

a move away from the typical monotonous urban sprawl of family houses that characterise subdivisions of previous years. The master plan will ensure that a new community is developed. Land is therefore rezoned on the basis of the master plan'.

But beware, once the land is rezoned, who will ensure that the master plan is implemented?

SOME OF THE PITFALLS THAT MIGHT ARISE

Some or all of the following pitfalls may arise. The degree to which they can be overcome will depend upon the District Plan provisions which accompany the zone change. Many of these have been encountered in Christchurch urban growth areas, either because of the lack of provisions in the PCP or because the PCP provisions are inflexible.

Owners fall out

If a consortium of landowners has been formed to promote the rezoning, they may disband as soon as the land is zoned. Individual owners may not wish to wait while their neighbour reaps the early profit. They could seek to develop a separate access to their block and provide their own reserve contribution. This can lead to disconnected road layouts and a lack of pedestrian and cycling linkages. It prevents the development of a well-organised settlement, with a focus, and strategically placed open spaces and community facilities. This situation is likely to occur unless mechanisms are established to ensure that development happens as a package, or by definite stages, despite the separate landholdings. It is not enough to rely on 'the good working relationship' of the stakeholders.

Developers move on

In the case where the land is all owned by one developer the likelihood of adhering to the master plan would seem to be more certain. But developers will often on-sell blocks or even the whole site, to other developers or design and build companies. New developers may not be interested in upholding the integrity of the master plan, especially where they have paid a premium for the land. Features, facilities and design standards promised at the outset may disappear, unless there are statutory mechanisms requiring their provision.

No takers for the "village centre"

The land allocated for shops and community facilities, intended to form the focus of the community may remain undeveloped. Residents

are disappointed. If someone comes along prepared to develop on the main road on the edge of the development, maybe a petrol station or a supermarket. There will be pressure to accept the proposal. Although not in the centre of the community, it is at least close by and handy for residents to stop off there on their way home, even if it is too far to walk. This could make nonsense of the fact that higher density housing and elderly persons' housing is now in the middle of the development. For no good reason, since the shops have been located elsewhere and there are no community facilities.

Master plan doesn't suit the developer or the market

A master plan may be drawn up on behalf of landowners and embodied in a District Plan, without the involvement of a developer. When a developer does become involved they may find that development in the form set by the master plan is not acceptable (Craig, 2003 p.8). This may be due to the development not being economically viable, it may be that the master plan is not designed to the best marketing advantage, it may be that the master plan does not lend itself to sensible staging. If the developer wants to change the master plan they could find themselves embroiled in resource consents, plan changes or variations.

Housing mix doesn't suit the market

There may be a lack of demand for a particular range of section sizes shown on the master plan. The developer then seeks to reduce the size of the larger sections or develops much larger sections than the minimum section size allowed in the higher density zoning. The mix of housing size is not achieved or its relative location within the development is no longer rational.

The land use zoning and/or development plan prove to be a strait-jacket

Where land use zoning and/or the development plan (or structure plan) are drawn around the master plan, designers (and the District Council) may well find when they get to the stage of drawing up detailed plans that the zone boundaries or development blocks are the wrong shape or size for an efficient development that relates well to its surroundings. Road alignments may no longer be appropriate, open spaces or community facilities may be in the wrong place.

New uses are proposed which are not catered for

Because the only uses that have been considered are the uses contained in the master plan, it could be difficult to incorporate other

uses which may be beneficial to the community but do not fit into the master plan. For example a secondary school, may become viable because of intensification of housing in an adjoining area.

Master plan out of date

Major developments are likely to take a long time to build out: 10, 20 years or more. Once a master plan has been drawn, there are all manner of reasons why changes to it will be necessary such as: wrongly anticipated or changed market demand; changes in taste; unforeseen ground conditions; unsatisfactory siting of non-residential uses; adjustments in section sizes and shapes; different requirements of new landowners; changes in ideas about sustainability; changed approach to surface water management; changes in roading philosophies; changes in adjoining land uses; new land uses or activities emerging; changes in work patterns, schooling or social activity; changes in shopping habits.

A master plan must be seen for what it is - one way of developing a site which may be the best idea at that particular point in time. Embodying a master plan, in a District Plan, in the way that it was in the Christchurch PCP, has caused implementation problems.

SO HOW DO WE PLAN FOR NEW COMMUNITIES?

The challenge then is to find the tools which ensure that urban growth areas adhere to the desirable principles demonstrated in master plans. The Christchurch City Council is undertaking a review of urban growth. We will be seeking ways of embodying in the District Plan, mechanisms for achieving sustainable communities on large greenfield sites. Statutory mechanisms are needed to ensure that we do not have urban sprawl and we do develop new communities. Unless the principles and mechanisms are embodied within statutorily binding documents there could be disappointment and frustration for many years'.

We are exploring the use of development frameworks that establish development criteria, as opposed to structure plans that detail urban form. The criteria will derive from the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan, the aspirations of the local community and other stakeholders, and the characteristics and context of the site - not from a master plan. The development plan is likely to remain, but in a form where only the essential and crucial features are fixed and there is flexibility in the way in which other requirements are met. Treating major subdivisions as controlled

activities is no longer seen as appropriate. We are devising cost share and staging mechanisms.

IS THERE A ROLE FOR THE MASTER PLAN?

Master plans should not be seen as rigid blueprints; rather they set the context for individual projects (CABE 2004). A master plan can be used to establish development feasibility and staging, by exploring the potential housing yield and enabling assessment of infrastructure costs. A master plan will give at least some indication of the number and nature of households anticipated and can therefore be used to assist public bodies in asset planning. A master plan is useful for testing briefs and development frameworks, to ensure that they generate the desired type of urban development. A master plan can help to market a site, either to those responsible for consenting to it or to the prospective homebuyer, by providing a vision.

A master plan needs to be constantly evolving as development is planned and as stages progress. The most successful examples of the use of master plans have been in situations of rapid growth, where all the land is owned by a single entity, particularly if they also have consent powers'.

The master plan is the tool of the developer. The territorial authority's role is to set the criteria which master plans must satisfy and establish the mechanisms by which they can ensure that the criteria are met - this is the more difficult task.

REFERENCES

CABE 2004. *Creating Successful Masterplans, A Guide for Clients* (www.cabe.org.uk)

Craig, Ian, 2003. *Masterplanned Suburban Areas, some recent experiences*. A paper presented to the Urbanism Down Under Conference 2003. Auckland. This paper includes a case study of one of the Christchurch urban growth areas.

FOOTNOTES:

1. In addition to the Christchurch examples above. Manukau City Council, in Proposed District Plan, Variation no. 13 - Flat Bush p7, state the following: "Consultation with the community and stakeholder workshops resulted in adoption of a development concept for the

NEWS IN BRIEF

WHAT'S HOT ON THE WEB

Suggestion is to use the theme of PQ to feature various relevant (to the theme) websites, with a little paragraph describing what the website contains, useful information etc.

"Children's Landscape"
<http://home.c21.net/swan>

Focuses on the interests of children and youth in planning processes. The site provides many ideas for modifying school playgrounds, institutions and neighbourhoods in urban areas so that they respond to the real needs of children and youth. Other important issues are "Architecture in Education", "Green Schools" and "Outdoor Education". The site also provides many useful links to existing projects of these issues in Scandinavia and other countries. The electronic newsletter, sent to schools in Scandinavia, helps to create and develop networks and link together important projects. Frode Svane

CONFERENCES

Hawai's Congress of Planning Officials and American Planning Association International Conference 2004. September 8-10 at Hilton Hawaiian Village in Waikiki. "Planning in the New Pacific Era - Emerging Issues & Innovations".

RMLA - Power to the People: Form the Mountains to the Sea - 30 Sept - 3 October 2004, The Great Lake Centre, Taupo.

YEAR OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT - 2005

The New Zealand Institute of Architects have proposed to the Government that 2005 be the Year of the Built Environment. This

area in 1999. This provides the basis for the provisions contained in this section."

2. Manukau City Council have chosen to incorporate detailed rules and assessment criteria in the Variation to the District Plan, as a means of ensuring that the Flat Bush community develops in a way that maintains the principles of the development concept. Essential flexibility to change the development concept is maintained through the restricted discretionary activity status of subdivision and building in this area. This enables the Council

initiative has the support of the New Zealand Planning Institute", the Urban Design Protocol Advisory Group and the Construction Industry Council. Further details can be found on www.nzia.co.nz

USEFUL PUBLICATIONS?

Urbecon - is published by SGS Economics and Planning. Material included in Urbecon is compiled from project work and research undertaken by SGS Economics and Planning. - www.sgs-pl.com.au

Auckland Regional Growth Forum - www.arc.govt.nz

CoalFace - produced by Solid Energy Marketing Teams - 0800 655 122

Reports on Research Findings

Generating the Future? The State of Local Government Planning for Children and Young People in New Zealand. Claire Freeman, Elizabeth Aitken-Rose and Ruth Johnston. Published by the Department of Geography, University of Otago, Dunedin.

COMMENTS IN BRIEF

IPENZ says infrastructure stocktake lacks substance

The findings of the nationwide infrastructure stock take are commendable. However, it lacks any analysis of whether existing processes, structures and initiatives are likely to solve any infrastructure deficits, said John Gardiner, Deputy Chief Executive, IPENZ. "While the Government has used the release as an opportunity to restate its initiatives in this area, there is no analysis as to whether these initiatives will solve the infrastructure shortfall problems." For further information contact John at jgardiner@ipenz.co.nz NZ *Engineering News June 2004*

to use the plan provisions to negotiate appropriate design solutions with developers.

3. For example: Newington. Homebush Bay, Sydney, developed as the Athletes Village for the 2000 Olympics.

Acknowledgements: My thanks to Josie Schröder, David Mountfort, Ivan Thomson and Vil Vabulis, Christchurch City Council for their comments on the draft and to Bruce Harland, Manager Flat Bush Design & Development, Manukau City Council, for sharing his knowledge and experience.