

IN THE MATTER OF

The Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Notices of requirement for designations under section 168 of the Act, in relation to Te Ahu a Turanga; Manawatū Tararua Highway Project

BY

NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY

Requiring Authority

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AMELIA LINZEY (SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) ON BEHALF OF THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY

8 March 2019

BUDDLEFINDLAY
Barristers and Solicitors
Wellington

Solicitors Acting: **David Randal / Thaddeus Ryan / Frances Wedde**
Email: david.randal@buddlefindlay.com
Tel 64-4-499 4242 Fax 64-4-499 4141 PO Box 2694 DX SP20201 Wellington 6140

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS	10
COMMENTS ON COUNCIL SECTION 42A REPORTS.....	15
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FROM THE HEARING PANEL.....	22
ATTACHMENT 1 - MEDIA COVERAGE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF THE GORGE CLOSURE	25
ATTACHMENT 2 – FEEDBACK FORM USED FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ..	26

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is **Amelia Linzey**.
2. I am a Senior Technical Director in Planning at Beca Group Limited.
3. I lead the team who prepared the Technical Assessment #3: Social Impact Assessment ("**Technical Assessment 3**") as part of Volume 3 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects ("**AEE**"), which accompanied the Notices of Requirement ("**NoRs**") lodged on 2 November 2018 in respect of Te Ahu a Turanga; Manawatū Tararua Highway Project ("**the Project**").
4. My qualifications and experience are set out in paragraphs 2-3 of Technical Assessment 3.
5. In preparing Technical Assessment 3 and my evidence, my team and I have:
 - (a) completed a site visit of the Project site and surrounding areas;
 - (b) participated in discussion with community members and other attendees at the consultation events run by the New Zealand Transport Agency ("**Transport Agency**") (all attended by either Jo Healy or Amelia Linzey) on 19, 20 and 21 July 2018 (in Ashhurst), 25 July 2018 (in Woodville), 26 July 2018 (in Palmerston North), 31 July 2018 (in Dannevirke) and 1 August 2018 (in Pahiatua);
 - (c) reviewed public feedback provided during the consultation process carried out by the Transport Agency during the 'long list to preferred option' phase, and feedback forms provided by members of the public during that consultation process, and consultation material (as summarised in Part F of Volume 2 'Supporting Material');
 - (d) reviewed and responded to the Councils' request for further information under section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 relating to social impacts;
 - (e) reviewed submissions relating to Technical Assessment 3, and associated matters relating to potential social impacts;
 - (f) reviewed the questions from the Hearing Panel and the Reporting Officers' Section 42A materials relevant to my evidence; and

- (g) had ongoing interaction and communication with other specialists, including those involved in Project design, traffic and transport assessment, and noise assessment.

Code of Conduct

- 6. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. My evidence has been prepared in compliance with that Code, as if it were evidence being given in Environment Court proceedings. In particular, unless I state otherwise, this evidence is within my area of expertise and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.
- 7. The assumptions and exclusions applied in my assessment are set out at paragraphs 10-19 of Technical Assessment 3.

Purpose and scope of evidence

- 8. Technical Assessment 3 assesses the potential social impacts of the Project, and recommends measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate those potential impacts.
- 9. My evidence does not repeat the detail set out in that assessment, but rather in this evidence I:
 - (a) present the key findings of Technical Assessment 3, updated to take into account information received more recently, in the executive summary;
 - (b) comment on submissions received in respect of the NoRs lodged;
 - (c) comment on the Council section 42A reports; and
 - (d) answer questions by the Hearing Panel that are relevant to my evidence.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 10. The Project is to construct and operate 11.5km of new State highway running from the State Highway 3 ("**SH3**") western entry to the closed Manawatū Gorge route, across the Ruahine Ranges ("**the Ranges**") north of the Manawatū Gorge and south of Saddle Road, and rejoining SH3 west of Woodville. The Project replaces the section of SH3 through the Manawatū

Gorge that was closed on 24 April 2017 following a large slip, and that has been closed since due to ongoing stability issues in the Gorge.

11. Technical Assessment 3 is based on the existing environment, which includes a transport network featuring the use of two alternate routes over the Ranges; Saddle Road and the Pahiatua Track (the "**alternate routes**").
12. It assesses social impacts of construction (temporary impacts) and operation (permanent impacts) of the Project at a regional, local and Project extent scale. The regional scale considers people within the Tararua, Manawatū, and Palmerston North Districts and surrounding areas who are dependent on this section of SH3 to traverse east and west of the Ranges. The local scale considers Ashhurst and Woodville. The Project extent considers local landowners and neighbours within or adjacent to the Project. The assessment is largely qualitative and provides an appraisal upon which preliminary mitigation measures have been recommended.

Social impacts – construction of the Project

13. Activities associated with the construction of the Project have the potential to exacerbate negative social impacts that have been experienced by Woodville, Ashhurst and the wider region since the closure of the Gorge and the use of the alternate routes. These impacts relate to reduced accessibility (including trip reliability) for people travelling across the Ranges (e.g. between Woodville and Ashhurst / Palmerston North).
14. At a regional and local (particularly for the Woodville community) scale, I consider that the additional construction traffic using Saddle Road may impact on the way people carry out their daily activities, such as increasing their commuting times for travel to work or education or accessing services and facilities (e.g. health services).
15. Other potential social changes arising from increased traffic include changes in patterns of behaviour, arising from community concerns for safety for pedestrians and others using the road network leading to a choice to delay or defer trips. This is a potential disruption to people's way of life. However, given that construction traffic is a relatively small increase on existing traffic using the route, I do not consider these adverse effects to be significantly adverse.
16. I acknowledge the existing disruption to businesses that use Saddle Road as a route east-west over the Ranges, and the further potential disruption over

the construction period. That said, because of other economic activity generated from construction activity and indirectly through construction workers in the area, there is likely to be an increased demand for service, supply and retail business activities, and use of services within both Woodville and Ashhurst due to their proximity to the proposed construction site. These are potential social benefits for local businesses and residents associated with these business activities in the local community.

17. During the construction period, the existing constraints on the use of Pahiatua Track as a cycle route¹ over the Ranges may also be exacerbated, further reducing connectivity over the construction period. I note that while this route is primarily a recreation and tourism movement for cyclists, there was at least one person (during consultation) who identified using this route to commute by cycle to work.
18. The Ashhurst community is less reliant than the Woodville community on traversing the Ranges for 'day-to-day' or quality of life activities. However, construction traffic may exacerbate impacts already experienced from the higher traffic volumes currently travelling through residential parts of Ashhurst. Social impacts associated with this activity include potential changes to the way people carry out daily activities, come together as a community, and otherwise move within Ashhurst, and further potential disruption to the lifestyle (the quality of the residential environment) these people enjoyed prior to the Gorge closure (when this was a quieter residential area).
19. While construction traffic will represent a relatively low level of change compared to the existing traffic volumes using the route, high volumes of construction traffic at night could increase the severity of this impact, as people are often more sensitive to changes in the quality of environment (particularly noise and light disturbance) over-night periods. Mitigation strategies recommended by **Dr Stephen Chiles** and conditions proposed by **Ainsley McLeod** will aim to limit traffic volumes at night time, reducing potential social impacts. Notwithstanding this general comment, it is also acknowledged that there may be some social benefits associated with reducing overall construction periods (for example, communities may be

¹ The Pahiatua Track makes up a section of the Tararua Traverse (A 67km section of the National Cycleway between Palmerston North and Masterton). The current update on the New Zealand Cycle Trail site is that the 10km section along the Pahiatua track is closed (which I understand to mean the formal Cycle Trail notifier has been removed) due to diversion of heavy traffic onto this route since the Gorge closure and subsequent safety concerns <https://www.nzcycletrail.com/find-your-ride/heartland-rides/tararua-traverse/>.

tolerant of increased disruption for a shorter period of time – I discuss below the importance of involving communities in mitigation strategies).

20. Construction management planning will address issues of traffic, noise and other environmental emissions. In addition to those measures, I consider the potential adverse social impacts of construction activities can be appropriately mitigated by community liaison and communication / engagement mechanisms over construction to allow the Project to respond to issues as they arise, and provide appropriate channels of communication and forums to raise these issues and respond accordingly. These measures are proposed as conditions to the designation (as discussed in the evidence of **Ms McLeod**).

Social impacts – operation of Project

21. In contrast to the shorter-term construction impacts (albeit still in the order of 5 years), at a regional and local scale the Project, once open to traffic, will have longer-term and permanent positive social impacts that range in scale from moderate to high.
22. These social benefits will arise by addressing many of the existing safety and trip reliability transport issues that have been experienced by residents and road users since the closure of the Gorge. As described in the evidence of **David Dunlop**, the Project will reinstate a SH3 connection between the east and west across the Ranges in this area. **Mr Dunlop** concludes that the Project will have significant positive effects on the transport network, both for general traffic and freight, and for public transport and emergency services.
23. The social benefits arising from these transport benefits include opportunities to improve social cohesion (connectivity between communities), enabling people to improve their way of life (reduced time in travel or reduced time wasted in travel time unreliability) and opportunities to further provide for their social and economic wellbeing (e.g. improved opportunities for economic activities between the east and west of the Ranges).
24. The redistribution of traffic off the local road network (both in Woodville and Ashhurst) is also identified by **Mr Dunlop** as resulting in a better transport environment for residents, pedestrians and cyclists. This change in the quality of environment provides opportunity for social benefits for residents in these local communities (e.g. improving way of life by increasing the ability for residents to walk / cycle on local roads and quality of environment).

25. In addition, as a consequence of the Project, **Mr Dunlop** identifies positive transport outcomes for cyclists, improving connectivity across the Ranges by creating the opportunity to reinstate the regional cycle route (NZ Cycle Trail route (via the Pahiatua Track or elsewhere, as discussed further in the evidence of **Jonathan Kennett**)), and by providing shoulders along the new road that can be used by cyclists.
26. The Transport Agency has also (as discussed by **Sarah Downs**, and confirmed in the conditions presented by **Ms McLeod**) committed to:
- (a) providing a pedestrian / cycling upgrade to the Ashhurst Bridge prior to the opening of the Project route;
 - (b) creating a pedestrian and cycling facility from the Ashhurst Bridge to the Manawatū Gorge Scenic Reserve car park ("**MGSR**") and the western end of the reserve;
 - (c) providing a dedicated walking facility across the new Manawatū Bridge (as well as cyclable shoulders), to future-proof access to potential future recreation opportunities on the north side of the reserve; and
 - (d) providing an extension to the existing separate pedestrian and cycling facility in Woodville (between the centre of Woodville and Hampson Street) further west, facilitating pedestrian and cycling access to the Ferry Reserve and delivering part of the proposed "Lindauer Arts Trail".
27. From a social perspective, these outcomes improve both recreation activity/connectivity for residents and provide opportunities for similar tourism activity. This is identified by the community as important for both their sense of place/identity and for socio-economic wellbeing.
28. For approximately 10 residences (including those on lifestyle blocks along the corridor) within proximity of the Project, there will be changes to visual and aural amenity. These effects are assessed by **Dr Chiles** (in respect of noise effects) and by **Boyden Evans** (in respect of visual effects).
29. Views will be altered by the presence of the road, changing a predominantly rural outlook. There will be some additional permanent noise effects experienced from roading and/or intersection changes. This potential impact will be experienced by residences along the corridor or in proximity to the new intersections proposed between the Project and existing roads.

30. These changes will also create a potential social impact for residents, impacting on the quality of their environment and their sense of place values. Physical responses, such as noise mitigation structures, address the physical effects of the Project (as discussed by **Dr Chiles**). The wider change of character and quality of environment is recognised as a low negative social impact (due to scale of change and the scale of impact). I propose mitigation for these effects below.
31. There is also expected to be an increase of traffic for residents and lifestyle block residences on SH3 at each end of the Project. This impact is a result of the reduced traffic volumes these residents are experiencing as a result of the Gorge Road closure. For these residents, the quality of environment and sense of place will change as a result of increased traffic and the associated noise of traffic and potential 'loss of privacy', both during construction and in the longer-term operation of the Project. This will potentially be exacerbated for those in proximity to the roundabouts proposed, as they will require land take and will bring the road corridor physically closer to some residents. Whilst these are changes from the existing environment, the environmental outcomes of the Project will be similar to the environment prior to the Gorge closure. Taking that into account, I am of the opinion that this will be a low negative social impact.
32. The potential physical impacts associated with visual and landscape changes and noise are addressed by other specialists (and specific mitigation measures are proposed in that regard). I also recommend that residents identified as affected are included in detailed design discussions around landscape and noise mitigation. For example, such input may identify opportunities for landscaping to provide further visual screening for these residents (either from their homes or the outdoor spaces they enjoy on their properties). I understand that **Ms McLeod's** evidence details amendments to the proposed conditions relating to the Landscape Management Plan (Condition 12(e)) and a Post-Construction Review (Condition 29A). In my view, these conditions deal appropriately with the effects described, including the fact that they provide 'opportunities' to affected landowners and the wider Community Liaison Group, rather than confirming design now, so that residents and community representatives can consider the alignment design (as it develops) and responses that work for them.
33. It is my opinion that providing mitigation via relevant management plans (such as in relation to the management of construction traffic), targeted

communication, and further engagement and consultation with the community, will enable the potential negative impacts to be appropriately remedied and mitigated. However, it is acknowledged that construction is likely to be a disruptive impact for communities. That disruption is a necessary process to achieve the longer term positive social outcomes of the Project.

COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

34. A number of submitters express overall support for the Project, focussing (either expressly or implicitly) on the transport benefits of the Project. As explained above, it is my opinion that the positive transport benefits of the Project also bring longer-term and positive social impacts (ranging in scale from moderate to high).
35. Multiple submissions have been received on a number of topics either specifically relating to social effects or having potential consequential social impacts. I address these key topics below:
 - (a) effects on people and property, in particular resulting from the redirection of traffic back onto the State highway through Woodville;
 - (b) providing for access to the Manawatū Gorge Scenic Reserve (“**MSGR**”);
 - (c) facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders along the Project route; and
 - (d) provision of / for the proposed Lindauer Arts Trail (which would link from Ferry Reserve to Woodville).

Effects on People and Property: redirection of traffic back on the State highway

36. A number of submitters have raised concerns about changes to quality of life during construction and operation of the Project. These relate primarily to effects arising from the re-directing of traffic back on the State highway network through Woodville and Ashhurst.
37. Barbara C M Cooke and Nicholas M Shoebridge (submitters 105 and 103) have raised these concerns in respect of their property, with particular reference to the gateway roundabout at Woodville. These are two separate submissions, neither of which explicitly state the address of the property. I

understand that both submitters are residents at 49846 Napier Road (SH3) between Troup Road and Franklin Road.

38. This issue is addressed in Technical Assessment 3 and in my initial assessment and discussed in general terms in my executive summary above. I do recognise that there will be a permanent change in environment for some residents, particularly in respect to the redirection of traffic back onto SH3 (including along the frontage of this property). As noted above, from a social perspective I have assessed this as a low negative impact based on the level of physical environmental change assessed by others (in particular **Dr Chiles**).
39. However, I acknowledge that there is a high degree of uncertainty associated with infrastructure projects, and that these residents will experience disruption. For this reason, in addition to mitigation in respect of physical works (e.g. noise, light and visual impacts), I have recommended that residents identified as potentially affected are included in detailed design discussions, particularly in respect of the associated landscape and noise mitigation works that are proposed in the vicinity of these properties. That recommendation is now reflected in draft Conditions 12(e) and 29A as put forward by **Ms McLeod**.
40. The submission from Janette S McHugh (submitter 238) (amongst others) raises concerns regarding the increase in traffic volumes on the State Highway in Woodville itself, and in respect of the quality of life and environment for residents. In his evidence, **Mr Dunlop** refers to the potential impacts of increased traffic volumes in Woodville and the need for the Transport Agency to consider the future management of the State highway through the town/village centre, with or without the Project. The evidence of **Ms Downs** confirms that the Project does not preclude a future bypass.
41. In respect of the potential social impacts arising from the Project and the implications of such a bypass, I observe that the Project will effectively reinstate the environment (e.g. the traffic volumes) that used the State Highway through Woodville prior to the closure of the Gorge Road. Furthermore, I refer to the concerns that have been expressed by other residents and businesses on the adverse socio-economic conditions arising from the diversion of traffic off the highway, as a result of the closure. Specifically here I refer to commentary on this issue in Technical Assessment 3, and in the engagement feedback summary provided by the Transport

Agency in the AEE. I have provided examples of media coverage of socio-economic impacts of the Gorge Closure (**Attachment 1**).² As I set out in Technical Assessment 3, the Woodville township has developed as a 'main street' commercial and retail area, with a number of businesses and services relying on passing traffic. There has been a focus on effort to re-divert traffic back into Woodville since the Gorge closure, as noted by **Scott Wickman** in his evidence.

42. The Project will result in some changes in the amenity and quality of environment for some residents. Having said that, I remain of the view that for others this change reflects the re-establishment of the township which has developed around the main street. As such it has potential positive impacts for those residents that value the business activity in this area. For these reasons, I agree with **Mr Dunlop's** conclusion that at the time the Transport Agency undertakes any investigation on the future of the State highway network through Woodville, it should take into consideration community aspirations and economic conditions of the town centre.

Providing for access to the Manawatū Gorge Scenic Reserve

43. Submissions from the Department of Conservation ("**DOC**") and the Manawatū Gorge Governance Group identify the importance of this reserve and the provision of access and services to support tourism / recreation use of the MGSR.
44. I recognise the social importance of the MGSR, contributing to the quality of environment and sense of place for residents (and as a tourism resource for the wider community). I understand that the Project will maintain access to the carpark and walkway throughout the Project construction, and that these facilities will be reinstated once the Project is operational. I have reviewed the draft conditions put forward by **Ms McLeod** and confirm that they require a pedestrian and cycling facility to be provided from the Ashhurst Bridge to the MGSR car park and the western end of the reserve.
45. I support these Project requirements. It is my opinion that the proposed Manawatū Gorge Carpark Reinstatement Plan appropriately addresses the concerns raised by DOC and the Manawatū Gorge Governance Group in relation to this specific area.

² Printed copies of the articles can be provided on request.

Facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders along the Project route

46. A large proportion of submitters have raised concerns about the lack of safe facilities along the Project route for pedestrians and cyclists (including over the Ranges and the Ashhurst Bridge). Some submitters also refer to access for horse-riders.
47. As set out in the Technical Assessment 3, it is my understanding that the Project route over the Ranges is not intended to be the main cycle route between Palmerston North / Ashhurst and Woodville. The reinstatement of the Paihātua Track as a regional cycle (and NZ Cycle Trail) route will be enabled by the completion of this Project. **Mr Dunlop** and **Mr Kennett** refer also to the improved cycling conditions on Saddle Road that will result from the completion of the Project.
48. Furthermore, as set out in the evidence of **Mr Dunlop**, the Project footprint provides sufficient capacity for the shoulders of the proposed new highway to be used safely by cyclists.
49. The Transport Agency has also committed (subject to consenting) to upgrading cycling / walking access over the Ashhurst Bridge before the Project route opens. This is reflected in the draft conditions put forward by **Ms McLeod** (Condition 26(b)(ii)).
50. **Mr Dunlop** also explains in his evidence that the Project will improve conditions for horse riders in comparison with the existing situation.
51. On the basis of this information, I consider the accessibility outcomes for active modes, including horse-riders (primarily for recreation use / tourism but also potentially for some commuter use) arising from the Project is positive, and as such there are no further adverse social impacts arising from the Project that need to be addressed further.
52. The NoR does not provide for an off-road walking and cycling facility alongside the Project corridor. Such a facility could provide for further positive social outcomes. However, for the reasons above I do not consider the inclusion of these in the Project is necessary for mitigation of any social impacts.
53. Furthermore, with the commitment by the Transport Agency (as set out in paragraph 26 above) to include provision for pedestrian crossing of the new Manawatū bridge, I am of the opinion that the Project maintains and

facilitates future opportunity for development of wider pedestrian and cycle connections (potentially either recreation or commuter).

54. From a social perspective I am supportive of the comments made by **Mr Dunlop** and **Mr Kennett** on this matter. Namely, from a technical perspective and considering the identified community values of the environment, the potential users of such a facility and the role of such a facility for recreation and tourism, any consideration of separated pedestrian and cycling facilities linking east-west should also consider other facilities (including any opportunities for such connections to be provided through the Gorge). In my opinion, there are a number of alternative connection options that could be more appropriate and appealing to deliver positive social and particularly recreation outcomes. For example, referring again to the commitment for a pedestrian facility along the new Manawatū Bridge, this increases accessibility to the north side of the Scenic Reserve and as such provides opportunity to realise any community aspirations to open that area up in future (e.g. for recreation use).

Provision for the Lindauer Arts Trail

55. The submissions of Bruce Hutton (submitter 297), Robin Winter (submitter 441) and Woodville District Vision (submitter 362) seek that the Project provides for the protection of a proposed future project, the Lindauer Arts Trail. I have reviewed this submission and subsequent information received from Mr Hutton (with others).
56. I understand the intention behind the Arts Trail is to provide an additional 6km (approximately) walkway linking from the Manawatū Gorge Loop Track (and Upper Gorge Loop Track), both walkways managed through the Department of Conservation (e.g. linking to the Ferry Reserve at the eastern end of this walkway).
57. Technical Assessment 3 did not specifically assess potential impacts on this proposed walkway. However, it did acknowledge the desire of the community and Tararua District Council to attract more visitors to Woodville, adding to its vibrancy and sustainability, and the importance of the Manawatū Gorge Track for recreation / tourism in the area (values including sense of place, sense of identity and environmental quality).
58. I understand that, following consultation with the relevant submitters, the Transport Agency has committed to extend the existing separate pedestrian

and cycling facility in Woodville (between the centre of Woodville and Hampson Street) further west, facilitating pedestrian and cycling access to the Ferry Reserve and delivering part of the proposed Arts Trail. This will bring positive social impacts by meeting those community desires, as set out above, by enabling some parts of the Arts Trail.

59. Further, I understand that no aspect of the Project will preclude development of remaining sections of the Lindauer Arts Trail in future and as such, I maintain my opinion that the Project does not give rise to adverse social effects (e.g. does not compromise or impede this aspiration) in that regard.

COMMENTS ON COUNCIL SECTION 42A REPORTS

60. In this section I respond to comments made in the section 42A report where they relate to social impacts. For clarity, I outline the relevant details of the section 42A report followed by my response. Where the section 42A report raises issues already addressed in this evidence (e.g. where it is a matter identified by submitters), I have cross-referenced to that section of my evidence.

Section 42A Technical Evidence: Social Impact Assessment

Section 5.1 Construction Phase Effects on Ashhurst – Impacts on the quality of the environment (Section 5.1.1.1)

61. Kirsty Austin is of the view that the scale of effects on the quality of the environment in Ashhurst during construction is more severe than I concluded in my assessment. I provide responses to the following issues she has raised that contribute to her assessment:
- (a) the uncertainty about night-time construction and related mitigation, without which it is not possible to determine the scale to which Ashhurst residents will be affected;
 - (b) the assessed reduction in cyclist and pedestrian safety or perceived safety, and that no mitigation is proposed to address this matter; and
 - (c) that the effects differ to the community's vision for the township.
62. I concur with Ms Austin that night-time construction traffic has the potential to impact on the quality of life for residents. However, from my experience in both preparing management plans and reviewing construction programmes

for infrastructure projects, the health and safety issues that arise, and the increased construction complexity of night construction means that such works are not prevalent. As such, I made an assumption that such activity would be limited.

63. Notwithstanding this, I have reviewed the current draft conditions presented in the evidence of **Ms McLeod** and confirm that these conditions include a requirement that the Construction Traffic Management Plan ("**CTMP**") describe methods to limit the movement of heavy vehicles through Ashhurst at night and peak times, including limiting night-time movements to oversized loads and essential movements (such as concrete trucks for continuous pours) (Condition 22(g)). It is my opinion that this provides assurance that there will be an appropriate mechanism to limit night-time construction traffic (while maintaining the construction team some the flexibility to respond to works that may be needed). In my opinion, while I maintain that my earlier assumptions were appropriate, I consider that the revised conditions proposed further reduce the uncertainty raised by Ms Austin.
64. With regards to cyclist and pedestrian safety, the CTMP will outline how to maintain the current provisions for walking and cycling (Condition 22(i)). I am aware that the Transport Agency is currently undertaking work in Ashhurst to improve road safety including traffic calming, shared paths and pedestrian crossings. This is not part of the Project, but rather part of the Agency's ongoing response to the impacts associated with the closure of the Gorge (and was a matter consulted on by the Agency at the time of our Project consultation).³
65. As noted in Technical Assessment 3, it is important to acknowledge the existing environment and the social effects that the community is already experiencing from the closure of the Gorge. I understand that the Transport Agency is continuing to work with the community to address transport issues as a response to the Gorge's closure. This includes local road safety improvements in and around Ashhurst, Woodville and Saddle Road. It is my understanding the transport effects assessment as presented in the evidence of **Mr Dunlop** and Technical Assessment 3 have both considered these works as forming part of the existing environment, and as the baseline for the assessment of effects. On this basis, I remain satisfied that **Mr Dunlop's** transport assessment does not identify the concerns for pedestrian and

³ Please refer to the Transport Agency website: <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh3-Manawatu/ashhurst/> for details on the Transport Agency project in Ashhurst to address current effects from the Gorge Closure.

cycling safety that would subsequently raise concerns for social impacts (either quality of life or people's wellbeing).

66. With regards to the matters raised by Ms Austin in respect of the community's vision, I agree that the existing environment does not align with the aspirations of the community (and maintain the view that this has been as a result of the closure of the Gorge route since April 2017). Although construction will increase noise and disruption, it is my opinion that it is associated with works that contribute to the alternate route (and, importantly, ultimately reinstating a situation where the State Highway will bypass the community). This is an outcome that the community is strongly in support of and in my opinion will support the long-term values they hold for the quality of environment; as a quiet village. In other words, the construction disruption is a 'means to an end', and is not a significant increase in the traffic currently using the route.
67. On this basis, I maintain my conclusion that this impact (as a result of construction) is appropriately mitigated by seeking to manage the disruption on the community through the CTMP, and the requirement to appoint a community liaison officer and the establishment of the Community Liaison Group will provide a mechanisms for members of the community to raise any concerns (and get a response to these concerns) as they arise.

Section 5.1 Construction Phase Effects in Woodville – Impacts on the quality of the environment (Section 5.1.2.1)

68. Ms Austin proposes that the scale of social effects on the quality of the environment in Woodville during construction are more severe than I concluded in my assessment. I provide responses to the following issues she has raised, that contribute to her assessment:
- (a) impact of construction vehicles on safety/perceived safety for children attending Woodville Primary School and Te Kohanga Reo Atawhai, if construction vehicles use Vogel Street during drop-off and pick-up times; and
 - (b) that construction of the western roundabout may also impact the residential amenity of nearby properties.
69. With regards to construction vehicles' impacts on safety, I consider that this has been addressed through the CTMP, which will manage potential effects. Woodville Primary School and Te Kohanga Reo Atawhai are part of the

Community Liaison Group and will be part of discussions to form an appropriate management strategy once construction details are available.

70. The effects of the construction of the Western Roundabout are dealt with through conditions, which require the Transport Agency to work with individual properties to manage mitigation (as discussed above).

Section 5.2 Operational Phase Effects

71. Based on my review, I consider there are two remaining matters of difference between the review by Ms Austin and my assessment with regard to the scale of social effects. These relate to cyclist safety and the recreation/leisure opportunities of the Project. I will address these remaining 'matters of difference' in turn.

Pedestrian and cyclist safety

72. I concur with Ms Austin that safety of road users is a technical matter most appropriately addressed by the transport specialists. However, I address her reference to how these considerations give rise to social effects, because it results in a difference in the identified potential effects on people's wellbeing.
73. Ms Austin suggests the Transport Agency is creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians and cyclists. However, from my review of the evidence of both **Mr Dunlop** and **Mr Kennett**, I remain of the opinion that the new corridor improves pedestrian and cyclist conditions when compared to the existing environment. In particular, traffic will be diverted off the main pedestrian and cyclist routes in Ashhurst, Saddle Road and the Pahiatua Track. This will result in a significant reduction in traffic (allowing safer cycle access). Further, the Project corridor will provide a shoulder that is available for cyclist use (which was not previously available on the Gorge Road, or currently on the alternative routes).
74. Ms Austin suggests that cyclists and pedestrians will be dissuaded from undertaking recreational activities because they perceive the environment as unsafe. However, there are a number of off-road walking opportunities currently available over the ranges, and I do not consider that the Project will impact on the future use of these facilities, and the Project provides a number of measures (including pedestrian access from the area around Ferry Reserve to Woodville (subject to sufficient land availability)) that will improve use of such facilities.

75. I acknowledge the opportunity for further facilities to enable and enhance pedestrian and cycling opportunities, and as a result, potential further positive social outcomes arising from the Project. However, for the above reasons, I do not consider that the social impacts arising from the Project require specific mitigation in the form of separate cycling and pedestrian facilities along the length of the new corridor.

Recreation opportunities

76. I agree with Ms Austin and Jeff Baker that recreational facilities have community benefits and, as a result, social benefits. However, for the reasons set out above and earlier in this evidence, I do not consider that the Project reduces the recreational opportunities of the existing environment, rather in some cases it is my opinion that the Project will enhance such opportunities (be that through specific pedestrian facilities or by improvements to the road network that will make recreation opportunities more accessible, particularly with inclusion of provision for pedestrian facilities on the Manawatū Bridge). **Ms Downs** outlines the objectives of the Transport Agency in her evidence, and similarly concludes that this Project does not preclude further development of recreational facilities in the future. On this basis, I do not consider that the Project is required to provide further recreation opportunities (e.g. as a means to offset or mitigate social impacts not otherwise addressed).

77. A key difference in opinion between my assessment and that of Ms Austin is that I do not consider that the 'failure' to deliver on the recreation opportunities of a cycle path means that the regional social effects are 'somewhat reduced' as concluded in Ms Austin's report (paragraph 197).

78. In my opinion, any lack of realisation of an opportunity to deliver a positive social outcome for a Project does not negate other social effects, particularly (as is the case here) where further opportunities are not precluded in the future (and are arguably enabled by some particular elements of work that has been committed to in the design, including some parts of the Lindauer Arts Trail and provision for pedestrian facilities on the Manawatū Bridge).

79. In my opinion, more resilient and reliable accessibility over the Tararua Ranges will have positive impacts on the way of life for residents (vehicle users), who will make up the majority of people using the corridor. Although recreation is important, it is not the primary objective of the Project or the purpose for which its social outcomes should be measured.

Sections 7 and 9 mitigation, environmental offsetting and conditions amendments

80. Section 7 of Ms Austin's report provides a summary of the mitigation proposed by the Transport Agency, and makes recommendations for additional measures. This section closely correlates with section 9 of Ms Austin's report, which goes on to set out proposed amendments to the designation conditions, which were provided as part of the AEE. To avoid repetition, I address these matters together.
81. Section 7.1 sets out Ms Austin's review of the mitigation measures proposed and generally supports these measures (including establishment of a community liaison person, a complaints register, Communications Plan, the Community Liaison Group and the Manawatū Gorge Scenic Reserve Car Park Management and Reinstatement Plan). She goes on to make a number of recommendations to strengthen the effectiveness of these measures. I respond to these matters in turn.
- (a) Ms Austin seeks specific inclusion of a number of construction details in the Communications Plan (in paragraph 143 and by specific changes to wording including paragraph 188). In particular this includes 'construction routes' and 'construction progress'. I consider these matters are adequately provided for in conditions 7(c)(iii)C and E. However, I am not opposed to the expanded list of matters set out by Ms Austin.
- (b) Ms Austin also seeks further definition of the stakeholders to be involved or invited to participate in the Communications Plan and Community Liaison Group (paragraph 143 and paragraph 190). I note that the list of stakeholders identified in the conditions was not intended to be exhaustive, and there is scope for others to be added. I am supportive of amendments to the conditions to provide for a wider scope of stakeholders to be 'invited' to participate in both the Communications Plan and Community Liaison Group, however it is important that such drafting neither requires or relies on participation from these stakeholders (e.g. cycling groups). I also suggest, with this increased specificity, that accessibility advocates or similar are included as another vulnerable 'road user group' alongside cycling groups.
- (c) Ms Austin seeks a number of amendments to involve the Community Liaison Group in the preparation of the Outline Plan and CEMP. I agree with a number of these amendments, subject to the discussion

below on involvement of the community in detailed design processes.

In particular:

- (i) I support expansion of the commencement of the Community Liaison Group, to enable this group to provide a forum for review of the Outline Plan, including aspects of the CEMP, where potential social impacts have been identified (this relates to landscape management, construction traffic management and construction noise activities in particular);
- (ii) I support provision for the Community Liaison Group to continue up to 12 months following construction (to align with final monitoring reporting), but recommend that provision is made for the early cessation of the group should that be agreed by the majority of non-Project participants; and
- (iii) I support minor clarification of the wording of Condition 8(b)iii, to more clearly set out that the intention of the Community Liaison Group is to provide a forum for the community representatives to raise issues and concerns and for the Project team to monitor and respond to these issues.

Section 7.2 Mitigating social effects by involving community in detailed design

82. For the reasons set out earlier in this evidence, I do not consider it appropriate for the Conditions to require community input to all design matters on the Project. In particular, while there may be opportunities for integration of the Project with future opportunities for increased walking and cycling paths (or bridle trails), I do not consider these are necessary works to mitigate social effects and it is not appropriate that there is a requirement for this Project to provide that forum.
83. It is, however, good practice for the Transport Agency (and any other public agency) to undertake community consultation in the development of public good projects. In my experience with the Transport Agency, this would be a likely approach it would take to any such planning. However, in my opinion it is not necessary as a requirement of the designation for the Project.
84. I therefore do not feel that the recommendations put forward by Ms Austin in paragraph 147 of her report are relevant to the stage of design post the confirmation of the designation and Project scope. Where information about the Project needs to be shared or public opinion sought, I consider the

requirements of engagement in the preparation of management plans and the Community Liaison Group provide appropriate mechanisms to do so. For these reasons, I do not feel a separate Engagement Plan is required and that the development of the communications plan (Condition 7) with the amendments above, will provide for appropriate community involvement in the design processes.

85. However, for clarity, I do support minor amendment to the conditions in respect of landscape management, construction environmental management and construction traffic in particular, to clearly set out the role of the Community Liaison Group in review and comment on these plans as they are prepared.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FROM THE HEARING PANEL

86. In this section I respond to questions from the Hearing Panel relevant to my social impact assessment. For clarity, the question from the Panel is provided followed by my response.

Technical Assessment 3 Page 6 Paragraph 13 - Given we are concerned with effects of the designation on the environment, how can we determine those effects if impacts experienced at an individual household level have not been the focus of your social impact assessment?

87. Technical Assessment 3 does provide an assessment of the impacts on the neighborhood community. One of the scales included in my assessment relating to the Project extent is 'neighbourhood'. The purpose of this assessment is to consider where the social impacts for these households may be specific and different to the wider community (i.e. those near the proposed roundabouts). However, Technical Assessment 3 does not specifically include 'individual social impacts' because the assessment is not intended to either replicate (or replace) the role of the individual submitters to make submissions and be heard about individual impacts of concern to them.
88. For completeness, I consider that the social impacts for the 'neighbourhood community' consider the properties within or adjacent to the proposed corridor. My report recommends measures, particularly in respect to community involvement in mitigation design (landscape and noise mitigation), to mitigate these effects.

Technical Assessment 3 Page 6 Paragraph 14 – Is it usual or standard practice to rely on the data you have referenced in this paragraph?

89. In my opinion it is standard practice to have reference to such data when considering potential social impacts. This data would typically include project design and methodology, and any environmental factors relevant to the project. For roading, this would include current and future traffic and noise.
90. The data referred to by the Hearing Panel relates to factual information provided about the Project in relation to design, methodology and current and future environmental factors (noise and traffic). This information is a collection of factual evidence that provides a framework from which I have assessed potential social impacts. Without an understanding of the Project design, methodology, and the current and future noise and traffic environment, we would be unable to determine the potential social impacts. In my opinion, these factors are relevant, as they provide context to the existing way of life, sense of place and quality of environment values that a community may have. They therefore provide a measure to consider the degree of change the project may make to these values.

Technical Assessment 3 Page 7 Paragraph 16 – Can you be more specific as to the specific management measures, design and implementation details you refer to in this paragraph and how do you consider we can provide for an opportunity for community input on the assumption this designation is approved?

91. This refers to opportunities for community to be involved in mitigation measures of relevance to them, without imposing compulsion on them. As set out above in response to the matters raised in the section 42A report, I am supportive of amendment to the conditions regarding the preparation of the Outline Plan (Condition 5A) and the CEMP (Condition 10) to more clearly define the role of the Community Liaison Group in reviewing and commenting on those plans.

Please provide an example of the feedback form used within the public consultation.

92. This is provided as **Attachment 2**.

Have you considered the 'social impacts' of the possible cessation of the Ballantrae Hill Country Research Station fertiliser trials, particularly in light of concerns raised by submitters including AgResearch, Fertiliser NZ, Balance, Beef and Lamb and various individuals?

93. I did not consider the specific social or socio-economic impacts of this outcome, but did reference this issue in Technical Assessment 3.⁴ Since preparing my technical assessment, the Transport Agency has sought specific technical evidence in respect of potential impacts on this facility, including the importance of the facility and the fertilizer trials to the agricultural sector. I refer to the evidence of **Jeff Morton** and **Dave Horne** who have given this specific consideration.

Technical Assessment 3 Page 50 Paragraph 152(b) – Can you explain why you have singled out childcare facilities for particular attention?

94. Along with schools, childcare facilities are present along the current alternate route in Ashhurst and Woodville. These sites represent both community connection points and are facilities for more vulnerable community members (in respect of both their sensitivity to and limited mobility to respond to issues such as construction).

Are your conclusions/recommendations set out in paragraphs 149 to 161 addressed in the NOR conditions offered by NZTA?

95. Yes, I consider that the conditions offered by the Transport Agency (and presented in the evidence of **Ms McLeod**) meet the conclusions and recommendations set out in my report.

Amelia Linzey
8 March 2019

⁴ See paragraph 146e.

**ATTACHMENT 1 - MEDIA COVERAGE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF
THE GORGE CLOSURE**

Provided separately

ATTACHMENT 2 – FEEDBACK FORM USED FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Provided separately

Attachment 1 – Media Coverage of Socio economic impacts on Woodville from Gorge Closure

<https://i.stuff.co.nz/business/93344417/tough-times-for-woodville-main-street-as-gorge-traffic-bypasses-town>

<https://i.stuff.co.nz/motoring/105749483/woodville-gets-preview-of-new-manawat-gorge-route>

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11869993

<https://i.stuff.co.nz/national/94879245/what-options-are-there-for-the-manawatu-gorge>

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/wairarapa-times-age/news/article.cfm?c_id=1503414&objectid=11042864

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11888386

Te Ahu a Turanga Project Feedback Form

1. How has the Manawatū Gorge closure affected you and the local community?

2. Construction of the road will take approximately six years - how would you and the local community be affected if this timeframe was shorter, or longer?

3. What are the opportunities you see to the region or yourself related to the project over the next few years?
(e.g. more jobs or business opportunities)

4. What would be your main purpose for using the new road? (e.g. business, recreational, family visit)

5. What are the important recreational activities to you in relation to this road? (e.g. cycling, sightseeing)

6. Do you have any specific interests in the project other than the road as a transport solution, for example, cultural, spiritual or environmental concerns?

7. The new route will cross the Manawatū River and this means constructing a new bridge on the western side of the gorge. What should we be considering during design, construction and operation?

8. Any other thoughts or comments?

There are a number of ways you can submit your feedback:

- » **Complete this form now and hand back to us**
- » **Take this form home and post it to us (refer to address at the end of this form)**
- » **Email this form to us at manawatugorge@nzta.govt.nz**

Please submit your feedback by Friday 3rd August 2018.

Feedback made on behalf of

Name

Address

Phone

Email



Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions or concerns:

0800 740 560
manawatugorge@nzta.govt.nz

www.nzta.govt.nz
www.facebook.com/nztacni
www.twitter.com/nztacni

Completing this form is voluntary, but by completing it you will be ensuring that the NZ Transport Agency is aware of your concerns. The completed feedback forms will be kept confidential to the NZ Transport Agency, to the extent permitted by the Official Information Act 1981.

Thank you for your feedback on the Te Ahu a Turanga Project.
Mail to: **C/- Stefan Wolf**
New Zealand Transport Agency
Private Bag 11777
Palmerston North 4442