

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT AUCKLAND**

ENV-2020-AKL-000064

**I MUA I TE KOOTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA
TĀMAKI MAKAURAU ROHE**

IN THE MATTER of an appeal under the first
schedule of the Resource
Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

BETWEEN **AWATARARIKI RESIDENTS
INCORPORATED**

Appellant

AND **BAY OF PLENTY REGIONAL
COUNCIL**

First Respondent

AND **WHAKATĀNE DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

Second Respondent and
Requestor of Plan Change 17

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AMELIA LINZEY
ON BEHALF OF WHAKATĀNE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

SOCIAL IMPACT SPECIALIST

10 August 2020

**BROOKFIELDS
LAWYERS**

A M B Green / R H Ashton
Telephone No. 09 379 9350
Fax No. 09 379 3224
Email: green@brookfields.co.nz
P O Box 240
DX CP24134
AUCKLAND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Executive Summary	3
2. Introduction	5
3. Qualifications and Experience	6
4. My Role	7
5. Code of Conduct	11
6. Assessment of the Social Impacts of the Proposed Plan Changes	11
7. Response Appeal Matters	28
8. Conclusion	30

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. My role in this proposal has been to provide Whakatāne District Council (the **District Council**) with advice on the potential social costs and benefits of the Proposed Plan Changes and advice on whether, from a social perspective, these considerations may have resulted in a change to the evaluation reporting (pursuant to section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)) in respect of the Proposed Plan Changes.
- 1.2. I consider that the Proposed Plan Changes will have social impacts and consequences. I have reached this conclusion in acknowledgement that the Plan Change provisions will:
 - (a) Change land use patterns in the Matatā community (both future and existing);
 - (b) Potentially change the status of people's material and physical circumstances;
 - (c) Potentially result in changes to social networks and overall community cohesion given the scale of the residential land impacted relative to the settlement; and
 - (d) Impact on some people's wellbeing as the process itself generates uncertainty and exacerbates fears and potential mistrust of the District Council.
- 1.3. A number of these social costs have been recognised and in some instances quantified by the District Council in its evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan Changes. Since preparing my review report, I have undertaken engagement (interviews) with a number of landowners and community representatives. This has provided further detail on the nature and scale of social costs as I have reported in this evidence. A number of these effects were identified in Council's initial evaluation or my subsequent evidence evaluation as reported in evidence at the Council Hearing. While my review identified some additional social costs and potential social costs (as well as potential social benefits) from the Proposed Plan Changes, I remain of the opinion that these do not materially change the overall evaluation of the

effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan Changes, as reported in the Section 32 Report.

- 1.4. While the above social costs are acknowledged, I also consider the natural hazard, and in particular the actuation of that hazard in 2005, has also resulted in adverse social outcomes and that for others, the social costs of an alternative option of not progressing the Proposed Plan Changes would have potentially significant adverse social outcomes. I further conclude that any future event would also be likely to generate significant adverse social outcomes, the most significant of which would be the loss of life from within the community.
- 1.5. Therefore, while the additional research I have undertaken in preparing this statement of evidence has identified some further social costs and I acknowledge that there are adverse social consequences of the Proposed Plan Changes, the potential social consequences of the 'do minimum' or status quo which would allow people to continue to live in an area subject to high loss of life risk are also considered to be significantly adverse (albeit the timing for the occurrence of a debris flow event is not certain).
- 1.6. On the basis of the review of potential social consequences of the Proposed Plan Changes as presented in this evidence, I consider that the potential adverse social consequences of this 'status quo' alternative are higher (more adverse) than those of the Proposed Plan Changes. These include the consequences associated with a potential alternative option that some (a reduced community) remain living in the area, while others cannot build or re-build homes and acknowledging the current situation where a number of landowners and residents have moved from the area.
- 1.7. In terms of considering the relative costs and benefits of the Proposed Plan Changes, pursuant to section 32 of the RMA, I conclude that the potential social costs identified for the 'status quo' (being the potential loss of life and the potential adverse social consequences on people's quality of life resulting from the damage / loss of property, which I understand are considered the likely result of a debris flow hazard event) are greater than the social costs identified from the Proposed Plan Changes, albeit acknowledging that there are some high social costs associated with them.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. My full name is Amelia Joan Linzey.

2.2. I have given evidence on behalf of the District Council in relation to:

- (a) Proposed Plan Change 1 (Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā) to the Operative Whakatāne District Plan; and
- (b) Proposed Plan Change 17 (Natural Hazards) to the Bay of Plenty Regional Natural Resources Plan (a private plan change request from the District Council)

(together referred to as the **Proposed Plan Changes**).

2.3 This evidence is prepared on behalf of the District Council in relation to the appeal, against the decision confirming the aforementioned Plan Change, made by the Awatarariki Residents Incorporated Society on the 9th June 2020 (**referred to as ‘the Appeal’**).

2.4 My evidence relates to the potential social costs and benefits of the Proposed Plan Changes and responses to the grounds of appeal. In particular, my evidence will cover:

- (a) The social impact review I undertook of the relevant social costs and benefits considered in the section 32 evaluation report prepared by Boffa Miskell (2018) (**Section 32 Report**) in respect of the Proposed Plan Changes (the Preliminary Social Impact Review of the Potential Costs and Benefits of the Awatarariki Plan Changes, 19 April 2018) (**Preliminary Social Impact Review**);
- (b) My review of submissions and subsequent consideration of the potential social consequences in respect of sense of place values in Matatā in light of the Proposed Plan Changes; and
- (c) The consultation and research I have undertaken since decisions on the Proposed Plan Changes by the Bay of Plenty Regional Council and the District Council and as a result the changes to the social costs and benefits I have identified since my assessment and evidence presented at the hearing.

3. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 3.1. I hold the position of Senior Technical Director and Chief Planner in the Planning business at Beca Group Limited.
- 3.2. I have the following qualification and experience relevant to this review:
- (a) Over 20 years' professional experience in environmental 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).
- 3.3. 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 Whakatapokai site, Oranga Tamariki;
 - (b) Ōtaki to North of Levin Transport Corridor, NZ Transport Agency (ongoing);
 - (c) Options for the proposed Huia Water Treatment Plant, Auckland, for Watercare;
 - (d) East West Project (involving preparation of a SIA and presentation of evidence to a Board of Inquiry), for NZ Transport Agency;
 - (e) Peer review of the SIA for the Redoubt Road-Mill Road Corridor Project, for Auckland Transport;
 - (f) 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;

- (g) The resource consent applications to abandon the wreck of the MV Rena on the Astrolabe Reef (including presentation of hearing evidence);
- (h) 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);
- (i) The Ruakura Inland Port Proposed Plan Change (2013-2014) including presentation of hearing evidence;
- (j) The Waterview Connection Proposed Plan Change for the NZ Transport Agency (2010-2011) including presentation of evidence at the Board of Inquiry; and
- (k) Peer review of the MacKays to Peka Peka SIA (2012), for the M2PP Alliance, on behalf of the NZ Transport Agency.

4. MY ROLE

- 4.1. I have had a relatively recent role in the Proposed Plan Changes. I was asked to provide the District Council with review and advice on the assessment they had undertaken (at that time) on potential social costs and benefits of the Proposed Plan Changes. My advice was focused on whether, from a social perspective, consideration of further social costs and benefits may have resulted in a change to the evaluation reporting (pursuant to section 32 of the RMA) in respect of the Proposed Plan Changes. This role was initiated in early 2018 and I reported the findings of my review in my report "Preliminary Social Impact Review of the Potential Costs and Benefits of the Awatarariki Plan Changes", dated April 2018.
- 4.2 The Preliminary Social Impact Review considered the following documents:
 - (a) Landslide and Debris Flow Hazard Management: Issues and Options, prepared by Boffa Miskell for Whakatāne District Council and dated 5 July 2013;

- (b) Planning Provisions for Debris Flow Risk Management on the Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā: Issues and Options, prepared by Boffa Miskell for Whakatāne District Council and dated 10 August 2017;
- (c) Planning Provisions for Debris Flow Risk Management on the Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā: Section 32 Evaluation Report, prepared by Boffa Miskell for Whakatāne District Council and dated 31 January 2018;
- (d) Consultation material recorded by the District Council, including written material received by Council in respect of the Proposed Plan Changes;
- (e) Other technical and background reports on options and the consideration of options in respect of the Awatarariki Fanhead (as cited in the references of the Scope of Social Costs / Benefits report dated April 2018); and
- (f) Website and social media information available at the time of preparing that report (also cited in the references of the report).

4.3 I note that I refrained from considering cultural impacts in my original report as I consider it more appropriate for mana whenua or tāngata whenua to lead such an assessment. Notwithstanding this, my report took into account the communications and submissions of local iwi, noting that in general iwi are in support of the proposed Plan Change.

4.4 In March 2020, I appeared as expert witness at the hearing, at which I outlined the findings of my report. In the preparation of this evidence I relied on a site visit to both Matatā and the Awatarariki fanhead (referred to by some as the Kaokaoroa area), as well as reviews of the following additional documents and reports:

- (a) Submissions Received on the Proposed Plan Changes;
- (b) Consultation material supplied by the Residents Association, dated over the period 2013-2018; and
- (c) Documents and consultation material received in respect of recent Council engagement and community shaping programmes,

including feedback received from the community on the Annual Plan 2019/20 (which identifies the plans for the managed retreat programme at Matatā) and the plans for engagement in January 2020, in respect of the Matatā lagoon.

- 4.5 In the last 2 months I have been involved in preparation for the appeal hearing. My earlier report and evidence focused predominantly on desktop studies of the community and the event, noting that the earlier review had not included face-to-face consultation or engagement with the community. In my preparation of evidence for this appeal hearing, I have interviewed a range of stakeholders and affected landowners from the Matatā and Whakatāne communities. The aim of undertaking this additional social inquiry / community engagement has been to ‘test’ my earlier observations and findings and obtain further information (if possible) about the social costs and benefits of the event and Plan Change process.
- 4.6 I have undertaken this social inquiry through face-to-face (and some online, face-to-face) interviews with property owners and representatives from the community. Given the time duration since the 2005 debris flow event, and the fact that a number of landowners and residents of the Awatarariki fanhead or Kaokaoroa area are no longer resident in Matatā, I have identified interviewees from the following process:
- (a) I provided the District Council with a list of people I would like to interview including different landowners, community representatives and Council personnel that had been involved in the process of considering options for the fanhead and subsequent development of the Plan Change (managed retreat process);
 - (b) The District Council provided a list of suggested contacts on the basis of my request (e.g. for those people for whom they still had contact details – noting some people had moved from the District). From this list, I selected 15 parties to interview. These were selected randomly although I endeavoured to ensure that a range of perspectives were represented in the interviews (such as residents who had sold early, property owners who had gone through the mediation and arbitration process and community representatives).

- (c) During some interviews, subsequent people were identified and included in my interviews (ranging from mana whenua representatives, residents and wider Matatā residents). In total, I met with 28 people, over 14 interview meetings.

4.7 Interviews were conducted in late July and early August. I interviewed a range of people from the community as follows (noting that a number of the people interviewed may represent more than one of these groups):

- (a) Elected representatives involved in various stages of the process from the event, the Consensus Development Group, those involved in the decision to proceed with the retreat programme to current elected representatives;
- (b) Local representatives of Ngāti Rangitahi and local mana whenua;
- (c) Some Council staff involved in various stages of the work to mitigate the debris flow hazard and the development of the Proposed Plan Changes and mitigation package process (not otherwise involved in the evidence for the Proposed Plan Changes);
- (d) Local residents of Matatā generally;
- (e) Those who owned land (but were not residents);
- (f) Those who have owned land and dwellings, and were residents, but who have since sold this land;
- (g) Those who owned land and dwellings and have settled for sale, but are currently remaining in the area;
- (h) Those who own land and dwellings and have not settled; and
- (i) Representatives of community groups such as emergency services, residents and ratepayers etc.

- 4.8 The content of these interviews differed from person to person dependent on their role and knowledge of the event, but broadly my inquiry focused on the following:
- (a) People's observations and perceptions of the character of Matatā and its community (both now and over the last 15 years);
 - (b) Reflections and recollections on the event itself and how those who had been involved recalled and were impacted by the event and subsequent recovery and/or processes in respect of the land;
 - (c) Perceptions of community impacts of the event and the process that followed the event, including the Plan Change process; and
 - (d) Views and perceptions on elements of the land acquisition and other package of works and its impacts on the community (this included the timing and process of land acquisition and the subsequent proposals by Council for the reserve development at the Awatarariki fanhead).
- 4.9 I have listed a record of the key themes I recorded from the social inquiry / interviews (Appendix 1).

5. CODE OF CONDUCT

- 5.1. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2014. I also agree to comply with the Code when presenting evidence to the Court. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I state that I rely upon the evidence of another expert witness. I also confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions.

6. ASSESSMENT OF THE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGES

- 6.1. I have provided a review of the potential social costs and benefits of the Proposed Plan Changes and advice on whether, from a social perspective, these considerations may have resulted in a change to the evaluation reporting that had been prepared at that time (pursuant to section 32 of the RMA) in respect of the Proposed Plan Changes. The

preparation of my Preliminary Social Impact Review considered the work completed by Boffa Miskell¹, consultation documents (pre the Section 32 Report) and desk-top research. My review concluded that social impacts had been considered in the preparation of the Proposed Plan Change and in the Evaluation Report prepared by Boffa Miskell (for the Council). I identified a number of additional social costs and benefits (and potential costs/benefits) in my report (discussed further in section 6.6 - 6.26 of this evidence). At the time of my review I concluded that these additional factors would be unlikely to materially change Boffa Miskell's evaluation of the Proposed Plan Changes.

- 6.2. Post my review, and prior to preparing my evidence, I completed a site visit, reviewed further consultation and research and reviewed the Voluntary Managed Retreat (**VMR**) Programme (noting this is Council's naming reference for that programme)². Since the Council Hearing, I have undertaken further interviews with community representatives, residents, landowners and ex-landowners at Matatā.
- 6.3. In this evidence I provide a review of my assessment, to supplement the existing evaluation of options and where appropriate provide further commentary on potential social costs and benefits of the Proposed Plan Changes in light of the above.
- 6.4. For completeness, I confirm that I have relied on the following understanding in respect of the Proposed Plan Changes:
- (a) A high loss-of life risk from future debris flows from the Awatarariki catchment exists to residents within the high-risk area of the Awatarariki Fanhead (in particular I rely on the evidence of Prof. Tim Davies in respect of risk and options for management of this

¹ This includes:

- Landslide and Debris Flow Hazard Management: Issues and Options, prepared by Boffa Miskell for Whakatāne District Council and dated 5 July 2013;
- Planning Provisions for Debris Flow Risk Management on the Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā: Issues and Options, prepared by Boffa Miskell for Whakatāne District Council and dated 10 August 2017; and
- Planning Provisions for Debris Flow Risk Management on the Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā: Section 32 Evaluation Report, prepared by Boffa Miskell for Whakatāne District Council and dated 31 January 2018.

² Whakatāne District Council. (2019). 'Awatarariki Managed Retreat Programme'. <https://www.whakatane.govt.nz/residents/awatarariki-managed-retreat-programme>

risk, and also on the evidence of Dr Chris Massey, Mr Kevin Hind, and Dr Mauri McSaveney);

- (b) Consideration has been given to both physical engineering (structural) and non-structural resource options (such as catchment management and warning system alternatives) (as presented in the evidence of Mr Hind, Mr Tom Bassett, Prof. Davies, Dr Phillips and Dr Massey). While options have been investigated and developed by the District Council over some period of time, I understand that it has been determined that they are insufficient to appropriately reduce the potential risk to human life to an acceptable level. This conclusion has been accepted by a number (though by no means all) in the community, including residents of the land in high risk areas, as evidenced in summaries of engagement, documented feedback on the options, and the interviews I have conducted; and
- (c) I have concluded, based on the evidence of other experts (particularly that of Prof. Davies), that a future event is effectively inevitable at some point in the future, and that the consequences of such an event (potential loss of life at a community scale) would be either difficult or impractical to mitigate via other means (e.g. in a manner sufficient to reduce the high risk to medium or low risk).

6.5 The VMR Programme provides a means to ameliorate a number of potential social costs identified (particularly in respect of property rights and material wellbeing for residents), recognising that these measures are not a requirement or pre-requisite of the Proposed Plan Changes, but that the process has been agreed and is being implemented³ (with the majority of the affected property owners with buildings having now commenced engagement in this process and most landowners having reached some form of settlement with Council). I refer to the evidence of Mr Jeff Farrell for details.

Findings of the Council Section 32 Review

6.6. In reviewing the evaluation of the Proposed Plan Changes, I concluded that a number of social issues were identified in the reports that the District

³ Whakatāne District Council. (2019). 'Awatarariki Managed Retreat Programme'

Council had prepared in their consideration of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan Changes (e.g. in their evaluation of whether the Proposed Plan Changes achieved the objectives of the relevant statute and the purpose of the RMA). The Section 32 Report recognises and provides commentary on:

- (a) The risk to life and the economic cost of such risk to life;
- (b) The material wellbeing, personal and property rights changes for impacted residents;
- (c) The views and concerns of residents in respect of their wellbeing, fears and aspirations;
- (d) The opportunities that the VMR Programme provides to respond to potential adverse social consequences in respect of material wellbeing and private property rights. In particular, the opportunity for this as mitigation is reflected in the timing of the Regional Plan Change (Plan Change 17) (as the date for effect of the Plan Change was sequenced to enable the delivery of the VMR Programme and the Regional Plan Change is only required if that programme is not taken up by any landowners); and
- (e) The opportunities that remain to enable people to be involved in subsequent statutory and planning processes (both in respect of the changes to the Plans under the RMA and in other plans such as those associated with the open space / reserve areas), thereby maintaining the opportunity for people to participate in democratic and statutory systems.

6.7. From my review, I concluded that the Section 32 Report recognised the overall potential economic and social costs of retreat. However, I noted that it did not identify the scale or nature of these 'costs' nor provide any further quantification, beyond the economic cost to life and the identified property costs. My Preliminary Social Impact Review concluded that there has been an acknowledgement of social impacts of the Proposed Plan Changes and that this has informed the overall evaluation of the provisions of the Proposed Plan Changes. However, I also identified potential 'gaps' or additional social costs and benefits from those identified in the Section 32 Report and I comment further on these from section 6.13

of this evidence. In preparing this evidence, I have also conducted further social investigations including interviews with stakeholders and affected landowners, during which I have sought to obtain more information about the potential nature and scale of these social costs and benefits.

Summary of the Social Impact Assessment of Potential Social Impacts of the Proposed Plan Changes

- 6.8. In my review report and evidence prepared for the Council Hearing, I provided supplementary consideration of the potential social consequences of the Proposed Plan Changes.
- 6.9. My assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the International Association for Impact Assessment framework (2003) and using the New Zealand Transport Agency Social Impact Guidelines (2017) in respect of potential social impacts. This was outlined in section 1.1 of my report (2018). In summary, I considered social impacts in respect of:
- (a) Changes to people's way of life and material wellbeing;
 - (b) Physical and biophysical environment and quality of the environment for the community;
 - (c) Impacts on social cohesion; and
 - (d) Impacts on people's health and wellbeing.
- 6.10 Since my report, I have also included impacts 'political systems' from the International Association for Impact Assessment framework (2003). In this evidence, I provide assessment of the extent to which the community's relationship and perceived ability to participate in decisions that have affected their lives and the democratisation of decision making in the process has impacted on the community's trust or confidence in political systems.
- 6.11 I discuss these matters in turn, reflecting on both my initial assessment of these matters and as appropriate supplementing or amending this assessment in light of the social research undertaken specifically in the preparation of this statement of evidence.
- 6.12 I have not attempted to quantify the financial costs of these impacts, but rather have focused on a qualitative assessment of the scale and nature

of potential social consequences. The purpose of my assessment has been to consider whether such impacts may have a material impact on the evaluation of the provisions of the Proposed Plan Changes (in other words, might the evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan Changes reach a different conclusion with these considerations in mind).

People's way of life and material wellbeing

- 6.13 The Section 32 Report recognises the potential costs to people's way of life resulting from the Proposed Plan Changes. This includes the loss of their homes (and/or holiday homes) for those 16 properties which currently have dwellings on them, and the loss of property for the remaining landowners. The "VMR Programme" that is being advanced / funded by the District Council, the Bay of Plenty Regional Council and central government is recognised as a measure to address this impact (effectively as a form of 'mitigation package'). In particular, this method seeks to facilitate and enable people's ability to move away from areas of high hazard risk by addressing the potential material impacts that may mean people are reluctant or less able to consider this option, for example by buying the land and homes at a market rate and providing support services to enable this (e.g. land valuation costs).
- 6.14 While the Section 32 Report has quantified the costs of the impacts on people's way of life in economic terms, I also consider the following potential social costs are also relevant considerations to impacts on people's way of life, particularly in light of the interviews I have undertaken with landowners and other members of the community.
- 6.15 **Loss of People's ability to live in Matatā** - The properties impacted by the Proposed Plan Changes represent approximately 10% of properties owned in Matatā. In my 2018 report, I identified that the owners of the affected properties may not be able to continue to live (or holiday) in Matatā or may not choose to remain in the area and that this may impact people's way of life. In my recent engagement with landowners, a number noted that either they or a number of their fellow ex-residents had moved some distance from Matatā (e.g. to Australia, Kerikeri, Tauranga and elsewhere). In some cases, residents appear to have made the decision to leave the district for their own lifestyle choices (e.g. irrespective of the

Proposed Plan Changes). However, for others the move was cited as being that people were unable to find suitable 'like for like' alternative properties in Matatā, or in one case that they had moved because their relationship with Council or experience with the wider process associated with the Proposed Plan Changes had deteriorated such that they no longer wished to stay in the area. Given the scale of this impact, I consider this has been a significant social consequence for some affected individuals.

- 6.16. In addition, the reasons people have given for leaving the area or for not rebuilding are various. In some cases, landowners have stated that they have not sought to develop their properties given their own uncertainty and concern to the risk of a future debris flow event, while in other cases, landowners have indicated that they have not built because they have not been able to (due to the inability to issue new building consents as discussed in the evidence of Mr Farrell⁴). Other reasons and explanations have included constraints on ability to get insurance, the uncertainty created by the Plan Change process and the desire from some to 'move on'.
- 6.17. The scale of this impact (significant adverse) is the same as I initially assessed in my 2018 review, though the scale of impact differs from one landowner to the next; those landowners who were planning to move out of Matatā regardless have in my opinion experienced less severe social consequences to their way of life, while the social costs have been highest for those with strong ties to Matatā, such as family and land connections.
- 6.18 **Loss of Community Way of Life arising from the Loss of Residents -**
I consider that, at a local community level (for the Matatā community) the loss of some 10% of residents has also had a wide impact on the way of life for the community. I have assessed this as a moderate adverse potential social impact, arising as some of the impacted residents were involved in delivery of community services and others participated in the community to support activities (e.g. the community centre). Again, some of this adverse impact was experienced as a result of the debris flow event itself (with some landowners never returning), other impacts arose from the uncertainty of the recovery process following the event (for some this

⁴ See Paragraph 5.25 to 5.35 of the Statement of Evidence of Mr Jeff Farrell.

included the inability to rebuild homes due to building code restrictions) and other impacts arose as people have accepted the mitigation package and people have left the area.

- 6.19 **Loss of Recreation Choices for Residents** - For those properties impacted that were used as holiday accommodation, property owners' way of life will also be impacted. I consider this is to be a less significant degree than permanent residents, as they will lose some of the recreation opportunities they established for themselves by owning a 'holiday home' or 'private camp site'. Again, from my interviews I conclude that for some this impact arose from the Plan Change itself (which prohibits them from using their property as originally intended), while for others the debris flow itself or the challenges of rebuilding triggered a lack of desire to return to Matatā. As such, these changes to way of life are in part a result of the Proposed Plan Changes but are also attributable to people's responses to the event itself.
- 6.20 While acknowledging the impacts mentioned above as consequences of the Proposed Plan Changes, it is also recognised that for some, these social impacts have already been realised as a consequence of the 2005 debris flow events (in that some dwellings and buildings have not been rebuilt since that time). In this regard, it is noted that the hazard event (both historically and in the context of any potential future event) represents a significant potential adverse social impact on people's way of life (resulting from loss of property) and of the more significant and fundamental impact from the risk to life of any such future event. This means that there are potential social costs of the 'status quo' or counterfactual option to the Proposed Plan Changes, which also have the potential to result in adverse effects in respect to people's way of life, which should be acknowledged.

Physical, biophysical environment and quality of the living environment

- 6.21 The Proposed Plan Changes themselves will not change the physical or biophysical environment. However, the Regional Plan Change will remove the occupancy use rights (i.e. under section 10 of the RMA) for the existing buildings on those properties within the High Hazard Risk Area. This has a consequential impact on the physical environment as residential properties in the area are being removed and the Proposed Plan Changes

will mean that an area that was 'anticipated' to have residential activity will not. Other physical and biophysical impacts will depend on the future ownership and use of the 'Plan Change area (e.g. its use and development as a reserve).

- 6.22 Since preparing my 2018 report – the Preliminary Social Impact Review, planning by District Council officers has commenced for the future longer term open space development of the High Hazard Risk Area and surrounding existing open space land (e.g. the land area subject to the Proposed Plan Changes and its surrounds). I understand that the District Council is planning to commence work with the Matatā community and other interest groups regarding the potential design and use of the open space which could be created by the purchase of properties starting in the summer / first quarter of 2020 and a number of those I interviewed confirmed that Council has approached them in this regard. A key goal, expressed by Council officers I have spoken with, is for this process to engage or involve the community, including Iwi, input and ownership both in respect of the engagement process and the open space development planning.
- 6.23 For some in the community, I assess that this outcome will be a positive social consequence, creating a quality environment able to be enjoyed by the wider Matatā community. In particular, mana whenua interviewed have expressed interest in the development of this reserve land, and the opportunity to create a positive, community-oriented space that reflects and respects the wāhi tapu of the area as an urupa. However, some residents interviewed expressed scepticism about the objectives of the Proposed Plan Changes, and suggested that the Proposed Plan Changes may be a 'means to an end' of enabling other land uses in the fanhead area, such as higher density residential dwellings. I consider that the development of plans and plan provisions for this space may reduce or address some of these concerns, by providing clarity around the intentions for this space.

Existing family and social networks and cohesion of the community

- 6.24 As noted above, the Proposed Plan Changes will impact approximately 10% of residents and properties in the Matatā settlement. However, when looking at impacts on existing dwellings and current residents, this

percentage is lower, given that many of the sites affected did not have dwellings on them (and currently is significantly lower as further properties have been removed through the VMR programme).

- 6.25 As a result of the impacts on people's way of life discussed above, I also identified a potential impact for the wider community, in respect of social cohesion and family networks as a result of the loss of residents from the area (from my 2018 review). From my subsequent interviews, I acknowledge that there are some landowners that have had a strong connection to the wider Matatā community, particularly those whose landholding has been intergenerational and those who are mana whenua. While acknowledging this, there have been instances, where these same people have found opportunities to remain in the Matatā community (e.g. found new properties locally), which will reduce (if not avoid) this social impact. Beyond this and acknowledging the timeframe since the debris flow event and subsequent investigations and planning processes, alongside wider trends of social change in Matatā, I have identified limited evidence of any wider adverse impacts on social cohesion for the Matatā community. However, I do note there is still some uncertainty around the intentions of the remaining residents should they leave their properties.
- 6.26 Furthermore, while acknowledging this impact, I also consider the counterfactual to the Proposed Plan Changes is a relevant consideration. In my opinion, the impacts on social networks and community cohesion of a debris flow event (e.g. particularly if such an event resulted in the loss of life and/or property) would also be adverse. This has been demonstrated in consideration of the consequences of the 2005 debris flow event. In this regard, the impacts of the status quo relative to the Proposed Plan Changes are considered to have potentially higher adverse social consequences (albeit an effect of uncertain timing and lower probability than the 'certain' outcome of the Proposed Plan Changes).

People's health and wellbeing (including fears, aspirations and uncertainty)

- 6.27 The risks to human life and wellbeing are the key reason for the Proposed Plan Changes. I understand that the Plan provisions seek to reduce risk to life by removing residential activity from the areas where the

consequences of a debris flows are considered to have high potential for loss of life. While there was no loss of life in Matatā in the 2005 debris flow event, it is also recognised that this event had and has been having adverse social and community effects (both in terms of people's way of life and in terms of their wellbeing, particularly psychological health). This was strongly expressed in all interviews with residents involved in the 2005 event, though attribution of these impacts was mixed. Some identified the event itself as having significant impacts on their wellbeing, others provided comment on the impacts of the clean-up and 'return to normal', while many others referred to the lack of ability to recover (e.g. the inability to rebuild on their land) as a significant impact on their wellbeing.

- 6.28 I consider the purpose of the Proposed Plan Changes is to proactively respond to the potential social costs to people's health and wellbeing. It is noted that the Section 32 Evaluation Report, (Boffa Miskell, dated 31 January 2018 (cited on page 5 of this evidence)) provided some specific cost calculations in regard to potential loss of life as a reflection of this.
- 6.29 While the overall driver of the Proposed Plan Changes (to provide for the community's health and wellbeing) is acknowledged, it is also recognised that the Proposed Plan Changes have adversely impacted on these same factors. In particular, Plan Change 17 extinguishes existing use rights for residential activity on the affected land, while Plan Change 1 changes the anticipated ability for people to develop their land for residential use⁵. This loss of land use rights has impacted the wellbeing of a number of residents interviewed. For some, this is clearly attributed to the removal of property rights, others consider it has largely arisen from the uncertainty and for many a combination of these.
- 6.30 The conclusion and decision for retreat from the hazard area (the Proposed Plan Changes) has been an option progressed by the District Council after consideration of a number of different alternatives, including engineering mitigation, catchment management and early warning systems. This process (in itself) has generated uncertainty for residents

⁵ It is noted that the Plan Change effectively formalises a situation whereby there is already a limitation to development of the land (arising due to the inability to issue building consents in the risk areas). This matter is addressed further in the evidence of Mr Farrell.

and this has adversely impacted people's wellbeing⁶. Community engagement, as reported by the District Council and as noted in the interviews I have conducted, highlights some of the frustration and impacts of uncertainty the process has had for landowners and residents of this area. Further, some residents have explicitly cited physical health and wellbeing impacts associated with this process, for them or in one case for someone who has since passed away.

- 6.31 In addition to the above, it is acknowledged that the statutory processes of a Plan Change and the communication between Council and the community have the potential to generate and escalate community concerns and wellbeing. In particular, the length of time taken to settle on a course of action, the time to confirm the VMR Programme and the number of options explored since the debris flow have contributed to significant uncertainty, misunderstanding, fear and anxiety throughout the community. I discuss this further in respect of impacts on political systems later in this evidence.
- 6.32 It is acknowledged that the Council has made information available through its website and I have seen material such that I consider Council has sought to provide ongoing community engagement. I consider these measures are appropriate processes to mitigate potential impacts. However, it is recognised that the process has not been considered sufficient by some residents (though has been acknowledged by others). In the interviews I conducted with residents, there was a strong sentiment that the process itself has involved a number of significant delays and uncertainty, something which has increased the stress experienced by residents who were already recovering from experiencing a traumatic event. This issue was also raised previously in submissions, with the Awatarariki Residents Association noting that the uncertainty in selecting management and mitigation options has resulted in adverse impacts on people's way of life.
- 6.33 Since preparing my Preliminary Social Impact Review, the BOPRC, the District Council and central government have progressed the VMR Programme. This commenced from July 2019 and has been discussed in

⁶ Noting also that consideration of the alternative risk mitigation options was itself driven by Council's goal to identify risk reduction methods / processes that would not require properties to be taken / loss of property rights.

the evidence of Mr Farrell. I also understand that the process is based on a market value for land/property (as if the 2005 debris flow had not occurred and the Proposed Plan Changes were not in place), includes resource support for legal and relocation costs and combined this also provides certainty in respect of material wellbeing. At the time that this evidence was prepared, I understand that 22 of the 34 affected property owners had settled, with a further 3 settlement processes being subject to unconditional agreements and only 3 properties / property owners that have not entered into the process (with 5 houses remaining in the Plan Change area, 2 of these part of settled agreements). While not a property specialist, I am familiar with the land purchase processes of the Public Works Act 1981 and consider this framework for the purchase package is at least comparable and for many landowners is considered fair and reasonable (I note the evidence of Mr John Reid reaches a similar conclusion, though he considers the process better than one under the Public Works Act, recognising the issues of considering the natural hazard impact which would be required under the Public Works Act).

6.34 While acknowledging that this process does not fully address the perceived right⁷ for many landowners to choose what they do with their land including when to sell it, I consider this package provides certainty for impacted landowners in respect of a process for their future and is a measure to mitigate the above effects. I note that for the majority of landowners I interviewed that have entered the process, and consider the package has been appropriate mitigation for effects on them. Some residents interviewed specifically commented that they felt relieved and reduced stress once they had settled, as they would now be able to 'move on' with their lives. However, a few others noted that they were simply worn out from years of uncertainty and settled less out of a desire to sell their property, but more out of exhaustion and a desire to move on from the Plan Change process. It is important to also note that a small group of landowners do not consider the mitigation appropriate or sufficient and have not entered into or accepted this process.

6.35 Finally, the process I have discussed above (paragraph 6.22) in respect of the open space development may also provide an opportunity to

⁷ I note and acknowledge that there is often a difference in perception of landowner's rights to use land and resources relative to the rights afforded under different legislation.

establish environmental and disaster protection zones, as well as passive recreational spaces. Community involvement in the development of this space has commenced. This process and the outcomes for the development of the area, may assist in mitigating potential impacts from this change in land use also identified above, by giving people an opportunity to be involved in the process of future development on areas that were their homes. However, I acknowledge that not all in the community want to enter this process.

Political systems

- 6.36 I have not been involved in the processes that the District Council has undertaken since the hazard events at Matatā in 2005. However, I have been involved in delivery of a large number of infrastructure projects (e.g. involving designations), which also have relatively long planning processes, often involve a high degree of uncertainty and optioneering and uncertainty for potentially impacted landowners. I have also reviewed the substantial documentation, which has included consideration of various management options (retaining structures) and mitigation planning (warning systems and catchment management) and the consultation material that has been prepared and has been recorded from engagement processes, as well as conducting interviews with stakeholders and landowners. It is clear that this has been a long and fluctuating process, and while others provide technical explanation to this (see evidence of Mr Davies and Mr Bassett), it is my opinion that these processes and the uncertainty generated often result in adverse social impacts for impacted communities. This impact relates not only to people's way of life and their wellbeing, but also to their engagement and trust in political processes (e.g. the role and function of local and central government). I further consider that in this case this is evident in the submissions, and this sentiment was also expressed in the interviews I carried out with affected property owners
- 6.37 A strong sentiment expressed in the interviews I conducted (though certainly not expressed by ALL residents) was a sense of distrust towards Council and Council processes, including a notion that Council had made early promises about returning people to their homes which did not eventuate. This miscommunication, despite likely being underpinned by good intentions, has resulted in the relationship between Council and

residents deteriorating to the point that dealing with Council has been stressful and anxiety-inducing for some residents.

- 6.38 While this social impact was not explicitly explored in my original report, loss of faith in political systems has since emerged as a strong theme amongst those I interviewed and was discussed in the evidence I presented in the Council hearing. There is a strong sense of disenchantment with Council and political processes amongst many of the residents I interviewed. A number stated that Council gave the impression immediately after the event that residents would be able to return to their homes eventually, and then 'broke' this promise years later, after many people had invested in rebuilding their properties and been hopeful of returning to them. Residents noted that as time went on, it became apparent that the engineering solutions proposed were not viable and that life was not likely to return to 'normal'; however, some also felt that it took some time for Council to communicate this. This sense of being kept in the dark about decisions and not having promises honoured has led to residents feeling disillusioned and unwilling to trust communications from Council and elected representatives; something which I consider has likely caused further loss of confidence in political systems. I note this issue was raised in a number of submissions to the Hearing, including those made by the Awatarariki Residents Association, who noted that the uncertainty and delays involved in the process to date have lessened people's desire to engage with political systems and processes.
- 6.39 Further adding to this uncertainty is the fact that in the years since the event occurred, there has been turnover in both council staff and elected representatives. This has contributed to some (again, not all) residents feeling disconnected from the people involved in the decision-making process, and therefore feeling further distanced from the decisions being made about their homes and lives.
- 6.40 While I acknowledge this social impact, I also consider that the lengthy process to date could be seen as a demonstration of genuine consideration and evaluation of options on the part of Council (which is an important consideration in respect of the need for the Proposed Plan Changes). This sentiment was expressed by some interview respondents (albeit a smaller number). Furthermore, the process has now culminated in the Proposed Plan Changes which, as reflected in previous

submissions and interviews with residents and council staff, now provides far greater certainty for residents and landowners on the use of this land in the future.

- 6.41 A small number of submitters (in earlier submissions on the Proposed Plan Changes) and a few interviewed residents raised concerns relating to the diminishment of their individual property rights and right to self-determination. From a social perspective, this matter relates to their involvement in political processes and potentially to their health and wellbeing (i.e the stress and anxiety around loss of self-determination on one hand and the stress and anxiety of the consequences of any event in the future).
- 6.42 However, while acknowledging the issues and concerns of some in my opinion, from a social perspective, there is a clear expectation that government (both central and local) will manage natural and physical resources for the health and wellbeing of the environment and the community. This expectation is both set in statute (e.g. the RMA, the Local Government Act 2002, the Building Act 2004 and the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002), the Regional Policy Statement (as discussed in the evidence of Ms Wendy Saunders) and is reflected in wider community sentiment. In this case, the increased return periods forecast for the hazard of the Awatarariki Fanhead (as discussed in the evidence of Mr Peter Blackwood and Mr Bassett) emphasises this issue.

Social Consequences of the Do-Nothing Option

- 6.43 From my assessment, while it is acknowledged that there will be social consequences arising from the Proposed Plan Changes, the natural hazard and any future event would have the potential to generate more significant adverse social outcomes. This is demonstrated by the social consequences of the actuation of that hazard in 2005. A number of these impacts are described in the submissions received on the Proposed Plan Changes from impacted residents and were also expressed in a number of the interviews that I conducted with residents, and as a brief summary, include:
- (a) Impacts on people's way of life and material wellbeing through the loss and damage to property (noting a number of interviewed

residents had significant property damage and loss of personal effects) and in some cases people's homes (this includes the properties 'functionally compromised'⁸ by the event both within and outside the high risk zone which are affected by the Proposed Plan Change area);

- (b) Loss in the quality of the living environment for impacted residents (most clearly for those properties that were lost or otherwise damaged by the event, but also for neighbouring properties where the amenity of their environment changed);
- (c) Disruption to families and social cohesion with the displacement of people from impacted residences, particularly those with strong family connections in Matatā and those who have had to move away from friendships and family; and
- (d) Adverse impacts to people's wellbeing from what was clearly a terrifying event (while also acknowledging that no one was directly significantly physically hurt in the 2005 event); such as one resident who stated that they felt scared each time it rained until they were able to move out of Matatā.

6.44 I understand that a future event could include the potential for physical harm or even loss of life for residents and others in the community (e.g. for any people residing in the area impacted by such an event or any others that go into such an area, such as emergency service providers). Furthermore, on the basis of the consequences of the 2005 event, I consider that there would be social / community consequences for the wider community, associated both with the event and response to it and from recovery following the event. In this regard, I consider that the 'status quo' (the current environment) means that a future event has the potential for significant adverse social costs, both direct and indirect (e.g. to family and friends in the wider community).

6.45 This was also noted in the submissions received on Plan Change 17, where some submitters expressed the view that the Plan Change would play an important role in reducing not only the hazard risk, but the potential

⁸ This is the term used by the Regional Policy Statement in respect of the impacted properties.

social consequences of a future event. I recognise that the Plan Change does not eliminate or remove the potential for all adverse social impacts, in that there is potential for damage to other properties in areas of moderate risk, albeit that the potential risk regarding potential loss of life has been reduced from High as required by the RPS.

- 6.46 In addition, I note that while for some the rejection of the Proposed Plan Changes may allow them to continue to use their land in some form (e.g. their existing houses on the land), for many others the situation would create further uncertainty that I consider would generate adverse social effects (on their material wellbeing, way of life and trust in political systems). Even for those landowners who may chose to stay in the area, in the circumstance of such an outcome, I do not think many of the adverse social impacts I have identified would be resolved and 'new' issues may give rise to social impacts (future development limits, ability to sell and ability to obtain insurance as examples).

7. RESPONSE TO APPEAL MATTERS

- 7.1 Below, I respond specifically to relevant concerns raised in the appeal lodged by the Awatarariki Residents Inc, in respect of social impacts.

Part 2

- 7.2 The appellants raised concerns that the Plan Change is not in accordance with Part 2 of the RMA. I consider this has largely already been covered in my evidence. For completeness, I am of the opinion that the Plan Change has given consideration to social wellbeing and the health and safety of the community. While I acknowledge that there are social impacts associated with the Managed Retreat programme, I consider that the potential social impacts of retaining the status quo, and consequently putting lives at risk, are potentially more significantly adverse (in respect of quality of life and health, safety and wellbeing). Furthermore, I consider that both District and Regional Councils have an obligation to consider the health and safety of their community, and I consider that there would be significant social impacts (in respect of people's confidence in political systems) if another debris flow, with loss of life, occurred and these Council's had failed to take reasonable steps to protect the population from this event.

Statutory framework

- 7.3 The appellants posit that the Decision is not consistent with the statutory functions of the Regional and District Councils; noting that the Proposed Plan Changes do not achieve integrated management because the adverse impacts are disproportionate to the risks being managed. While others have provided more specific evidence in respect of the risks, I have discussed this matter in respect of potential social impacts. I considered that the Proposed Plan Changes have considered a range of potential costs and benefits of retreat. While I acknowledge there were 'gaps' in the consideration of social impact assessment, in my opinion these gaps (which are now addressed in my review and this evidence) do not materially affect the findings of the evaluation report or the decision to proceed with the Proposed Plan Changes.
- 7.4 I acknowledge the appellants' opinion that the adverse impacts of the Proposed Plan Changes outweigh the potential risks of the 'status quo' approach. However, as I have set out in this evidence, from a social impact perspective, I do not support this position. I recognise that there will be adverse social impacts arising from the retreat programme. However, the potential loss of life (at a community scale) that could occur in the inevitable event of another debris flow, and the social impacts that would flow on from this loss of life, in my professional opinion outweigh the potential impacts should the Proposed Plan Changes be rejected.
- 7.5 Lastly, I recognise that the identification, exploration and dismissal of alternative solutions over the past 15 years has been a source of significant uncertainty, delays and frustration for some members of the community and that the process itself has had adverse social consequences. However, the mitigation package and Proposed Plan Changes themselves have brought a sense of relief and certainty to a number of affected landowners, something which was apparent in a number of the interviews I conducted. As I have stated earlier in this evidence, I consider that further alternatives, such as allowing temporary use of the residential dwellings in the Fanhead area, would create further uncertainty for residents, both now and into the future in how and under what conditions people could use and develop their land and conduct or operate their way of life (e.g. uncertainty in how they could maintain and

develop property and uncertainty of the impact of a future debris flow event on them).

Adverse effects and risk assessment

- 7.6 The appellants raise concerns that the Decision will result in significant adverse effects to the wellbeing of landowners. Furthermore, paragraph 19 of the appeal notes that while the risk assessment informing the Proposed Plan Changes is uncertain, the consequences to Awatarariki Residents Inc. members and their families are both certain and unfounded.
- 7.7 I address the potential social costs and benefits of the plan change (including those social impacts relating to wellbeing) in my initial report, as well as throughout this evidence. As I have outlined previously, I acknowledge that the existing community and landowners have experienced adverse social impacts arising from the Plan Change process, but I maintain my conclusion that any future debris flow event could have more significant social consequences. Furthermore, I consider there would be other social consequences associated by processes that left residents with the ownership and use of land from a planning perspective but would not negate other factors of risk (e.g. insurance, building consent requirements and property resale / LIM requirements).

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1. I consider that the Proposed Plan Changes will have social impacts and consequences. However, it is also clear that the natural hazard, and in particular the actuation of that hazard in 2005, has also resulted in adverse social outcomes and that a future event would have the potential to generate significant adverse social outcomes, the most significant of which would be the loss of life from within the community.
- 8.2 For this reason, while the adverse social consequences of the Proposed Plan Changes are recognised and acknowledged, I am of the opinion that the potential social consequences of the 'do minimum' or status quo which would allow people to continue to live in an area subject to high loss of life risk are also considered to be significantly adverse (albeit the timing for the occurrence of a debris flow event is not certain). Furthermore, given the risks of living in the area, there would be high potential for additional

social impacts in respect of the ability of people to use and develop their land and homes (e.g. due to potential building restrictions, and potential insurance implications).

- 8.3 The additional interviews I have carried out have confirmed the existence of a number of potential social issues I raised in my earlier review, such as the uncertainty and frustration experienced by landowners, and the relief and mitigation of these effects that has been provided for some people (due to the purchase of homes and land). The review has also highlighted the social impacts on people's relationship with political systems and democratic processes and for some, these remain significant issues that are having wider social impacts (including impacts on quality of life and health and wellbeing). While the findings of these interviews have been added to this evidence, I consider this provides depth and detail on the context of the social impacts, but that there have not been any further issues or social impacts raised that alter my consideration of these acknowledged social costs.
- 8.4 On the basis of the review of potential social consequences of the Proposed Plan Changes (as presented in this evidence statement), I conclude that the potential adverse social consequences of this 'status quo' alternative are higher (more adverse) than those of the Proposed Plan Changes.

Amelia Linzey

10 August 2020

Appendix 1. Themes of social impact matters recorded from interviews July / August 2020.

Theme	Recorded comments from residents / community representatives interviews <i>(note use of term 'resident' is for all who did live in the area at 2005 (or in one case someone who bought subsequent to the event), interviewee includes those that owned land but did not reside in the Plan Change area in 2005)</i>	Recorded comments from elected representative and staff interviews
People's way of life and material wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some former residents and landowners have moved as far afield as Kerikeri and Australia • Some people have moved for lifestyle choice, retirement, other opportunities • Some residents wanted to stay in Matatā, and this has included people who have successfully found land / property in the area, while others indicated that the lack of land availability was a push factor outside the community. A number of landowners had found new property or remained in the Matatā local area. • One landowner and one resident said that they were exhausted by the process and this was a factor in wanting to 'get away' from the area. One resident indicated that they moved from the area due to distrust of Council and not wanting to be in the District any longer. • Residents who owned rental properties in Matatā were in limbo for some time, as their tenants moved on after the event but they could not rebuild on the section – lost income and uncertainty • One interviewee noted being very happy with the offer they received from Council for their property – it was more than they would have asked for themselves. A number of other interviewees noted that the mitigation process was reasonable or fair or acceptable to them. • One interviewee noted that they first started discussing the settlement, and were given a tentative offer for their property by Council, in 2016 – however it was years before this money actually became available and the settlement was able to be progressed. • One interviewee noted that they had an offer of sale for their property, which they had to set aside as at the same time, they received information from Council (2014 they thought) that planned retreat was the option being progressed. • Other residents noted that they considered the mitigation package should compensate for the wellbeing impacts of the process • Some residents (not settled or arbitration settlement) noted that the offers from Council were not reasonable or reflective of what they were losing (e.g. coastal frontage or development opportunity) • One resident noted that despite their house being largely unaffected it took just under a year before they were allowed to move back into their house. • Residents noted that those who chose to rebuild had invested their money back into these properties – only to again have to lose this investment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense amongst Council staff/Councillors that the average person in the district has not been affected by the event, has moved on and is not overly concerned about the Plan Change process. It was noted, for example, that when submissions on the Annual Plan are received, the only submissions relating to Matatā are from Matatā residents themselves rather than from people elsewhere in the District. • There is fairly low housing turnover in Matatā as there is some wariness from potential buyers about floods/debris flows. • Council staff member noted that some former residents have now found their dream home elsewhere and are happy to have moved. • Former Councillor mentioned the impact of the process on the halting of the reticulated sewage wastewater in 2005 as a wider impact which is often missed.

Theme	Recorded comments from residents / community representatives interviews <i>(note use of term 'resident' is for all who did live in the area at 2005 (or in one case someone who bought subsequent to the event), interviewee includes those that owned land but did not reside in the Plan Change area in 2005)</i>	Recorded comments from elected representative and staff interviews
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant life decisions were made by some residents on the basis of the information they were given by Council. For example, this included one resident where the information enabled them to buy into the area after the event for others this was related to rebuild or investment on their properties. • Several residents mentioned the beach front lifestyle which Matatā provided. Some noted they will be unable to get that elsewhere. • One resident noted they were happy with the end result but not with the process that got them there. • Some residents noted that the term 'Voluntary Managed Retreat' was a misnomer as did not feel voluntary. • Several residents had retirement plans which were impacted – ie. Building a new house and retiring in Matatā from another Region, or moved and resided in Matatā with plan to retire there. • Mention of some people having to move out of Matatā for a short period after the event. 	
Physical, biophysical environment and quality of the living environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One resident noted that there was no point in spending a lot of money on the development of the reserve, as it will be destroyed once another event occurs. • Culturally the area is wāhi tapu and people don't go there or did not consider it appropriate for housing (it is home for the deceased not the living). Culturally, the area was considered suitable for reserve / place of reflection. • Some residents have long standing relationship with the land, as mana whenua or as residents who have bought, raised families, built their 'legacy' on the site and for those where the land that has been passed through generations, as residents who have raised family, developed gardens, lost family etc on the properties. • Residents considered the Awatarariki fanhead as the 'end of the road' in Matatā, others as the gateway, others as part of the wider area and others as attractive for the coastal edge and access to recreation values of the area (noting some cited a number of these). • Residents value the small size of the Matatā community as well as the proximity to the coast. • Some residents noted their agreement with the land becoming part of the reserve as the site is tapu for the local iwi. Disagreed with development occurring on the site to begin with. • One resident noted that Matatā was unique in its size as most coastal towns have drastically increased in size. However, they noted that Matatā had not – reasons identified largely related to restrictions in part due to its lack of services (wastewater particularly). • Several residents referred to the lack of other beachfront properties available elsewhere at similar prices which was an environmental quality they valued. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council staff noted that Matatā has a lot of 'big' issues in a 'small' community – ie wastewater, aging infrastructure and managed retreat. • People value Matatā for its proximity to the coast and its small size. It was noted by several Council representatives that Matatā has not seen as much growth as other parts of the District, but this could change if the reticulated wastewater system is put in place. • Council staff noted that a lot of people (both in Matatā and throughout the District) are unclear on the difference between a debris flow and a landslide, and therefore the uncertainty of precedence.

Theme	Recorded comments from residents / community representatives interviews <i>(note use of term 'resident' is for all who did live in the area at 2005 (or in one case someone who bought subsequent to the event), interviewee includes those that owned land but did not reside in the Plan Change area in 2005)</i>	Recorded comments from elected representative and staff interviews
Existing family and social networks and cohesion of the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residents have long standing relationship with the land, as mana whenua, as landowners for whom the land has been passed through generations, as residents who have raised family, developed gardens, lost family etc on the properties. • Some respondents had family in Matatā, though for a number with family that family was within the Awatarariki fanhead / Kaokaoroa area. • A small number of residents interviewed indicated that they did not / do not want to speak up against those who are feeling very angry or are vocally opposed to the project. This appeared to be more from a perception that they had 'a right' to be angry and they did not want to debate / oppose that voice (even if they themselves thought the plan was reasonable or appropriate). This appeared to be a case of thinking that an 'angry view' was more important (or significant) than an accepting one or one driven by wanting to maintain local community cohesion. • Some former property owners were renting their Matatā properties out to tenants, so their own social networks were not disrupted when the event occurred or when they sold their property. • One resident noted that they have not returned to Matatā since they moved from the area. • One resident noted the impacts of having so many residents move out of the area on businesses and community clubs. • The event and the process following negatively impacted relationships within the household. This comment was made by a number of residents. • The feeling was expressed by several residents that Council was attempting to separate the community. • Some residents mentioned reluctantly moving away from friendships they had formed in the area • Sense from some residents that close friendships have been formed from the 'rallying to support against actions from Council and others' and from the shared experience and the need to support each other. • Some residents identified that the process had segregated those impacted from the wider community and later those that had settled from those that had not. • Several residents gave the sense that prior to the event there was some separation between older and newer residents (typical of small communities). This sentiment was echoed both by new and old residents. • One resident expressed the opinion that the Matatā community was changing prior to the event with the influx of new residents. • One resident described Matatā as having a strong sense of community, and a village-like feel to it. Some residents did indicate a degree of separation to the rest of Matatā, largely a physical separation was cited as the reason. 	

Theme	Recorded comments from residents / community representatives interviews <i>(note use of term 'resident' is for all who did live in the area at 2005 (or in one case someone who bought subsequent to the event), interviewee includes those that owned land but did not reside in the Plan Change area in 2005)</i>	Recorded comments from elected representative and staff interviews
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other interviewees did indicate that they had 'some connection' with residents in Matatā, but others were more connected to the land, the recreation opportunities, or to places of work (e.g. Kawerau, Tauranga and Whatā Kane were noted). Some noted that their relationship with the community had changed over time, but none of the residents interviewed thought this was because of the Plan Change – though some did note some separation from the community as the process of accepting the mitigation package proceeded. Interviewees from the wider community did see the residents of the Awatarariki fanhead / Kaokaoroa area as separated from the rest of the community. Some attributed this to physical separation, while a few did raise the process of the debris flow risk reduction / planned retreat programme as reasons. 	
People's health and wellbeing (including fears, aspirations and uncertainty)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong emotions and trauma associated with the event for many residents. Some residents reflected on their experiences of the event, such as sheltering in their neighbour's house or rushing back home to get to shelter. For those who were not in Matatā during the event, there are still strong memories and emotions associated with the event. These residents recounted stories of other people, such as their tenants, who experienced the event. Residents did recall the very rapid change in circumstances in the debris flow event (in the order of minutes). One recalled 'racing to a neighbour's property to avoid a waterfall of water. Another resident indicated significant impacts associated with the loss of their home and wellbeing impact on their children (ongoing). One resident felt fear each time a rain event occurred in Matatā, up until they moved elsewhere. Others indicated they did not experience fear after the event or that they felt they could self-manage this risk. Some residents experienced relief when they found out they were able to sell their property. Some wanted to get out immediately as they no longer wanted to be in Matatā and be reminded of the event, and therefore accepted the offer as soon as it was made or as soon as they could. Sense of frustration from some residents and interviewees that the Plan Change is being appealed by a small minority. It was also noted that other projects in Matatā, such as the wastewater scheme, have also been held up by similarly small groups of people who are vocally opposed to projects, which has become frustrating for the other residents over time. Some felt that the event had not happened again and that the risk was mitigated (reasons included: that the debris had been removed by the event, that the new road would provide a barrier and that land management up the catchment could address the risk). This was a minority view by respondents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council staff noted that there was a mix of very happy and very unhappy landowners when they were told that funding had been approved for the managed retreat programme. While some landowners were relieved to be able to sell their homes, others were sceptical that the funding would actually eventuate after many years of delays and broken promises, and felt that there would likely be further delays and changes. Council have endeavoured to support people's wellbeing throughout the process, such as through the appointment of Navigators and the offer of counselling to people going through the settlement process. There is a desire amongst Council staff to get things right this time. It was noted that a small number of people have said they would like to work with a

Theme	Recorded comments from residents / community representatives interviews <i>(note use of term 'resident' is for all who did live in the area at 2005 (or in one case someone who bought subsequent to the event), interviewee includes those that owned land but did not reside in the Plan Change area in 2005)</i>	Recorded comments from elected representative and staff interviews
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residents felt they could manage the risk themselves (e.g. self-evacuation in rainfall events). Others felt that other forms of mitigation, such as an early warning system, would be adequate to address the risk. • Several residents mentioned the impact of the stress of the process combined with other events in their life such as work or illnesses of friends and family. • Several residents mentioned the impact the extended time period for resolution of the issues or the ongoing lack of resolution of these issues has had on their emotional wellbeing. • Several residents feel that some landowners settled due to the stress of the situation and pressure from the Council rather than because they were happy with the result. • One resident noted their fear that even if they could stay a similar event might occur when they are older and less able to deal with the aftermath – so their acceptance of the risk had decreased over time. • Several residents spoke of their emotional attachment to their properties and the resulting wellbeing impacts of having to move away from them. This included residents who were accepting of the process and one other who was opposed to the process but had agreed to it 'out of exhaustion'. • One resident expressed some positive wellbeing noting that their home had been able to be relocated (in part), even though they were no longer resident in the property. • One resident indicated that the death of a family member had been exacerbated by the stress of the process and another that the stress added to medical conditions for a family member. • A small number of residents expressed the view that Council should recompense for the stress of the process on affected landowners wellbeing. • Some interviewees and one resident noted that the Kaokaoroa area was not really appropriate for housing, being an urupa and wāhi tapu. The comments made related to poor wellbeing outcomes for any using the area for residential activity (for the living) and the observation that some people did not go or want to work (land development) in the area due to this (a potential wellbeing impact for those in the wider community). 	<p>Navigator (most are happy without one) but those who have accepted the offer have forged strong, positive relationships with them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council staff member noted that in their experience, people do 'move on' and are able to move past their grief once they have settled. • Council staff noted that where possible they have worked hard to make the settlement process easier for residents. For example, one former resident expressed a strong desire for their former house to be relocated rather than demolished. • Former Councillor noted that people's response to the compensation package appeared to depend on how well it aligned with their personal plans and expectations.
Political systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of interviewees and residents noted there has been high turnover in Council staff/Councillors over the years – means there is a lack of continuity and residents feel frustrated that each time a new staff member comes on board, they take up more time to familiarise themselves with the process and form relationships. • Sense amongst residents that although they attended every meeting that Council held, they did not actually have any input into the decisions being made about their properties and their lives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former councillor noted that early in the process, most people in council thought another debris flow was unlikely. It was only further down the track that people learnt more about the risk and realised the huge H&S responsibilities of Council if they did

Theme	Recorded comments from residents / community representatives interviews <i>(note use of term 'resident' is for all who did live in the area at 2005 (or in one case someone who bought subsequent to the event), interviewee includes those that owned land but did not reside in the Plan Change area in 2005)</i>	Recorded comments from elected representative and staff interviews
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some residents were sceptical that the engineering solutions would ever be viable – they seemed impractical and extremely expensive. From a hindsight perspective, some said they never believed the options (particularly the retention dam) would be feasible. • One resident noted that they slowly came to the realisation that Council was not going to pursue an engineering solution after all – but had to wait a long time to actually hear this from Council. • One resident had been told at the outset that they would not be able to build on the affected land. Others indicated they had been advised the opposite (this does not appear to be related to the risk profile of properties). • Sense amongst some residents that the intention was never to implement an engineering solution, but Council still went through the motions in order to show that they had considered this option before proceeding with the managed retreat programme. Some expressed frustration (and some significant frustration) that promises were made and time was wasted if this approach was never actually viable. • Some residents are supportive of the managed retreat programme and are somewhat understanding of the delays and changes throughout the process to date. • A small number of residents were sceptical of the motives behind the plan change, and suspected that Council may be intending to free up beachfront property for high intensity development. • Interviewees and residents expressed mixed views on the CDG. A number felt it pushed an agenda through, some happy and one person indicated that they were mis-quoted in the outcomes of the process. Comment made that they sensed that Council did not listen to the views expressed by some at or to the Consensus Group. • Some residents feel that Council could have done more to prevent the debris flow from happening in the first place. There was a sense that from the start Council had not acted with the best interests of residents in mind. • One resident noted that individual members of Council had been amazing at helping out – however was disappointed in Council as a whole. • Common feeling among residents that Council often went back on their word. • One resident noted that given the duration of the process legislation has changed over time – altering the Council's actions and resulting in a negative perception of Council's actions. • Common feeling among residents that prior to the event the Council did not value the Matatā community. • Feeling that Council's action were driven by the need to follow a process rather than genuine effort to support the residents. Lack of support or care was felt. 	<p>nothing to prevent loss of life in a future event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense from Council staff that all options were meticulously assessed and there was a genuine belief that the debris dam would be workable, until this turned out to be unviable. • One interviewed representative remembered hearing how expensive and resource intensive the debris dam would be, and being shocked. • Council staff member noted that while there have been delays in the process, these are not entirely the fault of Council • It was noted that residents were keen to get back into their homes so Council felt they needed to pursue this option first. • Interviewee expressed desire by Council to empower the community to make decisions about the reserve land so that it is 'their' space once it is complete. Also, conscious that there are 3 iwi who want to be involved. Role for Council to balance these inputs. • Interviewee stated their belief that the CDG enabled residents to have their say • One interviewee noted Council had been driven by 'liability' thinking more than community wellbeing thinking. • Residents who chose to rebuild or move into the area after the event noted that this was not a rushed decision, and felt the Council had

Theme	Recorded comments from residents / community representatives interviews <i>(note use of term 'resident' is for all who did live in the area at 2005 (or in one case someone who bought subsequent to the event), interviewee includes those that owned land but did not reside in the Plan Change area in 2005)</i>	Recorded comments from elected representative and staff interviews
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One interviewee expressed the opinion that the situation might have been handled better if navigators were used from the start. Another resident expressed distrust on the role of navigator. • One interviewee noted that the Regional Council should have stepped in to help the Whakatāne Council sooner. • One resident felt that the managed retreat process had been conducted in a transparent manner and values were negotiated fairly. • Varying degree of mistrust towards the Council expressed by many residents. Many residents expressed the feeling that Council had, and still has, their own agenda and many of their actions are self-serving. 	<p>more than enough time to decide whether or not people should be allowed to do this.</p>