

**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

Summary statement of Louise Strogon for the New Zealand Transport Agency (Social impact)

Dated 20 July 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/

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF LOUISE STROGEN FOR THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY

1 Introduction

1.1 This summary statement provides a summary of my Evidence In Chief ('**EIC**'), dated 20 April 2017, and my rebuttal evidence, dated 15 June 2017.

2 Summary of evidence in chief¹

2.1 In my opinion, the overall net social effect of the Project will be positive.

2.2 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),² its *Guide to Assessing Social Impacts for State Highway Projects* (October 2015),³ and the International Association for Impact Assessment's ('**IAIA**') criteria concerning social impact assessment ('**SIA**').⁴

2.3 The existing social environment for the Project is broadly defined by the communities adjacent to the Project area which consist of nine Census 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.

2.4 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.

2.5 These effects are manageable either by property purchase and associated compensation (for property related effects) or through the use

¹ EIC, section 5.

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

³ <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.

⁴ International Association for Impact Association, 2003 *Social Impact Assessment International Principles*.

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.

- 2.6 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.
- 2.7 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.
- 2.8 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.

3 Summary of rebuttal evidence

- 3.1 In my rebuttal evidence, I addressed matters raised in the evidence of:
- a Ms Joanne Hart, Auckland Council (Planning – Designation);
 - b Mrs Maylene Barrett, Auckland Council (Public Open Space and Community Facilities);
 - c Mr Stephen Brown, Auckland Council (Landscape and Urban Design);
 - d Mr Peter Fogarty; and
 - e The report (Noise and Vibration Effects) of Mr Jon Styles for the Board of Inquiry.

- 3.2 I also addressed the outcome of discussions with the Ministry of Education following review of my EIC and that of **Mr McGahan** in response to their submission.
- 3.3 I concluded that, I remain of the opinion that from a social perspective, the Project will result in significant net social benefits largely due to the improvements to regional and local road networks, active transportation networks and linkages between existing places above the current situation.⁵

4 Updates to evidence

- 4.1 I have no updates or changes to my evidence as a result of conferencing and/or further discussions with submitters.
- 4.2 I confirmed that I have reviewed the changes to the SCP conditions put forward by the planners in their previous JWS. From a social effects perspective, I found these edits helpful, in particular, the addition to SCP.3(vii) and additional clause (viii).
- 4.3 I understand that the planners have had further conferencing in respect of the noise and vibration conditions and I have not seen the final wording of those conditions or any other amendments made by the planners.



Louise Strogon

20 July 2017

⁵ Rebuttal evidence, section 9.