Integrated Assessment: evolving sustainability pillars

Stephen Timms and Martin Ward

IAIA Brisbane 2019



Better Urban Planning, More Resilient Communities



# NZ's largest natural disaster

- 3rd largest insurance claim in the world
- 170,000 building claims 19% over \$100,000 cap
- 7,187 properties 'red zoned' = 636ha of land
- Rebuild around \$45 billion (roughly 20% NZ GDP)
  - Tohoku, Japan earthquake roughly 4.6%
    GDP
  - Queensland floods roughly 1% GDP
- First major earthquake to hit an urban centre in NZ since Napier 1931
- Plans, strategies and programmes urgently needed to expedite recovery





# What is Integrated Assessment?

- A formal approach used to predict the potential effects of a policy, with particular attention paid to impacts on health and wellbeing; in addition to social, economic, cultural and environmental matters
- Designed to inform development of plans and policies through early iterations
- A collaborative multi-agency and cross disciplinary approach





- Impact Assessment; Integrated Assessment; Sustainability Assessment; Strategic Environmental Appraisal; Regulatory Impact Statement; Section 32 Analysis; Health in all policies approach...?
- Sustainability Appraisal recognised as having clear 'four pillar' approach as the foundation
- Integrated Assessment used as generic label





# The framework approach

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



### Integrated Assessment – basic steps

Establish assessment frame, what are we assessing for?

**Develop assessment criteria** 

Workshop criteria, plus top & bottom lines

Testing' early iterations of the plan using criteria

**Re-apply assessment criteria if useful to later draft (s)** 



## Integrated Assessment roll call:

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

Canterbury Regional Council

 Wellbeing Assessment of the Castle Plaza Development Plan Amendment, 2011

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

- Sustainability and Wellbeing Assessment of the Draft Christchurch Central City Plan, 2012
   CERA, Christchurch City Council & CDHB
- 4. Integrated Assessment of the Draft Land Use Recovery Plan, 2013 Canterbury Regional Council & CDHB
- 5. Wellbeing Impact Assessment of the Draft Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, 2014 Canterbury Regional Council, Port of Lyttelton & CDHB
- 6. Integrated Assessment of the Draft Waimakariri Residential Red Zone, 2015 CERA, Waimakariri District Council & CDHB
- 7. Integrated Assessment of the Otakaro/Avon River Corridor Plan, 2018 Regenerate Christchurch, CDHB & others



## Developing assessment criteria

- Provisional work by a small specialist assessment team to:
  - Identify capital assets under four pillars
  - Develop assessment criteria to be used (from existing planning & policy framework)
  - Agree scale (e.g. -1 to +3)
  - Compose preliminary descriptors







## Workshops

- Agree capital asset sets and criteria elements
- Amend/confirm assessment criteria and scale descriptors
- Set top and bottom lines
- 'Score' the plan/project options
- One, two or three workshops have been used



#### **Example 'scoring' of the draft plan**

#### Red circle = bottom line; Blue box = top line Green cross is where the participants 'scored' the draft plan

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

Greater Christchurch Land Use Recovery Plan summary of recommendations

26

#### 1st iteration

### 2<sup>nd</sup> draft

### Final draft

· Integrate active and public transport into new development and local retail centre

Land use change part of annual monitoring and reporting

Ensure community participation in monitoring and review of implementation
 Ensure wide range of community representation on the Strategic Implementation Forum

Address the implications of hazard and managed retreat from identified areas – this is not inclused.

· Ensure natural green spaces and cover (green roofs, stormwater, buildings, natural corridors)

Focus on building communities and urban villages- difficult but not included in actions

Part Three

TRANSPORT

IMPLEMENTATION

HAZARDS AND ENVIRONMENT

and no explanation has been provided

REBUILDING AND BUILDING COMMUNITIES

LOCATION AND QUALITY OF DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDINGS

· Consider more mechanisms/ tools for intensification rather than regulatory

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



Issues

Clearly direct staging and sequencing of Greenfield land Review tenure issues to support intensification and multiple ownership
HOUSING Transitional housing is not well developed Outline ways to integrate preater housing density into inner urban areas that are semi occupie of poor quality to use existing infrastructure Fourse quality and repair of esisting and new housing
Listore quarty and repart or existing and new noticing
Solutions

#### Description of table:

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

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

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





## IA was a success because:

- Early in the process
- Involved plan writers and those advising decision makers early (so not defending the plan, but open to ideas)
- Used pre-established criteria
- Efficient for testing early ideas (time, resourcing, budgets)
- Useful for defending challenges (legal, political, community)





Allow lead in time

Good facilitator is essential

Need a 'champion' to promote/explain IA

Collaboration/consensus building requires good relationships (trust & time/effort)

Planning is inherently political



# Appropriate participation

- Compositional bias will introduce a content and outcome bias
- The most helpful participants are likely to be busy and will show participant fatigue
- Need to understand equity issues (and the social determinants of health and wellbeing)
- And 'speak' for future generations
- Need an understanding of resource (capital) asset management and the notion of capital substitution
- Mana whenua must be involved



### Legacy

- A positive participative approach to plan making
- More robust and transparent 'testing' of plan development
- Saves time/money/resources (esp. post disaster)
- Collaborative multi-agency planning processes
- Mana whenua involvement now the norm
- Contributes to better plans for health and wellbeing of community
- Better urban planning, more resilient communities



## Where next for Integrated Assessment?

- Refine base methodology with interested practitioners
- Finalise a 'how to' guide
- Further promotion and capacity building for:
  - IA practitioners and potential exponents
  - Urban planners and allied professions
  - Management/commissioning decision makers
- Potential use in Australia and further afield





## Thank you

Stephen Timms Principal Meridian Urban

<u>stephen.timms@meridianurban.com</u> m. +61 (0) 429 039 189