

Before a Board of Inquiry
Transmission Gully
Notices of Requirement and Consents

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Notices of requirement for designations and resource consent applications by the NZ Transport Agency, Porirua City Council and Transpower New Zealand Limited for the Transmission Gully Proposal

between: **NZ Transport Agency**
Requiring Authority and Applicant

and: **Porirua City Council**
Local Authority and Applicant

and: **Transpower New Zealand Limited**
Applicant

Statement of rebuttal evidence of Gary Martin Rae (Social effects) for the NZ Transport Agency, Porirua City Council and Transpower New Zealand Limited

Dated: 18 January 2012

REFERENCE: John Hassan (john.hassan@chapmantripp.com)
Nicky McIndoe (nicky.mcindoe@chapmantripp.com)

**STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF GARY MARTIN RAE
FOR THE NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY, PORIRUA CITY COUNCIL
AND TRANSPOWER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED**

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Gary Martin Rae.
- 2 I have the qualifications and experience set out at paragraphs 2-4 of my statement of evidence in chief, dated 10 November 2011 (*EIC*).
- 3 I repeat the confirmation given in my EIC that I have read, and agree to comply with, the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (Consolidated Practice Note 2011).
- 4 In this statement of rebuttal evidence, I respond to the evidence of:
 - 4.1 Dr Marie O’Sullivan on behalf of the Rational Transport Society (*RTS*);
 - 4.2 Dr Ralph Chapman on behalf of the RTS;
 - 4.3 Mr John Horne on behalf of the RTS;
 - 4.4 Mr Kevin Gywnn on behalf of Mana Cycle Group; and
 - 4.5 Ms Elizabeth Thomas on behalf of Living Streets Wellington.
- 5 The fact that this rebuttal statement does not respond to every matter raised in the evidence of submitter witnesses within my area of expertise should not be taken as acceptance of the matters raised. Rather, I rely on my EIC and this rebuttal statement to set out my opinion on what I consider to be the key social effects matters for this hearing.
- 6 Consistent with my EIC, in this statement of evidence when referring collectively to the NZ Transport Agency (*the NZTA*) Project¹, the Porirua City Council (*PCC*) Project² and the Transpower New Zealand Limited (*Transpower*) Project³ I will use the term “Transmission Gully Proposal” (and hereafter, *the Proposal*).

¹ The ‘NZTA Project’ refers to the construction, operation and maintenance of the Main Alignment and the Kenepuru Link Road by the NZTA.

² The ‘PCC Project’ refers to the construction, operation and maintenance of the Porirua Link Roads (being the Whitby Link Road and the Waitangirua Link Road) by PCC.

³ The ‘Transpower Project’ refers to the relocation of parts of the PKK-TKR A 110kV electricity transmission line between MacKays Crossing and Pauatahanui Substation by Transpower.

- 7 I will refer to the NZTA Project and the PCC Project collectively as the "Transmission Gully Project" (and hereafter, *the TGP* or *the Project*).

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 8 I have read all of the statements of evidence provided by submitters in relation to the Proposal's wider social and community effects.
- 9 In this evidence I address some matters raised in the evidence of Dr O'Sullivan and Dr Chapman, relating to public health issues and impacts on social well-being. In summary, it is my view that the matters raised by Dr O'Sullivan and Dr Chapman are quite generic considerations and are not directly attributed to this Project in their evidence.
- 10 I consider that the Project will have a number of public health and social benefits, as detailed in my EIC, and note that these specific benefits do not seem to have been assessed or acknowledged in the statements of evidence of those submitter witnesses.
- 11 I also consider that concerns expressed in the evidence of Mr Horne, Ms Thomas and Mr Gywnn regarding community severance impacts arising from the Project's effects on regional park walking and running trails, mountain biking trails, and on pedestrians will not cause significant social or community issues.
- 12 My review of that evidence has not caused me to depart from the opinions expressed in my EIC. I re-confirm the conclusions reached with regards to social effects.

EVIDENCE OF SUBMITTERS

Public health and community well-being (Marie O'Sullivan and Ralph Chapman)

- 13 Dr O'Sullivan's evidence seems to take the principled position that road transport projects, such as the TGP, will necessarily have negative impacts on public health and social well-being. For example in paragraph 14 of her statement: "*The transmission gully route is a clear example of the inequality of road transport policies. The increasing car dependence fostered by such projects in general leads to air pollution, urban sprawl, exposure to environmental hazards, physical inactivity and lack of an accessible built environment*".
- 14 Paragraph 15 states that: "*The resultant poor urban design contributes to poor health outcomes, with increase in the incidence of obesity, respiratory conditions, cardiovascular diseases, traffic related injury, stress and social isolation*". The next paragraph goes

on to state that: "... major roads [are] known to disrupt social networks and reduce neighbourhood connectivity" (paragraph 16).

- 15 Dr O'Sullivan's evidence states that socio-economically deprived communities are most affected by these factors (paragraph 21). Her evidence at paragraph 27 states: "*From a health perspective, none of this [in reference to the discussion on health of children in Porirua] argues for the creation of a new major route past these communities with connector roads, but rather that the necessary steps are taken to improve air quality, local connectivity and access to public transport. All of these measures run counter to the proposed Transmission Gully project ...*".
- 16 Dr Chapman states, by way of a general observation, that projects which expand road capacity may stimulate additional vehicle travel. He records, at paragraph 42: "...*this can lead to future indirect health impacts that are not fully measured, such as increased pollution over time, increased reliance on private car travel, reduced efficiency of public transport systems, barriers to walking and cycling, and reductions in physical activity*" (emphasis is added).
- 17 In this respect, I consider that both Dr O'Sullivan's and Dr Chapman's statements of evidence take a very generic view of the Project. In doing so they do not take account of the following factors which are all relevant to health effects, and are specific to this Project:
- 17.1 Public transport – **Mr McCombs'** evidence in chief is that this Project is part of the comprehensive and integrated Regional Land Transport Strategy, of which public transport forms an important part;
- 17.2 Accessibility and traffic safety – **Mr Kelly's** evidence in chief outlines the overall improvements in accessibility and mobility along the route and the resulting safety benefits for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. **Mr Kelly** explains how the expected reduction in traffic on the existing State highway 1 and 58 will be beneficial for the promotion of both walking and cycling;
- 17.3 Urban design and connectivity – **Ms Hancock's** evidence in chief addresses the urban design issues for each section of the route including for the communities adjacent to the connecting roads in Porirua East (e.g. Waitangirua) and outlines the design and mitigation measures to ensure connectivity for healthy functioning communities;
- 17.4 Air quality effects – **Mr Fisher's** evidence in chief addresses the air quality effects of the Project and outlines the mitigation measures proposed during construction. His

evidence is that vehicle emissions will be within the standards and guidelines for air quality, which are designed to protect the health of vulnerable individuals in the community. **Mr Fisher's** evidence demonstrates that air quality will be improved in many parts of the Project area, following the Project's completion;

- 17.5 Noise – **Dr Chiles'** evidence in chief addresses the effects of noise and states that the relevant New Zealand standards for noise will be met, where appropriate. He concludes that all operational and construction noise and vibration will be restricted to within reasonable levels; and
- 17.6 Local communities – **Ms Lawler's** evidence in chief concludes that the Project will provide significant social and community benefits both locally and regionally, including benefits for coastal communities and a revitalisation of the Waitangirua suburban centre. **Ms Lawler's** evidence concludes that the Project is consistent with the Porirua Development Framework and with local community initiatives for this area.
- 18 In light of that evidence, it is my view that the health effects of this Project have been adequately assessed and that the Project will have a number of positive impacts on both public health and social wellbeing.
- 19 I consider it is also relevant that the Social Impact Assessment team consulted with Regional Public Health which is the agency with overall responsibility for public health issues. Some concerns were raised that are similar to some of the matters in Dr O'Sullivan's statement of evidence, particularly regarding potential health effects on the lower socio-economic sectors of the community. However, following on from that consultation, attention was paid to matters that may affect public health in affected communities (such as in Waitangirua village) in a series of urban design workshops, as noted in my EIC (paragraphs 69-71). I note that Regional Public Health did not submit on the Proposal as notified.

Severance effects: walking tracks, mountain bike tracks and pedestrian linkages (John Horne, Kevin Gywnn and Liz Thomas)

- 20 Mr Horne's evidence raises concerns at the TGP's severance effects for trampers and runners in both the Belmont Regional Park (*BRP*) and Battle Hill Farm Forest Park (*BHFFP*). **Ms Hancock's** rebuttal evidence addresses these concerns. She states that for BRP, the connectivity to the larger area of the park is a primary urban design consideration and one that has been addressed in the Project (paragraph 11). Her evidence describes the realignment of the existing tracks and outlines how new link tracks will maintain connections across BRP. In relation to BHFFP, **Ms Hancock**

supports the dedicated use of Bridge 7 and the approach tracks for walkers, horses with their riders, and cyclists (and for the bridge to not be used by logging trucks) in order to assist with connectivity for park users.

- 21 Mr Gywnn's evidence (on behalf of Mana Cycle Group) is concerned with severance impacts for mountain biking, and he makes several suggestions for mitigation and further consultation. **Ms Hancock's** rebuttal evidence addresses those matters and explains how potential severance will be mitigated by the Project's design measures (for example at paragraphs 19 -21, 23-26). She also considers that the consultation process proposed in the amended conditions will appropriately enable input from the Mana Cycle Group and other community stakeholders to the final location and design of the realignments to the Duck Creek and Takapu tracks (paragraph 23).
- 22 Ms Thomas's evidence raises concerns at the potential effects of the Project on pedestrians. She records that: *"There are a number of significant new intersections created by this road as it passes through existing communities that will require appropriate pedestrian crossings. I note that signalised intersections are proposed rather than roundabouts. These could provide a high LOS if well designed"* (paragraph 22).
- 23 From a community perspective I support the need for well-designed intersections to cater for pedestrians. However, I note that there will in fact be very few new intersections passing through existing communities, and of those, only one will have traffic signals. In any event, the design of these intersections will accommodate pedestrians, and this has been addressed in the Urban Design and Landscape Framework. **Ms Hancock's** rebuttal evidence at paragraphs 36 – 40 further addresses the specific considerations raised by Ms Thomas for the design of intersections.
- 24 In relation to the existing coastal road (SH1), Ms Thomas states that: *" ... a high degree of severance will remain without remedial actions and there is no data to show that pedestrians will experience a reduction in trip time as a result of the project."* (paragraph 24). As noted in my EIC (at paragraphs 49.3, 79), I consider the Project will reduce the incidence of community severance in the coastal communities, principally through reduced traffic.
- 25 In that respect I concur with the following statements in **Mr Kelly's** rebuttal evidence:

" ... it is reasonable to expect some increase in pedestrian activity within and between those communities in the SH1 corridor which will experience significant reductions in both traffic volumes and severance." (paragraph 83);

"Ms Thomas identifies a number of 'notable severance issues for pedestrians'. All of the issues are existing and improvements in Pukerua Bay and Mana will follow from the removal of through traffic. For the Paremata – Porirua section, a parallel pedestrian (and cycle) route is currently available utilising Papakowhai Road, Okowai Road and a short off-road track." (paragraph 86).

- 26 For these reasons, I consider that the concerns relating to severance effects are adequately addressed in the design of the Project.

MINOR CORRECTION TO EVIDENCE IN CHIEF

- 27 I would also like to take this opportunity to make a very minor correction to my EIC. At paragraph 40 of my EIC, I referred to **Ms Lawler's** evidence and cited the paragraph reference as paragraph 19 of her evidence in chief (see footnote 4 of my EIC). In fact, the correct paragraph reference is paragraph 20 of her evidence in chief.



Gary Martin Rae
18 January 2012