

Before a Board of Inquiry
MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway Proposal

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Notice of requirement for designation and resource consent applications by the NZ Transport Agency for the MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway Proposal

applicant: **NZ Transport Agency**
Requiring Authority

Statement of evidence of **Jane Black** (consultation) for the NZ Transport Agency

Dated: 3 September 2012

REFERENCE: John Hassan (john.hassan@chapmantripp.com)
Suzanne Janissen (suzanne.janissen@chapmantripp.com)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JANE BLACK FOR THE NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY	2
QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE	2
SCOPE OF EVIDENCE	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
CONSULTATION PHASES	4
Early consultation	4
Phase One: Alignment and Interchange Options	5
Phase Two: Design Development	5
Existing State Highway 1 modification	6
CONSULTATION METHODS	6
PARTIES CONSULTED	7
Directly affected landowners	7
Businesses and residents	8
Properties where access was required for site investigations.....	8
Key stakeholders	8
Tangata whenua	9
General public.....	9
Summary	9
FEEDBACK AND OUTCOMES	10
Phase One: alignment and interchange options	10
Phase Two: Design development	14
RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK ON THE CONSULTATION PROCESS.....	14
FUTURE CONSULTATION	15
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT DURING CONSTRUCTION	15
RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS	15
Early consultation 2009: misleading and inadequate	16
Phase One and Phase Two: misleading and inadequate	16
No direct contact	16
Consultation during construction	17
Working group	17
Positive submissions on consultation	17
Key stakeholders	17
CONCLUSIONS	18
ANNEXURE 1: PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS WHO ATTENDED EXPOS	19
ANNEXURE 2: TIMELINE OF CONSULTATION	21

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JANE BLACK FOR THE NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1 My full name is Valerie Jane Black.
- 2 I am an urban planning consultant with over 25 years' experience. I have a Bachelor of Town Planning degree, I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and I am an accredited Independent Commissioner. I am currently employed as an urban planner with Incite Resource and Environment Management (*Incite*). I have been in this role for 5 years.
- 3 I have undertaken planning and consultation on public projects, including advising and giving evidence before the Environment Court on behalf of Wellington City Council in relation to the Wellington Inner City Bypass project. I have been involved in the development of and consultation on many high profile and contentious public space projects. I have been involved in the Wellington Waterfront Project for 25 years.
- 4 My evidence is given in support of the Notice of Requirement (*NoR*) and applications for resource consent lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority (*EPA*) by the NZ Transport Agency (*NZTA*) for the construction, maintenance and operation of the MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway (*the Project*).
- 5 I am familiar with the area that the Project covers and the State highway and local roading network in the vicinity of the Project.
- 6 I am the reviewer of the Consultation Summary technical report¹ that formed part of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (*AEE*) lodged in support of the Project. The report was written, under my supervision, by my colleague Jeremy Brophy at Incite.
- 7 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as contained in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note (2011), and I agree to comply with it as if this Inquiry were before the Environment Court. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 8 My evidence will deal with the following:

¹ Technical Report 3.

- 8.1 Consultation phases;
 - 8.2 Consultation methods;
 - 8.3 Parties consulted;
 - 8.4 Feedback and outcomes;
 - 8.5 Response to feedback on the consultation process;
 - 8.6 Future consultation;
 - 8.7 Stakeholder engagement during construction;
 - 8.8 Response to submissions; and
 - 8.9 Conclusions.
- 9 I am the Manager of Stakeholder Engagement for the Project. In this capacity, I drafted the consultation material and oversaw its production, I led the contact with directly affected property owners, responded to queries from the public and interest groups, organised Expos, briefed Project team staff, and attended all Expos.
- 10 I can confirm that consultation was carried out in accordance with the NZTA Public Engagement Manual 2008.²
- 11 The focus of my evidence is to describe the consultation process and the outcomes. My evidence does not comment extensively on how issues raised during the consultation process have been analysed and addressed by the Project team. The relevant experts will address those issues in their evidence.
- 12 My evidence on consultation also relates to that of **Dr James Bentley** (as to engagement with key stakeholders), **Mr Andrew Quinn** (as to consultation with utility operators), **Ms Julie Meade Rose** (social impacts), and **Mr Amos Kamo** (iwi engagement and cultural effects).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 13 There were two phases of consultation for the proposed Expressway:
- 13.1 Phase One: consultation on alignment options and interchanges; and
 - 13.2 Phase Two: consultation on design development.

² See page 258 of Chapter 10, Part F of the AEE.

- 14 Before Phases One and Two, initial consultation was undertaken on corridor options. Extensive consultation was then carried out for the two phases and a range of consultation methods was used. These included what were termed "expos" (ie open days) in four locations on the Kāpiti Coast, brochures, phone lines and an Information Centre at Coastlands Mall in Paraparaumu.
- 15 Key members of the Project team, including designers, technical specialists, construction engineers, NZTA property managers and planners were involved in the consultation process, were available at the Expos, and were able to respond to queries. A full list of the Project team members who attended the Expos is attached as **Annexure 1** to my evidence. All feedback was recorded in a computer programme (Darzin) and reported to the Project team for consideration. Feedback was summarised and provided to designers to consider as part of the design process and decision making.
- 16 I consider that the consultation process was extensive in seeking feedback from the public and key stakeholders. The Project team was responsive to the matters raised and all queries within and outside the consultation periods were responded to in a meaningful and timely manner. The Consultation and Engagement chapter of the AEE describes the consultation process in detail and briefly describes the response of the Project team to the issues raised during consultation.³

CONSULTATION PHASES

Early consultation

- 17 In 2009, the NZTA consulted on three corridor options for a four lane Expressway between MacKays Crossing and Peka Peka.⁴ Consultation was undertaken for 10 weeks between August and October 2009 and included the sending of a brochure to all households seeking feedback on the options, the informing of potentially affected landowners, and the holding of a series of eight open days, three public meetings and a number of individual meetings as requested. Following the consultation, a preferred route largely following the Western Link Road Corridor was chosen. A summary of the consultation findings is contained within the *MacKays Crossing to Peka Peka Community Engagement Report 2009*.⁵

³ Part F, Chapter 10 of the AEE, from page 257.

⁴ The objectives of this early consultation phase are set out at page 259 of Chapter 10 of the AEE.

⁵ MacKays Crossing to Peka Peka Community Engagement report 2009. Available at <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/mackays-to-peka-peka/consultation.html>

Phase One: Alignment and Interchange Options

- 18 The first phase of consultation was undertaken by the Alliance, on behalf of the NZTA, in November/December 2010. The purpose of this phase of the consultation was to gain feedback on the preferred alignment options developed to that date for the Project. Specifically feedback was sought from the general public and key stakeholders on the following key issues:

18.1 The route options between north of the Waikanae River and Te Moana Road;

18.2 The number and location of interchanges;

18.3 The northern connection at Peka Peka Road; and

18.4 The southern connection around Poplar Avenue.

Phase Two: Design Development

- 19 In May 2011 the alignment of the proposed Expressway and the location of the four interchanges were confirmed. Following this, further consultation was undertaken with the general public and key stakeholders on design development of the proposed Expressway and its surrounding environment.

- 20 Feedback was specifically sought on the following design aspects:

20.1 Cycleways, walkways and bridleways;

20.2 Local road connections;

20.3 Possible mitigation measures including earth bunding and landscape treatment for visual and noise mitigation;

20.4 Noise, vibration and air quality;

20.5 Stormwater/drainage and wetlands; and

20.6 Ecology.

- 21 Two workshops were held to focus on the specific issues. The first workshop focussed on Waikanae design issues, and the second focussed on the proposed cycleway, walkway and bridleway. The Waikanae Design Workshop was attended by Project team experts including acousticians, stormwater/drainage engineers, urban designers, landscape architects, road designers and planners with residents of Puriri Road, Kauri Road and Te Moana Road to discuss local concerns. The discussions helped inform the design team.

- 22 A Cycleway, Walkway and Bridleway Workshop was held with the Kapiti District Coast Council (KCDC) reference group to discuss how

the Project design provided for the cycling and walking paths and bridleways in the district.

- 23 During and between the consultation phases, the Project team responded to queries and attended meetings (as requested) to provide greater understanding of the Project and to further hear the concerns of the community.
- 24 A comprehensive timeline of the consultation undertaken is attached to my evidence as **Annexure 2**.

Existing State Highway 1 modification

- 25 In August 2011 consultation was undertaken on the future of the current State Highway 1. Meetings were held with key stakeholders and interest groups and two Expos were held in Waikanae and Paraparaumu to start the consultation period. This provided the opportunity for people to find out more about the revitalisation concepts, ask questions, request further information and give feedback. Feedback was specifically sought on the following design aspects:

- 25.1 Changes to intersections or local roads;
- 25.2 Car parking in the town centres;
- 25.3 What the road might look like in rural and urban areas;
- 25.4 Opportunities for future adjoining land uses next to the current SH1;
- 25.5 Opportunities for walking, cycling, and horse riding;
- 25.6 Connections to public transport; and
- 25.7 Landscaping and stormwater management.

CONSULTATION METHODS

- 26 The consultation methods used included:
- 26.1 Brochures and postcards, sent to all addresses in the district;
- 26.2 Expos (ie open days where there was an opportunity for members of the public to view panels, maps and information, and discuss issues with members of the Project team) held at four different locations on the Kāpiti Coast (Southward Car Museum, Kāpiti Community Centre, Waikanae Memorial Hall, and Raumati South Memorial Hall);

- 26.3 Individual meetings, with people directly affected by the Project and as requested by members of the public and local businesses;
 - 26.4 Media releases;
 - 26.5 Newspaper and radio advertising;
 - 26.6 A staffed Information Centre at Coastlands Mall in Paraparaumu;
 - 26.7 A project website;
 - 26.8 A toll free phone line; and
 - 26.9 Feedback forms.
- 27 Feedback forms were available at a number of these locations and online. The forms could be completed and sent postage paid to the Alliance postal address, posted on line, handed in at all Expos or left at the Information Centre until the closing date for feedback.
- 28 A full explanation of the methods used and submission methodology is contained in Technical Report 3 (TR3).⁶
- 29 A computer programme (Darzin) was used to record all communications and feedback. Feedback received was summarised and categorised to provide greater understanding of the types of issues raised. The issues that needed to be considered as part of the design development were reported back to the design team for their consideration and design response. These issues are addressed by the relevant technical experts in their evidence and technical reports.

PARTIES CONSULTED

- 30 A full list of parties consulted can be viewed in the AEE - Part F: Consultation and Engagement.⁷

Directly affected landowners

- 31 Communication and engagement with directly affected landowners⁸ was undertaken in November 2010 prior to the Phase One public consultation. All private properties identified by the Project team that may be directly affected by the proposed Expressway were

⁶ See in particular, sections 1.2 and 5.2.

⁷ AEE Part F – Consultation and Engagement Page 262, Table 10.1.

⁸ A directly affected landowner is someone who owns property within the proposed designation footprint.

visited. Where owners and/or occupiers were not home, letters and calling cards were left providing more detail on how further information could be obtained. Subsequent phone calls and site visits were arranged following this initial contact. Letters were sent to absentee landowners who were not living on their properties.

- 32 In Phase Two, following announcement of the proposed alignment and the location of the four interchanges, landowners were contacted by phone and advised them whether or not their land was required. A letter was sent confirming the advice and enclosing a map showing the land requirement. Best endeavours were made to contact all directly affected owners prior to the consultation with the wider public, which commenced on 15 May 2011. Meetings were arranged with landowners to discuss the property acquisition process under the Public Works Act 1981 (*PWA*) with the Crown's accredited suppliers.

Businesses and residents

- 33 Members of the Project team have had ongoing meetings throughout the consultation phases with business owners and residents that work and live near the proposed Expressway. The effects of the Expressway on their properties and how access will be maintained were among the issues discussed at these meetings.

Properties where access was required for site investigations

- 34 Land entry agreements were obtained where ground investigations needed to take place along the proposed alignment. Ground investigations were required to inform the construction methodology for the Project. Where the works created some noise or would have been highly visible (for example, drilling rigs working within a road reserve) adjoining property owners were also advised of the works in advance by letter. The letter informed them of the nature of investigations and when they would be undertaken. Advertisements were also placed in the Kapiti News, Kapi Mana News and the Kapiti Observer newspapers advising of the dates and types of investigation activities that were scheduled.
- 35 Where further site access is required for investigations, a similar process will be followed.

Key stakeholders

- 36 Key stakeholders⁹ were sent a letter informing them of the commencement of public consultation in November 2010 (Phase One). The letter informed them where further information could be obtained, and invited them to meet with the Project team to discuss the proposal further.

⁹ Identified by the Project team and listed in Appendix 3.1 to TR3.

- 37 A consultation brochure was sent to all key stakeholders in May 2011 (Phase Two), confirming the chosen alignment. During Phase Two, meetings were held with key stakeholders seeking feedback on the proposed Expressway design. As required, relevant Project team members met with various groups and individuals.
- 38 Feedback was provided by some key stakeholders. Consultation with these parties was ongoing throughout the development of the project and a summary of their comments is contained in Section 10.14 of the AEE - Part F: Consultation and Engagement.

Tangata whenua

- 39 Engagement and consultation was undertaken with tangata whenua in the Project area. The evidence of **Mr Kamo** discusses the engagement process with iwi, hapu and whanau groups. Engagement with tangata whenua allowed the Project team to:

39.1 Obtain feedback from tangata whenua; and

39.2 Assist in the identification of effects and appropriate mitigation.

General public

- 40 Consultation with the general public was carried out using a wide range of methods. The 2010 and 2011 consultation phases started with a series of Project Expos held in four different communities with further detail provided in consultation brochures: including links to a website and contact details.
- 41 The public could provide feedback at the Expos by filling in forms provided or take the forms away complete and send them back to the NZTA. They could also complete forms on the Project website or leave them at the Information Centre. A date was provided by which feedback would be received.
- 42 Members of the Project team attended the Expos and were available to answer questions from the public. Information was also available to the general public through advertising, media releases and from the Information Centre. The Information Centre was established in Coastlands Mall in Paraparaumu and was kept up to date with the latest information. The Centre was also staffed allowing members of the public the opportunity to ask questions and obtain additional information.

Summary

- 43 In my opinion, the Project team has consulted widely and meaningfully on the Project in order to define the most appropriate alignment and interchange configuration and to improve the design of the proposed Expressway for the communities through which it

travels, for road users outside the District, for iwi and for key stakeholders.

FEEDBACK AND OUTCOMES

Phase One: alignment and interchange options

- 44 Feedback during Phase One covered a wide range of topics, from comments on the various proposed design and alignment options to environmental and community considerations. A large amount of interest was generated by the options for the southern end (at Raumati South), the Waikanae alignment and by the location and number of interchanges.
- 45 The number and location of interchanges proposed by the NZTA was widely supported.
- 46 In Raumati South, two alternate alignment options were identified for consultation. The Queen Elizabeth Park option and the Main Road Option. These options are explained in the evidence of **Mr Noel Nancekivell**. Feedback indicated that the alignment option through Queen Elizabeth Park was preferred over the Main Road option.¹⁰ The main reason for opposition to the Main Road option was the disruption to and removal of residential homes. The decision to proceed with the Main Road option is explained in section 9.6 of Chapter 9 of the AEE.¹¹
- 47 In Waikanae, two alternate options were also identified for consultation. Option 1 ran closest to the urupa in the Takamore cultural precinct and Option 2 was further east and impacted on private properties and the Greenaway Homestead. Option 1 (the closest to the urupa) was preferred overall in the feedback to Option 2. Primarily this was because Option 1 affected fewer properties.¹² Option 1 was also preferred by the Project team.¹³
- 48 The main reasons given by the public during feedback on these alignment options are set out in Section 3.3 of TR3. Further information on the alternative design options and how the public feedback was incorporated into the design process is outlined in the Assessment of Environment Effects Part E: Consideration of Alternatives.
- 49 I summarise the other key issues raised in Phase One of consultation below.

¹⁰ 362 responses opposed the Main Road option out of 461 responses who specifically mentioned the southern end alignment.

¹¹ Specifically section 9.6.4.4.

¹² 259 responses mentioned the Waikanae alignment and 142 preferred Option 1.

¹³ See section 9.6.4.4 of Chapter 9 of the AEE.

Whether the Expressway went over or under local roads

- 50 Feedback confirmed that people were concerned about whether the Expressway went over or under local roads. Concerns were focused on character, ease of use, access for adjoining properties, and disruption to pedestrians and cyclists. Both over and under options were considered by the Project team. The consultation feedback confirmed that it was important to keep the Expressway as low as possible to blend in with the surrounding landscape and maintain the existing east-west connectivity. **Mr Nancekivell** explains how the heights of some overbridges were able to be reduced by lowering existing roads.

The quality of design of the Waikanae Bridge

- 51 The importance of the quality of the design of the Waikanae River bridge was acknowledged by the NZTA following feedback and as a result an architect was employed to design the structure. Feedback was focused on the height of the bridge, treatment of land under the bridge and access. Walking and cycling tracks under the bridge are proposed to be maintained, and a new pedestrian and cycle accessway across the river will be provided as part of the Expressway bridge structure.

Providing for local access

- 52 As noted, there was a common request to keep all east/west local road connections. There was related feedback concerning congestion, airport connection, access at Elizabeth Street, and the closure of Leinster Avenue. **Mr Nancekivell** explains why closure of Leinster Avenue is considered necessary, and **Mr Andrew Murray** explains how access for residents will be maintained. All main east-west roads are unaffected including Kāpiti Road and Te Moana Road where the Expressway will connect with the local roads through the interchanges.¹⁴

Accessibility and connectivity within the District

- 53 Feedback raised issues with access to public facilities, access points for cyclists/pedestrians, length of the proposed bridleway and the height of overpasses. As a result of this feedback, a walking and cycling survey was undertaken to ensure the most appropriate location of the cycleway/walkway to maintain existing levels of connectivity. Opportunities to maintain informal connections were also taken into account by the Project team, with two pedestrian/cycle bridges over the Expressway proposed to be provided at key points.¹⁵ These matters are also explained by **Mr Nancekivell**.

¹⁴ **Mr Murray** further explains how the Project maintains east-west connectivity.

¹⁵ The exact locations of the pedestrian/cycle bridges will be determined through an outline plan process.

Construction effects

- 54 Comments focused on construction noise, vibration, dust and the transportation of construction materials. Businesses were particularly concerned about disruption during construction. The Project team took this into account when developing the construction environmental management plan (*CEMP*).

Environmental considerations

- 55 A number of feedback forms commented on environmental issues such as hydrology, ecology, noise and vibration, emissions, and hazards. This feedback was provided to the relevant technical specialists to ensure that when addressing these issues they understood local concerns.

Social and community impacts

- 56 Primarily the focus of feedback about social and community issues was about the division (or severance) of the community, how it would impact on recreation, and impacts on amenity and community dynamics. These impacts will be discussed in the evidence of **Ms Meade Rose** and **Mr Robert Schofield**.

Health and safety

- 57 Comments on health and safety issues were focused on access to and crossing the Expressway, traffic accidents, and road safety. Meetings with landowners were held to further understand access issues and to ensure good access is maintained. The safety of cyclists and pedestrians was taken into account in the design of the proposed Expressway.

Amenity and urban design

- 58 The focus of feedback on amenity and design related to interchanges and their effect on character, planting around interchanges, impacts on existing views and lighting effects. The experts who developed the Urban and Landscape Design Framework took into account these concerns when developing appropriate design approaches and other mitigation measures.

Cultural heritage and archaeology

- 59 The significant cultural heritage and archaeological importance of the area and in particular the Waikanae area was identified early by the Project team. Feedback related to the potential impact to archaeology, lack of respect and insensitivity to aspects of cultural significance. Cultural heritage and archaeological effects are addressed in the evidence of **Mr Kamo** and **Ms Mary O’Keeffe** respectively.

Economic impacts

- 60 Feedback on economic issues focused on cost/benefit ratios, adverse effects on viable communities and town centres, impact on businesses and the constructions costs.

Property impacts

- 61 Individual meetings were held with all landowners to understand concerns and provide advice regarding acquisition of properties under the PWA. The need to progress the property acquisition process was made a priority by NZTA recognising the need to provide affected property-owners with certainty. Other feedback related to property values, compensation, subsidies for noise protection, and the use of excess land for public purposes.

Transportation issues

- 62 In terms of transportation issues, a focus of feedback was the desire for a railway station at Raumati South. However, leaving aside the desirability or otherwise of a new railway station, it is not part of this Project. Discussions were however held with interest groups on this matter and investigations undertaken to ensure that the Expressway did not inhibit the ability for parking to be provided in the vicinity of the possible railway station. Other feedback was generally focussed on carparking (at interchanges for carpooling and on the side of the Expressway) and public transport.

Impact on local roading network

- 63 Feedback was received on local road congestion, access and maintenance. Issues were also raised about the use and upgrade of the existing State Highway. Additional consultation was undertaken on conceptual design plans for potential modification of the existing SH1. This work was jointly undertaken by the NZTA and KCDC.

Justification of the route and other options

- 64 The decision to further investigate an Expressway route between MacKays Crossing and Peka Peka had already been made by NZTA prior to this consultation.¹⁶ Even so, feedback sought justification for that decision. Other issues raised were the limited benefits of the Project, the optimism in the traffic predictions and the Project being unsustainable. A review of the alternative route options for an Expressway confirmed the benefits of the selected route compared with the other principal options, including significantly fewer property impacts, considerably less overall impact on the urban environment, and a much shorter construction timeframe.¹⁷

Consultation process

- 65 Responses on consultation were mixed. Some supported the process but others expressed concerns that the process was not transparent, the community was not being listened to and the level of information was not adequate. A consultation report was

¹⁶ Refer to Section 9.4.2 of Chapter 9: Consideration of Alternatives in the AEE.

¹⁷ Refer to Section 9.4.3 of Chapter 9: Consideration of Alternatives in the AEE.

produced that summarised the feedback and outlined the process and methods undertaken.¹⁸

Phase Two: Design development

- 66 The purpose of the second stage of consultation was to focus attention on the design of the proposed Expressway. Feedback was received on the same key issues identified above but with a sharper focus on design aspects. Local knowledge gained from the consultation process helped inform the design as it developed and in my view people generally engaged in this level of detail to ensure a good outcome for the community.
- 67 The technical specialists were available at Expos during Phase Two to talk to members of the community and to respond to concerns raised as well as receive information that would inform the design process.
- 68 Key areas of interest were the quality of the design, specifically in relation to landscape and urban design, noise, accessibility, stormwater/ecology, cultural heritage and interchange design.
- 69 Feedback received during Phase Two was summarised and reported to the design team for consideration in the development of the design.
- 70 The Peka Peka Road interchange attracted a number of comments from local residents who considered that the configuration did not adequately serve the local area. These concerns were discussed at length by the Project team and KCDC before the design was confirmed. **Mr Nancekivell** explains what informed the preference for the design of the Peka Peka interchange and local roading arrangements.

RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK ON THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

- 71 A number of people considered that the consultation process was good. Others considered that there had been enough consultation and that NZTA just needed to get on with it. Some people felt that they were not being listened to. Criticism of the process was in some cases linked with opposition to the Expressway. I believe that people were given many opportunities to engage with the Project and to provide feedback. In addition to the series of Expos, the information centre was staffed so that people could find out more, and the phone line and website were both available for people to make comment and seek information. I believe that we considered feedback carefully and ensured that designers took account of the issues raised.

¹⁸ MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway Consultation Report May 2011. Available at <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/mackays-to-peka-peka/consultation.html>

FUTURE CONSULTATION

- 72 Consultation will continue with directly affected landowners whose properties are required or partially required and with whom the acquisition process has not yet been finalised. Ongoing engagement will also occur with tangata whenua, KCDC, and other key stakeholders as the Project progresses.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT DURING CONSTRUCTION

- 73 During the construction of the Expressway, engagement and communication with stakeholders and the wider public will be carried out in accordance with the Stakeholder and Communication Management Plan (*SCMP*) as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan.¹⁹ The purpose of the SCMP is to provide a framework to:

- 73.1 Inform the community of construction progress;
- 73.2 Engage with the community in order to foster good relationships and to provide opportunities for learning about the Project;
- 73.3 Provide early information on key Project milestones; and
- 73.4 Respond to queries and complaints.

- 74 The objective of the Engagement and Communication Plan is to promote the overall objective of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (*CEMP*) - to minimise the effects on the surrounding environment and the local community. A range of methods will be employed as appropriate to the specific construction activity. These include, maintaining the Information Centre in Coastlands Mall, free phone and email, establishment of a community liaison group, open days, newsletter, media releases, notifications and mail drops and personal visits. An enquiry and complaints register will be maintained and a process developed for addressing all matters raised.²⁰ The proposed designation conditions requiring the SCMP are discussed in the evidence of **Ms Meade Rose**.

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

- 75 I have reviewed the submissions lodged on the Project that discuss consultation. I will address the main themes in those submissions below. Nothing in these submissions causes me to depart from the conclusions in my evidence.

¹⁹ Refer to *CEMP* Appendix S Stakeholder and Communication Management Plan

²⁰ These methods are explained in more detail in the draft SCMP: CEMP Appendix S.

Early consultation 2009: misleading and inadequate

- 76 A number of submitters consider that the consultation undertaken in 2009 prior to the decision by NZTA to adopt a route that followed the Western Link Road alignment was misleading and inadequate. This consultation was undertaken before I was engaged as the Manager of Stakeholder Engagement and a response to these submissions is therefore addressed in the evidence of **Mr Rod James**.

Phase One and Phase Two: misleading and inadequate

- 77 Some submitters consider that there was inadequate consultation and that the information provided was misleading in its representation of the proposed Expressway. Others also think that the information provided was deliberately confusing and difficult to analyse. A few submitters consider that the opinions expressed by people have been ignored.²¹

- 78 As explained above, there were two phases of consultation and during both, information was provided to all households, Expos were held and a range of opportunities to seek information were provided including team members attending meetings with groups or individuals. In my view, every attempt was made to provide information on the proposed Expressway that enabled people to understand the design. Feedback received as a result of the consultation was taken into account and provided to the designers to consider as part of ongoing design development. Feedback received was not necessarily adopted as a good design idea, as there were other factors to take into account such as technical matters.

No direct contact

- 79 Some submitters, whose properties are in proximity to the proposed Expressway but are not required under the PWA process, are critical of the consultation process and consider that the Project team should have contacted them directly.²² As I set out above under consultation methods, every household was sent information about the proposals and the design as it developed as part of consultation. Contact details were provided with every communication and the Project team responded to requests for more information and meetings. A number of one to one meetings were held at the request of the landowner to explain the design and effects. The team was very responsive to these requests and best endeavours were made to provide as much information as requested.

²¹ Submissions include Anderton (0293), Te Ra School (0340), Alliance for Sustainable Kāpiti (0572), Begovich (0651), and Harris (0713).

²² Submissions include Smith (0011), Handbury-Sparrow (0287), Waikanae Property Development (0474), and Howard (0558).

Consultation during construction

- 80 Several submitters have requested that they are consulted prior to and during construction in order to ensure that effects such as dust and noise are managed and mitigated. They have also asked when the Community Liaison group will be established. The SCMP²³ outlines the process for consultation and communication prior to and during construction. More detailed SCMPs will be produced for each activity to specifically address the anticipated effects and identify those affected with whom the Project team will consult. It is proposed that the Community Liaison Group is established at least 30 days prior to construction and meet to provide a regular forum through which information about the Project can be provided to the community and an opportunity for concerns and issues to be raised with the Project team. It is also proposed that there be two groups – north and south.

Working group

- 81 Kapiti Cycling Inc (submission 0601) and the Implementation Group of the Kapiti Coast District Council Advisory on Cycleways Walkways and Bridleways (submission 0485), request that a working group between the users they represent and the Project team be established during construction to ensure safety during construction. It is proposed to establish a Community Liaison Group for the purposes of communication and consultation during construction and this will be, in my view, the appropriate forum for this.

Positive submissions on consultation

- 82 A number of submitters consider that there have been decades of consultation on roading options in Kāpiti and that it is time to “get on with it”. Others comment that the consultation on this project has been thorough, informative, readily accessible and commendable.²⁴

Key stakeholders

- 83 NZ Historic Places Trust (submission 0647) acknowledges the willingness of the Project team to engage with them. Their submissions states:

In relation to the effects on archaeology and built heritage NZHPT is satisfied that avoidance and mitigation offered by the applicant is sufficient to ensure the effects on archaeology and built heritage over the entire route are less than minor. This agreement is in no small part as a result of the meaningful engagement and consultation that occurred prior to lodgement.

²³ See CEMP Appendix S Stakeholder Communication Plan

²⁴ Submissions include Mason (0148), Wiggs (0298), Henderson (0351), and Kapiti Coast Chamber of Commerce (0665).

- 84 Takamore Trust (submission 0703) acknowledges the positive working relationship with the Project team and that this has been inclusive, constructive and respectful. As recognised in the submission, consultation will continue with the Takamore Trust as discussions on mitigation proposals develop.
- 85 Te Runanga o Te Ati Awa ki Whakarongotai inc (Runanga) (submission 0708) is very satisfied with how the Project team has engaged with them and the high level of sensitivity and respect shown to the concerns of the iwi. They consider that maintaining and enhancing this relationship with NZTA is important.
- 86 KCDC (submission 0682) also acknowledges that the Project team has worked hard to establish and maintain a relationship with Takamore and the Runanga.

CONCLUSIONS

- 87 The two phases of consultation sought feedback on the alignment and the developed design. For each phase key stakeholders and the public were provided with opportunities to comment and engage in discussion about the Project. Throughout the duration of the Project the Project team have had on going liaison with tangata whenua, key stakeholders and directly affected landowners and where requested with the general public including those people whose properties are in proximity to the proposed Expressway. The Project team have been available to people to explain the Project and to listen to their concerns and been responsive to those concerns. In my view, the consultation process has been extensive and meaningful.



Jane Black
3 September 2012

ANNEXURE 1: PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS WHO ATTENDED EXPOS

Name	Role
Andrew Quinn	NZTA Project Manager
Ian Gray	NZTA Property Manager
David Arrowsmith	NZTA Project Interface
Rowan Oliver	NZTA Resource Management Planner
Laura Willoughby	NZTA Resource Management Planner
Mark McGavin	NZTA
Jim Bentley	Alliance Project Manager
Graham Spargo	Approvals Manager
Jane Black	Stakeholder Engagement Manager
Robert Schofield	Consents Manager
Greg Vossler	Resource Management Planner
Louise Miles	Resource Management Planner
Anna Lewis	Resource Management Planner
Alexandra Strawbridge	Resource Management Planner
Marc Baily	Urban Planner
Noel Nancekivell	Design Manager
Ian Billings	Design Advisor
Geoff Brown	Structural Designer
Doug Stirrat	Roading Design Engineer
Lucy Coe	Geotechnical Engineer
Graham Levy	Stormwater and Drainage Engineer
Iain Smith	Stormwater and Drainage Engineer
Eric Whitfield	Traffic Engineer
Boyden Evans	Landscape architect
Matiu Park	Ecologist

Name	Role
Siiri Wilkening	Acoustic Engineer
James Whitlock	Acoustic Engineer
Charles Kirby	Air Quality Engineer
Amos Kamo	Maori Cultural Advisor
Julie Meade Rose	Social Impact Advisor
Stephen Wright	Construction Manager
Andrew Goldie	Construction Manager
David Hoffman	Construction Engineer
Bruce Little	Financial Manager
Stefan Wolf	Information Centre Manager

ANNEXURE 2: TIMELINE OF CONSULTATION

October 2009	NZTA Scoping and Corridor Assessment	6 May 2011	Letter to directly affected confirming land requirements and informing of consultation report Media statement confirming dates and venues for Expos Media statement announcing alignment and interchanges Web page on decision made Radio Advertising - Expo 2 Brochure confirming alignment to all households Ads in paper re expo dates
30 July 2010	0508 M2PP INFO line opened Project website launched info@m2pp.co.nz launched Information centre opened	15 May 2011	Part 2: Public Consultation (EXPO 2)
22 November 2010	Media statement released in morning announcing Expos Advertisements in local papers and radio	17 May 2011	Southwards Car Museum
23 November 2010	Postcards to households informing consultation dates and actions	19 May 2011	Waikanae Memorial Hall
25 November 2010	Individual visits with potentially directly affected property owners	20 May 2011	Kapiti Community Centre Raumati South Memorial Hall
27 November 2010	Consultation Brochures arrived at all households	12 June 2011	Waikanae local area design workshops
28 November 2010	Part 1: Public Consultation (EXPO 1)	15 June 2011	Cycle/Walk/Bridleway design workshop
30 November 2010	Southwards Car Museum	27 June 2011	Close of feedback for Part 2
1 December 2010	Kapiti Community Centre	October 2011	Consultation report for Part 2 available
2 December 2010	Waikanae Memorial Hall Raumati South Memorial Hal	November 2011	Project update newsletter, confirmation of changes to the Peka Peka Interchange design
4 February 2011	Close of feedback for Part 1	January 2011	Project update newsletter
March 2011	Consultation report for Part 1 available	May 2011 through to today	Continuing engagement with directly affected property owners, key stakeholders, and property owners adjoining the Expressway
5 & 6 May 2011	Phone calls to property owners advising of land requirements		
6 May 2011	Postcards to all household with dates and venues for Expos		