge that implementing the sustainable development paradigm poses (Lemos & Agrawal, 2009). This section will interrogate trends identified across the literature of governance surveyed, and will outline discussions around the new approach to governance that is required for the implementation of the sustainable development paradigm. It will place particular emphasis on governance processes and structures for urban growth management.

2.4.1 Traditional and New Approaches to Governance

Whilst traditional governance processes and institutions have worked well in promoting economic growth and social wellbeing, they lack the capacity to facilitate sustainable development due to its need for a holistic and long-term approach (Albrechts, 2006;
Blowers, 1992; OECD, 2002; Pollard, 2000). As far back as 1987, the Brundtland Report recognised that sustainable development contradicts traditional governance structures, which tend to be “independent, fragmented and working ... with closed decision-making processes” (WCED, 1987:310). Callway (2005:4) called this a “silo mentality.” Such fragmentation of governance processes is incompatible with sustainable development, which requires a holistic approach to decision-making, including the integration of social, economic and environmental dimensions (Albrechts, 2006; Blowers, 1992; Callway, 2005; Dierwechter, 2008; OECD, 2002; Pollard, 2000). The UNFPA (2007), Blowers (1992), Pollard (2000) and the OECD (2002) also recognised a major impediment to sustainable development to be the short length of political cycles, which acts as an incentive to focus on short-term issues. The lack of coordination of policy and decision-making processes amongst sectors and actors, and the short-term focus of many of these processes, has resulted in negative governance outcomes such as poor policy coherence (OECD, 2002). Wheeler (2002) identified such lack of integration amongst actors and levels of governance, and short-term focus, to have led to poor policy coherence in urban growth management, and to have contributed to urban sprawl.

The OECD (2002) and Callway (2005) recognised that the implementation of the sustainable development paradigm creates a significant challenge to governance processes. Doing so will require a shift from compartmentalised and specialised structures and institutions and the development of the capacity to achieve specific priorities and goals under a common umbrella. This is especially relevant for urban growth management, which needs to address issues in a coordinated manner (Callway, 2005; UNFPA, 2007). The shift towards greater collaboration amongst actors is facilitated, and required, due to the major changes in power relations and governance responsibilities that has occurred across the developed world as the neo-liberal economic and political paradigm has been implemented.

A shift from the traditional concept of ‘government’ to the more contemporary concept of ‘governance’ is identified across discourses of governance (Albrechts, 2006; Baker & Eckerberg, 2008a; Berger & Steurer, 2008; Lemos & Agrawal, 2009; Pike, Rodriguez-Pose & Tomaney, 2006). ‘Government’ is considered to be the process of the state, or the formal apparatus of institutionalised power, making policy decisions and implementing them in a closed manner (Lemos & Agrawal, 2009). ‘Governance’ is identified to be a
more open process, involving a wide range of actors from not just the state, but the private and community sectors in policy making and implementation (Albrechts, 2006; Baker & Eckerberg, 2008a; Berger & Steurer, 2008; Lemos & Agrawal, 2009; Pike, Rodriguez-Pose & Tomaney, 2006). Governance is defined by collaboration between these actors and public participation in decision-making.

This shift towards new governance processes has occurred in the last three decades, as part of a wider neo-liberal economic and political paradigm shift in the western world (Albrechts, 2006). Like these wider shifts, it has seen a move away from regulation, towards a market-based approach. It has also seen the introduction of more bottom-up led governance processes as opposed to more traditional top-down approaches (Lafferty, 2004a). As governments decentralise, devolve and privatise governance responsibilities, and as the role of the state has downsized, there has been a shift in power structures. This has resulted in power being dispersed amongst actors within decision-making processes (Baker & Eckerberg, 2008a). This shift in power has been away from the state and towards sub-national governments, regional and local communities, private sector organisations and non-governmental organisations (Graham, Amos & T., 2003; Janssen-Jansen, 2005; Meadowcroft, 2008). It has seen the role of the state shift from being prohibitive and regulative, to a positive steering and conditioning role where the state provides leadership and facilitation for decision-making and policy implementation (Albrechts, 2006; Janssen-Jansen, 2005).

It has been identified that existing governance processes are failing to achieve sustainable development outcomes in urban growth management. Given the economic, social and environmental implications of contemporary urban growth patterns, the absence of good governance processes provides a challenge that needs to be addressed if the challenge of sustainable development is to be met. The remainder of this section will interrogate trends and debates in governance and urban growth management discourses and show that developments in these fields are providing principles for governance of urban growth management that can better achieve sustainable development.

2.4.2 Integration

The shift from government to governance, which has seen the dispersal of power and the expansion of actors within governance processes, has not only promoted integration in decision-making processes, but has required it. The knowledge, resources, initiatives,
Legitimacy, authority and power of actors within governance processes are relied upon to provide effective decision-making outcomes (Meadowcroft, 2008). It is widely recognised within governance and planning discourses that participation of such stakeholders in decision-making and policy implementation can improve outcomes, by promoting integration of knowledge (Blanes, 2008; Callway, 2005; Meadowcroft, Farrell & Spangenberg, 2005; UNFPA, 2007). This results in improved decision-making, promotes better implementation, enhances legitimacy and educates the public (Blanes, 2008; Callway, 2005; Meadowcroft, Farrell & Spangenberg, 2005).

There is currently a large degree of fragmentation, crossover, duplication and conflict over the governance of many issues relating to sustainable development. Ayre and Callway (2005) argue that these problems can only be addressed through greater vertical and horizontal integration of dialogues and decision-making. The issues of vertical integration (integration across international, national, regional and local governance levels) and horizontal integration (integration across the actors on the same level) are discussed widely (Bomberg, 2004; Haughton & Counsell, 2004; Lafferty, 2004a; Lemos & Agrawal, 2009; Meadowcroft, 2008).

Lemos and Agrawal (2009) pointed out that the mere expansion of actors within decision-making does not necessarily make governance systems more democratic, or achieve such improvements in outcomes. How the actors are integrated and engaged with governance systems and processes will affect the ability of the processes to achieve such improvements to a greater degree. Meadowcroft et. al (2005) argued that effective governance processes include mechanisms that encourage adequate representation of stakeholders, the inclusion of different forms of knowledge, deliberative engagement and social learning.

Calabuig, Peris and Ferrero (2009) and Baker (2008a) identified that governance in democratic, pluralistic societies, requires the involvement of all of those who are relevant to a particular issue. Implementation of the sustainable development paradigm, and the management of urban growth, will have far reaching consequences on the lifestyle of the communities who implement it. Thus, with democracy being a central facet of governance in the western world, participation of the general public in decision-making processes is an essential element of governance for sustainable development and urban growth management (Calabuig, Peris & Ferrero, 2009). This was recognised in Agenda 21, which described public participation in decision-making as a “fundamental prerequisite for
the achievement of sustainable development” (Agenda 21 1993:para. 23.2). Arnstien’s (1969) *Ladder of Citizen Participation* has been particularly influential in promoting public participation in planning processes over the last three decades. Bond and Thompson-Fawcett (2007) found that “[i]nclusive and equitable processes are [now] recognised as an ideal in much planning theory and practice…,” including urban growth management movements such as smart growth and new urbanism.

Whilst the Charter for the New Urbanism (Congress for the New Urbanism, 2001) commits new urbanist development to “citizen based participatory planning” the movement is widely lamented for being top-down and for limiting the ability of the public to influence the outcomes of planning processes. Design charettes are a tool commonly used to facilitate public participation in new urbanist developments, but can often be seen as exercises aimed at co-opting support for development rather than a process that will actually affect development outcomes (Thompson-Fawcett & Bond, 2003; Grant, 2005).

Perhaps due to the normative nature of the movement, public participation processes have been shown by Thompson-Fawcett and Bond (2003) and Grant (2005) to usually be consultative rather than effectively engaging the public. This lack of public involvement can potentially have affects on the outcomes of such development. The OECD (2002) recognised that consultation should be adequately linked to decision-making processes, so that it does not become a token effort. It also argued that public participation should not be used as an excuse for states from making the politically tough decisions that implementation of the sustainable development paradigm requires.

On the other hand, Meadowcroft (2004:186) argued that “it is worth remembering that participation is not everything.” The functional benefits of improved knowledge, greater likelihood of successful implementation, enhanced legitimacy and public education must be weighed against other functional elements, particularly cost, time and effectiveness. Resources and effort put into public participation should be reflective of the needs of the particular issue in contention.

The literature has shown that integration of a wide range of actors in governance processes leads to improvements in decision-making outcomes, legitimises the outcomes and educates the public. Lafferty (2004b), Meadowcroft (2004) and Lemos and Agrawal (2009) discussed the need for effective mechanisms to support stakeholder engagement in governance, including a legal framework to provide clear guidelines for consultation.
processes, and resources for coordination and trust and relationship building. Lemos and Agrawal (2009) highlighted that there needed to be a willingness amongst actors to give up some functions and powers that they may have previously treated as their own.

### 2.4.3 Geographic Scale

Few of the issues that governments deal with are neatly contained within their political boundaries. Issues can span international, national, regional or local scales. Some issues affect only particular areas or affect different areas differently. Different communities often have differing views on how issues should be dealt with. There are actors from various geographic scales, from the international scale to the individual scale, playing a part, however significant, in the governance of most issues. This is especially so where a holistic approach, as prescribed by sustainable development paradigm is implemented, including within urban growth management. Despite this, modern democracies divide the work of government between central and sub-national governments. There is usually one geographic scale that dominates the governance structure of particular issues. Brunkhorst (2002) explained that the structure of governance processes should reflect the form and function of the issues that it seeks to control. This has raised debates as to which geographic scale the governance of urban growth management should be led from. It is clear, however, that there is a general consensus that the scale at which urban growth management has been traditionally been governed is out of line with the contemporary form and function of urban areas (for example Wheeler (2002,2009) and the UNFPA (2007)).

The problem as identified by the UNFPA (2007), is that political boundaries of sub-national authorities rarely coincide with the geographic scale that urban areas influence. Cities have a huge impact on their surrounding region, but in most cases do not have responsibility for managing it (Wheeler, 2002). Jurisdictional fragmentation and decentralisation of governance responsibilities has led to the boundaries of local governments being inappropriate for dealing with the drivers and impacts of urban growth. Fragmentation of urban areas brings administrative inefficiencies and is a common reason why growth management decisions are often independent and even contradictory (Wheeler, 2002). Wheeler (2002) identified competition that occurs between authorities for rates and taxes, as being a force that undermines governance of cross-jurisdictional issues, such as urban growth management. Decentralisation of land-use governance mattered far
less in previous decades, where urban areas were more rural and small-town than urban or metropolitan (Brunckhorst, 2002; Calthorpe, 1999; Wheeler, 2002). However, human settlement patterns have evolved over time to a point where cities and metropolitan areas are now the dominant structures. Governance structures have failed to evolve with this trend, creating, as Dierwechter (2008:58) explained, a “massive disjuncture between governance structures … and actual daily lives.”

New regionalists such as Wheeler (2002; 2009), Brunckhorst (2002) and Calthorpe (1999) argue that the economy, society and environment operate on a regional scale. Air and water quality, habitat and farmland preservation, housing and employment markets, patterns of social interaction, transportation networks and basic infrastructure, all reach beyond the scale of city or town, whilst remaining unique to a region (Brunckhorst, 2002; Calthorpe, 1999). New regionalists also recognise city-regions as the fundamental economic unit in the contemporary globalised economy, and thus an appropriate scale for many governance systems. The UNFPA (2007) called upon a new governance system for urban growth management based on a broader notion of space than that imposed by abstract political and administrative boundaries. They proposed the city-region as a useful geographic space and as an “easily understandable starting point in advocating for a more coordinated and effective approach to deal with [urban issues]” (UNFPA, 2007:53).

In response to problems of contemporary urban growth patterns there has been a growing acceptance of the new regionalist argument amongst planning academics and practitioners. For example, Blanes (2008), Evans et. al. (2008), Gow (2000) and Janssen-Jansen (2005) have recognised that regional, or city-region, levels of government are the best levels to govern urban growth management at. Janssen-Jansen (2005:39) stated unequivocally that “resolving sprawl requires regional governance.” Urban growth management movements such as smart growth and New Urbanism reflect the new regionalist argument. The second principle in the Smart Growth Manual, by Duany and Speck (2010:1) is “think globally, act locally, but plan regionally.” As discussed earlier, regionalism is a foundation for many of the principles of New Urbanism. The movement does, however, recognise the varying scales at which planning principles must be implemented; ranging from the building level to streets, neighbourhoods, districts, towns, cities and regions. The Charter for the New Urbanism promotes planning for urban form at the regional level. For example, principle two states;
"The metropolitan region is a fundamental economic unit of the contemporary world. Governmental cooperation, public policy, physical planning and economic strategies must reflect his new reality”

(Congress for the New Urbanism, 2001)

The smart growth movement also argues for a new geographic space for the coordination and implementation of growth management policies and actions – the city-region. This represents the adoption of the new regionalism paradigm that has evolved in discourses of economic development and governance by urban growth management movements (Dierwechter, 2008; Pike, Rodriguez-Pose & Tomaney, 2006). Such aspects of urban growth management have not been implemented and perhaps, understandably, sustainable development has not been achieved.

Berger and Steurer (2008) canvassed literature on multi-level governance, and argue that in the European Union formal authority has been dispersed from nation-states to the supra-national land sub-national scales. Likewise, Lemos and Agrawal (2009) also recognised such shifts in power away from nation-states to the supra- and sub-national levels. However, they argue that the nation-state is still a critical level of governance, containing the capacity of steering and guiding policy and decision-making through framework legislation or strategy implementation, and through the role of the public sector in urban development.

Thus far, this section has summarised discourse of integration and new regionalist arguments within governance literature. From here, it will interrogate discourses on the structure and form of governance that give effect to the new integrated, regional approach needed to effectively implement urban growth management theories.

2.4.4 Structure and Form

Lafferty (2004a, 2004b) explored the relationship between form and function, and found that how governance is structured, shapes processes and thus outcomes. The recognition that governance for sustainable development, especially for urban growth management, needs to integrate and engage a wide range of actors, and should occur as the scale of functional regions, has seen the development of a wide discourse aimed at achieving this outcome. It is clear that new structures and forms of governance are required in order for sustainable development to be achieved (Bomberg, 2004; Delmas & Young, 2009).
It has been identified across the literature that hybrid systems and structures of governance are becoming increasingly common in the attempt to facilitate sustainable development (Bomberg, 2004; Delmas & Young, 2009; Lemos & Agrawal, 2009). This is reflective of the widening of governance to involve actors that were previously outside of policy and decision-making processes. It also recognises that no single actor possesses the capabilities to address the wide-ranging needs of governance for sustainable development. Governance for sustainable development invites new and innovative mechanisms, including those beyond traditional forms of government regulation (Bomberg, 2004). Such structures identified include co-management between the state and communities, public-private partnerships, private-social partnerships and multi-partner governance.

New regionalism promotes, and requires, a wider and more flexible understanding of governance structures (Pike, Rodriguez-Pose & Tomaney, 2006; Wheeler, 2002). Implementing integrative governance processes at the regional or sub-regional level often requires the development or reorganisation of governance structures and institutions. Such reorganisation has been identified as being a difficult shift to make (Wheeler, 2002). New regional planning agencies with broad mandates are unlikely to be created in most places due to political realities, and those that are formed may not be effective in solving many regional problems (Wheeler, 2002). Fundamental political difficulties work against the creation and success of regional governments, including strong opposition from local, state and national government unwilling to give up power, and the hostility of voters. Wheeler (2002) recognised that the established political notion of decentralisation works against the creation of new regional institutions. Pollard (2000) also identified that such institutional resistance to change is reinforced by political pressure from interests that profit from sprawling development patterns and automobile centred transportation systems.

In recognition of the difficulties in establishing a new level of sub-national governance, Wheeler (2002) recognised that coordination of regional goals can, and do occur without a centralised regional government structure. Ad-hoc working groups of governments, operating agreements between municipalities, and sophisticated sets of incentives and mandates between existing levels of government can help co-ordinated public-sector action on issues including growth management (Wheeler, 2002). Meadowcroft (2008) identified the potential for independent, single-purpose regional agencies. The transfer of functions to autonomous actors that work at arms length from existing institutions can provide
advantages such as reducing political interference, freeing decisions from established bureaucratic routines and mind-sets, increasing public confidence and serving as a hedge against changing political priorities (Meadowcroft, 2008). Gow (2000), however, expressed concerns with such autonomous structures, finding that they tend to be less successful than structures with more power and mandate.

Whilst the role of national governments might have changed with the shift of power that has caused the move from government to governance, Lafferty (2004a) and Meadowcroft (2004) argued that it has not decreased in importance. It is evident from the breadth of governance discourses that in fact it has perhaps become more important. A major role of the state is to strive for consensus amongst actors engaged in contemporary governance processes through facilitating collaboration (Albrechts, 2006). The state also has an important role in setting strategic direction, establishing the governance framework, and in leading the implementation of the sustainable development paradigm (Vos, 2007). Lafferty (2004b) established that leadership, and a clear commitment from the highest level of governance, was crucial for the formulation and implementation of sustainable development objectives and strategies. Whilst sustainable development may be realised with strong and persistent political leadership, it will not be realised without it.

Whilst sub-national levels of government such as regions and city-regions are widely considered to be the best level to govern urban growth management at, the national level is still considered to be a critical level of governance. The national level has the capacity to steer and guide policy and decision making through legislating and resourcing planning and governance frameworks. Baker (2008b), Evans et al. (2008) and Gow (2000) recognised that the capacity of sub-national levels of government to effectively govern is in a large part related to the level of autonomy and support granted to those levels from the national level. Gow (2000) found, in his assessment of urban growth management practices in the United States, that empowering authorities at the metro or city-region scale with formal powers and resources, was the best way to develop growth management strategies. Evans et al. (2008:85-86) reinforced this argument, stating that;

“National level legislation and policy priorities are key drivers in the sustainable development field, and although governments may pursue innovative and adventurous policies without central government support, policy capacity may be greater when this support is present.”
The broad consensus amongst literature surveyed was that a top down approach in setting strategy for urban growth management, and a bottom up approach to the technical aspects, was the most appropriate governance framework (Baker & Eckerberg, 2008b; Berger & Steurer, 2008; Blanes, 2008; Evans et al., 2008; Gow, 2000). Such a framework enables common national or international principles to be adapted to the local context, circumstances and demands.

Governance for sustainable development requires clear commitment and leadership, at the national level, and specific institutional mechanisms to steer integration and effective stakeholder participation. Howell-Moroney (2007) evaluated the effects of different growth management approaches in the United States on land development outcomes, and found that only states with strong growth management frameworks have consistent success at altering land development outcomes. He also found that the key element to the success of these states was the state government requiring growth management to be undertaken, and providing auxiliary policy, such as planning tools like urban growth boundaries to the sub-national levels to actually implement through. Likewise, Meadowcroft (2004) argued that governance for sustainable development depends first and foremost on active governments that place sustainable development as a central goal and clearly establish legal and organisational frameworks to facilitate appropriate participation. Lafferty (2004b) argued that effective implementation of the sustainable development paradigm requires an institutional catalyst in charge of leading its implementation, and for it to be located strategically within formal governance structures. He also argued for the establishment of clear frameworks for enforcement and assessment of lower levels and public sector performance towards the nationally set strategy. Khanna and Brouhle (2009) found that the effectiveness of voluntary sustainable development initiatives was mixed, with the majority being largely ineffective in achieving improved outcomes, supporting Lafferty’s (2004b) argument.

The state of Oregon in the United States is the most often cited example across discourses of urban growth management (for example; (Dierwechter, 2008; Holcombe, 2001; Howell-Moroney, 2007; Wheeler, 2002). The Oregon planning framework, first developed in 1972, reflects the mixed top-down/bottom-up structure promoted across the literature. It establishes statewide planning goals as a broad policy framework, under which comprehensive plans are required to be developed by all cities and counties within the
state. Although these plans must comply with the state goals, the framework provides flexibility for local application and implementation. This means that through public participation in planning, planning documents can be reflective of the local communities needs, whilst adhering to state-wide strategy (Dierwechter, 2008; Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, 2008). Similarly, Hawaii, the first state in United States to implement urban growth management processes, divided the state into four zones – urban, rural, agricultural and conservation, and required lower levels of government to zone land within these areas, subject to the restrictions placed upon their zone (Dierwechter, 2008). The state of Florida passed legislation in 1875 to require all local governments to prepare, adopt and implement comprehensive plans, and required vertical, horizontal and internal consistency among state, regional and local plans, a principle which Florida is best known for (Dierwechter, 2008).

How governance structures and processes are shaped can affect their ability achieve sustainable development. It has been recognised that implementing the sustainable development paradigm will require a new approach to governance. A new approach to the governance of urban growth management requires governance structures and processes that promote integration and appropriate geographic scales. This section has interrogated these issues, and discourses discussing how to achieve the implementation of sustainable development through new structures and forms of governance.

4.1 Conclusion and Rationale for the Current Research

This review of sustainable urban development and governance literature has highlighted important aspects for the current research. It recognised that success in implementing the sustainable development paradigm has not followed the success of the paradigm in gaining the attention of governments, businesses, community groups and the wider public within the developed world. This theme was developed further, in the context of urban development, and urban growth management. With the majority of the world’s population living on less than three percent of the world’s land, urban areas were identified as key loci in meeting the challenge of sustainable development (Earth Institute, 2005). The spatial form of urban areas was identified as having a significant effect on the ability of cities to function sustainably. Urban growth management arose as a response to the contemporary and unsustainable, urban growth pattern, urban sprawl. Such processes aim to direct the spatial growth of urban areas towards more sustainable patterns. Urban growth
management theories such as smart growth and new urbanism establish normative models proposing sustainable urban patterns.

As with the wider sustainable development paradigm, the implementation of urban growth management theories has not provided the outcomes they promote. Responsibility for this failure has been placed upon the way in which the implementation processes have been governed. The importance of governance on the implementation of the sustainable development paradigm was outlined. It was shown that traditional approaches to governance fail to promote the integration of actors and knowledge, and do not reflect the correct geographical scale needed for sustainable development. Aspects of a new approach to governance of urban growth management processes were interrogated, and included integration of actors within decision-making processes, stakeholder and citizen participation, new regionalist understandings of geographic space, and the role of the state within governance and planning.

Although the majority of projected urban growth is expected to be in the developing world, cities in the developed world have much higher per-capita resource rates, posing a significant challenge for sustainable development. By investigating how New Zealand’s planning framework provides for the governance of urban growth management processes, this research will address the lack of progress made towards the implementation of the sustainable development paradigm within urban development. The research will assess how New Zealand’s planning framework provides for urban growth management processes, and evaluate urban growth management practice under the current planning framework. It will seek lessons on how New Zealand’s planning framework could best reflect a new sustainable development approach towards governance of urban growth management. From this it will contribute towards addressing the disjuncture between theory and practice, both in terms of ensuring better governance of the implementation of urban growth management, and in the wider respect of implementing the sustainable development paradigm

The following chapter will discuss the strategy adopted for this research. It will outline the methodological approach used, and will discuss the research processes undertaken to examine the themes identified through this review of literature in the field.
3 Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines and justifies the research methodology of this thesis, and how it seeks to address the research aim and objectives identified in Chapter One. To re-iterate, Table 3.1 states the research questions. This chapter begins by discussing the research design, including the qualitative approach taken, the use of a case study and ethical considerations. It also outlines the data collection process, and discusses how the data collected was analysed. The final section of the chapter provides a reflection on the research process and discusses the limitations encountered with the particular methodology adopted.

Table 3.1: Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question One</th>
<th>How does New Zealand’s planning framework provide for urban growth management processes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question Two</td>
<td>How have urban growth management processes been governed in the Greater Christchurch sub-region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question Three</td>
<td>What lessons can be learnt from how urban growth management processes have been governed in Greater Christchurch, including lessons for New Zealand’s planning framework for urban growth management?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Research Design

Figure 3.1 visualises how the current research was designed. The process began with a review of academic literature, which provided a basis for specific research questions. From this, a review of documents establishing the urban growth management framework in the New Zealand context was undertaken. This was followed by a case study of urban growth management practice in the Greater Christchurch sub-region. From here, implications and
lessons for the New Zealand context were provided. These lessons and implications then contributed towards the discourse of governance for urban growth management and sustainable development.

![Figure 3.1: Research Process](image_url)

Even if not explicitly articulated, all research is guided by a set of philosophical assumptions that form a theoretical framework (Kitchen & Tate, 2000). The theoretical framework subscribed to by researchers shapes how they conceptualise their research, and how data is collected, interpreted and reported. It affects the choice of theories, approaches
and methods utilised (Graham, 2005). It is therefore important to understand the theoretical basis from which researchers are coming from in their research, in order to facilitate ones own understanding of that knowledge.

The present research has utilised an interpretive paradigm. An interpretivist approach to research is based upon the understanding and describing of social actions and processes as being socially constructed, and thus created by the researcher. (Davidson & Tolich, 2003c). This is appropriate due to governance being a social process.

### 3.2.1 Qualitative Research

The current research primarily utilises qualitative methods. Qualitative research is described by Sarantakos (1998) as “employing methods of data collection and analysis that are non-quantitative, and aiming towards exploration of social relations, and describ[ing] reality as experienced by respondents” (Sarantakos, 1998:6). Qualitative methodologies adopt a subjective perception of reality and employ a naturalistic type of inquiry. Their central principles are openness, a process-nature towards the research and object, reflexivity of object and analysis, and explication and flexibility (Sarantakos, 2005). The central principles of the qualitative methodology are taken from a relativist orientation, a constructivist ontology and an interpretivist epistemology (Sarantakos, 2005).

Qualitative methodologies are dynamic, focussing on processes and structural characteristics of settings and trying to capture reality in interaction through intense contact in the field (Sarantakos, 2005). A qualitative approach was appropriate for this research because governance is a social process, involving power relations between social actors.

### 3.2.2 A Case Study Approach

Case studies enable an in-depth understanding of complex social phenomena and are common research strategies in both planning and political science (Yin, 2003). They are a particularly relevant research strategies for how and why questions, especially in relation to contemporary phenomena that the researcher has no control over (Yin, 2003). The current research utilised a case study approach, using the Greater Christchurch sub-region as a case study of urban growth management in New Zealand.

Bradshaw and Stratford (2000) advise researchers to choose case studies that are practical and appropriate for their research. The Greater Christchurch sub-region was chosen as a
practical and appropriate case study for the current research for a number of reasons. Firstly, it was a topical and relevant case study within the realm of urban growth management. The Greater Christchurch sub-region offered an example of governance of urban growth management aligned closer to the new approach for sustainable development than how urban growth management was being governed elsewhere in the country. This provided an opportunity to draw conclusions on how governance of urban growth management could incorporate contemporary ideas of urban growth management within the New Zealand context. With a population of 414,000 in 2006, Greater Christchurch represented a city within the size range where the majority of future urban growth is projected to occur (small to medium sized cities with a population under 500,000) (GCUDS, 2007; UNFPA, 2007). Greater Christchurch also presented a case where the spatial extent of the urban area expands over more than one territorial authority area. Finally, Christchurch provided a location that was practical in terms of the time and funding constraints of this research.

3.2.3 Ethical Considerations

The nature of qualitative research allows close contact with participants, which can lead to ethical issues. Sarantakos (2005:13) recognises that “research produces knowledge, and knowledge is power”. Hence control in research means control of power. Power relationships exist between the producers, controllers and consumers of knowledge within research processes. There are particularly evident ethical issues related to this within the current research due to the political nature of the topic – governance. As a result of potential ethical problems, consideration of ethical issues and utilisation of ethical standards are an integral part of research methodologies (Sarantakos, 2005). Thus, the current research was designed around five common principles presented by Davidson and Tolich (2003b). These include; doing no harm; voluntary participation; preservation of participants anonymity and confidentiality; avoiding deceit, and; the faithful analysing and reporting of data. Ethical approval was sought and granted from the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee prior to fieldwork commencing.

All participants in the research participated by their own accord, their participation was entirely voluntary. The details of the research project were explained to all participants before interviews took place, they were made aware that they did not have to answer any question if they were uncomfortable doing so, and they could end the interview at any
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time. This was detailed in an information sheet presented to key informants before their involvement. Written consent was obtained from all participants prior to the interviews commencing (see Appendix A for Information Sheet and Consent Form). All participants were guaranteed personal anonymity and have been made aware that they are eligible to obtain a copy of the results if they wish.

3.3 Data Collection Methods

Researchers draw upon many different perspectives and sources in the course of their work. This is a process known as triangulation; using different bearings to find the correct position (Patton, 1990; Valentine, 2005). Triangulation permits researchers to utilise the strengths of each method to overcome the deficiencies of the others, thus producing more valid and reliable results and recommendations (Patton, 1990; Sarantakos, 2005). Therefore, in order to obtain the most valid data and a comprehensive understanding of issues of governance of urban growth management in New Zealand, a number of methods of information collection were used. Research involved two stages of data collection. Secondary data was used to provide an overview of relevant international literature on relevant topics. It was also used in content analysis of relevant documents, which established the existing framework for urban growth management in New Zealand. The sources of literature included academic books and journals, government and council documents, legislation and online documents. Primary data collection involved semi-structured interviews with selected key informants, and occurred in the Greater Christchurch area over the period of 5 July to 9 July 2010.

3.3.1 Literature Review

The aim of a literature review is “multifaceted”, it states what the research is about, clarifies and organises the research project, and demonstrates the relevance of the project by making connections to an existing body of knowledge (Davidson & Tolich, 2003a:95). A good knowledge of relevant literature is vital for the formulation of the research design, as it provides starting points for thought and highlights areas to investigate (Flowerdew, 2005). The breadth of the current research required an extensive literature review to be conducted. The literature review interrogated issues in relation to the governance and urban growth management, with particular regard to the sustainable development paradigm. The review was significant in providing a contemporary academic grounding of the research problem, and in identifying areas and issues to be investigated in the Greater
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Christchurch context. The literature review was one of the first steps taken in the project and was used to inform the research methods and the development a set of themes and questions that were to be explored in key informant interviews and in secondary research.

3.3.2 Content Analysis

Content analysis is the process of studying the content of documents produced by writers other than the researcher (Sarantakos, 2005). It offers the advantages of being relatively quick, easy and affordable compared to primary research (Sarantakos, 2005). Aside from providing a contextual overview for the research, document analysis was utilised in the current research to help answer research questions. Analysis of relevant data sources such as legislation and policy documents was required in order to establish an understanding of the existing planning and governance framework for urban growth management in New Zealand and to answer research questions. It was particularly relevant to answering research question one, which sought to establish how planning documents, as the codified part of the planning framework, provided for urban growth management processes. Document analysis was also used to help address research question two, which sought to find out how urban growth management processes were governed in Christchurch, by enabling an understanding of the written strategy, action plan and governance arrangements. A descriptive content analysis, aimed at identifying and describing the main content of the relevant documents took place following the review of academic literature. Table 3.2 lists the main sources analysed within the current research.

Table 3.2 Documents Analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Resource Management Act 1991 and related amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government Act 2002 and related amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Transport Management Act 2003 and related amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Law</td>
<td>Auckland Regional Council v North Shore City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runciman Rural Protection Society v Franklin District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZRPG Management Ltd v Western Bay of Plenty District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td>Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (including proposed Change One)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Cabinet Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hansard – New Zealand Parliamentary Debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics New Zealand Census Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope of a National Policy Statement on Urban Design Report by MfE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UDS Forum – Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.3 Key Informant Interviews

Semi-structured interviews with key informants formed the basis of primary data collected in this research. Initial exploratory work provided a comprehension of the breadth of actors within the Christchurch urban growth management governance process and enabled the identification of a number of organisations of potential usefulness. Purposive sampling, identifying information-rich participants was undertaken. This ensured that key informants were on the basis of their experience related to the research topic (Bradshaw & Stratford, 2000; Patton, 1990). The use of purposive sampling reduced the importance of sample size, meaning that a relatively small sample size of nine key informants was sufficient to effectively cover the breadth of the key organisations involved in the governance of urban growth management in Greater Christchurch (Patton, 1990).

Prospective key informants were approached by email and asked to participate in the study. Appendix B outlines the email that was sent to key informants alongside the information sheet. The organisations represented by key informants in this research are listed in Table 3.3. Interviews took place in environments of the key informants choice, predominantly their workplaces, and at a time that was suitable for them. This provided a setting that was non-threatening to the key informants and helped facilitate a more relaxed conversation. Interviews were recorded using a Dictaphone.

Table 3.3 Organisations and Positions Represented by Key Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Implementation Manager</th>
<th>Christchurch City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Transport Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semi-structured interviews were valuable in answering research questions two and three, enabling in-depth interrogation of issues and concepts. The use of semi-structured interviews enabled predetermined questions to be posed to the key informants, at the same time as allowing for flexibility in the way that issues were addressed and how the interview proceeded (Dunn, 2000). This format allowed key informants to respond in their own terms, and to address areas that had not previously been considered. To ensure that the data collected was relevant to the objectives of the current research an interview guide was
developed. This consisted of a number of central themes that were to be covered in the interview and is appended as Appendix C. Following initial data analysis, it was planned that follow-up questioning would occur with a number of key informants, in order to further develop and interrogate key concepts and findings. However, as discussed in the limitations section, this could not occur.

3.4 **Data Analysis**

The aim of data analysis is to search for “patterns and regularities in the data collected” (Davidson & Tolich, 2003b:154) It is undertaken to make sense of the information collected and to identify the knowledge and meaning contained in that information. Davidson and Tolich (2003b) identified three steps to data analysis; data reduction, data organisation and data interpretation. Sarantakos (2005) suggested, however, that while there are three steps to data analysis, they are not entirely independent of each other. Thus, as the data was being collected it was also being reflected upon, analysed and helping to steer the direction of the future of the research.

The key informant interviews and wide document analysis resulted in a large amount of raw data. Data reduction involved reducing the vast volumes of data collected into a more manageable form (Davidson & Tolich, 2003b). The first steps of data reduction occurred while still in the field, with the raw data collected in interviews (audio recordings) being transcribed using Express Scribe and Microsoft Word. Transcripts of initial interviews were analysed, enabling emerging themes to be built upon in further interviews, and for interviews to be steered away from irrelevant themes and topics. Secondary data was reduced by only drawing upon the most relevant aspects of the documents analysed, and recording the themes and excerpts electronically and physically.

Data organisation is the organisation of information around themes (Davidson & Tolich, 2003b). A list of themes was developed from those that had emerged from the literature and from initial impressions of the interview transcripts. From this a process of coding began. Concepts and key quotes from interview transcripts were ascribed relevant codes and amalgamated into lists and matrices of similarly coded data. Information collected through document analysis was similarly organised.

Data interpretation is the use of organised data to draw conclusions (Davidson & Tolich, 2003b). Coded data was deconstructed, summarised into themes and mind-mapped into
working concepts. The patterns and regularities identified through the organisation of the data collected were used to draw conclusions and make recommendations. Further support for the conclusions and recommendations was gained from reference to existing academic literature in order to provide support for the findings and argument. Data was presented in three chapters based upon the research objectives. Information was presented within these chapters by the use of quotes, tables and figures.

3.5 Reflections and Limitations

The research design and methods outlined above were chosen as the most appropriate means of addressing the aim and objectives of the current research in light of the context and available resources. Although every effort was made to ensure the reliability and accurateness of the methodological approach taken, a number of limitations and difficulties encountered during the research are apparent. It is an important part of critical reflexivity that they are identified and acknowledged so that they can be addressed, and so that readers of this thesis are aware of them.

Qualitative methodologies have been criticised for not being reliable, representative, generalisable or objective enough (Sarantakos, 2005). Qualitative research does not provide objectivity, meaning that the quality of findings can be questionable. The degree of accuracy of results derived from qualitative research is not as high as those derived from quantitative research. This is especially so with the use of semi-structured interviews, which rely upon the researchers interpretations of what key informants are saying. There is no way of ensuring that the researcher fully and correctly captures the true meanings of respondents. Also, because qualitative research does not produce representative results, generalising the findings is difficult. These limitations were identified before choosing the research methods, and so were well known prior to the commencement of the fieldwork.

Immediately prior to follow-up questioning of a number of key informants, the Canterbury region was affected by a magnitude 7.1 earthquake, which significantly affected the Greater Christchurch urban area. It was inappropriate to expect any person affected by this event, let alone those working for local authorities in the area, to participate in research. Therefore, further questioning and interrogation of issues could not go ahead within the time period available. Whilst this was unfortunate and no doubt affected the depth of some of the results and conclusions, it was unavoidable.
3.6 Conclusion

The present chapter provided an outline of the research methodology used in the current research. It discussed how the methodological framework, following a qualitative approach, shaped the research design. It justified the use of a case study approach and outlined the ethical considerations taken in the design and conduction of the research. It discussed and justified the use of research methods employed and the process of data analysis. Finally it reflected upon the limitations of the research methodology.

The following chapters will present, analyse and discuss the results of the research. The results are divided into three chapters relating to the three research questions.
4 Planning Framework

4.1 Introduction

Together, planning institutions, methods, policies and tools, form a framework that establishes and shapes planning processes. How planning frameworks are structured can have a significant effect on how planning processes operate, and on how successful they are in achieving sustainable development of urban areas as an outcome (Lafferty, 2004a, 2004b). Therefore, it is important to understand how New Zealand’s planning framework provides for the governance of urban growth management. This chapter draws upon document analysis to answer Research Question One, which asks: “How does New Zealand’s planning framework provide for urban growth management processes?” It finds that New Zealand’s planning framework comprises a number of statutory and non-statutory mechanisms that establish the institutions, methods and tools for urban growth management. From this, it interrogates how these statutory and non-statutory mechanisms provide for the governance of urban growth in New Zealand.

The chapter finds that whilst planning responsibilities are largely devolved to regional and local authorities, central government also plays a key part through its role in structuring the planning framework and through the involvement of the public service in urban development. It is establishes that governance of urban growth management processes in New Zealand is largely devolved to local government. The present geographic scale of local government was established in 1989, which saw the creation of 73 territorial authorities and 12 regional councils (Local Government New Zealand, 2008). The 1989 local government reforms occurred over a period where New Zealand was experiencing significant neo-liberal reform, and the resulting local government structures reflect the decentralisation that accompanied the new-liberal paradigm, as recognised by Albrechts
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These local government structures have changed only slightly over the following two decades, although as of 1 November 2010, will decrease in number as the territorial authorities and regional councils of Auckland are amalgamated to form a unitary authority. The Auckland local government reform is the largest reform of local government structures since 1989. As the planning framework for the new Auckland Council is different to the national planning framework, and is still under development, this chapter focuses on the planning framework for the remainder of the country.

New Zealand’s planning framework for urban growth management is not codified in a single document. Rather, central government has provided a planning framework for growth management issues through a range of statutes, policies and planning tools. Three key pieces of legislation, the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA) provide the basis for this framework. These three Acts establish the majority of planning tools and processes available to local authorities in terms of urban growth management. The framework that these Acts provide is fractured and overly complex, and different parts of the framework are poorly integrated. The relationship between the Acts and their planning tools is ambiguous. This has led to local authorities relying upon non-statutory guidance and case law to understand how they should, and can, govern their urban growth management processes. The result of this has been a confusing planning framework for urban growth management, and has ultimately led to unproductive planning processes and unsustainable urban growth outcomes.

4.2 Resource Management Act 1991

The RMA is New Zealand’s primary environmental statute. Its purpose is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources (section 5, RMA 1991). The Act establishes requirements and planning tools for sub-national levels of government to carry out certain planning and consenting functions and processes. However, it has been lamented, from different sectors of the community for its failure to provide for effective environmental governance processes and in failing to achieving its purpose. It has also been criticised for failing to adequately provide for the management of urban environments (Memon, 1993; Zollner, 2004).

Passed in 1991, the RMA reflected the shifting political and economic direction towards a neo-liberal, free market philosophy (Memon, 1993; Thomas & Memon, 2007; Zollner,
2004). The RMA represented a shift from legislation (the Town and Country Planning Act 1977) that prescribed what activities were allowed, to legislation that permitted almost all activities as long as their effects on the environment were addressed (Oram, 2007). This removed the statutory basis for forward-looking, strategic planning, and created a reactionary, market-led development process. The RMA was hailed as a world first for its freedom, flexibility and focus on effects-based environmental management. Indeed, it is still admired overseas for its success in integrating a wide range of environmental regulation and processes in one piece of legislation (Oram, 2007). However, within New Zealand, the RMA has been a highly contentious Act amongst the community and business sector, and has become a political football. This has resulted in the Act being incrementally amended numerous times over the previous 19 years. However, these amendments have focussed mainly on improving processes, rather than improving the ability of the Act to achieve its purpose.

The Act establishes requirements for regional and local authorities to carry out certain planning processes and functions. It also provides them with tools to implement these functions. The Act sets out a hierarchy of policy documents that act as key implementation tools. These include tools for both the national, regional and local levels of government. Box 4.1 shows Section 30(1) of the RMA, which establishes the relevant functions of regional councils under the Act, whilst Box 4.2 shows Section 31, which establishes the relevant function of territorial authorities under the Act.

The instruments available under the RMA at the national level include national policy statements, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, national environmental standards and water conservation orders. National policy statements provide national level guidance for matters of national significance. They state objectives and policies for matters of national significance that are relevant to achieving the purpose of the RMA. Local authorities are required to give effect to the objectives and policies included in national policy statements through the preparation of plans, and through consent processes. The responsibility for preparing and enacting national policy statements lies with the Minister for the Environment.

At the regional level, regional councils are required to have a regional policy statement that establishes the significant resource management issues for the region, and objectives, policies and methods to address those issues. Urban limits are often included as policy
within regional policy statements. Regional plans are available to regional councils as an
optional tool to manage certain functions, including the control of land use for limited
purposes, and can contain rules for doing so. Territorial authorities are required to prepare
district plans to manage the use of land within their district. District plans are required to
state the objectives for the district and policies to implement those objectives, and rules to
implement those policies. Land use zoning is a major policy and tool within district plans.
Appendix D sets out the sections of the Act that relate to contents of regional policy
statements and regional district plans.

### 30 Functions of regional councils under this Act

(1) Every regional council shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this
Act in its region:

(a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to
achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the region:

(b) the preparation of objectives and policies in relation to any actual or potential effects of
the use, development, or protection of land which are of regional significance:

(c) the control of the use of land for the purpose of—
   (i) soil conservation:
   (ii) the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water in water bodies and
        coastal water:
   (iii) the maintenance of the quantity of water in water bodies and coastal water:
   (iiiia) the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystems in water bodies and coastal
           water:
   (iv) the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards:
   (v) the prevention or mitigation of any adverse effects of the storage, use, disposal, or
       transportation of hazardous substances:

…

(gb) the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use through objectives, policies, and
methods:
…

**Box 4.1: Section 30 RMA 1991**

### 31 Functions of territorial authorities under this Act

(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to
this Act in its district:

(a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to
achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of
land and associated natural and physical resources of the district:

(b) the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of
land

…

**Box 4.2: Section 31 RMA 1991**

Figure 4.1 visualises the hierarchy of key policy documents relevant to urban growth
management as set out by the RMA. It shows that policy tools have to give effect to the
planning tools higher in the hierarchy. For example, the district plan of a local authority within a certain region must give effect to the regional policy statement of that region, in turn that regional policy statement must also give effect to any national policy statements at the national level. The purpose of all planning tools mandated by the RMA is to achieve the overall purpose of the Act, therefore planning tools must give effect not only to higher planning tools, but the purpose of the RMA itself.

![Hierarchy of planning documents as mandated by the RMA 1991](image)

**Figure 4.1: Hierarchy of planning documents as mandated by the RMA 1991**

Decision-making on particular development proposals occurs at regional and local authorities level depending on which jurisdiction the consent falls under. Decisions on consents for land use are made at the territorial authority level. Consent applications are assessed against the policies within the relevant regional or district plan. Therefore, all decisions on consents must be made in accordance with not only the overall purpose of the
Planning Framework

Act, but the policies and rules as established in policy tools higher in the planning hierarchy.

In theory, this structure provides an integrated planning hierarchy, promoting consistency from national level tools such as national policy statements, through regional policy statements and plans to and district plans. This would support the top down approach for setting strategic direction, and bottom up approach for integrating technical and localised aspects as was the broad consensus across the literature surveyed, as being the most appropriate governance framework for urban growth management (Baker & Eckerberg, 2008b; Berger & Steurer, 2008; Blanes, 2008; Evans et al., 2008; Gow, 2000). However, in practice, there are very few national policy tools in force. There are just two operative national policy statements, one on electricity transmission, and the other the mandatory New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. Neither of these have any relevance to urban growth management. Whilst this is not necessarily a failure of the Act itself – more so central government for not enacting any - it has created what Oram (2007) identified as a gap between the vision and principles of the Act and the outcomes it delivers.

Another area where the Act has been criticised for failing to achieve its purpose is in relation to the urban environment. The overwhelming focus of the Act is on the natural environment, and as a result it does not specifically provide for the management of urban environments (Memon, 1993; Zollner, 2004). For example, the built environment is not referred to in the definition of “environment” or in section 6, which lists matters of national importance that must be recognised and provided for in all actions under the Act. Only one of these matters of national importance, the protection of historic heritage, relates to the built environment. The failure of the RMA to specifically provide for the management of urban environments is recognised by the current Minister for the Environment, Nick Smith, who stated that in his view “the architecture of the Act was not designed well for dealing with urban issues” (Smith, 2010:3).

Whilst the RMA fails to specifically provide for the management of the urban environment, and although central government has not utilised the ability to use national level tools to set national direction for urban growth management, the Act places obligations upon local authorities to consider matters that concern urban growth. Sections 30(1) and 31 of the Act (see Boxes 4.1 and 4.2) establish a number of functions, powers and duties for regional councils and local authorities, such as the establishment and
implementation of policies to achieve integrated management of natural and physical resources of the region or district. These functions, whilst not explicitly referring to urban growth management, provide councils, particularly regional councils, with responsibilities relating to sustainable management of urban growth. These responsibilities are met by regional and local authorities through planning tools such as regional policy statements and regional and district plans.

4.3 Local Government Act 2002

Because the RMA devolves most planning functions to sub-national levels of government, making local government the key actors in planning and urban growth management the Act governing local governments is a relevant part of the planning framework. The LGA is the statute that provides a framework and powers for sub-national levels of government within New Zealand. It establishes processes and provides planning tools for planning and decision-making at the regional council and territorial authority levels of government. It also provides for local authorities to play a broad role in promoting the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of their communities, through promotion of sustainable development (section 3 LGA 2002).

Section 10 of the LGA establishes the purpose of local government, to be the promotion of democratic local decision-making that promotes social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of the communities in the present and future. In performing their roles, local authorities are required to act in accordance with the principles set out in Section 14 of the Act, including the principle of collaboration and co-operation and taking a sustainable development approach in their governance and actions.

Part 6 of the LGA relates to planning, decision-making, and accountability. It sets out obligations and processes, and provides tools, for planning and decision-making at the local authority level. It requires local authorities to undertake certain processes during planning and decision-making processes. These include identifying and assessing all reasonably practicable options, consultation and consideration of community views, identification of community outcomes and the adoption of development contributions under the RMA. This focus on public consultation reflects the principle of public participation in decision-making as promoted by Agenda 21 and supported by Calabuig, Peris and Ferrero (2009), Baker (2008b) and Meadowcroft (2004, 2008).
The LGA requires local authorities to consult with their communities to determine what public goods and services the community wants provided. This process leads to the development of 'community outcomes', which are then translated, into an action plan – Long Term Council Community Plans (LTCCPs). LTCCPs are the key tool provided by the LGA, and help local authorities meet their obligations under the Act. They are ten-year strategic plans that outline all envisaged economic, social, cultural and environmental activities for a local authority area. All local authorities are required by the Act to have a LTCCP. Section 93(6) establishes the purpose of LTCCPs to be describing the activities of councils; the outcomes of those activities; and to provide for integrated, long-term decision-making processes that involve public participation. Schedule 10 of the Act outlines information that must be included in LTCCPs. This includes the requirement of local authorities to consider the impacts of growth on infrastructure. Clause 2(1)(d) requires local authorities to identify in their LTCCPs; how they will manage changes in demand for services, and service provision levels and standards; what additional asset capacity is required in respect to such changes; how the provision of additional asset capacity will be undertaken; estimated costs of provision of additional asset capacity; and, how such costs will be met. LTCCPs are used to set Annual Plans, which set year-by-year funding for council spending including infrastructure.

Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act 2004 amended the LGA. It ‘provide[d] for better alignment between land transport and land-use decision-making by requiring changes to Auckland Planning documents’ (Carter, 2004b). This involved changing the Auckland Regional Policy Statement, and territorial authorities’ district plans to integrate land transport and land use provisions and make those provisions consistent with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy. It was recognised that “confused decision-making … resulted from an inefficient and cumbersome governance structure with too many bodies involved in it” (Carter, 2004a:3). The processes of centralisation and integration has been carried on by the current National-led government, who agreed in Cabinet Committee minutes (Cabinet Committee Minutes, 2009) that the functions of the new amalgamated Auckland Council will include the development of a spatial plan under the LGA, which will inform other council plans by providing strategic direction.

The LGA establishes the powers of the Local Government Commission. These include the powers to re-organise boundaries of local authorities. Schedule 3 establishes who may
initiate reorganisation proposals, limiting this to affected local authorities, the Minister for Local Government or a petition of at least ten percent of the electors of the area subject to the proposed reorganisation. In deciding the appropriate boundaries for reorganised local authorities, the Act requires that the boundaries conform with catchment boundaries, that district boundaries conform to regional boundaries where practicable, and that the boundaries conform to statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand. There is no requirement that ensures boundaries reflect the geographic scale of the issues that local government deal with. The sections of the Act, relevant to re-organisation of local government boundaries are shown in Appendix E.

4.4 Land Transport Management Act 2003

The final of the three core Acts of New Zealand’s planning framework for urban growth management is the LTMA. The LTMA governs how New Zealand’s land transport system is developed, managed and funded. Enacted in 2003, the Act replaced previous transport planning Acts, replacing them with a highly integrated approach to land transport management. Section 3(1) of the Act establishes the purpose of the Act to be; to contribute to the aim of achieving an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system.

Like the RMA and LGA, the LTMA provides for, and requires, a number of policy documents. These include a government policy statement, a regional and national land transport strategies and regional and national land transport programmes. All of these planning documents are specifically required to contribute to the aim of achieving an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system. Regional land transport strategies are prepared by regional councils, and are required to identify land transport outcomes and the strategic options for achieving those outcomes, as well as a statement of relevant regional economic and land use considerations, and include a demand management strategy. They effectively provide a tool that promotes the integration of planning for land use and transport infrastructure.

4.5 Non Statutory Dimensions

Whilst the three cores Acts provide a strong basis for New Zealand’s planning framework, part of the framework is provided through non-statutory dimensions, including central government policy, non-statutory planning tools and case law. Whilst many aspects of the
non-statutory dimension of the planning framework might not necessarily compel sub-national governments to plan in the way that they promote, they often help provide an indication as to how they should plan.

Broad level government policy including the singing of international accords (such as Agenda 21 and the Kyoto Protocol), the enactment of an Emissions Trading Scheme, and an Energy and Conservation Strategy exemplify an acceptance of environmental issues such as climate change as a major policy challenge, and sustainable development as a suitable response. Such policies set a tone, or policy direction, of which lower levels of government work under. However, without legal obligations to operate in conjunction with many of these policies, such as Agenda 21, local government action can be non-existent.

The direction that the planning framework has been moving towards exemplifies an insight into how central government views the future of environmental management and local government issues. Central government has been moving the statutory planning framework towards a more integrated and strategic approach to land use and urban growth management planning over the past decade. This is reflected in the enactment of the LGA and LTMA in 2002 and 2003 respectively, and amendments to these Acts and the RMA. Whilst the 2004 amendments to the LGA, and the 2010 local government reform only covered the Auckland region, they provide a clear statement of central government’s land use and transportation integration intentions, highlighting a national move towards a more integrative and regional approach to planning.

Central government has recognised the importance of its role within the planning framework in terms of creating an integrated approach to urban development. The dispersal of urban issues across numerous central government institutions coupled with a widespread inability of central government agencies to effectively cooperate on the development of cross-portfolio issues was recognised by the previous Labour-led government in its 2003 Sustainable Development Programme of Action. This Programme saw the creation of an Urban Affairs portfolio within Cabinet, signalling the government’s intention to address fragmentation of urban policy at a national level (DPMC, 2003). However, this portfolio was dis-established following the election of the current National-led government in 2008. As a result of the Programme of Action, a pilot programme, the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme was established, and sought to provide collaboration amongst various local and central government institutions in relation to
sustainable development, including in relation to urban form. However, funding for the programme finished in 2006, and the partnership ceased (Manukau City Council, 2006).

The Programme of Action also led to the development of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol. The Protocol seeks to ensure that, among other things, the design of urban environments is sustainable. It establishes seven design qualities that the parties, which include central and local government institutions as well as developers, agree to implement through their respective roles within urban development. Amongst these qualities are context, custodianship and collaboration, the type of key concepts identified by Benfield et. al. (2001a), Zovanyi (2004) and Dierwechter (2008) as being important to sustainable urban development. The government saw the purpose of the protocol to be;

"to signal the Government’s commitment to quality urban design, to start debate and raise awareness of urban design across the country, to improve the exchange of learning and information, and to initiate a programme of action to result in quality urban design" (Ministry for the Environment, 2005:8).

However, as the Protocol is a voluntary agreement and has no force in law, so there is no requirement for government institutions or developers to comply with the design qualities it promotes. As a result, although the Protocol provides a signal of the governments desired development of urban areas it does not require it.

There are also areas of the planning framework, where the statutes do not provide enough clarity, and where such gaps are filled by decisions made at the Environment Court, or higher, through case law. For example, the Court of Appeal established, in Auckland Regional Council v North Shore City Council, the legal precedent that regional councils could use urban limits and include them in regional policy statements under section 30(1)(a) of the RMA. This ruling was developed further in Runciman Rural Protection Society v Franklin District Council and NZRPG Management Ltd v Western Bay of Plenty District Council. Prior to this there had been disagreement between territorial authorities and regional councils as to whether or not regional councils had the power to do so.

4.6 Overall Framework

New Zealand’s planning framework for urban growth management is not codified in a single document. Rather, central government has provided a planning framework for growth management issues through a range of statutes, policies and planning tools. Three key pieces of legislation provide the basis for this framework; the RMA, LGA and LTMA.
These three Acts establish the majority of planning tools and processes available to local authorities in terms of urban growth management. The framework that these Acts provide is fractured and overly complex, and the different parts of the framework are poorly integrated. The relationship between the Acts and their planning tools is ambiguous, and their interpretation is hugely variable amongst local authorities, who are devolved responsibility for planning processes (Oram, 2007). This has led to local authorities relying upon non-statutory guidance and case law to understand how they should, and can, govern their urban growth management processes.

There are limited provisions within the Acts as to how planning processes and tools relate to each other. The RMA requires local authorities to have regard to any management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts when preparing planning documents. The LGA requires local authorities to describe how the community outcomes in LTCCPs relate to other key strategic planning documents or processes, and allows for combined or concurrent consultation when consultation is also required by other statutes. The LTMA provides the clearest relationship between the Acts, specifically noting the relationship and hierarchy between planning documents prepared under the LTMA and RMA. Overall these statutory directions provided by the Acts are very weak considering the reliance of local authorities upon the three acts for setting the direction of their planning processes and the potential for overlap and integration between the processes and tools provided by each Act.

The local government institutions charged with the responsibility for the majority of planning processes are based largely upon geographic spaces that were established over two decades ago. The ineffectiveness of these geographic spaces in governing the urban areas, including urban growth management has seen the government take action on local government reform in Auckland. This is reflective of the new regionalist arguments of Wheeler (2002, 2009) and Brunckhorst (2002). However, the remainder of the country is still governed at the local levels by organisations based upon contemporarily abstract boundaries that often fail to meet the requirements of scale for sustainable development. The Local Government Commission’s reactionary approach does not provide for proactive local government reform, stymieing the attainment of local government with the geographic scale to effectively address urban growth management issues.

Overall, New Zealand’s framework does not specifically require urban growth management. Howell-Moroney (2007) found that only where there are strong requirements
for growth management have there been consistent success in altering land use development. As a result of failing to clearly require urban growth management processes, basing governance institutions on arbitrary boundaries, and having an overly complex relationship between the three planning Acts, New Zealand’s planning framework fails to specifically provide for the new approach to governance that is promoted across the literature surveyed.

New Zealand’s planning framework does not specifically provide for the new approach to urban growth management governance that is required for sustainable development. Nor too does it reflect the integrated and strategic approach or the geographic scale appropriate required for urban growth management. According to Lafferty (2004a, 2004b) and Howell-Moroney (2007) this will have a significant effect on the ability of sub-national governments to manage urban growth in a way which will lead to sustainable development outcomes. Evans *et. al.* (2008:85-86) argued that;

“National level legislation and policy priorities are key drivers in the sustainable development field, and although governments may pursue innovative and adventurous policies without central government support, policy capacity may be greater when this support is present”

### 4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the statutory and non-statutory basis of New Zealand’s planning framework. It has shown that three key planning Acts – the RMA, LGA and LTMA – provide planning tools and processes for the local authorities, who are devolved responsibility for the governance of planning processes. Although the three planning Acts overlap each other considerably in terms of the institutions involved in their processes and the issues they are dealing with, together they fail to clearly and succinctly outline a planning process for the governance of urban growth management. The geographic scale of many of the local government institutions that are devolved responsibility for planning processes were established over two decades ago. As a result, they are now often outdated in relation to the changing issues that local authorities are responsible for addressing. This means that local government structures do not reflect the functional region approach prescribed by new regionalists, and many urban growth management theories.

The following chapter will present and discuss the results of a case study of planning practice under New Zealand’s planning framework. It will assess how a new approach to
the governance of urban growth management processes has been implemented under New Zealand’s current planning framework. It will examine how the planning framework has shaped urban growth management governance in practice, and whether or not it acts, in practice, as a driver, inhibitor or enabler of the new approach required for sustainable development. The case study will also evaluate how successful new approaches to governance of urban growth management can be implemented without central government support.
5 Practice

5.1 Introduction

This chapter explores how New Zealand’s planning framework for urban growth management, as outlined in the previous chapter, affects planning processes in practice. It assesses whether New Zealand’s planning framework inhibits or enables a new approach to governance for urban growth management. It does so by presenting the results from key informant interviews and analysis of relevant documents to answer Research Question Two, which asks: “How have urban growth management processes been governed in the Greater Christchurch sub-region?” This chapter provides the basis for the discussion in the following chapter in relation to Research Question Three, which asks: “What lessons can be learnt from how urban growth has been managed in Greater Christchurch, including lessons for New Zealand’s planning framework?”

The chapter begins by establishing the background to urban growth management in Christchurch by describing the impetus for the current governance arrangements. It is shown that the reactionary, market-based approach of the RMA-led planning framework of the 1990’s, failed to adequately provide for the sustainable development of urban Christchurch. The chapter then explores the collaborative governance process that the statutory authorities, and other relevant actors, have taken to establish an integrated, strategic and forward-looking planning strategy for the development of the sub-region. These processes are explained in relation to New Zealand’s planning framework. It establishes how the Strategy was developed under LGA processes, and is currently being implemented through planning tools mandated under the RMA, LGA and LTMA. The case study provides an insight into how New Zealand’s planning framework affects urban growth management processes. It finds that the present planning framework fails
to effectively provide for the new approach to governance of urban growth management required for the sustainable development of urban environments. Whilst it fails to actively promote the new approach to urban growth management, nor too does it actively prohibit it.

5.2 Case Study Context

The case study for this research is the Greater Christchurch sub-region of New Zealand. It was chosen, for the reasons outlined in the research methodology chapter, including its size, the fact that its spatial extent spans more than one territorial authority area, and because of its efforts at providing a new approach to governance of urban growth management processes.

The Greater Christchurch sub-region is the largest urbanised area in the South Island of New Zealand, encompassing 1,426 square kilometres (GCUDS, 2007). With an estimated population of 414,000 in 2006 it is the third largest urban area in New Zealand by population (GCUDS, 2007). As a result of natural increase and migration, the population of the sub-region is projected to grow to over 500,000 by 2026, and to almost 550,000 by 2041 (GCUDS, 2007). The sub-region represents a city within the size range where the majority of future global urban growth is projected to occur (small to medium sized cities with a population under 500,000) (GCUDS, 2007; UNFPA, 2007).

The topography of the sub-region poses just two distinct barriers for urban spatial growth, Banks Peninsula to the south-east, and the Pacific Ocean to the east. The Canterbury Plains, to the north and west of the city provides flat and easily developed land. Figure 5.1 shows the urban area of Christchurch and its spatial expansion in relation to topographic features of the sub-region.

In the early 2000’s the Greater Christchurch area was governed by four territorial authorities; Christchurch City Council and Banks Peninsula, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils. In 2006 Banks Peninsula District Council amalgamated with Christchurch City Council. The Canterbury Regional Council (known as Environment Canterbury) has the functions of a regional council for the whole of the sub-region. The result of having a relatively large number of local government authorities was fragmented governance of urban growth management processes, with land use planning being dispersed across four different district plans.
Figure 5.1: Satellite Map Showing Christchurch and Physical Barriers to Spatial Expansion (adapted from NASA, 2008)

5.3 A New Approach

Over the period of 1991 to 2001 the population of Christchurch City and its neighbouring territorial authorities, Banks Peninsula, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, grew by 12 percent – or over 43,000 (Stats NZ, 2006). Because Christchurch faces limited physical barriers to urban growth, and because of the existing planning processes, the majority of this growth was accommodated in Greenfield sites that were previously agriculturally productive land (Key Informant 2). This included significant development within Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, making them two of the fastest growing districts in New Zealand (Stats NZ, 2006). This outward growth led to urban sprawl, identified by Jenks et al. (1996) and Breheny (1992) to be an inherently unsustainable urban form. By the late 1990’s, early 2000’s there was a growing awareness amongst the local government authorities of Greater Christchurch that the existing planning processes had failed to adequately promote the sustainable development of urban Christchurch. The consensus
amongst key informants was that this awareness led to a widespread recognition that planning processes had to change.

5.3.1 Impetus for Change

By the end of the 1990’s the planning authorities of the Greater Christchurch sub-region had begun to realise that their planning processes were failing to provide for sustainable outcomes in terms of the development of urban areas. Key informants identified a number of reasons for this, including a realisation of the failures of the RMA to provide a framework for effective urban growth management, a recognition that urban growth management involved cross boundary issues, and direction from central government pointing towards a more strategic, integrative approach to planning processes. These reasons reflect many of the impetuses for urban growth management and new regional governance structures identified across the literature. Table 5.1 provides an example of the range of comments key informants made in relation to the impetus for a new approach to governance of urban growth management in Greater Christchurch.

Key Informant 3 stated that “proper planning”, meaning long-term, strategic land use planning, was not legally mandated after the RMA superseded the Town and Country Planning Act in 1991. Key Informants agreed that the reactionary, market-led planning that the RMA instead provided for was not providing desirable outcomes. Key Informant 2 stated that;

“The former approach to urban growth was fairly reactive... the District Plan spoke about being developer led, and there was a wee bit of a backlash to that approach, because the outcomes were foreseen as negative, some of the townships were losing their character, there was a lack of integration in terms of infrastructure and development, it was sporadic, [and there was] not a lot of consistency between the development led by private developers...”

Over the late 1990’s to the early 2000’s recognition that effective planning for sustainable development and management of urban areas required a more integrated, and strategic approach than what the interpretation of the RMA in Greater Christchurch was providing grew. The statutory authorities of the area recognised this, collectively stating that;

“there is a need to address strategic long term planning for Greater Metropolitan Christchurch. Some significant urban development issues face our metropolitan urban area which, if not addressed by our Local Authorities in a collaborative and strategic fashion, will likely undermine our current quality of life.” (GCUDS, 2004:3)
Table 5.1 Selected Key Informant Quotes about the Impetus for the Collaborative UGM Planning in Greater Christchurch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RMA failing to promote productive processes</th>
<th>“Around the end of the 1990’s it was quite apparent that market driven, private plan change, councils doing it all on their own - that approach really wasn’t working very well.” (Key Informant 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The regional viewpoint had been significantly weakened by the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which ended up being pretty much a bunch of platitudes that could mean anything to anybody … the Environment Court basically said, ‘well your Regional Policy Statement doesn’t have any directive capability, doesn’t have any precision, its all full of waffly terms and concepts, and so take it away, we’re not interested’.” (Key Informant 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There’d been that sort of history of unproductive planning arguments, and unproductive appeal processes…” (Key Informant 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The RPS that was in existence had proved quite ineffectual in terms of providing a guidance for more integrated, sustainable form of urban development and there was a need to develop a stronger strategy for Canterbury, for the sub-region.” (Key Informant 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Planners were really struggling with ad-hoc decision making…” (Key Informant 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross boundary issues</td>
<td>“there were questions then being raised, certainly by the councils as to whether or not something needed to be done about the RPS, and if it was to be done, what would it be, which sought of led on to discussions about ‘how do we manage urban growth across three territorial authorities’.” (Key Informant 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There was a serious lack of coordination between what happened in terms of a regional view point and what happened in terms of the different view points of the individual councils … [and] the Regional Council … saw that if there was gonna be a successful strategy, it needed to be a more of a collaborative effort form the various councils, rather than councils having different approaches to urban growth.” (Key Informant 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I suppose many people looked at Pegasus Bay as sort of the catalyst for getting this underway because of the size … and the potential downstream effects … and the fact that there was no one agency that had the overall responsibility for working with that planning. Of course it fell through a huge crack because there were different views taken by different councils.” (Key Informant 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“… generally the feeling, amongst the planners anyway, … was that there’s gotta be a better way … it was obvious that there had to be a united view.” (Key Informant 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction from central government</td>
<td>“We had to do it ourselves or it would be imposed upon us” (Key Informant 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“… I think the government did sort of indicate, through the Auckland case, that they wanted some more collaboration between regional councils and TA’s, so there was basically a ‘go and do it yourselves – if you don’t do it yourselves we’ll do it for you’ type approach.” (Key Informant 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was noted by Key Informants 2, 3 and 7 that the Environment Court had recognised that the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement lacked any strategic direction, and failed to establish effective policies on managing urban growth. Key Informants recognised that this led to a situation where the regional policy statement needed to be changed in order to provide better direction to local authorities to plan for growth. Whilst this was a failure of Environment Canterbury, it was also seen by key informants to be a result of poor capability of the RMA to provide direction to local authorities in regards to management of the urban environment.

Key Informants also widely identified that a growing recognition that Christchurch as a city functioned across political boundaries as being a major impetus for a change in planning processes. Key Informants 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9 identified a history of unproductive planning processes in Greater Christchurch, recognising that the councils had individually planned for the same underlying issues, but in an uncoordinated, ad-hoc and haphazard way. The local authorities recognised that a wider approach to the issues was the only way in which to achieve sustainable outcomes. Key Informant 8 called this the “we can’t do it on our own philosophy”. Key Informant 4 explained further, stating that;

“Christchurch City Council, recognised that on its own it couldn’t control growth in Waimakariri and Selwyn - it had no powers. Whilst it might consolidate urban growth for its own area, if that wasn’t matched with some sort of relationship with the neighbouring [councils], potentially you wouldn’t achieve your overall objectives.”

This recognition that governance processes should reflect the form and function of the Greater Christchurch urban area supports the new regionalist arguments of Brunckhorst (2002) and Wheeler (2002; 2009). It also aligns itself with the smart growth and new urbanist understandings of spatial scale.

It was widely noted by key informants that the local authorities felt as if central government was heading towards a regional approach to urban planning. Key Informants 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9 identified the legislative requirement for Auckland Councils to plan for spatial growth as a major reason for these thoughts. Other evidence of a changing direction in planning for urban growth, such as the enactment of the LGA and LTMA were recognised by Key Informants 1, 5, 6 and 8 as also providing a basis for a more integrated and forward-looking style of planning. Key Informant 2 recognised that these legislative changes to the planning framework have moved the planning framework towards a
direction where planning processes would be “more reflective of a regional type of approach.” The consensus amongst the councils was that it would be better to plan collaboratively on a voluntary basis rather than being compelled to by law or under-going local government amalgamation.

5.3.2 A Partnership Approach

The recognition that existing planning processes were failing to promote sustainable development of Christchurch’s urban areas, and that the answer to many of the issues was a wider geographic scale and more integrated planning and governance processes, led to discussions amongst the local authorities of the area (Key Informants 3 and 8). It was identified that the space that was the most appropriate scale to manage the urban growth of Christchurch overlapped four territorial authority areas. This posed a challenge in terms of deciding how to structure the governance of planning processes. Pollard (2000) and Wheeler (2002) recognised the challenges posed by planning at a different geographic scale than at which existing governance institutions had jurisdiction for. They found that whilst the re-organisation of governance structures is a difficult process, a new approach to governance requires a greater flexibility in understanding governance structures. Potential structures proposed by Wheeler (2002) included co-ordination of planning processes by existing institutions without a centralised governance structure, as was established in Greater Christchurch.

Key Informants 1, 3 and 8 identified what Key Informant 9 called “several false-starts” at collaborative urban growth management within Greater Christchurch. Eventually, however, in 2003 the Christchurch City Council, Waimakariri, Selwyn and Banks Peninsula District Councils, Environment Canterbury and Transit New Zealand voluntarily agreed to work collaboratively on setting long-term direction and strategy for the growth and development of the sub-region. The purpose of the collaboration was defined to be: “to ensure an excellent quality of life in greater metropolitan Christchurch through an integrated and collaborative planning approach for future metropolitan urban development” (GCUDS, 2004:3).

The partnership structure was based around each organisation maintaining their independence, as opposed to the establishment of a new urban development organisation, or the amalgamation of local government authorities. This involved the development of a governance structure where the partners could collaboratively make decisions before
independently implementing the plan and decisions. The partner councils decided to develop a combined urban development strategy that would include a vision of the settlement pattern of Christchurch in 35 years time, and an action plan outlining what each of the partner organisations would do to ensure that development occurred according to the settlement plan. It was decided that the strategy would be developed under the LGA, and implemented through the local authorities planning processes and tools under the RMA, LGA and LTMA. This represents the ad-hoc type working groups of government institutions that Wheeler (2002) identified as being a potential response to the need for coordination of public sector action. It also represents an example of the hybrid forms of governance that were widely identified as being required for sustainable development.

Key Informants discussed the benefits and costs of a collaborative partnership as opposed to alternative governance processes. The consensus amongst key informants was that a voluntary collaborative approach to urban growth management was better than local government amalgamation or the creation of an independent growth management authority. Key Informants 2, 6 and 9 recognised the benefits of retaining the existing local authorities as being better autonomy, subsidiarity and ultimately more democratic decision-making processes. Key Informants 3, 4 and 9 recognised that consultation and wide input into decision-making processes would still need to occur under an amalgamated council, or an independent growth management authority. Key Informant 3 stated;

“If you had only one mega council for the sub region, that mega council isn’t gonna be in a position just to say ‘righto we’ve decided and this is what’s gonna happen’. They’re gonna have multiple community boards and interest groups, and factions, and so on, and that will involve them in the same sort of consultative processes and arguments and so on, it’ll just be organised in a slightly different way, but I don’t think it will be any cheaper.”

Key Informant 4 noted, from previous experience in much larger authorities that although an amalgamated authority would provide “… a speedier process, … you’d still need to put a significant amount of resource into ensuring that even one large organisation was all moving in the right direction.”

Because of the necessity to manage urban growth on a sub-regional scale, it was recognised that if the voluntary partnership were to fail, the Local Government Commission would get involved and find that amalgamation was necessary. Key Informant 6 stated that;
“the [partnership] is a voluntary pact to avoid of the necessity of local government reform, but if [it] falls over no-one is under any illusions that local government reform would be necessary... the CCC would be at the Local Government Commission immediately if partnership fell apart ... and in my view local government reform is inevitable and necessary in the medium term anyway.”

The process undertaken in Greater Christchurch is reflective of the collaborative approach prescribed by the LGA. Key Informant 9 stated that; “collaboration is more in the spirit of the LGA than councils being childish and taking each other to the Local Government Commission anyway.” It was also recognised that amalgamation of territorial authorities would still require collaboration with non-government stakeholders, to integrate knowledge and provide greater effectiveness anyway.

### 5.4 Strategy Development

The Strategy, including the vision for settlement pattern, and the action plan, was developed collectively under the LGA. A forum, comprising representatives of the partner organisations and key stakeholders, led the process of strategy development. Extensive background and issue analysis was undertaken, as well as a comprehensive public consultation process. The information gained in these processes was combined to develop the Strategy including the proposed settlement pattern and the implementation action plan. Figure 5.2 outlines the process undertaken by the partner councils to develop the Strategy.

The development of strategic, integrated plans is not promoted under New Zealand’s planning framework. As a result the partnership undertook case studies from overseas, including looking at how cities like Melbourne and Toronto have implemented sustainable planning theories including smart growth and transit-orientated development (Key Informant 3). The partnership also looked at other approaches to urban growth management within New Zealand, particularly SmartGrowth in the Tauranga sub-region (Key Informant 7). The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol was also used as a tool to provide background information and design qualities and experienced consultants were utilised to help facilitate the collaboration process and the development of technical aspects (Key Informant 1).
5.4.1 Urban Development Strategy Forum

One of the first steps taken by the councils was to establish a forum in which they could collaboratively direct the development of the Strategy and settlement plan. The forum met on average once every two months from the beginning of 2004, until the strategy was finalised and adopted in April 2007. Key informants recognised that this forum was crucial to the collaborative development of the strategy and action plan; Key Informant 1 stated...
that the forum was the driver of the whole process, providing decision-making and directing staff working groups. The scope, process, governance and management structures of the forum were set out in the UDS Forum Terms of Reference, as shown in Box 5.1.

**The scope of the UDS will be to:**

- Produce a “proactive” Strategy that will provide direction and integration for existing and proposed urban development
- Integrate future urban development including residential land use, transport, commercial/retail, open space and infrastructure activities, including assessments of social, environmental and economic impacts and associated threats.
- Produce a Strategy which is adopted by participating Councils and supported by other relevant agencies, to act as a commitment to the community regarding future urban development
- Take account of, build upon and integrate existing relevant strategies and commitments of participating councils
- Ensure the continued protection and enhancement of natural and physical resources
- Focus on the greater metropolitan area
- Have a forecast period of up to 30 years
- Engage with and achieve support from project partner agencies in achieving mutually beneficial outcomes
- Conduct appropriate consultation and discussion on Options for the UDS and for a Draft Strategy
- Produce a Strategy which is robust and resilient to uncertainties

**Box 5.1: Scope of UDS Forum (Source: GCUDS, 2004:3-4)**

The UDS Forum consisted of elected representatives of the key strategy partners, and of key stakeholder organisations. This included four elected members from Christchurch City Council, and two elected members from each of Selwyn, Waimakariri and Banks Peninsula District Councils and Environment Canterbury (GCUDS, 2004). Membership also included representatives of Transit New Zealand and seven to eight members representing key stakeholders who were not local authorities (GCUDS, 2004). The partner councils recognised the usefulness of other stakeholders in helping achieve integration across strategies and sectors (GCUDS, 2004). Due to the large scope of the issues that the Strategy was to address there were a large number of stakeholder organisations that were appropriate to include in the decision-making process (GCUDS, 2004). Engagement with such stakeholders was promoted through regular stakeholder meetings, stakeholder participation in staff working groups and the inclusion of a number of stakeholder representatives on the UDS Forum itself (GCUDS, 2004). These key stakeholders included Transit New Zealand, the Canterbury District Health Board, the Ministry of Education, Federated Farmers, Chamber of Commerce, the University of Canterbury, Ngai Tahu, and
Lemos and Agrawal (2009) argued that the way in which actors are engaged with governance systems and processes affects the ability of processes to achieve such improvements more-so than the mere expansion of actors within the process. Similarly, Meadowcroft et. al. (2005) argued that effective governance processes include mechanisms that encourage adequate representation of stakeholders, the inclusion of different forms of knowledge, deliberative engagement and social learning. The collaborative approach that Christchurch took towards urban growth management reflected this ‘new’ approach to governance, with the strategy being developed and implemented through a partnership of relevant sub-national authorities and key stakeholders from the private and community sectors and central government.

5.4.2 Analysis of Issues

Work groups comprised of staff from each of the partner councils and relevant key stakeholder organisations as well as contracted consultants, were assigned a wide range of issues to research and develop. These included population projections, land use and settlement patterns, transport, infrastructure and community facilities and natural environment (Key Informants 1, 4 and 8).

As identified earlier, the partnership recognised the need to plan for growth at an appropriate scale, understanding that Christchurch functions across political boundaries.

“the proposal to jointly prepare a greater metropolitan Urban Development Strategy recognises that the area functions geographically as one social, economic, and cultural entity and that the natural and physical resources it draws on, or impacts on, include public resources that are not under the control of any one agency”

(GCUDS, 2004:2)

Within the issue analysis process was an evaluation of the most appropriate scale for the partnership to look at. The staff work groups finalised the geographic scale and extent of ‘functional Christchurch’ early on in the development process. The scale that the partnership was mandated to manage urban growth within was defined as encompassing “the principal commuter, household and job catchment area between Christchurch and surrounding areas” (GCUDS, 2004:4). Figure 5.3 shows the geographic area that the
Strategy incorporates in relation to local authority boundaries and existing urban areas. This scale reflects the form and function of the issue that is being sought to control, as new regionalists like Brunckhorst (2002) promote.

Figure 5.3 Geographic Scale of GCUDS Area

Key Informants 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8 identified the commuter belt as the main contributing factor to the geographic scale of the partnership. Key Informant 8 suggested that urban growth pressures arise from the overlapping of commuter, housing and employment catchment areas, stating that the areas in Greater Christchurch experiencing growth pressures are those within the commuter belt. Most of Banks Peninsula, and the western parts of the Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts are outside of the area managed by the partnership. However, the partnership recognises that “Issues do not stop at boundaries. If [an] issue requires an area outside to be considered, it will be.” (GCUDS, 2007:9).
The identification of an appropriate geographic scale alongside the theory and lessons gained case study analysis, and the technical information gained from issues analysis provided the basis for four options for future settlement patterns. The integration of this wide range of information led to the development of models and scenarios which were put to the community for consultation.

5.4.3 Public Participation

The strategy partners realised from the beginning of the process that because the strategy would be implemented through RMA and LGA processes extensive consideration of community views would be required (GCUDS, 2004). Key Informant 2 highlighted the importance of consultation and collaboration with the public by stating that not only was the Strategy “a collaborative process between the partners, but also between the communities within the districts - there was a lot of consultation that went on.”

There were two stages to the communication and consultation process; awareness raising, and options consultation (GCUDS, 2006). The first was aimed at raising public awareness of the proposed strategy and the issues it aimed to address. This included publications, advertising, media releases and a website. Two months after the awareness campaign started, public consultation over options for Christchurch’s future urban form began. As discussed by Key Informants 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 the public were given four options for future settlement pattern, as set out in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Settlement Pattern Options put out for Public Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>A concentrated urban form, with development concentrated in central Christchurch, Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Rolleston. 60% of new development in Brownfield sites and 40% in Greenfield sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Balanced growth between existing urban areas with some expansion into adjacent areas. 40% of new development in Brownfield sites and 60% in Greenfield sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>A dispersed urban form, with 10% of new development in Brownfield sites and 90% in Greenfield sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business as Usual</td>
<td>20% of new development in Brownfield sites and 80% in Greenfield sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several communication modes were used, including; a consultation booklet; a website; partnership with the major newspaper, The Press; council publications such as community newsletters; advertising materials including posters and print advertising; display
materials; vehicle signage; media releases; special events and a roadshow (GCUDS, 2006). The communication and consultation process lasted for six weeks.

Key informants described community interest in the Strategy as being unusually high. Key Informant 1 stated that; “… there was three and half thousand people [submit], which was a lot, [Christchurch City Council] only had 149 submit on the LTCCP at the same time”. It was also widely noted by key informants that there was significant community support for an urban development strategy, and for a compact urban form. Table 5.3, summarises selected key informant comments in relation to the levels of community support for an urban development strategy, and for a consolidated urban form.

Key Informant 2 identified the need to have community support for the process due to its voluntary nature, and identified how this could have provided for better planning outcomes stating that;

“Doing it in this more collaborative, voluntary basis, allowed greater input from the communities in terms of determining which towns were allowed to grow, which perhaps would have not [have happened if the councils were compelled to do so by law] … doing it in a voluntary way potentially produces better outcomes for the communities.” (Key Informant 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Key Informant Quotes about the public support for the UDS and the proposed urban forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The majority of the politicians thought [the public would] go for Option B, but in fact they overwhelmingly went for Option A. 64 percent went for Option A, and then another 12 percent wanted something even more sustainable that that.” (Key Informant 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[There were] a lot of submissions, a lot of people participated in it. So its got a fair degree of solid support.” (Key Informant 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“When we did the consultation … the overwhelming feedback was to have a concentrated stroke consolidated urban pattern.” (Key Informant 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There was a pretty substantial support for a mixture which allowed continuation of Greenfield business as usual suburban development but also promoted the idea of higher density focussed on urban nodes and central city.” (Key Informant 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So there was a lot of strength in [the results of the community consultation], and that actually gave the politicians quite a lot of confidence, so they were actually able to push staff a lot more.” (Key Informant 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[Public support] was overwhelming, and continues to be overwhelming. We’ve got a hotly contested mayoralty here … neither side is attacking the fundamental principles of the UDS.” (Key Informant 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s the small things that have opposition – but not the overall direction.” (Key Informant 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Likewise, Key Informants 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 recognised that a high level of community support lowers the risks of partner councils pulling out of the voluntary partnership. For example, Key Informant 5 stated;

“The Strategy is only there because it’s still supported by the council[s]. It’s seen at least two to three election cycles so there is actually a lot of support for it through the community ... At the end of the day it is essentially a community document and the community see value in it. So that’s where it lends most of its support ... I would say that for any council to go against the Strategy at the moment would be a pretty big step.”

The public engagement process reflected the function of public participation in governance to include education as discussed by Meadowcroft (2004). However, Key Informants 1, 3 and 7 expressed opinions that consulting over pre-developed options as opposed to a more open consultation process could have affected the outcome of the process. Key Informant 8 stated that; “People have different views over the extent to which public consultation process was directed by the way in which the choices were explained.” This highlights concerns raised by Thompson-Fawcett and Bond (2003) that public participation in urban growth management can often be consultative rather than genuine engagement in decision-making.

The community consultation ultimately helped the forum partners to agree upon a Community Charter, which outlined the guiding principles and strategic direction of the Strategy. It also provided information to, and directed the staff working groups into favouring a consolidated form over a dispersed one (Key Informant 1).

5.4.4 Inquiry by Design

Intensive collaboration amongst partner councils, Transit New Zealand and key stakeholder organisations coupled with a rigorous community consultation process combined to a highly integrated decision-making process. Key Informant 1 explains how the information gained from the public consultation process, combined with technical data gathered by council staff, fed into an integrated decision-making process that established the urban form that the Strategy would strive to deliver;

“... we took the findings from the community consultation, and got all the data and information that we had together, and we had two, week-long workshops where we ... worked out the blue network of where the water went, and we got the green network, the social network, and the transport network which overlaid that, and all
the population projections, and those sought of things, those trends, were put into the mix and we ended up with a settlement pattern.”

These inquiry-by-design workshops were facilitated by consultants from Urbanism Plus, and involved over 100 technical staff from the partner councils and relevant key stakeholders (Key Informant 1). From this process a proposed settlement pattern was developed, and was fed into the strategy development process, including the establishment of a vision and the implementation action plan. The inquiry-by-design process reflects integration of knowledge and power through hybrid governance structures, argued for by Pike et. al. (2006) and Wheeler (2002).

The Strategy was finalised in early 2007, and adopted under the LGA as policy by the partner councils. The status of the strategy is set out to be;

“... a broad scale, long-term, land-use strategy prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 ... The Strategy will be implemented through tools such as the Regional Policy Statement under the RMA 1991, amendments to the Regional Land Transport Strategy as mandated by the Land Transport Management Act 2003, and Long Term Council Community Plans prepared under the Local Government Act 2002.” (GCUDS, 2007”13)

5.5 Strategy Implementation

Following the adoption of the Strategy as council policy, the partnership established a new governance structure to oversee the implementation process. As outlined earlier, each organisation maintained their independence, and implementation occurred through the statutory and non-statutory processes of the government and non-government organisations strategy partners. The basis of the implementation plan was about implementing the Strategy, including the vision for the settlement plan through statutory processes and plans under the RMA, LGA and LTMA. However, the difficulties of implementing a non-statutory plan through poorly integrated planning documents posed a challenge. The governance structure established to facilitate implementation was focused on ensuring consistency of implementation across the partners, and to prevent the fragmentation that tended to occur under the planning framework due to its failure to promote collaboration and integration.

5.5.1 Relationship with Planning Framework

As outlined in the Strategy itself, the implementation is occurring through planning tools mandated by the RMA, LGA and LTMA as well as non-statutory implementation tools.
Figure 5.4, visualises the relationship between the Strategy and the Acts. Key Informant 5 summarises the relationship of the Strategy to the planning tools mandated by the three Acts by stating:

“If you think of the Urban Development Strategy of sitting over the top, as sort of like of the umbrella ... it’s giving some shape in terms of the policies that the councils will pursue. The RLTS and the RPS are effectively some of the implementation tools which sit beneath that, and they drive a certain part of the Urban Development Strategy.”

Key Informant 3 supported this view, stating;

“I think it’s been reasonably well accepted now, around New Zealand that long-term growth strategies ... are done under the Local Government Act as consultative documents and adopted as policy. Then the ‘giving effect to’ bits fall out of that, and they fall out on either district plan changes, or regional plans, or long term council community plans, or budgets or future spending priorities, so that’s the next level down, the implementation.”

Figure 5.4 Relationship of the UDS to the Statutory and Non-Statutory Documents and Processes of the Strategy Partners (GCUDS, 2007:13)

Strategic planning through the use of the Urban Development Strategy provided obvious benefits to the partner councils. It was widely recognised amongst the Key Informants that
the strategic planning that the Strategy provided had positive benefits for council’s functions under the RMA, LGA and LTMA. Key Informant 3 noted that the forward-looking nature of the Strategy “increases the certainty that councils have … we don’t have to be planning our capital works programmes all over the place, we’re able to focus on where we know with reasonable certainty where developments going to be focussed.” Key Informant 6 noted that LTCCP’s prepared under the LGA, and giving effect to the Strategy, were; “a huge step forward in terms of their capital projects, staging the sequencing of infrastructure for growth”. Key Informant 8 also stated that “… before the LTMA was amended [in 2008 to require a 30 year outlook in RLTS’s] we already had a 30 year transport plan, because of the UDS, so we’d already gone there and it was really easy.”

All key informants recognised a number challenges faced in implementing the Strategy under the existing planning framework. These challenges largely arose from unclear relationships between the three planning Acts (the RMA, LGA and LTMA). Key Informant 1 summarised this by stating;

“… it was quite challenging for a lot of people because its outside of the normal … we really were pushing the boundaries … because there’s no hierarchy of legislation in New Zealand. In places like New South Wales, the Protection of the Environment and Administration Act sits over other pieces of legislation, and under each of those there’s policy guidance. Where [as] we have the RMA, which is sitting beside the LGA and there’s not policy guidance to discuss the link between them, or the hierarchy. So everyone does it in a piecemeal way.”

Key Informants 1, 6 and 7 identified particular challenges in defining the relationship between the Acts at the Environment Court. Key Informant 7 stated; “… we’re trying to slot [LGA and LTMA decisions] into RMA decision-making, and that’s a real challenge. The [Environment Court is] having to with this - we’re making them”. Key Informant 6 expressed the opinion that; “Environment Court judges often want to say ‘Well I don’t care what’s been done under the LTMA [or LGA], it’s got no relevance here, Thanks’.” Key Informant 1 provided a an example of such a difficulty;

“… what we’re trying to get the Environment Court to understand, is that we don’t want growth on a third front because we’d have to put in another whole set of infrastructure and pay for that … [and] that cost goes back to the ratepayers, so there’s lots of financial responsibilities [under the LGA] that we’re having to work through. [The Environment Court] needs to recognise [that] the LGA provides the strategic planning and the RMA is a tool in which to implement that.”
There was also concern expressed by key informants about the implementation of growth management process through the statutory planning tools and how the processes under each Act aligned with each other. This largely revolved around the length of time taken from the inception of the Strategy to its implementation. Key Informant 4 noted; “… it took a long while to get [the Strategy] agreed and then the key aspects of it implemented within the statutory documents, like the RPS and the RLTS”. Implementing through the LGA and LTMA was much easier than implementation through the RMA. Key Informant 8 stated that “… before the LTMA was amended [in 2008 to require a 30 year outlook in RLTS’s] we already had a 30 year transport plan, because of the UDS, so we’d already gone there and it was really easy to just pull that out, drop it in. It was really easy.” However, implementing the Strategy through the RMA provided a much more significant challenge. Key Informants 4, 6 and 8 recognised excessive effort spent in community consultation processes. Having first gone through extensive consultation under the LGA to develop the Strategy and Action Plan, and then having to go through lengthy consultation and appeals processes to implement the Strategy through the regional policy statement; “It’s a long process unfortunately” (Key Informant 8).

The challenges experienced by the Greater Christchurch sub-region’s attempts to adopt a new approach to the governance of urban growth management are reflective of Howell-Moroney (2007) and Evans et. al.’s (2008) assertion that the planning framework shapes processes. It is shown that central government-led changes to the planning framework have helped shift the planning framework, and urban growth management practice, towards an approach that is more reflective of sustainable development. Despite this, the framework still poses unique challenges that have required the voluntary partnership in Greater Christchurch to develop new, hybrid forms of governance to implement the strategy.

5.5.2 Partnership Structure

Like its development, the implementation of the Strategy is governed through a collaborative process. Although the Strategy is implemented through the actions of the individual partner councils as set out by action plan, there is a need for constant conversation over its implementation (Key Informants 6 and 9). The governance structure for this process is established within the Strategy itself. Whilst the Strategy was developed through the UDS Forum, which had a membership comprised of elected members of each of the partner councils and representatives of key stakeholder organisations, after adoption
of the Strategy by the councils through LGA processes, the governance evolved into a more formal local government process. This required the Forum to split up into a local government committee and a stakeholder forum. The local government committee was delegated authority to govern the implementation of the strategy and the action plan.

Figure 5.5 visualises the structure of the implementation groups, and the following pages describe each of the component parts of the structure. Appendix F provides the Terms of Reference within the Strategy for each of the component parts.
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Figure 5.5 GCUDS Implementation Governance Structure

The adoption of an implementation structure reflects the difficulty in implementing a strategic plan under the existing planning framework. It has taken the joint resources of the partner councils and independent staff to implement the strategy through the RMA, LGA and LTMA. Initially the implementation committee was only going to be in existence for three years, however implementing the strategy collaboratively has taken longer, and more resources than initially expected, and the Implementation Committee’s existence has been extended indefinitely (Key Informant 8). The benefits of joint governance of the strategy implementation process has been to ensure integration across all levels, and to ensure
consistency in decisions and changes made after the agreement of the strategy. The hybrid governance structure reflects a more flexible understanding of governance as Pike et al. (2006) and Wheeler (2002) have promoted.

**Partner Councils**

By the time the Strategy and Action Plan was finalised the partner councils included Christchurch City Council, Waimakariri District Council, Selwyn District Council and Environment Canterbury. Banks Peninsula District Council amalgamated with Christchurch City Council the year prior to the adoption of the strategy. The partner councils delegate decision-making authority, through Clause 30 (Schedule 7) of the LGA, to a joint committee.

**Development Strategy Implementation Committee**

The Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee (UDSIC) is a sub-committee of the partner councils, formed under section 30, schedule 7 of the LGA, and provides the “ultimate governance of the UDS” (Key Informant 4). “[It] has representation from the elected members of the councils and the regional director of NZTA’ (Key Informant 4), as well as representatives of Tangata Whenua and an Independent Chairperson (GCUDS, 2007). The key roles of the implementation committee are to provide growth management leadership, oversee the implementation of the Strategy, coordinate implementation across multiple agencies, monitor progress against milestones, and review and adjust the Strategy if circumstances change (GCUDS, 2007). The committee meets approximately every two months, and either signs off on approaches or endorses approaches that are then signed off at the individual council committees (Key Informant 4).

**Chief Executives Advisory Group**

The Chief Executives of the strategy partner organisations, alongside the Independent Chairperson and Implementation Manager form the Chief Executives Advisory Group (CEAG). The chief executives take responsibility for high-level issues, including the status of the Strategy within the priorities and workload of the partner organisation they represent (Key Informant 5).

**Urban Development Strategy Implementation Management Group**

The Urban Development Strategy Implementation Group (UDSIMG) sits below the implementation committee and the chief executives. The implementation management
group is a collection of senior management and staff members of the strategy partners, who manage the implementation of the strategy at a staff level. The group is involved in steering, leading and supporting implementation of the Strategy. The group meets monthly, or as required, to service the implementation committee (Key Informants 3 and 5).

**Staff Working Groups**

Below the implementation management group are sub-groups, which are largely where the work of the implementation group gets completed. These groups are made up of relevant staff from each of the strategy partners, and contribute to collective work and decision-making in relation to implementation of the strategy and action plan. Direction comes from the action plan chapter 6 of the strategy and “also in a strange way it is what has to happen in order to make a partnership work” (Key Informant 6).

Table 5.4, below presents selected Key Informant quotes in relation to the staff working groups under the implementation management group.

**Table 5.4 Selected Key Informant Quotes relating to staff work groups under the UDSIMG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Informant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“… as we’ve gone along we’ve set up a number of groups underneath IMG … we’ve got a transport group, we’ve got a comm[unication]s group, we’ve got things like that. They’re all chaired by a staff member from anyone of the partners, depending on who the right person happens to be. They deal with a lot of the ground work before things get to the IMG …”</td>
<td>Key Informant 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We have now got a plethora of staff groups that meet between the councils on a weekly basis. There are management groups, there are staff groups, there are specialist groups.”</td>
<td>Key Informant 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Beneath the staff group we’ve got plan changes, so basically RMA planning, we have communications, we have monitoring, transport. They’re the four major groups and there are sub-groups that work around those as well.”</td>
<td>Key Informant 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Now we have a PC One Project Group - planners who will give evidence [at RPS Change Hearings]”</td>
<td>Key Informant 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the Strategy is implemented through the actions of the individual partner councils, once decisions are made within the staff working groups and the implementation management group, council then undertakes the actions agreed upon through the collaborative decision-making process. Key Informant 5 described this, stating; ‘within the councils themselves, [there are] programmes around the urban development strategy and the parts that [they individually] need to deliver as part of it” (Key Informant 5).
**Strategic Partners Forum**

The Strategic Partners Forum (SPF) is a “sounding board” comprised of “interested organisations” (Key Informant 4). It includes representatives from economic, social, health, education, environment, transport and community sectors. The forum enables the integration of relevant knowledge and skills into the decision-making process from organisations that are not mandated by the planning framework to do so. Rather than having prescribed decision-making powers, the forum provides ongoing consultation with relevant and interested groups. Key Informant 4 explained that “whilst [the implementation management group] takes the issues [the strategic partners forum] have and try to build them in, and potentially report those to the council implementation committee, the partnership forum isn’t a decision making body”. The SPF also provides a mechanism for the UDSIMG to report back to the groups on their progress on the strategy (Key Informant 4). The Strategic Partners Forum represents a hybrid governance structure, enabling the participation of non statutory stakeholders in governance processes, reflecting the type of hybrid structures and forms that Wheeler (2002) found were needed for the implementation of sustainable development paradigms.

Recently, there has been a recognition that the structure of the strategic partners forum has failed to provide strong, adequate consultation and has not provided for the best outcomes. Key Informants 1, 4 and 6 identified that the existing structure provides a group that is too large and too mixed. Key Informant 6 noted that organisations such as government departments are ‘not interested in arguing in smaller things that community groups are… It’s one thing to get them around the table. It’s another to get them really engaged and understanding where the value could be.’ This supports Lemos and Agrawal’s (2009) assertion that how actors are engaged in governance processes affects the ability of the process to deliver improved decision-making, as opposed to how many.

As a result the forum is being reformed, and split into three groups, each with a slightly different remit. One of these groups will be a grouping of government agencies that are involved in the implementation of the Strategy, but who are not strategy partners. Key Informant 6 noted that; “that’s everyone from the Police, the Fire Service, Education, Stats New Zealand, MSD, Labour, Immigration, Housing, Transport.” Another second group will include community and topic interest groups, organisations like the Automobile Association, Sustainable Christchurch, cycling groups, the University of Canterbury –
groups who are more interested in "how" rather than ‘what’ (Key Informant 6). The final new group will address what Key Informant 4 described as; “limited success engaging Maori issues”. A rununga group, operating on an as-needed basis, will address this, and as Key Informant 6 stated; “they don’t have the resourcing or don’t have the desire to be involved constantly in a dialogue but when there are issues of importance they want to be engaged… and that deserves to be on a bilateral basis.” This reflects the need for flexibility in governance arrangements especially where there are new and hybrid governance processes and structures.

5.5.3 Relationships within the Partnership

Key informants recognised that the relationship between the partner and stakeholder organisations was a significant factor in the shaping of the implementation governance framework. This reflected Lemos and Agrawal (2009) argument that the way in which actors are engaged in governance processes can significantly effect the ability of the process to deliver improved decision-making. The Christchurch partnership took a careful approach to ensuring that the voluntary, collaborative partnership functioned effectively. Whilst staff of the partner councils undertake the implementation of the Strategy, there are two independent staff members, whose role it is to facilitate the partnership, collaborative decision-making and implementation of the Strategy. These are the Independent Chairperson, and the Implementation Manager.

The role of the Independent Chair, as established by the Strategy, is one of facilitation, leadership and advocacy with an emphasis on consensus decision-making and anchoring strategy implementation effectively through the strategy partners. The chairperson chairs the implementation committee, chief executives advisory group and the strategic partners forum. The current Independent Chairperson has experience in collaborative urban growth management strategies outside of Christchurch (Key Informant 1).

The other independent staff member, and the only full-time independent staff member of the partnership is the Implementation Manager, also known as the Implementation Advisor. The role of the Implementation Manager is leading and planning the implementation of the Strategy, managing the resources that are employed to achieve it, including facilitating with the staff from each partner organisation. The Key Informant 6 described the position as; “One third facilitator, one third lobbyist, and one third change
agent.” The job involved “holding everyone’s hand, keeping everyone on track, on task, delivering on time frames” (Key Informant 6).

Key Informants 4 and 8 highlighted the importance of the Implementation Manager’s role in fostering the relationship and collaboration between the partner organisations. They argued that effective communication between the partner organisations and their staff was integral to achieving the most appropriate implementation of the Strategy. Key Informant 4 stated:

“... lack of communication would mean that people would sometimes start veering off on a slight tangent, be it a small detail or something bigger. But unless there’s a lot of time and effort and resourcing put into the partnership working, sometimes you can take two steps forwards and then have one step back.”

Key Informant 2 recognised that the councils involved in the Greater Christchurch sub-region partnership had historically had different approaches to managing growth. This has led to “a series of Environment Court cases with the Regional Council on one side, and the TA’s on the other side. So it [has] been quite a litigious type of environment” (Key Informant 2). However, they (Key Informant 2) recognised that under the UDS partnership “the TA’s and Regional Council have made quite significant strides in working together”.

This relationship was identified by Key Informants 3 and 6 as being facilitated by the Action Plan within the Strategy, by a Memorandum of Agreement and; “also in a strange way by what has to happen in order to make a partnership work” (Key Informant 6). Table 5.5 presents selected Key Informant quotes in relation to the relationship and collaboration between strategy partners.

| “... there were memorandums of understanding, on how the different parties would behave towards to one another. Basically no surprises, we undertook to understand and consult and agree, so that’s sitting in the background.” (Key Informant 3) |
| “Things simply happen in the course of being a council, in terms of administering the city plan and things like that … In the absence of a partnership you wouldn’t talk to anyone, but in the presence of the partnership you need to talk through what you’re gonna do, its just part of collaboration.” (Key Informant 6) |
| “Anything that involves anything across border, we talk about, but equally anything in anyone’s territory that might have an impact across border, or have an impact on the [wider 2041 vision for Christchurch] that then needs to be talked through.” (Key Informant 6) |

Table 5.5 Selected Key Informant Quotes about general collaboration amongst Strategy Partners
The relationship between strategy partners is facilitated by a Memorandum of Agreement, which is attached as Appendix G. The purpose of the Memorandum is to “establish principles and approach to the implementation, monitoring and review between the parties in order to facilitate co-operation, collaboration and co-ordination of growth management responsibilities in the Greater Christchurch area” (GCUDS, 2007:174). The Memorandum recognises that a governance partnership requires co-ordination, relationship building, trust and a willingness to give up some functions of power, as identified by Lemos and Agrawal (2009). It also reflects the need for effective mechanisms to support collaborative partnerships as recognised by Lafferty (2004b).

Key Informants 3, 6, 7 and 9 identified that decision-making is based upon “Consensus, but with the flexibility for dissenting views” (Key Informant 3); “We consensus build. Sometimes people are happy to be overruled by the majority, if it doesn’t really put their noses out of joint, that’s fine, but otherwise we try to consensus build” (Key Informant 6). Key Informant 7 noted that;

“We can take votes, and we occasionally do, but the reality is its all very well having standing orders and what have you that give you dispute resolution procedures and votes. [But] collaboration doesn’t work like that. If one party’s really pissed off, sure you can vote out them, but to what end? If they’re still pissed off with you, you’ve got a problem.”

Key Informant 9 stated that; “We fight like cat and dog – that would sum up some our meetings, but we do get there in the end.” Key Informants 1, 3, 6, and 7 agreed that the support for the overall vision of the Strategy ensured that the partners were committed to ensuring resolution to conflict or disagreements. Key Informant 6 explained this further, stating that;

“It generally works, the organisations all buy-in to the long-term vision, they just might argue about how to get there, or whether they really need to do that really hard thing right now, or whether this is the right way to do things and that’s naturally something to argue about.”

Key Informant 3 stated that “a willingness by all the parties to recognise that sometimes one council wouldn’t see the world exactly the same as all the others” provided space for individual partners to disagree with decisions made by the collective group. For example, the Waimakariri District Council submitted against the location of the aircraft noise contour, which would have prevented development in a certain portion of Kaiapoi. Key Informant 3 noted that Waimakariri District Council “had the status of supporters for 95
percent of [the Strategy], but opposed for 5 percent of it.” And that “it was accepted by the other parties that Waimakariri would be appearing for support of general propositions, all the objectives, policies and so on, and then appearing as a submitter saying ‘but we don’t agree with this bit’.” Key Informant 3 explained this;

“If you’ve been in planning for while, you get to the point where you say, ‘the process will deal with that. You don’t agree with me, there’s a process there. I make the plan, you’re the submitter, you don’t like decision you can appeal it.’ At the end of the day someone’s going to make a decision, so we don’t have to fall out over it. That’s stood us in good stead I think.”

Relationships between staff of the partner organisations were identified by Key Informants 3, 4 and 7 as being an important factor in the successful implementation of collaboratively governed strategies. Key Informant 3 believed that; “In a project like this, the relationships are everything, Absolutely everything … So its all about that relationship building, so people understand where other parties might not agree with them, so they can get that out on the table and argue that out…” Likewise, Key Informant 7 stated; “You can’t overestimate [personal relationships]. It’s really, really important.”

Staff of the partner organisations meet on occasion informally, helping to create a more human relationship amongst the partnership, rather than an adversarial one. Key Informant 3 stated;

“... the CEO’s, they bicker and argue a bit, but at the end of the day, they sit down and have a meal together, the UDSIC, the UDSIMG, the planners involved in plan administration and dealing with plan changes ... again much the same, they have their little cups of coffee and snacks, before or after, and talk to each other ... That sort of relationship building is hugely important.”

The approach taken by the Greater Christchurch partnership reflects the approach supported by Lafferty (2004b), Meadowcroft (2004) and Lemos and Agrawal (2009). This involved placing effort and resources into fostering positive relationships amongst the actors involved in the governance processes, and ensuring that there were effective mechanisms in place to support stakeholder engagement with the process.

5.6 Progress

As at late 2010, the partner councils had integrated the strategy into their LTCCP’s and Annual Plans, and the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Strategy had been changed to reflect the strategy. However, implementation under RMA processes, including the
establishment of urban growth limits in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement has proven much more difficult. Plan Change One to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement sought to insert a new chapter “12A Development of Greater Christchurch”. This chapter established the land use distribution and prescribed household densities for the Greater Christchurch sub-region, and provided perhaps the most significant statutory backing to the Strategy, especially in relation to spatial development.

The plan change to the regional policy statement was publicly notified in July 2007. Variations to the plan change were notified in August 2008. External commissioners were appointed by Environment Canterbury, and heard submissions on the proposed change to the regional policy statement over 4 months to September 2009. Their recommendations were accepted by Environment Canterbury in December 2009. The recommendations accept that Proposed Change 1 is an appropriate response to the urban development issues of Greater Christchurch, and provide minor adjustments to the urban growth boundary. However, over 50 appeals have been lodged in the Environment Court against the proposed change, and there will be a lengthy appeals process before the plan change is operative (Key Informant 6). Only then will the territorial authorities be required to give effect to the urban limits. Key Informant 3 did, however, state that because of the advanced stage of the plan change, territorial authorities did have to give some consideration and weight to the plan change in consideration of resource consent applications.

5.7 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined a case study of growth management practice under New Zealand’s planning framework. The approach to urban growth management undertaken in the Greater Christchurch sub-region has shown that despite New Zealand’s planning framework not effectively providing for strategic and integrated governance of urban growth management, voluntary collaboration amongst relevant organisations can attempt to manage urban growth in a manner that reflects the new approach needed for sustainable development. The challenges faced by the Christchurch partnership are largely related to the ineffectiveness of the planning framework. Although the partnership has been successful in developing a strategy to manage the growth of its urban areas across boundaries, implementing the strategy through the planning framework has provided challenges. A voluntary governance structure created to oversee the implementation of the Strategy has attempted to overcome some of the failures of the planning framework.
However, the voluntary nature of the relationship poses some risks, with personal relationships amongst the staff, and willingness of local politicians being crucial to the continued existence of the collaborative approach.

The following chapter will draw upon the results of this case study and the previous ‘Planning Framework’ chapter to derive lessons as to how New Zealand’s planning framework enables the new approach to governance of urban growth management. It will suggest potential responses based upon the results and the actions favoured across the literature surveyed.
6 Lessons

6.1 Introduction

It is recognised that a new approach to the governance of urban growth management is required in order to achieve sustainable urban development (Callway, 2005; OECD, 2002). The statutory authorities and communities of Greater Christchurch have recognised this and have changed their planning processes to better reflect such an approach. The new approach to urban growth management adopted in Greater Christchurch in the early 2000’s reflects many of the concepts identified across literature on planning for sustainable development. This includes governing urban growth issues at the appropriate sub-regional scale, having wide stakeholder integration within the governance process, and employing a long-term, forward looking outlook. However, the adoption of this new approach has occurred on a voluntary basis, as opposed to being actively facilitated by New Zealand’s planning framework. The Christchurch case study has shown, that whilst the planning framework does not specifically promote a new approach to the governance of urban growth management, nor to does it specifically preclude it. It does however, act as more of a hindrance than a facilitator. Despite this, central government initiated changes to the planning framework, over the last decade, have moved the planning framework towards the more integrated and regional approach required for sustainable development. This supports Baker (2008b), Evans et. al. (2008) and Gow’s (2000) argument that central government has a key role in shaping planning frameworks and processes.

This chapter draws upon results from content analysis and key informant interviews, interrogating the relationship between the planning framework, and planning practice evaluated in the case study to answer Research Question Three, which asks: “What lessons
can be learnt from how urban growth has been managed in Greater Christchurch, including lessons for New Zealand’s planning framework?” It identifies a number of core lessons for the governance of urban growth management in New Zealand. It concludes, by offering potential responses that central government could take to address the key issues identified with the planning framework.

6.2 Key Lessons

This research, through the case study of planning practice in Greater Christchurch, has provided five key lessons for the governance of urban growth management in New Zealand. Firstly, that the existing planning framework is too complex, and as a result, a lack of alignment and clarity between the acts has led to poor integration between processes, plans and decision-making. Secondly, that the planning framework does not proactively provide for urban growth management. Thirdly, that the geographic spaces that governance is occurring at are not reflective of the issues being dealt with. Fourthly, that the engagement of central government in urban planning has been poor, and that in order for the planning framework to effectively provide for the new approach to governance of urban growth management needed for sustainable development, national leadership must be provided. Lastly, it is recognised that recent changes to the planning framework have been moving planning processes towards the new approach required.

6.2.1 The Current Planning Framework is too Complex

New Zealand’s planning framework acts as a hindrance to the application of a new approach to governance for urban growth management. The complexity of the processes and tools provided by the planning framework inhibit local government attempts at managing urban growth in a sustainable manner. Despite there being significant overlap in the institutions, processes, tools and issues dealt with by the three planning Acts, the integration and clarity of the relationships between them is poor. This has resulted in a situation where the requirements and processes, placed upon local authorities by the planning framework, are open to interpretation, leading to different local authorities, and the Environment Court implementing the framework in different ways. As a result, planning processes across different jurisdictions, and across the three different Acts are hugely varied. Not only is this inefficient in terms of continual re-interpretation and re-invention of planning processes and the time and effort spent in legal battles, but it creates difficulties in achieving integrated planning.
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It is clear that planning tools prepared under each of the three Acts are poorly aligned. The planning tools provided by the planning Acts have their own processes, timescales and requirements for consultation. The limited provisions within the Acts as to how planning processes and tools relate to each other are very weak considering the reliance of local authorities upon the three acts for setting the direction of their planning processes. The overlap and potential for integration between the processes and tools provided by each Act calls for a more coherent approach to the establishment of processes by the planning framework.

The effect of poor alignment between processes and tools has been a lack of clarity and inefficient planning processes. For example, prior to the collaborative approach to urban growth management in Greater Christchurch, the partner councils had interpreted the Acts in very different ways, and had structured their operations and processes very differently. Not only was this inefficient in terms of different councils having to individually interpret the Acts and structure their planning processes, but it caused fragmentation, disengagement and posed a challenge when it came to agreeing how to work within the acts collaboratively. The range of interpretations of the framework was also shown to be a problem, with the Environment Court’s scathing view of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement for not providing enough direction, which was something that Environment Canterbury had previously not interpreted as being within its responsibilities.

Also, whilst the Strategy had received overwhelming support from the community during consultative processes under the LGA, implementing the settlement pattern through the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement under the RMA required another lengthy consultation and appeals process. The RMA has since been amended to waive local authorities requirements to consult under RMA processes if the subject has been the matter of consultation with the same people within 36 months prior to the notification of the proposed policy statement (Schedule 1(3C) RMA). This change reflects a positive move by central government to address mis-alignment between the three planning acts.

The effect of having a planning framework split across three separate statutes that were developed in isolation from one another is reflected in the slightly different terminology used to express the concept of sustainable development. The RMA refers simply to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The LGA requires a wider sustainable development approach including the promotion of social, economic,
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environmental and cultural well-being of communities in the present and future. The LTMA, seeks to contribute to the affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system. Whilst the purposes of each of the Acts places different responsibilities on local authorities, the Environment Court only takes into account local government’s obligations under the RMA to provide for sustainable management of natural and physical resources, rather than the wider definitions of sustainability provided under the newer Acts. This posed a challenge for the implementation of the growth boundary through the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, as the councils struggled to convince the Environment Court of their financial reasoning for the limits proposed.

The complexity of the planning framework is not helped by the fact that the Acts were prepared and enacted up to twelve years apart from each other. The difficulties arising from having governance processes and issues being mandated from across a number of poorly aligned Acts are exemplified by the RMA. The RMA has been shown to be outdated, badly aligned with the other Acts well, and not reflective of the integrated, strategic approach required. Key Informant 6 summarised such concerns around the RMA;

“we use all three [Acts], and it would be fair to say that the hardest one to make work within that framework is the RMA. It’s the oldest, and its not well integrated with the others. It doesn’t talk to the others, or to put it the right way around, it doesn’t listen to the others very well ... The RMA sits a bit on its own, relative to the others. The others are great tools.”

The complex nature of the planning framework, as established by central government, has shown that national level legislation and policy influence the ability of lower levels of government to pursue a sustainable development approach to governance processes. This corroborates Evans et al.’s (2008) assessment of the importance of national level support in being key drivers of sustainable development.

6.2.2 Urban Planning is not provided for by the RMA

The RMA is New Zealand’s primary environmental and resource management statute. Not only is it the least integrated of the planning Acts, its age also means that it has become outdated in terms of the overall approach it provides towards planning. The Act does not adequately provide for urban planning, and as result poses a major impediment for the integrated, strategic approach to governance of urban growth management that is needed to promote sustainable development. The focus of the RMA is upon managing the natural environment, and as a result it lacks the ability to provide for the management of urban
environments. The effects based nature of the RMA, as opposed to being strategic and forward looking also poses a hurdle for planning for sustainable urban development.

The RMA is largely redundant in relation to urban growth management. Because the Act’s primary focus is on managing effects of activities on the natural environment it does not specifically provide for management of the built environment. The built environment is not referred to in the purpose of the Act or the definition of “environment”, nor is it reflected in the issues of national importance. The absence of relevant national level planning tools such as a National Policy Statement relevant to the urban environment also exacerbates this. This lack of mandate for urban planning issues has contributed towards the inability of local authorities to manage urban growth and development in a sustainable manner.

The effects based approach to development that the RMA provides places the momentum of development upon the market, with developers taking a leading role in deciding where, when and how development occurs. This approach inhibits forward-looking, visionary planning that is required for sustainable development. This is exacerbated by the short-term nature of political cycles, which has directed much focus onto short-term issues. For example, the majority of the amendments to the RMA have been focussed on improving the efficiency of planning processes, rather than focussing on the planning outcomes. Such an approach does not align with the forward-looking, long-term nature of sustainable development, nor does it provide for effective urban growth management. Previous failed attempts at collaborative, integrative and long-term planning in the Christchurch sub-region were partly blamed upon the lack of a mandate or requirement for strategic planning under the RMA based planning framework.

The inception of a collaborative, integrative and strategic approach to urban growth management in Greater Christchurch reflected recognition amongst local authorities, businesses, the community and the Environment Court, that the market-led, reactive approach to planning under the RMA had failed to achieve sustainable development of urban Christchurch. The RMA was widely panned by key informants as not providing for long-term, forward-looking, strategic planning. However, it was recognised that recent developments in the planning framework have shifted planning processes towards the strategic, integrative and collaborative model required for governance for sustainable urban development. The enactment of the LGA in 2002 provided for strategic planning,
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exemplifying the ability of planning frameworks to promote or inhibit planning processes at sub-national levels.

Whilst the planning framework does not specifically provide for integrated, strategic urban planning, nor does it specifically prevent it. The lack of clarity and alignment between processes does, however, act as an impediment. Howell-Moroney (2007) found that only where there is a requirement for urban growth management planning are there consistently success in achieving development outcomes. It has been shown that voluntary approaches to sustainable development governance, as the approach in Christchurch is, are less likely to produce the outcomes required for sustainable development (Khanna & Brouhle, 2009).

6.2.3 Boundaries of Local Government are Often Abstract

The majority of local authorities within New Zealand are based upon geographic boundaries that were created over two decades ago. In Greater Christchurch the urban areas and issues have grown and now reflect a wider geographic space than what the authorities have jurisdiction for. This has seen resource and urban growth management processes being undertaken in fragmented and unproductive manners. This is reflective of Wheeler (2002) and the UNFPA’s (2007) findings that political boundaries of sub-national authorities rarely coincide with the geographic scale that urban areas influence. Jurisdictional fragmentation and decentralisation of governance responsibilities has led to the boundaries of local governments being inappropriate for dealing with the drivers and impacts of urban growth.

The Local Government Commission has a reactive approach to the re-organisation of local authority boundaries. The initiation of re-organisation proposals is limited to affected local authorities, the Minister of Local Government or ten percent of the electors of the affected area. Planning practitioners in Greater Christchurch were against local government amalgamation, reflecting Wheeler’s (2002) argument about entrenched political motives working against local government reform or the creation of new regional authorities. However, as the merger of the Banks Peninsula District Council with Christchurch City Council showed, local government reform does occur when absolutely necessary.

Central government recognised that the fragmentation of local government in the Auckland region posed a significant impediment to the efficient and sustainable governance of the region. As a result, and as of 1 November 2010 the territorial authorities and regional
Lessons
council of Auckland will be amalgamated to form a unitary authority. Other areas within New Zealand with fragmented local governance structures are yet to see proactive engagement by central government. As shown in the case study, however, there is expectation that this will, and should occur in the medium term.

6.2.4 Central Government Engagement has been Poor
The engagement of New Zealand’s central government in urban growth management has been poor. Not only has there been a lack of strategic direction set within the framework, but the government has also been slow in reacting to the increasing need for a new approach to governance. As a result of central governments failure to be actively engaged in the governance of urban growth management, New Zealand has a highly devolved planning framework. The current framework places responsibilities on local government but does not adequately facilitate the processes required for those responsibilities to be effectively achieved. Central government has not utilised the ability to establish national direction through the development of national level policy tools under the RMA. Whilst it has made progress in terms of amending the legislative framework and processes, it has not gone far enough, as the case study of urban growth management practice in Greater Christchurch has shown.

It was recognised across the literature surveyed in chapter two that the best approach to planning is often a combination of top-down and bottom-up planning (Baker & Eckerberg, 2008a; Blanes, 2008; Evans et al., 2008; Gow, 2000). Overall strategic direction is best coming from central government, whilst technical aspects are best derived at the local level. New Zealand’s planning framework provides the basis for this approach, with central government largely devolving planning functions to local government. The policy hierarchy that the RMA establishes provides for national level policy documents such as national policy statements. Such documents can establish national level strategy that must then be given effect through lower planning documents such as regional policy statements and district plans. However, in the almost two decades since the RMA has been passed, there has been very little central government leadership, in terms of producing national level policy tools such as, national policy statements. There are only two operative national policy statements, and four national environmental standards, none of which are of particular relevance to urban growth management. This has resulted in a planning framework that relies heavily upon the way in which individual councils interpret planning
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legislation and how they reflect their communities’ values through planning processes. The effect of this is that planning processes and outcomes that are not always reflective of the issues considered to be of national, and international importance.

As a result, where sustainable development approaches to the governance of urban growth management are being undertaken in New Zealand, they are being driven by a bottom-up approach, from the local level, as opposed to being a result of national strategic direction. This provides evidence to support Vos’ (2007) finding that where the implementation of the sustainable development has been happening, that it has been led from the local level and community and private sectors as opposed to national or international levels. It also supports arguments that identify the international and national levels as being responsible for the failure of the sustainable development paradigm to be implemented properly.

New Zealand’s government has recognised failures of the planning framework to adequately promote the sustainable development of our urban areas. However, its response to this has been limited in success. For example, the issue of poor statutory integration has posed a problem for central government. In the 2003 Sustainable Development Programme of Action, the then Labour-led government recognised the need for integrated and strategic planning in relation to urban growth. An Urban Affairs portfolio within cabinet was established, but action on its intended purpose was not realised, perhaps due to a lack of resourcing or willingness to challenge the status-quo governance arrangements. The portfolio has since been dis-established by the current National-led government. Cabinet also struggled with the issue of integration during discussion leading to the 2005 amendments to the RMA. It indicated that following the completion of the 2005 review, the government intended to work on the issues of how explicit recognition of other government strategies could be undertaken, and how linkages between LTCCPs and RLTS and the RMA could be improved (Cabinet Minutes, 2004).

A 2004 review of the RMA sought to improve a number of perceived weaknesses in the Act. Cabinet Minutes (2004:25) supporting the introduction of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2004, which later became the Resource Management Amendment Act 2005, stated that the Bill sought to amend section 30(1) of the RMA to ‘require regional councils to consider promoting sustainable urban form, and timely and effective provision of infrastructure and its integration with land use policies’. It also established that regional policy;
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‘needs to be more influential and strategic in its direction to address land use conflicts, providing increased certainty to promote sustainable urban form, manage infrastructure and its integration with land use activities and allocate natural resources’

(Cabinet Minutes, 2004:25).

However, these amendments were removed from the Bill by the time it was enacted. Instead, section 30(1)(gb) was inserted into the RMA by the 2005 amendments. The insertion of this clause required regional councils to integrate infrastructure planning with land use, and reflects a central government directive on the importance of integrated planning approaches to growth management. Whilst this was a move in the right direction, it still lacked the significance and clarity that the amendments originally proposed, and showed a failure of central government to provide for effective leadership.

A top-down approach to setting overall strategy and direction was recognised across the literature surveyed as a highly appropriate governance structure (Baker & Eckerberg, 2008a; Blanes, 2008; Evans et al., 2008; Gow, 2000). This enabled national level strategy and direction to be established and for lower levels of government to operate processes and tools accordingly, whilst adapting to reflect the local context. The government has signalled its desired urban development characteristics through the Urban Design Protocol. However, the voluntary nature of the Protocol has limited its implementation to individual developments. Legislating to require statutory planning processes and tools to reflect the design characteristics in the Protocol would place less reliance upon political support and voluntary processes. As a result, it would provide for wider implementation of urban design principles. As identified earlier, although the RMA provides for national policy tools such as National Policy Statements, they have yet to be utilised.

6.2.5 Recent Changes have been in the Right Direction

Despite these leadership failures, the overall direction that the planning framework has been moving towards over the previous decade has pointed towards greater integration and strategic planning, better reflecting the new approach required. The non-statutory actions and the enactment of the LGA and the LTMA, and subsequent amendments to these Acts and the RMA have moved planning processes towards a more integrated, strategic approach to land use planning. These changes have moved the planning framework, and the processes it shapes towards the new approach to governance of urban growth management necessary for sustainable development. The case study has shown that central
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government actions in changing the framework has affected processes at the lower levels of government, thus supporting the arguments of Lafferty (2004a; 2004b) and Howell-Moroney (2007) that frameworks affect processes, and Meadowcroft (2004), Baker (2008a) and Evans et. al.’s (2008) argument that central government has a pivotal role in shaping the planning framework and providing leadership.

The LGA, enacted in 2002, provided for strategic and collaborative planning. Key informants stated the LGA was the pivotal piece of legislation that provided for the, integrative approach to governance. They identified the enactment of the LGA in 2002 as being a major reason why the partnership did not fail as had the previous attempts at collaborative, strategic planning in greater Christchurch had.

The importance of the enactment of the LTMA in establishing greater integration within the planning framework was emphasised by Key Informant 5, who stated that;

“[When] Transit ... was operating under the Transit New Zealand Act, it’s main purpose effectively was to manage the state highways in terms of making sure they ran efficiently and they were safe ... So it was a fairly narrow authority that it had ... The LTMA provides for NZTA to actually look at integrated, sustainable, affordable, safe, and responsive transport networks.”

Not only has the enactment of the LGA and LTMA helped progressively develop a more integrated planning framework, but amendments to the three planning Acts have done so too. Amongst these amendments mentioned by key informants were 2005 amendments to the RMA including; the insertion of section 30(1)(gb) which required regional councils to integrate infrastructure with land use, and; the insertion of section 73(4) which required district plans to ‘give effect to’ regional policy statements (as opposed to ‘not be inconsistent with’). Key Informant 3 recognised that Environment Canterbury;

“got a fair bit of encouragement from the change to the RMA that changed the relationship between the RPS and district plans, from being ‘not inconsistent with’ to ‘must give effect to’, that gave a bit of encouragement to the idea that there could be leadership shown in the RMA context by regional councils.”

Key Informants 2, 3, 6 and 8 also recognised that 2004 amendments to the LGA, requiring Auckland’s local authorities to integrate land transport and land use planning through the regional policy statement and district plans provided an indication of the governments direction in planning policy. Key Informant 2 recognised that these legislative changes to the planning framework have moved the planning framework towards a direction where
planning processes would be “more reflective of a regional type of approach”. Likewise, the local government amalgamation in Auckland in 2010 also reflected the new approach to governance.

Much of central government’s recent focus has been directed towards Auckland. The 2003 Programme of Action explicitly stated that Auckland would be the focus of initial central government efforts. The importance of Auckland was re-enforced by the current government, who recognised urban planning as one of the key reasons behind the amalgamation of Auckland’s local authorities into a regional unitary authority. As a result of the amalgamation, action on urban development has been postponed until after Auckland’s governance arrangements have settled in. In the meantime the rest of the country has been left to govern development processes under the existing planning framework.

The result of changes to the planning framework has been a shift towards the more integrated, strategic approach to governance of urban growth management processes required for sustainable development. It has been shown by the case study of urban growth management practice in Greater Christchurch that this has affected planning and governance processes. This shows the importance and ability of the planning framework in providing, supporting, promoting and facilitating planning processes and outcomes. It supports Lafferty (2004a) and Howell-Moroney’s (2007) assertions that the national level of governance has a crucial role in steering governance processes at sub-national levels. However, as outlined above, despite the movement of the planning framework towards a more strategic, integrated and collaborative approach to urban growth management, there are still significant weaknesses in the direction it sets. The changes that have occurred have not gone far enough to effectively promote the new approach needed. The framework is still fragmented and does not require integration or long-term urban growth management planning. To continue moving the planning framework in the right direction, greater national leadership is needed.

6.3 Responses

New Zealand’s government has made some progress in the past decade in moving the planning framework towards the new approach to governance prescribed across the literature surveyed. However, this progress has not gone far enough. The planning framework still fails to adequately provide a strong basis for sustainable growth
management governance, which Howell-Moroney (2007) found to be required to provide for consistent success in land development outcomes. Lafferty (2004a) recognised that although the role of governments and nation-states has changed over the previous three decades as neo-liberal reform has contributed to a shift from government to governance, their importance has not. Indeed, the role of central government in urban growth management is crucial. Central government has the ability to promote and support the sub-national governance of urban growth management in a way that would better provide for sustainable outcomes. It too, can act as a barrier or inhibitor to such governance, as the Christchurch case study has shown.

This section will outline potential responses that the New Zealand government could take in relation to the planning framework for urban growth management. It will explore four key responses that central government should take. Firstly, that there need to be strong national strategic direction provided, promoting and support local government to govern urban growth management processes in a way that can contribute to the sustainable spatial development of urban areas; secondly, that urban planning should be provided for through the RMA; thirdly, that the statutory planning framework should be clarified, to remove inconsistencies, and to provide for more effective planning processes; fourthly, that appropriate geographic scales for local government should be enabled.

The overall premise of these responses rests upon the understanding that action needs to be taken at the national level, supporting the findings of this research, and of Lafferty (2004a;2004b) and Howell-Moroney (2007). Lafferty (2004b) argued that effective implementation of the sustainable development paradigm requires an institutional catalyst within the formal governance structures to provide leadership and ensure consistency amongst the vertically and horizontally integrated actors. Re-creating a cabinet-level position with responsibility for urban affairs could provide such a catalyst, and act as a national level leader for the implementation of sustainable urban development processes. This would also ensure that there was vertical and horizontal integration of the sustainable development paradigm within planning and urban growth management, and ensure consistent and continual direction.

6.3.1 Provide National Level Strategy

Central government should use the RMA as it seemingly was intended to by its creators and utilise this ability, by enacting a National Policy Statement on Urban Design, as
investigated by the Ministry for the Environment (2009). Utilising the policy hierarchy within the RMA provides a relatively easy process, and enables national level priorities to be set, and given effect to by local government. This will provide greater consistency in planning and consenting processes at local levels, and will help local government understand the national governments priorities and expectations.

Central government should not take its involvement in the governance of urban growth management further than its facilitatory and strategy-setting role. It should not be involved in decision-making at local government levels, and nor too should it be heavily involved in relationships between councils and stakeholders, aside from the involvement of relevant public sector organisations. The presence of the mixed top-down/bottom-up approach provides for the devolution of planning responsibilities to local government enabled by the RMA. This structure was recognised across the literature surveyed as being the most appropriate structure for urban growth management (Berger & Steurer, 2008; Baker, 2008b; Blanes, 2008; Evans et al., 2008; Gow, 2000).

**6.3.2 Provide for Urban Planning within the RMA**

The failure of the RMA to adequately provide for the strategic, integrated management of urban environments needs to be addressed. The Act should be amended to better reflect the importance of urban environments in meeting the challenge of sustainability. This could include amending the definition of “environment” in the Act to include the built environment, inserting the built environment as an issue of national importance in section 6. It could also entail utilisation of existing national policy tools such as national policy statements. Provision for urban growth management through the RMA, for example by enacting a relevant national policy statement, would provide local government with clear responsibilities in relation to the management of urban growth.

In the mid to late 2000’s there was recognition that the RMA provided national policy statements as a tool to set national direction, and that the neglect to utilise such tools had been an oversight by central government. The Ministry for the Environment began consultation on a potential national policy statement on urban design in 2008. The result of this consultation was conditional support for a national policy statement on urban design (Ministry for the Environment, 2009). Submitters to the proposal considered a national policy statement as crucial to achieving sustainable development of urban areas. It was identified that the major advantage of a national policy statement would be to increase
consistency and reduce duplication of effort across local authorities. It was also recognised that a national policy statement would foster a more integrated approach to the management of the urban environment. A national policy statement would also legitimise urban design as a valid matter for consideration under the natural environment focussed RMA. The voluntary Urban Design Protocol establishes the direction that central government wants urban issues to be dealt with, however, its voluntary nature means that it is indicative only. Without any statutory backing its implementation is likely to remain limited. Implementing the concepts within the Protocol through a national policy statement would require all planning documents at regional and local levels to give effect to them.

Although progress on national scale changes to the framework had been stalled whilst Auckland local government amalgamation was undertaken, the Minister for the Environment, Nick Smith, indicated in a speech to the New Zealand Planning Institute Auckland Spatial Plan Conference in September 2010 that “a National Policy Statement covering the urban environment could … set out [the] principles needed for a well functioning and well designed city” (Smith, 2010:3). This shows a potential willingness of the present government to act upon the recommendations within the Report on Submissions on the scope of a potential National Policy Statement on Urban Design.

6.3.3 Provide Clarity within the Statutory Framework

Reforming the statutory framework, by removing the complexity that currently inhibits planning processes and results in various interpretations and legal battles, would be a major step towards providing for the type of strategic, integrated and collaborative planning required for the sustainable development of urban areas. Some form of national guidance as to how the three planning Acts work together, would save constant ‘re-invention of the wheel’. Streamlining of planning processes across the three Acts was supported by key informants as a being a valuable response. The lengthy process of consultation and appeals of getting the urban limits consulted on, and agreed to in the Strategy implemented through RMA processes needs to addressed.

Both non-legislative changes and amendments to legislation are possible solutions. Non-legislative guidance as to how the three Acts relate to each other is a potential solution to the wide variation in interpreting the planning framework. There is also potential for amendments to the Acts that would, for example, direct the Environment Court to consider local government responsibilities under the LGA when making RMA decisions. However,
it is clear that one size approach does not fit all contexts. This reflects the need and reason for a top-down approach to governance of strategic direction, and a bottom-up approach to the development of technical aspects.

6.3.4 Ensure Appropriate Geographic Scale for Governance

There is a need for central government to better structure governance at the appropriate geographic scale. Although the partnership in Greater Christchurch has provided the governance at the appropriate scale, there is potential for the partnership to fall apart considering it is completely voluntary. Amalgamations could be necessary where collaboration fails, and where cross boundary issues must be dealt with in order to enable sustainable development.

Central government could legislate to reform local government, as they have done in the case of Auckland. Another possibility is to change the processes that the Local Government Commission takes in reorganising local government. At present the Commission is reactionary, only initiating boundary changes, or local government amalgamations when requested to. Such requests are limited, perhaps reflecting Wheeler (2002) and Pollard’s (2000) argument that existing and traditional political notions work to maintain the status quo. Decisions on what new boundaries should be, are guided by requirements to reflect existing abstract political or statistical boundaries, rather than the geographic scale of the issues that local government is responsible for dealing with.

6.4 Conclusion

This chapter synthesised lessons gained from the evaluation of how New Zealand’s planning framework provides for urban growth management, and a case study of planning practice under the framework. It concluded a number of lessons that need to be addressed in order for the planning framework to better provide for the new approach of governance of urban growth management necessary for sustainable development. These included; that the existing planning framework is too complex; that the RMA does not provide for urban planning, and; that central government’s engagement in urban growth management has been poor. It recognised that national level leadership was crucial at addressing these issues, due to the integral role of within governance frameworks. Potential national level responses to the lessons identified were suggested, including; providing for urban planning within the RMA, providing national level strategy to better reflect the mixed top-down,
bottom-up model of governance, and clarifying the statutory framework to remove the complexity that has inhibited planning processes.
7 Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

The objective of this thesis was to undertake a review of how urban growth management processes are provided for under New Zealand’s planning framework. From this it sought to make recommendations based upon international literature and case study analysis, as to how the planning framework could be improved to better facilitate sustainable urban growth management. To achieve this, it answered three research questions, as set out in Table 7.1. This chapter synthesises the results from these questions, and discusses the conclusions that can be drawn from them. It outlines how the themes developed in the literature review relate to the findings and makes recommendations based upon the lessons learnt are then provided. Finally, this chapter evaluates the implications of these conclusions for the broader urban growth management and governance fields, and suggests possible directions for future research.

Table 7.1: Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question One</th>
<th>How does New Zealand’s planning framework provide for urban growth management processes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question Two</td>
<td>How have urban growth management processes been governed in the Greater Christchurch sub-region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question Three</td>
<td>What lessons can be learnt from how urban growth management processes have been governed in Greater Christchurch, including lessons for New Zealand’s planning framework for urban growth management?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Governance for Urban Growth Management

Although the sustainable development paradigm has continued to grow in acceptance, acknowledgement, breadth and understanding, there remains a disjunction between theory
and practice. This gap is especially evident in urban growth management, where the implementation of planning theories which promote sustainable urban form, such as smart growth and new urbanism, have failed to deliver the sustainable development outcomes promoted. The governance of implementation processes has been identified as one, if not the key reason for this disjuncture.

It is recognised across the literature surveyed that a new approach to how urban growth management processes are governed is needed, in order to provide for sustainable development of urban areas. The new approach focuses on greater integration of actors and knowledge within governance processes in order to better reflect the holistic approach prescribed by the sustainable development paradigm. It also calls for a new geographic scale for governance, the functional region, or city-region, so that decision-making and responses to particular issues could be dealt with at a scale that effectively reflects those issues.

This research firstly outlined how New Zealand’s planning framework provides for the governance of urban growth management. It found that the processes and tools provided by the framework are poorly integrated. It also established that the planning framework does not actively promote urban growth management processes. It recognised that the planning framework does not properly reflect the mixed top-down/bottom-up structure that is widely recognised as being required for effective governance of urban growth management and sustainable development.

The Greater Christchurch case study provided an example of urban growth management practice under New Zealand’s current planning framework. Despite the fact that the planning framework does not actively promote the new approach to governance, voluntary efforts at structuring governance in such a way are not prohibited. The challenges that were faced by the Greater Christchurch partnership were mainly related to the ineffectiveness of the planning framework to provide for the required integrated, collaborative, regional approaches to urban growth management.

The penultimate chapter provided lessons identified from the case study relating to how New Zealand’s planning framework affects the ability of growth management processes to reflect a sustainable development approach. Finally, a number of potential responses were identified. The following section provides specific recommendations based upon the
lessons learnt from the Greater Christchurch case study of urban growth management practice under New Zealand’s planning framework.

7.3 **Recommendations**

The following recommendations are derived from the lessons learnt about how urban growth management processes have been governed in Christchurch, under New Zealand’s planning framework. The basis for the recommendations are drawn from the theory outlined in Chapter Two, and are intended to help address the disjuncture between urban growth management theory and its practice. They are directed towards the New Zealand Government, reflecting the importance of central government’s role in establishing governance and planning frameworks, and in facilitating sustainable development. The recommendations propose courses of action that would provide for the new approach to governance of urban growth management.

**Enact a National Policy Statement on Urban Environment**

The Minister for the Environment should utilise existing powers to provide national level strategic direction through the RMA, by enacting a national policy statement on the urban environment. By providing strategic direction at the national level through a national policy statement, local government would be required to give effect to the strategy through their planning documents. Doing so would legitimise the urban environment as a valid matter for consideration under the natural environment focussed RMA. The requirement for lower levels of government to give effect to a national policy statement would provide for the implementation of urban design principles at the more appropriate and wider scale needed, than the voluntary Urban Design Protocol does. It would also reduce the wide range of growth management practices by increasing consistency across local authorities.

**Simplify the Statutory Planning Framework**

Planning processes provided for by the statutory framework should be simplified and aligned. Legislative amendments could provide better alignment between the planning processes and tools under the RMA, LGA and LTMA. This would ensure improved integration and more efficient planning processes. It would also remove the litigious nature of urban growth management, where the onus is often on local authorities to justify their approach and choice of policies and tools at the Environment Court. An example of recent legislative changes, simplifying and aligning planning processes between the Acts was the introduction, and extension of Clause 3C, Schedule 1 of the RMA. This waived local
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authorities requirements to consult under RMA processes if the subject has been the matter of consultation with the same people within 36 months prior to the notification of the proposed policy statement.

**Improve Local Government Reorganisation Processes**
The Local Government Commission should be given a more proactive mandate for assessing the appropriateness of geographic boundaries of local government areas. The option of giving the Minister for the Environment the ability to initiate re-organisation proposals should also be explored. Clause 4 (Schedule 3) of the LGA should be amended to require the boundaries of any re-organised local authority to take into account functions such as housing and job markets and transport and recreation patterns. Such considerations should be given more weight than the existing requirements for boundaries to conform to other arbitrary boundaries. Ultimately, the geographic scale of local authorities would become better aligned to the issues that they are charged to deal with.

**Re-create the Minister for Urban Affairs Position within Cabinet**
Re-creating the role of Minister for Urban Affairs would provide the institutional catalyst and leadership required to effectively implement sustainable development across urban growth management. Resourcing and empowering the position, so that it could effectively implement the required new approach to governance of urban growth management across central and local government would provide for the integration and consistency needed. Such a position would provide oversight and support at the highest level for the actors and processes within urban development. This would enable central government to be more responsive to urban development needs, and more proactive in implementing required changes to the planning framework.

**7.4 Contribution to Literature**

Urban growth management provides the ability to direct the spatial growth of urban areas towards sustainable development. However, it is recognised that traditional governance structures and processes do not adequately provide for the effective implementation of urban growth management theories. This thesis interrogated this research problem by undertaking a review of how urban growth management is provided for in New Zealand, and provided lessons as to how the governance framework established in New Zealand could better reflect a sustainable development approach.
The lessons and recommendations provided by this research contribute towards knowledge that can help address the disjuncture between theory and practice. Both in terms of ensuring better governance for the implementation of urban growth management, and in the wider respect of implementing the sustainable development paradigm. The findings of this research support Lafferty’s (2004a, 2004b) assertion that how planning processes are structured can have a significant effect on how planning processes operate, and whether or not they reflect the approach required for sustainable development. It also supports Howell-Moroney’s (2007) argument that central government has a key role in the development of the planning framework, and in shaping, facilitating, promoting sustainable development.

The majority of the findings, lessons and recommendations gained from this research are only applicable to the New Zealand context. However, the broad scale conclusions reflect many of the assertions from within the literature. The research is also important and in the context of the need to close the gap between the theory of sustainable development, and its practice.

There was only scope within the current research for a single case study. Further research, into different locations within New Zealand could explore other approaches to urban growth management under the same planning framework, and could potentially provide different perspectives and lessons. Whilst Greater Christchurch has been relatively successful in adopting a governance model that reflects the approach needed for sustainable development of urban areas, research into areas where there has not been such success could be undertaken. A particularly important area for future research is to interrogate how the new governance arrangements in Auckland affect urban growth management processes. From such research, there could well be pertinent lessons for the planning framework for the wider country.
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Information Sheet and Consent Form
14 April 2010

GOVERNANCE OF URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Project?

This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for the Master of Planning Degree. The aim of the project is to find out whether New Zealand’s planning framework provides for management of urban growth in a way that incorporates discourses of sustainable development.

What Type of Participants are being sought?

The participants sought include representatives of statutory authorities, private consultants and other actors within urban growth management in New Zealand, specifically the greater Christchurch area.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to take part in a semi-structured interview of approximately 30 minutes in duration which will involve questions relating to the project aim outlined above. The interview will be conducted in person and will be audio-taped.

Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?

You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?

This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

Access to the data will be limited to the researcher and supervising staff member.
The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve your anonymity. You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the project should you wish.

The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned below will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University's research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

Reasonable precautions will be taken to protect and destroy data gathered by email. However, the security of electronically transmitted information cannot be guaranteed. Caution is advised in the electronic transmission of sensitive material.

**What if Participants have any Questions?**

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:-

Brendon Harper  
Department of Geography  
Telephone Number: (03) 479 4216

or  
Dr. Linda Malam  
Department of Geography  
Telephone Number: (03) 479 8784

This proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Geography, University of Otago
GOVERNANCE OF URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-

1. my participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. the data (audio-tapes) will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed;

4. This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.

5. The results of the project may be published and available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity.

I agree to take part in this project.

................................................................. ......................................................

(Signature of participant) (Date)

This proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Geography, University of Otago.
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Email Requesting Key Informants Participation
Dear ____________,

My name is Brendon Harper, I am a Master of Planning student at the University of Otago. As a part requirement for my degree I am undertaking thesis research on the governance of urban growth management in New Zealand, and am using the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy as a case study.

I am writing to ask you if you would like to participate in a short interview, of approximately 30 minutes duration, in relation to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy and the governance of urban growth management in New Zealand in general.

I have attached an information sheet for research participants to this email if you would like further information on my research and what an interview will involve.

I will be in the Christchurch area during the week of Monday 5 July 2010 to Friday 9 July 2010. If you are available at any stage during this week, and willing to participate in an interview, I would be very grateful.

I look forward to your reply.

Yours Sincerely,

Brendon Harper
MPlan Student
Department of Geography
University of Otago
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Interview Outline
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Introduction

- Scope of research
- Consent form

Personal

- Name and Organisation
- Role / Position
- Background / Involvement with UGM & GCUDS

How was urban growth managed prior to the UDS?

- Structures
- Failures

What were the drivers of the UDS process? / Where did the idea of GCUDS originate from?

- Negative aspects of existing growth patterns
- Change i.e. popn. growth, labour, households
- International planning trends (e.g. sustainable development, smart growth)
- National / Regional / Local level (LGA??)
- Individuals
- Political will

How was the geographic scale decided upon and why?

- What factors were used in deciding upon the geographic scale and why

How was it decided what organisations would be involved in the process?

- Strategy Partners
- Strategic Partners Forum – Scope of sectors
- Levels of government – Local, Regional, National
- Tangata Whenua

How has the public been involved in the process?

- What level of public participation was decided to be appropriate?
- How did public consultation adjust priorities?
- Role of NGOs, community groups

What are the roles of the different actors and organisations?

- Implementation Committee
- Strategic Partners Forum
- Strategy Partners
- Role of KI’s organisation
- Central Govt

How have the actors collaborated and co-operated together?

- Structures
Appendices

- Power and influence
- Resourcing – costs, staff,
- Conflict resolution
- Monitoring/Reviewing/Updating
- Central Government

Implementation

- How does UDS fit into planning hierarchy?
- Use existing statutory based planning tools

How has the UDS incorporated sustainable development?

- Vision – lip service or actually basis for everything
- Integration of sectors
- Balance economic, social, environmental needs
- Time scale
- Why was sustainable development incorporated?

What lessons can be learnt from the GCUDS in relation to governance of urban growth management in the rest of New Zealand?

- National level leadership?
- National Policy Statement
- Stay voluntary / become mandatory
- Can use existing organisations rather than establishing new organisations
- Pros: independent of political election cycles / ECAN issues
- Cons: ??
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Relevant Sections of the RMA 1991 outlining contents of local government’s RMA planning tools.
62 Contents of regional policy statements

(1) A regional policy statement must state –
   (a) the significant resource management issues for the region; and
   (b) the resource management issues of significance to –
      (i) iwi authorities in the region; and
      (ii) the board of a foreshore and seabed reserve, to the extent that those
           issues relate to that reserve; and
   (c) the objectives sought to be achieved by the statement; and
   (d) the policies for those issues and objectives and an explanation of those
      policies; and
   (e) the methods (excluding rules) used, or to be used, to implement the policies; and
   (f) the principal reasons for adopting the objectives, policies, and methods of
      implementation set out in the statement; and
   (g) the environmental results anticipated from implementation for those policies
      and methods; and
   (h) the processes to be used to deal with issues that cross local authority
      boundaries, and issues between territorial authorities or between regions; and
   (i) the local authority responsible in the whole or any part of the region for
      specifying the objectives, policies, and methods for the control of the use of
      land –
      (i) to avoid or mitigate natural hazards or any group of hazards; and
      (ii) to prevent or mitigate the adverse effects of the storage, use disposal, or
           transportation of hazardous substances; and
      (iii) to maintain indigenous biodiversity
   (j) the procedures used to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies or
      methods contained in the statement; and
   (k) any other information required for the purpose of the regional council’s
      functions, powers and duties under this Act.

(2) If no responsibilities are specified in the regional policy statement for functions
    described in subsection (1)(i)(i) or (ii), the regional council retain primary
    responsibility for the function in subsection (1)(i)(i) and the territorial authorities
    of the region retain primary responsibility for the function in subsection (1)(i)(ii).

(3) A regional policy statement must not be inconsistent with any water conservation
    order and must give effect to a national policy statement of New Zealand coastal
    policy statement.
67 Contents of regional plans

(1) A regional plan must state—
   (a) the objectives for the region; and
   (b) the policies to implement the objectives; and
   (c) the rules (if any) to implement the policies.

(2) A regional plan may state—
   (a) the issues that the plan seeks to address; and
   (b) the methods, other than rules, for implementing the policies for the region; and
   (c) the principal reasons for adopting the policies and methods; and
   (d) the environmental results expected from the policies and methods; and
   (e) the procedures for monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies
      and methods; and
   (f) the processes for dealing with issues—
      (i) that cross local authority boundaries; or
      (ii) that arise between territorial authorities; or
      (iii) that arise between regions; and
   (g) the information to be included with an application for a resource consent; and
   (h) any other information required for the purpose of the regional council's
      functions, powers, and duties under this Act.

(3) A regional plan must give effect to—
   (a) any national policy statement; and
   (b) any New Zealand coastal policy statement; and
   (c) any regional policy statement.

(4) A regional plan must not be inconsistent with—
   (a) a water conservation order; or
   (b) any other regional plan for the region; or
   (c) a determination or reservation of the chief executive of the Ministry of
      Fisheries made under section 186E of the Fisheries Act 1996.

(5) A regional plan must record how a regional council has allocated a natural resource
    under section 30(1)(fa) or (fb) and (4), if the council has done so.

(6) A regional plan may incorporate material by reference under Part 3 of Schedule 1.
75 Contents of district plans

(1) A district plan must state—
   (a) the objectives for the district; and
   (b) the policies to implement the objectives; and
   (c) the rules (if any) to implement the policies.

(2) A district plan may state—
   (a) the significant resource management issues for the district; and
   (b) the methods, other than rules, for implementing the policies for the district; and
   (c) the principal reasons for adopting the policies and methods; and
   (d) the environmental results expected from the policies and methods; and
   (e) the procedures for monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies and methods; and
   (f) the processes for dealing with issues that cross territorial authority boundaries; and
   (g) the information to be included with an application for a resource consent; and
   (h) any other information required for the purpose of the territorial authority's functions, powers, and duties under this Act.

(3) A district plan must give effect to—
   (a) any national policy statement; and
   (b) any New Zealand coastal policy statement; and
   (c) any regional policy statement.

(4) A district plan must not be inconsistent with—
   (a) a water conservation order; or
   (b) a regional plan for any matter specified in section 30(1).

(5) A district plan may incorporate material by reference under Part 3 of Schedule 1.
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Sections of the LGA Relevant to the Geographic Scale of Local Authorities
Schedule 3

1 Who may make reorganisation proposal
(1) A reorganisation proposal that involves the alteration of a boundary or the transfer of a responsibility may be made—
   (a) by an affected local authority; or
   (b) by the Minister; or
   (c) by a petition signed by at least 10% of the electors of the area subject to the proposed reorganisation.
(2) A reorganisation proposal that involves the constitution of a new district or region may be made—
   (a) by resolution by 1 or more of the affected local authorities that has the consent of each of the affected local authorities; or
   (b) by the Minister; or
   (c) in the case of a proposed new district with a population of not fewer than 10 000 persons, by a petition signed by at least 10% of the electors of each of the affected districts; or
   (d) in the case of a proposed new region with a separately elected regional council and population of not fewer than 50 000 persons, by a petition signed by at least 10% of the electors of each of the affected regions.
(3) A reorganisation proposal that involves the abolition of a district or region and its inclusion in 1 or more adjoining districts or regions, or the union of districts or regions, may be made—
   (a) by resolution by 1 or more affected local authorities and with the consent of each of the affected local authorities; or
   (b) by the Minister; or
   (c) by petition signed by at least 10% of the electors of each district or region that is proposed to be abolished; or
   (d) by petition signed by at least 10% of the electors of each of the districts or regions proposed to be united.
(4) A reorganisation proposal that involves a territorial authority becoming a unitary authority may be made by—
   (a) resolution of 1 or more of the affected local authorities that has the consent of each of the affected local authorities; or
   (b) the Minister; or
   (c) a petition signed by at least 10% of the electors of each of the affected districts or regions.

4 Appropriate boundaries
In determining boundaries under any reorganisation proposal or scheme, the joint committee of the affected local authorities or the appointed local authority or the Commission must ensure that,—
   (a) if practicable, the boundaries of regions conform with catchment boundaries; and
   (b) if practicable, the boundaries of districts conform with the boundaries of regions; and
   (c) the boundaries of regions and the boundaries of districts conform with the boundaries of statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand and used for parliamentary electoral purposes.
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Terms of Reference for Governance Structures within the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Partnership

(Source: GCUDS, 2007:177-186)
Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee (USIDC) Terms of Reference

- Growth management leadership
- Overseeing the implementation of the strategy
- Ensuring organisation systems and resources support the strategy implementation
- Taking responsibility for progressing those actions specifically allocated to the Strategy Implementation Committee in the Strategy and ensuring implementation occurs
- Monitoring and reporting progress against milestones
- Over viewing the management of the risks identified in implementation
- Reviewing and recommending adjustments to the strategy
- Identifying and resolving any consultation inconsistencies between the Strategy and subsequent public consultation processes of the partner councils
- Facilitating consultation with the community
- Establishing the Strategic Partners Forum
- Selecting and appointing a Independent Chairman, appointing a Strategy Implementation Advisor after considering recommendations from the Chief Executives Advisory Group
- Implementing a Memorandum of Understanding as adopted by the Committee to provide a basis for developing working relationships and the resolution of any conflict

Chief Executives Advisory Group (CEAG) Terms of Reference

- Promote the strategy within the culture of each of their organisations
- Assess the impact on their organisations of requests for internal resources
- Support the setting aside of sufficient funding to complete the strategy
- Review achievement of action milestones
- Focus on inter-organisation process and document alignment
- Advise the UDSIC where necessary
- Assist with effective and consistent internal communication
- Recommend the appointment of the UDS Implementation Manager to the UDSIC

Urban Development Strategy Implementation Management Group (UDSIMG) Terms of Reference

- Select and recommend the appointment of the UDS Implementation Advisor to the Chief Executives Advisory Group
- Oversee the Implementation Plan in particular the action milestones with the UDSIC
- Receive regular reports from the UDSIC
- Undertake and report on action monitoring and risk management issues via the UDSIC to the UDS
- Maintain close links between UDS and any other related strategies for implementation to help achieve a broadly based sustainable development outcome
- Review all action outputs prior to UDSIC presentation
- Ensure that systems and resources are functioning effectively
• Ensure that any related studies and investigations are drawn to the attention of the UDSIC in order to avoid duplication of effort
• Liaise with the Chief Executives to ensure good understanding and ownership of the project within each of the participating organisations

**Strategic Partners Forum (SPF) Terms of Reference**

• Provision of information and input to the UDSIC to enable sound decision making. Work collaboratively with the UDSIC to utilise respective agency skills and knowledge or if required collective knowledge of SPF to identify solution to issues related to UDS implementation
• Monitor, by acting in a community audit role in respect of the implementation of UDS, against milestones.
• Raise issues for discussion within the SPF meetings to be taken to the UDSIC
• Develop issues/recommendations that have not been solicited by the UDSIC and present these to the committee
• Provide feedback and or recommend action to the UDSIC including all of the opinions and positions of the SPF participants. SPF participants will be able to present, in person, their differing views to the UDSIC to ensure their position is appropriately articulated

**Independent Chairperson Terms of Reference**

• Chair meetings of the UDSIC
• Provide key advice on courses of action to progress the committee in its deliberations and outcomes
• Manage public communication processes in relation to implementation strategies that are related to governance matters
• Other responsibilities as may be decided by the UDSIC
• Coordination of joint approaches to Central Government in relation to growth management issues
• Manage meeting agendas in conjunction with UDS Advisor
• Provide a facilitative style of chairmanship than enables quality participation and outcomes
• Ensure timeframe/targets set by the committee are achievable and achieved

**Implementation Manager / Advisor Terms of Reference**

• Leading and planning the implementation of the Strategy and managing resources that are employed to achieve the agreed objectives
• Day to day project management, including planning, organising and control of the physical and financial resources provided by the three principle partners for the implementation of the Strategy
• Prepare tender briefs and provide the UDSIC with a detailed evaluation and recommendation on all proposals received
• Convene meetings of the UDS implementation management
• Manage the budget for the Strategy, with accounting assistance from the appointed partner Council
• Report to the UDSIC on key issues arising from actions and on the risk profile
• Provide input in to the community engagement Strategy
• Liaise between SPF, the UDSIC and the UDSIMG
• Convene and provide support to the SPF
• Request meetings of the CEAG as appropriate
• Liaise as and when necessary with the Chairperson and members of the UDSIC
• Brief partner councils, SPF, and other agencies on implementation progress on at least an annual basis
• Facilitate forums and encourage community participation
• Promote the aims of this study within the context of sustainable development outcomes
• Establish and maintain administrative and information support systems and resources
• Make submission on central and local government and other agencies policies and plans to promote alignment with the UDS
• Manage the communication plan and lead communication on issues as they arise
• Support the Independent Chair on governance issues
Appendix G

Memorandum of Agreement between Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Partners

(Source: GCUDS, 2007:174-176)
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Establishing principles and approach to the implementation of the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (Environment Canterbury)

SECTION 1: OBJECTIVE

The objective of this Agreement is to:

Establish the principles and approach to implementation, monitoring and review between the parties in order to facilitate co-operation, collaboration and co-ordination of growth management responsibilities in the Greater Christchurch area.

SECTION 2: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The parties to this Agreement:

2.1 Support
The aim of the Strategy to provide a comprehensive sub-regional framework for growth management to address a wide range of key sub-regional issues relative to economic, social, health, cultural, environmental and developmental objectives for the region.

2.2 Recognise and Support
The established voluntary, co-operative and co-ordinated approach to growth management in the area and that such an approach between regional and local government and relevant community sector groups be continued.

2.3 Endorse
The use the Strategy as the primary sustainable Strategy for the area and to be used by regional and local government and community sectors to co-operatively manage growth in the area. The Strategy is also to be promoted to central government and agencies as the basis for engagement and action in respect of the area.

2.4 Recognise
That the Strategy provides a policy and planning framework which will guide growth management in the area over the next 35 years but within the context of a 50-year period.

2.5 Commitment
To the implementation of approaches to the funding of growth related infrastructure that will utilise a number of funding mechanisms together with appropriate area and local funding mechanisms.

The parties to the Agreement also acknowledge:

2.6 The benefits of growth management planning and the need to share responsibility for such planning between the parties in consultation with key sector groups and in consultation with the community.
2.7 The Strategy Implementation Committee has been established to ensure that the approved recommendations and associated actions are taken up by each party both on an individual and collective basis as defined by the Strategy.

2.8 The Strategy plan provides for more effective strategic planning on a regional and sub-regional basis and will facilitate co-ordination between the parties in terms of infrastructure and service provision, public works, policy development, environmental management and general planning activities.

2.9 The matters contained in this agreement may be appropriately included in the 2007 Triennial agreement.

SECTION 3: URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY APPROACH

3.1 The parties to this Agreement will continue to support the implementation, monitoring and review of the Strategy.

3.2 All parties have a responsibility both collectively and individually to:

- Acknowledge the agreed outcomes of the Strategy process in the development and application of policy and programmes as they affect the area and commit to the implementation of outcomes as appropriate through statutory planning instruments and policy processes as well as capital works and service delivery programmes.
- Have regard to the objectives and principles contained in the Strategy in undertaking programmes and activities.
- Undertake co-operative and co-ordinated delivery of programmes
- Adopt a “no surprises approach” to implementing the Strategy.
- Act in accordance with the collaborative approach and contribute to the implementation of agreed Strategy outcomes.
- Promote a co-ordinated approach to growth management consistent with the agreed outcomes of the Strategy.
- Integrate social, health, economic, cultural and environmental management of their areas within a sub-regional context.
- Develop a sub-regional decision-making process amongst the parties to deal with matters of sub-regional significance which affect local communities.

SECTION 4: IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND REVIEW

The parties to this agreement have:

- Endorsed the Strategy as the primary growth management Strategy for the area and each agency will have regard to in its planning, budgetary and programme activities, and infrastructure provision.
- Endorsed the Strategy as the basis for collaborative management of growth in the area by all local government in the area, Tangata Whenua, relevant community sector groups and government agencies.
- Committed to participate in the implementation, monitoring and review of the Strategy in accordance with the arrangements outlined in the approved Strategy.
• Initiated action to enable the implementation of the agreed principles and priority actions contained in the Strategy and associated implementation plan.
• Committed to not adopting policies or actions which are inconsistent with the outcomes sought by the Strategy, without them being first negotiated with the other partners.

The parties acknowledge the need for a mechanism to resolve conflicting points of view that may arise during the initial three year implementation period and a mechanism by which any member(s) of the UDS Implementation Committee may request its use to ensure that any matter or issue is given fair and reasonable consideration prior to formal consideration by the Committee.

For the purposes of conflict resolution the following procedures should apply:

• Any member(s) of the UDSIC may feel that further discussion, evaluation or consideration is required prior to moving forward on a particular matter.
• It is proposed that in such situations, any member(s) may request the referral of such matters for further review. It is noted that this mechanism is not for the purposes of creating any delay but solely to ensure matters have been given adequate consideration.
• If any matter is referred for review, the review is to be undertaken by the UDS Implementation Adviser in conjunction with the Chairman and two UDSIC members. The review group is to include the member or at least one of the members, who requested that a matter be reviewed. The Chairman shall select the two members of the UDSIC who will participate in the review group having regard to the nature of the matter being reviewed. After consideration of the matter, the review group will report back to the UDSIC on the outcome.
• Requests for reviews shall be made at any meeting of the UDSIC. The Chairman shall be the final arbiter of what matters are to be referred for review. Review requests must be accompanied by reasons.
• Review requests are to be made without other committee members criticising the request. The ability to make such a request in a non-threatening environment is part of “this is the way we do our business” approach.

SECTION 5: RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTING VIEWS IN THE UDS IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

The parties agree to act in good faith in respect of implementing this agreement.

This agreement will run until the first review of the Strategy.

This agreement takes effect on the date it is signed by all parties.

SECTION 6: INTERPRETATION

• Local government means the Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council.
• Greater Christchurch area means that land within the administrative areas of the city and the districts (defined as the area) and includes that part of the administrative area of the Canterbury Regional Council as it relates to the city and districts.

Any questions of interpretation of this agreement are to be raised with the parties to the agreement and collectively resolved.