

Appendix K

Technical Specialist's Memorandum – Archaeology

Memorandum

To:	Paul Ryan – Hamilton City Council		
From:	Nicholas Cable	Date:	12 May 2025
cc:			
Subject:	Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure Requirement – Technical Specialist Report for Section 42A Reporting		
Technical Area:	Archaeology		
Version:	Final		

Purpose

1. This memorandum has been prepared to provide technical assessment under section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), in respect of archaeology in relation to the Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure Requirement (the Requirement).

Introduction

2. My name is Nicholas Cable. I am a professional consultant archaeologist with 23 years of experience in New Zealand archaeology. I hold a Master of Arts in Archaeology from the University of Otago, awarded with Distinction and Bachelor of Arts with Honours Degrees in Anthropology and Classical Studies, also from the University of Otago. I hold a Post-Graduate Certificate in Historical Archaeology from the University of Leicester in England. I hold a Level 6 Certificate in Environmental Management from the Open Polytechnic of New Zealand. I am a professional member of the New Zealand Archaeological Association and an Approved Person under *the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014*.
3. I have relevant experience working in the Waikato region for local authorities, government agencies, private companies, and private individuals. This work has included providing assessments of effects on archaeological sites, mapping archaeological sites for decision making purposes, archaeological investigations, and monitoring of works on archaeological sites, and reporting on archaeological work to Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga in compliance with authorities issued under the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014*. Of particular relevance, I prepared the archaeological assessment for the Te Rapa Bypass in 2005 and recently provided technical support to Hamilton City Council on Plan Change 9 and Private Plan Change 17.

Code of Conduct

4. I have read the Environment Court Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and agree to comply with it. I confirm that the opinions expressed in this memorandum are within my area of expertise except where I state that I

have relied on the advice of other persons. I have not omitted to consider materials or facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I have expressed.

Scope

5. This memorandum covers the following:
 - a. The relevant environmental effects of allowing the Requirement and whether any adverse effects will be acceptable,
 - b. Relevant statutory considerations,
 - c. Recommended amendments and/or additions to the Requiring Authority's proposed designation conditions¹.

Executive summary

6. I have reviewed the NOR and the Archaeological Assessment. I am satisfied that the methodology used in the archaeological assessment to identify known archaeological sites is appropriate and follows professional archaeological practice. I adopt the findings from the archaeological assessment that there are no known archaeological sites in the NOR project footprint and therefore no adverse effects on archaeological values. I support the recommendations in the archaeological assessment and the proposed conditions relating to archaeology in the NOR.

Documents considered

7. I considered the following documents when preparing this assessment:
 - a. *Rotokauri Strategic Infrastructure Designation: Notice of Requirement: Final Report 19 September 2024: Prepared by Beca Limited for Hamilton City Council*, (the NOR).
 - b. NOR Appendix F: *Archaeological Assessment – Rotokauri Arterial Network, Hamilton*. Prepared by Sian Keith June 2023, (the Archaeological Assessment).
 - c. NOR Appendix I: *Rotokauri Arterial Designation Cultural Impact Assessment*, prepared by Te Haa o Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa for Hamilton City Council (THaWK) (the Cultural Impact Assessment).
 - d. ArchSite Archaeological Site Record Digital Database, maintained by the New Zealand Archaeological Association (ArchSite).
 - e. *Hamilton City Operative District Plan and Plan Change 9 Historic Heritage and Natural Environment*

Site Visit

8. I have not undertaken a site visit as there are no locations of interest to focus a field visit. I am familiar with the general location as I undertook site visits to this area in 2007 as part of my assessment work for this section of Mangaharakeke Drive (then known as "Te Rapa Bypass").

¹ See s10 of the NOR.

Analysis

9. I have reviewed the Archaeological Assessment and sections of the NOR relevant to archaeological sites and provide a summary and analysis of this information below.
10. The requiring authority commissioned an archaeological assessment from Sian Keith Archaeology Ltd.
11. The requiring authority commissioned a cultural impact assessment from THaWK. This assessment contained reference to the archaeological assessment and considered archaeological sites within the Requirement.
12. I am satisfied that the methodology followed in the archaeological assessment is appropriate and consistent with professional archaeological practice and follows Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga guidelines for writing archaeological assessments.
13. Sections 4 to 8 cover the documentary review for archaeological site information and the history of land use in this location. I have verified the ArchSite search results and am satisfied that the documentary research undertaken provides a sufficient understanding of previous land use and the likelihood of there being any archaeological sites present. Reference is made to references of a Māori walking track and known archaeological sites around the margins of Lake Rotokauri.² These sites lie over 1 km outside of the project footprint.³ Reference is also made to the North Island Main Trunk Railway Line, although the archaeological assessment states that modern activities are highly likely to have removed all pre-1900 fabric of the railway line.⁴
14. I reviewed the NOR Cultural Impact Assessment to confirm the details on Māori sites of significance in the vicinity of the NOR. I found that the Cultural Impact Assessment agrees with the findings of the Archaeological Assessment.⁵
15. Section 10 and 11 of the Archaeological Assessment provide an assessment of archaeological values and an assessment of effects.⁶ As there are no archaeological sites identified within the NOR project footprint, no actual assessments have been carried out. Rather, the Archaeological Assessment states that “There are no recorded archaeological sites directly within the project footprint....and therefore no known archaeological values.” This position is further qualified by comment on the “low potential for archaeological sites”, which refers to the possibility that some previously unknown buried archaeological site might be found during earthworks given the history of land use. The “low potential for archaeological sites” is a slightly different position to “no known archaeological values” and I believe there would have been merit in providing statements of archaeological values in relation to non-specific evidence of pre-1900 Māori activity and pre-1900 European farming activity. Consideration of the effects of the NOR on these archaeological values would provide support for the adoption of an Accidental Discovery Protocol as mitigation, although I note this protocol is recommended in the Archaeological Assessment and included in the proposed designation conditions in the NOR⁷.

² Keith 2023:14-15.

³ Keith 2023:29.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ THaWK 2023:3.

⁶ Keith 2023:29.

⁷ Proposed conditions 5.1 through 5.4

16. I support the recommendations in the Archaeological Assessment that no alterations should be made to the project footprint based on archaeological values, and that earthworks should follow an Accidental Discovery Protocol.

Environmental Effects

17. I am happy to adopt the findings in the Archaeological Assessment and the NOR that there are no adverse effects on any known archaeological sites in the vicinity of the NOR.

Matters raised in submissions

18. No submissions raised concerns about effects on archaeological sites or resources.

Statutory Considerations

19. The archaeological assessment summarises the archaeological site provisions in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2-14 and the Resource Management Act 1991.⁸ The analysis identifies the need to identify any known archaeological sites within the NOR project footprint and assess the effects of activities on these sites. There are no known archaeological sites identified in the NOR project footprint. There is reference to the Hamilton City District Plan but no analysis of specific policies, objectives, or rules in relation to archaeological sites or historic heritage. I do not consider this to be a matter that needs to be addressed, given the absence of any known archaeological sites.

Conclusions

20. In my opinion, the designated works, managed by the proposed designation conditions, will have no adverse effects on known archaeological sites.

Recommendations

Modifications to the Requirement

21. I have no recommendations for modifications to the Requirement.

Designation conditions

22. I have no recommendations for amendments or additions to the requiring authority's proposed designation conditions.

⁸ Keith 2023:9-10.