

**BEFORE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**Independent Hearings Commissioners**

**UNDER THE**

the Resource Management Act 1991  
(the **Act**)

**IN THE MATTER OF**

An application by Ara Poutama Aotearoa/Department of Corrections for resource consent to establish a rehabilitative and reintegrative residential accommodation programme within an existing property at 14 Bristol Street, Christchurch (RMA/2020/173)

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AMELIA LINZEY ON BEHALF OF  
ARA POUTAMA AOTEAROA / DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**(Social Impact)**

Dated: 16 August 2021

---

---

**GREENWOOD ROCHE**  
LAWYERS  
CHRISTCHURCH  
Solicitor: L J Semple  
(Lauren@greenwoodroche.com)

Level 3, 1 Kettlewell Lane  
680-690 Colombo Street  
Christchurch 8011  
PO Box 139  
Christchurch 8140

## **1 INTRODUCTION, QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE**

1.1 My name is Amelia Joan Linzey. I am a director at Beca Group Limited.

1.2 I have the following qualification and experience relevant to this project:

- (a) Over 20 years' professional experience in environmental and social impact assessment and consultation;
- (b) Master of Science in Geography (First Class Honours) from the University of Auckland and Bachelor of Science;
- (c) Full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and recipient of the Distinguished Service Award from the institute in 2019; and
- (d) A member of the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) and I have undertaken the IAP2 Certificate Programme in Public Participation (2003).

1.3 I prepared or was otherwise involved (as specified) in undertaking Social Impact Assessments (SIAs) for the following projects or matters:

- (a) The change in designated use for the establishment of a Youth Justice facility at the existing Whakatakopokai site in Auckland, Oranga Tamariki.
- (b) The alteration of designated use for the continued operation of Korowai Manaaki Youth Justice facility in Auckland, Oranga Tamariki.
- (c) Social Impact advice for Whakatāne District Council on Proposed Plan Change 1 (Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā) to the Operative Whakatāne District Plan; and Proposed Plan Change 17 (Natural Hazards) to the Bay of Plenty Regional Natural Resources Plan (a private plan change request from the District Council).
- (d) Review of the Social Impact Assessment prepared for Kiwirail's designation of the Rail Hub, Palmerston North, including the

section 42A report and evidence for the hearing, Palmerston North City Council (current).

- (e) Ōtaki to North of Levin Transport Corridor, Short List Options, Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency.
- (f) Peer review of the Social Impact Monitoring Report for Wiri Prison, Auckland, Ara Poutama Aotearoa / Department of Corrections (**Ara Poutama** or **the Department**).
- (g) Options assessment for the proposed Huia Water Treatment Plant and social impact evidence for the hearings for the resource consent applications, Auckland, Watercare.
- (h) East West Project (involving preparation of a SIA and presentation of evidence to a Board of Inquiry), Waka Kotahi.
- (i) Peer review of the SIA for the Redoubt Road-Mill Road Corridor, Project in southern Auckland, Auckland Transport.
- (j) The designations for the City Rail Link for Auckland Transport, including presentation of evidence at the Council and subsequent Environment Court hearings on appeals to those designations.
- (k) The Drury South Plan Change, a private plan change initiated by Stevenson Ltd to extend the Metropolitan Urban Limit and change the zoning of rural land in Auckland (Drury) to a mix of urban land uses (including industrial and business park land).
- (l) The Ruakura Inland Port Proposed Plan Change SIA, including presentation of hearing evidence, Tainui Holdings Ltd.
- (m) The Waterview Connection Proposed Plan Change including presentation of evidence at the Board of Inquiry, Waka Kotahi.
- (n) Peer review of the MacKays to Peka SIA, for the M2PP Alliance, Waka Kotahi.

1.4 I led the social impact assessment team and co-authored the Social Impact Assessment (**SIA**) report for the Bristol Street proposal (**Proposal**) with my colleague, Jo Healy. This SIA formed part of the

application for this resource consent. In preparing the SIA and my evidence, my team and I have:

- (a) Undertaken a baseline study of the Departments facility 'Tai Aroha' in Hamilton (see SIA report for specific research activities) to provide baseline information for my SIA assessment and subsequent report.
- (b) Collected data based on a multi-modal research methodology for the SIA assessment and report (see Section 3 below for details).
- (c) Conducted the assessment based on International Association of Impact Assessment Best Practice Guidelines.
- (a) Reviewed the updated Consent Application for the Proposal, notified in March 2021.
- (b) Reviewed Councils' request for further information under section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and Ara Poutama's response.
- (c) Reviewed submissions relating to the SIA.
- (d) Reviewed the Reporting Officers' Section 42A materials relevant to my evidence.
- (e) Reviewed and assessed additional historical information (pertaining to Tai Aroha) and operational changes presented after the SIA was completed (discussed in this evidence).
- (f) Had ongoing interaction and communication with other specialists including those involved in operations, collateral information on offending behaviours, traffic assessment and landscape plans and reviewed these as part of this evidence.
- (g) Reviewed the statements of evidence given by the other experts and witnesses on behalf of Ara Poutama.

### **Code of conduct**

- 1.5 I have read and am familiar with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, contained in the Environment Court

Practice Note 2014, and agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. Other than where I state that I am relying on the advice of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

## **2 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 2.1 My evidence is presented on behalf of the applicant, Ara Poutama Aotearoa.
- 2.2 It addresses the social impact assessment prepared as part of the application for this consent and is structured as follows:
  - (a) SIA Methodology.
  - (b) Summary of Key SIA Findings.
  - (c) A review and assessment of further information provided by Ara Poutama after my SIA was completed.
  - (d) My response to the section 42A report.
  - (e) My response to submissions.

## **3 SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY**

- 3.1 The SIA used a multi-modal research method in four phases as follows:
  - (a) **Phase one – Scoping.** This phase was undertaken to understand the scope of the Proposal from a social impact perspective, including its potential effects (based on a review of literature and similar services). The first part of this work involved collecting an understanding of community based residential rehabilitation programmes similar to the Proposal. We conducted case study research on the experienced social impacts and outcomes of Tai Aroha (an existing residential programme which the Bristol Street proposal will be based on) and reviewed wider literature on 'similar' activities. The second part included a preliminary review of potential social impacts including identification of an initial area of assessment for the Bristol Street proposal and observation and

review of Ara Poutama consultation as well as independent research conducted by the social impact team (see section 3.2.1 of the SIA for details).

- (b) **Phase two – Community Profiling.** This included collation of data to develop an understanding of the community that would be potentially impacted by the Proposal, including characteristics that might influence the extent to which they are impacted. It also provided a baseline of the existing environment from which we used to assess potential social change that may occur as a result of the Proposal.
- (c) **Phase three – Assessment of potential social impacts.** The identification and assessment of potential social impacts involved the process of overlaying information gathered for scoping effects and the community profile with the relevant components of the Proposal. This included an identification of the type of potential social impacts that may be experienced, and identification of the likely impacted community, and the scale of these potential impacts.
- (d) **Phase four – Recommending mitigation measures to address identified potential social impacts.** Following the assessment of potential impacts, measures were identified or recommended to avoid, remedy, or mitigate potential adverse impacts, as appropriate. These recommended measures draw from experience on other projects, particularly social service and residential service projects, feedback from engagement activities and interviews with Ara Poutama.

## **4 SUMMARY OF KEY SIA FINDINGS**

### **Phase One**

- 4.1 The study of Tai Aroha concluded that there was no substantial evidence to support the tested hypothesis that establishing a corrections residential rehabilitation unit in a residential neighbourhood causes negative social impacts to the local community. It was acknowledged that this finding may, at least in part, be due to how the residential programme was run (in other words, that there

remained the potential for adverse social consequences arising from such facilities and services if they were operated in a different way from the Tai Aroha case study).

#### 4.2 The study also found:

- (a) evidence of positive impacts particularly around well-being and sense of safety for neighbouring residents;
- (b) that familiarity with the residence by the wider community declined with increasing distance from the Programme; and
- (c) that the longstanding presence of Tai Aroha was considered to have helped the community to become accustomed to the residence and its operational 'effects' or the character of operations in the community.

4.3 From the literature review, we observed that in the majority of cases and generally, the anticipated adverse impacts of supported residential homes and similar 'unattractive' social services are not realised. This trend includes public perception of risk<sup>1</sup>. However, there were also cases identified in the literature that this outcome does depend on how the programme and/or facility was run. For example, the following factors influenced the realisation (or otherwise) of any adverse social change: the efficacy of the programme; the maintenance of the site and buildings (physical appearance); and the overall management of the service, including responsiveness to and education of the community in which such services were located. In other words, it appears that facilities that operate as 'a good neighbour' are more accepted by the community that surrounds them and do not realise the adverse social impacts that many in the community anticipate will be experienced.

### **Phase Two**

4.4 The site of the Proposal was historically used for residential care and supported accommodation for the Cerebral Palsy Society and most

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to our literature review I refer to Dr Gilbert's evidence on this matter.

recently temporary visitor accommodation. It has 23 bedrooms<sup>2</sup>. Our findings are that neighbours of the site appeared to report few or minimal issues with both historical operations. Issues that were mentioned or raised from our review were around site maintenance and noise from residents, and occasional issues with residents' behaviour. These few issues were largely identified as being associated with its use for unsupervised temporary visitor accommodation (rather than occupation by the Cerebral Palsy Society).

- 4.5 In the SIA, we characterised the local neighbourhood as mainly residential with a relatively large component of rental accommodation. It was noted that the area had undergone urban intensification and development. We identified that some residents reported pressure on on-street parking and some reported busier streets and more traffic congestion. As a residential area, it was acknowledged that existing residences could include people under home detention sentences (as is the case in any residential area).
- 4.6 In terms of way of life and activities outside of the home in the area, we identified that people spoke about the area being very walkable to many amenities. The parks and green spaces in the area provided recreation opportunities and those with families were attracted to this. The convenience of the location in relation to access to amenities (including work) and walkability was also a key value for people living in the local neighbourhood. In addition to this, the relative quietness of the area and natural environment were highlighted by residents as things they valued.

### **Phase Three**

- 4.7 The SIA provided an assessment of the potential social impact of the Proposal by the nature of that impact (type or values impacted), the scale, and the likely impacted community (or parts of that community).

---

<sup>2</sup> I note that initially 16 of these were proposed to be used for this programme (e.g. the full number of bedrooms that may have been used on this site in the past were not proposed to be used as bedrooms for this proposal). Furthermore, since the SIA, it is understood that the current proposal is that 12 of the bedrooms on the site would be used as bedrooms (see evidence of Mr Clark paragraph 4.11 for further details).



### **Potential Impact Rating**

- 4.8 Our assessment analysed the potential impacts on a five-point rating scale ranging from very low to very high potential effects. These are based on the assessed severity of social change experienced, extent of impact and the duration of that impact, for example:
- (a) Very High: a high to very high degree of social change (severity) to most of the identified community, particularly if that impact is likely to be permanent in duration.
  - (b) High: a moderate to high degree of social change (severity) to more than half of the identified community that is likely to be long term to permanent in duration.
  - (c) Moderate: a low to moderate degree of social change (severity) to around half of the identified community that is likely to be transitional to long term in duration (months to years).
  - (d) Low: a low degree of social change (severity) to around 10% up to 50% of the identified community that is likely to be transitional in duration (months).
  - (e) Very Low: a very low or negligible degree of social change (severity) to a small portion (less than 10%) of the identified community that is likely to be short term/temporary in duration (weeks to months).
- 4.9 The following scale guidance (Figure 1) provides an indication of where the impact categories used in this SIA compare to the categorisation of effects applied under the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**). It is also noted that some variability in the correlation of effects is a reflection of the temporal nature of some effects identified in the SIA (e.g. potentially moderate adverse effects but of a short or limited time duration correlate to a minor effect, while such effects if permanent might be more appropriately considered as 'more than minor').

Figure 1: Scale of Impacts referenced against determination of minor as per the Resource Management Act 1991



### **Assessment findings<sup>3</sup>**

#### *Positive effects*

- 4.10 We considered that there were potential positive social outcomes for the successful graduates of the programme and their families and wider community in terms of way of life, environment and health and well-being. However, as we noted in the SIA the primary focus of the report was on the local neighbourhood and St Albans West suburban area. Given that it was unknown if any graduate would be part of this community in the future, we did not quantify this potential positive social outcome further in the SIA report.

#### *Way of life*

- 4.11 We assessed that the potential social effects of the Proposal on way of life for the local neighbourhood (in particular, how neighbours use their outdoor areas and how they undertake activities including recreation (walking) in the local area) will initially have a low negative or adverse impact. I note that the assessment in the SIA was based on the management programme we understood was proposed for the site (i.e. consistent with the operation of Tai Aroha). It is also important to note that this assessment was based on the original scope of operational activities proposed. In my opinion, the subsequent changes (as outlined in the evidence of Mr Gimblett) have provided greater certainty regarding perceived safety and potential privacy impacts (such as detail on landscaping and screening of windows, a proposed reduction in resident numbers and confirmation of a planned

<sup>3</sup> It is noted the following assessment findings is a summary of our assessment that was completed before changes were made to the proposal including reduction of residents, landscaping, use of rooms and the operational manual. In addition it was before submissions.

gradual buildup of resident numbers at commencement of operations). In the SIA, it was also assessed that potential impacts on way of life would likely decrease over time to a very low to negligible adverse impact. In RMA "effects" terms, I correlate this to a minor effect trending to a less than minor effect over time.

- 4.12 In terms of where (or for whom) these impacts would be experienced, the SIA identified that the effects for the wider St Albans West suburban area would be less than the local neighbourhood area. This assessment is based on my experience from previous projects, as well as the Tai Aroha baseline assessment. In my experience, awareness of potentially "undesirable activities" and the operational characteristics of such activities decrease with distance and it is almost exclusively those in close proximity that can hear or see a site that are most aware of it.
- 4.13 In addition to the assessment above, a further potential way of life impact was identified for direct neighbours. This potential impact is a consequence of privacy and safety concerns for these neighbours and the potential that this may impact how these residents live and use their homes and private outdoor areas. In the SIA, it was considered that the landscaping plan proposed for the site provided some mitigation to address this potential impact (providing opportunity for these properties to have some screening). The SIA identified further opportunities to offer mitigation to residents (for example, by offering direct neighbours to provide privacy measures on their properties, such as planting on private properties and/or window covers/screening). This recommendation was made because of the pattern of built development surrounding the site (and the limitations for screening within the Bristol Street site to provide a sense of physical screening for occupants of particularly the second story windows). I note that this mitigation was proposed as an additional measure that could strengthen the sense of privacy for neighbouring residents, if they chose to take it up (recognising some would see this as a trade-off with other considerations such as outlook). However, even without this particular aspect of the mitigation the SIA considered the potential effect with landscaping and appropriate screening on the Bristol Street site would result in low negative potential impacts for immediate neighbours, again reducing over time.

*Sense of place and character*

- 4.14 During the planning phase of the Proposal (see section 5 of Mr Clark's evidence), the relationship between Ara Poutama (as site operator) and the community was (and still is) developing. We acknowledged that during this period the Proposal had generated a high level of concern from residents in the local neighbourhood, with the community anticipating a wide range of serious effects.
- 4.15 In the SIA, we considered (and still maintain) that a community's anticipation of an impact is often greater than the effects experienced in implementation (a finding we base on literature and experience on other project examples). We also considered that such community viewpoints are influenced by community-generated information. Notwithstanding these observations, we acknowledged that this anticipation of community change arising from a project has the potential to generate effects on the values people put on the environment / community they live in. On this basis, the SIA assessed that the planning stage has potential low to moderate negative social impacts on the local neighbourhood's sense of place; particularly the perceived desirability of the local neighbourhood for residents in the local area.
- 4.16 However, based on case studies and the site comparator - Tai Aroha, we considered this to be a temporary adverse impact. In the SIA we expected these issues and concerns to diminish, particularly over the initial months of establishment and operation, (most likely over the first 6-12 months). Relying on the assumption that the site would be run in a manner similar to Tai Aroha, we assessed that these temporary effects would diminish. Further, with the opportunity for ongoing communication between Ara Poutama and residents in the community, we identified an opportunity for the trust between these parties to develop and for the site to become 'part of the suburb and local neighbourhood' with a much lower association of negative perceptions from the community. On this basis, we assessed that, for the local neighbourhood area, there is a potential low negative effect on sense of place and character over the operation phase (again this impact reduced (to negligible) for the wider St Albans West suburban area scale of community).

*Quality of environment – fears and concerns for safety*

- 4.17 The matter of safety had also been addressed within the Assessment of Environmental Effects and subsequent information through risk assessments conducted by Mr. Louw, a psychologist from Ara Poutama and a review by psychologists Dr Cording and Dr Polaschek on behalf of Christchurch City Council and Ara Poutama respectively. We relied on the first two specialists with regards to the assessed risk of harm to the community (noting the evidence of Dr Polaschek has since been made available).
- 4.18 On this basis, the SIA assessed that there will be a very low negative impact on people's quality of environment as a result of concerns and risk to people's safety. However, we acknowledged that there are fears and concerns from residents, particularly in the planning and establishment phase. This could result in a sense (or perception) that people feel less safe in their local neighbourhood environment. For this reason, the SIA identified this as a potential adverse effect on the value residents place on the quality of their environment. However, and again based on the literature review findings, the baseline study of Tai Aroha and our experience with other 'similar' or comparable projects, the SIA concluded that these adverse impacts will diminish over time (from low to very low), as the operation of the site becomes 'normalised' in the existing suburban environment. Measures to address the quality of the environment arising from perceptions of safety of the local neighbourhood are discussed below and in the mitigation recommendations.

*Health and wellbeing*

- 4.19 This section considered the physical, mental, social, and spiritual wellbeing (physical safety risks being noted in the previous section) of the local neighbourhood. Within this neighbourhood, it was noted that some people had experienced both the earthquakes (and recovery process) and the fear associated with the terrorist mosque attacks and, while this had in some people built "resilience", a number of people had reported a baseline of high levels of stress associated with this sequence of events. Whilst we could not comment on cumulative psychological stress, the assessment considered the potential social

consequences of this proposal in light of those concerns. We assessed that there would be potential negative impacts on the community's health and wellbeing arising from the proposed activity and that a sense or feeling of having an 'unwanted and uninvited' activity being 'put upon' people in the community exacerbates this. Overall, the SIA assessed that there is potential to have moderate negative impacts on health and wellbeing during the planning phase, but these impacts were considered temporary and will reduce to low and very low over time as a result of the operating conditions proposed by Ara Poutama for the site. The SIA acknowledged that some people have indicated that this is increasing stress and anxiety for some members of the community. However, the SIA concluded that such potential impacts will also likely decrease over time as the programme settles into the community.

#### *Conclusion*

- 4.20 The social impacts identified in the SIA primarily related to anticipatory fears expressed by the community and related to the local neighbourhood surrounding the site. Comparative data from Tai Aroha, literature and interviews with experienced stakeholders and technical specialist reports indicated that the likelihood of the fears anticipated being realized is very low and in some cases comparative to potential effects that could be experienced within the existing local neighbourhood environment in the absence of this facility. Notwithstanding this, it was acknowledged in the SIA that the process of establishing an 'unwanted and uninvited' activity in a community gives rise to potential social effects related to the sense of pride people have in their community, the values they place in their environment and potentially (in limited cases) to the way of life for people in the community. Overall, we considered the potential adverse social impacts from this Proposal (given its scale and assuming a management approach comparable to Tai Aroha), are low (or "minor" in RMA effects terms) though some temporary potential moderate adverse effects are identified. These moderate impacts are assessed and expected to reduce/ameliorate over time.

#### **Phase 4**

- 4.21 The main mitigation measures proposed in the SIA related to the nature of the potential adverse effects (e.g. related to community perceptions and fears/concerns of the activity). These measures were effective management of the programme, including responsiveness to community concerns, maintenance of the property – including screening of the property from direct neighbours (and potentially visa-versa) and adherence to risk reduction and safety measures. Further recommendations were made in respect of community and stakeholder engagement; to support the development of communication (and ideally trust) between the residents of the local neighbourhood and personnel on the site from Ara Poutama. These measures were mainly designed to ease the transition of this programme into the community and minimise the degree of change experienced by the community.
- 4.22 With mitigation and post 6 to 12 months of operation, we assessed that impacts will be low to very low and over time be reduced to very low. We acknowledged in the SIA that due to personal circumstances some members of the community may not ever become comfortable with these operations and as such may continue to perceive that there is a risk to their safety. For these people, there is the potential that they may alter their way of life (for example, avoiding walking past the site). However, we considered that this is likely to be for only a very small number of people in the community and not dissimilar to the behaviour that people may take to some residential properties where the residents or activities at a residence are considered to exhibit antisocial characteristics (for example, noise, dogs on the property, poor property maintenance etc.).
- 4.23 In terms of the context of the RMA and the determination of 'effects', we concluded that the overall potential social effects of the Proposal are minor (acknowledging some short-term moderate potential adverse effects). Furthermore, we consider that with mitigation the overall social effects will be minor, becoming less than minor over time.

## **5 REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF FURTHER INFORMATION**

5.1 Since the SIA was undertaken and the Application was notified, Ara Poutama has:

- (a) provided additional information to the Council regarding incidents at Tai Aroha;
- (b) responded to a request for further information from the Council, and as part of that, identified changes to the Proposal in response to the submissions received; and
- (c) proposed a suite of conditions on the resource consent, if granted.

5.2 I set out below the implications of each matter for my assessment of the social impacts of the Proposal.

### **Tai Aroha Incidents**

5.3 Further information was provided to Council in May 2021 regarding incidents at Tai Aroha. I have reviewed this information and note that there were more incidents (departures from the residence) than the information used in the assessment in the SIA. On the basis of these incidents, I consider it reasonable to assume that this will mean there is an increased likelihood that residents of Bristol Street may also leave without permission.

5.4 However, while this data indicates an increased frequency of such events, from what we reviewed, it also shows that these incidents have not resulted in subsequent adverse events for the community. In this respect, I do not consider that this will result in changes to the well-being, character, or way of life of the community (e.g. as a result of consequential actions following a resident leaving without permission). For this reason, I do not consider this information changes my initial assessment of the potential adverse social effects of the proposal on the Bristol Street community.

### **Response to the RFI - Changes to Bristol Street Proposal**

5.5 The RFI response identifies a number of changes to the Proposal which have been made in response to the submissions received.



*Reduced resident numbers*

- 5.6 The proposed maximum number of residents in the programme has changed from 16 to 12. I consider that this will:
- (a) Reduce potential movements outside the site of both visitors, and residents (and potentially staff).
  - (b) Reduce noise and activity generated by the residents in outdoor areas.
  - (c) Provide more group, recreation, and communal space for residents (particularly the usability of indoor areas for such space).
- 5.7 I am supportive of this change as I consider it will assist the residence to have a more consistent scale of activity to the surrounding residential area and therefore further reduce potential impacts on the quality of the local neighbourhood environment. In particular, I consider that the reduction in residents will assist in reducing the physical evidence and therefore the legibility or visibility of the site operations (assisting the programme to “blend in” to the surrounding environment) for the local neighbourhood and particularly the immediate neighbours. It may also serve to assist the community to adjust to the presence of the programme over a shorter period (for example, through reducing the duration of effects I identify as being temporary in nature). In these respects, these changes are, in my opinion, positive and reinforce my conclusion that the overall adverse effects of this Proposal on social wellbeing will be minor, with the potential to become less than minor over time.

*Phasing*

- 5.8 In the SIA, we identified the opportunity for an incremental or staged establishment of operations at the site to assist with better facilitating the incorporating of the Proposal into the neighbourhood. This has now been proposed by the Department and is detailed in its RFI response and in the evidence of Mr Clark.<sup>4</sup> I am supportive of this approach and consider as outlined in our SIA that this will aid the

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer paragraph 6.10 of Mr Clark’s evidence.

transition of the residence operating within the community. It does not change our overall findings but affirms our assumptions with mitigation (as a phasing approach was considered in the assessment with mitigations).

### **Proposed Conditions**

5.9 I have reviewed the conditions and consider a number of these will assist to manage and or mitigate potential adverse social impacts I have identified. These include:

- (a) Measures to maintain privacy and quality of private living spaces for neighbours through strategic use of outdoor spaces, and the proposals for landscape planting and window screening/covers.
- (b) Measures to minimize the use of public space and outdoor space areas surrounding and within the site, to reduce potential effects on the character and sense of place of the neighbourhood. For example, this includes requirements of the operational manual to discourage gathering of staff and visitors on the street and operational restrictions for some outdoor space areas within the site that may be visible / audible to neighbours.
- (c) Measures to enable the community to have contact with Ara Poutama, both to raise concerns (if needed) and to get feedback on the operations of the site through the provision of a contact number to operators of the site and through the establishment and operation of a community liaison group (**CLG**).

5.10 I consider that the changes proposed to the programme by Ara Poutama and the suite of conditions will be appropriate to manage the potential adverse social impacts identified in my report. I remain of the opinion that with this mitigation the adverse effects of the Proposal on the community will be minor, moving to less than minor once the Proposal becomes more established.

## **6 RESPONSE TO SECTION 42A REPORT**

6.1 I have reviewed the social impact advice provided by Ms. Louise Strogon for Christchurch City Council. I note that on the whole Ms. Strogon and I are in agreeance of the potential impacts, albeit that

Ms. Strogon does not consider that the adverse effects will reduce to the same extent over time. I have focused on the following areas where there are some differences in conclusion (particularly recommendations for conditions).

- 6.2 Overall Ms. Strogon considers impacts will be moderate to low (with low impacts being achieved over time). I consider that with mitigation and the passage of time (post 6-12 months of operation) social impacts will be low extending to very low. I reiterate that my assessment is based on both a review of the Tai Aroha operations (from the Anglesea Street site) and my experience with other 'comparable' land use activities. Nothing in Ms. Strogon's assessment revises my conclusion.
- 6.3 In paragraph 34 of her memorandum Ms. Strogon notes that we as the Social Assessors did not undertake bespoke face-to-face social impact interviews or engagement exercises with the local community. However, as a minor observation I note we did do specific engagement in the form of SIA interviews (albeit the majority by phone) with local community stakeholders and follow up interviews with some of the local community residents, in cases where people provided contact details in their response to the survey. While I acknowledge these were (in the main) not face-to-face, I consider they were individual and bespoke interviews. As such, I consider we have taken that opportunity to deepen our understanding of the community's views on the Proposal and their assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposal (as they view it) on them. I consider this is further evidenced by the fact that our SIA covers the majority of the issues and concerns raised by submitters (albeit I note and discuss below a few specific issues raised in submissions that we did not specifically consider in the SIA).
- 6.4 In terms of 'matters for further discussion' or the measures put forward by Ms. Strogon for consideration (set out in paragraph 99 of her memorandum) I make the following comments:
- (a) I do not oppose the outcomes sought by Ms. Strogon where she recommends either additional on-site screening (noting that this has been proposed by the reporting planner's recommendations

as landscape planting). However, I am of the view that such measures (if provided) should be done in a manner that retains light and amenity for the residents of the Bristol Street site and a degree of permeability so that the residential character of the site is not lost (that being the environment intended for the successful operation of the Proposal). I also consider that neighbours should still have the option of further mitigation on their properties (as offered by the applicant), as in my view (acknowledging I am not a landscape architect) the additional on-site screening may not provide them the level of privacy that would address their concerns (noting this is at least in part driven by concerns of what residents from these neighbouring properties see when they look out, rather than the ability of residents within the Bristol Street site to look into the second story windows of these properties).

- (b) I understand there are limitations in terms of including an obligation on another person/residence in the conditions of a separate proposal (in this case, the Salisbury Street Foundation) (I further note that this has not been recommended for condition by Ms. Chapman). Notwithstanding this, and for completeness, I note that I do not consider the proposal to co-ordinate with the Foundation is managing a social impact identified in either my assessment nor the review of Ms. Strogen. There is, in other words, no evidence that outings by either the existing Salisbury Street Foundation activity nor the assessed potential impacts of the operation of this site, are generating adverse social impacts warranting such mitigation.
- (c) I understand that some staffing increases have been proposed by Ara Poutama, which may satisfy this matter (in that they would have a minimum of 3 staff during the period of weekend visiting hours). More broadly, although I defer to staff of Ara Poutama regarding proposals for staff numbers on the site, I make the following notes in respect of social effects and my observations from the Tai Aroha site. Some neighbours and residents surrounding the Tai Aroha site did express the view that the staff presence at that site made the area 'safer and more secure' (e.g., for cars parked in the street etc.). However, this is a positive social impact (and therefore not necessarily one that should be required

by condition) and I do not consider it related to the staffing ratios as proposed by Ms. Stroger. Secondly, while there was some negative comment and views made about the impact of 'people lingering in the street' at Tai Aroha (this related to both staff smoking and visitors waiting to be bought into the property). I consider these have been appropriately addressed by the management regime proposed for the Bristol Street site (with designated outdoor staff areas and visitor waiting areas inside the property). As such, and on the basis of my understanding of the site options, I do not consider there are any potential social impacts identified that warrant a conditioned requirement for additional staffing numbers during visiting hours. That said, I am certainly not opposed to conditions on that matter, if offered by Ara Poutama.

6.5 With regards to matters concerning conditions set out by Ms. Stroger in paragraph 100 of her memorandum<sup>5</sup>:

- (a) I am supportive of the first matter, to clearly identify in the conditions those areas of the site where residents access will be restricted / managed. I further note that Ara Poutama have put forward nominated 'no un-authorized access areas' for inclusion in the conditions (on the landscape plans).
- (b) I have reviewed the house rules and draft operations manual and remain of the view that the current behavioural expectations set out in that kawa would already provide for behaviours of residents outside the residence (e.g. on excursions). As such, I do not consider the amendment proposed by Ms. Stroger is needed to provide clear expectations of residents on behaviour outside the residence. I nevertheless understand that Ara Poutama has included these expectations explicitly within the proposed house rules.
- (c) I am supportive of a managed complaints registration and reporting process provided that the 24 hour response remains sufficiently flexible to allow for further investigations (as these are

---

<sup>5</sup> I have provided comment on all the matters put forward by Ms Stroger as the SIA reviewer. I acknowledge that not all of these matters for conditions have been included by the council planner in the section 42A report.

occasionally required to run for longer than 24-hours). I note that the conditions proposed by Ara Poutama and presented in the evidence of Mr Gimblett, provide a managed complaints process.

- (d) I do not consider it feasible for the nominated community liaison person to be available a consistent 7 days a week (as I note this is outside legal employment working conditions). However, I am supportive of a consistent phone number serviced 7-days a week during normal work hours and the opportunity for messages to be left and responded to outside this time (where practicable, I agree that continuity of personnel operating this phone is desirable).
- (e) I am not opposed to the extension of an invitation for CLG membership. However, I do have the following concerns:
  - (i) The recommendation of at least 4 community representative members may be of benefit, however, I do see it as beneficial that each representative has a clear mandate of who/how they are representing the community (e.g. if there are particular communities of interest they are representing). I also note that in my experience, the ability/interest of this level of representation for an 'operational liaison group' (as compared to during construction) can be difficult, given time commitments of people. For these reasons, I am supportive of a condition that maintains flexibility for up to four community representatives;
  - (ii) I am supportive of an invitation being issued to residents of the local neighbourhood. However, I consider Ms. Stroger's proposal for the invitation to join the CLG to go out to all submitters may not be appropriate to the intent of the community liaison group (as there are a total of 204 submitters, and some of these outside the local community area identified).
  - (iii) I consider that a better method for formation of the CLG may be a self-nomination form at either/both the open day<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Noting this is a separate recommendation from Ms Stroger that I am supportive of.

or in a local letter/newsletter. This would enable information to be provided on what the CLG purpose is and its functions, as well as expected commitments for members of the group. If there are numerous nominations it may be appropriate to consider a selection process, based on representativeness for the community i.e. of gender, age, and ethnicity, or it may be that the nominees meet and confirm who they consider would appropriately represent them (e.g. up to the 4 community representatives on the CLG). Again, I note that, in my experience, the issue of size of such groups has been more about establishing sufficient membership (rather than over subscription).

- (iv) I consider the proposal by Ms. Stroger for the ability of the CLG to 'co-opt' membership in response to specific issues needs some further clarification. If the concern is to enable 'new' community activities to be able to seek membership/representation on the CLG in the future, then I am supportive. From Ms. Stroger's comments, the alternative suggestion is that the membership may involve specific expertise to 'monitor' issues and impacts. I do not consider this is appropriate or necessary given the scope of identified potential social effects of the proposal. Furthermore, it is unclear how that person/membership would be identified or (depending on the expertise sought) even funded to undertake such work.
- (v) Finally, if there is a desire to reach a wider audience, the proposed distribution of meeting minutes provides a sufficient mechanism for a wider audience to gain information from the CLG. Furthermore, nominated representatives will have a role of working with the local community to garner feedback and report back information received from the CLG. In my experience, this approach is more pragmatic, acknowledging the limited time commitment for communities to attend CLG meetings themselves.

- (vi) I am supportive of the recommendations Ms. Stroger makes in respect of reporting issues and responses raised at the CLG.
- (vii) Finally, in terms of the recommendation Ms. Stroger makes for monitoring and evaluation of the programme. I support ongoing monitoring of outcomes for the residents and evaluation of its success/limitations to success. However, I consider that Ara Poutama's existing internal monitoring processes are appropriate to provide this function (e.g. effectiveness of the facility etc.). I do not consider that this monitoring needs to be reviewed by Council, the CLG or the community.
- (viii) I consider the complaints and incident registers, data on participation rates (e.g. numbers of residents going through the programme) and feedback to and from the CLG and any other community meetings held are sufficient to provide monitoring oversight of the potential social issues of the proposal. This is particularly relevant as the social impacts identified by both myself and Ms. Stroger, relate to anticipatory impacts from the community (generated from fears and community concerns regarding the activities of the proposal, rather than expected social change or 'harm' caused by the activity). From a social impact perspective I do not consider that a further impact assessment would provide any better information than these records. A further assessment may also well serve to unsettle the community or otherwise raise expectations from the community that are not able to be realised. In conclusion, I do not consider there are potential adverse effects of a scale that would mean that further assessment of social impacts was warranted.

6.6 Finally, in response to the 'matters encouraged' by Ms. Stroger in paragraph 101 of her memorandum, I acknowledge and support the proposal of an Open Day prior to operation of the residence. In my experience, such events can be a valuable way for the local community



to become more familiar with 'feared or unpopular' activities such as this proposal.

## **7 RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS**

7.1 A number of submitters (approximately 10 percent of total submissions) express overall support for the Proposal, either expressing that they do not have concern for themselves or the community as a result of the Proposal or expressing the potential benefits for the future residents of the programme, whanau of residents and wider community. It is noted that many of these submissions cite familiarity with Tai Aroha, the needs of the target population for this programme or trust in Ara Poutama as an organisation or in the procedures proposed. This corresponds with the findings of both the literature review and baseline study of Tai Aroha; that familiarity, a trusted relationship with the operator, and/or lived experience of a successful operation, result in minimising initial concerns and anticipated adverse social impacts of activities like the proposal.

7.2 The majority of submissions reference topics either specifically relating to adverse social effects or having potential consequential adverse social impacts. These are generally in opposition to the Proposal. I address the following key topics raised in these submissions below under the following themes:

- (a) SIA Methodology.
- (b) People's way of life.
- (c) Community – sense of place and character.
- (d) Amenity of the environment.
- (e) Community health and well-being.

### **SIA Methodology**

#### *Survey*

7.3 Several submissions questioned the SIA methodology in particular the survey and follow up interviews noting that they personally were not

interviewed. It appears to be implied from these comments, that as researchers we did not seek enough information from the community.

- 7.4 The survey was hand delivered to the mailboxes of all residents that had been notified by Ara Poutama of the proposal (if residents wished to share the survey with others they were able to do so and no response was excluded from our evaluation of the results). The follow up phone calls were not intended to canvas all participants of the on-line survey. Rather the purpose was to clarify information provided from the on-line survey, where we had further questions and sought to further understand statements made and / or where respondents had indicated they had particular knowledge we wanted information on (such as history of the site). The follow up phone calls also aimed to speak to a representative range of participants, in terms of age, gender, living circumstances, from the total survey responses received. For clarity, I note that it was the survey and follow-up one-on-one interviews, as well as observation of the open days at Rehua Marae, that informed our community social impact evaluation (not the door-knocking undertaken by Ara Poutama to discuss the proposal).
- 7.5 The SIA used a multimodal method to collate a wide source of information to inform the assessment. I consider this is aligned to best-practice. It is noted that a social impact assessment seeks information to understand the scope of community concerns, including what the community is anticipating in terms of the impacts of the proposal. This information is gathered alongside the views from other stakeholders and experts and comparative data (studies and literature reviews). Combined, the information provides data to assess the potential social impacts of the proposal.

#### *Independence of assessment*

- 7.6 Concerns have been raised by a few submitters as to the independence of the SIA. I acknowledge that I was contracted by Ara Poutama to undertake that assessment in my capacity as an independent expert. I have also been contracted to provide this evidence, which again, I do in my capacity as an independent expert witness.
- 7.7 As I have set out in paragraph 1.5, I have read and am familiar with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses,

contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014, and agree to comply with it. In particular, I would draw attention to clause 7.2(a) and (b) of that Note which state that:

- (a) An expert witness has an overriding duty to impartially assist the Court on matters within the expert's area of expertise.
- (b) An expert witness is not, and must not behave as, an advocate for the party who engages the witness. Expert witnesses must declare any relationship with the parties calling them or any interest they may have in the outcome of the proceeding.

7.8 In that regard, I further note that I am not part of the design team for this residence. Neither I, nor to the best of my knowledge does Beca (as my employer) have any confirmed role in the operation of the Proposal, if it proceeds.

7.9 The methodology for the SIA was proposed by me and my team. While Ara Poutama was consulted to assist the SIA team to identify contacts for specific stakeholders (information they held from their own communications and engagement process or operational knowledge), all interviews were held independently and raw survey data and interview transcripts were not shared with Ara Poutama unless the interviewee directly requested so or otherwise asked us to pass on specific information from our interviews. Ara Poutama reviewed our report and had inputs on accuracy of information pertaining to Ara Poutama operations and the proposal and general edits relating to the legibility of the report for the future readers. We provided Ara Poutama with our findings and recommendations for mitigation and management based on potential social impacts for their consideration.

7.10 In summary, I am confident that in preparing the SIA and in preparing this evidence, I have complied with my obligations as an independent expert.

#### *Comparison to Tai Aroha*

7.11 It is noted by some submitters that our findings in part relied upon the findings of the baseline study of Tai Aroha. Some submitters expressed the view that the operations and the community surrounding Tai Aroha

are not sufficiently comparable to the proposed operations of the Bristol Street proposal and the surrounding community of that site. Overall, these submitters express the view that the comparisons of effects are limited in applicability.

7.12 In the SIA it is recognised that there are similarities and differences between the community and proposals of the Bristol Street site and Tai Aroha. However, I remain of the view that the nature of the activity and the characteristics of the communities are sufficiently similar for the Tai Aroha operation to be a useful data source for the SIA. I note the following comparable features:

- (a) Residential neighbourhood.
- (b) Mixed housing typology – single houses, town houses and apartments.
- (c) Close proximity to CBD.
- (d) Established neighbourhood that has transitioned/is transitioning to higher density housing.
- (e) Close to popular recreation features (parks in Christchurch/river in Hamilton).
- (f) High level of walkability – many residents walk to shops, education, recreation, and work.
- (g) Other services within the neighbourhood include supported housing, social housing, and retirement housing/homes.
- (h) Schooling within approximately 400m+ of sites.
- (i) Mix of rental and owner occupiers.

7.13 Notwithstanding the above conclusion, I also note that the baseline research of Tai Aroha is not the only source of data informing our SIA. Other data includes the literature review, personal experience in other projects that have some similarities to this proposal, and information gathered from the survey and stakeholder interviews for this site.

7.14 I also refer to Mr Gimblett's evidence in paragraphs 4.16 and 4.17, where he also provides information on the comparability of the two sites and note that I am comfortable with that comparison.

### **Potential Social Impacts Identified by Submitters**

7.15 This section discusses the potential social impacts raised by submissions. It does not repeat our assessment rather will comment on additional social issues raised or where a difference in assessment has been raised.

7.16 Firstly, I consider that a number of submissions are made on the basis of what I consider to be different assumptions regarding the nature of the Proposal (for example, its scale or operational characteristics). For example a submission assumed that there would be no filtering out for mental health, drug and alcohol and sexual violence, all of which are matters screened for and I understand that untreated mental health and/or drug/alcohol addictions and known sexual offending are exclusion criteria for the programme. Other assumptions made in submissions included that there is no outdoor space or facilities to exercise on the site. From my site visits I observe that both of these are provided for though the outdoor courtyard area and exercise rooms. For completeness, I set out my assumptions related to the Proposal as they informed the SIA and our assessment of potential social impacts:

- (a) The proposed residents are members of the community who are eligible for home detention, where in that case they might otherwise be living in a residential community (without on-site or in-person supervision). On this basis, the SIA report considered the impact of up to 16 residents attending a programme together under supervised home detention, relative to a baseline 'alternative' – that these potential residents live in private homes throughout the wider community (with or without others) under home detention. I note that the number of residents has since been reduced to 12 residents which reinforces the conclusions as I discussed above.
- (b) There is an assessment of the risk of re-offending for successful applicants to the residents programme. The criteria for potential

residents is based on the assessed 'high-risk of any re-offending within a 5 year period'. This is consideration of any 'offending' that would mean that the person would appear back within the criminal justice system. I understand that this could be for a range of offences including minor traffic offences through to violent reoffending.

- (c) As noted in the RFI response of (March 2020) by the department (Dr Louw) and evidence of Dr Polaschek, the eligibility assessment (both for acceptance into the programme and ongoing attendance) specifically considers whether the potential resident would pose any safety risk to the residence or the surrounding community (I note that this is also an important consideration in the court process of determining whether to impose a community sentence). If an immediate risk is identified they would not be eligible for the programme.
- (d) That Ara Poutama has determined the property is suitable to carry out the proposed programme / operations from a space (caters for the number of residents anticipated – again noting the proposal has reduced that number from 16 to 12) and function perspective (can carry out group and other programme activities required). We have assessed the potential social impacts of the chosen location in respect of how operations on the site may interact or impact on the community in which it is located.
- (e) We have assumed that Ara Poutama will provide the required expertise and staffing levels required to operate the residence, drawing from our observations, review of the draft Operations Manual content and review of the Tai Aroha operations.

#### *Way of life*

7.17 Many submitters indicated that they would make changes to their way of life due to the Proposal including:

- (a) Increased security measures at home – physical safety measures.

- (b) Restricting walking around the community particularly past the residence (in particular women and children).
- (c) Restricting the time they walked in the neighborhood.
- (d) Changing walking commutes to work/school.
- (e) Restricting time spent in the outside areas of their home that were publicly visible.

7.18 These issues are addressed in the SIA, and in my summary of the SIA's key findings above. To the extent it is relevant, I have also addressed the implications of the proposed changes to the Proposal on these potential impacts above.

7.19 In summary, I recognise that some members of the community anticipate that they will want to change the way they live as a response to their fears and concerns (e.g. the safety risks they anticipate) from the proposed residence. From a social impact perspective, I have assessed this as a low negative impact initially, reducing to a very low negative to negligible impact in the long term. I consider that potential impacts will reduce both with distance from the site and over time (as the operation becomes an established part of the environment). This is based on details of the Proposal, project experience, literature review of studies for other sites/programmes and experiences for other 'unsociable activities' in communities, and the Tai Aroha case example.

7.20 I also acknowledge that there is a high degree of uncertainty of the outcomes that will be experienced by the community that is associated with a proposal that people are not familiar with. This sort of facility is not one that is generally well understood (with many such operations actively keeping a low profile in communities). The low profile is in part promoted by those running the activities themselves but is also associated with the stigma of such activities from the wider community. This means that a community's understanding of the existing distribution of activities such as home detention, criminal activity and even violent offending (particularly if one factors in domestic violence) are generally not well understood. As such, people's perceptions of 'risk' associated with a new activity such as

this sort of facility are elevated disproportionate to the actual change in risk being experienced. In my experience in talking with stakeholders and community representatives (and I note a feature supported by our research review), is those who have some familiarity with these sort of facilities often have a much greater appreciation of the relative risks of such activities and as a result, many do not have the same degree of fear or concern to the potential impacts of such facilities, relative to those without it (I acknowledge there are some submissions to the contrary to this and that some others have separate concerns about maintaining confidentiality of place of residence for themselves in this specific community). The data of criminal activity around facilities such as that proposed at 14 Bristol Street does not support the fears that it will result in an increased concentration of risk of harm to the community. While acknowledging that people's fears and concerns do have the potential to generate adverse social effects (for example, if people in the community change the way they live or the value they place in their environment), I maintain that the appropriate way to manage such 'anticipatory effects' is more through communication and engagement with the community (addressing the fact that it is derived from uncertainty and perception).

7.21 I have discussed measures to address this issue in respect of mitigation proposals and in response to the memo from Ms. Strogon on proposed management/conditions for the proposal. Acknowledging that Ara Poutama is an organisation that many of the local neighbourhood residents will not have an established relationship with, in the SIA we recommended that Ara Poutama undertake measures to address effects of transition and change in the community (discussed in section 6.3 of my report). These include ongoing communication and engagement strategies, staged opening and operation from partial to full capacity and an incident review process. As set out in the RFI response, the Department has accepted these recommendations. Furthermore, I am supportive of the Department's proposal to reduce the scale of operations at the 14 Bristol Street site. While I do not consider it necessary to address social impacts, I consider it will make the scale of activity more similar to residential activity in the local area, further reducing the potential change to the quality of the residential environment.



- 7.22 In addition to these potential effects, I note that some submitters raised that their way of life may change in respect of friends and family members who may not visit them should this Proposal go ahead. This is cited as being due to the perceived risks associated with the residence. I acknowledge this potential effect was not specifically addressed in my assessment and I respond to this matter further below.
- 7.23 Overall, and for the reasons set out in respect of resident community impacts, I consider that this concern is similar in nature to those discussed above in that it is largely experienced in the initial period of change to the environment and in anticipation of changes to the community's safety. I acknowledge this particular submission concern is a different effect; a potential impact on social cohesion, arising from people in the wider community changing their behaviour towards the local neighbourhood community. However, for the reasons discussed in the SIA I do not consider this to be a significant adverse effect and that the potential for this change in behaviour will reduce over time as the operation becomes normalized. I consider the mitigation measure I have described, in respect of potential way of life impacts are appropriate to address this matter as they will enable residents in the community to be aware of and familiar with the operations of the site and this will assist to reduce fears and concerns they have regarding it.
- 7.24 A number of submitters raised concerns regarding the impacts of the Proposal on the neighbours' sense of privacy. I note that it is the current built form that creates the issues of visibility between properties at the site (albeit mostly from neighbours being able to look into the residence (acknowledging that some neighbours outdoor space are partially visible from the residence) as the building is single storey and many neighbours are two storey – this is an existing issue). Notwithstanding this, I appreciate that the proposed change in the activity at this site will mean that people's concerns relating to these existing privacy matters could be exacerbated. On this basis, I acknowledged this as a potential adverse social impact for immediate neighbours surrounding the site, such as increased fear and perceptions of being surveilled by residents of Bristol Street that would lead to neighbours changing their way of life, restricting outside use

of space or avoiding some activities/uses of some upstairs rooms. As discussed, I have reviewed the RFI and proposed landscape plans as well as the proposal for window screening/treatment. I consider that these measures will assist to mitigate that potential adverse social impact.

#### *Community - Sense of Place*

- 7.25 With regards to sense of place and residential/suburban character, submitters raised concerns that the neighbourhood would lose its safe, quiet community feel as people would retreat to the safety of their homes and not interact with each other on the street or out the front of their homes.
- 7.26 I note that the existing environment does not exclude people on home detention sentences residing within the community nor other facilities that may provide assistance to those with criminal convictions or on home detention (for example, a therapeutic programme proposed as a day facility at Bristol Street could be established as a permitted activity, that could serve the same or similar residents to those proposed to be at the Bristol Street facility). Furthermore, such 'permitted' scenarios may be established with less overall support of these people (e.g. providing for unsupervised travel to and from such activities). While I acknowledge that awareness of this Proposal has generated a number of fears and concerns, this needs to be assessed alongside this permitted baseline, which people may be less aware of, but is a normal aspect of our communities across society.
- 7.27 The potential impacts on sense of place (and residential character) have been addressed in the SIA and summarised above. I further note that many of the "sense of place" values described for the local neighbourhood in the vicinity of the Bristol Street site are similar to those described by residents in the neighbourhood surrounding Tai Aroha; safe, quiet, family friendly and walkable. Neighbours were observed and reported walking around the area, many had not erected fences at the front of their houses and on our site, visits were observed outside their properties (e.g. in front yards). Some of those we interviewed who resided near Tai Aroha reported that they interacted with their neighbours as they encountered them on the street or out

front of their houses. Some of these residents cited that generations of families had lived in the area and many who left returned to the area to raise families. On the basis of these comments, I maintain my opinion that these are not substantially different characteristics of the neighbourhood expressed in submissions made for the Bristol Street proposal.

#### *Community cohesion*

- 7.28 With regards to community cohesion some submitters raised concern that people would not interact as much (as would retreat to safety of home) and in addition people would 'leave the area' as a consequence of the Proposal (approximately 5% –this was both reference to others behaviours and/or referred their own behaviour/intentions). This was either a consideration the submitter was contemplating for themselves or a prediction of behaviour change for neighbours or tenants.
- 7.29 This was not directly assessed in the SIA report. It is noted in the residents' survey that some participants of the survey anticipated or speculated that if the programme went ahead people would leave the community in order to protect themselves and their families. In my assessment of this issue having an adverse impact on social cohesion, I consider this both in terms of likelihood, and the potential impact based on the existing environment and change already underway in that environment.
- 7.30 With regards to the existing community I observe that there is a mix of long term and shorter term residents. It has been noted by some residents that this neighbourhood has been quite transitory (people moving and new development in the area) although some note this activity has reduced more recently. As cited in the community profile in the SIA, the St Albans West census statistics (2018) indicated that more houses than average (Christchurch average) were not owned by the occupier and this was corroborated by information collected by Ara Poutama, i.e. of those they spoke to in door-knocking, 65% rented. Census data indicated that approximately 68% (compared to 76% for Christchurch) had resided at their accommodation a year prior to the census. It was noted that of those renting some indicated an intention

to move in the near future (not associated with the Proposal) this was also encountered in follow up phone calls of the neighbourhood survey.

7.31 In terms of likelihood of people leaving the area, I acknowledge this is a personal decision based on individual perception of the impact of the programme on the household and as noted above at this stage it is only an anticipated action. Based on observations from the Tai Aroha example, I maintain that this does not seem likely over a long-term period; in that case, the immediate community is relatively stable with many homes being occupied by families for generations. Beyond these more immediate community observations, we were unable to capture the reasons for people moving out of the community surrounding Tai Aroha. However, based on the responses to our survey, the awareness of the residence from this community was low and in my opinion it is unlikely its existence is an influential causal factor. On that basis, I acknowledge there is potential that if the consent for this site is granted people may leave before the residence is operational (without awaiting to see if their fears are realised) and others may not. If the fears and concerns of residents do not materialize (as evidence suggests is the case) I consider it probable that others may end up remaining in the community (or at least not leaving as a response to the activity).

7.32 Due to the likelihood (noting this impact is anticipatory) and the scale to which it may occur in context of the wider community I consider this potential impact is unlikely to have a material effect on the community cohesion of the area.

*Quality of environment – fears and concerns for safety*

7.33 The majority of submissions in opposition to the Proposal cited concerns for safety as their primary concern. Specifically, this concern related to fear of crimes being committed by the proposed residents on the community (both violent and non-violent crimes) and in particular on the 'vulnerable'. These included people with disabilities, children, females (particularly living alone) and elderly within their community. It is noted that many of these submissions (approximately 50% of those reporting this concern) were made in respect of 'others' e.g. concerns expressed for others in their community.

7.34 In the SIA, we assessed that there will be low negative impact on the quality of environment for the community arising from impacts to physical safety overall. I set out below the data and matters raised in that data that we considered in reaching this conclusion:

- (a) Literature review – this literature showed little if any correlation between well run facilities and neighbourhood crime.
- (b) Tai Aroha assessment – the local crime rates and reports from police show no evidence of crime increasing due to Tai Aroha relative to the general community.
- (c) Tai Aroha assessment – in our interviews with residents a number indicated that they felt safer due to operations at Tai Aroha (contrary to the anticipated effects of residents in submissions). Some of the reasons for this were the presence of staff monitoring the site and in particular the safety for cars parked in the street because of staff presence in the area.
- (d) Tai Aroha assessment – operational reports indicate that the consequence of residents leaving without permission has not resulted in any physical harm for local residents, and therefore the act of “leaving without permission” does not, in itself, create a community safety effect. Importantly, it is what residents *do* when they leave which is of importance – and the information from Tai Aroha Hamilton has shown a strong tendency to go somewhere (resulting in them leaving the suburb/surrounds quickly). In addition, it is noted that early operations and safety / risk procedures of the Tai Aroha site have evolved as the programme has developed. In particular, potential applicants who were identified as having mental health and/or drug and alcohol issues are now required to have treatment and stabilisation prior to being able to enter the programme and other processes have been adopted for screening the suitability of people seeking to enter the programme.
- (e) Review of the physical/operational measures proposed for the Bristol Street site and in particular the surveillance measures, and staff support and supervision (with 24/7 support on the site).

- (f) The risk assessment provided by Dr Louw and Dr Cording which concludes that overall there is a low risk of harm to the local community.
- (g) Operational procedures for the facility, including ongoing assessment of residents in respect of their behaviour and suitability to be in the programme and 'house rules' (including regulations of noise and planning of offsite activities).

7.35 I have also considered the evidence provided by Professor Devon Polaschek and Dr Jarrod Gilbert. In considering this evidence I continue to be of the opinion that as there is a low physical safety risk overall, that the potential impacts on people's way of life and quality of environment in respect of these issues is also low.

7.36 However, as discussed in the SIA and set out in the summary of key findings, I acknowledge that there is a difference between the 'risk' and people's fears and concerns in anticipation or as a result of the uncertainty created by the proposal (which represents a change to people's perception of the neighbourhood). I consider this is in part a reflection of the planning process itself and more generally, because people have limited interest in or exposure to the nature of these social service facilities in their community.

7.37 As noted above, many facilities like that proposed at Bristol Street, actively seek to 'maintain a low profile' in the community and as such, it is the very process of change and in this case, the notification of a new activity that generates heightened interest and in some cases word-of-mouth information about the proposal (some of which is not accurate). A salient example of this was cited in our survey, where one respondent identified that in their recent conversations with others in the community about this proposal, they had now learnt about Salisbury Street Foundation. Their comments to us (unprompted) were explicit that the awareness of the Salisbury House residence had resulted in her feeling 'less safe and anxious' about its existence. This was at the same time as acknowledging that previously she had felt safe within her community and that nothing physical had happened in relation to the residence that resulted in her change in view (it was just her awareness of it).

7.38 In considering this specific example, it is noted that others in the community have explicitly made reference and comment as to how the fears and concerns of such residences have receded over time. For example, the same above referenced facility has been established for over 30 years and over that time there has been a change in community response to it. As quoted in the Otago Daily Times (2019) – *“there are always concerns around this type of thing when children are involved [this is in reference to children being in proximity to the residence]... However, we have to trust that Corrections have the appropriate procedures in place to ensure there is no impact on the local community”* and *“It’s well-run, it’s well-managed and it has the full support of the justice system”*. It was reported in the same article that the community needed to know *“what assurance is there for the safety of the people in the neighbourhood, what do we need to know to feel comfortable that this is a safe neighbourhood. That’s what I think the residents would want to know”*.

7.39 I consider that the conditions proposed (in particular the community liaison group) will assist in the processes to enable improved information between the community and Ara Poutama’s operation of the facility and improve development of trust in the operators over time.

#### *Health and wellbeing*

7.40 Potential impacts on the residents in the community’s health and wellbeing are largely related to potential consequences of the fears and concerns they have regarding their safety, which are discussed above. Some submitters have expressed that the current proposal and anticipation of change is creating stress and anxiety. It is noted that some submitters reference existing anxiety and stress from previous events (earthquakes and terror attacks) and the anticipated cumulative impacts (this was also noted in our SIA). Whilst we could not comment on cumulative psychological stress the assessment considers the potential social consequences of this Proposal in light of those concerns. Others express that concern for physical safety impacts their wellbeing. While not dismissing the concern that change can cause anxiety for some in the community, I maintain the opinion that as the fears and anticipated effects are based on low risk (and

probably very low risk when compared to risks experienced in the general community) as set out in the evidence of both Dr Cording and Dr Polaschek, and therefore as these consequences do not materialise, stress and anxiety for most will diminish over time. As set out in the SIA, I maintain my conclusion that the social effects relating to health and wellbeing will be moderately negative for the local neighbourhood (though less for the wider community) initially but decreasing to low over time.

- 7.41 Whilst I acknowledge the reaction from the community and particularly the issues/impacts of stress and anxiety generated from this uncertainty are potential health and wellbeing impacts for the community, I consider that it can be addressed by appropriate mitigation. The mitigation put forward in conditions including, physical safety measures, operations manual (including safety procedures – screening and operations), communications plans and the community liaison group will assist to reduce impacts. Furthermore, reducing the number of residents and providing more details of operations, combined, serve to reduce these impacts.

## **8 CONCLUSIONS**

- 8.1 I recognise from our research and the subsequent submissions that some members of the community are deeply fearful of this Proposal and perceive potential social consequences from it. While I consider these are 'anticipatory' issues, I acknowledge they have the potential to generate social impacts, as people may change the way they live or act as a result of such fears and concerns. However, while a small number of people may not become comfortable with these operations and continue to perceive a risk to them and their community and alter their lives accordingly, based on our research and assessment and the evidence presented I do not believe these anticipatory effects will be realised to the scale and nature that has been presented in the submissions and raised during our research.
- 8.2 For the reasons set out in this evidence, I conclude that the managed process of screening and selecting men for this programme, and the subsequent treatment of these people will, once the site is established and operational, have no more than minor social impacts for the



community in the long-term. I reach this conclusion based on the proposed privacy and site management measures, community engagement, communication and relationship building and operational procedures that will, in my opinion, appropriately manage and mitigate the potential adverse social impacts of the proposal. In particular, I consider the communication and liaison between Ara Poutama and the community will support the 'transition' from the moderate adverse effects arising from anticipated consequences, to the reduced impacts that I assess will be experienced by the community once the site is operational.

**Amelia Linzey**

**16 August 2021**