

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND  
WELLINGTON REGISTRY**

**I MUA I TE KŌTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA  
TE WHANGANUI-Ā-TARA ROHE**

**ENV-2023-WLG-000005**

Under the **RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

In the matter of the direct referral of applications for resource consents and notices of requirement under sections 87G and 198E of the Act for the Ōtaki to North of Levin project

By **NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY-WAKA KOTAHI**

Applicant

---

**JOINT STATEMENT OF SOCIAL IMPACT EXPERTS**

24 July 2023

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. This joint witness statement relates to expert conferencing on the topic of social impact.
2. The expert conferencing was held on 24 July 2023 via video conference and was facilitated by Environment Commissioner Buchanan.
3. Attendees at the conference were:
  - (a) Jo Healy (witness for Waka Kotahi). Ms Healy is the author of Technical Assessment E: Social Impacts lodged with the application, and of a statement of evidence dated 4 July 2023.
  - (b) Michala Lander (witness for the District Councils). Ms Lander is the author of Appendix 4 (Social Impact) to the section 198D report for the District Councils. Ms Lander provided a note setting out issues that remain in dispute in advance of the conference.

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**


4. This joint statement is prepared in accordance with section 9.4 and 9.5 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023.
5. We confirm that we have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and agree to abide by it.

## **PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF CONFERENCING**

6. The purpose of conferencing was to identify, discuss, and highlight points of agreement and disagreement on social impact issues arising from the Project.
7. Conferencing proceeded in line with the agenda agreed to by all relevant parties and experts, and provided to Commissioner Buchanan in advance of the conferencing.
8. All attendees reviewed Technical Assessment E and the evidence, Ms Healy's evidence and council expert reports and Ms Lander's note on issues that remain in dispute in advance of the conference.
9. **Annexure A** records the agreed issues, areas of disagreement and the reasons, along with any reservations.
10. Except where recorded in Annexure A, the attendees agree that the primary data, methodologies and standards, and key facts and assumptions are as

set out in the Assessment of Environmental Effects for the Project, and in particular Technical Assessment E: Social Impact.

Date: 24 July 2023



---

**Jo Healy**



---

**Michala Lander**

## ANNEXURE A – EXPERT CONFERENCING ON SOCIAL IMPACT

Participants: Jo Healy (JH), Michala Lander (ML)

Issue	Agreed Position	Disagreements or reservations, with reasons
Individual vs community impact	<p>Defining the issue:</p> <p>With regard to community impacts at a sub local level it is recognized that where property impacts results in an individual with long standing connections leaving the community there will be community impacts, the scale of which is assessed as low to moderate by JH and moderate by ML. Both agree there are no material impacts on the overall outcomes of the project and no further mitigation is required.</p>	<p>ML reservation is in regard to how the issue of loss of community connections has been factored into the broader category of community which contributed into the overall level of assessment at the sub-local level.</p>
Recreation Assessment	<p>ML accepts on face value that the screening process has assessed all relevant recreation facilities and confirm that local road access to these facilities is maintained and therefore they are not directly impacted by the proposal.</p>	<p>ML reservations are she did not have evidence of the screening process.</p> <p>JH to provide screening map of equestrian facilities to ML.</p>
Community facilities assessment (Sensitive Receivers)	<p>ML accepts on face value that the screening process has assessed all relevant sensitive receivers and their location in relation to the potential project area influence (E.g. acoustic, dust, vibration).</p>	<p>ML reservations are she did not have evidence of the screening process.</p>

Emergency Services	No issues remain between the social experts in relation to the impact of the project in terms of emergency services.	
Mitigation	Agree that the provisions in the conditions are adequate to address social effects identified and no further mitigation identified.	
Recommendations	JH has recommended in her evidence some minor changes to the conditions. The principles of these changes are supported by ML.	