

IN THE MATTER

Of the Resource Management Act (ōThe Actö)

AND

IN THE MATTER

Application for resource consents from Central Plains Water Trust and a Notice of Requirement for a Designation of land by Central Plains Water Limited associated with the construction and operation of the Central Plains Water Scheme, now revised as stated in Minute 10 of Commissioners preliminary recommendation, 10 July 2009.

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JOANNE ELIZABETH EASTERBROOK ON
BEHALF OF NZ HISTORIC PLACES TRUST POUHERE TAONGA**

Introduction

1. My full name is Joanne Elizabeth Easterbrook. I am employed as a Heritage Adviser Planning for the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (NZHPT) Southern Regional Office, Christchurch. I am a graduate member of the NZ Planning Institute and a full member of ICOMOS New Zealand. Further details of my background are identified in my original evidence.
2. As stated in the Commissioners Minute 10, the proposal has been revised to exclude the Upper Waimakariri intake and tunnel and the dam and reservoir. My understanding is that the Notice of Requirement application is being revised to exclude these areas. The original location of the proposed headraces remains the same.
3. Although the scope of the irrigation proposal has changed, the original evidence submitted by NZ Historic Places Trust in May 2008, by myself and Bridget Mosley,

Regional Archaeologist still applies for the area of his revised proposal. In particular, the points I would like to reiterate are the following:

NZHPT Registration

4. There are a number of places registered with NZHPT in the area of the proposed irrigation scheme, and a number of these places still remain to be affected by the revised proposal and the notice of requirement. In particular Homebush is a significant heritage site with a number of specific listings on the property (see list below). Homebush Station was one of the earliest farms in the Canterbury region. John and William Deans, who established the first farm on the Canterbury Plains at Riccarton in 1843, took up this run in 1851 after part of their original land was required for the settlement of Christchurch. At Homebush they farmed and ran a large brick-making and pottery works. The brick woolshed on Homebush marks the Deans family's early presence in the district.

Homebush Station Woolshed, Category I ó number 279

Homebush Station Homestead, Category II, number 7102

Homebush Station Bridge, Category II, number 7137

Homebush Station Whare, Category II, number 7138

Homebush Station Pigsties, Category II, number 7140

Homebush Station Applehouse, Category II, number 7141

Homebush Station Stables, Water Tower, Tubine and Grain Store, Category I, 7175

5. As part of this proposal the headrace runs through the Homebush property. Part of the original rationale for the location of this headrace was to be in close proximity to the proposed dam. However, given that the dam is no longer part of this application we believe there is a no reason that the headrace needs to be located on the Homebush property. An alternative location could be on the other side of Homebush Road. This would ensure that the Homebush property will not be affected and the significant heritage values at this site would remain.

Other examples of structures that are included on the NZHPT Register that are located within the proposed area, particularly in the area of the Notice of Requirement include:

Terrace Station homestead, Category I
Cotonø Cottage (Hororata), Category II

Historic Heritage

6. As stated in our original evidence, NZHPT requests that the applicant commissions a suitably qualified heritage professional to undertake a comprehensive historic heritage assessment to determine the effects of the proposed scheme (now revised) on historic heritage values.

Archaeological Values

7. The Selwyn District is significant for both Maori and European history. There are a number of sites identified by tangata whenua as having cultural value such as waahi taonga sites, which are generally identified as archaeological sites such as ovens and pa sites, waahi taonga management areas, mahinga kai sites and silent file areas.
8. Additionally, the applicant states that an *“Accidental Discovery Protocol will be developed to cover instances where archaeological sites (prehistoric and historic) are unearthed during the construction phase”*. Given there are a number of recorded archaeological sites within the area of the revised proposal, Accidental Discovery Protocol is not an appropriate mitigation measure. The NZ Historic Places Trust advocates strongly that, as a matter of best practice, adequate assessment is required to inform the decision making process (both in relation to historic heritage under the Resource Management Act and the archaeological site provisions of the Historic Places Act). Coming out of this assessment, should the consents be granted, a Management Plan specifically addressing impacts on historic heritage should be required in the conditions of consent.
9. As a result of a number of submissions, the applicants have provided an archaeological report from Dr Jeremy Habberfield-Short. However the scope of this

report is limited to just recorded archaeological sites of Maori origin, therefore does not provide the level of survey and assessment that NZ Historic Places Trust would require for the revised proposal, and it does not include archaeological sites of European value. Additionally, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu has expressed the view that the report is unsatisfactory, and should be considered a preliminary report only. The peer review from Chris Jacomb reiterates this. Given the density of recorded Maori sites there is a high possibility that further unrecorded sites of Maori origin may be identified.

10. In addition to the resource consent process under the RMA, Section 10 of the Historic Places Act 1993 states that ‘...it shall not be lawful for any person to destroy, damage or modify, or cause to be destroyed, damaged or modified, the whole or any part of an archaeological site, knowing or having **reasonable cause to suspect** that it is an archaeological site [my emphasis]’. An archaeological authority will likely be required for the proposal to proceed, therefore should the consents be granted, we recommend the following advice note be included:

This proposal will affect recorded archaeological site(s). Work affecting archaeological sites is subject to a consent process under the Historic Places Act 1993. An authority (consent) from the NZ Historic Places Trust must be obtained for the work prior to commencement. It is an offence to damage or destroy a site for any purpose without an authority. The Historic Places Act 1993 contains penalties for unauthorised site damage. The applicant is advised to contact the NZ Historic Places Trust for further information.

Dated this 2nd October 2009

Joanne Easterbrook
Heritage Adviser (Planning)

New Zealand Historic Places Trust
Southern Regional Office