

Before the Board of Inquiry
Waterview Connection Project

in the matter of: the Resource Management Act 1991

and

in the matter of: a Board of Inquiry appointed under s 149J of the Resource Management Act 1991 to decide notices of requirement and resource consent applications by the NZ Transport Agency for the Waterview Connection Project

Second Statement of evidence of Amelia Linzey (Social Effects) on behalf of the **NZ Transport Agency**

Dated: 12 November 2010

REFERENCE: Suzanne Janissen (suzanne.janissen@chapmantripp.com)
Cameron Law (cameron.law@chapmantripp.com)

Chapman Tripp
T: +64 9 357 9000
F: +64 9 357 9099

23 Albert Street
PO Box 2206, Auckland 1140
New Zealand

www.chapmantripp.com
Auckland, Wellington,
Christchurch



INDEX

INTRODUCTION 3
SCOPE OF EVIDENCE 4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5
BACKGROUND AND ROLE 6
SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL EFFECTS 6
SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN..... 19
POST-LODGEMENT EVENTS 23
COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS 24
PROPOSED SOCIAL AND PUBLIC INFORMATION CONDITIONS 45
ANNEXURE A: AMENDMENTS TO PROPOSED SOCIAL AND PUBLIC INFORMATION CONDITIONS46

SECOND STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AMELIA LINZEY ON BEHALF OF THE NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Amelia Joan Linzey. As noted in my first statement of evidence, I am the joint Planning Team Leader and Consultation Manager for the Waterview Connection Project (*Project*). I have the qualifications and experience set out in the introduction to my first statement of evidence in chief dated 12 November.
- 2 I repeat the confirmation given in that statement that I have read, and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (Consolidated Practice Note 2006).
- 3 In addition to the experience noted in my first statement of evidence, I have specific experience in the areas of social impact assessment and consultation. I have undertaken the IAP2 Certificate Programme in Public Participation (2003).
- 4 I have been involved in and have prepared social impact assessments on a number of projects, both stand-alone reports and as part of wider environmental assessments. I have also undertaken consultation on a range of planning and infrastructure projects. Recent examples include:
 - 4.1 The review of a social impact assessment for Pakuranga to Penrose Transmission Line Undergrounding, Transpower, 2009 , and the direction and writing of social impact assessments for Hunua No. 4 Water Pipeline, Watercare, 2009, Drury Plan Change, Stevensons, 2009, and Wairakei Ring 220kV Line, Transpower, 2008;
 - 4.2 Social impact assessments as part of wider environmental assessments for the following infrastructure projects:
 - (a) Southwestern Corridor to East Tamaki Strategic Study, NZTA, 2007–2008;
 - (b) Marsden Rail, Northland Regional Council, 2002–2008,
 - (c) Hastings Northern Arterial Road, Hastings District Council, 2000–2003; and
 - (d) Belize Airport Link Road, Government of Belize (Ministry of Transport), 2002.

- 4.3 Consultation and reporting of consultation for the following infrastructure projects:
- (a) Manukau Harbour Crossing, Manukau Harbour Crossing Alliance, 2007–2008;
 - (b) Britomart Transport Centre, Auckland City Council, 1999–2005; and
 - (c) State Highway 16/18 Alignment, Transit New Zealand, 1997–2000.
- 4.4 I have also provided project scoping, facilitation and consultation for a number of other large planning projects. Recent project examples include:
- (a) Kaipara District Plan Review, Kaipara District Council, 2006–ongoing;
 - (b) Whangarei Urban Form/District Plan Review, Whangarei District Council, 2007–2009;
 - (c) Whangarei Coastal Structure Plans, Whangarei District Council, 2007–2009; and
 - (d) Waipa Growth Strategy, Waipa District Council, 2008.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 5 This evidence is in two parts. Firstly, I will discuss the social impacts associated with the Project. Secondly, I will discuss the consultation process undertaken between since 2000.
- 6 My evidence will deal with the following:
- 6.1 Executive summary;
 - 6.2 Background and role;
 - 6.3 Summary of assessment of social effects;
 - 6.4 Summary of consultation undertaken;
 - 6.5 Post-lodgement events;
 - 6.6 Comments on submissions; and
 - 6.7 Proposed social conditions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 7 The social impact assessment undertaken by myself and my colleague Lisa Franks has identified a wide range of effects, both positive and negative, through the planning, construction and operational phases of the Project. Extensive consultation, survey and background research has been undertaken to identify potential social effects of the Project. This has informed the assessment of alternatives and enabled mitigation of social effects through the design process for the Project.
- 8 The social impact assessment set out in my Report¹ has assessed the impacts of the Project during the planning, construction and operation stages of the Project.
- 9 In my opinion, the potential negative social impacts of the Project have been effectively managed through Project route assessment, alignment, design, designation footprint (i.e. land take) and proposed conditions. In particular, the decision to tunnel some 2.5km of the SH20 alignment significantly avoids adverse social effects. In addition, the alignment traverses between, rather than through, established residential communities thereby reducing potential severance impacts of the Project.
- 10 I consider the social impacts during the construction phase to range from minor positive impacts to potentially significant negative social impacts, varying across the Project area according to proximity to construction areas and the types of construction activities being undertaken. The most significant social impacts will be experienced by those residents living directly adjacent to construction areas (e.g. within approximately 20m of the Project footprint), and for the Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten. I consider that appropriate methods are proposed through the proposed conditions for mitigation of these effects.
- 11 I consider the social impacts during the operation phase of the Project range from moderately to significantly positive benefits associated with the improvements to accessibility and mobility for the wider regional as well as local community. There will however, be potentially significant adverse impacts (for localised areas) from the Project, particularly in Sector 9 where the Project introduces new infrastructure (albeit that this land corridor is already designated for rail). The mitigation proposed by the Project, particularly for reinstatement of open space / recreation areas, the provision of pedestrian connections over the motorway (e.g. Hendon Park Bridge) and ongoing liaison with the community and other agencies (e.g. Auckland Council, Housing New Zealand Corporation and iwi), will provide for the appropriate mitigation of these effects.

¹ AEE, Part G, Technical Report G.14.

BACKGROUND AND ROLE

- 12 As noted in my first statement, the NZTA retained Beca as part of a consortia team to assist with the investigation, engineering and planning of the Project. I prepared an Assessment of Social Effects report (*Social Report*) in relation to the potential social effects of the Project, with the assistance of Lisa Franks, a Planner at Beca. Ms Julie Meade Rose, Director of Social & Environmental Limited, peer reviewed the Social Report.
- 13 The Social Report was lodged with the EPA on 20 August 2010 as part of the overall Assessment of Environmental Effects (*AEE*) (specifically, Part G, Technical Report G.14).
- 14 Given my role in this Project, both as the joint Project Team Leader and the author of the social impact assessment, as well as the long history of my involvement in the Project (since 2000), Ms Julie Meade Rose will provide evidence of her conclusions from her peer review of the social impact assessment and the Social Report.
- 15 I have also been the Project Consultation Manager on the Project between 2000 and 2006 (for the SH20 components of the Project). In this role I was responsible for developing the Project consultation strategy and executing consultation on issues and for the environmental effects assessment. Since the SH20 and SH16 Projects were merged in 2009, I have also been responsible for providing advice to the NZTA on consultation and leading the technical team's involvement in this consultation.
- 16 Over the course of the Project, the consultation has been fronted by personnel within the NZTA (this has included the Communications Manager, Project Manager, Project Director, Property Manager and Planning representatives).

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL EFFECTS

Summary of Assessment Scope

- 17 The Waterview Connection Project is complex, with a high level of contention and varying spatial distribution of effects and benefits. Recognising this difference, the assessment of the social effects of the Project was carried out on two different scales: regional and local. Effects were assessed for the planning, construction and operational phases of the Project, consistent with current good practice in social assessment.

- 18 The regional social assessment² covers social impacts derived from changes to one or more of the following variables:
- 18.1 Transport, accessibility and connectivity;
 - 18.2 Economic growth and development;
 - 18.3 Environmental sustainability; and
 - 18.4 Healthy communities.
- 19 The local social assessment³ covers social impacts derived from changes to one or more of the following variables:
- 19.1 Attitudes, Expectations and Aspirations
 - (a) Attitudes to the Waterview Connection including perceptions of equity;
 - (b) Impact on the future plans, expectations and aspirations of individuals and communities, including people's expectations of neighbourhood character and safety.
 - 19.2 Wellbeing and Way of Life
 - (a) Changes to wellbeing (including stress/anxiety);
 - (b) Perceptions or concerns for health impacts;
 - (c) Impacts on quality of life;
 - (d) Impacts on patterns of day to day living, including at-home activities and accessibility/connectivity;
 - (e) Impacts on people's property rights;
 - (f) Impacts on leisure and recreation opportunities, including impacts on reserves/open space.
 - 19.3 Culture
 - (a) Changes to shared beliefs, values or practices;
 - (b) Impacts on cultural/heritage landscapes.

² Section 6 of the Social Report.

³ Section 7 of the Social Report.

19.4 Community

- (a) Impacts and disruption to community infrastructure, commercial areas and employment sites/structures;
- (b) Changes to community cohesion, structure/demographic composition, stability and character, including those resulting from severance or lost housing stock;
- (c) Creation/exacerbation of social tensions and divisions within the community.

Summary of Assessment Methodology

- 20 The social assessment has been ongoing over the SH20 Project. Following the decision to combine the SH16 and SH20 Projects as a single proposal of national significance, the SH16 upgrade component was added to the scope of the assessment (2009).
- 21 Between 2000-2010 for SH20, and 2009-2010 for SH16, the Project design/mitigation development process and social assessment have been carried out in parallel. This has enabled a two-way process whereby community feedback and other social considerations have informed route option assessments, Project design and the development of mitigation measures.
- 22 The Social Report was informed by, and relies upon, other assessment reports lodged with the EPA in support of the Project. Those reports are identified in section 4.2.3 of the Social Report and have been covered in the evidence of other experts, in particular:
- 22.1 Mr Gavin Fisher in respect of the air quality assessment (Technical Report G.1);
 - 22.2 Dr Rod Clough in respect of the archaeological assessment (Technical Report G.2);
 - 22.3 Ms Siiri Wilkening in respect of noise effects assessment (Technical Reports G.5 and G.12);
 - 22.4 Mr Terry Widdowson in respect of land and groundwater contamination (Technical Report G.9);
 - 22.5 Mr Gavin Alexander in respect of ground settlement (Technical Report G.13);
 - 22.6 Mr Andrew Murray and Mr John Gottler in respect of traffic and transport effects (Technical Reports G.16 and G.18);

- 22.7 Mr Peter Millar in respect of vibration effects (Technical Report G.19); and
- 22.8 Mr Stephen Brown in respect of the assessment of visual and landscape effects (Technical Report G.20).⁴
- 23 A variety of information sources and methods were used in the development of the Social Report. These are described in section 4.2 of the Social Report and include (as a summary) the following:
- 23.1 Site visits (between 2003 and 2010) and observational surveys (between 2006 and 2010), to compile a study area profile and to understand how residents use of parks and community facilities might be affected by the Project;
- 23.2 Community and stakeholder consultation feedback, to understand the views and issues associated with the Project;
- 23.3 Community focus groups held for the SH20 Project in 2002, 2003 and 2006, to gain insight into community values and issues, concerns and ideas with respect to the SH20 Project;
- 23.4 Community and stakeholder consultation in 2010, including meetings and interviews, to inform on the Project and to receive feedback on key social issues;
- 23.5 A series of 36 interviews with randomly selected local residents in Te Atatu, Waterview and Owairaka. These interviews were carried out by Tasman Research Ltd in 2010 with direction and scope from the NZTA and myself. These interviews were conducted to confirm the scope of issues and concerns identified in earlier consultation exercises, given the time lapse since earlier SH20 focus groups (with the last being in 2006). This method was considered appropriate to gain a balance of views and opinions of individuals less involved in other forms of consultation on the Project, to enable a more balanced range of community perspective to inform the Social Report;
- 23.6 Review of relevant Project Technical Reports, to provide a 'social lens' in regard to these technical matters; and
- 23.7 Literature review and internet research, to compile a community profile and to scope potential social impacts associated with the Project.

⁴ In addition, I consider the more recent evidence of Dr David Black regarding the health effects of the Project and Mr Michael Copeland in respect of the wider economic impacts of the Project are also relevant to the conclusions of my overall assessment of the social impacts of the Project.

Summary of the Assessment of Social Effects

24 In this section of my evidence I will describe the key findings of the Social Report.

Summary of Regional Impacts⁵

- 25 The Project has regional significance particularly in terms of the accessibility outcomes it will generate in the Auckland region.
- 26 I do not consider that there have been social impacts on a regional scale during the current planning phase.
- 27 During construction, I consider that the Project will result in minor to moderately negative social impacts on a regional scale, relating to disruptions to accessibility and connectivity along the SH16 corridor during peak travel times, and impacts on people's perceptions of environmental quality.
- 28 Once constructed, I consider that, as set out in Section 6 of the Social Report, the Project will result in the following positive impacts on a regional scale:
- 28.1 Significantly positive social benefits to the Auckland region in relation to transport, accessibility and connectivity outcomes. These are attributed to the improvement to travel time reliability and reduced congestion (as presented in the evidence of Mr Andrew Murray), which result in improvements to public transport opportunities, and improved access between residential areas, community facilities and educational, employment and recreational opportunities in Auckland);
 - 28.2 Significantly positive social benefits in terms of people's economic wellbeing, access to employment opportunities, and opportunities to provide for material quality of life in the Auckland region and realising the region's growth aspirations in accordance with the Auckland Regional Growth Strategy (as supported by the economic assessment of the Project presented in the in lodged documents and evidence of Mr Andrew Murray and Mr Tommy Parker);
 - 28.3 Minor negative to minor positive social impacts in relation to people's perceptions of environmental sustainability in the Auckland region, associated with environmental impacts and proposed benefits (via the mitigation, remediation and restoration proposed) on regionally significant areas including the Motu Manawa (Pollen Island) Marine Reserve, Traherne Island and Oakley Creek as presented in the evidence of

⁵ Page 163 of the Social Report.

others, particularly Ms Sharon De Luca and Mr Eddie Sides in relation to ecological impacts; and

- 28.4 Moderately positive impacts in relation to 'healthy communities' with improved traffic safety outcomes, access to 'active' modes of transport (cycling, walking and public transport) and access to health and recreation facilities in Auckland. The health consequences of the Project regionally with respect to air quality impacts (as presented in the evidence of Mr Gavin Fisher) and noise emissions (as presented in the evidence of Ms Siiri Wilkening), are considered negligible (as presented in the evidence of Dr David Black).

Summary of Local Impacts⁶

- 29 It is at the local level where most adverse social impacts will be realised.
- 30 Effects of the Project during the planning phase are considered to encompass minor positive, neutral and minor to moderate negative impacts, reflective of the range of views and concerns expressed by individual residents within the study area. These impacts are described in Chapter 7.1 of the Social Report, and are summarised as follows:
- 30.1 Minor positive impacts in some cases, and minor to moderate negative social impacts in other cases, in terms of the attitudes, expectations and aspirations of local communities (depending on people's specific circumstances during the planning phase). Impacts range widely across the Project area: many residents have reported looking forward to the improved accessibility the Project will bring (the 'hurry up and build it' attitude has been expressed frequently), while others reported being indifferent to the Project and others still have expressed significant concern about the Project. Impacts are generally considered to be the most severe in Sectors 5 and 7 - 9 where the Project's ten year history has resulted in uncertainty and mixed expectations about whether the Project would be built, in which location and in which form;
- 30.2 Neutral to moderate negative impacts on people's wellbeing and way of life, again reflective of the range of opinions and level of concern expressed to date by individual residents within the study area. Negative impacts have primarily arisen from the uncertainty of the Project's form and statutory planning process, leading to stress and anxiety for some local residents potentially affected by property acquisition;

⁶ Pages 164 - 165 of the Social Report.

- 30.3 Minor to moderate negative 'community' impacts in anticipation of the Project and as a result of early NZTA property acquisition (as discussed in the evidence of Mr Tommy Parker) and some voluntary relocation of residents. Such impacts have mainly been experienced by the Waterview community;
- 30.4 Social impacts in relation to people's culture have not been reported during the planning phase. I do however note the formation and strengthening of a number of community groups, acting as both a 'voice' on the Project and as wider environmental action groups. These groups have in some degree have been either formed or strengthened by the common interest in the Waterview Project.
- 31 Over the planning phase, the NZTA has given significant consideration to alternatives, particularly for the SH20 alignment and the design of both SH16 and SH20. In my opinion, the alignment, design and footprint (designation) of the Project has avoided adverse effects to the extent possible by,
- 31.1 Traversing the alignment of new sections of State highway between existing communities (e.g. between Owairaka and New Windsor) rather than through them, reducing potential social severance impacts;
- 31.2 Tunnelling SH20 for a length of some 2.5km beneath established urban areas; and
- 31.3 Minimising to the extent practicable the taking of residential and open space land, except where the environmental effects of the Project on this land warrant it (for example, in Alwyn Avenue and Hendon Avenue where the initial proposal to take only parts of the affected residential properties was considered to have potentially significant social impacts (e.g. on amenity and quality of life) such that the taking of the whole property was considered to have a lesser adverse effect).
- 32 I consider that the resolution of the planning phase itself will be a positive social impact for many; providing a greater degree of certainty in respect of the Project and enabling people to "move on" with their lives.
- 33 I consider the social impacts during the construction phase to range from minor positive impacts to potentially significant negative social impacts, varying across the study area according to proximity to construction areas and the types of construction activities being undertaken. The most significant social impacts will be experienced by those residents living directly adjacent to construction areas

(e.g. within some 20m of the Project footprint), and for the Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten. These effects are discussed in section 7.2 of the Social Report and in summary include:

- 33.1 Minor positive to minor negative impacts in relation to people's attitudes, expectations and aspirations, again depending on individual perceptions and the level of nuisance experienced by local residents;
 - 33.2 Minor positive impacts to minor and moderate negative impacts on people's wellbeing and way of life. Positive impacts relate to socio-economic activity associated with employment in the construction of the Project. Adverse impacts on individuals and households will vary depending on proximity to construction areas. On review of the technical reports on construction effects, the most significant impacts are envisaged to affect residents living adjacent to SH16 (Sector 1), the Great North Road Interchange (Sector 5), Great North Road Underpass (Sector 7) and Alan Wood Reserve (Sector 9).
 - 33.3 Minor negative to potentially significant negative impacts associated with impacts on community facilities and changes to community composition/character in Te Atatu, Waterview and Owairaka/New Windsor. Of particular note, these impacts on Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten will be potentially significant, mainly due to potential impacts and fluctuations on the school roll (e.g. resulting from the loss of residential properties in this area);
 - 33.4 Minor negative social impacts in relation to people's culture, mainly related to the damage of some parts of the Star Mill heritage site. This area has been identified as valued by the community. The impacts on this site during and following construction have been discussed by Dr Rod Clough in his evidence on archaeological effects. It is noted that beyond construction, the restoration and works in this area are identified as a positive environmental outcome of the Project.
- 34 A broad range of social impacts are associated with the operational Project, ranging from moderately to significantly positive benefits (for the wider local area) to potentially significant negative impacts (for localised areas). These effects are discussed in more detail in section 7.3 of the Social Report. In the interests of brevity, key matters identified in this assessment are summarised as follows:
- 34.1 The most significant adverse impacts relate to the impact of property acquisition on individuals, households and communities, particularly in Waterview where impacts will be

the most extensive. These impacts include disruption to people's way of life and people's wellbeing.

- 34.2 Improved accessibility will generate the greatest benefits for study area residents. These benefits include improved access to and from the State Highway network at Te Atatu and at the Maioro Street Interchange, improved accessibility on local roads as a result of reduced local road traffic (congestion) and improved access to other transport mode networks (including the pedestrian / cycleways along the surface section of SH20 and along SH16).
- 34.3 Minor positive to minor negative social impacts in relation to people's expectations and aspirations, as people adjust to the Project and become more accepting towards it, or as people move from the area and new populations (who move with knowledge and expectation of the Project) move in;
- 34.4 Moderately positive to potentially significant negative impacts in relation to people's wellbeing and way of life. The Project will generate positive impacts associated with improvements to accessibility and people's patterns of living. Negative impacts are primarily associated with changes to the character and amenity (or liveability) of certain local areas in the study area (for example, particularly in Sector 9 around Owairaka and New Windsor communities). Air quality impacts of the Project are not considered significant. While there is community concern expressed over health impacts, the evidence presented by Mr Gavin Fisher and Dr David Black states that the actual physical impacts on health are considered no more than minor. I consider that, once operational and with the monitoring proposed, these concerns will be allayed over time;
- 34.5 Neutral to moderate positive social impacts in relation to people's culture. As presented in the evidence of Dr Rod Clough and discussed above, the restoration and improved public access to the Star Mill heritage site around the Great North Road Interchange is identified as a positive environmental outcome. This is also considered a positive social outcome in relation to culture and identity;
- 34.6 Moderately to significantly positive community benefits associated with improvements to local accessibility and access to local business nodes (supported by the evidence presented from Mr Andrew Murray); and
- 34.7 Minor to potentially significant negative impacts on community cohesion, structure and stability. The most adverse impacts are associated with the fragmentation of

residential areas in Owairaka and the residential land take in Waterview.

- 34.8 In the case of the latter impact, the Waterview community is already isolated (by Great North Road to the east, the Northwestern Motorway to the north and the coastal marine area to the west). This isolation is compounded by the Project and the degree of land take has the potential for adverse effects on the stability and structure of the remaining community, particularly considering the roll impacts on facilities such as the Kindergarten and the potential loss of other facilities, including open space at Waterview Reserve. Mitigation is proposed in respect of these facilities and is discussed below.
- 34.9 In the case of the residential impacts in Owairaka, this community is larger and more geographically integrated with neighbouring communities. In addition, the residential land take required by the Project affects the 'edge' of this community (rather than creating a severance impact).

Mitigation⁷

- 35 Anxiety and uncertainty in the current planning phase is a key social impact of the Project. Should a decision be confirmed through the RMA process for the Project to proceed, this would play an important role in providing certainty for local study area residents, and enabling people to move on with their lives and make decisions that may have been delayed as a result of the uncertainty caused by the Project.
- 36 The NZTA has used consultation and active communication as a measure to reduce impacts associated with uncertainty and stress during the planning phase. I consider this has been an effective mitigation strategy. However, it is recognised that periods of uncertainty in the Project (particularly in relation to the assessment of alternatives) has in some instances resulted in adverse effects in the Planning phase.
- 37 The NZTA has executed a proactive, staged property purchase strategy to minimise impacts associated with uncertainty and stress during the planning phase, for those residents affected or potentially affected by property acquisition. As discussed in the evidence of Mr Tommy Parker, this has involved working with Housing New Zealand Corporation to provide advance warning regarding the purchase of properties from the national housing stock, to enable Housing New Zealand Corporation lead time to work with the individuals and families affected. The strategy has also included engaging with buyers on a 'willing seller, willing buyer' basis,

⁷ Pages 150 - 162 of the Social Report.

providing assistance in individual cases for resettlement, in accordance with the Public Works Act. Based on my involvement with the community through my role in consultation, I consider that this strategy has played an important role in reducing the uncertainty for individual households in the Project area.

- 38 During construction, I anticipate that most adverse social impacts will be able to be reduced or mitigated by the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and additional mitigation measures summarised below and set out in Section 8 of the Social Report.
- 39 I consider that the CEMP (as presented in the evidence of Mr Hugh Leersnyder) provides an appropriate construction management response for the following concerns identified in the Social Report:
- 39.1 Communication and complaints management, including a Community Liaison person. These measures will ensure that the community is informed of and can respond to the specific construction activities and the programme overall;⁸
 - 39.2 Noise and vibration- including setting of appropriate noise and vibrations standards during construction and mechanisms to ensure that these standards are complied with, including temporary noise attenuation through to options for temporary relocation of affected residents on a case by case basis (where effects cannot be mitigated on-site) and the treatment of buildings and facilities to provide appropriate internal acoustic levels for such sites (e.g. adjacent schools);
 - 39.3 Air quality, odour and dust;
 - 39.4 Settlement impacts – including monitoring and response to monitoring results over and following construction;
 - 39.5 Accidental discovery of archaeological sites;
 - 39.6 Visual amenity (including early planting of landscape design, and graffiti and lighting management);
 - 39.7 Traffic management (including identification of truck routes, pedestrian/mobility vehicle/cycle routes, property/facility access and communication of traffic management measures/temporary bus stop relocation);

⁸ Though I propose amendment to conditions regarding communication and community liaison in response to submissions later in my evidence.

- 39.8 Construction yard site accesses are managed so that Hendon Avenue is not used as the main access to construction yards within Alan Wood Reserve, to reduce disruption on local residents (instead using access from the SH20 alignment within the designation);
- 39.9 Contaminated land; and
- 39.10 Ecology (freshwater, vegetation, birds, coastal and lizards).
- 40 However, it is acknowledged that the potentially significant community impacts associated with the fragmentation the Waterview and Owairaka communities and the potential for fluctuation and change to the roll of Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten are not as easily able to be mitigated, and will require a combination of monitoring and multi-stakeholder response.
- 41 In addition to those measures set out in the CEMP, I also recommend that the following is undertaken during construction to reduce effects on local residents and community facilities:
- 41.1 That the NZTA offer to temporarily relocate Waterview Kindergarten⁹ to a suitable alternative site at least during construction (at no cost to the kindergarten), either within the grounds of Waterview Primary School or a site in close proximity (to be agreed between the NZTA, Auckland Kindergarten Association and Waterview Kindergarten)¹⁰;
- 41.2 That the NZTA develops a consultation and communications plan to facilitate an accurate information transfer and adequate feedback process between Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten, parents of students, and the NZTA, and to identify opportunities to reduce or mitigate impacts, particularly during construction (beyond those measures already set out in the CEMP)¹¹;
- 41.3 Community involvement in the detailed design and development of key structural elements of the Project and involvement in implementation of 'legacy' elements of the Project (for example community planting days for reserve restoration and riparian rehabilitation)¹²;

⁹ I understand that there is ongoing consultation between the NZTA, Ministry of Education, Waterview Primary School and the Auckland Kindergarten Association/Waterview Kindergarten to determine the most appropriate mitigation solution for the kindergarten.

¹⁰ As provided for in amended proposed social Condition SO.9.

¹¹ As provided for in proposed social Condition SO.7 (Education Liaison Group).

¹² As provided for in amended proposed public information Condition PI.5 (Community Liaison Group).

- 41.4 That the NZTA develops and implements a programme to monitor the school roll and specific concerns of teachers/parents/children at relevant education facilities in the local study area (in particular, at Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten). This should occur through the construction period and following the completion of construction¹³;
- 41.5 The provision of replacement open space and temporary facilities (as discussed by Mr David Little)¹⁴.
- 42 These are covered in the conditions proposed by the NZTA (with amendments discussed later), as shown in **Annexure A** to my evidence.
- 43 I consider that existing NZTA operational/management procedures provide an appropriate management response for the following concerns identified in the Social Report:
- 43.1 Maintenance work and graffiti removal;
- 43.2 Vegetation maintenance;
- 43.3 Receiving, recording and resolving complaints from stakeholders and road users.
- 44 I consider that the open space reinstatement provided for in the Project (as detailed in the evidence of Mr David Little) and the provision of pedestrian and cycle access (particularly maintenance of the Te Atatu Underpass and construction of the Hendon Park Bridge, will provide an appropriate mitigation response to the social and community effects associated with the loss of open space and local community connectivity. The reinstatement and restoration of open space areas through the Open Space Restoration Plans¹⁵ further provide for the mitigation of adverse social impacts, providing an opportunity for community involvement in the development of these areas.
- 45 To reduce and mitigate effects on local residents from the operational Project, I also recommend development of a mechanism to feedback the results of post-construction ambient air quality monitoring to interested parties. This mechanism is provided through the proposed Conditions SO.7 (Education Liaison Group) and PI.5 (Community Liaison Group).

¹³ As provided for in amended proposed social Condition SO.10.

¹⁴ As provided for in amended proposed social Condition SO.5.

¹⁵ As provided for in amended proposed social Condition SO.1.

- 46 In the Social Report¹⁶ I recommend that the northern ventilation stack be located as far away from the Waterview Primary School and kindergarten as practicable. As discussed in my planning evidence, the engineering constraints of the Project present limited options for the location of the ventilation stack, all of which remain proximate to the school and would therefore still result in the perception effects identified by submitters.
- 47 To reduce and mitigate effects on educational facilities from the operational Project, I recommend the following:
- 47.1 That the NZTA develops a communications plan to feed back the results of post-construction ambient air quality monitoring to relevant schools and kindergartens in the Project area (discussed above);
- 47.2 That the NZTA offers to provide information and/or develop an education programme about the Project for students of Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten and other schools and kindergartens that may be impacted by perception issues associated with the ventilation stacks in order to raise awareness about the air quality impacts expected¹⁷.
- 48 Recognising the limited statutory role of the NZTA as a transport agency, I consider that a multi-stakeholder partnership response is necessary to best mitigate 'community' effects associated with land use surrounding the Project area in Sectors 5, 7 and 9. In my opinion this would include a joint approach to the reinstatement of any residual residential land post-construction, undertaken as a partnership between the NZTA, Auckland Council as the territorial authority, and Housing New Zealand. Following consultation with a number of submitters (post-lodgement), this is proposed in the amended Working Liaison Group Conditions (Condition SO.12).

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

- 49 In this section of my evidence I will summarise the consultation that has been undertaken by the NZTA for the Project, primarily focussing on the consultation undertaken on issues and the response to these issues.

Consultation Objectives

- 50 Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the community and stakeholders for the SH20 Project (from 2000), and the combined SH16-20 Project (2010). The objectives of the consultation are set out in Section 10.1 of the AEE.

¹⁶ Page 159.

¹⁷ As provided for in proposed Condition SO.7 (Education Liaison Group).

Consultation Drivers

- 51 The Resource Management Act 1991, Land Transport Management Act 2003 and the NZTA Public Engagement Policy 2008 were important consultation drivers for the Project.

In particular, the NZTA Public Engagement Policy identifies four key commitments to public engagement: providing genuine opportunities for public contributions, ensuring people are informed, adopting an inclusive and representative approach to public engagement, and maintaining high professional public engagement standards. In my opinion, the consultation undertaken for the SH16 and SH20 projects is consistent with this policy.

Parties Consulted With

- 52 Consultation about the Project has sought to engage with:

52.1 Stakeholders;

52.2 The general public; and

52.3 Affected property owners.

- 53 Recognising the diverse range of spatial interest in the Project, consultation has aimed to engage with stakeholders covering local, regional and national interests. Accordingly consultation with stakeholders covered the relevant local and regional councils, education providers, iwi groups, health boards, network utility operators, government departments, community boards, environmental groups, churches, sports clubs, business associations, residents and community associations, as well as transport and local interest groups with a specific focus on the Project. A full list of stakeholders consulted is attached at Table 10.1 to the AEE.¹⁸
- 54 Consultation has also been undertaken with the public on a local, district and regional level. At the outset of the SH16 and SH20 projects, local study areas were set for the consultation purposes as depicted in Figure 1.

¹⁸ See Table 10.1, AEE Part D10, pages 10.5 to 10.10.

Figure 1: Project Study Area



- 55 In recognition of the wide public interest in the respective Projects, media releases and consultation material were released to the public via community and regional newspapers, and posters and advertising materials were circulated to community notice boards within the Project area¹⁹.
- 56 The Project team also developed and maintained three consultation databases for the Project (mail, email and stakeholder).²⁰
- 57 A range of consultation methods were employed to share information and seek feedback from stakeholders and the wider community²¹. This range was intended to recognise the diverse levels of Project interest and to maximise opportunities for interested parties to be involved in the consultation process.
- 58 Consultation for the Project occurred in distinct phases over the periods between 2000 and 2010 (for the SH20 Project) and between 2007 and 2010 (for the SH16 Project). These phases are reported in sections 10.7 to 10.9 of the AEE. The following key outcomes from each consultation phase are as follows:

¹⁹ See AEE Part D10, page 10.12 for a list of media and notice board locations.

²⁰ At the time of writing the AEE (August 2010), there were around 5,700 addresses on the mail database and 1,250 on the email database.

²¹ See Table 10.2, AEE Part D10, pages 10.14 to 10.18, which identifies the consultation methods employed.

- 58.1 In 2000, a long list of route options and associated social and environmental issues were incorporated into the constraints mapping and technical and environmental investigations for the SH20 preliminary scheme assessment;²²
- 58.2 In 2002 issues and concerns about the impacts of the short-listed route options for the SH20 project were identified and informed the evaluation of those options²³;
- 58.3 In 2002 to 2003, presentation of the preferred route for SH20 led to identification of stakeholder / community issues associated with that route. In response the NZTA directed the Project team to further consider below ground construction options and open space mitigation²⁴;
- 58.4 In 2006, consultation on the draft alignment and interchange options signalled a strong desire for tunnelling of the SH20 alignment. In response to this feedback the NZTA commenced investigation to consider options further undergrounding²⁵;
- 58.5 From 2008 consultation on various tunnel alignments identified issues and concerns associated with tunnelling (such as air quality issues and settlement²⁶) and with details of the Project alignment and design. In response to this feedback, the NZTA undertook more specific technical and environmental investigations (including consultation with the community) and considered various construction and alignment alternatives²⁷;
- 58.6 Consultation on the merged SH16/SH20 Project has informed mitigation through design amendments on both the SH20 and SH16 elements of the Project. These mitigation measures are discussed in the Technical Reports attached to the AEE and in the evidence of the relevant expert witnesses on the Project²⁸.

²² See Section 10.7.1, AEE Part D10 for further issues raised during this phase of consultation.

²³ See Section 10.8.1, AEE Part D10 for further issues raised during this phase of consultation.

²⁴ See Section 10.8.2, AEE Part D10 for further issues raised during this phase of consultation.

²⁵ See Section 10.9.1, AEE Part D10 for further issues raised during this phase of consultation.

²⁶ See Section 10.9.2, AEE Part D10 for further issues raised during this phase of consultation.

²⁷ See Section 10.9.3, AEE Part D10 for further issues raised during this phase of consultation.

²⁸ See Section 10.9.5, AEE Part D10 for further issues raised during this phase of consultation.

- 59 I consider that there have been appropriate opportunities for community and stakeholder involvement throughout the Project development process and that the Project has been revised over time to address, to the extent practical, concerns raised in consultation.
- 60 I consider that consultation has kept stakeholders and the community informed of the Project as it has developed, and that stakeholders and community have had an opportunity to provide feedback on community values, route option development, final construction form and mitigation measures. The NZTA has considered and responded to issues and concerns that have been identified and consultation feedback has been taken into account in decision making throughout the process.

POST-LODGEMENT EVENTS

- 61 Since lodgement of the Project, further work has been undertaken in three key areas that are relevant to the social impact assessment.
- 62 Firstly, as discussed in the evidence of Mr Andre Walter, the requirement for the emergency exhaust stack at 36 Cradock Street has been withdrawn, which avoids the need to consider any social effects of the construction and operation of this structure.
- 63 Secondly, additional design work has been undertaken²⁹ on the ventilation buildings and stacks following changes to the technical design requirements³⁰ and in response to concerns raised regarding the potential adverse effects of the bulk, location and form of those structures. I have considered these revised design options with regard to the social impact assessment. It is my opinion that the revised options reflect a reduction in the potential adverse social effects associated with the operation of the Project, particularly for the following:
- 63.1 Improving access to and usability of open space areas (as concluded in the evidence of Mr David Little) thereby reducing impacts on the community's wellbeing and way of life;
- 63.2 Improving the cohesion and integration of these facilities with the existing urban context (as presented in the evidence of Ms Lynne Hancock), reducing the adverse impacts on the community's expectations and attitudes.
- 64 Thirdly, given the concerns raised by submitters of the potential health impacts of the Project, I recommended that a public health expert be appointed by the NZTA to provide professional comment

²⁹ Refer to the evidence of Mr Andre Walter.

³⁰ Refer to the evidence of Mr David Gibbs.

on these submissions. Consequentially, the concerns raised by these submitters are addressed in the evidence of Dr David Black.

- 65 Since lodgement of the Project, the NZTA has continued to meet with stakeholders and members of the community to discuss Project concerns. In particular, consultation has been undertaken with the Auckland Council (previously Auckland City Council, Auckland Regional Council, Auckland Regional Transport Authority and Waitakere City Council), Iwi (Te Kawerau a Maki and Ngati Whatua), the Waterview Primary School Board of Trustees and Ministry of Education, and local residents.

COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

- 66 I have read submissions lodged on the Project that raise social issues, matters relating to consultation or related issues relevant to my area of expertise. In this section of my evidence I will address issues raised in these submissions, to the extent not already covered in the Social Report or the preceding evidence³¹.
- 67 I have grouped the submissions as follows:
- 67.1 Submissions relating to the Social Report;
 - 67.2 Submissions relating to impacts on educational facilities;
 - 67.3 Submissions relating to access, connectivity and severance;
 - 67.4 Submissions relating to impacts on recreation opportunities;
 - 67.5 Submissions relating to effects on residents;
 - 67.6 Submissions relating to community effects;
 - 67.7 Submissions relating to loss of housing;
 - 67.8 Submissions relating to consultation undertaken;
 - 67.9 Submissions relating to proposed Project communication mechanisms; and
 - 67.10 Submissions relating to other matters.

Social Report

- 68 Some submitters³² raised the issue that the Project documentation did not adequately assess social and community effects. For

³¹ My other statements of evidence address those submissions which raise planning concerns.

³² Including Submitter Nos. 199, 221, 223, 225 and 230.

example, The submission from Marianne Riley³³ states that “*the social, cultural, environmental and economic impact from the loss of houses, open space, connections, views and the negative impacts of noise, air, and visual pollution on the neighbourhood has not been taken into account in the assessment of the impacts on Waterview*”.

- 69 In my opinion, the Social Report³⁴ (together with the 29 other technical reports) provide a comprehensive assessment of the community effects of the Project, including impacts associated with loss of houses, noise and air emissions, visual impacts, open space and connectivity/severance.
- 70 David Mead³⁵ raises the need for a long-term assessment of the impacts (including social) to be undertaken, beyond the 2026 timeframe provided for in Project traffic modeling, particularly given anticipated growth in traffic over time. The Eden Albert Community Board³⁶ raised a related point, stating that the Project does not take into account the effects of induced traffic on community mobility and livability.
- 71 Mr Andrew Murray states in his evidence that while accessibility benefits (such as reduced traffic or improved travel times) may reduce over time, these benefits will still generally be greater than would occur under a future scenario without the Project. In my opinion, this does not ‘remove the benefit’ of the improved accessibility of the Project, rather it means that as anticipated population and traffic growth occurs, accessibility benefits are realised (albeit to a lesser extent) by a greater number of people. Likewise, the benefit of improved ‘livability’ (by redistributing traffic from local streets) will not be removed, but rather may reduce gradually over time. Again, such benefits will still be greater than would occur under a future scenario without the Project. In this regard, I consider the conclusions of the social impact assessment (comparing a ‘with Project’ and ‘without Project’ scenario in the future) remain valid.
- 72 The Stella Maris Trust³⁷ raises concerns that the Social Report did not fully assess the community impact of the proposed ventilation buildings being located above ground. My assessment did consider the social effects of above ground motorway structures, and in particular refers to the large scale of the infrastructure associated with the Project. The Social Report acknowledges that these structures will bring about considerable change in community

³³ Submitter No. 221.

³⁴ Technical Report G.14.

³⁵ Submitter No. 130.

³⁶ Submitter No. 129.

³⁷ Submitter No. 135.

character and impacts in the visual domain. The social impacts on residents are considered to represent minor to moderately negative impacts, recognising that most residents are likely to adjust to these impacts over time³⁸. I note that the above ground ventilation stacks were the primary focus for this assessment, given their particular dominance at a height of 25m. I also note that the effects conclusions made in the Social Report drew from the consultation on the impacts of the ventilation buildings generally, rather than any specific feedback on the design concepts as lodged.

- 73 The Trust also states that the assessment of people's ability to sell their property during construction of the Project is inadequate. I disagree. I noted in the Social Report that "*some residents have expressed concern that a perceived reduction in house 'saleability' during the construction period would impact on their future plans to 'move on' from the neighbourhood. In individual cases, it is acknowledged that this could restrict (but not inhibit) people's future plans, however on balance impacts are considered to be minor and not widespread*".³⁹ On this basis, I acknowledge that the disruption to people's way of life may, on an individual basis, be significant but this is neither widespread nor long term.
- 74 The Trust considers that the Project assessments are biased. As I noted in the background section of this statement, Ms Julie Meade Rose has been asked to provide an independent peer review of my assessment and the Social Report. Her conclusion, stated in her evidence, is that I have appropriately and adequately undertaken the social impact assessment and consultation processes.

Impacts on Educational Facilities

- 75 Numerous submitters⁴⁰ have raised concerns about impacts on Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten (including Auckland City Council⁴¹, the Waterview Primary School Board of Trustees⁴², Auckland Kindergarten Association⁴³ and the Ministry of Education⁴⁴, which are discussed specifically below). Concerns relate to educational impacts on students' learning, impacts on the character of the school and kindergarten, and impacts on the roll (and

³⁸ Page 146 of Social Report.

³⁹ Page 112.

⁴⁰ Including Submitter Nos. 33, 35, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 60, 62, 86, 97, 108, 115, 119, 129, 132, 133, 136, 140, 144, 167, 185, 186, 188, 191, 199, 203, 208, 213, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 228, 230, 231, 232, 235, 236, 237, 238 and 248.

⁴¹ Submitter No. 111, page 10.

⁴² Submitter No. 175.

⁴³ Submitter No. 153.

⁴⁴ Submitter No. 176.

therefore ongoing viability) of the school and kindergarten. I will address each of these issues in turn.

- 76 Submitters have raised concern that the northern ventilation building and stack would impact on school character and would lessen the ability of student's to take pride in their school. The submission from 'Residents of Oakley Avenue'⁴⁵ states that the *"location of the stack next to a primary school and kindergarten is inappropriate due to parental perception of the polluted environment for their children, potentially impacting on roll numbers and ultimately the long-term survival of the school"*. Many have requested that the ventilation stack and / or building be moved as far away as possible from the school and kindergarten site.
- 77 The Project does represent a significant change to the character and form of the existing urban environment. This change challenges the community's attitudes and expectations for their neighbourhood. While tunneling is a significant social mitigation of the Project, it is acknowledged that it does not completely 'remove' the Project from the area, and in turn creates its own effects including the requirement for ventilation structures.
- 78 All things being equal, from a social perspective, I consider that relocation of the vent building and stack to an area remote from the school and kindergarten would be positive. However, in my opinion, the NZTA has properly considered and carefully balanced the environmental and social effects of the fairly limited geographic range of locations for these facilities, against the engineering and cost practicalities. In view of these constraints, I consider it unlikely that the ventilation building and stack could be relocated to a site that would fully address all community concerns, and that more "minor" relocations would not substantially change the social impacts (e.g. it would still be visually and physically "present" for the community).
- 79 Furthermore, as presented in the evidence of others (particularly Ms Siiri Wilkening, Mr Gavin Fisher, and Dr David Black), the physical effects or emissions from the ventilation building and stack do not represent an actual adverse effect. As Mr David Gibbs, Ms Lynne Hancock and Mr Stephen Brown explain in their evidence, the visual treatment and consequential impacts on amenity and urban form can be mitigated through considered design and the application of specific design parameters. On the basis of these revised design parameters and a proposed amendment to the conditions⁴⁶ (including provision for community review and comment on the design process for these buildings) as well as the existing proposed conditions that provide for ongoing monitoring, reporting

⁴⁵ Submitter No. 132.

⁴⁶ See amended proposed Condition PI.5.

and liaison with the School; it is my opinion that the social effects of these structures on the community (particularly the community's attitudes and expectations) will be allayed over time.

- 80 Many submitters⁴⁷ are concerned about a reduction of the school roll, and seek additional mitigation for this potential effect. In a proforma submission, submitters stated "*the project will bring about a significant reduction in the school roll*" and requested that "*a more explicit consideration of the effects of removal of social housing, and the reduction of the school roll, be required, and additional mitigation provided*".
- 81 Impacts on the school and kindergarten roll are attributed to two factors: the removal of some 103 dwellings from the Waterview community, and the potential for parental perceptions associated with the proposed ventilation building and stack adjacent to the school. The first of these is considered to have a social impact (e.g. fluctuations of the school roll) and has already been considered in the Social Report⁴⁸ and responded to in the proposed conditions. The second is more difficult to accurately assess as it depends on the degree of parents' perception of effects, and the individual behavior of all parents who have children enrolled and is more closely linked to the considerations above.
- 82 Proposed conditions SO.10 and SO.11 set out that the school and kindergarten rolls will be monitored from the commencement of construction until the end of the school year following the completion of construction in Yards 5 and 7, and that school and kindergarten staffing levels will be maintained over that period. I support this proposed condition and consider it appropriately addresses the potential social effects relevant to the concerns raised in these submissions. Once the NZTA has confirmed its operational designation, there may be opportunity to reinstate housing in the Waterview community, which could re-establish the school / kindergarten population in this area.
- 83 In addition to the issues discussed above, the following specific comments are made with regard to submissions from the Ministry of Education, Waterview Primary School and Auckland Kindergarten Association⁴⁹.
- 84 These submitters state that the NZTA application fails to provide specific assessment of the Project in respect of Ministry of Education land. In response to the concerns of these submitters, I can confirm that specific assessment of the Project in respect of the school and

⁴⁷ See footnote 40 for a full list of submissions that raise this type of issue, the quote is specifically from Submission No. 35.

⁴⁸ Pages 109, 124-5 and 143-4.

⁴⁹ Submitter Nos. 176, 175 and 153.

kindergarten site has been undertaken and reported in Technical Reports G.5 (Construction Noise), G.12 (Operational Noise), G.14 (Social Effects), G.19 (Vibration) and G.20 (Visual and Landscape Effects). Specific concerns are addressed in the evidence of Ms Siiri Wilkening, Mr Peter Millar and Mr Stephen Brown, amongst others.

- 85 The submitters are concerned about the effects of construction on children's learning and the safety and amenity of the school and kindergarten. Issues of noise, vibration, air quality and traffic have been raised as having the potential to cause impacts on students' learning. This is an important social issue given that the proposed duration of construction can be compared to the length of a student's primary school education. I have considered these impacts together with the relevant Project technical experts.
- 86 While the Social Report recommended that construction avoid school times, it is acknowledged that technical constraints are likely to mean this is not practicable. On this basis, further consideration has been given to how construction effects on the school could be mitigated. The potential issues in relation to noise and vibration effects have been addressed in the evidence of Ms Siiri Wilkening and Mr Peter Millar respectively. I consider that the proposed mitigation put forward in that evidence will ensure that appropriate noise and vibration standards are met at the school. I support the construction of a solid noise wall along the shared designation / school boundary, which will provide noise mitigation within classrooms and for outdoor learning and play areas (such as the school pool and playground) and additional social mitigation (e.g. improving sense of security). In my opinion it is appropriate that the exact noise mitigation measures that will be employed are determined in consultation with the Board of Trustees and Ministry of Education. As noted in the evidence of Mr Tommy Parker, this discussion is ongoing.
- 87 In my opinion, construction effects on Waterview Kindergarten have been appropriately mitigated by the proposed condition to relocate the kindergarten over the period of construction.
- 88 These submitters seek that Waterview Kindergarten be relocated permanently (rather than temporarily during the construction period) to the site at 19 Oakley Avenue, in order to maintain the amenity of the kindergarten. While I acknowledge the concerns raised by these submitters regarding the impact of changing the learning environment for children, I consider this can be managed by the appropriate timing of any relocations to and from such facilities (e.g. over the school holiday period), which is specified in Condition SO.9⁵⁰.

⁵⁰ The NZTA is currently in negotiation with the kindergarten and Ministry of Education over this relocation.

- 89 These submitters also request amendment to proposed Conditions SO.10 and SO.11 regarding the monitoring of school roll impacts. They submit that the teaching levels be maintained for a roll at the 2000 year level (202 students compared to the proposed 2006-2009 monitoring level of 155 students) and that such monitoring be undertaken for five years following completion of the Project.
- 90 It is important to some to recognise, as discussed in the Social Report, that the Project is only one factor influencing the changing school roll (e.g. alongside an naturally aging population and the geographic catchment of the school). As such, in my opinion it is not appropriate to set the monitoring base in the condition to the 2000 year level but rather a level more consistent with the levels of the last 5 years at 155.
- 91 I note that the reinstatement of residential housing within the Waterview area may not occur simultaneously with the Project's completion. However, I consider that the submitters' suggested 5 year period does not take into account the various stages of construction (e.g. there is an estimated 12 to 18 month period of construction which is 'fit out' of the SH20 tunnels in which construction activities will substantially diminish) so the experience of construction effects at the school and kindergarten may cease prior to actual completion of the Project.⁵¹ On this basis, I propose an amendment to Condition SO.10 (**Annexure A**) to require that monitoring of the school and kindergarten rolls takes place for a period of up to 12 months after the NZTA has vacated Construction Yard 5⁵², and has confirmed the operational designation footprint in these areas. In my opinion, monitoring for this duration will be sufficient to mitigate the impacts of construction (e.g. fluctuation) on the roll of the school and kindergarten.
- 92 Several submitters requested ongoing consultation, liaison and a complaints/feedback processes to be put into place to manage effects on Waterview Primary School and Kindergarten⁵³. I agree that these are an important part of the construction management response. I consider however that the submissions are already addressed through the proposed conditions⁵⁴. In my opinion these measures, combined with the management plans identified in the

⁵¹ I do however recommend that a full school year following the major construction works is appropriate (to provide time for resettlement of the community).

⁵² Being the last major construction yard associated with the construction of tunnels in this Sector.

⁵³ This includes Auckland City Council, which requested that the NZTA "*works with the Council and regional partners to ensure that local schools, kindergartens, play centres and community facilities can continue to operate efficiently and effectively and that their ongoing viability and appeal is retained*".

⁵⁴ Specifically Conditions PI.5 (Community Liaison Group) and SO.7 (Education Liaison Group).

CEMP, provide sufficient scope to address the concerns raised and proposed by the 'Amenity Effect Programme' requested by the Ministry of Education, Waterview Primary School and Auckland Kindergarten Association.

- 93 Christine Jordan⁵⁵ raised concern in relation to potential impacts on children's learning, health and development at St Francis School. Two submissions have also been made from St Francis School, one from the Board of Trustees⁵⁶ and one from the School Principal⁵⁷. Submissions seek assurances that particular elements of school life will be able to continue during construction of the Project, including school activities in classrooms and on the field, and safe walking and cycling to and from school.
- 94 In response to these submissions, I support the proposal to install a 2m high barrier fence on the southern boundary of the School with the designation (with agreement of the School). I consider this will provide a 'sense of security' for the school, reduce the visibility of the works and Project within the school site and consequentially achieve improved noise outcomes. I note that the technical reports and evidence of Ms Siiri Wilkening, Mr Gavin Fisher and Dr David Black address issues regarding emissions of noise and air associated with the Project and the consequential health effects, and determine that impacts on St Francis School can be managed via the measures proposed by the Project. The other key element contributing to 'school life' is ability for teachers and students to gain access to and from the school. The evidence of Mr John Gottler addresses these concerns, noting that consultation with the School via the proposed Communication Plan and the Education Liaison Group will inform them of the relevant Site Specific Traffic Management Plan being prepared, and the specific mitigation measures proposed.
- 95 Unitec Institute of Technology⁵⁸ has raised concerns about impacts on students using Buildings 1 and 76, which will be open 24 hours a day during exam periods. This is covered in the evidence of Ms Siiri Wilkening who concludes that effects of construction noise for Building 1 will be minor. In respect of Building 76, Ms Siiri Wilkening concludes that Construction Noise Vibration Management Plan can appropriately manage and mitigate potential adverse noise effects. The submitter seeks assurance that pedestrian access between the Unitec residential village at 1510 Great North Road and the main campus will be maintained during construction. This bridge connection is outside the surface designation footprint and will not be affected by the Project works.

⁵⁵ Submitter No. 136.

⁵⁶ Submitter No. 93.

⁵⁷ Submitter No. 92.

⁵⁸ Submitter No. 160.

Impacts on Access, Connectivity and Severance

- 96 A number of submitters⁵⁹ have raised support and opposition to the Project in relation to its impacts on people's access, connectivity and community severance. A number of these submission concerns are covered in the assessment of transport effects (Mr Andrew Murray), urban design (Ms Lynne Hancock) and recreation / open space (Mr David Little). My responses refer specifically to the social issues of these submissions (those matters highlighted in paragraph 19 of this evidence).
- 97 In respect of the community, the submission of Harold Marshall on behalf of the Mt Albert Residents Association⁶⁰ acknowledges the benefits of the Project in terms of regional access to Unitec, the airport and other areas, but raises concern that local people will not realise much of this benefit given the lack of access for the community to SH20 at Great North Road. This sentiment is also reflected in submissions from local residents⁶¹. I agree that access to SH20 for the local Waterview and Point Chevalier communities would improve living patterns, accessibility and connectivity for this community. Options for local connections were assessed⁶², but could not be achieved without significant impacts including what would be, in my opinion, significant potential social impacts (e.g. the impact on the community infrastructure and heritage of the Unitec site and on the existing pedestrian and cycle connections). Other submissions⁶³ sought a more detailed assessment of options for the Great North Road interchange to reduce social and community impacts. I consider that the social and community effects (both for the Waterview and Point Chevalier communities) were appropriately considered in the assessment of design options for this interchange but ultimately the options for design of the interchange are limited by engineering and physical constraints⁶⁴.
- 98 The North Western Community Association⁶⁵ and Rory and Heather Docherty⁶⁶ state *"by their nature motorways sever open spaces and neighbourhoods, creating isolated residential pockets separated*

⁵⁹ Including Submitter Nos. 8, 18, 35, 42, 43, 55, 56, 58, 60, 79, 81, 86, 87, 89, 99, 103, 108, 115, 119, 120, 127, 129, 130, 135, 136, 140, 148, 153, 157, 167, 172, 178, 179, 180, 183, 185, 186, 191, 192, 199, 203, 204, 208, 213, 219, 223, 225, 226, 229, 230, 235, 236, 237, 238, 249 and 251.

⁶⁰ Submitter No. 120.

⁶¹ Including Submitter Nos. 62, 63, 147, 162, 180 and 251,

⁶² As noted in the evidence of Mr Andre Walter.

⁶³ Including Submitter Nos. 7, 35, 60, 108, 129, 140, 167, 208, 219, 220, 221, 228, 235 and 238.

⁶⁴ As discussed in Part D, Section 11.6.5 of the AEE Report and Mr Andre Walker's evidence.

⁶⁵ Submitter No. 185.

⁶⁶ Submitter No. 191.

from parks, shops etc. It is appreciated that the tunnelled section significantly mitigates this aspect to an extent, but not adequately”.

- 99 In respect of severance impacts, as set out earlier in this statement, in my opinion the alignment option for the Project has avoided most potential adverse effects associated with severance of existing neighbourhoods: either by tunneling, following either the existing State highway (SH16), or by generally running between existing communities (e.g. between Waterview and Mt Albert in the north of SH20 and between New Windsor and Owairaka in the south of SH20).
- 100 In Sector 1,⁶⁷ the Project design maintains the pedestrian underpass beneath the SH16 ramps and provides improved pedestrian facilities through the Te Atatu Road Interchange (e.g. via signalised lighting). It is my opinion, recognizing the existing SH16 through this area, that these measures mitigate potential severance issues in this Sector.
- 101 In Sector 5,⁶⁸ while the proposed enlargement of the Great North Road Interchange will visually reinforce the existing severance between the Waterview and Point Chevalier communities, the existing pedestrian / cycle connection over Great North Road to Carrington Road is not affected by the Project. I consider that the pedestrian connections proposed through the Urban Design and Landscape Plans⁶⁹ will maintain and in some cases enhance physical linkages between these areas (e.g. particularly from Waterview to the Eric Armishaw Park in Point Chevalier). In addition, as presented in the evidence of Mr Andrew Murray, the proposed Network Integration Plan has identified the opportunity to work with others (such as Auckland Transport) to improve pedestrian and passenger transport connections alongside Great North Road (between Oakley Avenue and the Great North Road Interchange) and I support this.⁷⁰
- 102 The decision to tunnel (in Sector 8) avoids potential severance in the Mt Albert community.

⁶⁷ For example, submitters raise the need for improved pedestrian and cycle connections over SH16 at the Te Atatu Interchange (e.g. Submitter Nos. 115, 119, 227).

⁶⁸ In their submission, Auckland City Council seek enhancement of pedestrian and cycle access across SH16 and SH20 to the Point Chevalier town centre (Submitter 111, page 10-11). Other submitters also seek additional ‘mitigation’ in the form of improved connections over SH16 between Waterview and Pt Chevalier (e.g. Submitter Nos. 30, 188, 200, 215 and 251).

⁶⁹ Plans in F.16 of the AEE and presented in the evidence of Mr David Little.

⁷⁰ As provided for in proposed operational traffic Condition OT.1.

- 103 Issues of severance are also raised in Sector 9⁷¹. There are currently no formal connections between the Owairaka and New Windsor communities (across Alan Wood Reserve). Those communities are separated by the Avondale Southdown rail designation and Oakley Creek. The Project follows this existing natural barrier. The Project will visually reinforce this physical separation, however the actual accessibility between Owairaka and New Windsor in this location will be improved as a result of the proposed pedestrian bridge (Hendon Park Bridge) and other pedestrian and cycle way provisions (including 3 crossings of Oakley Creek) will provide for walking access to and along this waterway⁷². The Friends of Oakley Creek – Te Auaunga also raised concern regarding access to and along the Oakley Creek over the construction period. It is acknowledged that there will be periods during construction where access to and along the Creek will need to be managed or restricted. In recognition of this, I support the addition of proposed Condition PI.7 to ensure that community groups and residents are appropriately advised of restrictions in access to and along the Creek.
- 104 A number of submitters including Cycle Action Auckland⁷³ have proposed further additional pedestrian or cycle connections in the local area as mitigation for the Project. For the reasons set out above, I do not consider that these connections are necessary to mitigate severance impacts.

Impacts on Recreation Opportunities

- 105 Numerous submitters⁷⁴ have raised concern over impacts on people's recreational opportunities. The majority of issues raised are linked to the Project's open space land requirements and proposed replacement. A frequent comment made referred to concern about *"loss of usable open space, and the reduction in quality of the remaining open space"*.⁷⁵ Submitters raised concerns that the proposed open space replacement was not appropriate in terms of location, sufficient quantity or quality, and that this would impact on the recreation opportunities and quality of life of local residents during construction and operation of the Project. These impacts have been addressed in the evidence of Mr David Little and I

⁷¹ For example, the Friends of Oakley Creek – Te Auaunga (Submitter No. 179) raise concerns over severance of community access to the Creek and open space, while others raise more general concerns of severance in this area (e.g. Submitter Nos. 43, 129, 167, 170, 185, 191, 227).

⁷² Plans in F.16 of the AEE and presented in the evidence of Mr David Little.

⁷³ Submitter No. 79.

⁷⁴ Including Submitter Nos. 13, 33, 35, 41, 42, 43, 55, 56, 60, 62, 68, 70, 81, 111, 129, 134, 135, 136, 139, 144, 148, 153, 167, 178, 179, 183, 185, 186, 188, 191, 203, 204, 207, 213, 217, 221, 223, 225, 228, 229, 230, 235, 236, 250 and 251.

⁷⁵ This point is made in a number of submissions (as cited above). This specific quote is taken from Submission No. 35.

support the mitigation proposed by Mr David Little to provide for replacement of permanent and temporary open space. Mr Gavin Fisher and Dr David Black also provide evidence in respect of the potential health effects of the Project on the proposed replacement open space. On the basis of this evidence, it is my opinion that the Project has mitigated impacts of the communities wellbeing and way of life in respect of their access to appropriate open space and recreation opportunities. Further, as discussed earlier in my evidence, it is my opinion that the consultation process proposed for the development of the Open Space Restoration Plans will provide further opportunity for the mitigation of impacts on people's recreation opportunities⁷⁶.

- 106 On behalf of the Te Atatu Pony Club, Vivien Dostine states in her submission⁷⁷ *"that planned construction phases planned during this project will impose upon and endanger the Te Atatu Pony Club and reduce the grounds."* She also considers that *"Insufficient priority has been given to the social aspects of this in the NZTA assessment reports"*.⁷⁸ The NZTA is currently progressing negotiations with the Auckland Council with the aim of ensuring as little disruption as possible to the Te Atatu Pony Club's activities during construction. In the meantime, we propose that within the proposed designation, we can generally maintain a 30m corridor, including bridle path, to enable use either side of the construction yard. The assessment in the Social Report is provided on the basis that the operation of the Te Atatu Pony Club will be maintained over construction, and following the works Construction Yard 1 will be reinstated (the specifics of the proposed mitigation are discussed further in my final statement of evidence). As such, I am of the opinion that the temporary adjustment in use of land will not impose *"severe social impacts ... on this public facility"* as these submitters indicate.
- 107 The Auckland Regional Public Health Service⁷⁹ has sought assurance that the recreational water area and reserve in the area of construction will be safe for public access with respect to potential discharge of contaminants in water. In our social assessments, none of the Coastal Marine Areas within the Project are presently identified as used for contact recreation (noting the restricted access to much of this area by the State highway). I have observed (and been advised that) people do swim in Oakley Creek, where water quality (as assessed by the Auckland Council) frequently exceeds the Auckland Council recreational water guidelines⁸⁰ (without the Project in place). On this basis, I consider the CEMP provides

⁷⁶ As provided for in Condition SO.1.

⁷⁷ Submitter No. 174.

⁷⁸ Similar issues and concerns are raised by submitters 37, 145, 150 and 163.

⁷⁹ Submitter 91.

⁸⁰ Auckland Council 'Monitor Auckland' data.

adequate mechanisms to manage the potential discharge of contaminants to water. Further, I note that the evidence of Mr Jonathan Moores notes projected improvements to annual sediment, zinc and copper loads in the Oakley Inlet and Waterview Estuary as a result of Project works.

- 108 Recreational impacts on boating activities are discussed in the evidence of Mr Rob Bell. I support the proposed condition to maintain navigation on the Whau River (providing recreation access to the Te Atatu Boating Club)⁸¹.
- 109 The North Western Community Association⁸² and Rory and Heather Docherty⁸³ request that the bridge over Oakley Inlet accessing the Oakley Inlet Heritage area be raised sufficiently to allow kayak access beneath, and the existing culvert beneath Great North Road be retained. The current design is sufficiently high to allow kayaks to pass beneath and no works are proposed to the culvert. I have confirmed this information with these submitters, since receipt of these submissions.
- 110 Recreational impacts associated with access to other areas of the Coastal Marine Area (particularly the Motu Manawa Marine Reserve) are covered in the evidence of Mr Owen Burn. With respect to recreation access, it is my opinion that the Project does not hinder or constrain access to these areas any more than is in the existing environment and I acknowledge the importance of balancing such access with the conservation values of this area.

Effects on Residents

- 111 Auckland City Council, together with a number of residents⁸⁴, were concerned that the proposed ventilation buildings and stacks would 'blight' the community by impacting on neighbourhood amenity and character or that they would increase the incidents of crime or anti-social behaviour. The visual and urban design impacts of the Project have been considered in the evidence of Mr Stephen Brown and Ms Lynne Hancock. In light of the further design work presented in the evidence of Mr David Gibbs, both Mr Stephen Brown and Ms Lynne Hancock conclude that there are design options capable of mitigating potential adverse visual and urban design effects. On this basis, I consider that as the structures become more of a reality and part of the environment (rather than an anticipated unknown), community attitudes and concerns will reduce and the potential for blight will abate. Notwithstanding this, as noted earlier, I support the proposed mitigation for the design of these buildings and

⁸¹ Proposed coastal Condition C.11.

⁸² Submitter No. 185.

⁸³ Submitter No. 191.

⁸⁴ Including Submitter Nos. 48, 56, 57, 62, 81, 97, 120, 129, 132, 133, 135, 139, 144, 153, 167, 172, 180, 185, 191, 232, 236 and 248.

structures and the opportunity for the community to comment and respond to the design development.

- 112 Submitters⁸⁵ have raised concerns with quality of life during the construction period, associated with the relatively long duration, nuisance effects such as noise, dust, visual amenity impacts and traffic and general disruption. Some submitters are concerned that construction activities could reduce people's use and enjoyment of their properties and outdoor living areas. Unitec Institute of Technology⁸⁶ and individual unit owners of the Unitec residential village⁸⁷ are concerned that this facility will be adversely affected. Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC)⁸⁸ has raised specific concerns relating to the wellbeing of tenants residing in its Great North Road pensioner units and Parr Road units (for residents with disabilities). As discussed in the evidence of Ms Siiri Wilkening and Mr Hugh Leersnyder, appropriate construction and noise conditions and management procedures will be put into place to manage effects on residents.
- 113 The Auckland Regional Public Health Service⁸⁹ has suggested that a 'hot line' be established to enable people adversely affected by construction activities to speak directly to a Project representative able to look into and resolve the situation. Similarly, the Auckland City Council⁹⁰ seeks that social and community support services are provided to assist local people with transition issues during the completion of the Project. Following further consultation with Auckland City Council, I consider the measures proposed and presented in the evidence of Mr Hugh Leersnyder, for the CEMP and the nomination of the Community Liaison Person and the Community Liaison Group over the construction period, appropriately address these concerns (including a freephone contact number). This is provided for in proposed Conditions PI.1 and PI.3.
- 114 The submission from Leonie Hayes⁹¹ requests that the NZTA allocate support and counseling services for residents who feel negative impacts from the Project. It is my opinion that the community liaison forum, communications plan and the nomination of a single point of contact for the community are sufficient and appropriate

⁸⁵ Including (as examples) Submitter Nos. 18, 42, 55, 65, 67, 98, 101, 106, 111, 117, 118, 125, 134, 135, 136, 145, 149, 152, 166, 180, 181, 184, 185, 191, 194, 201, 221, 240, and 251.

⁸⁶ Submitter No. 160.

⁸⁷ Including Submitter Nos. 69, 72, 98, 101, 106, 117, 125, 149, 166, 181 and 240.

⁸⁸ Submitter No. 197.

⁸⁹ Submitter No. 91.

⁹⁰ Submitter No. 111.

⁹¹ Submitter No. 62.

mitigation measures to establish clear lines of communication between the Project personnel and the community. While it is acknowledged that construction activities pose a potential disruption to people's way of life over the construction period, on the basis of the evidence presented by Dr David Black, the proposed management of these activities (in particular through the CEMP) are sufficient to avoid and mitigate potential adverse effects on people's health and as such I do not consider that this level of mitigation is warranted.

- 115 The North Western Community Association⁹² and Rory and Heather Docherty⁹³ have expressed concern that local businesses (e.g. the dairy, laundromat and bread shop) in Waterview will suffer from disruption and a loss of patronage during construction. Auckland City Council⁹⁴ has sought for the effects on local businesses to be specifically addressed through plans to manage their ongoing operation. I acknowledge the importance of these businesses to the community contributing as community infrastructure. As set out in the Temporary Traffic Management Plan and Settlement Effects Management Plan, the construction methods proposed seek to manage and mitigate effects so that these businesses can be maintained throughout construction. I further note, as I have seen through my role as Consents Manager on the construction project for Manukau Harbour Crossing, that local businesses in proximity to the construction site can significantly benefit from these Projects with the high volume of workers in the area.

Community Effects

- 116 The submission from the Springleigh Community Association⁹⁵ states that lower socio-economic and migrant communities are deliberately disadvantaged by the Project and that efforts to mitigate effects on these groups are not sufficient. The Social Report has undertaken a community profile of the Project area and it is acknowledged that there are higher rates of socio-economic deprivation in some communities surrounding the Project (though this does not include Springleigh) relative to the wider Auckland Region. I consider this matter has been taken into account in the Social Report and in the mitigation responses proposed, including in particular the proactive property purchase and liaison with HNZA that has been undertaken to assist this agency to progressively manage the resettlement of its affected customers.
- 117 I note that a number of submitters⁹⁶, including the Springleigh Residents Association, have sought additional mitigation for impacts

⁹² Submitter No. 185.

⁹³ Submitter No. 191.

⁹⁴ Submitter No. 111.

⁹⁵ Submitter No. 43.

⁹⁶ Including, for example, Submitter Nos. 185, 186, 199, 210 and 225.

during construction. Focusing on "social" mitigation, the relief sought (in addition to that discussed earlier) includes the establishment of a community centre in Waterview, the development of a Community Amenity Programme and the temporary relocation of community activities to one of the Council owned community halls nearby (i.e. Ferndale House, Mt Albert Senior Citizens Hall, Mt Albert War Memorial Hall and Western Springs Garden Community Hall) until the Proposal's construction is completed (point 100 of Auckland City Council's Submission⁹⁷). I consider that the mitigation measures proposed in the CEMP will be sufficient to manage the effect of construction on these facilities and generally enable their ongoing use over the construction period. In cases where the construction performance standards cannot be met (e.g. construction noise), the CEMP already provides for mitigation including temporary relocation of facilities as appropriate. (I further note that the Community Liaison Group, as proposed in Condition PI.5, may further facilitate this.) On this basis, it is my opinion that the Project mitigates the disruption and social effects of construction and that permanent establishment of a new community facility in this area is not warranted (with a number of existing facilities already available, including the School Hall and Methodist Church on Great North Road).

Loss of Housing

- 118 The loss of housing (including social housing) as part of the Project, in particular 103 dwellings from Waterview (8.5% of the total dwellings recorded in the 2006 Census) was raised in submissions⁹⁸. Submitters have requested that further assessment of the effects on this loss of housing be undertaken, in terms of the residents involved and the wider community. This has been addressed in the Social Report⁹⁹, which states that the loss of this housing will have potentially significant short term effects on community cohesiveness through an inevitable 'community transition' period, and a high degree of change to the individuals and families affected. Further, I note that the proactive land purchase strategy of the NZTA has resulted in nearly two thirds of properties within the designation having already been purchased at the time the Project was lodged for designation/ consent. On this basis, it is my opinion that there has been assessment of the social impacts of housing loss from the community and that further assessment is not required.
- 119 In regard to the mitigation, as identified in the Social Report and summarised in my evidence, I consider that the issue of long-term replacement of dwellings in Waterview will depend on a multi-agency response. I support the proposed Condition SO.12 for the

⁹⁷ Submitter No. 111.

⁹⁸ Including Submitter Nos. 13, 35, 56, 60, 62, 78, 108, 129, 132, 133, 140, 167, 191, 219, 221, 235, 236, 238 and 248.

⁹⁹ Pages 136, 137 and 147.

establishment of a Working Liaison Group to further work with agencies (such as the Auckland Council and HNZC) to progress this.

Consultation Undertaken

- 120 A number of submitters¹⁰⁰ have raised concerns relating to the Project consultation process.
- 121 In their respective submissions, Margi Watson, Rob Black, Belinda Chase, Robyn Mason, the Star Mills Preservation Group, Marianne Riley and Kim Ace¹⁰¹ raise concerns about NZTA's responsibility as a signatory to 'IAP2 Core Values for Public Participation' (being the International Association for Public Participation). As noted at the outset of my evidence, I have undertaken the training modules provided by the IAP2 and am a member of the Australasian division of this Association.
- 122 Other submitters, including the Eden Albert Community Board¹⁰², also questioned the extent to which feedback from the consultation process has been taken account of in NZTA decision making.
- 123 It is my opinion that the consultation has been undertaken in a manner so as to enable those potentially affected by the Project to be involved in decision making and ensure their input and feedback has influenced decisions and the assessment of the Project. Throughout the process, the NZTA has committed to 'informing' and 'consulting'¹⁰³ with the community. At each stage of the consultation process, feedback was communicated back to Project decision makers, and has informed the Project design, mitigation, management and monitoring decisions as appropriate. As an illustration, I refer to the evidence of Mr Tommy Parker, where he states that the consultation feedback informed the Board in their decision to progress further investigation of tunneling on the Project from the limited cut and cover proposal being consulted on at the time. It is acknowledged that, as with similar processes I have been involved with, while consultation feedback has been reported and considered, not all community aspirations or expectations have been included in the final Project.
- 124 Proposed Conditions SO.12 (Working Liaison Group) and PI.5 (Community Liaison Group(s)) seek to 'involve' and 'collaborate'¹⁰⁴ with stakeholders and community representatives (as appropriate),

¹⁰⁰ Including Submitter Nos. 18, 37, 43, 57, 62, 64, 97, 118, 127, 132, 133, 135, 136, 145, 150, 153, 156, 160, 162, 174, 179, 185, 186, 191, 199, 203, 213, 221, 223, 225, 228, 230, 233, 241 and 249.

¹⁰¹ Submitter Nos. 225, 186, 126, 203, 199, 221 and 223.

¹⁰² Submitter No. 129.

¹⁰³ Steps 1 and 2 (on a scale of 5) of the IAP2 public participation spectrum.

¹⁰⁴ Steps 3 and 4 (on a scale of 5) of the IAP2 public participation spectrum.

as part of the decision making process on final aspects of the Project design.

- 125 The Springleigh Residents Association¹⁰⁵ states "*the applicant makes false statements regarding the consultation process. No consultation occurred on the final version of the application. Consultation did not start in 2000 on a project that had similarities with the application*". I can confirm that public and stakeholder consultation on the SH20 section of the Project commenced in 2000¹⁰⁶. Consultation on the SH16 element of the Project commenced in 2007, prior to being merged with the SH20 Project in 2009. Further, in response to this submission and others, consultation was undertaken in August 2010, to specifically inform the community on the final form of the Project as lodged, in order that the community could make informed submissions on the Applications.
- 126 The Springleigh Residents Association goes on to state that there has been insufficient consultation on the restricted use of people's land. The key areas where the Project restricts the use of people's land is with the sub-strata designation¹⁰⁷. In the case of the below ground designation (NOR 5), which proposes an encumbrance on the use of land only for works below 7 metres (or for 1510 and 1550 Great North Road, 4 metres). Furthermore, I am aware that the NZTA has written to landowners of the proposal and provided information meetings on the proposed planning encumbrance. On this basis, I do not consider that private landowners will be adversely restricted in the day to day use of their land, and property acquisition of the sub-strata title will address compensation for other use restrictions. I consider the application has sufficiently consulted on this issue and provided the community and residents an opportunity to understand the nature of the proposed designation and its impact on their land.
- 127 Some submitters¹⁰⁸ have stated that they are affected parties which have not been sufficiently consulted with, or did not receive notification of the Project. As noted above, a consultation database has been maintained throughout the Project and it is my opinion that reasonable effort has been made to confirm landowners and

¹⁰⁵ Submitter No. 43.

¹⁰⁶ As set out in Chapter 10 of the AEE.

¹⁰⁷ Elsewhere the NZTA is generally seeking to acquire designated land. The exception to this is for three properties: two where the restriction will be for the installation of rock anchors (one a property owned by the Auckland Council) and one where the Project proposes to work with the landowner to maintain the dairy operating from this property. In these cases, landowner consultation has commenced and is ongoing.

¹⁰⁸ Submitter Nos. 75 and 188. Similarly, in the submission from the Auckland Regional Council (Submitter No. 207), the Council recognises that territorial authorities and local communities have been thoroughly consulted on the Project, but state that there are residences in proximity to the new proposed route which have not been consulted.

contact with them throughout the consultation process. In the case of open space concerning the Metro Soccer Club and Te Atatu Pony Club, I understand that consultation has been undertaken with these parties, however initial consultation was led with the landowners (then Auckland and Waitakere City Councils). Others have stated that further consultation needs to be undertaken on the Project, in particular in relation to the decision of whether or not to provide local access to SH20 at the north of the Project (e.g. from the Great North Road), and on the final look and form of the ventilation buildings¹⁰⁹. In the case of the local access at the Great North Road interchange, I do not consider that further consultation is necessary as this alternative has been assessed and is not proposed. In the case of detail on key design elements of the Project, I consider that the amendments to the Community Liaison Group (as discussed below) provides appropriate opportunity for community input to these elements of the Project.

Project Communication Mechanisms

- 128 Auckland City Council seeks that NZTA works with the Council and regional partners to ensure that local schools, kindergartens, play centres and community facilities can continue to operate efficiently and effectively and that their ongoing viability and appeal is retained. I agree that this is important from a social perspective. This is provided for in proposed Condition PI.5.
- 129 Some submitters have sought input into the 'Community Liaison Group' (CLG) mitigation as proposed in Condition PI.5¹¹⁰. I support recognition of kaitiaki groups (such as Iwi, Friends of Oakley Creek, Star Mills Preservation Group and residents associations) as important advocates of cultural, heritage and community social values, and therefore their inclusion in the CLG. I also support further clarification in the role of the CLG, as proposed in the amended wording of this Condition PI.6.
- 130 I also support those submissions that have sought more information sharing between other groups and agencies with a statutory, financial or environmental function in the wider Project area¹¹¹ and particularly the opportunity this creates for wider integration of the Project with other initiatives and recognition of these agencies in contributing to the cultural values and community. In my opinion, this is reflected in the revised wording for the Working Liaison Group (Condition SO.12).

¹⁰⁹ For example, Submitter Nos. 127 and 160 (Unitec Institute of Technology).

¹¹⁰ Including Submitter Nos. 185, 186, 199, 203, 213, 225 and 230.

¹¹¹ This includes (amongst others) submissions from Housing New Zealand Corporation (Submitter No. 197) who seek specific consultation and notice of works with respect to the timing and scheduling of construction activities for their properties, Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority (Submitter No. 241), who have requested provision for participation of Iwi in ceremonial practices and Auckland City Council (Submitter No. 111, point 98).

- 131 Auckland City Council seeks the opportunity for Auckland Council to work with the NZTA and HNZC to determine the future use of surplus NZTA land for residential development (particularly family homes to help replace lost housing), or for other appropriate land uses, and ensuring conformance to urban design best practice and the Council's aspirations for the area¹¹². Recognising the limited role of the NZTA in these aspirations, this is proposed as part of Condition SO.12, which would provide a forum to assist in mitigating a number concerns about population loss and community development outcomes in the local area.
- 132 The submission of Ngati Whatua notes the cultural importance of historic (but now reclaimed) Te Wai o Rakataura wetlands. I acknowledge that these were located in the vicinity of the Project (adjacent to Hendon Park). As discussed in the evidence of Dr Tim Fisher, Mr Eddie Sides and Mr David Slaven, the 'Oakley Creek Realignment and Rehabilitation Guidelines'¹¹³ provide for a sizeable (and ecologically functional) stormwater treatment wetland to be located within the historic footprint of these wetlands. I consider that the proposed establishment of the Working Liaison Group (and Community Liaison Group) provides the opportunity for the development of these areas and recognise Ngati Whatua as kaitiaki of the historic Te Wai o Rakataura¹¹⁴.

Other Matters

- 133 Concern was expressed over the visual and social impacts of the (the proposed) Cradock Street emergency exhaust¹¹⁵. This has been withdrawn from the Project design. As a consequence I consider this will alleviate the concerns of these submitters.
- 134 There are two churches the Samoan Assembly of God¹¹⁶ (established) and the Church of Tonga¹¹⁷ (planned, unconsented activity). Both have raised issues associated with the removal of the rear carparking area on their land by the NZTA designation. The Samoan Assembly of God has also expressed concern over construction nuisances which have the potential to affect affecting enjoyment of religious services. I understand that the NZTA is currently in consultation with this submitter regarding the opportunities to retain parking and manage construction activities to minimise disruption to their carparking. In regard of the

¹¹² Submitter No. 111, point 106.

¹¹³ Technical Report G.6, Appendix C.

¹¹⁴ I consider that the Community Liaison Group and Working Liaison Group (Conditions PI.5 and SO.10) recognise the kaitiakitanga status of Ngati Whatua o Orakei and Te Kawerau a Maki Tribal Authority.

¹¹⁵ Including Submitter Nos. 43, 102, 116, 127 128 and 137.

¹¹⁶ Submitter No. 177.

¹¹⁷ Submitter No. 163.

construction impacts, I consider the CEMP provides an appropriate management response to mitigate nuisance and social disruption impacts (as discussed in the evidence of Mr Hugh Leersnyder). The Church of Tonga has recently purchased land to develop a Church, and has advised that the designation may compromise the parking required for the Church. Again, I understand that the NZTA is currently in consultation with this submitter regarding the opportunities to retain parking and manage construction activities to minimise disruption to their carparking.

- 135 The Auckland Regional Public Health Service¹¹⁸ raised the need to undertake a Health Impact Assessment (*HIA*) for the Project. When scoping the Social Report, consideration was given to whether or not a HIA should be undertaken. It was decided that this was not necessary for several key reasons:

135.1 There appears to be most benefit in undertaking HIA early in the policy development process¹¹⁹. The potential physical health consequences of the Project were considered in a strategic level HIA undertaken as part of the development of the 2010 Auckland Regional Land Transport Strategy (safety, access and mobility, 'active' modes of transport, emissions and noise). This information informed the subsequent decision of the Auckland Regional Council Transport Committee to confirm the Waterview Connection;

135.2 The Project-specific assessment has confirmed that air discharges are below the National Environmental Standard for ambient air quality. These standards are set in recognition of the health/exposure impacts of air emissions (should this not have been the case, further health assessment would have been undertaken); and

135.3 Other relevant factors influencing people's health (including perceptions of health impacts and individual and community wellbeing) were considered to have been assessed as part of the Social Report.

I note that this decision has been independently considered by Dr David Black and he has reached a similar conclusion.

¹¹⁸ Submitter No. 91.

¹¹⁹ New Zealand Public Health Advisory Committee, 2005 *A Guide to Health Impact Assessment*, page 7.

PROPOSED SOCIAL AND PUBLIC INFORMATION CONDITIONS

- 136 In the documentation lodged with the AEE, the NZTA included a set of Proposed Consent Conditions (see Part E, Appendix E.1). These included proposed social and public information conditions¹²⁰ which I recommended would be appropriate to attach as conditions to the designations sought.
- 137 I consider that those conditions are still appropriate though I have made various amendments in response to the submissions (as discussed above), including the following:
- 137.1 A greater time period for monitoring of the rolls of Waterview Primary and kindergarten;
- 137.2 Further definition of the role of the Community Liaison Group; and
- 137.3 Inclusion of the Community Liaison Group in the consultation on the form and design of the northern and southern ventilation buildings and stacks.
- 138 In addition, I consider it appropriate to add the following condition:
- 138.1 Provision for a Working Liaison Group to bring together agencies involved in the provision of social infrastructure (e.g. social housing and transport) and other kaitiaki groups to improve opportunities for integration of delivery of other projects with the Project.
- 139 An amended set of proposed social and public information conditions I recommend is included as **Annexure A**.¹²¹



Amelia Linzey
November 2010

¹²⁰ Appendix E.1 at pages 33-35 and pages 9-11 respectively.

¹²¹ Aspects of these conditions that relate more specifically to open space are discussed in the evidence of Mr David Little.

ANNEXURE A: AMENDMENTS TO PROPOSED SOCIAL AND PUBLIC INFORMATION CONDITIONS

PROPOSED SOCIAL CONDITIONS

SO.1	The NZTA shall prepare Open Space Restoration Plans to outline how the reserve land occupied during construction will be reinstated or replaced on completion of construction, for handover to Auckland Council. <u>The Open Space Restoration Plans shall be submitted to Auckland Council for approval at least 3 months prior to practicable completion of construction works in the specific areas set out in SO.2.</u>
SO.2	The Open Space Restoration Plans shall be prepared in consultation with the Auckland Council, iwi, <u>Community Liaison Group, Working Liaison Group, NZHPT</u> , recreation users and other users representatives, <u>and</u> shall comprise the following specific plans: (a) Waterview Reserve Restoration Plan; (b) Alan Wood Restoration Plan (Including Hendon Park and 25 Valonia Street); (c) Oakley Creek Esplanade Restoration Plan (<u>Waterview Glades</u>); and (d) Jack Colvin Park Restoration Plan; (e) <u>Rosebank Domain Restoration Plan; and</u> (f) <u>Harbourview-Oranqihina Reserve Restoration Plan.</u>
SO.3	The Open Space Restoration Plans <u>shall be prepared in general accordance with the UDL Plans (Drawing Numbers 20.1.11-3-D-L-810-200 to 228 (and planting schedules))</u> , shall outline measures to mitigate the adverse effects of the Project on local residents and shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (a) Proposed reinstatement of open space by “like for like” quantity <u>and quality</u> of open space lost; (b) Urban design and landscape plans; (b) In the case of the Waterview Reserve Restoration Plan, measures to enhance the Oakley Inlet Heritage Area, including interpretative signage and pedestrian access; (c) Details of any proposed pedestrian/ cycle access within and to/from the reserve areas (including Hendon Park Bridge) including a full CPTED review and response; (d) Creation of esplanade reserve along Oakley Inlet and Craddock Street; (e) <u>Integration with the Oakley Creek restoration works;</u> (f) <u>Location of any artworks and educational signage; and</u> (g) Details of any vehicle access through the reserves and parking areas.

SO.4	<p>In preparing the Open Space Restoration Plans, consideration shall be given to the <u>equivalent reinstatement replacement</u> of <u>the following existing</u> recreational facilities <u>including</u>:</p> <p>(a) <u>Benched seating area at Jack Colvin Park</u>;</p> <p>(b) Three senior sports fields, one training field and associated parking requirements;</p> <p>(c) A children's playground;</p> <p>(d) Two ablution blocks;</p> <p>(e) Two <u>Half</u> basketball court; and</p> <p>(f) A volleyball court.</p> <p><u>These facilities are all to be provided locally within the affected area, generally as per the plans lodged with the application Drawing Numbers 20.1.11-3-D-L-810-212, 219, 221 and 222.</u></p>
SO.5	<p><u>At least 20 working days p</u>Prior to the occupation of the construction areas within Waterview Reserve and Alan Wood Reserve, <u>and where practicable,</u> the NZTA shall, in consultation and agreement with the Auckland Council, provide:</p> <p>(a) <u>A temporary playing field, basketball court and volleyball court within the relocated/ facilities within the Waterview Reserve and/or Saxon Reserve;</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Development of Saxon Reserve as a community park;</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Improvements to the existing pathway connections at Howlett Reserve, providing wider and safer access out to either Howlett Street or Oakley Avenue;</u></p> <p>(d) <u>Formalisation of the pathway linkage north of "Waterview Glades", connecting to Oakley Creek;</u></p> <p>(e) <u>A pedestrian connection to Eric Armishaw Reserve;</u></p> <p>(f) Three soccer playing fields within the Alan wWood Reserve area <u>including associated access, ablution block and carparking; and</u></p> <p>(g) <u>A temporary basketball court at Alan Wood Reserve.</u></p>
SO.6	<p><u>The "Hendon Bridge", as well as pedestrian connections south of the motorway in Alan Wood Reserve, along Oakley Creek shall be provided as early as practicable</u></p>
SO.7	<p>In addition to the Community Liaison Group established pursuant to Condition PI.5, the NZTA shall establish an Education Liaison Group, to provide a forum through which:</p> <p>(a) Relevant monitoring data can be provided (e.g. air quality monitoring);</p> <p>(b) Notice can be provided of when particularly noisy activities will occur in close proximity;</p> <p>(c) Particular concerns can be raised by educational facilities or parents, discussed and potentially addressed.</p>

	<p>The Education Liaison Group shall be established at least 2 months prior to construction commencing and shall have regular meetings throughout the construction period. The Education Liaison Group shall continue to meet for at least 12 months following the completion of the Project (or less if the members of the Education Liaison Group agree), so that ongoing monitoring information can continue to be disseminated.</p>
SO.8	<p>Where noisy construction activities (that exceed the Noise Criteria in the CNVMP) are proposed in close proximity or adjacent to schools/ childcare centres, the NZTA shall, where practicable, carry out these works outside school hours or during school holidays.</p>
SO.9	<p>Upon finalisation of the CNVMP, if compliance with appropriate noise and vibration standards for educational facilities is unable to be achieved while the Waterview Kindergarten is in session to the satisfaction of the Ministry for Education, the NZTA shall offer the Ministry temporary relocation of the Waterview Kindergarten to an alternative site, either within the grounds of Waterview Primary School or a site in close proximity for the entire duration of the construction period. <u>The timing for relocation of the kindergarten back to its original premises shall be determined in consultation with the Ministry of Education and Auckland Kindergarten Association (where practicable to undertake this relocation over holiday period between school years).</u></p>
SO.10	<p>The NZTA shall, in agreement with the Ministry of Education, monitor the Waterview Primary School and the Waterview Kindergarten rolls throughout the construction period and for a period up to 6-12 months after practicable completion <u>the NZTA has vacated Construction Yard 5 and confirmed the operational designation footprint in these areas.</u></p>
SO.11	<p>Should monitoring of the school rolls of Waterview Kindergarten and Waterview Primary indicate that they have dropped below 30 and 155 respectively, the NZTA shall work with the Ministry for Education and the school boards to ensure that appropriate <u>staffing levels resources are maintained for these roll levels are continued</u> over the construction period and up to 6-12 months after practicable completion <u>the NZTA has vacated Construction Yard 5 and confirmed the operational designation footprint in these areas.</u></p>
SO.12	<p><u>In addition to the Community Liaison Group established pursuant to Condition PI.5, the NZTA shall establish a Working Liaison Group inviting the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>Auckland Council;</u> (b) <u>Housing New Zealand Corporation;</u> (c) <u>Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority;</u> (d) <u>Ngati Whatua o Orakei;</u> (e) <u>KiwiRail; and</u> (f) <u>Department of Conservation.</u>

	<p><u>The purpose of this Working Liaison Group will be to provide a forum through which:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>(a) Opportunities for public work development (including social housing, passenger transport or recreation / open space) are identified where the NZTA confirms that the designation is no longer required (e.g. following construction activities);</u><u>(b) Comment can be provided on finalised urban design and landscape plans, including the finalised designs of structural elements of the Project (prior to their submission to the Auckland Council);</u><u>(c) Opportunities for integration of other environmental projects (e.g. restoration plantings) are identified; and</u><u>(d) Consideration is given to appropriate protocols for commencement and completion of construction activities (including blessings for commencement of construction phases).</u> <p><u>The Working Liaison Group shall be established at least 2 months prior to construction commencing and shall have regular meetings throughout the construction period.</u></p>
--	---

PROPOSED PUBLIC INFORMATION CONDITIONS

PI.1.	A construction liaison person shall be appointed by the NZTA for the duration of the construction phase of the Project to be the main and readily accessible point of contact for persons affected by the Project. The liaison person's name and contact details shall be made available in the CEMP and on site signage by the NZTA. This person must be reasonably available for ongoing consultation on all matters of concern to affected parties arising from the Project.
PI.2.	The NZTA shall prepare and implement through the CEMP, a Communications Plan that sets out procedures detailing how the public will be communicated with throughout the construction period. The Communications Plan shall be written in accordance with the external communication procedures set out in the CEMP <u>and provided to the Auckland Council and the Community Liaison Group(s) established by Condition P1.5.</u>
PI.3.	<p>At least three weeks prior to the commencement of construction, and at three weekly intervals thereafter, or as required depending on the scale of works and effects on the community, advertisements will be placed in the relevant local newspapers detailing the nature of the forthcoming works, the location of the forthcoming works and hours of operation. All advertisements will include reference to a 24 hour toll free complaints telephone number. Where relevant, advertisements will also include but not be limited to details of:</p> <p>(a) Any traffic disruptions or controls or changes to property access; and (b) Any other construction activities as highlighted in the conditions.</p>
PI.4.	<p>The NZTA shall manage, investigate and resolve (as appropriate) all complaints for the duration of the construction works in accordance with the environmental complaints section of the CEMP. The implementation strategy for complaints includes:</p> <p>(a) A 24 hour toll free telephone number and email address, which shall be provided to all potentially affected residents and businesses. The number shall be available and answered at all times during the entire duration of the works for the receipt and management of any complaints. A sign containing the contact details shall be located at each site specific work activity;</p> <p>(b) The NZTA shall maintain a record of all complaints made to this number, email or any site office, including the full details of the complainant and the nature of the complaint;</p> <p>(c) Upon receiving a complaint, within 10 days of complaint receipt, a formal written response will be provided to the complainant and Auckland Council;</p> <p>(d) The NZTA shall undertake corrective action where necessary to resolve any problem identified. All action taken and relevant information shall be documented. For the avoidance of doubt, 'where necessary' refers to where the works are not being carried out in accordance with conditions of this designation; and</p> <p>(e) All information collected in conditions PI.4 (b), (c) and (d) shall be detailed in a Construction Compliance Report (including the means by which the complaint was addressed, whether resolution was reached and how the response was carried out) prepared by the NZTA. This Report shall be submitted to the Auckland Council on a quarterly basis commencing at the beginning of the works and for the entire duration of construction.</p>

PI.5.	<p>The NZTA shall establish Community Liaison Group(s) at least 2 months prior to construction commencing <u>in each of the following key construction areas:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>Te Atatu</u> (b) <u>Waterview</u> (c) <u>Owairaka</u> <p>and hold regular meetings throughout the construction period <u>relevant to these areas.</u></p> <p>The Community Liaison Group shall be open to all interested parties within the Project area including, but not limited to the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>Auckland Council and Community Boards;</u> (b) Educational facilities within the Project area (including schools, kindergartens, childcare, <u>Unitec Institute of Technology</u>); (c) Relevant community/ environmental groups and representatives of local residents; (d) Department of Conservation; (e) Auckland Council; (f) Relevant Iwi groups; and (g) Public transport providers. <p>The purpose of the Community Liaison Group is to provide a regular forum through which information about the Project can be provided to the community, and an opportunity for concerns or issues to be raised</p>
PI.6.	<p>The purpose of the Community Liaison Group(s) is to provide a regular forum through which information about the Project can be provided to the community, and an opportunity for concerns or issues to be raised. The Community Liaison Group(s) shall be provided an opportunity to review and comment on the following (amongst other things):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>Open Space and Restoration Plans;</u> (b) <u>Finalisation and amendment to Urban Design and Landscape Plans;</u> (c) <u>Finalisation of designs for the northern and southern ventilation buildings and stacks; and</u> (d) <u>The Oakley Inlet Heritage Plan.</u>
PI.7.	<p><u>Where access to Oakley Creek will be disrupted for more than 3 days, or over a weekend, or there is no provision for a walkway detour, the Community Liaison Person shall notify the Friends of Oakley Creek at least 20 working days in advance of any planned disruption (except where the disruption is of shorter duration, or an emergency situation).</u></p>