# Waimakariri District Council

# Urban Amenity Trial Report

# 'Indicator Development Workshop'
# Held 15 December 2000

# Report Prepared April 2001

# 5 Waimakariri District Council – Urban Amenity Trial Report

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 1.0 Background to the Trial

At the outset, the Ministry for the Environment would like to thank Richard Johnson, Kathy Perreau (now at the Ministry for the Environment), and Nick Harrison from the 'Forward Planning Team' at Waimakariri District Council for agreeing to participate in the urban amenity trials for this project.

The Waimakariri District Council trial consisted of a one-day workshop held on 15 December 2000 at Waimakariri District Council. The following people attended the workshop:

| | |
|---|---|
| Richard Johnson | Waimakariri District Council |
| Kathy Perreau | Waimakariri District Council |
| Nick Harrison | Waimakariri District Council |
| Regan Yarrow | Ministry for the Environment (Wellington) |
| Paul Horgan | Ministry for the Environment (Christchurch) |
| Fiona Hill | Glasson Potts Fowler Ltd |
| Karen Bell | Enviro Solutions New Zealand Ltd |

The focus of the workshop was on the development of processes that practitioners can use to develop urban amenity indicators, and in particular on:

- how to progress from knowledge about the aspirations of the community in relation to amenity values to developing indicators to monitor changes in urban amenity (over time and space); and
- the development of indicators to monitor the effectiveness of provisions in the District Plan relating to amenity issues.

At the workshop the approach to indicator development that was developed by the Ministry for the Environment (under the Environmental Performance Indicators Programme in 1997) was tested, modified and enhanced for use at the district council scale in an attempt to develop indicators to monitor amenity issues.

Councils who were involved with the trials were provided with a report entitled the "Urban Amenity Trials Report" (Ministry for the Environment, Technical Report 64, October 2000). This report contained step by step processes and a number of templates for councils to fill in. The expected outcome from each of the trials was a report which includes the filled out templates, summarised the processes that councils used to define, manage and monitor urban amenity, and also a list of good practise points that can be passed onto councils throughout New Zealand.

This report is the Waimakariri District Council urban amenity trial report. Fiona Hill and Karen Bell have drafted this report with comments being added by Richard Johnson (Waimakariri District Council). It is noted that Waimakariri District Council was also involved as a case study council for this Urban Amenity Project. Those people who are interested to find out about the Waimakariri District and the characteristics of the people who live within it should refer to this case study (Ministry for the Environment, Technical Report 65). This trials report follows the

sequence of steps that were carried out in the workshop and is structured according to the following headings:

- Background to the trial
- An overview of the workshop
- Phase 1: Discussion on the key qualities of urban places
- Phase 2: Applying the P-S-R framework to urban amenity issues
- Conclusions

## 2.0 An overview of the workshop

The workshop consisted of two main phases:

- discussion on the qualities of urban places as described in the 'Urban amenity trials report' (Ministry for the Environment, Technical Report 64) and

- reviewing the methodology developed by the Ministry for the Environment's Environmental Performance Indicators Team, for the development of bio-physical indicators (based on adaptations of the P-S-R framework) for urban amenity issues at the local level.

## 3.0 Phase 1: Discussion on the key qualities of urban places

In the Waimakariri District there has been a deliberate decision on the part of the Council to actively involve the community in issues that the Council is required to make strategic decisions on. Because of this Council staff feel that they have a good understanding of the different perspectives that the community holds and that they were able to give feedback to the Consultant Team as to the validity of the qualities of urban places within Waimakariri District. In this context staff from Waimakariri District Council provided feedback to the Consultant Team on how relevant the key qualities of urban amenity included in the trialling report are to the Waimakariri District. This feedback is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

Following the discussion on the individual qualities (refer to Appendix 1), questions relating to the overall value of the qualities were asked. The questions and the responses from Waimakariri District Council staff are outlined below:

### *1. Do the qualities provide a means to define urban amenity?*

They do - but we found we did not need to actually define urban amenity – people like what they have and know what they want to maintain.

### *2. In your opinion should well-being be included as a quality of urban places?*

It is an important concept but we refer to the "magic" of the place instead of the term "well-being".

***3. Have our attempts to put the qualities into plain English been successful? Do you think there are clear boundaries between each of the qualities?***

Not totally, some terms could be simpler or stated differently (see comments in relation to each of the qualities).

***From your work in defining urban amenity, are there qualities that are missing?***

It is important to a lot of our community that Waimakariri is NOT Christchurch. People do not want change to the familiar and people like to distinguish between the two in terms of

- scale;
- speed of change and change to the familiar; and
- views

***4. Are there qualities that should be re-worded?***

- comfortable and safe – to health and safety
- healthy environment – to biophysical or natural environment
- quality of services – to quality of infrastructure given that it is the pipes, roads and rubbish things that still dominate small town concerns about "services"; and
- well-being – to magic or sense of satisfaction

***5. Do the qualities tell us whether our urban environments are sustainable over time and place?***

This was not discussed.

## 4.0 Phase 2: Applying the P-S-R Framework to Urban Amenity Issues

Phase two of the workshop involved applying the template that the Ministry for the Environment has developed for bio-physical indicators to urban amenity issues.

Workshop participants agreed that a good point to start was identifying priority anticipated environmental results (AERs) from the Proposed District Plan. WDC staff were of the view that some of the AERs included in the Proposed Plan need to be rewritten in order to be monitored effectively and robustly.

For the purpose of the workshop WDC staff identified two priority AERs:

- housing density and the maintenance of low density; and
- the character of the business area.

The reason for focusing on these areas was that one had a focus on the residential environment and one on the business environment. It should be noted that the focus for indicator development for both of these AERs was limited to the township of Rangiora, which has a population of approximately 10,000 people.

The process that was followed for the two examples was slightly different reflecting the fact that the process was refined when the second example was worked through.

The steps outlined below for each example summarise the process that was followed at the workshop. Appendix 2 to this report contains the completed template for the residential example. Appendix 3 to this report contains the completed template for the business example.

### 4.1 Example 1: Housing density and the maintenance of low density

**Step 1 Defining the issue:** The AER as recorded in the heading above was re-written as an issue. The issue statement that everyone agreed to is as follows:

**Issue**: Retaining the existing character of residential areas

**Step 2 Main policy goals:** The main policy goals contained in the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan relating to this issue were then identified. These goals are recorded below:

**Main Policy Goals**:
**GI)** Avoid and mitigate adverse effects on scale and character
**G2)** Good subdivision design and a range of living environments
**G3)** Minimal intervention

In the workshop there was some discussion as to the value of identifying policy goals. Overall it was considered that it might be better to identify the relevant AERs as they are outcome focussed.

**Step 3 Policy Gaps:** It was considered whether or not there were any policy gaps in the Waimakariri Proposed District Plan. No gaps were identified. However WDC staff felt that some people were concerned about potential gaps in the rules.

**Step 4 Identify the State (Condition):** The condition or part of the urban environment that is affected by the issue was then identified and is recorded below:

**STATE (CONDITION)**

*What is the condition of the environment, or the state of the urban environment that is affected by or relates to the issue:*

- Low-density single story detached dwellings.
- Low incidence of non-residential buildings (scale, nature), structures eg. Signs/towers

**Step 5: Identify the Pressures:** The pressures that give rise to the issue were then identified and are recorded below:

**PRESSURE**

*What causes the issue, what are the threats or pressures that influence the condition of the urban environment:*

- Development
- Small household sizes – i.e. impacts of ageing
- Change in family structures e.g. extended family, solo.
- Land available for development

**Step 6 Identify the responses:** The potential range of methods (regulatory and non-regulatory) that could be used to manage the issue were then identified as is shown below:

**RESPONSE**

*How can the issue be dealt with? This may be a policy or management action and may be what the Council or the community etc does:*

- Bulk & location rules
- Minimum lot sizes (e.g. 600m2)
- Public purchase of land.
- Structure/outline planning
- Guidelines/education
- Zoning

**Step 7 Identify how you are going to measure each of the matters identified in steps 4 to 6:** This step essentially involves identifying potential ways in which each of the matters identified under the headings Pressure-State-Response could be measured. The second part involved in this step is to record the main reasons why the different measures were chosen. This is an important step, as it requires people to stop and think whether the measure that they have chosen is the best one. The box on the following page highlights the results from the Waimakariri urban amenity trial:

| POTENTIAL INDICATORS | STATE (CONDITION) | PRESSURE | RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Measures to best represent the pressures, conditions, responses above* | *What do we need to measure to track condition:*<br><br>a) Site coverage<br>b) Number of dwellings per site<br>c) Bulk and location<br>d) Physical appearance | *What do we need to measure to track pressures:*<br><br>a) Census information – demographics<br>b) Resource consent conditions<br>c) Occupants survey<br>d) Number of relocates & new buildings<br>e) Understanding competing housing markets and use of houses. | *What do we need to measure to track response:*<br><br>a) Type of consents & conditions.<br>b) Number of breaches of resource consents.<br>c) Geographic locations.<br>d) Expenditure.<br>e) Tracking land left for development. |
| *Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us: (a), (b) etc. correspond to a), b), c) … above* | a) Establish a ratio of buildings to land<br>b) Easy information to get<br>c) Commonly used method<br>d) | a) Accessible information<br>b) Currency of information e.g. qualitative.<br>c) Cheap to obtain<br>d) Accessible<br>e) - | a) Accessible information<br>b) Currency of information e.g. qualitative<br>c) Cheap to obtain<br>d) Accessible<br>e) Relatively simple exercise |

**Step 8 Rank the potential indicators in accordance with the indicator criteria:** The potential indicators were ranked using the indicator criteria. The criteria used were based on the Ministry for the Environment's indicator selection criteria and included: measurable, analytically valid, cost effective, understandable, appropriate, effectiveness to plan, stand-alone (linked to other indicators). This exercise assisted in focusing the potential range of indicators so that the most 'robust' indicator was readily identifiable. The following box highlights the results from the Waimakariri urban amenity trial:

**Complete Part 2: Assessment of potential indicators against indicator criteria**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ***Prioritise and rank assessed 'potential' indicators:*** *(based on Part 2: Assessment of potential indicators against indicator criteria)* | 1) Site coverage; Number of dwellings per site; Bulk and location<br>2) Physical appearance | 1) Census information – demographics<br>2) Understanding competing house markets & use of houses.<br>3) Occupants survey<br>4) Number of relocates & new buildings; Resource consent conditions | 1) Type of consents & conditions; Number of breaches of resource consents<br>2) Tracking land left for development<br>3) Expenditure<br>4) Tracking land left for development. |

**Step 9 Check whether the prioritised indicators are policy relevant:** At the workshop it was agreed that an important first check was to consider whether or not the potential indicators are policy relevant. If they are not policy relevant then it was the view of the people at the workshop that they should be discarded as this stage. (It is noted that this step varies from the standard approach adopted by the Ministry for the Environment in that the policy relevant check is normally only one of a range of criteria that is applied). The following summarises the results from the workshop:

| PARAMETERS | POLICY RELEVANT |
|---|---|
| Bulk and location, site coverage, dwellings per site | √ |
| Census information e.g. demographics | ? |
| Type of consents and conditions, number of breaches. | √ |
| Understanding competing markets | ? |
| Tracking available land for development | x |
| Occupants surveys | |
| a) perception | √ |
| b) quantitative | x |

*[Note: If the parameter is not policy relevant and related to a measurable AER then it is not included or a measurable AER developed.]*

**Step 10 Assessment of potential indicators against indicator criteria:** This step involves applying the Ministry for the Environment indicator criteria to the potential indicators that were listed in Step 9. The people at the workshop thought this was an important step. The outcomes from the workshop for this step are included on the following page:

**Assessment of potential indicators against indicator criteria**

| PARAMETERS | CRITERIA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| Bulk and location, site coverage, dwellings per site, | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | |
| Census information e.g. demographics | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | |
| Type of consents and conditions, number of breaches. | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | |
| Understanding competing markets | √ | ? | ? | ? | | | |
| Tracking available land for development | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | |
| Occupants surveys | | | | | | | |
| a) perception | √ | √ | ? √ | √ | | | |
| b) quantitative | √ | √ | ? √ | √ | | | |

**Key:**
A= Measurable
B= Analytically valid
C= Cost effective
D= Understandable
E= Appropriate
F= Effectiveness to plan
G= Stand Alone

**Step 11 Draft indicators:** This step involves the writing of draft indicators using the information in Step 10. If a potential indicator meets all of the criteria in Step 10 then it likely that it will be robust. It may be that an indicator fails on one of the criteria, but it is critically important. For example it may not be cost effective to collect information on one of the draft indicators, but it may be possible for this cost to be shared either across units or with different agencies. Because a potential indicator fails in one criterion does not necessarily mean it should be discarded.

It is also important to redraft the potential indicators so that they are in a format that can be easily measured. For example rather than using the term 'bulk and location' it would be best expressed as something like the 'numbers of buildings over 8m in height'. It is **very important** that at this stage that the draft indicators are written in a form that can be easily measured.

It was also suggested by the Consultant Team that the draft indicators should be divided into two lists under the headings 'physical' and 'perceptual'. For instance, in terms of urban amenity issues there is the possibility of physically measuring the issue (physical indicators) and also the possibility of asking people their views on the issue (perceptual indicators). In some circumstances it will be necessary to draft both physical and perceptual indicators.

The following is a summary of the draft indicators that were developed at the Waimakariri District Council trial in relation to this issue:

**Draft Indicators**

**PHYSICAL**

- Number of buildings over 8m in height
- Number and location of two storey buildings
- Sites having more than two dwellings
- Number of sties with >35% site coverage
- Number of sites <600m2 – in new areas, old areas

**PERCEPTIAL**

- People's satisfaction of density levels
- People's opinions on likely future density
- People's reaction to change in outlook, day-look, privacy, and sense of enclosure
- Preference for streetscape

**Step 12 Possible indicator:** The next step is to decide on the potential indicator(s). This stage of the process essentially involves formulating a possible indicator(s) from the list of draft indicators.

It is important that the possible indicator is clearly drafted. In the workshop, time was spent discussing how the draft indicator is written. It was decided that it is critically important that the indicator has a spatial context (ie that the zone or area concerned is identified), and that it is clear and easily understood.

The possible indicator that was developed at the Waimakariri workshop relating to residential issues is as follows:

**Possible indicator:** (As a result of all of the above process)
Number of sites that are less than 600m2 in the Residential 2 Zone

**Step 13 Cross check the possible indicator against the selection criteria:** Following the identification of the possible indicator it was considered worthwhile to cross check it against the selection criteria. This was viewed as being important to ensure that the indicator was robust. The example that was worked through at the Waimakariri workshop is included below:

**Assessment against the indicator criteria:**

| Measurable | Analytically valid | Cost effective | Understandable | Stand alone | Consistent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| √ | √ | √ | √ | ? | √ |

**Step 14: Fill out the 'nuts' and 'bolts' for the indicator:** Once the indicator has been developed it is important to work out the specific detail as to 'how' and 'when' the monitoring is to take place. This is an essential step in the process. At the workshop participants applied the standard Ministry for the Environment template, which they found worked well. The filled out section of the template for this example is included below:

| **Potential indicator** | **Number of sites that are less than 600m2 in the Residential Two (R2) Zone** |
|---|---|
| What degree of change NEEDS to be detected (threshold/target) | Any changes |
| Existing monitoring: Techniques to use for monitoring *(note methods)* | Subdivision consent records, DCDB search |
| What degree of change CAN be detected? | Location and number of (mapped)<br>Incidence (graph over time) |
| Scale & geographical extent for monitoring *(note scale/extent of area to monitor)* | Over all sites in the R2 Zones in the district |
| How frequently to monitor | Need to monitor monthly/quarterly |
| Who could monitor | Students. Need to think about site use. |
| How/ to whom should information be reported*: (technical/executive summary)* | Through a GIS system. To policy team, RMR Committee, and consents team. |
| Links to other indicators (*use for range of situations*) | Unsure at present (as first indicator developed) |
| Recommended: Stage 1 or 2 or discontinue<br>Future work required: | Stage one indicator because it can be monitored now<br>Links with other indicators |
| Information Requirements: | Data protocols – consent information recorded GIS compatible, link building consents and subdivision consents and PIMS. |

## 4.2 Example 2: The character of the Business area

The process used for Example 1 was then applied to Example 2: The Character of the Business Area. In Example 2 the process was amended. The workshop participants felt that the sequence of steps for Example 2 included below was a clear and easy process to follow.

**Step 1: Defining the issue:** The AER as recorded in the heading above was re-written as an issue. The issue statement that everyone agreed to is as follows:

**Issue:** Threats to the pedestrian friendly nature of the Rangiora Town Centre

**Step 2: Identify the AERS:** Rather than identify the main policy goals, the workshop participants felt that it was more important to identify the relevant AERs as they are written in an outcome orientated form. The AER contained in the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan relating to the issue is recorded below:

**Main AER**:
A pedestrian friendly Rangiora Town Centre

**Step 3: Policy Gaps:** It was considered whether or not there were any policy gaps in the Proposed District Plan. No gaps were identified. However WDC staff felt that some people were concerned that there may be gaps in the rules.

**Step 4 Identify the state (condition) of the environment:** Identify the state of the urban environment that is affected by the issue. The WDC business example is included below:

**STATE (CONDITION)**

*What is the condition of the environment, or the state of the urban environment that is affected by or relates to the issue:*

- Traffic control humps
- Low traffic volumes
- On-street parking
- Pedestrian amenity – bins, verandas, benches
- Clean air, clean streets
- Music, entertainment
- Lighting, wide pedestrian streets
- Trees

**Step 5 Identify the pressures that affect the condition of the urban environment:** The results from the workshop for this step are included below:

**PRESSURE**

*What causes the issue, what are the threats or pressures that influence the condition of the urban environment:*

- Increase in through traffic
- Too many cars, trucks and 4wds.
- Vehicle emissions and noise
- A lot of people wanting to park outside a shop
- Laziness
- Location and design of off-street parking
- Business sector clash in expectations
- Sign clutter
- Business's use of footpaths
- A safety culture exists in the community

**Step 6 Identify the potential responses:** This step essentially involves the identification of the full range of management responses relating to the particular issue. The results from the workshop for this step are included below:

**RESPONSE**

*How can the issue be dealt with? This may be a policy or management action and may be what the Council or the community etc does:*

- Road-stopping
- Bylaws i.e. skateboards
- Safety education programmes
- Use of road hierarchy
- Asset management
- Beautification programmes
- Market anchor e.g. Warehouse
- Rules – verandas, display windows, signs
- Zoning
- Financial contributions
- Monitoring footpath occupation policy
- Education of new shop owners
- Co-ordination/liaison with Business Association

**Step 7 Identify the parameters you want to monitor:** The next step is to brainstorm a range of parameters that you may wish to measure. Parameters are the broad features of the issue that you may wish to measure. The results from the workshop for this section are included below:

| PARAMETERS |
|---|
| Accidents involving pedestrians |
| Clutter/use of footpaths |
| Number of pedestrians on street |
| Air quality |
| Length of verandahs |
| Quality of footpaths |
| Number of road closures |
| Speed of traffic |
| Number of ride on mobility |
| Perceptions on quality of pedestrian access – skateboarder, businessman, shopper, elderly |
| Number and location of facilities – parking, toilets, pedestrian crossings |
| Submissions to annual plans |
| Complaints |
| Length of display windows compared with retail frontage |
| Walkability – time/difficulty |

**Step 8 Check whether they are policy relevant:** It is important to do a quick check as to whether or not all the parameters you have identified are policy relevant. Parameters that are not policy relevant should be discarded at this point. The results from the workshop for this section are included below:

| PARAMETERS | AER | POLICY RELEVANT |
|---|---|---|
| Accidents involving pedestrians | √ | √ |
| Clutter/use of footpaths | √ | |
| Number of pedestrians on street | √ | √ |
| Air quality | √ | √ |
| Length of verandahs | √ | √ |
| Quality of footpaths | √ | √ |
| Number of road closures | √ | √ |
| Speed of traffic | √ | |
| Number of ride on mobility | √ | |
| Perceptions on quality of pedestrian access – skateboarder, businessman, shopper, elderly | √ | √ |
| Number and location of facilities – parking, toilets, pedestrian crossings | √ | |
| Submissions to annual plans | √ | |
| Complaints | √ | |
| Length of display windows compared with retail frontage | √ | √ |
| Walkability – time/difficulty | √ | |

**Step 9 Suggest some indicators**: Using the parameters write down suggested indicators and divide these indicators into two columns 'physical' and 'perceptual'. At this stage do not be too concerned about the words used to describe the indicator. The results from the workshop for this section are included below:

**PHYSICAL**

- Accidents to pedestrians within the business 1 zone
- Number of pedestrians
- Obstructions on footpath
- Public facilities – i.e. toilets per person, parks, etc
- Air quality
- Noise
- Length of display windows as a percentage of retail frontage

PERCEPTUAL

- Adequate public facilities
- Complaints
- Submissions to annual plan re pedestrian friendliness
- Ease of access/walkability – average time to walk to different locations, or how you can walk (walking isopleth)
- Feeling of safety

**Step 10 The potential indicator(s):** Choose one of the indicators from the list of suggested indicators that you think is the most relevant. Reword the indicator so that it identifies a threshold (a figure or a target) and a location. The results from the workshop for this section are included below:

**The potential indicator:** Annual or two yearly changes in community perceptions of pedestrian safety on High Street (Business 1 Zone)

**Step 11 Cross check the possible indicator against the selection criteria:** Following the identification of the possible indicator it was considered that it would be worthwhile to cross check it against the selection criteria. This was viewed as being important to ensure that the indicator was robust. The example that was worked through at the Waimakariri workshop is included below:

| POTENTIAL INDICATORS | CRITERIA | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Aplies to business 1 zone) | **Measurable** | **Analytically valid** | **Cost effective** | **Under-standable** | **Consistent** | **Stand alone** |
| Changes in community perceptions of pedestrian safety on High St (2000/01 etc) | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ - checklist | X |

Checklist: Public toilet strategy, Vision 2020, KPI's, community safety strategy, annual plan

**Step 12 Fill out the nuts and bolts for implementing the indicators:** Once the indicator has been developed it is important to work out the specific detail as to 'how' and 'when' the monitoring is to take place. This is an essential step in the process. At the workshop participants applied the standard Ministry for the Environment template for this section of the process, which they found worked well. The filled out section of the template (amended for use for this workshop) is included below:

| | |
|---|---|
| Potential indicator | Feeling of safety |
| What degree of change NEEDS to be detected (threshold/target) | Extent of change over time by safety issue for different members of the community – elderly, young, male, female, day and peak times etc |
| Existing monitoring | Complaints/submissions to annual plan<br>Central business liaison group<br>Community constable |
| Techniques to use for monitoring *(note methods)* | Survey pedestrians for level of satisfaction re safety |
| What degree of change CAN be detected? | ? |
| Scale & geographical extent for monitoring *(note scale/extent of area to monitor)* | Business 1 – King St. to railway line |
| How frequently to monitor | Monitor two yearly – before the annual plan. Phone survey, random sample |
| Who could monitor | Frank's staff/students |
| How/ to whom should information be reported*: (technical/executive summary)* | Report to Safe Waimakariri. RMR Committee, Business Association, Policy Unit |
| Links to other indicators (*use for range of situations*) | Not yet assessed |
| Recommended: Stage 1 or 2 or discontinue<br>Future work required: | Stage 1 - But needs thought for survey design and reporting<br>? |
| Information Requirements: | ? |

## 5.0 Conclusions

The main finding from this indicator development workshop at Waimakariri District Council was that the Ministry for the Environment's standard indicator development template can be adapted to assist in providing a systematic process for developing urban amenity indicators at the district scale.

At the workshop the Ministry for the Environment's standard indicator development template was worked through for two separate examples. The steps for each example have been outlined in detail in this report. When the second example was worked through some of the steps involved in the process were altered. The differences between the two examples are summarised below:

- AERs were included instead of the main policy goals. The reason for this is that AERs are outcome orientated.
- The steps involving identifying how you want to measure things and the ranking of these matters was removed. The main reason for this is that people at the workshop felt that these steps did not add value in the process. They were of the view that brainstorming the parameters or the broad areas of measurement was sufficient.

In general people at the workshop felt that the second example provides a systematic and robust method to develop urban amenity indicators that could be used by other Councils.

From participating in this workshop the people involved have learnt some lessons about applying this process in an efficient and effective manner. These lessons are summarised below:

- it is important to follow a systematic process when you are developing indicators;
- it does not add value to the process if you get too 'bogged down' in some steps of the process (ie it is not necessary to discuss the indicator selection criteria in a lot of detail);
- it should be possible to work through this process in a relatively short time period (the workshop progressed through more than was expected at the beginning of the process) ;
- it is useful to involve a group of people in this process;
- it is very important that you describe the indicator in a clear and unambiguous way;
- it is important to think outside the statutory planning area in finding things to document;
- be prepared to first try the AERs as in the Plan, then amend the AERs as outcome specific statements; and
- some of this is fairly basic step-by-step processes but it helps fulfill the needs to be systematic. For example there are some spin off benefits for S.32, and for ensuring specificity in relation to amenity – such as being able to answer basic questions, such as what?, when?, how?, who?

## APPENDIX 1: COMMENTS FROM WDC STAFF ON THE 'QUALITIES'

The information contained in the bullet points below reflects the comments made by WDC staff on the qualities of urban amenity contained in the trialling report:

***Sense of place***
*(Memorable or distinctive characteristics that differentiate one place from another)*

- This is important in the Waimakariri District.
- We call it "distinctive communities" (history, prejudice, competitiveness etc)

***Understandable***
*(Existence of entrances/exits/throughways that are easily identified and understood)*

- This is not relevant in Rangiora but the quality of the quality is important i.e. the industrial entrance to the city.
- For most small towns there is usually a dramatic sense of arrival at entrances; the transition from rural to urban is pretty abrupt and distinctive.
- For Southbrook, the issue was not the sense of arrival, but once an action plan was put in place to improve it, the issue was what standard was appropriate to give a sense of arrival. While a change from 'Grotsville' was accepted, the style and layout was important. We didn't go through a process of collectively deciding on the specific amenity qualities for Rangiora, or even if there was a need to be distinctive. The quality of the quality was the key.
- Another issue for understandability is simply a function of geography and road configurations. For geography nothing can beat arriving in Waiau from the Leader Road where you climb a steep hill, hit the crest and (POW!) there is the town. Dunedin is just as dramatic. Compare that to the Wairarapa towns where they sit on a flat, on a straight bit of road. They slide up on you, and you ease your way in through an indistinct entranceway. The role of signage is important and its amenity impacts.
- HUGE 50 kph signs at town entrances in the Waiarapa and at Culverden are shockers but do a job just like traffic calming.
- The size of the township means that understandability is a less relevant concept than it may be in larger settlements. Roading patterns are quite simple and based on few key spine roads around which the town is structured. There are some dominant activities that form the core components of mental maps that local people intuitively key into in making travel route choices.
- There are links to safety in the beach settlements.

***Comfortable and Safe***
*(Creation of a physical environment that is relatively free from nuisance /overcrowding danger – allows people to live and work in reasonable comfort).*

- Safety is VERY important (it has top of the head importance) – pedestrian access etc
- Not sure about the term "comfortable"
- The ordinary person would put health and safety together
- There is a growing safety culture in the District from WHO accreditation as a 'safe community'.

***Healthy environment***
*(A sustainable urban environment that is relatively free from noise and pollution and also where the natural features of the environment are looked after)*

- Elements of the biophysical environment are mentioned regularly in discussions with our community e.g. creeks and drains through the small rural town and the tree broken skyline

***Choice***
*(Availability of places that cater for all sections of the population – That provide for a diverse range of activities and experience)*

- Not sure if this is relevant as it has not been mentioned by our community – people are happy with their small towns (and that is why they live there)
- Expectations are relevant to the size of the community and the proximity to Christchurch, which means that people have a high degree of choice.
- It has not emerged through the district plan process but has been raised through the annual planning process by the business sector (who do see choice as important).

***Ability to adapt***
*(Degree to which the elements that make up a city are versatile enough to accommodate and support the range of activities that people might want to engage in and social/cultural needs)*

- Not important and was not raised by the community.
- People do not expect choice and adaptation.

***Accessible***
*(Ease with which it is possible to reach other places / people / activities / resources / services in a relatively direct and comfortable manner)*

- Always raised as an issue i.e. parking, pedestrian access etc.
- Skateboards have been banned on the main street.

***Quality of services***
*(Extent to which opportunity costs and travel time are reduced and use of existing infrastructure is maximised)*

- People regularly grumble about lack of transport and the quality of infrastructure (top of head grumbles)
- But the quality is not expressed in the same way – people refer to the "quality of infrastructure"
- Sewage disposal is a huge issue

***Included***
*(Extent to which there is a wide constituency of community members empowered to participate in the process and the extent to which people from different cultural backgrounds feel included)*

- This is too "touchy feely"!
- For WDC there is a limited ethnic mix. Resident's surveys confirm a high level of interaction with the Council and mostly positive dealings so there are possibly fewer barriers to participation in Council initiatives– we are an Agenda 21 Council and consult people regularly and have a track record of frequent, extensive consultation over a wide range of issues. An extensive community advisory group

system empowers a wide cross section to be involved in Council matters. Scale is important too. Many Councillors are well known and retain high levels of participation as individuals in community groups. This may not be the same for Cities.

- Some people just do not care or are too busy and there is nothing you could do to secure their participation!

---

***Well- being***

*(The overall sense of satisfaction that people feel)*

- Commonly expressed but not using the term "well-being" – the term used in Waimakariri is the "magic" of the place.
- People have huge satisfaction with the environment they live in and are very comfortable with it
- The sense of belonging is strong
- Where there are any threats to well-being, people rally and get involved.

**APPENDIX 2: RESIDENTIAL EXAMPLE**

**Ministry for the Environment indicator selection template *(amended)***
**Policy / Issue Based 'Pressure -State - Response' Indicator Framework**

---

**Part 1 - Indicator Development For Urban Amenity – Waimakariri District**

**Issue:** Retaining the existing character of residential areas.

**Main Policy Goals:**
**Gl)** Avoid & mitigate adverse effects on scale and character
**G2)** Good subdivision design & a range of living environments
**G3)** Minimal intervention

*[Note: in the final analysis it was decided that putting the policy goals in here confused the process and was not appropriate. It was decided that putting in the priority AERs was a better approach.]*

**Policy Gaps:** None noted but there may be gaps in detail e.g. rules

| PSR FRAMEWORK | STATE (CONDITION) | PRESSURE | RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Identify the 'state', 'pressure' and 'response' components of the issue – in a general/broad sense. Do not worry if it is hard to decide where exactly the issue fits (i.e. if necessary repeat the issue in more than one column)* | *What is the condition of the environment, or the state of the urban environment that is affected by or relates to the issue:*<br>• Low density single story detached dwellings. Pg 164 WDC DP<br>• Low incidence of non-residential buildings (scale, nature), structures e.g. signs/towers | *What causes the issue, what are the threats or pressures that influence the condition of the urban environment:*<br>• Development<br>• Small household sizes – i.e. impacts of ageing.<br>• Change in family structures e.g. extended family, solo.<br>• Land available for development | *How can the issue be dealt with? This may be a policy or management action and may be what the Council or the community etc does:*<br>• Bulk & location rules<br>• Minimum lot sizes (e.g. 600m2)<br>• Public purchase of land.<br>• Structure/outline planning<br>• Guidelines/education<br>• Zoning |

| POTENTIAL INDICATORS | STATE (CONDITION) | PRESSURE | RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Measures to best represent the pressures, conditions, responses above* | *What do we need to measure to track condition:*<br><br>a) Site coverage<br>b) Number of dwellings per site<br>c) Bulk and location<br>d) Physical appearance | *What do we need to measure to track pressures:*<br><br>a) Census information – demographics<br>b) Resource consent conditions<br>c) Occupants survey<br>d) Number of relocates & new buildings<br>e) Understanding competing housing markets & use of houses | *What do we need to measure to track response:*<br><br>a) Type of consents & conditions.<br>b) Number of breaches of resource consents.<br>c) Geographic locations.<br>d) Expenditure.<br>e) Tracking land left for development. |
| *Main reasons for choosing above measures / what will the measures tell us: (a), (b) etc. correspond to a), b), c) ... above* | a) Establish a ratio of buildings to land<br>b) Easy information to get<br>c) Commonly used method<br>d) | a) Accessible information<br>b) Currency of information e.g. qualitative.<br>c) Cheap to obtain<br>d) Accessible<br>e) - | a) Accessible information<br>b) Currency of information e.g. qualitative<br>c) Cheap to obtain<br>d) Accessible<br>e) Relatively simple exercise |
| **Complete Part 2: Assessment of potential indicators against indicator criteria** | | | |
| ***Prioritise and rank assessed 'potential' indicators:*** *(based on Part 2: Assessment of potential indicators against indicator criteria)* | 1) Site coverage; Number of dwellings per site; Bulk and location<br>2) Physical appearance | 1) Census information – demographics<br>2) Understanding competing house markets & use of houses.<br>3) Occupants survey<br>4) Number of relocates & new buildings; Resource consent conditions | 1) Type of consents & conditions; Number of breaches of resource consents<br>2) Tracking land left for development<br>3) Expenditure<br>4) Tracking land left for development. |

## Check policy relevance

| PARAMETERS | POLICY RELEVANT |
|---|---|
| Bulk and location, site coverage, dwellings per site | √ |
| Census information e.g. demographics | ? |
| Type of consents and conditions, number of breaches. | √ |
| Understanding competing markets | ? |
| Tracking available land for development | x |
| Occupants surveys | |
| a) perception | √ |
| b) quantitative | x |

*[Note: If the parameter is not policy relevant and related to a measurable AER then it is not included or a measurable AER developed.]*

### Assessment of potential indicators against indicator criteria

| PARAMETERS | CRITERIA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Measurable | Analytically valid | Cost effective | Understand able | Appropriate | Effectiveness to plan | Stand alone |
| Bulk and location, site coverage, dwellings per site, | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | |
| Census information e.g. demographics | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | |
| Type of consents and conditions, number of breaches. | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | |
| Understanding competing markets | √ | ? | ? | ? | | | |
| Tracking available land for development | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | |
| Occupants surveys | | | | | | | |
| a) perception | √ | √ | ? √ | √ | | | |
| b) quantitative | √ | √ | ? √ | √ | | | |

**Draft Indicators**

**PHYSICAL**

- Number of buildings over 8m in height
- Number and location of two storey buildings
- Sites having more than two dwellings
- Number of sties with >35% site coverage
- Number of sites <600m2 – in new areas, old areas

**PERCEPTIAL**

- People's satisfaction of density levels
- People's opinions on likely future density
- People's reaction to change in outlook, day-look, privacy, and sense of enclosure
- Preference for streetscape

**Possible indicator:** (As a result of all of the above process)
Number of sites that are less than 600m2 in the Residential 2 Zone

**Assessment against the indicator criteria:**

| Measurable | Analytically valid | Cost effective | Understandable | Stand alone | Consistent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| √ | √ | √ | √ | **?** | √ |

## Part 3 - 'Nuts and Bolts' for High Priority Indicators

| **Potential indicator** | **Number of sites that are less than 600m2 in the Residential Two (R2) Zone** |
|---|---|
| What degree of change NEEDS to be detected (threshold/target) | Any changes |
| Existing monitoring: Techniques to use for monitoring *(note methods)* | Subdivision consents record, DCDB search |
| What degree of change CAN be detected? | Location and number of (mapped)<br>Incidence (graph over time) |
| Scale & geographical extent for monitoring *(note scale/extent of area to monitor)* | Over all sites in the R2 Zone in the district |
| How frequently to monitor | Monthly/quarterly |
| Who could monitor | Students. Need to think about site use. |
| How/ to whom should information be reported*: (technical/executive summary)* | Through a GIS system. To Policy team, RMR Committee, and to Consents team. |
| Links to other indicators (*use for range of situations*) | Unsure at present (as first indicator developed) |
| Recommended: Stage 1 or 2 or discontinue<br>Future work required: | Stage one indicator because it can be monitored now<br>Links with other indicators |
| Information Requirements: | Data protocols – consent information recorded GIS compatible, link building consents and subdivision consents and PIMS. |

## APPENDIX 3: BUSINESS EXAMPLE

**Ministry for the Environment indicator selection template *(amended)* Policy / Issue Based 'Pressure -State - Response' Indicator Framework**

**Part 1 - Indicator Development for urban amenity – Waimakariri District Council**

**Issue:** Threats to the pedestrian friendly nature of Rangiora town centre
**Main Policy Goals:** Include the AERs rather than the policies: A pedestrian friendly Rangiora township
**Policy Gaps:** None noted – may be gaps in detail e.g. rules

| PSR FRAMEWORK | STATE (CONDITION) | PRESSURE | RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Identify the 'state', 'pressure' and 'response' components of the issue – in a general/broad sense. Do not worry if it is hard to decide where exactly the issue fits (i.e. if necessary repeat the issue in more than one column)* | *What is the condition of the environment, or the state of the urban environment that is affected by or relates to the issue:*<br><br>• Traffic control humps<br>• Low traffic volumes<br>• On-street parking<br>• Pedestrian amenity – bins, verandas, benches<br>• Clean air, clean streets<br>• Music, entertainment<br>• Lighting, wide pedestrian streets<br>• Trees | *What causes the issue, what are the threats or pressures that influence the condition of the urban environment:*<br><br>• Increase in through traffic<br>• Too many cars, trucks and 4wds.<br>• Vehicle emissions and noise<br>• A lot of people wanting to park outside a shop<br>• Laziness<br>• Location and design of off-street parking<br>• Business sector clash in expectations<br>• Sign clutter<br>• Business's use of footpaths<br>• A safety culture exists in the community | *How can the issue be dealt with? This may be a policy or management action and may be what the Council or the community etc does:*<br><br>• Road-stopping<br>• Bylaws i.e. skateboards<br>• Safety education programmes<br>• Use of road hierarchy<br>• Asset management<br>• Beautification programmes<br>• Market anchor e.g. Warehouse<br>• Rules – verandas, display windows, signs<br>• Zoning<br>• Financial contributions<br>• Monitoring the Footpath Occupation Policy<br>• Education of new shop owners<br>• Co-ordination/liaison with Business Association. |

## Part 2 - Assessing Potential Indicators Against Indicator Criteria

| PARAMETERS | AER | POLICY RELEVANT |
|---|---|---|
| Accidents involving pedestrians | √ | √ |
| Clutter/use of footpaths | √ | |
| Number of pedestrians on street | √ | √ |
| Air quality | √ | √ |
| Length of verandahs | √ | √ |
| Quality of footpaths | √ | √ |
| Number of road closures | √ | √ |
| Speed of traffic | √ | |
| Number of ride on mobility | √ | |
| Perceptions on quality of pedestrian access – skateboarder, businessman, shopper, elderly | √ | √ |
| Number and location of facilities – parking, toilets, pedestrian crossings | √ | |
| Submissions to annual plans | √ | |
| Complaints | √ | |
| Walkability – time/difficulty | √ | |
| Length of display windows compared with retail frontage | √ | √ |

## Suggested Indicators

## PHYSICAL

- Accidents to pedestrians within the business 1 zone
- Number of pedestrians
- Obstructions on footpath

- Public facilities – i.e. toilets per person, parks, etc
- Air quality
- Noise
- Length of display windows compared with retail frontage

**PERCEPTUAL**

- Adequate public facilities
- Complaints
- Submissions to annual plan re pedestrian friendliness
- Ease of access/walkability – average time to walk to different locations, or how you can walk (walking isopleth)
- Feeling of safety

**The potential indicator**: Annual or two yearly changes in community perceptions of pedestrian safety on High Street (Business 1 Zone)

**Assessment against the indicator criteria:**

| **POTENTIAL INDICATORS** | **CRITERIA** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Aplies to business 1 zone**)** | **Measurable** | **Analytically valid** | **Cost effective** | **Understandable** | **Consistent** | **Stand alone** |
| Changes in community perceptions of pedestrian safety on High St (2000/01 etc) | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ - checklist | X |

Checklist: Public toilet strategy, Vision 2020, KPI's, community safety strategy, annual plan

## Part 3 - 'Nuts and Bolts' for High Priority Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| Potential indicator | Feeling of safety |
| What degree of change NEEDS to be detected (threshold/target) | Extent of change over time by safety issue for different members of the community – elderly, young, male, female, day and peak times etc |
| Existing monitoring | Complaints/submissions to annual plan<br>Central business liaison group<br>Community constable |
| Techniques to use for monitoring *(note methods)* | Survey pedestrians for level of satisfaction re safety |
| What degree of change CAN be detected? | ? |
| Scale & geographical extent for monitoring *(note scale/extent of area to monitor)* | Business 1 – King Street to railway line |
| How frequently to monitor | Monitor two yearly – before the annual plan. Phone survey, random sample |
| Who could monitor | Frank's staff/students |
| How/ to whom should information be reported*: (technical/executive summary)* | Report to Safe Waimakariri. RMR Committee, Business Association, Policy Unit |
| Links to other indicators (*use for range of situations*) | Not yet assessed |
| Recommended: Stage 1 or 2 or discontinue<br>Future work required: | Stage 1 - But needs thought for survey design and reporting<br>? |
| Information Requirements: | ? |