

**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 designation and resource consent applications by the New Zealand Transport Agency for the Northern Corridor Improvements Project

---

**Statement of evidence of Louise Strogen for the New Zealand Transport Agency (Social impact)**

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	Code of conduct.....	4
4	Scope of evidence .....	4
5	Executive summary.....	5
6	Methodology .....	6
7	Existing environment.....	8
8	The benefits of the Project .....	9
9	Construction effects (temporary) .....	11
10	Operational effects.....	16
11	Mitigation methods.....	18
12	Response to submissions .....	20
13	Response to section 149G(3) key issues report .....	24
14	Conclusions .....	26
	Annexure A: Relevant experience .....	28
	Annexure B: Project's social effects assessment framework .....	29

## STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LOUISE STROGEN FOR THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY

### 1 Qualifications and experience

- 1.1 My full name is Louise Strogen.
- 1.2 I hold Master of Science in City and Regional Planning from the University of Wales College of Cardiff, now known as Cardiff University.
- 1.3 I am a Senior Environmental Planning Consultant and Team Leader of the Wellington Environment and Planning Team at Aurecon New Zealand Limited ('**Aurecon**'). Aurecon was established in 2009 and specialises in engineering, advisory and planning consultancy services.
- 1.4 I have been employed at Aurecon since May 2008. Prior to this, I held a range of relevant planning positions in the public and private sectors since 1995 in the United Kingdom.
- 1.5 I have had over 20 years' experience in environmental planning and consultation. My experience spans statutory, policy and strategic planning, the management of consultation and the assessment of effects including those concerning the social consequences of projects.
- 1.6 My relevant experience specific to social impact assessment includes examples set out in **Annexure A**.
- 1.7 My evidence relates to the New Zealand Transport Agency's ('**Transport Agency's**') resource consent applications and notices of requirement lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority ('**EPA**') on 14 December 2016 for the Northern Corridor Improvements Project ('**Project**').

### 2 Involvement with the Project

- 2.1 Since early 2016, one of my roles in the Project has been to undertake an assessment of social impacts. In this role, I have worked alongside the Transport Agency's Stakeholder and Communications Team and with the Project's other technical specialists to understand all the issues that could potentially have a social effect.

- 2.2 I have carried out the following as part of my role to gain insight into the Project area, its community, and attitudes towards the Project:
- a Visited the area on a number of occasions, either as part of an organised group or on my own which have been undertaken at different times of the day as well as weekends and evenings;
  - b Reviewed the stakeholder and public feedback from both the Phase 1 Consultation exercises considering the range of options and recommended option (2014-2015) and the Phase 2 consultation exercise on the preferred design (2016);
  - c Reviewed consultation reports and Project information distributed to the public;
  - d Attended meetings with groups and individuals that may experience social effects as a result of the Project;
  - e Attended the majority of the meetings with Auckland Council ('AC') Parks, Sports and Recreation Unit in respect of the Project's requirement for passive reserve land;<sup>1</sup>
  - f Participated in technical specialist workshops; and
  - g Participated in public open days at Albany Westfield and the NCI Project Office.
- 2.3 In addition to providing expert input on potential social effects, I have assisted in the preparation of the Assessment of Environmental Effects ('AEE') (Volume 2 of the lodgement package) for the notices of requirement and applications for resource consents lodged with the EPA by the Transport Agency in December 2016.
- 2.4 I am the lead author of the *Assessment of Social Effects* technical report (13 December 2016) that formed part of the AEE lodged in support of the Project. The other authors are my colleagues Michelle Burns and Mikayla

---

<sup>1</sup> The reserves are Tawa, Arrenway, Centorian, Meadowood, Alexandra Stream, Rook Reserve, Omega Reserve and Bluebird Reserve. The meetings with AC Parks representatives have occurred on a regular and continued basis. The outcomes of these meetings is discussed in detail and forms a large part of the evidence of Mr Greenaway.

Woods of Aurecon who assisted with data collection and collation as well as the description of the existing environment.

- 2.5 In preparing this evidence, I have reviewed that report and confirm that the content and conclusions set out in that report remain unchanged.

### **3 Code of conduct**

- 3.1 I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the current Environment Court Practice Note (2014), I have complied with it in the preparation of this evidence, and will follow the Code when presenting evidence to the Board. I also confirm that the matters addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I rely on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

### **4 Scope of evidence**

- 4.1 This evidence addresses the following matters:
- a A summary of my evidence;
  - b Methodology;
  - c The existing environment;
  - d The benefits of the Project;
  - e Construction effects;
  - f Operational effects;
  - g Mitigation methods;
  - h Comments on submissions lodged in relation to the Project;
  - i Response to section 149G(3) key issues report; and
  - j Conclusions.
- 4.2 In preparing this evidence, I have reviewed the following evidence:

- a Mr Glucina, Transport Agency;
- b Mr Moore, Project Design;
- c Ms Brock, Consultation;
- d Mr Rama, Iwi Consultation;
- e Mr Greenaway, Recreation and Reserves;
- f Ms Wilkening, Noise;
- g Mr Bluett, Air Quality;
- h Mr Bray, Landscape and Urban Design;
- i Mr Schofield, Alternatives;
- j Mr Hughes, Stormwater;
- k Mr Clark, Transportation; and
- l Mr McGahan, Planning.

## 5 Executive summary

- 5.1 In my opinion, the overall net social effect of the Project will be positive.
- 5.2 My evidence describes the methodological framework I have used for assessing the social impacts of the Project. This framework is informed by the Act as well as the Transport Agency's *Z19 State Highway Environmental and Social Responsibility Standard* (February 2016),<sup>2</sup> its *Guide to Assessing Social Impacts for State Highway Projects* (October 2015),<sup>3</sup> and the International Association for Impact Assessment's ('IAIA') criteria concerning social impact assessment ('SIA').<sup>4</sup>
- 5.3 The existing social environment for the Project is broadly defined by the communities adjacent to the Project area which consist of nine Census

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/Highways-Information-Portal/Technical-disciplines/Environment-and-social-responsibility/Standard/16-053-A13108-011-Standard-table-12072016.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/resources/guide-to-assessing-social-impacts-for-state-highway-projects/guide-to-assessing-social-impacts-for-state-highway-projects-draft.pdf>. This is a draft document with a final document yet to be confirmed.

<sup>4</sup> International Association for Impact Association, 2003 *Social Impact Assessment International Principles*.

Area Units ('CAU') that either abut or straddle the Project area. The existing social environment of this study area is the baseline that I have used to undertake my assessment of social effects.

- 5.4 The potential negative construction effects consist of impacts on individuals and businesses who will be displaced by the Project through property acquisition or those who may experience temporary disruption from construction activity. In addition, residents and businesses within the Unsworth Heights area will also be affected by new access arrangements.
- 5.5 These effects are manageable either by property purchase and associated compensation (for property related effects) or through the use of environmental management techniques to avoid other construction related effects as set out in the proposed conditions. However, additional measures are proposed in the proposed conditions which will address residual social effects. These include the establishment of a Stakeholder and Community Plan.
- 5.6 The operational effects of the Project are positive, and include its benefits for the community relating to reduced travel times, separation of local and State highway traffic, safety improvements and the provision of pedestrian and cycleway facilities resulting in better connectivity, and enhanced landscape planting within the State highway corridor.
- 5.7 I have read all submissions raising social effects issues. I confirm that the matters raised do not alter the views I express in the Assessment of Social Effects and in this evidence.
- 5.8 I have recommended an amendment to the proposed conditions, to provide for regular consultation events and information days with the community (residents, business) and stakeholders. These events will facilitate input into the management of construction impacts including road closures and traffic management plans.

## **6 Methodology**

- 6.1 The methodology developed for my assessment of social effects for the Project used a standard approach applied to roading projects in New Zealand. It involved scoping the assessment and developing an

appropriate social impact assessment framework and then undertaking an assessment of the Project against this by considering effects and evaluating ways to mitigate negative effects from a social perspective.

- 6.2 Tasks I undertook to develop the Project assessment framework were:
- a A review of the Act - section 5 (promote sustainable management), section 7 (other matters) and Schedule 4 (assessment of effects on the environment);
  - b A review of IAIA framework for the assessment of social impacts;
  - c A review of the Transport Agency's *Z19 State Highway Environmental and Social Responsibility Standard and Guide to Assessing Social Impacts for State Highway Projects*;
  - d Consideration of social issues identified in the review of literature, including SIA prepared for other roading projects within New Zealand;
  - e Consideration of social issues identified in statutory and non-statutory planning framework and policy environment applicable to the Project and Project area;
  - f A review of the feedback from the community engagement undertaken for the Project from 2014 - 2016; and
  - g Development of a project profile by way of site visits, analysis of local data, meetings with local community groups, as well as liaison with other technical experts.
- 6.3 The Project's assessment framework (see **Annexure B**) largely follows IAIA framework criteria which, I further adapted based on elements of the Transport Agency's *Guide to Assessing Social Impacts for State Highway Projects* and as well as community feedback, to fit the Project's range of likely issues and impacts at both the regional and local level.
- 6.4 I used the data from the Project area profiling and existing environment to identify and describe social effects (positive and negative).

- 6.5 With regard to assessing effects, I confirmed an affected community range so that an assessment of the equity of distribution using an approximate proportion of local people likely to be affected by the Project could be applied. In addition, I used the rating of social effects matrix as contained in section 7 of the Transport Agency's *Guide to Assessing Social Impacts for State Highway Projects* to complete my assessment.

## **7 Existing environment**

- 7.1 The Assessment of Social Effects contains a detailed description of the existing social environment from which I have extrapolated this summary.<sup>5</sup>
- 7.2 The study area considered for my assessment relates to nine CAUs (Albany, Fairview, Northcross, Pinehill, North Harbour East, Windsor Park, Unsworth Heights, Sunnynook and Target Road) which abut or straddle the Project area. I consider this study area to be representative of the directly affected and neighbouring properties to the Project area.
- 7.3 Reference to the 2013 Census returns for the study area confirms that it is an area of growth, accommodating a diverse population which is predominantly in its mid-30's with a high proportion of young families. A large number of the population is working.
- 7.4 The Project area itself is predominantly road corridor. The area immediately adjacent to the road corridor is largely industrial with residential activity only directly abutting the corridor to the south of SH18/Upper Harbour Highway ('UHH') and north east of the upper section of SH1.
- 7.5 There is a high proportion of commercial / industrial land use within the Project area. The North Harbour Business Park is located to the north of the UHH between Paul Matthews Road and the Albany Highway. Another cluster is located along Constellation Drive/Apollo Way/Rosedale Road with a third block straddling Rosedale Road to the west of its intersection with SH1.

---

<sup>5</sup> Section 4, Assessment of Social Effects.

- 7.6 To the north of the Project area, the Albany industrial estate is still under development. It forms part of a wider mixed use development area containing the Albany Mega Shopping Centre and a Westfield Shopping Centre.
- 7.7 The southern section of the study area is a well-established suburban residential area (Windsor Park, Unsworth Heights and Sunnynook), typically characterised by detached dwellings at low to medium densities. The newer residential areas to the north (Albany Heights, Fairview Heights, Oteha Valley (Northcross), Pinehill, Fairview), are generally medium to low densities. The majority of the residential land use is set back from the Project area along SH1 but the recent subdivision occurring at the western edge of the Pinehill/Fairview area has units abutting the boundary of the State highway.
- 7.8 A network of open space is interspersed throughout the study area with a number of key sporting facilities also present. This network is described in detail in **Mr Greenaway's** evidence.<sup>6</sup> Overall, my review of the study area indicates that the community is well served in terms of social infrastructure, having access to a range of day to day and higher order facilities and services.
- 7.9 In this section of the motorway network, SH1 and SH18 undertake a dual role not only completing the northernmost link of the Western Ring Route ('WRR') but also functioning as a north-south route for the local community between retail and services. Use of vehicles is the predominant mode of travel within the study area. The bus service within the study area is well used and there is demand for further service.
- 7.10 An existing cycleway network is present which utilises the local roading network but it is patchy with no defined north-south route.

## **8 The benefits of the Project**

- 8.1 A major outcome of the Project is the completion of final section of the WRR to motorway standard which is explained in more detail within the

---

<sup>6</sup> Section 7 and Annexure B of Mr Greenaway's evidence in chief.

evidence of **Mr Glucina**,<sup>7</sup> **Mr Moore**<sup>8</sup> and **Mr Clark**.<sup>9</sup> The completion of this recognised strategic network within Auckland will have regional benefits to the wider community in their inter-regional journeys (beyond Auckland northwards) and intra-urban traffic movement (from/to north, west and south Auckland).

- 8.2 From a social impact perspective, completion of this strategic route will be beneficial to the community as a whole in terms of accessibility and connectivity. In addition, travel times will substantially improve throughout the area, and will have a moderate to significant positive effect on the wider community. Feedback from stakeholders and the general community has indicated strong support for the overall Project, in terms of its strategic importance. The improved accessibility and connectivity will help meet community expectations of travel times, reliability, efficiency and safety.
- 8.3 The operation of the Project will provide a range of positive social benefits including improved access to social facilities in the surrounding area, and reduced queue lengths along the local roading network in the area which in turn improves their day to day pattern of living.
- 8.4 The Northern Busway route is an extremely popular commuter service for residents of the Project area and further afield. Implementation of the proposed extension for Constellation Bus Station to Albany Bus Station will reduce average bus journey times and improve the reliability of the service. Reduced traffic volumes on the local roads along which local bus services travel will benefit the journey time and reliability of these services too. These improvements will have a significant positive impact for users in terms of their way of life. With more service reliability, a mode shift from the car to public transport is anticipated and I consider this to be a positive social impact.
- 8.5 The Project will provide greater connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists, with the provision of the dedicated north–south shared use path (**'SUP'**) along SH1 and the east-west SUP along SH18. Links to the existing

<sup>7</sup> Paragraphs 4.1 and 6.5-6.9 of Mr Glucina's evidence in chief.

<sup>8</sup> Section 7 of Mr Moore's evidence in chief.

<sup>9</sup> Paragraphs 8.2 and 9.1 of Mr Clark's evidence in chief.

pedestrian and cycleway routes will be provided, creating an enhanced network providing more direct connections between locations within the Project area over the current situation. In total, the new SUPs are predicted to result in approximately 350 new daily cycle trips across the network in 2026.<sup>10</sup> In my opinion this is a significant social benefit resulting in improved active transport, and enabling important contributions to access, travel choice and wellbeing for the local community.

- 8.6 In general terms, it is likely that economic benefits will arise from the Project both from the construction phase and from the improvements outlined above with respect to accessibility and travel time surety for both people and freight. The latter should reduce lost revenue arising from delays and cancellations as currently experienced by users of the SH1/SH18 routes.
- 8.7 The Project will itself contribute to the regional economy, having a build budget of \$700 million with employment and revenue opportunities for the construction and infrastructure support industry in the region. With a work force of approximately 300 necessary to construct the Project, indirect benefits will be seen in the local area through the increase in day-to-day purchases by the workforce. I do acknowledge that this will be temporary and will reduce over time, but its positive impact should not be overlooked.

## **9 Construction effects (temporary)**

- 9.1 I consider that the majority of adverse social effects associated with the Project are linked to the construction phase, and will be temporary in nature and transient as the works will be undertaken in a staged manner cross the Project area. Construction works have the potential to be socially disruptive and present an annoyance to residents and road users depending on how well they are managed. The construction phase is estimated to cover a period of three and a half years, however I note that no one will be exposed to construction activities for the whole construction period.

---

<sup>10</sup> Assessment of Social Effects, 5.3.1, page 39.

- 9.2 The Project construction may result in the following social effects:
- a Impacts on transportation;
  - b Restrictions on access to recreation reserves;
  - c Disruption and stress from unmanaged construction conditions;
  - d Restrictions on business/loss of business; and
  - e Challenged expectations of neighbourhood amenity, character and safety.

*Transportation*

- 9.3 The Project will generate some adverse effects on the transport network whilst construction occurs within the State highway corridor, impacting on people's day-to-day patterns. The adverse effects likely to be experienced include longer journey times, frustration over congestion, and a potential loss of revenue for businesses as a result of delays. The Project may also affect children's way of life due to traffic disruptions resulting in longer travel times to and from school. These construction impacts on the transport network will be temporary and are unlikely to have regional economic consequences.
- 9.4 During construction, it is expected that traffic and bus services will be temporarily impacted by an increase in congestion as a result of traffic management measures (reduced lane widths, temporary road closures and associated detours). The effects will be temporary and localised and can be planned for in advance. As set out in **Mr Clark's** evidence,<sup>11</sup> a Construction Traffic Management Plan is required by the draft conditions which will ensure that the potential traffic effects are appropriately managed.<sup>12</sup> I consider that the construction effects will have a minor to moderate disruption on people's way of life.

---

<sup>11</sup> Paragraph 13.1 of Mr Clark's evidence in chief.

<sup>12</sup> Refer resource consent conditions CTMP.1 to CTMP.3 attached as Annexure A of Mr McGahan's evidence.

### *Accessibility to Reserves*

9.5 Several reserves may temporarily be inaccessible during the construction period. This has the potential to generate minor to moderate adverse effects on people's way of life as access to recreation space may be limited. As set out in **Mr Greenaway's** evidence, the impact on reserves during the construction phase will occur on a staged basis over the entire period of the construction of the Project.<sup>13</sup> Any impact on reserves will be temporary in nature and as outlined by **Mr Greenaway** there are other reserves within the local area that offer alternative locations for recreational activity.<sup>14</sup>

### *Disruption and stress*

9.6 There is the potential for adverse effects on the wellbeing of the local community. However, based on the feedback from the extensive consultation undertaken, there is not an overriding level of stress in the community about the Project effects. I have been involved in ongoing consultation with property owners and the wider community throughout the process to ensure the community is kept in the loop to the best extent possible. This has included face to face meetings with local residents and technical specialists (in particular acoustics) to discuss the Project details and how it is likely to affect them directly. Irrespective of this, there is still the potential for stress and anxiety effects to arise. These effects are difficult to quantify and will be experienced at different levels by different people. However, it is vital that discussions with the community continue throughout the construction process to ensure they are kept informed of progress and duration of works.

9.7 Where possible the Project components have been designed in order to minimise the direct effect on residential and businesses properties. However, it is likely that some individuals within the Project area have placed plans to upgrade/sell property on hold due to uncertainty with Project design or construction timing. In addition, the presence of the Project may cause reticence in investment and development or create uncertainty in terms of lease and tenancy arrangements. Further

---

<sup>13</sup> Paragraph 8.9 of Mr Greenaway's evidence in chief.

<sup>14</sup> Paragraph 5.6 and 7.30 of Mr Greenaway's evidence in chief.

information on Project timing and design will assist the local community in plan making, therefore mitigation in the form of Project information and updates will be critical.

- 9.8 In his evidence **Mr Bluett** states that during the construction phase, amenity and nuisance from earthworks is likely unless managed.<sup>15</sup> A Dust Management Plan is proposed and will include the primary management approach of suppression of dust at its source, and a dust monitoring programme to measure the effectiveness of the mitigation and facilitate a rapid response if, and when additional dust mitigation is required. With these controls in place, the likelihood of health, amenity and nuisance effects associated with air quality within the Project area is being low.
- 9.9 I acknowledge that construction noise and vibration levels are always higher than noise and vibration levels from the ongoing operation of a road. In her evidence, **Ms Wilkening** identifies potential short-term disturbance to occupants of specific buildings as a result of construction noise and in particular piling activity during Project construction.<sup>16</sup> A Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan ('**CNVMP**') is required under the draft conditions.<sup>17</sup> The CNVMP will include measures such as scheduling works to minimise disruption and erection of temporary noise barriers, equipment maintenance, and communication with neighbouring residents and businesses ahead of works taking place. With these measures in place, I do not consider that there is any need for additional mitigation from a social perspective.
- 9.10 As explained by **Mr Bray** in his evidence, there is a potential for visual effects arising from construction activity in close proximity to the motorway, particularly around SH18 and the new Colliston Rise / Spencer Road subdivision.<sup>18</sup>
- 9.11 **Mr Bray** considers that the mitigation of visual effects along SH18 can largely be achieved through a construction of the boundary fence as recommended in his evidence.<sup>19</sup> However, this fence needs to be erected

<sup>15</sup> Paragraphs 8.2 and 8.6 of Mr Bluett's evidence in chief.

<sup>16</sup> Paragraph 9.4 of Ms Wilkening's evidence in chief.

<sup>17</sup> Condition CNV.1, of the resource consent conditions attached as Annexure A of Mr McGahan's evidence.

<sup>18</sup> Paragraphs 13.57-13.59 of Mr Bray's evidence in chief.

<sup>19</sup> Paragraph 13.45 of Mr Bray's evidence in chief.

prior to the main construction works starting. He has also recommended that the proposed planting adjacent to this fence be undertaken as quickly as practicable.

- 9.12 As outlined by **Mr Bray**, there are little mitigation opportunities available around Colliston Rise, and many of the adjacent properties as well as some of those more elevated, will have views of the construction activity in this part of the Project. Whilst new residents in this area will also experience construction disturbance from other sources around them, **Mr Bray** considers that the construction visual effects of the Project in this area, although temporary, will be high.<sup>20</sup> Early engagement with the residents of these properties will be required to ensure they are aware of the construction sequence and duration works at this location as a way of social mitigation.<sup>21</sup>

#### *Business*

- 9.13 I consider that there are potential social impact issues for businesses with road frontage access that will be disrupted by the construction works<sup>22</sup> or by way of construction access through lots.<sup>23</sup> The effects are:
- a Partial severance or restriction for operational access;
  - b Potential loss of business vitality/viability if disruption is for extended periods; and
  - c Potential loss of staff or viability of operations due to staff and/or employment pressures.
- 9.14 While general Project communications may assist business owners to plan for disruption, it is my view that additional mitigation by way of a condition dealing with the management of business disruption is necessary to ensure that these businesses remain operational during the construction works.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Paragraph 13.59 of Mr Bray's evidence in chief.

<sup>21</sup> Paragraph 13.60 of Mr Bray's evidence in chief.

<sup>22</sup> For example, Paul Matthews Road, Rosedale Road, and Constellation Drive.

<sup>23</sup> For example, Rosedale Road, Arrenway Drive, Cowley Place, Saturn Place, and Bush Road.

<sup>24</sup> Condition SCP.4 of the resource consent conditions attached as Annexure A of Mr McGahan's evidence.

### *Challenged expectations*

- 9.15 Construction works can be socially disruptive and present an annoyance to the surrounding community, depending on how well they are managed. This will vary depending on how closely located each community member is to the construction activity, and the duration of exposure. Particularly disruptive construction activities may impact on use of outdoor living areas, or impact on sleeping patterns.
- 9.16 The impact in terms of neighbourhood identity is considered to be short term and restricted to properties where construction access may be required, thus will not present a risk to neighbourhood/community cohesion.
- 9.17 Overall, there is the potential for reduced liveability for the local community. However, the normal living patterns of the community will be retained throughout Project construction, as the closure of community services or facilities is not required (except for some recreational areas, as discussed).
- 9.18 However, with appropriate mitigation, these effects can be managed to a level that is less than minor.

## **10 Operational effects**

- 10.1 The key potential adverse social effects arising from the operation of the Project relate to noise, air quality and property impacts.
- 10.2 In her evidence **Ms Wilkening** confirms that a number of sensitive receivers (residential properties and childcare facilities) will be effected by increased noise once the Project is operational. Consequently, mitigation measures in the form of either building upgrade or the installation of noise barriers are proposed.<sup>25</sup> I support this measure as it will provide for the well-being and amenity of those residing or working at the affected properties.

---

<sup>25</sup> Paragraph 12.13 of Ms Wilkening's evidence in chief.

- 10.3 **Mr Bluett** confirms in his evidence that no mitigation or monitoring of effects from vehicle emissions is required once the Project is operational, as vehicle emissions to air are very unlikely to exceed the relevant criteria (AQNES, ambient air quality guidelines and AC air quality targets).<sup>26</sup> Consequently, I do not consider that there will be any social impacts from air emissions when the Project becomes operational as the health and well-being of the Project area community will not be affected.
- 10.4 Property acquisition is necessary for the Project, with 131 separate land parcels required either in full or in part for the designations. Of these parcels, three commercial/industrial parcels are required in full while the remainder constitute partial requirements.
- 10.5 The Project design has ensured that residential property requirements have been kept to a minimum, by keeping the majority of effects within rear yards and not the dwelling house itself. Of the eight residential lots affected, four have been acquired in full by the Crown, of which two are vacant lots within a subdivision under development. I do not consider that this level of effect on the residential properties within the Project area gives rise to any social effects concerning neighbour identity or cohesion as the number of properties affected is very low.
- 10.6 I acknowledge the Project impact on the business community is higher, with 44 business units directly affected. These businesses vary in type, consisting of retail trade, professional, and technical services, with their customer portfolio ranging from the local community to a regional base. Fewer than 50 percent of these businesses provide Auckland wide, or regional services. Considering this diversity and the size of the businesses concerns, it is my opinion that if any businesses were to close as a result of the Project, it will not undermine the business and retail sector of this area of the North Shore, and therefore will not result in adverse social effects. The affected business and property owners will be compensated for any loss under the Public Works Act 1981.

---

<sup>26</sup> Paragraphs 10.5-10.8 of Mr Bluett's evidence in chief.

## 11 Mitigation methods

- 11.1 A Construction Environmental Management Plan ('**CEMP**') is proposed which requires a suite of management and control measures identified by the technical experts to deal with environmental issues which may give rise to social effects on well-being (including health), amenity and accessibility, as explained above. I support the requirement for a Dust Management Plan; Construction Traffic Management Plan; a Contaminated Site Management Plan; and a CNVMP.
- 11.2 I also support the requirement in the resource consent conditions for an Urban Design and Landscape Plan ('**UDLF**') which will set out the details of the permanent landscape and visual mitigation works. This requirement will ensure that the concepts outlined in the draft UDLF are delivered to the benefit of the local community. In addition, the UDLPs are required to include measures to mitigate construction impacts on reserves affected by the Project. The Reserve Reinstatement Plans will be prepared in consultation with AC as part of a reserve reinstatement package.
- 11.3 Outside of peak traffic periods traffic management measures will be implemented to adequately manage adverse traffic effects to be no more than minor. Where carparks at the Park and Ride at Albany Bus Station are required to be temporarily occupied by the Project, alternative parking options are to be identified.
- 11.4 I acknowledge that concern and anxiety from local residents and business owners cannot be fully mitigated or avoided, therefore I consider that keeping the community informed through regular communication and engagement is the most effective mitigation measure. I consider that most adverse social impacts are able to be reduced or mitigated by the implementation of the Stakeholder and Communications Plan as required by condition SCP.1. This plan must provide for the following:
- a The appointment of a Community Liaison Manager;
  - b A communications strategy;
  - c The identification of key stakeholders;

- d The establishment of a series of liaison meetings with quarterly briefings for key stakeholders;
  - e The establishment of regular community meetings to allow community input into detailed design elements and to be informed about upcoming works (these meetings will be conducted under a Charter established in accordance with the IAP2 Guidelines and approved by AC);
  - d Measures to maximise opportunities for customer and service access to businesses during construction;
  - e Measures to mitigate potential severance and loss of business visibility during construction;
  - f Other measures to assist businesses to maintain accessibility; and
  - h Implementation of a formal complaints/feedback process.
- 11.5 While it is intended that this is a live document to be continually updated over the course of the Project, its first iteration needs to be in place prior to construction work commencing. Its purpose is to disseminate information regarding the construction of the Project in advance of it taking place, including proposed mitigation measures. A key component will be the formal feedback process, where the output will be monitored with responses employed quickly. It is just as important for this information to be used to inform future mitigation responses as the Project works through its staged development. The process of engaging with the community as site specific measures are developed means the measures will be tailored to community values, and more readily accepted.
- 11.6 To assist with the construction phase engagement, I have recommended the use of regular consultation events and information days to provide a point of contact with the neighbouring residential and business communities in addition to more established stakeholder groups. Such an approach will provide a useful mechanism giving the neighbouring community the opportunity to have input into the management of the Project effects and its construction, and to also be informed in advance of upcoming works including closures and in relation to traffic management

plans. Changes are proposed to condition SCP.3 as outlined in the revised resource consent conditions attached as Annexure A of **Mr McGahan's** evidence.

- 11.7 In recognition of the large business community within the Project area, condition SCP.4 requires the Stakeholder and Community Plan to include measures for the management of business disruption which will be essential assistance for affected local businesses. This will allow this community to plan ahead and reduce impacts on both staff and customers. A key component of this measure will be advanced warning and signage during works.

## 12 Response to submissions

- 12.1 I have read the submissions lodged on the Project. A number of these submissions raise matters that I consider relevant to social aspects of the Project. My responses to those submissions are set out below.
- 12.2 A submission has been received from Ms Tregonning (submission 126095) outlining her concerns that access to Albany Bus Station is difficult from Brown's Bay and without a dedicated access from Greville Road onto the busway for local bus routes, patronage will decline. As pointed out by **Mr Clark**, the benefits of the busway are realised without any additional bus stations being added.<sup>27</sup> The provision of any further bus stations is outside the scope of this Project.
- 12.3 Mr Shasha's submission (submission 126123) raises concerns about the potential impacts of the Project on his property at 5 Wren Place as a result of the Paul Matthews Road Connection. His concerns relate to potential noise, lighting, privacy and visual effects.
- 12.4 I note that this property is set back from SH18/UHH with a number of intervening properties between it and the proposed alignment of the Paul Matthews Road Connection which is to the north east. As set out in the *Assessment of Operational Noise and Vibration*, this property is identified as a Category A PFF while those in front of it (numbers 9,11,13,14 Wren Place) are Category C PFF requiring noise mitigation which has been

---

<sup>27</sup> Paragraphs 10.10-10.15 of Mr Clark's evidence in chief.

proposed in the form of a 3m noise barrier. **Ms Wilkening** has confirmed in her evidence that noise mitigation is not required for 5 Wren Place.<sup>28</sup>

- 12.5 The Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects and **Mr Bray's** evidence both conclude that the height of the proposed structure and associated infrastructure proposed adjacent to 5 Wren Place while visible from that Property, will not be over dominant resulting in adverse visual effects or loss of privacy for the Unsworth Heights community.<sup>29</sup> Consequently, there are no adverse privacy effects on Mr Shasha's property from the Project. I also note in **Mr Bray's** evidence that he does not consider, due to the height of proposed light poles and distance from the residential properties in Unsworth Heights that visual impact will occur.<sup>30</sup> Continued engagement with Mr Shasha through the Stakeholder and Community Plan may assist in alleviating the anxiety and concerns he holds regarding the Project.
- 12.6 The Meadowood Community House and Crèche (submission 126233) requests the installation of a noise barrier to the property boundary with SH18 and Constellation Drive, as well as buffer boundary planting in advance of earthworks taking place. **Ms Wilkening** concluded in her assessment of operational noise and vibration that noise and vibration effects on commercial activities can be appropriately managed through communication and engagement, and through a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan<sup>31</sup>. As set out in **Mr Bray's** evidence, no 'buffer planting' is proposed in this location in advance of the commencement of earthworks.<sup>32</sup> However, the CEMP will ensure that the potential effects associated with earthworks such as dust and noise are appropriately managed.
- 12.7 **Mr Hughes** has addressed the concerns raised by Meadowood Community House and Crèche in respect of drainage, concluding that the Project will generally enhance the drainage system in the area which will

<sup>28</sup> Paragraphs 9.4-9.6 of Ms Wilkening's evidence in chief.

<sup>29</sup> Section 12, and paragraph 14.7-14.9 of Mr Bray's evidence in chief.

<sup>30</sup> Paragraphs 13.37-13.50 of Mr Bray's evidence in chief.

<sup>31</sup> Paragraphs 9.6, 9.13 and 11.2 of Ms Wilkening's evidence in chief.

<sup>32</sup> Paragraph 13.49, and 14.10-14.14 of Mr Bray's evidence in chief.

to a degree assist the localised issue within the Community House and Crèche grounds.<sup>33</sup>

- 12.8 The Meadowood Community House and Crèche also raises the issue of the loss of the public reserve for the purposes of the proposed Caribbean Drive widening. A compensation package under the Public Works Act 1981 will be negotiated between AC and the Transport Agency for loss of public reserve at this location. The impacts of the loss of this space on recreational resources within the local area are addressed by **Mr Greenaway**.<sup>34</sup>
- 12.9 The Ministry of Education (submission 126309) has requested that it be added to the list of representatives in the Stakeholder and Communication Plan<sup>35</sup> as an interested stakeholder to be engaged with at a more strategic level due to the potential for construction work to disrupt or impact on educational facilities in the area. While no educational facilities lie within the Project area, I agree that children and staff's commute to and from school may at times be affected by construction activities. The list in SCP.3 as lodged was indicative and was not meant to be exhaustive, hence the wording of subclause SCP.3(b). The inclusion of the Ministry of Education is acceptable, and SCP.2 has been amended accordingly.
- 12.10 I understand the Ministry of Education's concern about maintaining accessibility to schools, in particular the pedestrian and cycle connectivity. I do not agree with the Ministry's proposed rewording of draft SCP.4 which deals with measures to specifically address business disruption to include provision for education facility disruption with respect to ongoing pedestrian and cycle connectivity. I consider that the relief sought by the Ministry would be better provided for within draft SCP.2. Accordingly, SCP.2 has been amended to refer to schools.
- 12.11 The AC submission (submission 126345), while not specifically identifying social effects as an area of concern, has flagged a number of matters which are relevant to social aspects of the Project. Both **Mr Moore**<sup>36</sup> and

<sup>33</sup> Paragraphs 13.39-13.41 of Mr Hughes' evidence in chief.

<sup>34</sup> Paragraphs 7.24-7.25 of Mr Greenaway's evidence in chief.

<sup>35</sup> Condition SPC.3 of the resource consent conditions attached as Annexure A of Mr McGahan's evidence.

<sup>36</sup> Section 7 of Mr Moore's evidence in chief.

**Mr Scholfield**<sup>37</sup> consider the issue of the chosen alignment of the SUP on SH18. In paragraph 5.1.7 of its submission, AC has questioned the northern route of the proposed SUP on SH18 between Albany Highway and Paul Matthews Road, indicating a preference for a full southern alignment to serve the Unsworth Heights community.

- 12.12 Currently, there is no direct east-west pedestrian/cycle connectivity, it is achieved by way of a circuitous use of local roads and paths. North-south connectivity is restricted to the underpass at Alexandra Stream/Rook Reserve. When the Project is in place, with the North/South switch, the local community consisting of both the residential population and the business community will have the opportunity to access the SUP at Albany Highway, the Alexandra Stream/Rook Reserve underpass ramp, the Paul Matthews Road/Caribbean Drive connection and the maintained Cabello Place connection. This does provide for enhanced active transport for Unsworth Heights community and better social connectivity to services on the northern side of SH18 (e.g. schools) over and above the current situation.
- 12.13 At paragraph 2.1.4 of its submission, AC has also raised the lack of provision for a community liaison group in the conditions. As a result, I have recommended changes to SCP.3 to include a requirement to provide briefings to key stakeholders and consultation events or information days for the community. In my view, such meetings will be of great benefit during the construction phase of the Project in providing a conduit for information between the contractor, the Transport Agency and their neighbours.<sup>38</sup>
- 12.14 **Mr Greenaway**<sup>39</sup> in his evidence responds to the matter of the loss and quality of recreation reserve land. However, I acknowledge that the usability of certain passive reserves will be restricted to the community during construction works but alternatives are available close by with individuals able to reuse the park facility again on completion of works.

---

<sup>37</sup> Section 10 of Mr Schofield's evidence in chief.

<sup>38</sup> Condition SCP.3 of the revised conditions attached as Annexure A of Mr McGahan's evidence in chief.

<sup>39</sup> Paragraph 5.6 and 5.7 of Mr Greenaway's evidence in chief.

- 12.15 The Centre for Urban Transport ('**CUTS**') (submission 126516) raises concerns that the walking, cycling and public transport components of the Project have been included at the expense of road users. The benefits of the Project in terms of traffic movement are covered in both **Mr Glucina's**<sup>40</sup> and **Mr Clark's**<sup>41</sup> evidence. As Mr Wilmot acknowledges in the CUTS submission, all movement has social value.
- 12.16 The Project, while addressing existing road transport issues, has also sought to adopt a multi-modal approach to movement on the North Shore with the proposed Busway extension and new SUPs. A significant proportion of the Project area population uses public transport as their main mode of transport for work.<sup>42</sup> I am of the view that the busway expansion northward will have a positive impact on this commuting population and the socio-economic characteristics of the city. CUTS also expressed concern regarding consultation with only certain lobby groups (i.e. cycling and walking pressure groups). As outlined in **Ms Brock's** evidence,<sup>43</sup> the Project has engaged with many transport user groups including the proponents of vehicle movement.

### **13 Response to section 149G(3) key issues report**

- 13.1 Paragraph 51 of the Key Issues Report questions whether the positive effects of the proposed SUP counterbalance the adverse effects associated with loss of open space and reserves. Paragraph 123 of the Key Issues Report states that a matter for consideration is the extent to which ancillary infrastructure such as stormwater treatment devices and discharge structures located in reserves will displace recreational use and affect amenity and natural values. I deal with these matters together below.
- 13.2 In my opinion, the provision of the SUP will be a community asset enhancing active transport within the Project area. I do not see this as a trade-off with or to open space and reserves. Along SH1 no passive or recreational reserve is required as a consequence of the Project. A number of marginal strips of land adjacent the motorway are required for

<sup>40</sup> Paragraph 9.1 of Mr Glucina's evidence in chief.

<sup>41</sup> Paragraphs 5.1, 9.2, and 10.28 of Mr Clark's evidence in chief.

<sup>42</sup> Assessment of Social Effects, Appendix C.

<sup>43</sup> Paragraphs 9.1 and 10.1 of Ms Brock's evidence in chief.

the Project but only Arrenway Reserve (a grass access strip) is necessary for the SUP. The Project will result in the activation of Arrenway Reserve and the transformation of grassed linear motorway buffer strips into green corridors as envisaged by the UDLF.

- 13.3 I am aware that the intended after use of the former Rosedale Landfill is for open space use, however, no open space strategy plan or master plan has been developed for the site indicating possible uses or their location. I understand it will be some years before the site is ready to be handed over as its aftercare regime as a closed landfill site is still in process. The Project's effect on this site is limited to the western extent which is a challenging topographical area and unlikely to have a significant contribution to open space activity in the future.
- 13.4 I have acknowledged above that the Project will affect a number of reserves, the majority of which are not in public use, being marginal strips of land adjacent the motorway. However, a number of reserves which provide both passive (Meadowood Reserve, Rook Reserve and Bluebird Reserve) and sports recreation (the North Harbour Hockey Stadium ('NHHS'))<sup>44</sup> will be affected by the proposed SH18 upgrade works including the proposed tie in to SH1.
- 13.5 **Mr Greenaway** in his evidence deals with the impact of the Project on the recreational use of these reserves in detail. He concludes that the Project will, through various negotiated agreements with AC, ensure a commensurate level of future service.<sup>45</sup> A full relocation of the NHHS is being progressed, which is the subject of a resource consent application currently being processed by AC. I understand that AC has agreed to dispose of the land at Rosedale Park South subject to a compensation package for the future sports field provision being agreed. It should also be recognised that while NHHS is relocating, the entire land parcel is not required for the Project and part of the site will remain in the ownership of AC. As such, it can be retained for recreational or sporting activities.

<sup>44</sup> While Rosedale Park South is currently not a publicly accessible reserve with a sporting function, its potential to contribute to future sporting provision is considered by Mr Greenaway in his evidence.

<sup>45</sup> Paragraph 5.7 of Mr Greenaway's evidence in chief.

- 13.6 I appreciate that during the installation of structures and stormwater devices, access to reserve land will be restricted and may in some instances be blocked, for example during the construction of the stormwater management wetland at Rook Reserve. However, as outlined in **Mr Greenaway's** evidence, the Project area is well served by a network of local parks providing alternative passive recreation space which will not be affected by the Project and which will continue to provide open space for the local community within easy walking distance.<sup>46</sup>
- 13.7 As explained by **Mr Greenaway**, overall, the Project area community will have sufficient accessible passive and recreation facilities once the Project is operational, although the quantity of overall open space will have reduced.<sup>47</sup> It is proposed that reserve reinstatement plans are provided that will ensure the reserves are left in a suitable condition for future recreation following completion of the Project. For example, the stormwater pond at Rook Reserve will be integrated into the reserve to provide an amenity feature enhancing the quality of open space offering within this reserve.

## 14 Conclusions

- 14.1 My overall conclusion is that from a social perspective, the Project should bring significant net social benefits largely due to the improvements to regional and local road networks, active transportation networks and linkages between existing places. These aspects of the Project will improve accessibility and amenity for local residents and pedestrians and cyclists moving through the area, as well as improve the safety of transport users and motorists.
- 14.2 There is the potential for a number of negative social impacts which I consider to be localised and experienced only by a limited number of property owners, residents and businesses. On balance, the number of actually or potentially affected parties is low.
- 14.3 Negative effects generally relate to the construction phase of the Project, and are expected to be able to be mitigated through sound construction

---

<sup>46</sup> Paragraphs 7.29-7.32 of Mr Greenaway's evidence in chief.

<sup>47</sup> Paragraph 8.6-8.7 of Mr Greenaway's evidence in chief.

management practices the other technical experts and I have outlined in evidence. Such effects are of short duration. The potential adverse effects will be able to be reduced and/or mitigated by the preparation and implementation of a CEMP and its associated suite of management plans as well as a Stakeholder and Communications Plan.

- 14.4 In my opinion, with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures required by the conditions of consent, on balance the social effects of the Project will be positive.



---

**Louise Strogen**

**20 April 2017**

## **Annexure A: Relevant experience**

1. Northland Bridges Project – Makakohe Bridge (2016): Provision of a Social Effects Statement outlining the likely social effects of the Project on the surrounding area to support the necessary Notice of Requirement and resource consents for the new bridge and State highway 12 realignment.
2. City Rail Link – Britomart Notice of Requirement (2015): Assessment of the effects of construction and operation of the proposed works associated with the Britomart Notice of Requirement on the social environment surrounding the Britomart Transport Centre.
3. Southern Corridor Improvements Project (2014-15): Assessment of the effects of construction and operation of the proposed works associated with the motorway improvements project for SH1 between Manukau and Papakura on the social environment of the surrounding area.
4. Temburong District Plan, Brunei: Commentary and advice in respect of likely social impacts on the local community arising from proposed objectives, policies development standards and zoning proposed under this land management plan.
5. Energy from Waste Facility, Capel, Surrey UK: As part of the overall Environmental Impact Assessment, provision of an assessment of the likely social and economic impact of the construction and operation of the facility itself as well as those social consequences related to the project's contribution to waste management within the county.
6. Materials Recycling Facility, Willesdon Junction, London UK: Assessment of the likely effects of construction and operation of the proposed facility as part of the overall Environmental Impact Assessment.
7. Lakeside Neighbourhood, Scunthorpe UK: Assessment of the potential adverse effects of land use change (from rural to urban) in respect of the development of a new residential suburb including 1,000 dwellings and a neighbourhood centre.

## Annexure B: Project's social effects assessment framework

Issue	Effect parameter
<b>Regional</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Transport, accessibility and connectivity;</li> <li>■ Economic growth and development;</li> </ul>
<b>Local</b>	
Way of Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Accessibility, connectivity and mobility</li> <li>■ Changes to patterns of day to day living</li> <li>■ Changes to ways of walking &amp; cycling</li> <li>■ Changes to public transport</li> </ul>
Well Being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Changes to wellbeing (including stress/anxiety)</li> <li>■ Impacts on quality of life</li> <li>■ Health and safety</li> </ul>
Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Impacts on the quality of the environment in which people live, work and socialise</li> <li>■ Impacts of noise, dust, visual changes on use of areas and sites</li> </ul>
Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Impact on neighborhoods and cohesion</li> <li>■ Impacts on community areas and sites</li> <li>■ Impacts on individual and community plans and aspirations</li> <li>■ Impacts on and accessibility to commercial areas</li> </ul>
Personal and Property rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Uncertainty and timing</li> <li>■ Impacts due to the property acquisition process</li> </ul>