

Before the Independent Hearing Panel

In the Matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

And

In the Matter of an application to the Central Otago District Council and Otago Regional Council for resource consent to establish and operate a gold mining activity at 1346 – 1536 Teviot Road, Millers Flat

Reference RC230325 (Central Otago District Council)
RM23.819 (Otago Regional Council)

Summary Statement of Evidence of Victoria Ross on behalf of Hawkeswood Mining Limited

(Archaeology)

Dated 13 May 2024

Jeremy Brabant
Barrister
Foundry Chambers
Level 4, Vulcan Buildings
PO Box 1502, Shortland St
Auckland City
021 494 506
Email: jeremy@brabant.co.nz

Introduction

1. My full name is Victoria Ross. I am a Principal Archaeologist and Team Leader for New Zealand Heritage Properties. I prepared a statement of evidence (EiC) dated 29 April 2024.
2. I outlined my qualifications, experience, role on the project, and commitment to comply with the Environment Court Expert Witness Code of Conduct in my EiC. I confirm that I have continued to comply with the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses in preparing this summary statement.

Scope of Evidence

3. I was not the primary author of the Archaeological Assessment, but I worked on the Archaeological Assessment before it was finalised.
4. My EIC addresses the scope of archaeological assessment, archaeological and heritage landscape, recommendations and mitigation, and matters raised by the Central Otago District Council's (CODC) s 42A report and submitters.

Archaeological and Heritage Landscape

5. The archaeological assessment identified two previously recorded archaeological sites (G43/232 and G43/233), and two sites that were recorded as a result of the assessment (G43/285 and G44/159), that will be impacted by the proposed works.
6. While there are no recorded archaeological sites of interest to manawhenua within the project area, the sites G43/2 and G44/12 are evidence of the presence of Māori on the landscape. G43/2 is recorded approximately 730m northwest of the project area, and G44/12 is recorded approximately 230m southeast of the project area.
7. The assessment identified there was further potential for unrecorded archaeological remains to be encountered throughout the project area.

8. There are no scheduled items on the CODP within the project area, nor any listed places on New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero. No wāhi tūpuna were found to be recorded on available district plans or management plans; however, Kā Rūnaka have noted there are wāhi tūpuna proposed for inclusion on the COPD.

Recommendations and Mitigation

9. The EiC outlined the recommendations and mitigation measures included in the archaeological assessment, including: gaining an archaeological authority under Section 44 of the HNZPTA 2014; archaeological monitoring of all topsoil stripping (completed with a hydraulic excavator) in high risk areas (Figure 9-3 and 9-4 of report); two test trenches (shown as orange zones in Fig 9-3 of report) to identify any archaeological remains around the vicinity of the Tima Burn, if archaeological deposits or buried topsoil are encountered in these test trenches, these will be left in situ, until a new authority is sought for excavation of these sites; beyond the red and orange zones, works should operate under On-Call Protocols; artefactual remains should be salvaged and reinstated; work be guided by an Archaeological Management Plan (**AMP**); and that if archaeological material of Māori origin is discovered at any stage, all work must stop within 20m of the find, until all required parties are notified.
10. In my view, the recommendations and mitigation proposed in the archaeological assessment are seen to appropriately manage or mitigate the potential adverse effects on the recorded and potential (unrecorded) archaeology; with the negative impact on the physical and contextual values being supported by the positive impact on the information value of the recorded and unrecorded sites, as well as the amenity value through the display of salvaged items and interpretation panel within view of the cycle trail.

Matters Raised by Submitters

11. The EiC addressed submissions from Aukaha and Kāi Tahu regarding the location of archaeological sites of interest to manawhenua, as well as the

limitations of the survey in steep areas. In summary, I concluded that from an archaeological perspective, the effects on potential unrecorded pre-1900 Māori archaeology is suitably mitigated as that archaeology will be avoided and that with the proposed mitigation measures, the overall effects of the proposal would be appropriate.

12. The evidence lodged on behalf of submitters, including Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Kāi Tahu Ki Otago, do not raise any additional archaeological concerns not already addressed in my EiC. I therefore remain of the view that with the proposed mitigation, the overall effects of the proposal will be suitably mitigated.

Conclusion

13. I consider that the overall impact of the proposed works on archaeology will be major; however, with the mitigation recommended in the assessment, the overall adverse effects will be reduced and can be supported.

Victoria Ross

Dated 13 May 2024