

I hereby give notice that a hearing by commissioners will be held on:

Date: Monday, 15 May 2023
Time: 9.30am
Meeting Room: Uxbridge Theatre
Venue: 35 Uxbridge Road, Howick, Auckland 2014

APPLICATION MATERIAL

SECTION 92 DOCUMENTS – VOLUME 5

**5 REEVES ROAD, PAKURANGA HEIGHTS (EB2);
207 TI RAKAU DRIVE, PAKURANGA HEIGHTS
(EB3R)**

**AUCKLAND TRANSPORT IN CONJUNCTION
WITH EASTERN BUSWAY ALLIANCE**

COMMISSIONERS

Chairperson Sarah Shaw
Commissioners Ian Munro
Nigel Mark-Brown

**Patrice Baillargeon, Senior Hearings Advisor
KAITOHUTOHU MATAAMUA WHAKAWĀ/
SENIOR HEARINGS ADVISOR**

Telephone: 09 890 4692 or 027 338 5383
Email: patrice.baillargeon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Note: The reports contained within this document are for consideration and should not be construed as a decision of Council. Should commissioners require further information relating to any reports, please contact the hearings advisor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS – VOLUME 5

PAGE NO.

Letter from Applicant in response to further information request - dated 7
February 2023

3 - 4

Attachment 1 Social Impact Assessment Addendum

5 - 56

7 February 2023

Auckland Council
Private Bag 92300
Victoria Street West
Auckland 1142

Attention: Warwick Pascoe

Dear Warwick

Re. Response to Council further information requests for the EB2 and EB3R Application Packages

I am writing in regard to Auckland Council's (the Council) further information request letter of 9 September 2022 for the Eastern Busway 2 (EB2) Eastern Busway 3 Residential (EB3R) application packages. As per earlier discussions with yourself and other Council officers, we have prepared this response to address the Council's queries regarding the EB2 and EB3R social impact assessment (SIA).

Given the technical nature of these queries, an addendum document has been prepared by the Project's social impact assessment specialists and has been attached to this letter. Matters addressed in the addendum include:

- Identification and further assessment of 'vulnerable groups'
- Identification and further assessment of 'key organisations'
- Further detail on the Project's engagement events and related outcomes
- Cross References to the proposed conditions sets.

We note that Council's SIA reviewer also raised questions in regard to noise and air quality matters. We consider that these matters are already comprehensively addressed in both the submitted application documentation (i.e. the AEEs and technical reports) and the section 92 responses provided in November 2022. In addition, we note that SIA related queries regarding 'counter-factual scenarios' are addressed by the previously submitted Options Assessment (Appendix 20 of the EB2 application package).

Based on the above, the Eastern Busway Alliance considers that the Council's SIA related queries have been sufficiently addressed and as such, are resolved.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Zame', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Matt Zame
Alliance Project Director

Attachment 1 – SIA Addendum

Eastern Busway

EB2 and EB3 Residential

Social Impact Assessment Addendum

Document Number: EB234-1-PL-RP-Z2-000029






Eastern Busway EB2 and EB3 Residential

Social Impact Assessment Addendum

Document Number: EB234-1-PL-RP-Z2-000029

Document History and Status			
Rev	Date	Author	Status
A	January 2023	Kate Symington and John Daly	Council Issue
B			
C			
1			
2			
3			

Document Approval					
Rev	Action	Name	Position	Date	Signature
A	Author	John Daly	Social Impact Assessor	31/01/2023	
A	Author	Kate Symington	Social Impact Assessor	31/01/2023	
1	Reviewer	Roger McDonald	Principal Planner	31/01/2023	



2	Reviewer	Jarrod Snowsill	EBA Planning and Property – Team Leader (Acting)	01/02/2023	
3	Approver	Matt Zame	Alliance Project Director	01/02/2023	

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations and Definitions	5
1.0 Introduction	7
2.0 Table of Response.....	8
3.0 Methodology.....	21
3.1 Overview.....	21
3.1.1 Risk Assessment and Impact Rating	21
4.0 Updated impact tables.....	23
4.1 Construction impacts.....	23
4.1.1 Construction impacts for EB2	23
4.1.2 Construction impacts for EB3R.....	30
4.2 Operational impacts	36
4.2.1 Operational impacts for EB2.....	36
4.2.2 Operational impacts for EB3R	41
4.3 Recommended Management and Response Measures.....	46
5.0 References	50

List of Abbreviations and Definitions

Abbreviation and Definitions	Description
AEE	Assessment of Environmental Effects
AUP(OP)	Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) 2016
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CPTED	Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
EB1	Eastern Busway 1 (Panmure to Pakuranga)
EB2	Eastern Busway 2 (Pakuranga Town Centre)
EB3 Commercial/ EB3C	Eastern Busway 3 (Gossamer Drive to Botany)
EB3 Residential/ EB3R	Eastern Busway 3 (SEART to Gossamer Drive)
EB4	Eastern Busway 4 (link between Ti Rakau Drive and Te Irirangi Drive, Botany Town Centre Station)
EBA	Eastern Busway Alliance
ETBP	East Tāmaki Business Precinct
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HWCN	Howick Walking and Cycling Network
ITA	Integrated Transport Assessment
km	Kilometre(s)
LBA	Local Board Area
LBP	Local Board Plan
m	Metre(s)
m ²	Square Metre(s)
m ³	Cubic Metre(s)
MCA	Multi-Criteria Analysis
NPS - UD	National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020
NoR	Notice of Requirement
PTCMP	Pakuranga Town Centre Masterplan
PWA	Public Works Act 1981

RTN	Rapid Transit Network
RRF	Reeves Road Flyover
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
SEART	South-Eastern Highway

1.0 Introduction

This report is an addendum to the Social Impact Assessment dated July 2022 for Eastern Busway 2 (EB2) and Eastern Busway 3 Residential (EB3R) sections of the Eastern Busway Project.

This addendum provides additional information in response to the Auckland Council Section 92 Request for Information under the Resource Management Act 1991. The response has been prepared following a meeting with Council's Social Impact Reviewer (Robert Quigley) on 18 October 2022.

2.0 Table of Response

Comment	S92 Comment	Response
(26)	<p>Please provide a detailed description of the specific project elements to be assessed (p15 and 16)</p> <p>Understanding what is being assessed is a key early step in assessing potential impacts (Section 3.2.1 and Section 3.2.2). The current lists have a limited description of the project features, and instead mostly include commentary on potential outcomes – which is the purpose of the specialist assessments and would not typically be in the project description. For example, all that can be determined from the project description in the SIA about the Reeves Road Flyover is that it is an ‘elevated structure.’</p> <p>The rest of the material in the RRF dot point relates to potential outcomes. For example, given it is a flyover, the treatment of the spaces running the full length beneath the flyover would likely be critical to achieving outcomes for crime prevention, amenity, pedestrian usage, cyclist usage and the access between community facilities, but there is no information presented on this in the SIA.</p> <p>For the U-turn facilities on EB3R it is not clear whether they are signalised and in phase with other traffic lights. Such details greatly affect potential outcomes but are not provided. These are just two examples of where there is insufficient detail about the project, and as such it is difficult to review whether the potential effects identified in the SIA are appropriate or not.</p>	<p>The AEE should be read in conjunction with the SIA.</p> <p>For EB2 a detailed description of the project is provided in Section 4 of the AEE.</p> <p>For EB3R a detailed description of the project is provided in Section 3 of the AEE.</p>

<p>(27)</p>	<p>Please provide an assessment of vulnerable groups</p> <p>The methodology and analysis section (4.1) describes: ‘However, awareness of the differential distribution of impacts among different groups in society, particularly the impact burden experienced by vulnerable groups in the community should always be of prime concern.’ However, engagement with vulnerable groups is unclear, and little analysis/assessment is undertaken as the population groups assessed are geographically determined, and not determined by need. In a transport project, vulnerable groups to assess would typically include people with disabilities, older people e.g., the residents of 33 Dale Crescent or 14 Edgewater Drive, and children. Given the number of businesses potentially affected, small businesses could also be added. Community engagement would assist in determining if these were the only appropriate groups to consider.</p> <p>On occasions, vulnerable groups are discussed, e.g., in Community Severance (Section 7.3.1.1.3) disability is mentioned, however, potential social effects are not described for people with disabilities. AT Capital Projects Accessibility Group is cited as solving access problems with no direct link back to the issues identified in this project, and it appears that tactile paving, wheelchair access and visually contrasting ground surfaces are to be used in the construction period, whereas they are more likely operational outcomes?</p> <p>While pedestrian access is assured for all businesses and facilities during construction, is that access suitable for vulnerable groups? There is insufficient information</p>	<p>Vulnerable groups</p> <p>The vulnerable groups that were identified for the SIA included children (those at local schools and early learning centres), elderly (including those at retirement villages), local Asian community, local Māori and Pasifika community, low-income groups and local communities including Asian communities.</p> <p>The analysis which supported the identification of these groups included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the EB2 and EB3R SA1 area 19% and 17.2% respectively were under 15 years old compared to 19.4% and 20% in Howick LBA and the wider Auckland Region. For those aged 65 years and over, there were slightly higher proportions within the EB2 and EB3R SA1 areas (12.7% and 15.8% respectively) than the Auckland region (12%). • A significant proportion of the population in EB2-SA1 identified as Asian (44.7%). There were also communities of Pacific Peoples (11.8%) and Māori (6.7%). In EB3R-SA1 37.2% identified as Asian, 13.1% identified as Pacific Peoples and 10.6% as Māori. • The deprivation scores along the corridor indicated that there were some areas of high deprivation. The average median wage for EB2-SA1 was \$29,280 and for EB3R-SA1 was \$31,704 compared to \$34,400 in the Auckland Region. <p>Engagement with vulnerable groups</p> <p>Section 4.7 of the SIA sets out the key stakeholders and communities that have been consulted as part of the Project. Section 6.7 sets out the relevant community consultation outcomes.</p> <p>Additional engagement events were held at Pakuranga Shopping Centre, Edgewater College and Pakuranga Intermediate School, and were attended by the Social Impact Assessor. Invites were bilingual, school venues were asked to circulate invites to the school community with invites sent directly to residents, representatives of the Chinese community, mana whenua and wider stakeholders. The feedback generally fell into three main categories: the Ti Rakau Park playground upgrade, design suggestions, and construction.</p> <p>The detailed design of the Project will be informed by further consultation with the community, including vulnerable groups as required by Communication and Consultation Plan (CCP) (EB2 Condition 15, EB3R Condition 20) and through the Urban Design and Landscape Plan (UDLP) (Condition 40 for EB2, Condition 45 for EB3R).</p> <p>Social impacts</p> <p>Vulnerable groups, including people with disabilities, were considered in the assessment. Additional information to support the assessment set out in Section 7.0 of the SIA is provided below.</p> <p>Potential social impacts for people with disabilities include:</p>
-------------	---	---

	<p>provided to understand the potential effects on vulnerable people.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More accessible public transport infrastructure, such as new bus station facilities and improved pedestrian facilities which will make travel safer and easier. ○ Improved access to the Town Centre, employment opportunities, community and cultural facilities ○ Improved access to parks through better connectivity, safer access and upgraded facilities including an all-abilities playground at Ti Rakau Park. • Construction Impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Severance issues due to unsuitable access to services and facilities during construction with the potential for these to be higher for people with disabilities. ○ Stress and anxiety from the uncertainty associated with the delivery of the project and the change to the surrounding environment by the project ○ Impacts from noise and dust generated by the Project. • Operational impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impacts from noise and dust generated by the Project. <p>Mitigation</p> <p>AT Capital Projects Accessibility Group is one of a number of groups that AT will consult with in terms of the design and final mitigation for the project.</p> <p>Accessibility requirements for those with disabilities are noted in section 4.5.1 of the CTMP which includes references to temporary footpaths for vulnerable users.</p>
(28)	<p>Please provide an assessment of key organisations</p> <p>The methodology and analysis section (4.1) describes that assessment is important 'at the level of an individual person, an economic unit (family /household), as social group (circle of friends), a workplace (a company or Government agency) or by community/society general.' The assessment largely considers community/society general with little reference to specific companies or organisations. For example, when considering construction access to connectivity (Section 7.3.1.1.2) the SIA states 'Several</p>	<p>Section 7.0 of the SIA makes reference to specific groups / properties / vulnerable groups where impacts are considered to be notable. Additional discussion is provided below.</p> <p>Key organisations are identified and considered in the SIA include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and early learning centre • Medical centres • Library, Citizens Advice Bureau and Local Government offices • Art Gallery • Places of worship.

<p>commercial and residential properties in the EB2 neighbourhood area will have access impacted during construction works.'</p> <p>It is unlikely that the social effects are identical across all organisations and there is insufficient information to understand potential social effects. For example, the medical centre may have a larger proportion of users who are sight impaired, physically disabled, neurodiverse, and/or anxious compared with other organisations. Or to put it another way, perhaps a business might experience a different social effect than a mosque – certainly given the different services they provide one would assume so? The social effect is considered to be 'access and connectivity', but that is the determinant of the social effect. If access and connectivity is restricted, the potential social effects of that for mosque worshippers is most likely different to that of medical centre visitors. But what are these social effects? And so, it continues with schools, medical centres, businesses, residents, libraries, galleries or emergency services.</p> <p>Therefore, the assessment should consider the extent, duration, magnitude, likelihood, consequence and impact rating for different types of organisations, the actual social effect, and once that is known some organisations might need different mitigation to others. The necessary detail is lacking in the assessment. This issue plays out in nearly every assessment section, where descriptions of effects are applied to a large grouping and the effects themselves are broad, rather than specific to any particular organisation or vulnerable group.</p>	<p>There are no emergency services in the study area. The closest emergency services are located in Howick (Fire Station and Ambulance). Section 4.6 of the CTMP specifically identifies how access will be managed for emergency services.</p> <p>The SIA considered access and connectivity effects. Additional commentary for the medical centre and the mosque is provided below.</p> <p>The Pakuranga Medical Centre also provides associated services like the pharmacy, radiology, dentist, triton hearing. Pakuranga Medical Centre currently use the AT road reserve for temporary car parking through an agreement with AT which has a one month vacation notice period. The loss of this carparking has been highlighted by the medical centre as a key concern with the need for staff and patients to have parking close to the facility.</p> <p>EBA has been working with the Pakuranga Medical Centre to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide up to date information about the program of works • Identify alternative parking locations • Maintain suitable access to the medical centre for vulnerable users. <p>East Auckland Islamic Trust/Masjid Abu Bakr Al-Siddiq Mosque is one of the largest Shia Islamic centres in Auckland. There are typically 20-40 groups for prayers with evenings and Fridays being busier times, however prayers and classes occur throughout the day. The mosque is likely to be busier in April/May due to Ramadan and Eid al-Fitr. For the Mosque there is limited existing parking for users of this space, so parking in the wider town centre area is used. Most people travelling to the mosque come via Reeves Road and will be able use William Roberts Road once it has been extended (the resource consent for the extension of William Roberts Road has been approved).</p> <p>Note the EBA Planning Team that the busway will provide mode choice, so there will be alternatives to driving and parking at the mosque.</p>
---	--

<p>(29)</p>	<p>Please provide a definition for each effect assessed and a thorough assessment for each effect chosen to be assessed.</p> <p>The International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) SIA framework (Section 4.5) chosen is a broad description of potential categories to base an assessment on. The SIA continues to use the broad IAIA categories within the assessment chapter (Section 7). This leads to other concerns, as assessment headings such as “People’s way of life, community and culture” are bold in their breadth. Way of life, community, and culture are three separate categories in the IAIA SIA framework, each a potentially enormous topic, but in this SIA are all rolled into one.</p> <p>As such, there is insufficient detail in the SIA to understand the potential effects across these categories. For example, for culture, the SIA attempts to cover this topic within a single paragraph on community character (Section 7.3.1.1.1 and repeated in Section 7.3.2.1.1). What culture is, is not defined, and how culture relates to community character is not described. Social effects are not identified, consequence, likelihood and a social impact rating are not described in the text, nor in the summary (Section 7.5). This is one example of many throughout the assessment, where the SIA suggests significant topics will be discussed, but there is insufficient detail provided.</p>	<p>The framework for the assessment was set out in Section 4.5 of the SIA.</p> <p>The SIA adopts the categories set out in the International Association for Impact Assessment Social Impact Assessment Guidance. The assessment has been grouped under the categories where appropriate and commentary is proportionate to the level, nature and scale of effects, with additional information provided in this response.</p> <p>Additional information about the social impact rating has been provided in Section 3.0 (methodology) and 4.0 (updated impact tables) of the SIA Addendum.</p>
<p>(30)</p>	<p>Please provide the literature review</p> <p>Section 4.3 describes a ‘literature review has been undertaken’. It is normal practice with a literature review to describe the research questions that are being asked/answered, the search strategy used, and a summary of findings. In particular, the empirical</p>	<p>SIA guidance was reviewed to inform the approach to the submitted SIA. This guidance is referred to in Section 4.0 of that document.</p> <p>SIAs prepared for transport projects in Auckland were reviewed due to their similar scale, infrastructure type and urban locations. The outcome of this review was to obtain information on the range of actual and potential impacts associated with the Project.</p>

	<p>evidence regarding transport interventions and social outcomes is a critical component of a literature review.</p> <p>The description of documents included in the literature review (Section 4.3) appears to include all written documents that have been read for the SIA, which is unusual for a literature review. While it is usual in a SIA to read consultation reports, local policy, and other technical assessments etc, unless they help in answering the research questions set for the literature review by uncovering empirical evidence, they would normally be described/discussed separately.</p> <p>Section 5 of the SIA is headed 'Review of social impacts from transport projects.' However, this heading is somewhat misleading as the documents reviewed are SIAs, and SIAs rarely provide evidence about actual social effects. Rather, they instead project potential effects. A review of topics covered in SIA is helpful to inform what topics might be assessed in an SIA. There is insufficient detail about the literature review undertaken and the findings from it.</p>	<p>The SIA reviewed Social Impact Management Plans and Social Impact Annual Reports for the City Rail Link project. The outcome of this review was to obtain insights into the actual experiences of affected communities during the construction process. The review of these documents is set out in Section 5.0 of the SIA.</p> <p>The SIA reviewed planning policy and local plans to understand the Council and community aspirations for the area. This forms part of Section 6.5 of the SIA.</p> <p>Relevant published literature was reviewed to identify and / or inform the assessment of the potential social impacts associated with the Project. Where appropriate, the literature was referred to and referenced in Section 7.0 of the SIA.</p>
(31)	<p>Please include the voice of local stakeholders and those being assessed in the SIA and then address/respond to those concerns within the SIA.</p> <p>In Section 4.7 the SIA team acknowledge 'social impact engagement is a limitation of this assessment.' Acknowledging this is the first step, the second step is rectifying it. Community interviews and community open days were held by the planning team, and some relevant questions were asked. The SIA team say they have 'analysed the findings of the consultation feedback reports' however, the data reflecting this community voice is only sporadically articulated in the SIA and any</p>	<p>Community consultation outcomes are set out in Section 6.7 of the SIA.</p> <p>Consultation feedback has been considered in the assessment of impacts (Section 7.0) and this response. Key feedback has been referred to in the SIA.</p> <p>The social impact assessors attended community engagement events in June, July, August 2022. These events were held at Pakuranga Plaza, Edgewater College and Pakuranga Intermediate.</p> <p>The responses to the engagement held are published in the Consultation Outcomes Report available at: at-eastern-busways-feedback-summary-report-community-information-days-july-and-august-2022.pdf</p> <p>Feedback was received from Edgewater College and residents of the retirement community at an event held at Edgewater College in August 2022. This noted that there is currently a large amount of traffic which turns right out of Edgewater Drive west in the afternoon peak. This feedback is currently being considered by EBA in terms of the design for those turning out of Edgewater Drive. However, it is considered that the changes will not result</p>

	<p>rationale for why community concerns might be unfounded is not presented.</p> <p>To provide sufficient detail, separate presentation of community data about social concerns is requested. For example, Section 6.7.4 says 'Engagement with educational facilities raised concerns about safety, road layout, and accessibility for educational facilities including Edgewater College, Riverhills School and the ability for parents and students to access the school(s).' The assessment section (7.3.2.1.3) focuses only on 'Edgewater College is currently accessed by school buses...' and the discussion becomes about how to enable a U-turn by buses on Edgewater Drive. In Section 7.5 Summary of Effects, the assessment results for Edgewater College and proposed mitigation do not appear. Overall, it appears the voice of the school community has been slowly quietened as the document continues, providing little to no assurance that concerns have been heard or addressed, or the school community provided reassurance that the current design is appropriate. Simply, there is insufficient detail.</p>	<p>in significant severance or wider access issues, any inconvenience is expected to reduce as new routes become established and the community makes use of the busway.</p> <p>Consultation has included a number of schools in the area including Riverhills School. Riverhills School is a small primary school (approximately 100 children) with a localised school catchment located mostly to the north of Ti Rakau Drive and including the suburb of Burswood. There is the potential for a small number of students to be impacted by intersection works at Edgewater Drive East and Gossamer Drive.</p>
(32)	<p>Please clearly identify social effects arising from altered transport outcomes.</p> <p>The SIA's role is to assess social outcomes arising from alteration to transport outcomes, yet on many occasions the SIA stops the assessment at the transport outcome or presents cursory social effects. For example, DW Family Doctors, is being displaced with no current surety of another location (Section 7.3.1.2.1). A close reading of the characterisation of effects is "The loss of these facilities will be felt at a local community level..."; "...the loss of these facilities still has the potential to affect existing patients and the community..." and "patients may not be able or willing to relocate to a different</p>	<p>In terms of the possible rating, the GP Surgery is on a short-term tenancy and will be provided with advance and extended notice of the intention to end the lease agreement. This allows the GP Surgery time to find an alternative premise. Advanced notice will also allow time for communication with patients, allowing them to plan ahead. On this basis the impact has been categorised as possible.</p>

	<p>practice which may result in delays seeking help and poor health and wellbeing.” The last sentence is the only sentence which describes a potential social effect.</p> <p>It is considered that the medical centre and patients who go there have far more to say than one sentence about the potential social effect from displacement. Yet, the likelihood of this occurring is described as ‘possible’, which is defined as ‘might occur at some time.’ This appears to substantially under-rate the likelihood of an effect occurring. It is noted that the likelihood for many of the other assessments are also rated as ‘possible’, when categorisation of ‘likely’ or ‘almost certain’ appear more suitable.</p>	
(33)	<p>Please provide the meeting notes from individual meetings with each of the stakeholders in the consult and involve columns in Table 4.</p> <p>To be able to determine if the breadth of concerns of residents and organisations have been appropriately assessed in the SIA, the notes for each of the individual meeting are requested. These notes will provide sufficient information on the context of the facilities such as how many people attend for what purpose, relative availability of similar facilities in the local area, who accesses the facilities, by which mode of transport, any particularly vulnerable groups, positive and negative comments on the design, and suggested mitigations, etc. Referenced documents in the SIA provide insufficient detail about community concerns.</p>	<p>All information regarding consultation that has been carried out to date is available at: https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/eastern-busway/pakuranga-to-botany/</p> <p>The SIA assessment has been informed by the Consultation Outcomes reports prepared by EBA’s engagement team. The team consists of IAP2 accredited professionals. In addition, the SIA has further been informed by a detailed briefing from the engagement team on the engagement feedback.</p>
(34)	<p>Please provide a discussion of the evidence underpinning each assessment, along with the scale of people impacted, time period and severity - for each topic assessed and for each population assessed. The pre- and post-mitigation effects, with the mitigation clearly described for each, are also needed.</p>	<p>Refer to Sections 3.0 and 4.0 for updated Social Impact Rating Tables and a description of duration and severity.</p> <p>As set out in response to query (30) range of literature and social impact assessments have been reviewed to inform the SIA.</p>

	<p>Each assessment topic in Section 7 considers consequence and likelihood, however consequence is broadly defined in the method section, incorporating extent, duration and magnitude. Within the discussion there is little reference to the characteristics of the impact rating described in the method (Section 2.2.4.2) e.g., number/magnitude of people impacted, time period/duration of exposure, severity/consequence.</p> <p>It is considered that this information would be provided for all topics, all backed up by a discussion drawing on the project description, literature review, community data and finally the assessor's judgement. The effects pre- and post-mitigation, with the mitigation clearly described for each, are also needed, in one discussion. At present it is difficult to follow the judgements made and there is insufficient detail.</p> <p>Below is a single summary example from another SIA, that Robert Quigley (council's social impact specialist) has recently reviewed that clearly laid out the information for the reader for each social topic assessed, including (1) description of the impact topic; (2) An assessment of the potential impact; (3) The mitigation proposed; and (4) A summary of the impact assessment pre- and post-mitigation. A hyperlink to the SIA is here.</p> <p>[cid:image002.png@01D8D7D7.AF83A390]</p>	
(35)	<p>Please provide an analysis that clearly describes what is being assessed versus a counter factual.</p> <p>At present there is no mention of the counter factual. Is it the status quo? A counter factual is the basic premise of all impact assessment but is not mentioned. Instead, the SIA describes effects without any comparator. Clearly setting out what is assessed should occur in the</p>	<p>The SIA assesses the impacts of the project on the existing community and social environment, as set out in Section 6.0 of the SIA.</p>

	methods section and be implemented in the assessment section.	
(36)	<p>Please include an assessment of potential social effects for residential areas with a high risk of offensive or objectionable dust nuisance and provide reassurance that the mitigation will achieve a low social effect.</p> <p>The Air Quality Assessment concludes Te Tuhi (Area B in the Air Quality Assessment) has the potential to experience a medium risk of objectionable dust, and residential areas (Areas A and C) a high risk. Within the SIA, only Te Tuhi is considered under air quality. The mitigations referenced in the SIA are generic but are heavily relied upon to achieve low social effects. Sensitive receivers like Te Tuhi are only metres from an elevated work site and there is insufficient information to determine what the social effect may be.</p>	<p><u>Air quality</u></p> <p>Residential properties on Dale Crescent (adjacent to the SEART tie in), William Roberts Road and Ayr Road (north of Ti Rakau Park) are identified as having high risk of offensive or objectionable dust nuisance in the Air Quality Impact Assessment. The SIA impact rating includes consideration of these properties. It is also noted in the EB2 AEE that an air discharge consent is not required for the proposed works given compliance with the permitted activity standards of the AUP(OP) and the NES-AQ.</p> <p>Compliance with the air discharge standards and the implementation of the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Erosion Settlement Control Plan, including site specific measures, are appropriate methods to manage dust effects. These technical measures, alongside the CCP, have been considered in the assessment and resulted in the low impact rating following mitigation.</p>
(37)	<p>Please assess potential social effects arising from operational noise exposure for vulnerable populations and residences exceeding noise standards</p> <p>The SIA has taken the overall noise assessment summary and applied it to all properties. Please consider the land uses of those properties experiencing moderate adverse and significant adverse noise effects (in Appendix D, operational noise assessment) and work with the affected properties to identify if a social effect might arise or not. For example, one of those addresses experiencing a moderate significant adverse noise effect, 33 Dale Crescent, is a retirement village. The SIA discounts social effects from noise because the 'noise levels are not unexpected for an urban environment',</p>	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>The SIA has considered the social impact of noise for the EB2 and EB3R local community study areas. The SIA acknowledges that there are increased noise levels at specified locations along the corridor due to the removal of houses for construction. There are also reductions and no changes for some properties.</p> <p>In terms of noise level increases for EB2 there are 5 Protected Premises and Facilities (PPFs) (out of 280 PPFs) and for EB3R there are 24 PPFs (out of 273 PPFs) predicted to have a noise level increase of 3 dB or greater compared to the do-nothing scenario. Mitigation, in the form of noise walls, has also been offered by AT at the most affected properties. Further detail is provided in the noise and vibration assessment.</p> <p>These increases from baseline are acknowledged, but the noise increases are not considered to be out of keeping with an urban environment, and nor would they prevent the continued use of residential properties or community facilities.</p>

	<p>however that is not the premise for social impact assessment; it is project versus no project.</p> <p>Furthermore, Appendix D of the operational noise assessment shows many properties exceed NZS 6806 noise criteria during operation with mitigation 4, and no assessment of social effects on those properties is carried out. At present there is insufficient information to understand the potential social effects arising from noise.</p>	<p>The social impact rating is considered to be neutral up to positive for the corridor, i.e. where noise levels decrease or remain the same, with localised low adverse for the properties which will experience an increase in noise. The impact rating has been revised accordingly.</p>
(38)	<p>Please provide additional information about the neutral social effect arising from the RRF, day and night, and along the full length of the flyover.</p> <p>Section 7.4.1.4.4 says 'With the proposed design features which are anticipated to create an attractive and safe environment underneath the flyover the social impact rating is considered neutral.' Please identify where the assessment of an attractive and safe environment is from? The Landscape and Visual Assessment does not assess safety (or severance, or access to facilities), though it does report a moderate to high negative effect for some residential viewing audiences; and low-moderate for Pakuranga Community Centre (p49). At present there is insufficient information to understand the potential social effects arising from the flyover, especially at night, or along the full length as the flyover moves away from the town centre and lowers to the ground.</p>	<p><u>Visual</u></p> <p>We acknowledge that there is the potential for a visual impact and change to community character, but the Project is proposing quality urban design outcomes and integrating CPTED measures for the RRF. There are also benefits associated with diverting traffic away from Pakuranga Town Centre and will improve pedestrian crossings and movement within the area.</p> <p>The visual impact and quality of the urban realm will inform the community's enjoyment and sense of well-being. The Natural Character, Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment notes that there are some moderate visual effects associated with the RRF. However, there are benefits associated with diverting traffic away from the car dominated Town Centre.</p> <p>Prior to mitigation it is considered that the social impact is low adverse (likelihood = unlikely, consequence = minor).</p> <p>To ensure that a high-quality urban realm is delivered a condition for a comprehensive Urban Design and Landscaping Plan (UDLP) (Condition 40) is proposed. The condition specifically requires urban design details for the RRF to be included in the UDLP to create an attractive and safe environment.</p> <p>The social impacts associated with the RRF have been revised to be from neutral to up to low adverse (likelihood = rare, consequence = minor).</p>
(39)	<p>Please consider the RRF in the 'Fear of Crime' assessment.</p>	<p><u>Fear of Crime</u></p> <p>The issues usually associated with poor underpass design are related to personal safety, amenity (dark, uninviting and poorly maintained facilities), and the physical obstacle created by the change of level. These can be avoided by considering the underpass location and design as early as possible within a transport project (NZTA, 2009).</p>

	<p>Section 7.4.1.5.1 Fear of crime does not include an assessment of the flyover space, especially at night and along the full length of the flyover space.</p>	<p>To ensure that a high-quality urban realm is delivered a condition for a comprehensive Urban Design and Landscaping Plan (UDLP) (Condition 40) is provided which requires urban design details for the RRF to be incorporated.</p> <p>Condition 40 requires a CPTED assessment of the RRF to be carried out, this will embed crime prevention into the design which in turn will support a reduction in the incidence and fear of crime, as well as an improvement in quality of life¹ for vulnerable groups and the wider community as they walk through and near to the RRF.</p>
(40)	<p>Please cross reference mitigation proposed with lodged conditions.</p> <p>It is difficult to see the mitigation proposed in the SIA within the Designation Conditions document or Resource Consent Conditions document as there is no cross-referencing in the SIA, nor a specific section for social conditions in either. The word 'social' is not in either document.</p>	<p>The mitigation measures have been cross referenced with the conditions and sections of the management plans in Section 4.3 of the SIA Addendum.</p>
(41)	<p>Please clarify Figure 4-25 of the AEE.</p> <p>Figure 4-25 shows the layout of the Bentonite/polymer plant. The quality of the image is too low to understand what the brown shading represents, especially the shading in front of Te Tuhi.</p> <p>(42) Table 6 and 7 in the air quality assessment reports a score of 1 for 'sensitive receptors may be downwind of the construction area under prevailing wind conditions'. Yet sensitive receptors are described in Section 5.1 of the air quality assessment, and some are downwind of construction activities. Should this value be 1 in those situations? And the flyover is an elevated structure, does that get reflected in the Table 6 assessment? The approximate time duration for construction of the RRF is three years according to p51 of the Integrated Transport Assessment but is 'more than one year' in Table 6 of the</p>	<p>No air discharge permits are required for the Project and the proposed works comply with relevant air quality permitted activity standards.</p> <p>The comments go beyond the scope of the SIA and have been passed to the planning and air quality team. Please refer to the AEE which has fully assessed the air quality effects of the Proposal</p> <p>No updates are therefore proposed to the SIA.</p>

¹ [Cover_part1_v5.indd \(justice.govt.nz\)](https://www.justice.govt.nz/cover-part1-v5.indd)

	<p>dust assessment for all areas assessed, including Te Tuhi. Might this be an underestimate? The timings for construction are presented in the EB2 AEE (p45) but provide little detail on when each of the Areas in the air quality assessment might actually experience construction.</p>	
--	---	--

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Overview

Further information has been requested to assist in the understanding of the assessment. The effects rating has identified effects at a Project-wide level, with consideration given to specific groups/properties where the impact is significant or where this impact is specific to a receiver or vulnerable group which has been identified as significant.

The summary tables of effects in Section 4.0 have been updated to consider the extent, duration, magnitude, likelihood, consequence and impact rating for different effects. In addition, further detail for vulnerable groups has been provided following the methodology set out in section 4.0 of the SIA. Further information on the risk assessment framework has been provided in Section 3.1.1 below.

3.1.1 Risk Assessment and Impact Rating

The risk assessment framework used for the social impact assessment is shown in Figure 3-1.

		Consequence Level				
		1	2	3	4	5
Likelihood Level	Descriptor	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
A	Almost certain	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5
B	Likely	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5
C	Possible	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
D	Unlikely	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5
E	Rare	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5

Risk Rating ■ Low ■ Moderate ■ High ■ Extreme

Figure 3-1 IAIA Risk Assessment Framework (Vanclay F. E., 2015)

The likelihood of the impact occurring was considered using the criteria described in Table 3-1. The overall consequence level is determined from the duration of the effect, its spatial extent, the number of people impacted and the severity of change. Duration criteria are described in Table 3-2, severity criteria are described in Table 3-3 and the consequence criteria are described in Table 3-4.

Table 3-1 Likelihood criteria

Likelihood	Description
Almost certain	Expected to occur in most circumstances
Likely	Will probably occur in most circumstances
Possible	Might occur at some time
Unlikely	Could occur at some time
Rare	May occur in exceptional circumstances

Table 3-2 Duration criteria

Duration	Description
Short term	Less than six months
Short-medium term	Between six months and two years
Medium term	Between two and five years
Medium-long term	Between five and ten years
Long term	More than ten years (effect likely to be irreversible)

Table 3-3 Severity criteria

Severity	Description
Neutral	No discernible change to baseline condition
Small	Small change to baseline condition
Medium	Medium change to baseline condition
Large	Large change to baseline condition

Table 3-4 Consequence criteria

Consequence levels	Consequence descriptors
Insignificant	No discernible positive or adverse changes to baseline condition.
Minor	Small change to baseline condition, generally short-medium term, confined to a locality or suburb and can be mitigated or enhanced.
Moderate	Medium change to baseline condition that may be short, medium, or long term. The spatial extent may vary; however, impacts will usually respond to mitigation or enhancement.
Major	Large change to baseline condition usually resulting in medium to long-term impacts. Spatial extent is generally at an LGA or regional level with the potential for substantial impacts on the social or economic environment. Adverse impacts will require extensive mitigation.
Catastrophic	Irreversible, wide-spread and long-term, with limited response to mitigation.

4.0 Updated impact tables

The summary below provides a breakdown of magnitude, duration, likelihood and consequence that informed the social impact risk rating identified in the SIA. There have been three amendments to the tables. These are:

- To include a social impact rating for community character (Construction)
- To update the social impact rating for:
 - Visual impact of the RRF (Operation) (EB2)
 - Operation noise (EB2 and EB3)
- To update the duration of some effects to include a worst-case scenario for community severance effects from short-term to medium-term which is the maximum period for construction of the entire project.

4.1 Construction impacts

4.1.1 Construction impacts for EB2

Table 4-1 Summary of social impact ratings for EB2

	People's Way of Life, Community and Culture		
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Impacts on community character		
Cause of impact	Construction works giving rise to impacts on diverse groups, including community facilities and businesses.		
Stakeholders affected	Diverse communities in the project area including local Asian and Muslim community		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Early and ongoing communication with specific cultural and language groups as required by the CCP (Condition 15).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small

Duration ²	Medium term	A complaints mechanism is proposed via a condition, with issued raised reviewed to ensure mitigation measures are effective.	Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Impact	Reduced accessibility		
Cause of impact	Changed road conditions, changed property access, temporary loss of parking		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Pakuranga Town Centre and those who travel via Reeves Road, William Roberts Road, Ti Rakau Drive and Pakuranga Road		
Extent	Local Community and those in the Wider Community and Regional Community that travel to the town centre / along Reeves Road, William Roberts Road, Ti Rakau Drive and Pakuranga Road		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 15). Access and parking are maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 20). Engagement with vulnerable groups ³ on construction traffic routes as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration ⁴	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Impact	Community severance		
Cause of impact	Physical barriers like road or footpath closures		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Pakuranga Town Centre and those who travel via Reeves Road, William Roberts Road, Ti Rakau Drive and Pakuranga Road. Vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly and those with disabilities may find navigating barriers more challenging.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 15).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Insignificant up to minor - no discernible change or small change to baseline condition.

² Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB2.

³ Including early learning centres, schools and retirement villages. A list of these receivers is included in the CTMP.

⁴ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB2.

Severity	Medium	Design of fencing and hoardings to be considered in the CCP (Condition 15). Engagement with vulnerable groups ⁵ on construction traffic routes as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).	Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate up to high adverse		Low up to moderate adverse
Impact	Reduced access to community and cultural facilities		
Cause of impact	Changed access for local community facilities		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Te Tuhi Gallery, Barnados Early Learning Centre and Pakuranga Leisure Centre, Pakuranga Library and Citizens Advice Bureau, Bread of Life Church and Pakuranga Mosque Diverse communities in the project area including local Asian and Muslim community, children and low-income groups.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 15). Access and parking are maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 20). Engagement with vulnerable groups ⁶ on construction traffic routes as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
	People's Health and Wellbeing		
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Inability to access healthcare or delay in healthcare being provided		
Cause of impact	Displacement of DW Family Doctors and Pakuranga Dental Surgery Changed access to Pakuranga Medical Centre		
Stakeholders affected	Patients of DW Family Doctors, Pakuranga Dental Surgery and Pakuranga Medical Centre, including vulnerable groups diverse community members, including Asian community, elderly, people with disabilities, children and low income groups.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		

⁵ Including early learning centres, schools and retirement villages. A list of these receivers is included in the CTMP.

⁶ Including early learning centres, schools and retirement villages. A list of these receivers is included in the CTMP.

Likelihood	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances	<p>Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders, including healthcare providers and patients, as required by the CCP (Condition 15).</p> <p>Access and parking are maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).</p> <p>Engagement with vulnerable groups⁷ on construction traffic routes as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).</p>	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Insignificant up to minor - no discernible change or small change to baseline condition.
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium to long term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate up to high adverse		Low up to moderate adverse
Impact	Ability to access open space for recreation, exercise and social connection		
Cause of impact	<p>Changed access to Ti Rakau Park</p> <p>Temporary changed access to Bus Stop Reserve</p>		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Ti Rakau Park and Bus Stop Reserve, including children, elderly and low income groups.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	<p>Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 15).</p> <p>Access and parking are maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).</p>	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition.
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Short to medium term		Short to medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Impact	Increased stress and anxiety		
Cause of impact	Uncertainty of timing, length and nature of construction, relocation, property prices etc.		
Stakeholders affected	Residents and businesses who remain in the EB2 area and experience construction works.		
Extent	Local Community, wider community travelling to the area and experiencing construction works		
Positive / negative	Negative		

⁷, Including early learning centres, schools and retirement villages. A list of these receivers is included in the CTMP.

Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	<p>Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 15).</p> <p>Access and parking are maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).</p> <p>Engagement with vulnerable groups⁸ on construction traffic routes as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).</p> <p>Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans set out in Condition 1 including the CEMP (Condition 24) and CNVMP (Condition 36,37 and 38).</p>	Unlikely - could occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Minor - small change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
People's Personal and Property Rights			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Inability to access private property including businesses in the town centre		
Cause of impact	Loss of parking on Aylesbury Street Changes to access for businesses and services in the Town Centre for servicing and deliveries		
Stakeholders affected	Owners / occupiers of businesses in the town centre Customers and those who use/supply the businesses in the town centre		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	<p>Access and parking are maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 20).</p> <p>Identification of alternative or relocated loading zones if needed as part of the CCP (Condition 15).</p> <p>Provide business signage for those ground floor properties which may be affected by fencing or hoardings as part of the CCP (Condition 15).</p>	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse

⁸, Including early learning centres, schools and retirement villages. A list of these receivers is included in the CTMP.

		Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders, including businesses, as required by the CCP (Condition 15).	
Impact	Displacement of owner / occupiers and tenants		
Cause of impact	Acquisition of two properties and notice given to 65 tenants in properties already acquired by AT		
Stakeholders affected	Owner / occupiers and tenants of properties required for construction		
Extent	Local community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances	Strategy to be implemented for both property owners and tenants to ensure impacts of displacement are avoided, remedied or mitigated as far as possible. Appendix A – Notification to Tenants Communications Plan forms part of the CCP (Condition 15).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Insignificant up to minor - no discernible change or small change to baseline condition.
Severity	Medium		Medium
Duration	Short to medium term		Short to medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate up to High adverse		Low up to Moderate adverse* Note: The social impact may have occurred by the time the designation is confirmed, as people vacate properties and AT implement the strategy.
People's Environment			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Reduced amenity and quality of environment		
Cause of impact	Air quality impacts of construction works		
Stakeholders affected	Residents, businesses and community facilities. Particularly children and older people who may be more susceptible to the impacts.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans set out in Condition 1 including the CEMP	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition

Severity	Medium	(Condition 19) and CNVMP (Condition 31, 32 and 33).	Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Cause of impact	visual impacts of construction works		
Stakeholders affected	Residents, businesses and community facilities. Particularly children and older people who may be more susceptible to the impacts.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans set out in Condition 1 including the CEMP (Condition 19) and CNVMP (Condition 31, 32 and 33).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Cause of impact	noise and vibration impacts of construction works		
Stakeholders affected	Residents, businesses and community facilities. Particularly children and older people who may be more susceptible to the impacts.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans set out in Condition 1 including the CEMP (Condition 19) and CNVMP (Condition 31, 32 and 33).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse

4.1.2 Construction impacts for EB3R

Table 4-2 Summary of social impact ratings for EB3R

People's Way of Life, Community and Culture			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Impacts on community character		
Cause of impact	Construction works giving rise to impacts on diverse groups, including community facilities and businesses.		
Stakeholders affected	Diverse communities in the project area including local Asian and Pasifika community		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Communication with specific cultural and language groups as required by the CCP (Condition 20).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration ⁹	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Impact	Reduced accessibility		
Cause of impact	Changed road conditions, changed property access		
Stakeholders affected	Those who travel along Ti Rakau Drive		
Extent	Local Community, Wider Community and Regional Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 20). Access is maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 25).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration ¹¹	Short term		Short term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse

⁹ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB3R.

¹¹ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB3R.

		Engagement with vulnerable groups ¹⁰ on construction traffic routes as required by the CTMP (Condition 25).	
Impact	Community severance		
Cause of impact	Physical barriers like road or footpath closures, impacts on school bus		
Stakeholders affected	Those who travel along Ti Rakau Drive, students at Edgewater College and their parents Vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly and those with disabilities may find navigating barriers more challenging.		
Extent	Local Community, and Wider Community and Regional Community that travel along Ti Rakau Drive		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 20). Mitigation for school bus routes to be prepared in consultation with school as required by CTMP (Condition 25).	Unlikely up to possible – could occur at some time to might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Short term		Short term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Impact	Reduced access to community and cultural facilities		
Cause of impact	Changed access for local community facilities		
Stakeholders affected	Edgewater College, Pakuranga Baptist Church, Pakuranga Chinese Baptist Church and Congregational Church of Samoa and the Pakuranga Baptist Kindergarten. Diverse communities in the project area including local Asian and Pasifika community, children and low income groups.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 20).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small

¹⁰ Including early learning centres, schools and retirement villages. A list of these receivers is included in the CTMP.

Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition	Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 20). Mitigation works through Urban Design and Landscaping Plan (UDLP) (Condition 40).	Insignificant up to minor - no discernible change or small change to baseline condition.			
Severity	Medium		Small			
Duration	Short to medium term		Short to medium term			
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse			
Impact	Increased stress and anxiety					
Cause of impact	Uncertainty of timing, length and nature of construction, relocation, property prices etc.					
Stakeholders affected	Residents and businesses being displaced, including lower income groups. Residents and businesses who remain in the EB3 area and experience construction works.					
Extent	Local Community					
Positive / negative	Negative					
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 20). Access and parking are maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 25). Engagement with vulnerable groups ¹⁴ on construction traffic routes as required by the CTMP (Condition 25). Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans set out in Condition 1 including the CEMP (Condition 24) and CNVMP (Condition 36,37 and 38).	Unlikely - could occur at some time			
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Minor - small change to baseline condition			
Severity	Medium		Small			
Duration	Short term		Short term			
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse Note: The social impact may have occurred by the time the designation is confirmed, as people vacate properties and AT implement the strategy.			
People's Personal and Property Rights						
<table border="0" style="width:100%"> <tr> <td style="width:33%">Prior to mitigation</td> <td style="width:33%">Mitigation</td> <td style="width:33%">Post mitigation</td> </tr> </table>				Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation				
Impact	Inability to access private property including businesses					
Cause of impact	Changes to access for businesses for servicing and deliveries, residents of 10 long residential properties not being acquired by AT with long driveways which will be impacted during construction					

¹⁴ Including early learning centres, schools and retirement villages. A list of these receivers is included in the CTMP.

Stakeholders affected	<p>Owners / occupiers of businesses in the town centre</p> <p>Customers and those who use/supply the businesses in the town centre</p> <p>Residents of impacted properties</p>		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Unlikely - could occur at some time	<p>Access and parking are maintained as required by the CTMP (Condition 20). A new car park for customers is provided on the western side of the shops.</p> <p>Identification of alternative or relocated loading zones if needed as part of the CCP (Condition 20).</p> <p>Provide businesses signage for those ground floor properties which may be affected by fencing or hoardings as part of the CCP (Condition 20).</p> <p>Early and ongoing communication with affected stakeholders as required by the CCP (Condition 20).</p>	Unlikely - could occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Short term		Short term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Impact	Displacement of owner / occupiers and tenants		
Cause of impact	Acquisition of five properties and notice given to 78 tenants in properties already acquired by AT		
Stakeholders affected	Owner / occupiers and tenants of properties required for construction		
Extent	Local and Wider Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances	<p>Strategy to be implemented for both property owners and tenants to ensure impacts of displacement are avoided, remedied or mitigated as far as possible. Appendix A – Notification to Tenants Communications Plan forms part of the CCP (Condition 20).</p>	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Insignificant up to minor - no discernible change or small change to baseline condition.
Severity	Medium		Medium
Duration	Short to medium term		Short to medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate up to High adverse		Low up to Moderate adverse

			Note: The social impact may have occurred by the time the designation is confirmed, as people vacate properties and AT implement the strategy.
	People's Environment		
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Reduced amenity and quality of environment		
Cause of impact	Air quality impacts of construction works		
Stakeholders affected	Residents, businesses and community facilities. Particularly children and older people who may be more susceptible to the impacts.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans set out in Condition 1 including the CEMP (Condition 24) and CNVMP (Condition 36,37 and 38).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Cause of impact	visual impacts of construction works		
Stakeholders affected	Residents, businesses and community facilities. Particularly children and older people who may be more susceptible to the impacts.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans set out in Condition 1 including the CEMP (Condition 24) and CNVMP (Condition 36,37 and 38).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse
Cause of impact	Noise and vibration impacts of construction works		
Stakeholders affected	Residents, businesses and community facilities. Particularly children and older people who may be more susceptible to the impacts.		

Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - might occur at some time	Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans set out in Condition 1 including the CEMP (Condition 24) and CNVMP (Condition 36,37 and 38).	Possible - might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Small
Duration	Medium term		Medium term
Overall impact rating	Moderate adverse		Low adverse

4.2 Operational impacts

4.2.1 Operational impacts for EB2

Table 4-3 Summary of social impact ratings for EB2

People's Way of Life, Community and Culture			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Increased connectivity		
Cause of impact	More reliable public transport networks, safer and more legible connections including to Pakuranga town centre		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Pakuranga Town Centre and those who travel via Reeves Road, William Roberts Road, Ti Rakau Drive and Pakuranga Road. Vulnerable groups who benefit from mode choice.		
Extent	Local Community, Wider Community and Regional Community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances	N/A	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium to Large		Medium to Large
Duration ¹⁵	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive

¹⁵ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB2.

Impact	Access to community and cultural facilities																																
Cause of impact	Safer access and greater connectivity																																
Stakeholders affected	Users of Te Tuhi Gallery, Barnados Early Learning Centre and Pakuranga Leisure Centre, Pakuranga Library and Citizens Advice Bureau, Bread of Life Church and Pakuranga Mosque																																
Extent	Local Community and Wider Community																																
Positive / negative	Positive																																
Likelihood	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances	N/A	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances																														
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition																														
Severity	Medium		Medium																														
Duration ¹⁶	Long term		Long term																														
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive																														
People's Health and Wellbeing																																	
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width:33%; text-align: left;">Prior to mitigation</th> <th style="width:33%; text-align: center;">Mitigation</th> <th style="width:33%; text-align: right;">Post mitigation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Improvements to Ti Rakau Park</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Safer access and greater connectivity, upgraded facilities at Ti Rakau Park</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Users of Ti Rakau Park</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Users of new play space including children and people with disabilities</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Local Community and Wider Community</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Positive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Likelihood</td> <td>Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances</td> <td>Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consequence</td> <td>Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition</td> <td>Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Severity</td> <td>Medium</td> <td>Medium</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation	Improvements to Ti Rakau Park			Safer access and greater connectivity, upgraded facilities at Ti Rakau Park			Users of Ti Rakau Park			Users of new play space including children and people with disabilities			Local Community and Wider Community			Positive			Likelihood	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances	Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition	Severity	Medium	Medium
Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation																															
Improvements to Ti Rakau Park																																	
Safer access and greater connectivity, upgraded facilities at Ti Rakau Park																																	
Users of Ti Rakau Park																																	
Users of new play space including children and people with disabilities																																	
Local Community and Wider Community																																	
Positive																																	
Likelihood	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances																															
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition																															
Severity	Medium	Medium																															
Impact	Improvements to Ti Rakau Park																																
Cause of impact	Safer access and greater connectivity, upgraded facilities at Ti Rakau Park																																
Stakeholders affected	Users of Ti Rakau Park Users of new play space including children and people with disabilities																																
Extent	Local Community and Wider Community																																
Positive / negative	Positive																																
Likelihood	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances	N/A	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances																														
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition																														
Severity	Medium		Medium																														

¹⁶ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB2.

Duration ¹⁷	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
Impact	Increased uptake of active mode travel		
Cause of impact	Safer access and greater connectivity via active modes		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Pakuranga Town Centre and those who travel via Reeves Road, William Roberts Road, Ti Rakau Drive		
Extent	Local Community and Wider Community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances	N/A	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium to Large		Medium to Large
Duration ¹⁸	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
People's Personal and Property Rights			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Inability to access private property including businesses in the town centre		
Cause of impact	Impeded access for businesses in the town centre for customers, staff, services and deliveries Loss of some car parking		
Stakeholders affected	Owners / occupiers of businesses in the town centre Customers and those who use/supply the businesses in the town centre		
Extent	Local and Wider Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Unlikely - could occur at some time		Unlikely - could occur at some time

¹⁷ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB2.

¹⁸ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB2.

Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition	Promoting public transport and active transport modes as part of the Key Result Areas (KRAs) for the CCP (Condition 15).	Minor - small change to baseline condition
Severity	Small		Small
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Low adverse		Low adverse
People's Environment			
Prior to mitigation		Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Reduced amenity and quality of environment		
Cause of impact	Air quality impacts of project during operation		
Stakeholders affected	Those who live, work, study in the area. Those who are in proximity or spend more time in the area e.g., residents will be more severely affected		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Rare - may occur in exceptional circumstances	N/A	Rare - may occur in exceptional circumstances
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Minor - small change to baseline condition
Severity	Small		Small
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
Cause of impact	Visual impacts of project during operation		
Stakeholders affected	Those who live, work, study in the area. Those who are in proximity or spend more time in the area e.g., residents, including retirement villages, will be more severely affected.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Possible - Might occur at some time	Condition 40 requires a CPTED assessment of the RRF to be carried out	Possible - Might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - Small change to baseline, confined to a locality and can be mitigated.		Minor - Small change to baseline, confined to a locality and can be mitigated.
Severity	Small		Small

Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Neutral up to low adverse		Neutral up to low adverse
Cause of impact	Noise and vibration impacts of project during operation		
Stakeholders affected	Those who live, work, study in the area. Those who are in close proximity or spend more time in the area e.g., residents, including retirement villages, will be more severely affected.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative up to Positive		
Likelihood	Possible - Might occur at some time	Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans including Condition 51 for operational traffic noise.	Possible - Might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Medium
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Low adverse up to positive		Low adverse up to positive
	People's Fears and Aspirations		
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Perceived impacts to safety and increased antisocial behaviour		
Cause of impact	Design of Reeves Road flyover and the potential for unattractive / unsafe environment		
Stakeholders affected	Those who live, work, study in the area.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Unlikely - could occur at some time	Preparation of the UDLP as required by Conditions 39 and 40 to ensure urban realm is designed for safety and incorporates CPTED principles	Rare - may occur in exceptional circumstances
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Minor - small change to baseline condition
Severity	Small		Small
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Low adverse		Low adverse

4.2.2 Operational impacts for EB3R

Table 4-4 Summary of social impact ratings for EB3R

People's Way of Life, Community and Culture			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Increased connectivity		
Cause of impact	More reliable public transport networks, safer and more legible connections		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Ti Rakau Drive, Edgewater Drive, Gossamer Drive, including lower income groups that benefit from increased mode choice.		
Extent	Local Community and Wider Community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances	N/A	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium to Large		Medium to Large
Duration ¹⁹	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
Impact	Access to community and cultural facilities		
Cause of impact	Safer access and greater connectivity		
Stakeholders affected	Edgewater College, Pakuranga Baptist Church, Pakuranga Chinese Baptist Church and Congregational Church of Samoa and the Pakuranga Baptist Kindergarten. Attendees from the community, including those from diverse communities.		
Extent	Local Community, Wider Community and Regional Community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances	N/A	Almost certain - expected to occur in most circumstances
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Medium

¹⁹ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB2.

Duration ²⁰	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
People's Health and Wellbeing			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Improvements to Riverhills Park		
Cause of impact	Safer access and greater connectivity, upgraded facilities at Riverhills Park		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Riverhills Park		
Extent	Local Community, Wider Community and Regional Community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances	N/A	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Medium
Duration ²¹	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
Impact	Increased uptake of active mode travel		
Cause of impact	Safer access and greater connectivity via active modes		
Stakeholders affected	Users of Ti Rakau Drive		
Extent	Local Community, Wider Community and Regional Community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances	N/A	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium to Large		Medium to Large

²⁰ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB3R.

²¹ Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB3R.

Duration ²²	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
People's Personal and Property Rights			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Increased access to local businesses at Edgewater Shops		
Cause of impact	New bus station adjacent to the Edgewater Shopping Centre		
Stakeholders affected	Owners / occupiers of businesses at Edgewater Shopping Centre and employees Community members making use of local shops		
Extent	Local Community and wider community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances	N/A	Likely - will probably occur in most circumstances
Consequence	Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor up to moderate - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Medium
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
People's Environment			
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Reduced amenity and quality of environment		
Cause of impact	Air quality impacts of operation of the project		
Stakeholders affected	Those who live, work, study in the area. Those who are in proximity or spend more time in the area e.g., residents and vulnerable groups with the community, will be more severely affected.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Positive		
Likelihood	Rare - may occur in exceptional circumstances	N/A	Rare - may occur in exceptional circumstances
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Minor - small change to baseline condition

²² Based on indicative construction programme in Section 4.3.3 of the AEE for all of EB3R.

Severity	Small		Small
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
Cause of impact	Visual impacts of operation of the project		
Stakeholders affected	Those who live, work, study in the area. Those who are in proximity or spend more time in the area e.g., residents and vulnerable groups with the community, will be more severely affected.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Neutral up to positive		
Likelihood	Possible – Might occur at some time	N/A	Possible – Might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor – Small change to baseline, confined to a locality and can be mitigated.		Minor – Small change to baseline, confined to a locality and can be mitigated.
Severity	Small		Small
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Positive		Positive
Cause of impact	Noise and vibration impacts of operation of the project		
Stakeholders affected	Those who live, work, study in the area. Those who are in proximity or spend more time in the area e.g., residents and vulnerable groups with the community, will be more severely affected.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative up to positive		
Likelihood	Possible – Might occur at some time	Mitigation as proposed in the relevant specialist reports and management plans including Condition 44 for operational traffic noise.	Possible – Might occur at some time
Consequence	Minor - small to medium change to baseline condition		Minor - small to medium change to baseline condition
Severity	Medium		Medium
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Low adverse up to positive		Low adverse up to positive
	People's Fears and Aspirations		
	Prior to mitigation	Mitigation	Post mitigation
Impact	Perceived impacts to safety and increased antisocial behaviour		

Cause of impact	Perceived impact of increased crime as a result of the new bus stations at Edgewater Drive and Gossamer Drive		
Stakeholders affected	Those who live, work, study in the area.		
Extent	Local Community		
Positive / negative	Negative		
Likelihood	Unlikely - could occur at some time	Preparation of the UDLP as required by Condition 40 and 41 to ensure urban realm is designed for safety and incorporates CPTED principles	Rare - may occur in exceptional circumstances
Consequence	Minor - small change to baseline condition		Insignificant - no discernible change to baseline condition
Severity	Small		Small
Duration	Long term		Long term
Overall impact rating	Low adverse		Low adverse

4.3 Recommended Management and Response Measures

The mitigation proposed within the SIA is encompassed within the lodged conditions.

The social impacts will be managed through several management plans (Condition 1) including:

- Construction Environmental Management Plan (EB2 – Condition 19, EB3R – Condition 24)
- Communication and Consultation Plan (EB2 – Condition 15, EB3R – Condition 20)
- Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (EB2 – Condition 31, EB3R – Condition 36)
- Construction Transport Management Plan (EB2 – Condition 20, EB3R – Condition 25)

Table 4-5 Summary of Mitigation Measures

SIA Recommendation	Condition
People's community, health and wellbeing and way of life	
Early engagement has already been undertaken, specific notification and ongoing community engagement for construction and operation of EB2 and EB3R will be set out in the CCP.	EB2 Condition 1, EB3R Condition 1
To address the social impact the CCP is also expected to: Identify the relevant stakeholders including residents, businesses, emergency services, accessibility organisations and community groups	EB2 Condition 15, EB3R Condition 20 Within the CCP – Table 4: Eastern Busway Stakeholders
Provide an easy-to-understand description of works, results of technical studies, mitigation and details of any residual effects likely to be experienced. The material should be available in te reo Māori, English and community languages including Hindi and Chinese (simplified)	Within the CCP – Table 1: Consultation principles
Outline the timing and programme of works including construction traffic routes and hours, as well as the timing of offensive works supported by a clear explanation as to why the works programme has been set	Within the CCP – Table 8: Notification requirements
Outline opportunities for stakeholders and the local community to input into the construction works programme, i.e., to take account of community events or business requirements, above, if practicable, or explanation of the reasons for program if not possible	Within the CCP – Purpose of the Communication and Consultation Plan – Design and Construction
Include a review of construction practices and communication should NZ enter a future lockdown	In this scenario adverse effects will continue to be managed as per the conditions and required management plans.
Provide key contact points for stakeholders and the local community during design, construction, and operational phases and provide an onsite information point within the local area for the project	Within CCP – specific section for: Contact details
Provide a grievance procedure during construction phase which includes: mechanisms for the community to provide feedback or raise concerns or complaints a clear and transparent process to manage and respond to complaints, including an explanation when alternative mitigation is not practicable	EB2 Condition 15, EB3R Condition 20 c) Provide a process for responding to queries and complaints including, but not limited to: i. Who is responsible for responding; ii. How responses will be provided; iii. The timeframes for responses to be provided; and

	iv. How complaints will be reviewed and monitored to ensure mitigation is effective.
Provide the community with details of the complaints and feedback procedure during the operation stage.	This will be undertaken in line with AT's procedures as the road authority.
People's environment	
Consider the impacts on the liveability of residential properties, including the ability of people to work from home, and usability of businesses and community facilities, near construction works by: Preparing tailored community consultation messages and multi-channel methods of communication for neighbouring properties who will remain during construction	EB2 Condition 15, EB3R Condition 20 Within the CCP – specific sections for: Directly Affected Property Owners and Occupiers (Whole, Partial or Adjacent) Neighbouring Property Owners and Occupiers Businesses and Social Infrastructure
Providing advance notice of high impact works (e.g., noisy works) and additional resources where extended periods of works are required that may result in significant amenity impacts for neighbouring properties who will remain during construction	EB2 Condition 33, EB3R Condition 38
Provide a comprehensive information package and contact information which includes details of venues and locations where the community can work should construction work be disruptive	Within the CCP – specific section for: Thriving communities
Providing a dedicated contact point to raise issues including those that may require a timely response	EB2 Condition 31, EB3R Condition 36 g) Procedures for communication as set out in the CCP with nearby residents and stakeholders, including: i. Notification of proposed construction activities, ii. The period of construction activities; and iii. Management of noise and vibration complaints. h) Contact details for the Communication and Consultation Manager;
Provide training to ensure the construction team operate as a 'good neighbour', are aware of potential impacts on neighbouring residential, businesses and community receivers whilst working and the need for mitigation measure to be in place.	EB2 Condition 31, EB3R Condition 36 i) Procedures for the regular training of the operators of construction equipment to minimise noise and vibration as well as expected construction site behaviours for all workers;
People's personal and property rights For * mitigation, the requirement for the mitigation will reduce as people vacate properties and AT implement the strategy in advance of the designation being confirmed.	
It is recommended that a clear strategy to manage the impacts of displacement for both property owners and tenants is implemented, this strategy should: *Consider the timing of notice for impacted property owners and occupiers to ensure that notices are staggered as far as practicable to help minimise a spike in demand for alternative accommodation in the local area.	Within the CCP – specific section for: Directly Affected Property Owners and Occupiers (Whole, Partial or Adjacent)

*Provide a minimum 90 days advance notice to property owners and tenants affected by displacement to ensure that sufficient time is provided for tenants or owner occupiers to relocate	Within the CCP – Appendix A – Notification to Tenants Communications Plan
*Provide a comprehensive information package and contact information for housing advice for property owners and tenants affected by displacement	Within the CCP – Appendix A – Notification to Tenants Communications Plan
*Provide support for tenants who are required to relocate through waiving notice periods, providing discounted moving costs and providing real estate agent contacts. Consideration should be given to other practical measures that can assist with the stress and anxiety of relocating	Within the CCP – Appendix A – Notification to Tenants Communications Plan
Provide mental health and wellbeing support for property owners and tenants affected by displacement this has already been offered to some residents through Pakuranga Counselling Service and could be continued or expanded as needed to provide support for those affected by displacement.	Within the CCP – Appendix A – Notification to Tenants Communications Plan
It is also recommended that a clear strategy should be prepared for businesses potentially disrupted by the works and should: Identify businesses and community infrastructure close to or likely to be impacted by construction works and develop a strategy to support proactive and early engagement with the impacted businesses and community infrastructure	Within the CCP – specific section for: Directly Affected Property Owners and Occupiers (Whole, Partial or Adjacent) Businesses and Social Infrastructure
Provide a comprehensive information package and contact information for business advice for commercial property owners and tenants affected by displacement or construction works	Within the CCP – specific section for: Businesses and Social Infrastructure
Where social infrastructure, including cultural infrastructure, health infrastructure is affected provide a detailed resource to support users of these services with details of nearby commensurate alternatives and contacts for these alternative services	Within the CCP – specific section for: Businesses and Social Infrastructure
Maintain suitable access to businesses and social infrastructure during construction including a suitable quality of access for pedestrians including wayfinding signage	Within the CCP – Table 5: EBA engagement tools and techniques
Develop hoardings, fencing and other screening that will integrate construction areas with the local environment (by providing opportunities such as locational signage, artist murals or advertising for businesses) where practicable, and remove barriers as soon as possible once no longer required	Within the CCP – Table 5: EBA engagement tools and techniques
Wayfinding signage should be integrated with new structures and at decision points for cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers to support connectivity and encourage recreational and economic activity. Wayfinding signage can also reduce severance effects through providing clear information for preferred routes	Within the CCP – Table 5: EBA engagement tools and techniques
Provide alternative access for servicing, delivering, and loading areas for businesses impacted by construction works.	Within the CCP – specific section for: Businesses and Social Infrastructure
People's fears and aspirations	
Monitoring is included in the CCP and should:	Within the CCP – specific section for: Monitoring and Evaluation

<p>Detail a process for ongoing review of social impacts, including key measures to be reported on and a programme to carry out the review</p>	
<p>Report on the review of social impact annually including a review of concerns and complaints raised by the community and how these have been responded to</p>	<p>A complaints mechanism is proposed via a condition, with issued raised reviewed to ensure mitigation measures are effective,</p>
<p>Provide an opportunity for the community and stakeholders to provide feedback on impacts and how effective mitigation has been</p>	<p>Within the CCP – specific section for: Enquiries and Feedback</p>
<p>Explain impacts that cannot be practicably mitigated due to the nature and scale of the construction works</p>	<p>EB2 Condition 31, EB3R Condition 36</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) Management and mitigation options, and identification of the Best Practicable Option; f) Methods and frequency for monitoring and reporting on construction noise and vibration; g) Procedures for communication as set out in the CCP with nearby residents and stakeholders, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Notification of proposed construction activities, ii. The period of construction activities; and iii. Management of noise and vibration complaints.

5.0 References

NZTA. (2009). *Urban Design Principles: Underpasses*. Wellington: New Zealand Transport Agency.

