

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission by **AMBURY PROPERTIES LIMITED** on the **PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT PLAN** pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Act seeking the rezoning of land at Ohinewai

**JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT OF EXPERTS IN
RELATION TO SOCIAL IMPACTS**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 On 19 June, 2020, an expert conferencing session in relation to Social Impacts was undertaken by Robert Quigley (Ambury Properties Limited or "APL") Jo Healy (Waikato District Council or "WDC") and Melissa Hackell (Waikato Regional Council or "WRC").

1.2 This Joint Witness Statement is a record of the outcome of this session.

1.3 The session was facilitated by Hearing Panel members, Dr Phil Mitchell and Paul Cooney.

1.4 Also in attendance as observers were:

- (a) Chloe Trenouth, planning consultant to the Waikato District Council;
 - (b) Stuart Penfold, planning consultant for Ambury Properties Limited;
 - (c) Miffy Foley, planner for Waikato Regional Council;
 - (d) Gavin Donald, planning consultant for Waikato Tainui;
 - (e) Sandra Kelly, observer for Waikato District Council;
- and
- (f) Will Gauntlett, observer for Waikato District Council.

1.5 Notes were taken by Carolyn Wratt.

Agenda - issues considered at conferencing

1.6 The issues identified as forming the agenda for the conferencing are:

- i. Issues that are agreed between the participants;
- ii. The appropriateness of the methodology adopted in the APL SIA which relies on assessment of the full impact of the masterplan (not rezoning);
- iii. Perceived uncertainty in delivery of aspects of the masterplan (including proposed staging);
- iv. Groups assessed vs not assessed, including those interviewed (in particular Sleepyhead workers, school parents, rural community, Lumsden Road and Tahuna Road residents, and outputs of the public meeting);
- v. Potential impacts of the Ohinewai Structure Plan (OSP), particularly:
 - (i) Way of life
 - (ii) Employment
 - (iii) Housing
 - (iv) Existing residents
 - (v) early childhood, primary and secondary schools

1.7 The following sections of this joint witness statement addresses each of these issues or questions, noting where agreement has been reached and, in the event of disagreement, the nature of the disagreement and the reasons for that disagreement.

2. ISSUE ONE – ISSUES AGREED BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS

The following issues are agreed between the participants:

- (i) Employment: the scale of estimated employment opportunities has the potential to generate positive social impacts at the individual, family and community level.

- (ii) Construction is likely to have negligible impacts on local housing demands
- (iii) The development would have a potential neutral effect on emergency services
- (iv) Businesses: Employment for local families and consequent improvements in their incomes would likely have positive effects on local businesses .
- (v) Assessing other scenarios or scenarios where less of the master plan is implemented would have the potential to reduce effects identified in this assessment

3. **ISSUE TWO– THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE METHODOLOGY ADOPTED IN THE APL SIA WHICH RELIES ON ASSESSMENT OF THE FULL IMPACT OF THE MASTERPLAN**

Staging of social infrastructure to address partial development of OSP?

It is agreed that it is important that the development of social infrastructure is matched to the proposed staging of the development and that the district plan provisions are robust in ensuring that this is achieved.

JH considers there needs to be more work on how the planning provisions provide for development of social infrastructure regarding timing, type of social infrastructure (inclusion of development of parks...) and certainty of implementation.

It is agreed that where less of the masterplan is implemented, the positive social effects will be less than those assessed by RQ.

It is agreed that assessing alternative scenarios is complex and further assessment is required before being able to draw any conclusions for the other scenarios.

JH and MH consider that these alternative scenarios need to be considered so that appropriate mitigation and management can be put forward.

RQ does not agree and considers that assessing these alternative scenarios requires multiple assumptions and therefore any outcomes contain considerable uncertainty. It will necessitate assessments of part of programmes and it is difficult.

JH and MH considers that because a large part of the industrial component relies on a single entity, the risks and associated negative social consequences for the residents of that component failing, need to be clearly acknowledged.

RQ considers this was covered in the initial impact assessment and the probability concluded to be unlikely. Also, there are other smaller employers potentially contributing greater than 1,000 jobs, and the large site is still in a very desirable location if the main employer failed.

4. **ISSUE THREE – PERCEIVED UNCERTAINTY IN DELIVERY OF ASPECTS OF THE MASTERPLAN**

JH – see above re implementation of social infrastructure.

JH - There will be widespread competition for employment opportunities and JH has seen no guarantees for provision of local employment and therefore no assurance of local benefits. MH also draws attention to the lack of assurance that 20 percent of employment will go to local people, as assessed.

MH also raised the issue of existing employees that live in South Auckland and whether they want to relocate to that site. MH is concerned the Masterplan may result in unemployment in South Auckland to create employment in Waikato. MH considers that interviews with current employees could provide the necessary information for evaluating the impacts on current employees expected to relocate to Ohinewai.

RQ – There are 450 employees at the South Auckland plant. Initial work by The Comfort Group (TCG) estimates about 300 staff are considering moving to the new manufacturing site. APL staff are not a focus of the assessment.

MH considers interviews with staff are necessary to provide assurance on this matter and to address any concerns or issues staff may face in re-locating to Ohinewai.

JH asked whether employment for other people in the 1,100 households was considered? (i.e. the ability of the local area able to absorb the employment of other people in the household?).

RQ – Didn't factor in that one family member might not have work in those two-income families and he will discuss this with the economists. RQ noted how household composition and dynamics of family are diverse. Schools,

social infrastructure, housing, etc for household members of Ohinewai have been considered.

RQ - Related to the social needs of other family members in the households (of staff who settle at Ohinewai), RQ said dormitory towns require long driving distance (of up to two hours each way) with family time being in the car. Driving to Te Kauwhata or Huntly means 10-30 mins commute, and that length of commute time is common in much of NZ. It would be unusual to expect that people living in Ohinewai will be able to meet all their needs within Ohinewai and they will need to travel for certain things.

MH – If the current employees of Sleepyhead had been interviewed, then there would be some indication of the issues here and assumptions could be replaced by evidence.

RQ - would have to have amazing levels of details to be able to accurately assess the social impacts of APL employees if they move south. Also, existing APL staff are not a focus of the assessment.

MH disagrees. A relatively small sample of employees could provide indications of their concerns and/or any issues that need to be resolved.

Disagreement between RQ and MH on whether or not employees contemplating a move should or should not have been interviewed to result in more accurate data.

JH – in terms of the 20 percent local employment, did the social assessment consider the 1,100 houses and whether these are part of the employment figures?

RQ responded that 20 percent is based on the local area, including Te Kauwhata and Huntly. People moving to the Ohinewai site were not factored in the 20 percent, which is additional.

RQ – It is correct that there is no assurance that locals will be employed, but the economic and social assessments provide some assurance that such figures are realistic and achievable. RQ also described how fifty percent of employees are expected to be hired from the Waikato District. The social assessment has been made on that basis, but RQ is not able to make any assurances. RQ is comfortable that the local and Waikato District employment figures (used as a basis for the social assessment) are conservative. There are no planning provisions that could be put around employment, but there can be other ways of achieving this via relationships

with major stakeholders. A business case is being co-developed by Wintec, APL and Waikato Tainui to assist young people into trade training (via a School of Secondary Tertiary Studies). Such a programme is similar to the programme run by Manukau Institute of Technology.

JH and MH – consider that evidence of the above including emerging relationships and agreements would assist with their assessments.

5. **ISSUE FOUR – GROUPS ASSESSED VS NOT ASSESSED, INCLUDING THOSE INTERVIEWED**

MH – see above re: current APL employees

MH – there was not a lot in the assessment about the current residents of Ohinewai and their perspectives and concerns. The implications of a shift in size and character on the existing community was not explored to any great extent in the assessment. A deeper analysis of the social and cultural values existing in the assessment area and the relationship of these values to the plan could support the preservation of existing values and secure proposed benefits

RQ – RQ interviewed the 3 main people of the Ohinewai Area Committee (Chair, Deputy Chair and Secretary), the four businesses in Ohinewai, the primary school, marae, and residents of Lumsden Road and Tahuna Road.

MH asked if the assessment could have looked further into the other residents? RQ agreed it is possible, but in this case did not believe that additional people needed to be interviewed. RQ looks for arrows of evidence and digs deeper if necessary. RQ felt like he had enough information from this sample.

MH – Another source of information missing from the assessment was that arising from the community meeting.

RQ – didn't attend as he was not available at that time. RQ used the information from that meeting to inform the scoping to indicate what issues he should assess and help identify who to interview. RQ does not typically use information from such consultation meetings as a source of evidence about potential impacts.

MH asked what issues were raised at that meeting. RQ will provide that information (although notes were taken by others in attendance). SP will assist with provision of that information and advised that the community open day was just before the close of Ohinewai further submissions.

JH and MH – considers the rural community (larger rural Ohinewai community) need to be assessed in terms of social impacts so that the effects can be better understood. Submissions mentioned the rural and farming community. JH and MH consider the implementation of the masterplan will change the character of the area and impact the social and cultural values existing in the broader community. A change from rural to industrial and business and residential is a significant change in character. There is no sense in the assessment of how strongly the community values that rural character.

RQ – RQ remains unclear about which area and residents MH and JH are concerned about. RQ feels like this topic has been well covered via interviews with: residents on Lumsden Road, residents up to 2km along and both sides of Tahuna Road, Ohinewai Area Committee, marae, Ohinewai primary school and Ohinewai businesses.

JH and MH disagree and feel that the rural community aspect is still incomplete.

JH – were there any discussions with the Ministry of Education about the expansion of the school? Was there an opportunity to meet with parents?

RQ – APL met with Ministry of Education in person, and RQ talked to a Ministry of Education representative on the phone. The Ministry indicated their preference would be to expand Ohinewai Primary. RQ interviewed the Principal, Deputy Principal and school children and felt he had enough data without the need to also interview parents.

MH – MH considers that parents are a key group missing from the assessment.

RQ – RQ described that many of the people interviewed also had children at Ohinewai Primary e.g. the Kaumatua at the marae had children at Ohinewai Primary, but RQ did not explicitly seek out school parents to interview.

JH – asked if mental health, social services, child health had been canvassed.

RQ – RQ did not talk to the DHB, however he interviewed a wide range of community health and social service providers. The health and social service providers are bulk funded by population-based contracts. These providers indicated they have the capacity to provide their services to Ohinewai residents. It is likely there are other social service providers that were not

interviewed, but RQ did spend considerable time attempting to identify as many providers as possible.

JH had identified this as a gap but will review the information RQ has pointed to in terms of consultation with Ministry of Education and other social services and reflect on this in her evidence

6. **ISSUE FIVE – OTHER POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS OF THE OHINEWAI STRUCTURE PLAN**

JH – JH raised the potential for competition from masterplan site businesses with Huntly businesses e.g. food services, cafes, retail. Ohinewai may become the new spot to go to the detriment of Huntly (which has already suffered due to the bypass). Ohinewai may contribute further negative impacts.

RQ – RQ disagrees and considers these matters have been covered in the social assessment. For example, food services on the main street of Huntly are well supported by the local population and local workforce of Huntly. The predominant food retail outlets are takeaway-type offerings rather than café. Retail businesses were explicitly interviewed and those businesses saw 1) local people would keep supporting, and 2) while they might lose some custom to opportunities in Ohinewai, this would be offset by additional income of local residents. Also, many of the retail outlets had multiple sources of income and businesses projected some of their income streams would do better.

JH – did you look at the number of empty shops and overall decline of Huntly?

RQ – yes the assessment explicitly acknowledges that business numbers are declining in Huntly and Te Kauwhata. This decline is part of the reason why the business community are looking forward to the development. They were looking forward to local people being able to access employment and other employed families moving into the area. Except for the supermarket, Huntly was not considered a retail destination.

JH – what about the through-traffic (notwithstanding the decline due to the bypass). Is there a further impact beyond the bypass, they will stop at Ohinewai in preference to Huntly?

RQ –RQ did not do a social assessment of through-traffic. He noted that would be a massive job and suggested such an assessment sits better with NZTA, as a component of their assessments of the Huntly bypass. RQ suggests any potential negative retail effects on the loss of drive-through traffic is more because of the bypass than Ohinewai.

JH accepts that the bypass has had an effect but considered that the effects of this proposal may compound already experienced negative effects.

RQ disagrees based on conversations with Huntly retail businesses on the main street. The Huntly main street is not a significant destination for SH1 people stopping for food. Instead the retail food shops on Huntly main street are predominantly supported by locals.

MH – MH described how “rent-to-lease” doesn’t make sense and presumes it means “rent-to-own”. Additionally, with houses starting at less than \$500K, MH questions whether these houses are affordable. Further, it is unclear what portion of housing will be offered under rent to own. Having some of these details would provide more information and would provide assurances that social benefits associated with affordable housing would be realised. Also, MH considers that a fuller proposal of affordable housing options is required before any social benefits can be determined.

RQ – RQ agrees that it is meant to say rent to own, not rent to lease. Comfort Group are working on a rent-to-own scheme. Any social benefits from a rent-to-own scheme did not form part of the social assessment as the APL staff were not a target population to be studied in the assessment.

No agreement reached on this point.

RQ – RQ clarified that the price of a house would be unfeasible for a beneficiary but would be feasible for a salaried employee. APL’s intention is to provide a range of housing and the \$500K is a typical value. Some will be priced higher, some will be priced lower. RQ notes the term ‘affordable’ is tough to define as what is affordable for one person in one market, may not be for another person.

All agreed that further details of a rent-to-own scheme would be needed to assess the social benefits for APL employees.

RQ does not consider that such an assessment is necessary, MH disagrees.

7. PARTIES TO JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT

7.1 The signatories to this Joint Witness Statement confirm that:

- (a) They agree with the outcome of the expert conference as recorded in this statement;
- (b) They have read Appendix 3 of the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it; and
- (c) The matters addressed in this statement are within their area of expertise.

SIGNATURES:



[Robert Quigley]

Date: 23 June 2020



[Jo Healy]

Date: 22 June 2020



[Melissa Hackell]

Date: 23 June 2020