

**Before a Board of Inquiry
Northern Corridor Improvements Project**

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act')

In the matter of a Board of Inquiry appointed under section 149J of the Act to consider notices of requirement for designations and resource consent applications by the New Zealand Transport Agency for the Northern Corridor Improvements Project

Statement of evidence of Aimee Frances Brock for the New Zealand Transport Agency (Consultation)

Dated 20 April 2017

KENSINGTON SWAN

18 Viaduct Harbour Avenue Ph +64 9 379 4196
Private Bag 92101 Fax +64 9 309 4276
Auckland 1142 DX CP22001

Solicitor: C M Sheard/N McIndoe
christina.sheard@kensingtonswan.com/nicky.mcindoe@kensingtonswan.com

Table of contents

1	Qualifications and experience	2
2	Involvement with the Project	2
3	Scope of evidence	3
4	Executive summary	4
5	Consultation phases for the Project	5
6	The Transport Agency's consultation objectives for the Project	6
7	Phase 1: Consultation during investigation phase (2014-2015)	7
8	Phase 2: Consultation during pre-lodgement (2016)	9
9	Phase 3: Ongoing consultation post lodgement	10
10	Consultation methods used	11
11	Feedback from consultation	12
12	Summary of outcomes	20
13	Response to submissions	21
14	Conclusions	24

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AIMEE FRANCES BROCK FOR THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY

1 Qualifications and experience

- 1.1 My full name is Aimee Frances Brock.
- 1.2 I am a Communications and Stakeholder Manager at the New Zealand Transport Agency (**'Transport Agency'**). I have been in this position since April 2015.
- 1.3 I have a Bachelor of Communications Studies (BCS) qualification as well as the International Association for Public Participation (**'IAP2'**)'s Certificate in Engagement. I am also a member of IAP2 Australasia and the Public Relations Institute of New Zealand (PRINZ).
- 1.4 I have worked closely with the Transport Agency's Transport Planning team since joining the Transport Agency in 2015, to develop, manage and implement stakeholder engagement and community consultation activities for the Northern Corridor Improvements Project (**'Project'**). Prior to joining the Transport Agency I managed stakeholder engagement, community consultation and communications in various roles for the public health sector for 8 years, worked in a senior communications role for NZ Trade and Enterprise and worked as a business journalist.
- 1.5 My evidence relates to notices of requirement and resource consent applications lodged by the Transport Agency with the Environmental Protection Authority (**'EPA'**) on 14 December 2016 for the Project.
- 1.6 I am authorised on behalf of the Transport Agency to give this evidence.

2 Involvement with the Project

- 2.1 I am familiar with the area that the Project covers and the State highway and local roading network in the vicinity of the Project. I have been the Communications and Stakeholder Manager with primary responsibility for the Project since April 2015. Over the past 2 years I have been part of the core Transport Agency staff members responsible for the Project and have personally participated in all 2015 and 2016 consultation rounds. My

responsibilities have included developing, managing and implementing the Project's strategy to engage and involve stakeholders and the community in the development of the design.

- 2.2 I represented the Transport Agency at key stakeholder workshops held to gain feedback, managed the implementation of the 2015 and 2016 public consultation rounds, analysed the feedback gained through these surveys, workshops and events, and contributed to the writing and approval of the associated consultation reports.
- 2.3 I therefore have knowledge of the Project's decision-making processes that benefited from stakeholder and community feedback, from the initial investigation phases right through to the present time.
- 2.4 While I have been present for some of the iwi consultation undertaken, **Mr Rama** has taken primary responsibility for that aspect of consultation and addresses the consultation undertaken with iwi in his evidence.
- 2.5 I have reviewed Chapter 8 – Consultation and Communication section of the *Assessment of Environmental Effects* ('**AEE**') and confirm that I agree with the contents of that chapter.

3 Scope of evidence

- 3.1 This evidence addresses the following matters:
 - a A summary of my evidence;
 - b Consultation phases for the Project;
 - c The Transport Agency's consultation objectives for the Project;
 - d Phase 1: Consultation during the investigation phase (2014-2015);
 - e Phase 2: Consultation during the pre-lodgement phase (2016);
 - f Phase 3: Ongoing consultation;
 - g Consultation methods;
 - h Feedback from consultation;

- i Summary of outcomes;
- j Comments on submissions lodged in relation to the Project; and
- k Conclusions.

3.2 In preparing this evidence I have reviewed the evidence of **Mr Rama** (Iwi Consultation), **Ms Strogen** (Social Effects), **Mr Greenaway** (Recreation and Reserves) and **Mr Moore** (Project Design).

4 Executive summary

4.1 The consultation strategy for the Project has been informed by the Transport Agency's Public Engagement Policy 2008 and IAP2's best practice principles. Key consultation drivers for the Project derived from these documents focused on regular, timely and meaningful communication with affected landowners, stakeholders and the wider community.

4.2 There have been three phases of consultation from 2014 onwards:

- a During Phase 1 – Consultation during investigation phase (2014-2015), the Transport Agency undertook consultation with identified stakeholders and the wider community to understand their issues and needs, and to inform the development of the Project design at each stage. Methods of engagement used included individual and group meetings, workshops, presentations, newsletters, open days and letter drops. A Project Reference Group was also formed with core functional stakeholders in mid-2014, to provide strategic advice on the Project's fit alongside other regional infrastructure priorities.
- b During Phase 2 – Consultation during pre-lodgement (2016), the Transport Agency informed stakeholders and the community about the approval of the Project's preferred design, and sought further feedback on specific issues. One-on-one meetings, workshops, phone and email correspondence were the main methods of stakeholder engagement during this phase. Further engagement with the wider community began mid-2016 and also focused on detailed

topics. The stakeholder and community feedback helped inform refinements made to the preferred design of the Project.

- c During Phase 3 – Ongoing consultation post lodgement, the Transport Agency is continuing to inform affected parties and the public via meetings with community groups, businesses and stakeholders, letters to neighbouring properties and residents, and public meetings and open days. There are ongoing meetings to address effects on the services and assets of key stakeholders, and one-on-one dialogue with directly affected landowners and operators.
- 4.3 Key stakeholders being consulted on an ongoing basis include Auckland Council, the local boards, Watercare, Auckland Transport ('AT'), Business North Harbour, Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey, walking and cycling groups and utilities. Consultation feedback from these stakeholders, affected landowners and the wider community has played an important part in option selection and design refinement of the Project.
- 4.4 In my opinion, the consultation undertaken in relation to the Project has been robust and comprehensive and has helped shape the form of the Project.

5 Consultation phases for the Project

- 5.1 There have been three phases of consultation for the Project:
- a Phase 1: Consultation during the investigation phase (2014-2015) on a range of options and then the recommended options;
 - b Phase 2: Consultation during the pre-implementation / pre-lodgement phase (2016) on the preferred design; and
 - c Phase 3: Ongoing consultation post-lodgement with the EPA in relation to the concept design.
- 5.2 Each of the consultation phases is discussed in more detail below.

6 The Transport Agency's consultation objectives for the Project

- 6.1 The Transport Agency's Public Engagement Policy 2008 identifies four key commitments to public engagement:
- a Providing genuine opportunities for public contributions;
 - b Ensuring people are informed;
 - c Adopting an inclusive and representative approach to public engagement; and
 - d Maintaining high professional public engagement standards.
- 6.2 The Project consultation objectives align with the commitments within the Engagement Policy.
- 6.3 The IAP2 provides internationally recognised consultation best practice principles. The community engagement spectrum of participation is based on the decisions to be made and the associated level of influence (if any) the community has on Project decision making.¹
- 6.4 Both these documents informed the consultation process adopted for this Project. In summary, the key consultation drivers for the Project have been to:
- a Understand stakeholder and community issues and needs and use information gained to help inform the development of optioneering, design and decision-making at all stages of the Project;
 - b Work with affected land owners/operators to minimise or mitigate any potential impacts on their interests;
 - c Provide multiple opportunities and best practice methods to ensure regular, timely and meaningful input at each stage of the development of the Project, including advising how previous consultation has influenced the design so far; and

¹ See the IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum at Figure 45 in section 8.3.4 of the AEE.

- d Build understanding of the Project's strategic objectives and benefits for both the local and regional population.

7 Phase 1: Consultation during investigation phase (2014-2015)

- 7.1 During Phase 1 of consultation for the Project, consultation was undertaken with the community and stakeholders² to understand their issues and needs, and get their input into first the development of the Project's options, and then the resulting recommended package of works for the Project design.
- 7.2 Engaging with the stakeholders, affected landowners and the wider community at the early stages of the Project also allowed the Transport Agency to build relationships for the future stages of the Project.
- 7.3 Although I was not part of the consultation undertaken in 2014, I was given a comprehensive handover from the previous engagement advisors about the feedback received and key issues when I was employed in April 2015, and then managed the next activities and relationships from that point on until today.
- 7.4 Right from the beginning, a wide range of engagement tools were used. Methods of engagement were tailored for each stakeholder, and included individual and group meetings, workshops, presentations, newsletters, open days and letter drops.³
- 7.5 Neighbourhood and community group engagement and public consultation activities during 2014-2015 took the time to explain the complex optioneering process ahead in easy to understand, plain English to ensure meaningful input could be gathered at this early stage on the Project's objectives. Consultation during this period also asked for feedback at two important points: first for feedback on the issues, benefits and opportunities of the multiple design options being considered for each component, and then later, for feedback on the recommended package of works.

² Stakeholders identified and engaged with during 2014 and 2015 included Auckland Council and its Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs), the Transport Agency's internal stakeholders, Mana Whenua, local boards, business associations and community groups, and the wider community. Table 35 in section 8.4.1 of the AEE contains a full list of key project stakeholders.

³ See the consultation overview poster at Figure 46 in section 8.5.2 of the AEE.

- 7.6 Early meetings with potentially affected landowners and their long-term tenants sought to identify key issues that could affect the assessments or evaluations of the design options as they progressed, and to incorporate ways to minimise impacts.
- 7.7 Core functional stakeholders were also asked to join a Project Reference Group ('PRG'). The PRG was established in mid-2014 as an advisory group which would provide strategic advice on the Project's fit alongside other regional infrastructure priorities. This group consisted of key stakeholders including the Transport Agency and its internal groups, Auckland Council and its subsidiaries (e.g. AT), the local boards, Mana Whenua, relevant utilities including Watercare and Vector, and the former North Harbour Business Association (now known as Business North Harbour).
- 7.8 The PRG met monthly throughout 2014 and 2015 to provide strategic level feedback and advice on the Project's regulatory context, regional transport plans, cultural impacts, economic growth, environmental and operational constraints and opportunities in the geographic area. It also provided advice on engagement processes to follow and identification of key stakeholders. The PRG's advice provided input into the decision-making process during the investigation phase, when the Transport Agency had to assess, evaluate and develop the original multiple options into a single recommended package of works. While the PRG's strategic planning role was intended to be wound up at the end of this phase, the secondary objective of the PRG was to develop close working relationships for further stages of the Project, where engagement methods would transition into one-on-one tailored approaches with each group.
- 7.9 There was also further in-depth engagement with Auckland Council and AT through direct collaboration with the Project Team by various operational teams including staff from the major consenting, closed landfill, stormwater, local roads, walking and cycling and public transport teams. An AT representative was seconded to the Project during 2014 and 2015 to participate in all meetings and to ensure a collaborative

approach in relation to effects on the road network, public transport networks, and walking and cycling routes.

- 7.10 In my view, Phase 1 consultation was successful at introducing and informing stakeholders and the public about the strategic objectives of the Project and provided a robust mechanism for receiving feedback on first, the multiple design options for each component, key issues and benefits, and then the recommended package of works. As a result, a wide variety of feedback was received through a range of mechanisms. This stakeholder and community feedback was used to help inform the Project Team's development of the design at each stage, and were included as criteria in all decision-making processes. **Mr Moore** has elaborated on how this feedback influenced the design refinements in his evidence.⁴

8 Phase 2: Consultation during pre-lodgement (2016)

- 8.1 Consultation during this phase had the dual purpose of both informing stakeholders and the community about the approval of the Project's preferred design, as well as seeking further feedback on specific detailed topics that still needed to be worked on in more detail ahead of lodgement of the concept design.
- 8.2 A one-on-one engagement process was the main method of stakeholder engagement undertaken from January to November 2016, conducted through meetings, workshops, phone and email.⁵ This stakeholder consultation used a collaborative approach in order to progress technical topics such as the design standards for structures and roading, the scope for local road improvements, and proposed environmental, cultural or safety mitigations.
- 8.3 Further engagement with other community groups and the wider public occurred during the public consultation period, which began on 20 June 2016 following the Minister's announcement of the approval of the preferred design (called the "draft alignment plan" in the media release). Public consultation focused on public information days, distribution of a newsletter, feedback from to approximately 48,000 households across the

⁴ Section 6 of Mr Moore's evidence in chief (Project Design).

⁵ See section 8.6.2 of the AEE for list of key stakeholders engaged with.

wider area, and a letter drop to 1,190 neighbouring property owners in the vicinity of the Project. An online survey was also promoted via traditional media channels and online.

- 8.4 This round of public consultation focused on several detailed topics, asking for feedback on the proposed Unsworth Drive bridge, urban design, and walking and cycling.
- 8.5 This stakeholder and community feedback was used to help inform refinements made to the preferred design ahead of lodgement with the EPA at the end of 2016. **Mr Moore** explains in his evidence how this feedback influenced the final form of the concept design that has been lodged.⁶

9 Phase 3: Ongoing consultation post lodgement

- 9.1 Consultation is continuing through the statutory approvals process. I am leading the consultation programme which involves:
- a Meetings with community groups, local boards, road user organisations, local businesses and business associations;
 - b Meetings with key stakeholders (including network utility operators);
 - c Mail outs of letters to neighbouring properties and residents, and general newsletter updates; and
 - d Ongoing public meetings and open days.
- 9.2 This process is aimed at providing the public with information and assisting them with understanding the Project and the design that has been lodged. In some cases, neighbours and landowners have also met with the Project's noise and visual effects experts to start discussing plans for future Project mitigation during the construction and maintenance /operations periods.
- 9.3 Ongoing meetings with key stakeholders (such as AT, Auckland Council Parks, Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust, the Upper Harbour Local Board, Watercare and Transpower) are continuing with the objective of

⁶ Section 6 of Mr Moore's evidence in chief (Project Design).

addressing the effects of the Project on their services and assets. Further details about how these services and utilities are affected by the Project and the mitigation proposed is set out in **Mr McGregor's** evidence.

- 9.4 In addition, the Transport Agency is maintaining regular one-on-one dialogue with directly affected land owners and operators whose properties are required and will therefore proceed through the Public Works Act 1981 acquisition process in due course.

10 Consultation methods used

- 10.1 The consultation methods used for the Project have included:
- a Workshops and presentations to key stakeholders;
 - b Individual and group meetings with other stakeholders;
 - c Letters, operation of an online booking system and individual appointments with affected land and business owners at the Transport Agency Project office in Albany;
 - d Letters to key stakeholders including neighbours affected by proximity and community groups, followed by meetings;
 - e Posters, videos, and e-newsletters with feedback forms;
 - f Publication of a printed newsletter to 48,000 households, distributed four times over the two-year period (approximately every six months) and translated into Chinese and Korean;
 - g 17 public events, including several days at Westfield Albany, business breakfasts, bus station stalls, annual stands at the Business North Harbour Expo, and a club day at Massey University;
 - h Media releases, advertising and articles in newspapers;
 - i Social media feedback campaign (Transport Agency's Twitter and Facebook accounts); and
 - j Project website with online survey and contact details.

11 Feedback from consultation

Project Reference Group

- 11.1 The PRG has performed an important role in informing the Project's strategic direction throughout the design process. During Phase 1 feedback from the PRG focused on:
- a Refinement of the Project objectives;
 - b The strategic importance of future-proofing State Highway 1 and the local road network;
 - c The requirements for mitigations for the impact on landowners and local businesses;
 - d Feedback on various concept designs;
 - e Advice on engagement processes; and
 - f Identification of stakeholders in Phase 1.
- 11.2 As a result of the PRG's feedback, the Project entered into formal engagement processes with many of the organisations to which its members belong at a very early stage, and committed to large-scale public consultation processes. The Transport Agency also allocated significant resource to business and property owner engagement by the Project Team at a very early stage.
- 11.3 During Phase 2, engagement with the members of the PRG moved into a different model of tailored individual engagement, focused on environmental, technical and statutory topics. The feedback from this engagement is covered in the paragraphs below.

Directly affected landowners

- 11.4 During the early stages of the Project, one-on-one meetings were held with potentially affected land and business owners. They were primarily concerned with the uncertainty of the potential impacts of the Project on their business and property interests.

- 11.5 As the design process progressed, there was more certainty about the potential effects of the Project and the affected properties. Based on the design at the beginning of 2016, 160 potentially affected properties were identified. Based on the concept design lodged with the EPA, there are 131 directly affected properties. One-on-one meetings with affected landowners have continued throughout 2016.
- 11.6 Willing negotiations have commenced with a number of affected property owners and tenants as a result of the one-on-one consultation. There is ongoing engagement with affected property owners and occupiers.

Wider community

- 11.7 During Phase 1, feedback from the wider community focused on:
- a Significant support for inclusion of the busway in the Project. Subsequently, in part due to this feedback, the Transport Agency sought and confirmed additional funding for the busway to form part of the Project;
 - b Support in principle for the provision of a new motorway connection between State Highway 18 and State Highway 1;
 - c A range of feedback on the options proposed for the roads that connect with Upper Harbour Highway, and the necessary closure of Unsworth Drive's off-ramp, including the possibility of including an Unsworth overbridge in the Project;
 - d Concerns about the wider impact on the surrounding industrial area, Harbour Hockey and other sports clubs as well as the residential areas, with requests for engagement to be ongoing and consultative;
 - e Specific concerns were raised by property and business owners about the possibility of Paul Matthews Road being closed, which led to ongoing meetings to propose and workshop through other road design options. As a result of this process, which looked at many options, and in recognition of similar feedback from Business North Harbour, the local boards and Watercare, the Project Team decided by the end of the phase to recommend a bridge design and southern

alignment around the hockey site for Paul Matthews Road, as proposed by the business owners;

- f Support for the proposal to develop a Shared Use Path ('**SUP**') along State Highway 1, the busway and State Highway 18; and
- g Other matters outside the scope of the Project – for example, potential for a new bus station on the extension, ways to improve local bus routes, and parking at the existing bus stations. This feedback was passed onto AT. In addition, nearly a third of all comments queried the lack of provision for south and west-facing ramps in the design. In response, the Project Team explained the rationale that a south-facing ramp to State Highway 1 would not provide any benefits without further lane widening on State Highway 1 south of Constellation Drive through Tristram Avenue and Esmonde Road, and that other projects in the future would be able to look at this issue. However, we were also able to explain that even without these ramps, the Project would bring interim benefits to drivers wishing to make these movements. This explanation satisfied many members of the community and over time these queries became less frequent, except for ongoing feedback from Unsworth and Greenhithe residents.

11.8 During Phase 2, feedback from the wider community covered a number of key themes as follows:

- a Busway extension – there was continued strong support for the busway extension;
- b New bus station – there was significant support for a new bus station on the extension, in the lower Albany/Rosedale area. While this aspect is not part of the Project, it is a project is progressing in parallel;
- c Urban design – there were concerns around ensuring that planting, landscaping, artwork and noise wall designs achieve quality urban design outcomes;

- d Walking and cycling facilities – there was support for the recommended SUP alignment, with requests for specific features such as wide pathways and lighting, and a range of proposed connection points;
- e The proposed Unsworth Drive bridge – while some supported the bridge, others opposed the idea because of safety concerns and the risk of traffic using Unsworth Drive as a through-road. Combined with safety analysis and traffic modelling, this feedback helped the Project Team decide not to pursue this option further;
- f Local road improvements – feedback about lane capacity and traffic flows through key intersections such as Caribbean Drive and Greville Road and the bridge at McClymonts Road, which assisted the Project Team’s refinements to the lodged design;
- g South and west-facing State Highway 18/State Highway 1 ramps – while in this phase less questions were raised as to the possibility of including south and west-facing ramps in the Project than in the first phase, residents from Unsworth Heights and Greenhithe (who most regularly make these movements) continued to query this. Again, this assisted the design team’s refinements in the lodged design for the Caribbean Drive and Constellation Drive areas, and the Project Team was able reiterate the interim benefits the design will provide for these residents; and
- h Other matters outside the scope of the Project – further questions were asked about other potential walking and cycling path locations, the proposed SUP on the proposed Spencer Road bridge, and ways to improve parking at the existing bus stations.

Feedback from key stakeholders

Auckland Council

- 11.9 The Project Team has worked closely with Auckland Council in relation to numerous aspects of the Project, particularly with representatives from the Council’s:

- a Stormwater and Healthy Waters Units – this consultation is outlined in **Mr Hughes’** evidence;
- b Closed Landfills and Contaminated Land Response Team (**‘CLCLR’**) – as outlined in **Mr Amputch’s** evidence; and
- c Parks, Sports and Recreation Unit – as set out in **Ms Strogen’s** evidence.

11.10 I have not been directly involved with those aspects of the consultation.

11.11 I have however been directly involved in the collaborative project with Auckland Council’s Parks, Sports and Recreation Unit where we have been working on a solution for the Project’s impact on North Harbour Hockey since 2015.

11.12 At this time, a joint steering group was set up with dedicated team members from the Transport Agency, Auckland Council, Watercare, North Harbour Hockey, the Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust, and Hockey NZ, to investigate options for either reconfiguring or relocating the hockey facility.

11.13 As a result, a proposal has been identified that involves the reconfiguration of the use of Rosedale Park, the grant of long term tenancies to several sports codes, and the provision of additional sports fields. It also allows for Watercare’s expansion plans to serve population growth. Ongoing engagement with the Parks Unit is also being undertaken by the Project Team to ensure onsite activities in its reserves can function during the construction period.

Local Boards

11.14 Both the Upper Harbour and the Hibiscus and Bays Local Boards recognise that the Project is necessary at a strategic level. The key concern of the local boards has been to address the potential impacts of the Project on the North Harbour Hockey Stadium (**‘NHHS’**) and local businesses. The Transport Agency is continuing to work with the local boards on the relocation plans for the NHHS. In addition, the local boards’ feedback has focussed on:

- a The importance of the busway extension and any related projects that improve the level of service for their constituents;
- b The value they see in the new SUPs for encouraging modal shift and more active lives for their constituents;
- c The potential impact on the Unsworth Heights community, including the closure of the Unsworth Drive off-ramp;
- d The location of a stormwater pond at either Bluebird or Rook Reserves; and
- e Involvement with the design of works proposed in relation to various reserves.

Watercare

- 11.15 Regular fortnightly meetings were held with Watercare throughout 2016 to discuss the Project's impact on the Rosedale Wastewater Treatment Plant ('**RWWTP**'). These technical discussions were undertaken by other members of the Project Team. This consultation is outlined in **Mr McGregor's** evidence.⁷

Auckland Transport

- 11.16 Regular meetings have been held between AT and the Project Team to progress the Project footprint and agree on components of the general arrangement drawings throughout the life of the Project. Key matters addressed through this consultation were:
- a Local road improvements, which led to joint planning and decision making;
 - b Local network impacts during and post-construction, which led to joint planning. This included meetings and forward planning with AT's School Travelwise programme team;
 - c Investigations and joint decisions about the proposed overbridge at Unsworth Drive;

⁷ Section 7 of Mr McGregor's evidence in chief (Utilities).

- d The design and standards for the SUP;
- e The design criteria for the Northern Busway extension; and
- f The scope for upgrades at Constellation and Albany Bus Stations (required due to the busway extension).

11.17 More detail on the technical decisions made during the course of the Project's development is outlined in the evidence of **Mr Clark, Mr Moore and Mr Hale**.

11.18 The Transport Agency has also invested significant resources into a partnership project with AT to investigate and plan a potential new bus station between Constellation and Albany Bus Stations. Together AT and the Transport Agency undertook high-level investigations in 2014-15 (including alternatives assessments, design/layout and consultation). These investigations are continuing; however, they do not form part of the Project.

Walking and cycling groups

11.19 Feedback from various cycling and walking groups was sought during interactive workshops. The former Cycle Action Auckland (now Bike Auckland) is generally supportive of the dedicated walking and cycling facilities of the Project, and has identified a number of connecting routes that it considers should be prioritised. There has been ongoing consultation with Bike Auckland to assist with the design development, including feedback on suitable path widths and links to the road network. Walk Auckland is also generally supportive of the Project design, particularly the increased connectivity along the motorway corridor.

Business North Harbour

11.20 Regular meetings have been held with Business North Harbour to update progress on the Project and seek feedback on the development of the design.

11.21 In addition, the Project Team has exhibited at Business North Harbour's annual expo and hosted more than six public meetings or drop-in

sessions in 2015 and 2016 in partnership with Business North Harbour, to specifically inform its members and seek their feedback.

- 11.22 Business North Harbour is generally supportive of the Project, including:
- a The decision to bridge Paul Matthews Road and change the alignment to the southern side of the hockey facility;
 - b The provision of the SUP on the proposed Spencer Road Bridge to help employees gain access to the Corinthian Drive area (although not part of this Project);
 - c Support for the completion of the Western Ring Route and the benefits it will bring; and
 - d Excitement about the general growth the Project would bring to the area.
- 11.23 Ongoing consultation is continuing to take place, and in particular the Project Team is liaising regularly with Business North Harbour's members including the leasing agents on their Commercial Property/Leasing Subcommittee to identify and promote potential relocation sites for affected business owners that keep them within the business zones around the Project area.

Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey

- 11.24 The Project Team has worked closely with Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust ('**HHCT**'), North Harbour Hockey and Hockey NZ since it became clear the design options would affect part of the existing NHHS site in Rosedale Park. As noted above, the hockey parties have been part of the collaborative steering group established in 2015 to find the optimal solution, alongside the Transport Agency, Auckland Council and Watercare.
- 11.25 The steering group continues to meet weekly to find a solution for Hockey that will allow it to maintain its ability to service the hockey community both during construction of the Project and beyond.

- 11.26 HHCT and the Transport Agency have agreed to temporary upgrades of the existing NHHS to ensure the training and international events scheduled for 2017 can still occur. The Project's construction timetable allows Hockey to remain on the existing NHHS until after the conclusion of the events scheduled for November 2017.

Utilities

- 11.27 Vodafone, Vector, Chorus and Transpower all own assets within the Project area that are likely to be affected by the Project works. Ongoing consultation is taking place between the Project Team and these network utility operators to confirm the impact on their assets, understand key constraints and agree on diversions required.
- 11.28 These technical discussions were undertaken by other members of the Project Team. This consultation is outlined in **Mr McGregor's** evidence.

12 Summary of outcomes

- 12.1 Consultation feedback has played an important part in the ongoing option selection and design refinement of the Project and has made a valuable contribution to a number of decisions. **Mr Moore's** evidence addresses how the feedback has been incorporated into the design in detail.⁸ In summary, these areas include:
- a The strategic framework that guided the Project's option development and engagement processes;
 - b The decision to bridge Paul Matthews Road and move its alignment to the southern side of the hockey facility;
 - c The designs for upgrades to other local road intersections or structures, including Caribbean Drive, McClymonts Road and Greville Road;
 - d The decision not to proceed with a bridge at Unsworth Drive;
 - e The decision to relocate the hockey facility;

⁸ Section 6 of Mr Moore's evidence in chief (Project Design).

- f The locations for access points to the SUP and design standards for the SUP;
- g The inclusion and design standards for the busway extension, and upgrades to Constellation and Albany Bus stations; and
- h The construction methodology and environmental mitigations proposed around affected utility and services locations.

13 Response to submissions

13.1 Farro Fresh Food's submission (Submission 126203) requests that it wishes to remain informed to ensure there are no adverse effects on its carpark. In response to this submission, the Project Team has agreed to meet regularly with this submitter to provide updates.

13.2 Mr Fogarty's submission (Submission 126267) suggests that there has been insufficient consultation with the Unsworth Heights community (including a lack of mail drops and meetings, and insufficient information at open days). He comments that the public notice should have been online and that letter drops should have been in several languages. In response, I note the following:

- a In my view, the consultation undertaken, as outlined above, has been robust, comprehensive and in line with best practice;
- b Special efforts were made to contact and involve the Unsworth Heights community throughout 2014, 2015, and 2016, including:
 - i Letter drops on more than six occasions. This included letters inviting and advising them in advance of the consultation open days in 2014, 2015 and 2016, tailored letters in December 2016 to those households that may be affected by noise or visual effects, inviting them to meet with the Project Team, and a follow up tailored letter in February 2017 advising a wider area of the EPA public submission process and how it may affect them;
 - ii Hand delivery of Chinese and Korean language handouts in both 2014 and 2015, and on every piece of collateral from 2016, the

inclusion of information in all printed newsletters explaining how to request additional translated information;

- iii Printed newsletter and consultation material was delivered to around 48,000 North Shore households on four occasions, including a specially printed newsletter in June 2016 delivered to 1,788 Unsworth Heights households. This newsletter had a cover letter and freepost survey, inviting recipients to be involved in specific consultation on the proposed Unsworth Bridge. A total of 104 Unsworth Heights residents responded to the Unsworth Bridge survey and 263 people responded to the online survey. From these two feedback methods, 269 people responded to a question on their level of support for a proposed Unsworth Bridge. As part of this consultation, we also asked respondents to self-identify their suburb. This showed that 154 respondents noted they resided in Unsworth Heights or owned a nearby business.
- iv Specific local open days were held in the Unsworth Heights neighbourhood throughout the period, including hosting an open day at the Meadowood Community Centre in 2015 and a public drop day at Mosaik Café at Constellation Drive in 2016. The Project Team also attended a community planting day in 2016, where 100 people attended including the Albany Newcomers Group consisting of member of primarily Chinese descent. The Chinese translator spoke about the Project and distributed Chinese language newsletters. The Project Team has also recently attended a second open day at Meadowood Community Centre for Easter in 2017.
- v Individual meetings have been held on numerous occasions with a wide range of Unsworth Heights parties including resident group representatives, the Upper Harbour Local Board, Westminster School, Meadowood Community Centre, the collective of Greenwich Way business and retail operators, the Accident & Emergency Centre, local fire station and Greenwich Gardens Retirement Village.

- vi The Project Team's commitment to consulting with this neighbourhood was also clearly illustrated by the special consultation exercise undertaken for the proposed Unsworth Bridge.
 - vii More information on all these consultation exercises is contained in Chapter 8 – Consultation and Communication section of the AEE and further detail is attached as Appendix E of the AEE.
- c The EPA public notice was published online on the EPA's website and a link was also provided by the Transport Agency's website to this information. In addition, the Transport Agency went further and funded an additional advertising campaign in both printed newspapers and on the NZ Herald's website. Statistics show this online Herald advert reached 305,500 people and was clicked on to be read approximately 2000 times.
- 13.3 Meadowood Community House and Crèche's submission (Submission 126233) seeks to ensure that there is a good flow of communication available so that all parties involved are well-informed.⁹ In particular, greater communication between the submitter and the Transport Agency is sought regarding details and updates of the Project, given that the Community House is a hub for communication with local residents on issues that impact on the local community.
- 13.4 As outlined above, like other properties in the Unsworth Heights area, the facility has been contacted multiple times over the last two years (refer to all methods described in section 13.2). An open day was held at the Meadowood Community House in 2015 and a second open day was held during Easter this year. In addition, several individual meetings have occurred with the land owner, Auckland Council and Meadowood Community House and Crèche in 2016-2017. The Project Team considers this facility an important community partner, and in response to this feedback, is happy to commit to additional and ongoing communication

⁹ Page 4 of Meadowood Community House and Crèche's submission.

during the construction phase. This commitment is outlined by **Ms Strogen** in her evidence.¹⁰

14 Conclusions

- 14.1 Consultation and engagement has been an important element of the development of the Project. The consultation to date has influenced the Project in terms of the options development and refinement of the Project design.
- 14.2 The Transport Agency has undertaken regular, timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders, affected landowners and the wider community. Therefore, it is my opinion that robust and comprehensive consultation has assisted in shaping the Project.



Aimee Frances Brock

20 April 2017

¹⁰ Paragraph 11.4 of Ms Strogen's evidence in chief (Social Effects).