

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

Statement of evidence of Julie Meade Rose (Social Assessment Peer Review) 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 4

BACKGROUND AND ROLE 4

PROCESS UNDERTAKEN 5

CONSULTATION 6

COVERAGE OF ISSUES..... 7

COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS 11

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JULIE MEADE ROSE ON BEHALF OF THE NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Julie Margaret Meade Rose. I am a director and owner of Social & Environmental Limited, a consultancy company. My responsibilities include undertaking aspects of sociological work and overall management of the consultancy.
- 2 My qualifications include Bachelor of Arts Honours and a Master of Arts in Social Anthropology from Victoria University. I am a member of the New Zealand Planning Institute, the Resource Management Law Association and a committee member of the New Zealand Association of Impact Assessment. I have undertaken training in resource management mediation.
- 3 I am a social anthropologist with over 30 years experience in social and environmental planning. The focus of my work has been on social assessment. I returned to consultancy work in 2007 after two and a half years as the Environmental Services Manager at Otorohanga District Council. Prior to that, I had a consultancy business for 16 years after gaining considerable work experience for a large engineering based company. During these periods I worked on social and environmental planning projects, for many wide ranging organisations and companies, including network utility operators and regional and district Councils.
- 4 My experience also includes working in 17 countries outside New Zealand over 22 years. The focus of this work was on social assessment of effects of projects and policies on communities in several sectors including roading, energy, infrastructural projects, planning and forestry. Prior to that I undertook post graduate research, was a research assistant for the Huntly monitoring project and tutored in social anthropology at Waikato and Victoria Universities.
- 5 I wrote a Social Impact Assessment course for a degree and diploma for the Open Polytechnic of New Zealand and assessed all students' assignments over several years. I have given seminars on Social Assessment at several universities and polytechnics.
- 6 My evidence is given in support of notices of requirement and applications for resource consents lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority (*EPA*) by the NZTA on 20 August 2010 in relation to the Waterview Connection Project (*Project*). The Project comprises works previously investigated and developed as two separate projects, being:

6.1 The SH16 Causeway Project; and

6.2 The SH20 Waterview Connection Project.

- 7 I have been asked to peer review the social impact assessment carried out for the Project. I am familiar with the area that the Project covers, and the State highway and roading network in the vicinity of the Project.
- 8 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as contained in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note (2006), and agree to comply with it. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on facts or information provided by others. In preparing my evidence I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 9 My evidence will deal with the following:
- 9.1 Executive summary;
 - 9.2 Background and role;
 - 9.3 Process undertaken;
 - 9.4 Consultation;
 - 9.5 Coverage of relevant social issues; and
 - 9.6 Comments on submissions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 10 The Waterview Connection is a complex project. In my opinion, Ms Amelia Linzey has clearly analysed the Project and separated out the issues. I consider her approach and judgement of coverage of issues is professional and sound.
- 11 Overall, I consider that Ms Linzey has appropriately and adequately undertaken the social impact assessment process, consultation and coverage of relevant social issues for the Project.

BACKGROUND AND ROLE

- 12 My role in relation to the Project has been to undertake a peer review of the social assessment work for the Project undertaken by Ms Linzey. Given Ms Linzey's long history of involvement in the Project and her roles as both joint project Team leader and author of the social impact assessment, a peer review was considered

appropriate. In particular, I peer reviewed drafts of the Assessment of Social Effects Report (*Report*) prepared for the Project.

- 13 The final Report was lodged with the EPA on 20 August 2010 as part of the overall Assessment of Environmental Effects (*AAE*) (specifically, Part G, Technical Report G.14).
- 14 My peer review work undertaken before lodgement of the Report included undertaking two site visits, reviewing early drafts of the Report and preparing internal Peer Review response reports between 11 February 2010 and 13 August 2010, participating in two workshops with the Project's technical experts, and reviewing responses from Beca to my reports and the workshops.
- 15 In preparation of my evidence, I reviewed the final Social Effects Report, undertook an additional site visit and reviewed the lodged consultation reporting.

PROCESS UNDERTAKEN

- 16 I can confirm that Ms Linzey followed the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) process and framework for assessing social impacts,¹ throughout the SH20 Project, and for SH16 from the time that was added to the Project in 2009. She explicitly notes the objective relevant to all social impact assessments (SIA[s]), that is, improving social wellbeing of the wider community through "*planned interventions*".²
- 17 Ms Linzey took into consideration the key potential areas for assessment as outlined by the IAIA and added to that list the very important matter of assessment of people's attitudes. Ms Linzey adopted this consideration following my suggestion in a peer review report.
- 18 In my view, the wide range of methods used, including observations, consultations and reviews as stated in the Report, are appropriate and adequate to address the complex nature of this infrastructural Project of national significance. The regional and local social impact assessment frameworks that Ms Linzey has developed appropriately scope relevant issues from the many and varied information sources she has reviewed.
- 19 The assessment considers social impacts of the Project at the relevant phases of planning, construction and operation. The seven point scale, which assesses impacts as socially positive (significant, moderate or minor), neutral or negative (significant, moderate or

¹ Refer section 4.1 of the Report.

² Ibid.

minor) as outlined in the Report, is an appropriate scale by which to assess social impacts.

- 20 The process and methodology adopted in the Report follow the IAIA requirements which are recognised internationally as best practice for IAIA work. In my opinion, the process and methodology that Ms Linzey has undertaken for this Project is appropriate.

CONSULTATION

- 21 The consultation summary for the Project³ (Consultation Summary) overviews the key information source for the SIA, which is, as Ms Linzey indicates, community and stakeholder consultation. The primary purpose of the Consultation Summary is identifying key social issues relevant to the Project.
- 22 The Consultation Summary contains the consultation history and context, clearly stating the investigation process and consultation timeframes from 2000 for SH20 and from 2007 for SH16.
- 23 To identify key social issues, Ms Linzey used several consultation methods to engage with and gain input from the community, which I consider were indeed essential to gain such information. In time as the Project became more refined, additional methods were used to capture input from the affected communities. For example, media releases, drop-in centres and focus groups were added to help define route options after the Project corridor had been scoped. These additional methods were appropriate to capture key issues relating to route options in the context of this Project.
- 24 All data from community consultation was analysed and key social issues were identified for each phase of the process. Decisions were made at each consultation period from community input about future directions for the Project. Ms Linzey clearly states these outcomes from community input in the Consultation Summary.⁴
- 25 Ms Linzey appropriately indicates the key issues raised in consultation with key stakeholders⁵ and their relevance to the regional and / or local context of the SIA.
- 26 Key issues raised by the public and stakeholders have been categorised⁶ to provide a discussion about overall issues arising. The discussion is useful as it provides a snapshot of issues raised for this complex Project which has been in gestation for ten years.

³ Appendix C to the Report.

⁴ Ibid, Table 1.

⁵ Ibid, Table 2.

⁶ Ibid, section 4.

Issues emerging from consultation can be traced through to the discussion of social impacts in the Report.

27 Ms Linzey also summarises the consultation reporting undertaken for the Project.⁷ The reports which have been made available to the public during the consultation process have provided the consultation undertaken, methods used, feedback received and how NZTA have responded to key issues. The consultation reporting has closed the loop in the consultation reporting cycle, that is, results of input from the community have been communicated back to them. Reporting back to the community, which is an important step in the consultation cycle, has been undertaken for this Project.

28 In my opinion, the consultation undertaken for the Project over the ten year period from 2000 to 2010 was appropriate and adequate.

COVERAGE OF ISSUES

29 In my view, Ms Linzey has followed through relevant issues identified in community consultations, observations and reviews to the assessment of social impacts as appropriate for a SIA report.

30 Ms Linzey appropriately recognises the regional nature of the Project but also focuses on impacts at the local level, as she states *"It is at the local level where most adverse social impacts will be realised."*⁸ I concur with Ms Linzey's focus on impacts at the local level notwithstanding the importance of those at a regional level.

Regional Social Impact Assessment

31 Ms Linzey's framework for assessing regional social impacts⁹ is based on relevant issues identified from her extensive reviews and stakeholder consultations. The four themes emerging (Transport, accessibility and connectivity; Economic growth and development; Environmental sustainability; and Healthy communities) are appropriate bases against which to assess regional social issues for this Project.

32 At the planning phase, social impacts are not anticipated on a regional basis. However, Ms Linzey does recognise the challenge to people's and organisations' views and expectations about potential future impacts concerning environmental sustainability. In my view, recognition of this challenge is valid.

33 During the construction phase of the Project, mainly minor to moderately negative social impacts are anticipated. Ms Linzey anticipates social impacts to be minor to moderately negative along

⁷ Ibid, Table 3.

⁸ Section 9.2 of the Report.

⁹ Refer section 6 of the Report.

SH16 during peak travel times with disruption to accessibility and connectivity, minor negative impacts mainly from visual and noise challenging people's expectations of environmental sustainability, and travel delays associated with SH16 widening work impacting the health of communities. While these impacts will cause some disruption to people, Ms Linzey's notes that these impacts are temporary in nature, the construction period being five to seven years. I note also that not all impacts will occur for that entire period as construction works will be progressively completed within that timeframe.

- 34 During construction, Ms Linzey anticipates positive social impacts to arise from employment opportunities in construction and engineering providing regional economic growth and development. I concur with Ms Linzey's assessment.
- 35 During operation of the Project, significant positive impacts are anticipated for Auckland region. These include improvements in relation to transport, accessibility and connectivity, access to employment opportunities, people's economic wellbeing, and opportunities to improve people's quality of life. Other positive social impacts are anticipated also and include contributors to healthy communities (such as improved access to health services, recreation and leisure). There are negative impacts also. In my view, Ms Linzey rightly acknowledges the projected ongoing negative consequences of air emissions associated with vehicle emissions.
- 36 Overall, I concur with Ms Linzey's assessment of regional social impacts for the Project.

Local Social Impact Assessment

- 37 Ms Linzey's framework for assessing local social impacts¹⁰ is also based on relevant issues identified from her extensive reviews and stakeholder consultations. The four themes that emerge for the local SIA are Attitudes, expectations and aspirations; Wellbeing and way of life; Culture; and Community. These themes are appropriate bases against which to assess local social issues for this Project. In the local area, Ms Linzey also refers to local impacts in particular sectors, the local environment being divided into nine sectors for the Project. This level of identification is very useful in terms of development planning for the Project team as well as for the community and stakeholders.

Planning Phase

- 38 During the planning phase, impacts have ranged from minor positive to minor to moderately negative concerning attitudes, expectations and aspirations, depending on people's circumstances.

¹⁰ Refer section 7 of the Report.

Ms Linzey specifies Sectors 5 and 7-9¹¹ as the sectors where impacts are most severe due to the different form of proposals to construct the Project that have been put forward over time. The level of impact anticipated by residents is valid and Ms Linzey recognises it appropriately.

- 39 Uncertainty about the planning process for the Project has had moderately negative impacts on some people's wellbeing and way of life. Should the Project finally proceed, the conditions put forward concerning public information will help overcome some of this uncertainty (for example, at least three weeks prior to commencement of construction, advertisements would feature in the relevant local newspapers detailing the nature of the forthcoming works, the location of those works and hours of operation)¹².
- 40 To help mitigate adverse impacts on the Waterview community in the planning phase, properties have been purchased in advance of the Project proceeding. This strategic decision, noted by Ms Linzey, has reduced impacts on the community.
- 41 Overall, I consider that Ms Linzey has provided a balanced and appropriate assessment of social impacts arising in the planning stage and appropriate mitigation measures for the Project have been put in place or proposed.

Construction Phase

- 42 During construction in the local area, Ms Linzey identifies¹³ the range of impacts as minor positive to minor to potentially significant negative social impacts. Construction yards 1 and 5 – 12 are anticipated to be the most sensitive sites during the construction period, along with works undertaken outside these construction yards.¹⁴ Impacts will be experienced by adjacent residents and the Waterview Primary School and kindergarten. The detailed mitigation measures proposed (both through Project design and through the Environmental Management Plans) as discussed by Ms Linzey will considerably reduce adverse impacts on the affected community.¹⁵
- 43 Residents living adjacent to SH16, the Great North Road Interchange and Alan Wood Reserve are anticipated to be most significantly impacted by the Project during construction. Ms Linzey

¹¹ Described in pp 62–86 of the Report.

¹² Refer to Ms Linzey's Social Effects evidence Annexure A: Proposed Public Information Conditions and specifically PI.3.

¹³ Section 7.2 of the Report.

¹⁴ Refer Tables 7-1 and 7-2, pages 113 to 115 of the Report.

¹⁵ Refer section 8.2, page 154 of the Report.

appropriately addresses these impacts through design and management plans as discussed.

- 44 Impacts on community facilities and changes to community composition and character in Te Atatu, Waterview, Owairaka and New Windsor are anticipated to be minor negative to potentially significantly negative during construction. Again Ms Linzey addresses these issues through design, management plans and monitoring as noted in the Report.¹⁶
- 45 Ms Linzey also rightly notes the positive impacts of construction associated with the high level of local employment in construction of the Project.

Operational Phase

- 46 Once in operation, residents' concerns are anticipated to dissipate to some extent and there is likely to be more acceptance of the Project. This is typical for large infrastructure projects. I agree with Ms Linzey's assessment for this Project.
- 47 Ms Linzey appropriately acknowledges and addresses¹⁷ the negative and positive impacts anticipated on people's wellbeing and way of life, changes to the character and lifestyle being among the most noted when the Project is in operation. I agree with Ms Linzey's assessment that "*Operational effects of the Project have the potential to change the 'liveability' of the local study area for some residents...*"¹⁸ Several measures have been proposed that will potentially reduce adverse impacts for residents and include, for example, noise mitigation measures that have been put forward by the noise consultant Siiri Wilkenen in discussion with Ms Linzey.
- 48 Positive impacts on wellbeing and way of life should not be underestimated for people in the local area from the operation of the Project. As Ms Linzey's points out,¹⁹ these include improvements to accessibility and lifestyle for people.
- 49 I note that no negative impacts are anticipated on people's culture during operation.
- 50 Both positive and negative impacts are anticipated on the community when the Project is in operation. Ms Linzey correctly points out the potential negative impacts are the fragmentation of residents in Waterview and Owairaka, and also the potential drop in roll at Waterview Primary School and kindergarten. I note

¹⁶ Refer to section 8.2 pages 152 and 154 to 155, and section 8.3, pages 156 to 157.

¹⁷ Section 7.3 of the Report.

¹⁸ Refer to section 7.3.2 page 131.

¹⁹ Refer to section 7.3.2 page 135 to 136.

Ms Linzey puts forward specific measures to mitigate these potential impacts as discussed in her evidence.

- 51 During Project operation, positive impacts are anticipated on the community also. I concur with Ms Linzey's assessment that there will be considerable benefits in terms of improvements to local accessibility and access to local business areas²⁰.
- 52 In my opinion, Ms Linzey has recognised the potential for a wide range of social impacts in the construction and operation of the Project. These impacts range from significantly negative to significantly positive. In my opinion, Ms Linzey has taken a pro-active approach to address negative impacts. Her management role in the Project and at Beca, where she works, has put her in a position of working closely with staff and consultants working on the Project and contributing to the Project across all technical fields. It is not often that the SIA consultant has the opportunity to have so much influence on a project. In my opinion, Ms Linzey has had a considerably positive influence on the overall assessment of the Project. Thus social considerations pervade many mitigation measures and conditions put forward for the Project, and not just those which are specifically aimed at addressing social impacts.
- 53 Furthermore, in my opinion Ms Linzey has appropriately and adequately covered local social issues that have arisen from the proposed Project. Measures put forward to address adverse social impacts are adequate to mitigate adverse impacts anticipated.

COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

- 54 In this section of my evidence, I comment on relevant submissions that have raised concerns about the processes by which the Project social assessment and consultation were undertaken.

Stella Maris Trust

- 55 Ms Emslie, Ms Begg and Mr Parker on behalf of the Stella Maris Trust state²¹ "*No Community consultation re-changes to Plans released May 2009*". I consider that community consultation undertaken about changes to plans released in May 2009 was adequate to inform the community. I understand that the consultation specialists went out to the community in August 2010 specifically to advise of the further amendments being made to the Project as lodged so that the community could make informed submissions on the Project.²²

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Submitter No. 135.

²² Refer to the discussion on consultation in Ms Linzey's social effects evidence.

Margi Watson, Peter McCurdy, Ms Riley, Kim Ace

- 56 In their respective submissions, Ms Watson,²³ Mr McCurdy on behalf of Star Mills Preservation Group²⁴, Ms Riley²⁵ and Kim Ace²⁶ express concern that NZTA has not met its responsibility as signatory to the 'IAP2²⁷ Core Values for Public Participation' in that, they consider, NZTA has not ensured the public's contribution will influence the decision.
- 57 Ms Linzey discusses this matter in her evidence. I concur with Ms Linzey's discussion on this matter and am satisfied, having confirmed this matter in conversation with Ms Linzey, that all feedback from consultation has been taken into consideration. Information has been fed back into design mitigation, management and monitoring as appropriate. Feedback has influenced Project decision-making as Ms Linzey indicates. For example, Ms Linzey has stated in the Report "*Social considerations and urban design elements have involved the development of construction and design options for the SH16 causeway...*"²⁸ I also note that the establishment of a Working Liaison Group and a Community Liaison Group to collaborate with community representatives and stakeholders is provided for in the proposed designation conditions.

Julie Meade Rose
November 2010

²³ Submitter No. 225.

²⁴ Submitter No. 199.

²⁵ Submitter No. 221.

²⁶ Submitter No. 223.

²⁷ IAP2 is an international association whose members seek to improve the practice of public participation in relation to individuals, organisations and governments that affect public interest. The association promotes the values and best practices associated with involving the affected public in government and industry decisions. Refer to the www.IAP2.org.

²⁸ Technical Report G.14, Section 8.1 Mitigation by Design, page 151.