

MT MESSENGER BYPASS PROJECT: SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF RODNEY EDWARD CLOUGH (HISTORIC HERITAGE) FOR THE NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY

1. I am a consulting archaeologist and Director of Clough & Associates Limited. Along with my colleague Kim Tatton, I prepared the Historic Heritage Assessment included as Technical Report 9, Volume 3 to the AEE for the Project. This followed my Shortlist Options Report in mid-2017. Subsequently, field survey of the preferred realignment option was carried out by Clough & Associates on 7-8 August 2017 and 14-16 March 2018.
2. My evidence discusses the potential effects of the Project on historic heritage (archaeology and other historic heritage values), as well as the measures being adopted to address potential effects.

Historical background

3. My evidence provides a brief summary of the historical background of the Project area and the wider North Taranaki region to give relevance and context to the Project area.

Archaeological background

4. The desk-top archaeological assessments identified recorded archaeological sites in the general vicinity of the Project footprint. More than 20 recorded archaeological sites are located within a 7km radius of the Project footprint, all but one site located to the west, on or close to the coast. The choice of the Project route following the options assessment process has avoided all of these sites, and any effects on them.
5. No known archaeological or other historic heritage sites were identified within the Project alignment route. The closest recorded site was Q18/74 Maukuku Pa and related cultivation areas on a relatively flat spur overlooking the Mimi River valley, c. 500m away near the southern end of the Project alignment. Their locations in relation to the route are shown in Figure 12 of Technical Report 9.
6. I concluded in the Shortlist Options Report that although no known sites were affected, the presence of archaeological sites in the wider area combined with the nature of Māori settlement patterns – a broad territory or rohe, usually coastal in orientation but with access to numerous inland resources (mara) – indicated some potential to encounter settlement remains.
7. I also concluded in the Shortlist Options Report that the risks of encountering archaeology relating to pre-1900 farming along the Project route in the Mangapepeke Valley did not appear to be significantly higher than elsewhere.

Results of field survey

8. The steep inland bush country around Mount Messenger would generally have been unsuitable for intensive Māori occupation and use, which was focused along the coastal plains and near navigable rivers, but would have provided a source of raw materials accessed by tracks and trails. There is unlikely to have been any significant occupation of the Mangapepeke Valley because of its frequent flooding and steep inaccessible valley sides, although the valley may have been used by Māori to access inland areas.
9. Field work identified the remains of part of a historic pack track on the saddle ridgeline above the Mangapepeke and Mimi Valleys. It is located on private land to the south and above the driveway accessed off the rest area that was formed in the 1930s, and there could be further evidence of the pack track outside the Project footprint. Two small sections of an earlier Mt Messenger Road alignment were also identified during the field survey on corners of SH3 that could possibly relate to the period when the road was first formed as a pack track in 1894-96, prior to when the road was widened for wheeled traffic from 1900. No evidence was found along the SH3 Mt Messenger Road alignment of the roadside papa kilns that were dug away from the road banks for road metal from 1909.
10. No Māori archaeological sites have been identified within the Project footprint, either through historical information, previous investigations, or the field survey.

Assessment of effects and proposed mitigation

11. The pack track and earlier sections of road alignment would ideally be avoided by the proposed construction of the Project, but if not, any effects can be appropriately mitigated through archaeological recording under the provisions of the HNZPTA. Both sites potentially meet the definition of archaeological sites under the HNZPTA, meaning that the safe approach is to assume an Authority from Heritage NZ would be required to modify them. However, they are of limited to moderate archaeological value and historic heritage significance.
12. No Māori archaeological sites were identified within the Project construction corridor. However, in any area where archaeological sites have been recorded in the general vicinity it is possible that unrecorded subsurface remains may be exposed during development. I consider this to be a low possibility, given the steep rugged terrain covering much of the route and the fact that the remainder of the route is within low-lying valley floors prone to flooding.
13. The possibility of unrecorded archaeological sites can be provided for under the Transport Agency's Accidental Discovery Protocols P45 (modified as appropriate in

consultation with Ngāti Tama), which will ensure that the appropriate actions are taken, and the relevant organisations informed in the event that archaeological sites are encountered. However, as recommended in my assessment the Transport Agency has applied for an archaeological authority under the HNZPTA to cover all works undertaken for the Project as a precautionary measure and to avoid delays should unidentified subsurface features be exposed during construction.

14. The Project will remove the existing road over Mt Messenger from the State highway network. This will avoid further widening of the existing road and the potential removal of the Mt Messenger tunnel, which is preferable from a heritage perspective. However, the bypass will make the bypassed section of SH3 redundant and therefore ultimately compromise its heritage values if options for adaptive reuse (such as a walking or cycle route) are not considered as part of the State highway revocation process.

Response to Section 42A Report

15. My evidence responded to a query around the house and other various buildings on the Pascoe property at the northern end of the Mangapepeke Valley that are located within the Project construction corridor and will be removed. Background research and brief field inspection provided no evidence that any of these buildings have any heritage values or that they date much earlier than the 1940s.

Conclusion

16. Taking all of the above into account, I concluded in my evidence that the potential adverse effects of Project construction on archaeological sites/historic heritage will be minor. The relevant proposed designation conditions, and the implementation of Accidental Discovery Protocols and / or an archaeological Authority, which will include an approved Archaeological Management Plan, will ensure that any adverse effects are appropriately managed and mitigated.