

In the matter of an application for approvals under the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024

By **Tāiko Minerals and Metals Limited**

Applicant

Statement of evidence of Bree Wooller in relation to archaeology

9 April 2026

Applicant's solicitor:

Alex Booker

Anderson Lloyd

Floor 2, The Regent Building, 33 Cathedral Square, Christchurch 8011

PO Box 13831, Christchurch 8141

DX Box WX10009 Christchurch

p + 64 3 379 0037

alex.booker@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Introduction

- 1 My name is Bree Wooller.
- 2 My role in relation to the application by Tāiko Critical Minerals Limited (**the application**) for approvals relating to the Barrytown Mineral Sands – Southern Resources Block Project (**the Project**) has been to provide expert advice in relation to archaeology.
- 3 I prepared the Archaeological Assessment (**Report**) which has been provided in support of the application. This assessment supports the application for resource consents normally required under the Resource Management Act 1991, and approvals normally applied for under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 to modify or destroy recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites.

Qualifications and experience

- 4 I am a senior archaeologist at New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd (**NZHP**).
- 5 I hold the qualification of Master of Arts. I have worked as an archaeologist since 2018. I have held positions with NZHP and Kevin L Jones Archaeology, as well as working as a sole trader and on a contract basis with the University of Otago, and Southern Pacific Archaeological Research.

Expert witness Code of Conduct

- 6 While this application is not being considered by the Environment Court, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing this evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

Scope of evidence

- 7 The purpose of this evidence is to:
 - (a) provide my qualifications and experience relevant to the Report;
 - (b) confirm my compliance with the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses, contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023;

- (c) provide a brief summary of the Report; and
- (d) comment on the proposed conditions.

Archaeology

Archaeological Authority

- 8 This archaeological assessment has identified that there is reasonable cause to suspect that unrecorded artefact find spots, midden/oven sites, mining-gold and historic-domestic sites are present within the Project area and will be affected by the proposed mineral sand mining. Therefore, my assessment is that an archaeological authority is required.

Recorded Sites

- 9 There are two previously recorded sites (findspots), being:
- (a) K31/11 – concerning part of a shaped patu and a small greenstone chisel.
 - (b) K31/12 – concerning a shaped greenstone pendant.
- 10 My assessment is that these two previously recorded sites will not be impacted as they are already destroyed. However, their presence is indicative of other sites in the vicinity.

Unrecorded Sites

- 11 Although the Project area has undergone a large amount of surface modification, the dredged areas may contain redeposited archaeological material not in situ. Hump and hollowed areas may have intact archaeology under the humps. As the history of the area records largely transient and ephemeral occupation across the Project area, archaeology could be encountered anywhere across the site. The Report identified areas where there is a higher potential for archaeological remains to be encountered. Due to the scale of the mining operation, there is no scope for earthworks within the mining disturbance area to avoid archaeology.
- 12 The Report identified that there is reasonable cause to suspect that unrecorded artefact find spots, midden/oven sites, mining-gold and historic-domestic sites are present within the Project area and will be affected by the proposed mineral sand mining. The unrecorded sites are considered to have medium archaeological value. Due to the nature of the proposed works the overall impact of the works on the archaeological values of

unrecorded sites will be moderate to major. Conditions have been proposed to mitigate these effects.

Overall conclusion

- 13 For the purposes of the FTAA, archaeological monitoring of high-potential areas, protection to the structure under Cargills Road, recording, analysis, and reporting on any archaeological or heritage features modified by the proposed works provide sufficient mitigation to offset the impact to the archaeological values. As such NZHP supports approvals being granted under the FTAA, including a resource consent application and archaeological authority to modify these sites.

Proposed conditions

- 14 I have reviewed the proposed conditions in **Appendix P** as they relate to my area of expertise. I consider that they include my recommendations and support my assessment, including the following conditions identified for the archaeological authority:
- (a) Condition 1 concerns the briefing of contractors working on the project must be the section 45 approved person.
 - (b) Condition 2 relates to advising Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga of the beginning date of any on-site archaeological work and the date of completion of the on-site archaeological work.
 - (c) Condition 3 concerns archaeological monitoring.
 - (d) Conditions 4, 5 and 6 relate to taonga, kōiwi, archaeological sites and taonga tūturu.
 - (e) Condition 7 concerns the submission of site record forms.
 - (f) Condition 8 concerns filing final reports.
 - (g) Condition 9 concerns the avoidance of damage to the Drystone structure under Cargills Road. In my view, this condition is sufficient to protect this structure.

Bree Wooller

9 April 2026