



Ministry for the
Environment
Manatū Mō Te Taiao

Environmental performance
indicators

Technical Paper
No. 21
Urban

**Urban Amenity
Indicators
Workshop Report**

**Prepared for the Ministry for the
Environment and the Royal Society
of New Zealand by: David Hill/
Graham Spargo.**

Hill Young Cooper Ltd.

July, 1998.

Signposts for sustainability

URBAN AMENITY INDICATORS : WORKSHOP REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW.....	3
2. INTRODUCTION.....	4
3. THE WORKSHOP.....	5
4. BACKGROUND ON ‘URBAN AMENITY’	6
5. URBAN AMENITY - THE CONCEPTUAL BOUNDARIES	7
6. CRITICAL DIMENSIONS.....	11
7. MAJOR AMENITY ELEMENTS.....	12
8. CONSIDERATION OF PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE MATRIX.....	14
9. NEXT STEPS?.....	15
10. APPENDIX 1 : DRAFT FIRST-CUT INDICATORS.....	17
11. APPENDIX 2: INVITEES AND PARTICIPANTS	38

1. OVERVIEW

This report outlines the outcome and assessment of a workshop held to scope the potential for developing and applying urban amenity indicators. This work was commissioned by the Royal Society of New Zealand [RSNZ] and the Ministry for the Environment [MfE] as a contribution to the Environmental Performance Indicators Programme [EPIP].

A number of key factors emerged from this initial review:

- While only three percent of New Zealand is ‘urbanised’, the fact that over three-quarters of New Zealanders spend most of their lives in these urban areas led workshop participants to conclude that urban amenity is a ‘genuine’ *resource management* issue.
- Participants accepted that the statutory influence able to be brought to bear on *amenity* through the Resource Management Act [RMA] is limited. Nevertheless, a broad range of relevant perceived urban amenity qualities commonly influenced by activities in the environment was identified, along with a corresponding list of suggestions for urban amenity indicators.
- Participants were generally comfortable with the generic listing of ‘amenity’ values developed by the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (with one exception - ‘character of neighbourhoods’ - which was considered to be a subset of other values). This listing formed the basis for the workshop sessions.
- It was recognised that an agreed set of *national* urban amenity values is an unlikely objective - although this does not preclude the development of a national *set* of indicators for application at a regional or sub-regional level. By virtue of New Zealand’s regional diversity, the more productive approach is likely to be the pragmatic one of ascertaining the matters of greatest interest/benefit/relevance to particular defined communities.
- The P-S-R framework was applied in the examination of urban amenity issues, although some participants found the instructions somewhat unclear. Participants recognised that a much greater investment in the detailed analysis of each urban amenity topic area is required in order to define reliable indicators, along with more rigorous sifting and prioritising of issues.
- The workshop was unable to envisage urban amenity indicators that would provide meaningful or useful management information at the national level. Conversely, good potential was seen for the development of a *nationally consistent* set of indicators and methodologies capable of being applied at the district level. To this end a standard listing of generic urban amenity issues was suggested, which could be ranked by individual communities to assist in defining resource management issues for development and review of their District (and possibly Regional) planning instruments.
- A multiplication of effort at the district level is perceived to be occurring across New Zealand in investigating and assessing urban amenity issues. Adoption of a nationally consistent methodology for assessing various urban amenity matters was

seen to have merit, particularly for smaller local authorities who often have limited resource and expertise available. This information could then be picked up for consideration in terms of national monitoring of resource management initiatives.

- The use of *satisfaction surveys* for monitoring people's sense of amenity was identified as a currently used method capable of further refinement for the purpose of monitoring *urban amenity*. Surveys of resident values and views is seen as an important step in defining rankings, and is something which local and regional government should be encouraged to pursue on a more widespread basis.
- There seems to be a measure of acceptance that urban amenity centres around matters of spatial orientation, density, infrastructure [hard and soft], personal nuisance [which is really the infringement of amenity], choice, and security [personal and hazard].

2. INTRODUCTION

The Royal Society of New Zealand and Ministry for the Environment commissioned Hill Young Cooper Ltd to assist in an examination of matters relating to development of Urban Amenity indicators. A key component of the project was undertaking a scoping workshop to canvas this topic. The workshop was assisted with funding from the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology through its Purchase Agreement on technical advice from the Royal Society of New Zealand.

The project is part of the Environmental Performance Indicators Programme [EPIP] which has developed from the October 1994 **Environment 2010 Strategy** [E2010] and the 1997 **The State of New Zealand's Environment** [SNZE] Report. Two Environmental Performance Indicator reports have thus far been published : ***Proposals for Air, Fresh Water and Land*** [October 1997] and ***Proposals for stratospheric ozone and climate change*** [March 1998]. The Programme uses the pressure - state - response model (PSR), and the Workshop follows this approach.

While many aspects of amenity are already being considered elsewhere in the EPIP, urban amenity is considered to deserve special attention. As the majority of New Zealanders live, work and recreate in urban areas, the realisation of the E2010 Vision,

“ A clean, healthy, and unique environment, sustaining nature and people's needs and aspirations ”

is not possible without having due regard to *urban amenity*.

Urban, industrial and transport land covers almost 900,000 hectares - nearly double the current area of crops and orchards, and about 3 percent of the total land area. Urban areas, as classified by Statistics New Zealand, include any town, suburb or city with more than 1,000 people. They are currently estimated to cover 730,000 hectares while the nation's network of non-urban railways and roads is estimated at 160,000 hectares.

Although the urban population has increased by only 30 percent since 1969, the area of land classed as urban has almost trebled....

When averaged, the rate of urban expansion over the past 25 years has been around 4 percent per year, increasing from nearly 270,000 hectares in the late 1960s to 730,000 hectares.

The State of New Zealand's Environment - the State of Our Land [8.39ff]

However, while *urban amenity* is something that is generally accepted as being important to our sense of a particular place, it is notoriously difficult to define sufficiently for resource management purposes. Perhaps even more difficult is to articulate this as a *measure* of performance - without which we can have no reliable sense of *change* and the *value* of that change. In order to do this latter task - which really is about the state of our urban environments - we need *reference points* around which we can begin to discuss the extent to which our planning and delivery systems are realising and protecting those elements of our urban communities that we value - and giving us better policy direction in terms of the means and methods necessary for this. At the moment credible indicators of *urban amenity* are absent, which means that anyone and everyone can construct these values for their own ends in the statutory argument about the effects of activities in urban settings.

The first task in this exercise, and the subject of this piece of work, is to *trial run* some agreed aspects of *urban amenity* through the current EPIP framework to determine whether this is a practicable and useful approach.

3. THE WORKSHOP

As part of the project a workshop was convened in Wellington on 14 May 1998 to consider the extent to which the task of further¹ defining Urban Amenity indicators is realistic, meaningful and capable of development.

Some of the matters canvassed at the Workshop were:

- Identification and agreement on the scope of *urban amenities* - i.e. the main issues.
- Identification of key potential environmental/resource management policy goals underpinning the need for defining and monitoring urban amenity.
- Identification of the PSR model components of Urban Amenity.

¹ Some amenity values have already been defined through the work on air and water.

- Identification of and agreement on the critical criteria for establishing *urban amenity indicators*, and for prioritisation.
- Identification of a range of potential indicators of urban amenity, their possible clusters and the justifications for these.

Participants from a diverse range of backgrounds and skill bases were invited to take part in the workshop, in recognition of the multi-dimensional nature of urban amenity issues. An attempt was made to ensure that invitees had some appreciation of the Resource Management Act processes to assist in discussing how indicators might assist with available management interventions. A list of invitees/attendees is attached as *Appendix 2* to this report.

4. BACKGROUND ON 'URBAN AMENITY'

The concept of *amenity* is given statutory recognition through section 7(c) of the Resource Management Act [RMA] 1991 which notes that among the *other matters* to which *particular regard* is to be had by those exercising functions and powers under the Act is:

7(c) *The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values*

Amenity values are defined in **section 2 Interpretation** as follows:

"Amenity values" means those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes.

The RMA does not itself use the term *urban amenity* or qualify the term *amenity* in any other way - indeed, apart from these two references the term appears nowhere else in the Act. It should, however, be noted that a consequential amendment to the Environment Act 1986 from the RMA in 1991, amended the definition of *Environment* under that Act to specifically include the same words as define amenity values in the RMA as subsection (c):

"Environment" includes--

(a) Ecosystems and their constituent parts [including people and communities]; and

(b) All natural and physical resources; and

[(c) Those physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes; and

(d) The social, economic, aesthetic, and cultural conditions which affect the matters stated in paragraphs (a) to (c) of this definition or which are affected by those matters:]

The term *amenity values* is, however, not used in the Environment Act. The importance of this is that it is under this Act which both the Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment and the Ministry for the Environment are established and their functions and powers are (in part) stated.

The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment has accordingly indicated the interest of his Office in the matter of urban amenity through the release of a report on *The Management of Suburban Amenity Values : Administration by Auckland, Christchurch and Waitakere City Councils* [March 1997], and the recent establishment of an investigation into the *Management of the Urban Environment* [announced February 1998].

One of the principal recommendations from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment's suburban amenity values report, was as follows:

It is recommended that the Minister for the Environment develop environmental indicators for amenity values to assist local authorities and communities to monitor and report on the state of amenity values. [Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment 1997: viii]

This recognises the importance of monitoring changes in urban amenity values in the face of urban intensification pressures

5. URBAN AMENITY - THE CONCEPTUAL BOUNDARIES

Potentially the concept of *urban amenity* is very broad. This posed a challenge to the workshop as to how consideration of *urban amenity* might fit with the existing EPIP.

A principle question considered by the workshop was the extent to which under the RMA, *amenity* must be related to *tangibles* [essentially biophysical "things"] rather than to *intangibles* [essentially subjective "things" such as happiness, appreciation, or welfare].

In addressing amenity the workshop focused primarily on monitoring **outcomes** related to urban amenity (and in particular devising indicators) rather than addressing methods to achieve amenity outcomes such as rules in plans.

The characteristics for good indicators are identified under EPIP as follows:

What makes a good indicator?

Policy-relevant

- will be able to monitor the key outcomes of environmental policy and legislation and measure progress towards these goals
- will not change statutory monitoring responsibilities

Analytically valid

- measurable
- representative of the system being assessed
- reproducible and based on critical attributes of the system
- developed within a consistent analytical framework
- scientifically credible and robust
- helpful in relating causes, effects and responses
- responsive to environmental change
- able to detect human induced change from natural variations
- predictive

- consistent in standards for data collection, analysis and data management
- statistical integrity

Cost effective:

- require limited numbers of indicators to be established
- use existing data and information wherever possible
- simple to monitor

Simple and easily understood

- simple to interpret, accessible, information systems, robust and appealing
- clearly display extent of issues.

A matter which posed some difficulty for workshop participants was the need to put aside for the moment the matter of urban environmental policy goals, as these have not formally been stated [and were not in E2010]. This provides something of a vacuum in a resource management context and needs to be done if the work is to be progressed further.

The workshop task, however, included the need to categorise/identify ‘generic’ environmental policy goals [i.e. those natural and physical resources] for which and to which *urban amenity* contributes significantly. Unless we define *urban amenity* more specifically we run the risk to identifying indicators that point to multiple objectives and thereby lose strength as particular indicators.

The workshop agreed that the purpose of these indicators is to provide assistance primarily to local government. An important observation was that it is hard to envisage urban amenity indicators that would provide meaningful or useful management information at the *national* level - for example for use in developing a National Policy Statement. This task was not something that is amenable to resolution in a single workshop and will require further detailed thought. Conversely, good progress was made and potential seen for a *nationally consistent* set of indicators and methodologies that might be applied at the district or regional level. This leaves open the question of a role for central government in terms of monitoring and promoting consistency in methodology and practice.

The scope for definition therefore should sensibly be constrained by the relevant legislation under which local government needs to monitor *urban amenity*. In effect the two principal statutes are the Local Government Act 1974 [LGA] and the RMA. The LGA is largely silent on the matter of *amenity* - this matter being primarily the preserve of the Building Act 1991 [which has extensive regard to matters of *building amenity*].

There would therefore seem little to be gained by establishing indicators that go beyond the scope of the RMA - in itself a scope of unclear dimension.

Within the RMA one option is to define the 7(c) requirement by exclusion of all other matters raised in sections 6, 7 and 8. In other words, to assume the position that the law would not include any *double counting* of significant matters. Therefore, and to the extent that any of the matters already covered in sections 6,7 and 8 are elements in the broader concept, those elements might be *removed* from the working definition of *amenity values*.

If this approach was adopted, the following would be excluded:

- Section 6 (a) Natural character of coastal environment, wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins;
 (b) Outstanding natural features and landscapes;
 (c) Significant indigenous vegetation/habitats of indigenous fauna;
 (d) Public access [to and along the CMA, lakes and rivers];
 (e) Relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, waters, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.
- Section 7 (a) Kaitiakitanga;
 (aa) The ethic of stewardship;
 (b) Efficient use and development of ... resources
[(c) *Amenity values;*]
 (d) Intrinsic values of ecosystems;
 (e) Heritage values of sites, buildings, places, or areas;
 (f) Quality of the environment;
 (g) Finite characteristics of ... resources;
 (h) Habitat of trout and salmon.
- Section 8 The principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).

In the urban environment such a reductive approach is not considered particularly helpful as many of the above matters are more evident in the non-urban i.e. rural environment. What are otherwise cited, for example 7(e) heritage values, are so clearly matters of urban amenity value that to remove them on this account would be seen to be unduly artificial.

A more useful approach is to extend from the work already undertaken by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, bearing in mind the general RMA definition of *amenity values* [which can be broken into the following elements]:

- a) *Those physical qualities and*
- b) *characteristics of an area*
- c) *that contribute to people's appreciation of its*
 - i) *pleasantness,*
 - ii) *aesthetic coherence, and*
 - iii) *cultural and*
 - iv) *recreational attributes,*

and the fact that the RMA requires regard to be had to the manner in which these might be maintained or enhanced. Amenity values which, for whatever reason, are not capable of being maintained or enhanced through RMA actions [if there are any such] are thereby not relevant considerations².

The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment's report on *The Management of Suburban Amenity Values* notes:

² This work has not presumed any particular outcome from the Minister's *Thinkpiece* on the question of *amenity*. In the event that legislative changes are pursued a review of this report will be necessary.

Contributing factors to suburban amenity values include public and private open space, historic and cultural heritage, neighbourhood character, vegetation (e.g. bush, trees and gardens), safety, views, and noise levels.

and further that:

Significant effects of intensification on suburban amenity values include:

- *changes to the streetscape and the combination of the natural and built environment;*
- *the loss of vegetation, special character, and public and private open space;*
- *increased traffic, noise levels, on street car parking and the effects of increased traffic levels on safety. [Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment 1997:v]*

Among the matters indicated to have potential influence on suburban amenity values were:

- open space [private and public]
- landscape
- physical safety
- heritage and cultural values
- architecture
- vegetation, trees and gardens
- recreational space
- noise levels
- vista/views
- urban design
- character of neighbourhoods
- privacy

and, slightly more removed from these influences:

- transport infrastructure and management
- infrastructure management [services]
- urban growth
- urban form.

This leads the authors of the Parliamentary Commissioner's report to isolate the following general themes:

- *scale and dominance : the ratio of building height (and visual prominence) to other buildings and the interaction of buildings with adjacent buildings and with the streetscape;*
- *aesthetic coherence: the visual relationship between built and natural elements;*
- *environmental factors such as wind speed, sunlight, daylight, and outlook;*
- *noise levels, vibration and odour;*
- *heritage features and continuity with the inclusion of both natural and built elements from the past in an environment for the present;*
- *safety and accessibility of places. [Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment 1997:15]*

An indication of the range of variables considered relevant to defining amenity values can be gauged from the background reports commissioned by councils. In the three instances cited by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment were the following:

- *landscape assessments*
- *assessments of natural features*
- *ecological assessments*
- *cultural and heritage assessments*
- *reserves acquisition strategies*
- *stormwater management plans*
- *noise studies*
- *infrastructure reviews*

In summary, there seems to be a measure of acceptance in the above work that urban amenity centres around matters of spatial orientation, density, infrastructure [hard and soft], personal nuisance [which is really the infringement of amenity], choice, and security [personal and hazard].

Furthermore, the EPIP has already identified a few amenity values for air and water as follows:

Air	Inhalable particulate matter	PM ₁₀
	Nitrogen dioxide	NO ₂
	Visibility	
Water	Recreation	Water clarity [Bacterial levels in bathing water] ³ [Access to waterbodies] ¹

The air quality discussion also includes a section on *social / environmental indicators* [environmental and human health] noting that while epidemiological factors relating human health and air pollution may pose statistical problems, they are important for interpretative purposes.

6. CRITICAL DIMENSIONS

While working through the detail of potential amenity values, the Workshop kept returning to three elements that seemed to constitute some sort of critical *significance* dimension for defining *urban amenity*:

- Place
- Role

³ The report acknowledges the difficulty of establishing reliable indicators for these values.

- Time

These elements recognise that the amenity of something and its value differs between individuals and even for the same individual depending on a number of *context* factors.

In other words, if I am in what we might call *business commuter mode* early in the morning trying to get to an important appointment, what I value in terms of the amenity[ies] through which I pass will be quite different [although not necessarily totally different] to that which I might have if I am on holiday at the same place and time, or am a pedestrian, or am early for an appointment. It is the fact of this *variance*, even within the same individual, that makes the definition, and more pertinently the *management* of [and for] amenity values so very difficult.

From a resource management point of view the fact of *difficulty* does not make the search for indicators irrelevant. It is important to recognise, though, that there is continuing debate as to *which* amenity issues should be managed under RMA - and this should not be decided simply on the basis of the ease of identification, definition, and monitoring of the value.

One view is that the best that might be achievable is to seek to control identified *negative* amenity values [i.e. what we *don't* like] on a utilitarian basis - that is by concentrating on the control of those matters that will provide the greatest relief to the greatest number [such as noise]. The alternate view is that indicators should be chosen which also reflect outcomes to which a community may aspire - the *positive* amenity values. For example, creating something not currently present e.g. open space, or ecological corridors. Whether one manages amenity by *regulation* [negative] or *enhancement* [positive] goes to the heart of the debate as to whether amenity is an RMA issue [even though regulation is often in the interests of enhancement - as, for example, with the creation of esplanade reserves or the control of noise].

7. MAJOR AMENITY ELEMENTS

The key generic urban amenity matters [in no particular order of priority] identified by the Workshop were:

1. **Safety** - this value has a number of elements which includes personal safety from natural hazards [e.g. landslips and flooding] and generated effects of activities [e.g. proximity to hazardous materials and their use, and traffic accident risk]; occupational safety from workplaces and practices; and social safety [e.g. crime, personal abuse, and injury].
2. **Heritage** - this value covers the range of cultural heritage in urban settings [including remnant structures and special places and associations]; the historical built heritage of post-contact European urban society [including streetscape]; and natural heritage [which includes all the biophysical - including geopreservation - sites and structures].
3. **Open Space** - this value has the usual association of personal and community living space [including *density* issues]; the natural landscape [including urban streams and waterways]; vegetation [including urban trees]; reserves and playgrounds; but also the less commonly considered components such as

roading corridors and view shafts which contribute to our visual *sense of open space*.

4. **Neighbour Issues** - this value or collection of values includes all those matters that constitute a valued neighbourhood and over which neighbourhood disputes tend to emerge. Accordingly it relates to issues such as density, noise, sunlight, privacy, views, traffic, housing variety, and design.
5. **Mobility and Accessibility** - increasingly important as urban areas become more congested is the amenity value attached to being able to get around and from place-to-place for work, general purposes and leisure by a variety of modes of transport [including walking and cycling] and within reasonable time spans.
6. **Healthy Urban Environment** - this value includes the issues relating to the general quality of air, land, and water and is particularly focused on the effects of discharges and emissions.
7. **Healthy Communities** - many attributes go into the pot of values that represents a healthy community. These include the quality of living space, entertainment options, the nature of social interactions, the sense of identity and belonging, and the viability or vibrancy of the community. *Choice* is fundamental.
8. **Economy** - fundamental to urban amenity is economic wellbeing. A measure of the economic strength of communities is therefore important as an early indicator of potential change;
9. **Aesthetics** - the *feel* of urban areas in terms of its form and features is a recurring theme in discussions about urban amenity. This value includes elements of natural and built features, streetscape, design, visual patterns, and vibrancy and novelty.
10. **Infrastructure** - this value is one of the hidden elements that constitute urban amenity and, as such, is more often counted when it *fails* or is perceived to be *under stress*. It includes the components of network utilities [gas, electricity, telecommunications, water supply], roading and transportation [including ports and airports], and solid and liquid waste management.

These are held to apply generally and not simply to urban environments - although they are likely to have a different *tone* in the latter.

In reviewing the nature of these more generic concepts the workshop examined some in greater detail to see where this might lead. For example, on the matter of *access* the following sub-list was generated as access-related elements that might contribute themes to a suitable indicator field:

Access to outdoors	Views -v- Loss of views
Rural environment	Control
Trees -v- loss of trees	Urban design e.g. "villa vs tilt slab"
Visual x atmospheric appeal	Aesthetics and character
Access to recreation	Sense of space
Work and activity - related needs	Commercial activities
Heritage	Choice
Bush	Time saving urban efficiency
Air quality	Night sky

Sunlight -v- loss of sunlight	Sense of personal space [density]
Privacy -v- loss of privacy	Safety
Convenience	Connection to water
Ability to have work	Basic services
Noise	Interest vibrancy or peacefulness
Population diversity density	Visibility

In itself the list of associations is not particularly significant except for the fact that it demonstrates the many-sided nature of a social amenity construct such as *access*. Clearly *access* is being valued not just for its *tangible physical attributes* - the ability to go somewhere and touch something - bush, recreation, vista - but also for its *potential* - access to the night sky, sunlight, views of water - and in the *abstract* - choice, safety, privacy.

As indicated above, this suggests that amenity indicators like *accessibility* will have rather fuzzy space-time dimensions - not just the *here-and-now* of convenience [*I want to be able to go from A to B whenever I feel like it in less than X minutes*] but also *quality* attributes such as present and future safety, visual interest, and population diversity.

8. CONSIDERATION OF PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE MATRIX

To test the practicability of the MfE P-S-R matrix for amenity values the Workshop produced trial first-runs for the following potential indicators:

- access convenience
- open space
- heritage
- noise
- city character
- personal/family space
- sense of community

The incomplete worksheets are included in Appendix 1 for information purposes only.

Generally the Workshop found it reasonably easy to identify a suite of P-S-R components and measures [potential indicators] for the above. However, not too much should be read into them at this stage as the exercise was executed at a fairly generic level and the groups were given leave not to spend time on the important step of justifying the measures chosen. This latter step is, of course, **crucial** to the selection of realistic and valid indicators.

One of the key issues that emerged from the general discussion was the difficulty that participants had in making any significant linkage between urban amenity indicators at a local scale, as opposed to some more generic national standard. For example, while the amenity value of *security* was something that could be grasped and reasonably defined in a particular location such as inner-city Wellington, how this might be generalised to become an indicator of national *inner-city security* was far less clear. Work on defining an *index* to which amenity indicators might refer is a necessary part of the overall task.

Participants were generally of the view that the ability to derive a set of indicators of urban amenity that would be able to reflect a national state-of-the-urban-environment-type ranking was unlikely. Participants did, however, feel that developing indicators able to be used in a comparative matrix between urban centres was a real prospect. In other words, to develop urban profiles of the sort “*people in city X value A, B and C most and believe that values X, Y, and Z are changing for the ____.*” This latter prospect is dependent upon agreement being able to be reached by the community of interest about the *significance* of the value - which cannot be taken for granted. While the given urban amenity value, for example ‘access’, might be trending in a different direction or at a different rate of change over time in the areas to be compared, the significance of that to the inhabitants needs to be tested each time. This is important even if the demographic profile remains substantially the same. The measure of *attractiveness* implied by the result cannot be assumed to be constant over time.

Workshop participants were of the opinion that community surveys, such as the *satisfaction surveys* conducted by many local authorities, were likely to be an integral part of the monitoring methodology necessary to maintain an adequate understanding of *amenity values* over time.

9. NEXT STEPS?

The present exercise was largely designed to examine whether, at a theoretical level, it was likely to be possible to develop some objective measures for urban amenity that would also be able to fit into State of the Environment reporting and the Environmental Performance Indicators Programme framework. While the Workshop participants had some difficulty in deriving indicators using the generic framework, sufficient progress was made to suggest that the task is practicable.

Many local authorities [particularly territorial district and city councils] have already begun the task of trying to identify amenity issues for monitoring purposes, and some like Manukau City have defined a draft set of resource management indicators which include urban amenity. The real task now is to work through the methodological and practical issues of agreeing, justifying, specifying and linking indicators and measures.

The following steps / programme initiatives are identified and recommended for consideration and action:

1. Establish a process for further refining the P-S-R methodology for suitability for “soft” values such as amenity.
2. Refine the suggested set of generic amenity values [particularly through the local authority network] to try to reach agreement on the scope of the main elements of a framework. Even if nothing further is completed, a nationally agreed set of amenity categories / elements would be of considerable assistance.
3. Field test the refined values and indicators for community *relevance* and *significance* in a defined location. This is necessary to ensure methodological rigour in the values chosen, particularly in the “intervals” between the values [in order to avoid simple traps like double-counting values and bias in the spectrum of values used], and to establish an idea the extent of the range[s] along which they lie in different communities.

4. Execute a comparative urban amenity value assessment pilot study in at least three locations to test the robustness of the framework for comparative purposes.
5. Develop an appropriate matrix framework for national comparisons. Once the main indicator elements are identified and agreed it will be necessary to isolate useful sub-indicators from which matrix profiles of urban areas can be generated [as the values mesh of places is more likely to be represented by clusters rather than linear points along a single line].
6. Investigate the feasibility of constructing an index of urban amenity to which local monitoring can be referred. This can probably only be done once the matrix framework has been developed and applied and a sense is gained of which values really differentiate communities of interest.
7. Recommend the establishment of clear environmental policy goals for urban amenity as the absence of this is a significant impediment to the process of national identification.

10. APPENDIX 1 : DRAFT FIRST-CUT INDICATORS

Part 1 - Indicator Development

a) **TOPIC:** Urban Amenity

b) **ISSUE:** Access & Convenience

- c) **POLICY GOALS:**
- G1) Reasonable Access to shops/services/etc
 - G2) “ “ to workplace
 - G3) “ “ to schools etc
 - “ “ to recreation/leisure/open space

d) **CONDENSED GOAL(S):**

e) **POLICY GAPS:** Get the use of people’s time and resources to access services etc to a reasonable level/standard of service.

f) **IDENTIFY THE ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE**

P-S-R FRAMEWORK	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Identify the ‘pressure’, ‘state’ and ‘response’ components of the issue</p> <p>⇒</p>	<p><i>What causes the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Stems - from location and incidence of services - numbers ← population size + density</p> <p>Transport links</p>	<p><i>Specific part of the environment affected by the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Amount of time used up to access services ■ Cost (\$) to access services 	<p><i>Policy/ management actions for the issue (existing/ current):</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>TLA - (location) strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Density policy ■ Transport provision ■ Rooding provision ■ Zoning etc influences on location of services

g) IDENTIFY THE MEASURES (potential indicators) THAT BEST REPRESENT ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

POTENTIAL INDICATORS	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Measures to best represent pressures/ conditions/ responses above ⇒</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track pressures:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Size + a) Distribution of population b) Distribution of services c) d) e)</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track condition:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Monitor travel activity b) Monitor travel time consumption c) Monitor travel resource consumption d) e) Use of roads, vehicles, public transport</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track response:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Monitor TA policy b) Compare pressures thru time c) d) e)</p>

h) IDENTIFY MAIN REASONS FOR CHOOSING MEASURES IN f) ABOVE

<p>Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us (a), b), etc. correspond to a), b), c)... above) ⇒</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Demand for travel arises from relative location of residence and services. Access/convenience amenity = service benefits gained per time, \$ cost consumed in travel</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Zoning has major impact on location</p>
--	---	--	---

Part 2 - ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISING OF POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST INDICATOR CRITERIA

ISSUE: Access and Convenience

a) LIST MEASURES FROM PART 1 f) b) ASSESS and SCORE POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST CRITERIA

a) NAME POTENTIAL INDICATORS	b) CRITERIA							c) Priority status (high, med, low)
	policy relevant	cost effective	easily understood	sensitive to change	representative		total score	
Minimum travel time (x) to access services								
Minimum travel cost (\$x) to access services								
No need to replicate actual, simply travel required to access nearest, for representative trips. Weighted average across work types; shopping, leisure trips, school trips. Monitor annually or at census.								
Applicable to local TA level and easily implemented using GIS capability which most larger TAs have. Can monitor population shift annually through permit data, and service location through SNZ Business Directory.								

a) TOPIC: Urban Amenity

b) ISSUE: Open Space

c) POLICY GOALS: **G1)** Recreation and leisure space
 G2)
 G3)

d) CONDENSED GOAL(S):

e) POLICY GAPS:

f) IDENTIFY THE ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

P-S-R FRAMEWORK	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Identify the ‘pressure’, ‘state’ and ‘response’ components of the issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇒</p> <p>Private open space</p> <p>Public open space</p>	<p><i>What causes the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Infilling. Urban containment</p> <p>Changing recreational needs; safety. Changing demographics, under-provision. Sale of public land</p>	<p><i>Specific part of the environment affected by the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Part (<u>not all</u>) of the NZ Urban environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ green belt ■ densification ■ institutional space (loss) ■ inner city living 	<p><i>Policy/ management actions for the issue (existing/ current):</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Regulate subdivision Purchase of land Investment in quality of open space partnership. Convenants Rights of access Education/advocacy</p>

g) IDENTIFY THE MEASURES (potential indicators) THAT BEST REPRESENT 'PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE' COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

POTENTIAL INDICATORS	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Measures to best represent pressures/ conditions/ responses above ⇒</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track pressures:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Demographic change (stats) b) Complaints c) Monitoring recreation trends d) Resource consents/appeals e) Population density</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track condition:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Measure o/space and utilisation b) Reduction in greenbelt c) Loss of trees/gardens d) e)</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track response:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Success with inner city housing b) Development of new/alt open space c) Co-share policies - reserves d) Use of roading network for o/space e) State of environment survey</p>

h) IDENTIFY MAIN REASONS FOR CHOOSING MEASURES IN f) ABOVE

<p>Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us (a), b), etc. correspond to a), b), c)... above) ⇒</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>
--	--	--	--

PART 2 - ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISING OF POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST INDICATOR CRITERIA

ISSUE: Recreation and Leisure Space

a) LIST MEASURES FROM PART 1 f) b) ASSESS and SCORE POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST CRITERIA

a) NAME POTENTIAL INDICATORS	b) CRITERIA							c) Priority status (high, med, low)
	policy relevant	cost effective	easily understood	sensitive to change	representative		total score	
Measure extent of open space (DP's surveys, aerial photo)								
Subdivision consents (loss of private o/s)								
Extent of infill housing - building consents, resource consents								
Survey of use of recreational space								
Complaints re.quality/extent of open space								
Satisfaction/resident surveys.								

a) **TOPIC:** Urban Amenity - Heritage

b) **ISSUE:** Change in things with which we are familiar

c) **POLICY GOALS:** **G1)** Identification, registration
 G2) Protection
 G3) Management

d) **CONDENSED GOAL(S):** The management of change in an ordered and considered manner to protect the things which we are familiar with

e) **POLICY GAPS:** No statutory protection that is effective

f) **IDENTIFY THE ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE**

P-S-R FRAMEWORK	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Identify the ‘pressure’, ‘state’ and ‘response’ components of the issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇒</p>	<p><i>What causes the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development • Scale & intensity of use • Conflicting values. Natural vs built - amenity • Compatibility of new with existing/changing values • Appropriateness of use • Economic - valued for other uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ cost of protection etc ■ income 	<p><i>Specific part of the environment affected by the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Waahi tapu Buildings/sites Natural features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ landscape ■ vegetation ■ views ■ wildlife <p>NOTE: overlaps levels of significance attributes & meanings</p>	<p><i>Policy/ management actions for the issue (existing/ current):</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ district plan devel controls ■ district plan schedules/rules (RMA) ■ review of Historic Heritage Management ■ Hist. Places Act. ■ rates relief/incentives ■ public acquisition ■ design guidelines ■ spontaneous community action ■ unregistered buildings & sites of <u>perceived</u> significance

g) IDENTIFY THE MEASURES (potential indicators) THAT BEST REPRESENT ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

POTENTIAL INDICATORS	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Measures to best represent pressures/ conditions/ responses above ⇒</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track pressures:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Buildings RC’s b) District plan zoning/LU change c) Review of DP d) Infill development e) Public opinion (indiv, comm.gp) f) Land values</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track condition:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Registers b) Intensity of use c) Status & condition d) Compliance with resource consents e) Surveys of interest group perception of state of cultural heritage (declared & undeclared)</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track response:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) analysis of activities b) Analysis of statistical info c) Analysis of variety of responses d) e) Creating & maintaining networks with cultural groups</p>

h) IDENTIFY MAIN REASONS FOR CHOOSING MEASURES IN f) ABOVE

<p>Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us (a), b), etc. correspond to a), b), c)... above) ⇒</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>
--	--	--	--

PART 2 - ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISING OF POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST INDICATOR CRITERIA

ISSUE: Heritage

a) LIST MEASURES FROM PART 1 f) b) ASSESS and SCORE POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST CRITERIA

a) NAME POTENTIAL INDICATORS	b) CRITERIA						c) Priority status (high, med, low)
	policy relevant	cost effective	easily understood	sensitive to change	representative	total score	
No. of heritage buildings							
Intactness of Waahi tapu sites							
Change in vegetation covers							
Key views: change in.							
GIS SURVEYS (periodic-time series)							
→ recording significant sites							
STATISTICAL RECORD							
→ recording.....							

a) TOPIC: Urban Amenity

b) ISSUE: Noise

- c) POLICY GOALS:**
- G1)** To produce a healthy environment/healthy people
 - G2)** To manage desired levels of noise
 - G3)**

d) CONDENSED GOAL(S): To manage desired levels of noise to produce a sustainable healthy environment

e) POLICY GAPS: National guidelines on noise ‘amenity’ or national standards

f) IDENTIFY THE ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

P-S-R FRAMEWORK	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Identify the ‘pressure’, ‘state’ and ‘response’ components of the issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇒</p>	<p><i>What causes the issue:</i></p> <p>Interaction between</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Human activity Mechanised processes Vehicles/transport Animals Amplified music etc Residential living</p>	<p><i>Specific part of the environment affected by the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Ambient noise level Desired noise level</p>	<p><i>Policy/ management actions for the issue (existing/ current):</i></p> <p>National standards - air ports - helicopters</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Manage noise dangerous to health Plan policies/controls Enforcement Education-expectation Design (acoustic insulation/barriers) Policies on reverse sensitivity. Achieve a reduction in noise</p>

g) IDENTIFY THE MEASURES (potential indicators) THAT BEST REPRESENT ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

POTENTIAL INDICATORS	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Measures to best represent pressures/ conditions/ responses above ⇒</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track pressures:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Complaints b) Change in residential patterns c) “ “ traffic patterns d) “ “ technology/design e) “ “ options</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track condition:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Changes in ambient noise levels b) Changes in desired noise levels c) d) e)</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track response:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Survey perceptions of noise b) Complaints c) Measure noise levels d) (Regular surveys) e) Establish ‘contours’ f) Number of consents granted with noise conditions g) New abatement measures e.g. quieter equipment h) Revolutionary muffler system</p>

h) IDENTIFY MAIN REASONS FOR CHOOSING MEASURES IN f) ABOVE

<p>Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us (a), b), etc. correspond to a), b), c)... above) ⇒</p>	<p>a) b) Indicator potential conflict c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) Need to know characteristic of noise/tone, duration, pitch b) Are the ‘controls’ or ‘levels’ set meaningful c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) Indicator of degree of nuisance b) Identifies high noise low noise areas c) Sets expectations d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>
--	---	---	--

PART 2 - ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISING OF POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST INDICATOR CRITERIA

ISSUE: Noise

a) LIST MEASURES FROM PART 1 f) b) ASSESS and SCORE POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST CRITERIA

a) NAME POTENTIAL INDICATORS	b) CRITERIA							c) Priority status (high, med, low)
	policy relevant	cost effective	easily understood	sensitive to change	representative		total score	
Number of people going deaf								
Complaints (number and type)								
Increase in noise levels over specified time period.								
Level of compliance with noise conditions								
Cases specific acoustic insulation or barriers incorporated into design of buildings (building consents)								
Retail sales of noise prevention/abatement devices?								

a) TOPIC: Urban Amenity

b) ISSUE: Urban Character

c) POLICY GOALS: **G1) Garden City Character**
 G2)
 G3)

d) CONDENSED GOAL(S): Maintain/enhance ‘desired’ character

e) POLICY GAPS:

f) IDENTIFY THE ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

P-S-R FRAMEWORK	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Identify the ‘pressure’, ‘state’ and ‘response’ components of the issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇒</p>	<p><i>What causes the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Demand for infill urban containment cost of housing (demand for affordable housing) Private rights .v. public good</p>	<p><i>Specific part of the environment affected by the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Sub/peri-urban area Trees and (res) heritage buildings</p>	<p><i>Policy/ management actions for the issue (existing/ current):</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Regulation (e.g. density). Covenants Land purchase (e.g. o/space)</p>

g) IDENTIFY THE MEASURES (potential indicators) THAT BEST REPRESENT 'PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE' COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

POTENTIAL INDICATORS	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
Measures to best represent pressures/ conditions/ responses above ⇒	<i>What do we need to measure to track pressures:</i> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> a) b) c) d) e)	<i>What do we need to measure to track condition:</i> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> a) b) c) d) e)	<i>What do we need to measure to track response:</i> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> a) b) c) d) e)

h) IDENTIFY MAIN REASONS FOR CHOOSING MEASURES IN f) ABOVE

Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us (a), b), etc. correspond to a), b), c)... above) ⇒	a) b) c) d) e) <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	a) b) c) d) e) <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	a) b) c) d) e) <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>
---	--	--	--

PART 2 - ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISING OF POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST INDICATOR CRITERIA

ISSUE: Garden City/Urban Character

a) LIST MEASURES FROM PART 1 f) b) ASSESS and SCORE POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST CRITERIA

a) NAME POTENTIAL INDICATORS	b) CRITERIA							c) Priority status (high, med, low)
	policy relevant	cost effective	easily understood	sensitive to change	representative		total score	
Use of covenants to protect private o/s								
Perception surveys (res. Character)								
Aerial photography								
Vegetation surveys								
Loss of listed trees								
Building/resource consents granted								
Consent conditions to protect vegetation								
Acquisition of “compensating” open space (public)								
Loss of heritage buildings								

a) TOPIC: Urban Amenity

b) ISSUE: Personal and Family Space

- c) POLICY GOALS:**
- G1)** Adequate personal space provision to meet needs (range of)
 - G2)** “ “ family “ “ “ “ “ “ “ “
 - G3)** “ “ public “ “ “ “ “ “ “ “
 - “ “ utility/service space “ “ “ “ “ e.g. on road, in buses, in stores.

d) CONDENSED GOAL(S):

e) POLICY GAPS:

f) IDENTIFY THE ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

P-S-R FRAMEWORK	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Identify the ‘pressure’, ‘state’ and ‘response’ components of the issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇒</p>	<p><i>What causes the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Increasing population size increases density in centres of activity.</p> <p>Increasing population density reduces space in dwelling environment and in local neighbourhood.</p>	<p><i>Specific part of the environment affected by the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Individual comfort level in public Individual/family comfort in private</p>	<p><i>Policy/ management actions for the issue (existing/ current):</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Growth limits (?) Location of services/zones Population density policy</p>

g) IDENTIFY THE MEASURES (potential indicators) THAT BEST REPRESENT ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

POTENTIAL INDICATORS	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Measures to best represent pressures/ conditions/ responses above ⇒</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track pressures:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) monitor population density b) size of new dwellings c) size of new sections (incl subdivisions) d) monitor use of service etc spaces e) monitor roading congestion</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track condition:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) people’s satisfactions through survey b) c) d) e)</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track response:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) TA policy response b) (zoning of land for growth) c) allowance of density levels; space for services; also roading, provision, public transport funding d) e)</p>

h) IDENTIFY MAIN REASONS FOR CHOOSING MEASURES IN f) ABOVE

<p>Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us (a), b), etc. correspond to a), b), c)... above) ⇒</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Increasing population size & density has direct impact on available space in ‘normal’ day to day living (not just open space).</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>
--	--	--	--

PART 2 - ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISING OF POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST INDICATOR CRITERIA

ISSUE: Personal and Family Space

a) LIST MEASURES FROM PART 1 f) b) ASSESS and SCORE POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST CRITERIA

a) NAME POTENTIAL INDICATORS	b) CRITERIA							c) Priority status (high, med, low)
	policy relevant	cost effective	easily understood	sensitive to change	representative		total score	
Population density (range as well as average)								
Ratios: Population to service provision								
Ratios: Mean section size: household size								
Ratios: Mean dwelling size: household size								
Survey: satisfaction with living space								
Survey: satisfaction with public, service space								

a) TOPIC: Urban Amenity

b) ISSUE: Sense of Community

- c) POLICY GOALS:**
- G1) Stakeholdership**
 - G2) Ownership of Issues**
 - G3) Participation**

d) CONDENSED GOAL(S): Sustain appropriate sense of comm & comm involvement

e) POLICY GAPS:

f) IDENTIFY THE ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

P-S-R FRAMEWORK	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Identify the ‘pressure’, ‘state’ and ‘response’ components of the issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇒</p>	<p><i>What causes the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Change (from outside) Economic Pressure Travel Time/Transport</p>	<p><i>Specific part of the environment affected by the issue:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>Lifestyle Health (physical measures) Security Discretionary time Ownership/Participation Family unit Youth moving to cities independently</p>	<p><i>Policy/ management actions for the issue (existing/ current):</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safer community initiatives • Community agencies (Educn Progs) • Consultation LGovt <p style="text-align: center;">outside of table - Subjective issue self checking cultural differences</p>

g) IDENTIFY THE MEASURES (potential indicators) THAT BEST REPRESENT ‘PRESSURE-STATE-RESPONSE’ COMPONENTS OF THE ISSUE

POTENTIAL INDICATORS	PRESSURE	STATE (CONDITION)	RESPONSE
<p>Measures to best represent pressures/ conditions/ responses above ⇒</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track pressures:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) An urban form b) Micro-economy c) Demographics d) Property turnover e) Travel Times f) Relative property values</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track condition:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) Primary research - How “Feel” b) <u>Use</u> of clubs/recre facilities c) Health indicators d) Crime rates e) Insurance claims f) No. & involvement in community groups/public forums g) People walking</p>	<p><i>What do we need to measure to track response:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p> <p>a) b) c) d) e)</p>

h) IDENTIFY MAIN REASONS FOR CHOOSING MEASURES IN f) ABOVE

<p>Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us (a), b), etc. correspond to a), b), c)... above) ⇒</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>	<p>a) b) c) d) e)</p> <p>Written outside of any table- Media influence on general perceptions Important to monitor real variables too Self checking system</p> <p style="text-align: center;">⇓</p>
--	--	--	--

PART 2 - ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISING OF POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST INDICATOR CRITERIA

ISSUE: Sense of Community

a) LIST MEASURES FROM PART 1 g) b) ASSESS and SCORE POTENTIAL INDICATORS AGAINST CRITERIA

a) NAME POTENTIAL INDICATORS (employment safe noted outside of table)	b) CRITERIA						c) Priority status (high, med, low)
	policy relevant	cost effective	easily understood	sensitive to change	representative	total score	
Urban form (density,type,activity)							
Micro economy (household income, local business activity)	4	4	4	4	2	18	
Demographics	4	5	3	1	2	15	
Property turnover	3	5	5	3	3	19	
Travel times	4	5	5	2	2	18	
Relative property values	3	5	5	4	3	20	
Satisfaction survey							
Use of clubs/rec.facilities							
Health							
Crime							
Insurance claims							
Community groups/public forums/schools							
Pedestrian traffic							

11. APPENDIX 2: INVITEES AND PARTICIPANTS

1. Invitees and Participants [in bold]:

Lesley Baddon	Auckland Regional Council
James Barnes	Barnes and Associates
Frank Boffa	Boffa Miskell
Steven Bourassa	Architecture Property and Planning, University of Auckland
Nigel Cass	Hillary Commission
Sue Chamberlain	Wellington City Council
Denise Church	Secretary for the Environment
Les Clark	Tourism Resource Consultants
Jim Clarke	Boffa Miskell
Steve Colson	Rotorua District Council
Annette Dixon	Ministry of Health
John Edmonds	Queenstown Lakes District Council
Doug Fairgray	McDermott Fairgray Group
Lee Gatt	Manukau City Council
David Glover	Forsyte Research
Graeme Horsley	New Zealand Institute of Valuers
Phil Hughes	Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment
John Hutchings	Local Government New Zealand
Stuart Kinnear	NZ Institute of Surveyors
Graeme Lawrence	Thames Coromandel District Council
Nigel Lloyd	Acousafe Consulting & Engineering Ltd
Bob Nixon	Christchurch City Council
D.A. Ogier	New Plymouth District Council
Ian Poole	Waikato University
Stephen Rainbow	New Zealand Historic Places Trust
Jeremy Salmond	Salmond Architects
Robert Schofield	New Zealand Planning Institute
David Stewart	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors
Dr Nick Taylor	Taylor Baines and Associates
Alastair Thompson	Napier City Council
Alana Tipping	Statistics NZ
Helen Walker	Dunedin City Council
Dr Morgan Williams	Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment

2. Additional Participants

Karen Bell	Auckland City Council
David Brash	Ministry for the Environment
James Corbett	Manukau City Council
Kelvin Cooper	Ernst and Young
S Elvines	Dunedin City Council
Brett Gawn	NZ Institute of Surveyors
David Given	Consultant
David Hill	Hill Young Cooper
Robyn Fisher	NZ Planning Institute
Eleanor Jamieson	Wellington City Council
Graham Spargo	Hill Young Cooper
Sarah Stewart	Ministry for the Environment