


# ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS FOR THE PROPOSED UPGRADE TO THE WHARF END, RUSSELL, NORTHLAND

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED UPGRADE TO THE RUSSELL WHARF

Prepared for Far North Holdings Ltd

Prepared by R W Maguire

August 2015



heritagesurveyconsultants@gmail.com  
0210744660

## Archaeological Assessment for the Proposed Upgrade to the Russell Wharf

### Executive Summary

Heritage Survey Consultants were commissioned by Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) to undertake an archaeological assessment of effects for the proposed upgrade works for the shore end of the Russell Wharf, Russell, Bay of Islands, Northland.

Based on the findings of this assessment the majority of the proposed works will have no impact on identifiable archaeological values. However the removal of the current steps to the south of the wharf and their replacement with retaining boulders has the potential to effect archaeological deposits and will have to be undertaken with an Archaeological Authority, issued by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT), in place.

The information contained in this document produced by Heritage Survey Consultants is solely for the use of the Client identified on the cover sheet for the purpose for which it has been prepared and Heritage Survey Consultants undertakes no duty to nor accepts any responsibility to any third party who may rely upon this document.

No section or element of this document may be removed from this document, reproduced, electronically stored or transmitted in any form without the written permission of Heritage Survey Consultants.

# Archaeological Assessment for the Proposed Upgrade to the Russell Wharf

## Contents:

Introduction	6
Statutory Requirements	9
Methodology	10
Physical Setting	10
Historical Background	10
Previous Archaeological Work	22
Research Results	25
Constraints and Limitations	28
Archaeological Values	28
Historic Heritage Values	31
Assessment of Effects	32
Site Management	33
Conclusion and Recommendations	33
References	35

## List of Figures:

- Figure 1: The area of the proposed works, showing the new steps to the north and south of the wharf, the proposed landscaping and new benches
- Figure 2: Detail of the proposed northern steps
- Figure 3: Detail of the proposed southern steps with a sketch cross section of the proposed steps
- Figure 4: General location of site within New Zealand (Quickmap accessed 28/07/2015)
- Figure 5: The location of the proposed works within Russell (site marked in green) (Quickmap accessed 28/07/2015)
- Figure 6: Far North District Council Heritage Precinct Map for Russell (site marked in green)
- Figure 7: Old Land Claim Plan 300 - 1863
- Figure 8: Detail of Old Land Claim Plan 300, showing the approximate location of the current Russell wharf marked in grey with the subject area marked in green
- Figure 9: Survey Office Plan 5602C - 1867
- Figure 10: Survey Office Plan 5602 – 1890
- Figure 11: Detail of Survey Office Plan 5602, showing showing the Government Wharf and its associated structures
- Figure 12: Deposited Plan 18045 – 1924
- Figure 13: Detail of Deposited Plan 18045, showing showing the wharf, with the Customs building and the Northern Steam Ship Company building at the shore end of the wharf
- Figure 14: Plan showing the subject area (marked in green), the surrounding recorded archaeological sites and HNZPT Registered Places. (Background mapping provided by Quickmap)
- Figure 15: Plan of the 1995 excavation, showing the location of the excavated area in relation to the wharf (Best 1995)
- Figure 16: Sections from the 1995 excavation for a new fuel tank to the north east of the current wharf, showing the stratified deposits (Best 1995)

## List of Plates:

- Plate 1: Russell, Bay of Islands 1858. (Turnbull Library)
- Plate 2: Russell Bay of Islands 1868 (Turnbull Library)
- Plate 3: Russell waterfront – between 1887 and 1900 (Russell Museum)
- Plate 4: Detail of Plate 3, showing the shore end of the wharf
- Plate 5: Russell, Bay of Islands 1912 (Turnbull Library)
- Plate 6: Detail of Plate 5, showing the building at the shore end of the wharf (Turnbull Library)
- Plate 7: Russell, Bay of Islands 1912 (Turnbull Library)
- Plate 8: Detail of Plate 7, showing the shore end of the wharf and the building located to the immediate south of the wharf (Turnbull Library)
- Plate 9: Wharf at Russell 1952 (Turnbull Library)
- Plate 10: Detail of Plate 9, showing the wharf at Russell in 1952 (Turnbull Library)
- Plate 11: The Russell Wharf 1973 (Turnbull Library)



Plate 12: Detail of Plate 11, showing the absence of the buildings at the shore end of the wharf (Turnbull Library)

Plate 13: The current concrete retaining wall located to the immediate south of the Russell wharf

Plate 14: The small timber piles located at the low tide mark to the north of the current Russell wharf

Plate 15: The remaining piles visible below the current Russell wharf

**List of Tables:**

Table 1: Recorded archaeological sites within a 250m radius of the Russell Wharf

Table 2: Values Assessment Table

Table 3: Historic Heritage Values Assessment Table

## Introduction

The following report is an archaeological assessment of effects relating specifically to the proposed upgrade works at the eastern end of the wharf at Russell, Bay of Islands, Northland. Heritage Survey Consultants have been commissioned by FNHL, on behalf of the Russell Wharf Maritime Trust, to undertake the archaeological assessment of effects.

### Brief Description of Proposed Works

It is proposed that the existing steps and retaining walls at the wharf end, both to the north of the wharf and to the south, be upgraded to improve access to the beach. Limited landscaping will also be undertaken with the installation of new boulders to retain the areas where current steps have been removed. Installation of new bench seating and seating boulders in proximity to the new steps is also proposed (Figure 1, 2 & 3). The footings for the proposed benches are planned to extend 200mm below the current ground surface, with the seating boulders set into the ground to the same depth (Galbraith, C. 2015, pers comm. 3 August).




Figure 1: The area of the proposed works, showing the new steps to the north and south of the wharf, the proposed landscaping and new benches

The proposed new steps are to be constructed from cast concrete with exposed beach gravel aggregate. The foundations of the new steps will extend down to bedrock within the beach, while the upper foundation will be placed against the seaward side of the existing concrete retaining wall and be cut into the ground surface (Figure 3).




Figure 2: Detail of the proposed northern steps




Figure 3: Detail of the proposed southern steps with a sketch cross section of the proposed steps

## Location

The subject area is located at Russell in the Bay of Islands (Figure 4) and the upgrade works are proposed for the east end of the town wharf (Section 1 Blk VI Russell SD). The wharf at Russell is located on the seaward side of The Strand, immediately adjacent to Cass Street (Figure 5). The wharf itself projects from the shore approximately 100m into the sea and is a prominent local landmark. The wharf end itself falls within the area of the Strand Heritage Precinct, as defined by the Far North District Council (FNDC) District Plan (Figure 6).




Figure 4: General location of site within New Zealand (Quickmap accessed 28/07/2015)




Figure 5: The location of the proposed works within Russell (site marked in green) (Quickmap accessed 28/07/2015)




Figure 6: Far North District Council Heritage Precinct Map for Russell (site marked in green)

### Statutory Requirements

There are two pieces of legislation in New Zealand that control work affecting archaeological sites. These are the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* and the *Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)*.

The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga administers the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014*. The *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* contains a consent (authority) process for any work affecting archaeological sites, where an archaeological site is defined as:

- An archaeological site means, subject to section 42(3),—
- (a) any place in New Zealand, including any building or structure (or part of a building or structure), that—
    - (i) was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900 or is the site of the wreck of any vessel where the wreck occurred before 1900; and
    - (ii) provides or may provide, through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand; and
  - (b) includes a site for which a declaration is made under section 43(1)

The RMA requires City, District and Regional Councils to manage the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way that provides for the wellbeing of today's communities while safeguarding the options of future generations. The protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is identified as a matter of national importance (section 6f).

Historic heritage is defined as those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures, derived from

archaeological, architectural, cultural, historic, scientific, or technological qualities.

Historic heritage includes:

- historic sites, structures, places, and areas
- archaeological sites;
- sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu;
- surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources (RMA section 2).

These categories are not mutually exclusive and some archaeological sites may include above ground structures or may also be places that are of significance to Maori.

Where resource consent is required for any activity the assessment of effects is required to address cultural and historic heritage matters (RMA 4th Schedule and the district plan assessment criteria).

The proposed works relate to an area in close proximity to where there is recorded evidence for occupation and activity prior to 1900 and there is reasonable cause to suspect that there will be in ground archaeological features and deposits associated with this.

### **Methodology**

This archaeological assessment involved both a desktop survey and site inspection.

The desktop survey consisted of an examination of the New Zealand Archaeological Associations (NZAA) Archsite digital portal, Far North District Councils GIS viewer, previous archaeological assessments and archaeological reports for the local area, early survey plans, available aerial images and historic photographs of the Russell waterfront.

A site inspection was undertaken on the 30<sup>th</sup> July 2015 at low tide, during sunny dry conditions. No test pitting was carried out as the area of the proposed seating was covered with tarmac and within the gravel beach test pits were unfeasible. Digital photographs were taken of the subject area accompanied by a visual inspection in the water below low tide, of the beach, of the current retaining structures and of the current shore surfaces.

### **Physical Setting**

The current environment of the subject property is within a built up urban zone and is located at the shore end of the Russell Wharf. The site is located within the Russell Heritage Precinct that is recorded on the Far North District Councils District Plan.

The subject area is located along the former edge of a gravel beach ridge immediately behind the beach. The area east of The Strand, beyond York Street slopes down into what was a swampy boggy area during the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Nevin 1999). This has subsequently been drained. Within Russell the main area of historic occupation and settlement occurred along the raised beach ridge running the length of the beach (Best 2010). However the area is now within an urban area and the original topography has been significantly modified.

### **Historical Background**

Numerous historic and archaeological reports have been written about Russell/Kororareka and it is recognized that the town played an important part in the history of New Zealand. Most notable of these are Marie Kings *Port in the North* and *A Most Notable Anchorage* (King 1949 & King 1992), and Jack Lees *The Bay of Islands* (Lee 1983).

Prior to the arrival of Europeans the area around Russell/Kororareka was controlled by Ngatiawa. This situation changed about the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century when Ngapuhi became dominant in the region. Ngati Raumati, a hapu of Ngatiawa held the area around Kororareka until the early 18<sup>th</sup> century when Kororareka was given to Ngatimanu, a hapu of Ngapuhi, as compensation after the killing of a chief. Ngatimanu were still holding Kororareka in 1805 when the area was visited by Captain Stewart.

When The Church Missionary Society established their first mission at Oihi in 1814 it seems that whaling ships were already visiting Kororareka. Samuel Marsden was called upon to resolve a dispute between local Maori and the crew of The Jefferson, a recently arrived whaler. Thomas Hansen also purchased land at Kororareka in 1814. From this time on the local Maori began to sell land to the arriving Europeans.

In 1827 Kororareka was visited by Captain Dillon in July 1827. He was met with friendly local Maori and noted that there were several European tradespeople living along the beach. These tradespeople were living with Maori wives and seem to have been acting as a service industry for the visiting ships. He notes that there were coopers, blacksmiths and sawyers.

Captain Dillon also notes that he visited the village and fort of the late chief Pomare at Matauwhi, to the south end of the beach at Kororareka. He also records that a Captain Brind, of the whaler Emily had built a shore-home and furnished it. This Captain Brind was the son-in-law of the late chief Pomare.

In 1830 the Girls War occurred, this event was centered in Russell. Lee states this event started as a squabble between two native girls onboard Captain Brinds ship, the Toward Castle. According to Maori tradition one of the girls involved was Hongi Hika's daughter Pehi and the other was Moewaka, Rewa's daughter. The squabble deteriorated along tribal and hapu divisions with an estimated 100 people being killed. The Paihia based missionaries of the Church Missionary Society attempted to intervene to stop the violence with varying degrees of success. Pomare, the local chief placed a tapu on the beach where the slain bodies were located, effectively ending the conflict and establishing the wahi tapu at the north end of the Russell beach.

In 1845 as a result of the Treaty of Waitangi Hone Heke cut down the flagpole above Russell for the third time. An attack on the town of Russell followed, during which the European townspeople were evacuated onto HMS Hazard. The subsequent battle resulted in the burning of the town, with the exception of the Catholic Marist mission buildings at the south end of the town and the Anglican Church.

Following the 1845 sacking the town was re-established, however a combination of global economic factors and the 1840 establishment of the capital in Auckland lead to a decline in the importance of the town as a port.

The current wharf at Russell has been preceded by several other wharfs and jetties along the beach. A chronology for these earlier structures is provided by local historian Marie King (King 1949) and is summarised below.

**1850s:** *"Stephensons" wharf, built in the early 1850's, was probably one of the first one on Russell beach. It was a wooden structure and boasted a small iron crane, imported from England. Trolley lines ran the length of the wharf and across the road into Samuel Stephenson's warehouse with its stores of whale oil. With the decline of the whaling industry, the wharf fell into disuse and gradually rotted away.*

Heritage Survey Consultants

Russell Wharf Upgrade Archaeological Assessment of Effects

**1862:** *A photograph of Russell in 1862 shows the township to be an unlovely assortment of buildings, but proudly possessing two privately owned jetties...*

*Only a narrow pathway separated the buildings from the beach, but several boat-sheds and store-sheds were built on the beach itself. At the left of the photograph we see the old "Cricketers' Arms" with Stephenson's bonded store and wharf next to it...Next, another bonded store and wharf first owned by a Jew named Davis; then by Vilco a Frenchman; and in the '70s by James Macfarlane, a native of Greenock.*

**1876:** *...the government built a wharf out off Cass Street. It was a wooden construction with two storehouses, a flight of boat-steps and davits for the Custom Officer's gig. A small lean-to was built on to one of the storehouses and this served as the wharfingers office...The crane which had been on Stephenson's jetty was purchased and set up on the new wharf. In later years a second flight of boat-steps was added, and the Custom's gig's davits were removed.*

**1926:** *...Russell's only wharf was now about fifty years old and was looking its age. Through not definitely unsafe, it was clear that the old structure could not last much longer and arrangements were made for the construction of a new one*

*Authorities recommended that the new wharf be built between Greenway Street and Walker Passage but the recommendation was far from receiving the unanimous approval of the Russell residents. One section of the community reasoned that if the experts said that the new site was better, the wharf should be built there; another section affirmed that the new site was not suitable because in rough weather the surge was so much greater there, and that if the old site had sufficed for fifty years why change it now? The remainder of the residents did not care where the wharf was, provided they could be sure that they were no longer in danger of falling through it.*

*The controversy raged for some time and finally a ballot was held in which all ratepayers in the Bay of Islands Harbour Board District cast their votes. The result was that the new wharf was built on the old site.*

*The old crane was shifted once more and set in position on the new structure.*

**1927:** *The wharf was completed in 1927. It was officially opened by the Hon. G. J. Anderson, Minister for the marine, on the 7<sup>th</sup> June of that year.*

#### **Early Survey Plans**

Old Land Claim map 300 (Figure 7):

This survey plan dates to 1863 and shows the layout of Russell at the time. Property boundaries are clearly marked, as are the roads within the town, but there are no details of buildings or structures. There is no trace of Stephenson's Wharf and there are no structures shown near the location of the current wharf. It is noted however that The Strand is present as a road with a variable width.






Figure 7: Old Land Claim Plan 300 - 1863




Figure 8: Detail of Old Land Claim Plan 300, showing the approximate location of the current Russell wharf marked in grey with the subject area marked in green

Survey Plan 5602C (Figure 9):

This survey plan dates to 1867 and again shows the property boundaries within Russell. As with the 1863 survey plan there are no details of any coastal structures indicated.




Figure 9: Survey Office Plan 5602C - 1867

Survey Plan 5602 (Figure 10):

This survey plan was produced by Wheeler in 1890 and covers the entire area of Russell. Wheeler has included a great deal of information on his plan, including the buildings on properties, their owners, the use of some of the buildings, some fences within properties and the Government wharf. Details of the structures on the wharf are also indicated on the 1890 survey plan and can be determined as a light room at the end of the wharf, a goods shed with an attached office and a set of steps on the north side of the wharf (Figure 11).




Figure 10: Survey Office Plan 5602 – 1890




Figure 11: Detail of Survey Office Plan 5602, showing showing the Government Wharf and its associated structures

Deposited Plan 18045 (Figure 12):

This plan was produced in 1924 for the Bay of Islands Harbour Board and shows the foreshore area at Kororareka Bay. A wharf is indicated on the survey plan, but the structures on the wharf are not included. It is notable that there are two subsidiary structures at the south side of the shore end of the wharf. The annotation on the survey plan indicates that one is likely a Customs building and the other a ticket office for the Northern Steam Ship Company (Figure 13). At the time the survey plan was produced the Northern Steam Ship Company were operating a regular service to ports in northland using their ship the S.S. Clansman (Auckland Star 1924).




Figure 12: Deposited Plan 18045 - 1924




Figure 13: Detail of Deposited Plan 18045, showing showing the wharf, with the Customs building and the Northern Steam Ship Company building at the shore end of the wharf

#### Description of historic photos

There are a number of historic photographs of the Russell which are publicly available. Fortunately many of the early examples have been taken from high points at either end of Kororareka Bay and so show the wharf and jetty structures which projected from the shore.

#### Plate 1:

This photograph purports to date to 1858 and is looking south over Russell. In this photo it is there are no structures at the site of the current wharf, but boats are drawn up all along the beach front. In the foreground is Stevenson's wharf with what appears to be a small crane at the end of the structure.




Plate 1: Russell, Bay of Islands 1858. (Turnbull Library)

Plate 2:

This photograph purports to date from 1869 and has been taken looking south over Russell from near the flagstaff. There are no structures at the site of the current wharf, but both Stevenson's and Vilco's/MacFarlane's wharves are visible.




Plate 2: Russell Bay of Islands 1868 (Turnbull Library)

Plate 3:

This photograph is looking south over Russell and was taken between 1887 and 1900. There is a wharf structure at the current location which corresponds to the wharf shown on the Survey Office Plan 5602 as a set of steps are visible on the north side of the structure and it is just possible to make out the store shed. The remains of both Stevenson's and MacFarlane's wharves are visible in the foreground.




Plate 3: Russell waterfront – between 1887 and 1900 (Russell Museum)



No structures are shown around the shore end of the wharf and there are no obvious revetments or retaining walls separating The Strand from the beach. It appears that there is a grassed slope leading down from the road onto the beach (Plate 4).




Plate 4: Detail of Plate 3, showing the shore end of the wharf

Plate 5:

This photograph dates from 1912 and shows a similar view as Plate 4, looking south over Russell. A small building with a hipped roof is present at the shore end of the wharf (Plate 6) which may be either the Customs building or Northern Steam Ship office shown on Deposited Plan 18045. There is also a steamship moored on the southern side of the wharf, which may be the S.S Clansman.




Plate 5: Russell, Bay of Islands 1912 (Turnbull Library)



Plate 6: Detail of Plate 5, showing the building at the shore end of the wharf (Turnbull Library)

Plate 7:

A second photograph also dating from 1912 shows the Russell waterfront, looking north from the south end of Kororareka Bay. There is again a wharf present at the current location and the building at the shore end of the wharf is also visible. On close examination this building is shown to be supported on piles driven into the beach to the south side of the wharf and is not part of the wharf structure itself (Plate 8). It is apparent that there is no form of revetment or retaining wall separating The Strand from the beach.




Plate 7: Russell, Bay of Islands 1912 (Turnbull Library)




Plate 8: Detail of Plate 7, showing the shore end of the wharf and the building located to the immediate south of the wharf (Turnbull Library)

Plate 9:

This aerial photograph was taken in 1952 and is looking east over Russell. The wharf which was re-constructed in 1927 is present. At the shore end of the wharf the hipped roof building shown in Plate 7 and Plate 9 appears to be present with a gabled extension on the western side (Plate 10). It is possible that these are the two buildings shown on the 1924 DP 18045 (Figure 12), but it is not possible to definitively determine if this is the case. It is also notable that there is a retaining structure to the south side of the wharf (Plate 10) which appears to be the current concrete retaining wall.



Plate 9: Wharf at Russell 1952 (Turnbull Library)






Plate 10: Detail of Plate 9, showing the wharf at Russell in 1952 (Turnbull Library)

Plate 11:

This aerial photograph was taken in 1973 and is looking south west over Russell. The wharf which is present is largely the same as that shown in Plate 10, although jetty structures have been added to the south side of the main wharf. The buildings at the shore end of the wharf are no longer present (Plate 12).




Plate 11: The Russell Wharf 1973 (Turnbull Library)



Plate 12: Detail of Plate 11, showing the absence of the buildings at the shore end of the wharf (Turnbull Library)

### Previous Archaeological Work

Within a 250m radius of the Russell Wharf there are 24<sup>1</sup> recorded archaeological sites (Table 1) as well as two HNZPT Registered Places (No.67 – Former Russell Customhouse, No.421 – The Gables) (Figure 14). While there are only two HNZPT Registered Places within this radius, there are ten others Registered Places within a 1km radius. This indicates the historic nature of Russell. The recorded archaeological sites also support this as twenty two of the sites relate to historic activity. These are listed on the table below.

NZAA Site Number	Site Type	Grid reference (NZTM)
Q05/1163	Historic Domestic	E 1702006, N 6097499
Q05/1164	Historic Domestic	E 1702058, N 6097386
Q05/1165	Historic Cottage	E 1701963, N 6097325
Q05/1166	Historic Workshop	E 1702063, N 6097325
Q05/1167	House Site	E 1702059, N 6097217
Q05/1169	Historic House	E 1702063, N 6097125
Q05/1170	Historic House	E 1702162, N 6097425
Q05/1171	Cottages/Workshop	E 1702163, N 6097325
Q05/1178	Pa	E 1701963, N 6097125
Q05/1179	Pa	E 1701963, N 6097125
Q05/1184	Historic Commercial	E 1702063, N 6097225
Q05/1185	Historic House and Commercial	E 1702058, N 6097276
Q05/1186	Historic Midden	E 1701963, N 6097325
Q05/1287	Historic Artefacts	E 1702163, N 6097226
Q05/1289	Historic Rubbish Pit	E 1702013, N 6097345
Q05/1389	Historic Midden	E 1702133, N 6097135
Q05/1468	Historic Commercial	E 1702032, N 6097384
Q05/1470	Historic Commercial	E 1701994, N 6097516
Q05/1480	Historic Midden	E 1702102, N 6097262
Q05/1487	Historic Wharf	E 1701925, N 6097337
Q05/1499	Historic Well	E 1702072, N 6097216
Q05/1506	Historic Midden	E 1702041, N 6097180
Q05/1508	Historic Commercial	E 1702009, N 6097406
Q05/1515	Find Spot – 1826 Coin	E 1702016, N 6097262

Table 1: Recorded archaeological sites within a 250m radius of the Russell Wharf



Figure 14: Plan showing the subject area (marked in green), the surrounding recorded archaeological sites and HNZPT Registered Places. (Background mapping provided by Quickmap)

Due to this concentration of archaeological sites a number of archaeological surveys, assessments and investigations have occurred with the center of Russell. The results of the various investigations indicate that there are surviving archaeological features below the current row of buildings which front onto The Strand and associated archaeological features, such as privies, wells and rubbish pits, in the lots behind the buildings. The spatial distribution of the recorded archaeological sites reflects this, although it should be noted that the spatial pattern may be partly due to archaeological investigations being carried out as requirements for building works or redevelopment. Of these investigations the excavations carried out by Best in 1995 (Best 1995) and by Maingay in 2002 and 2003 (Maingay 2002 & 2003) have a direct bearing on the proposed upgrade works to the wharf.

During the 1995 excavations for a new fuel tank, to the immediate north east of the current wharf (Figure 15), Best found that there were stratified layers of deposits containing historic artefacts surviving under The Strand (Best 1995). Although he noted that the top 0.7m of the southern portion of the excavation area had been disturbed (Figure 16).

As a result of this excavation the archaeological site Q05/1186 was generated. The current location of this site on Archsite is not in the correct place, being indicated approximately 40 meters away from its true position.




Figure 15: Plan of the 1995 excavation, showing the location of the excavated area in relation to the wharf (Best 1995)




Figure 16: Sections from the 1995 excavation for a new fuel tank to the north east of the current wharf, showing the stratified deposits (Best 1995)

Best has also recorded rubbish pits from the 1850s and 1870s and a possible early timber retaining wall within excavations carried out in Cass Street in 2002. These features were apparently located in Cass Street on the seaward slope of the road and have been recorded as Q05/1289 (Figure 15).

Maingay monitored the excavations for a cable trench on The Strand in 2002, immediately in front of the Duke of Marlborough Hotel, and for a drainage trench in Cass Street in 2003. Both of these excavations showed that the stratified deposits identified by Best were present in the vicinity of the wharf.

An assessment for proposed extensions to the current wharf was carried out in 2011 by Callaghan (Callaghan 2011). This assessment detailed the chronology of wharf structures which have been present at Russell and recorded the former location of the Government Wharf constructed in 1876 as an archaeological site (Q05/1487). This is the first maritime archaeological site which has been recorded in Kororareka Bay. It was concluded that there were probably elements of the former wharf still present in the sea bed, but no underwater investigation was undertaken to record any actual structures. Callaghan's assessment did not focus on the shore element of the earlier wharf and does not provide any information on the archaeological potential of the area surrounding the proposed upgrade to the shore end of the wharf.

### **Research Results**

The available historic information indicates that there has been permanent European settlement on the beach ridge since at least 1827 when Captain Dillon visited the area and observed the settlement. Maori occupation along the beach ridge was focused towards the southern end of the beach at Rewa's Pa closer to Pompallier House.

Since the arrival of European settlement there has been a direct and important connection between the settlement at Russell and the sea. There have been several wharf structures built out into Kororareka Bay to enable the loading and unloading of cargo which was not possible by landing directly on the beach. The earliest recorded such structure was Stephenson's wharf which was built, approximately 140 meters north of the current wharf, by Samuel Stephenson in the 1850's.

This was followed by another wharf which was first owned by Davis in the 1860s and served a bonded store located approximately 90 meters to the north of the current wharf. In the 1870s the Government constructed a third wharf at Russell in the same location as the current wharf. This was undertaken so that deeper water could be reached to provide berths for larger vessels (King 1992). It is this wharf that has been recorded as archaeological site Q05/1487 on the NZAA site recording scheme. The Government wharf seems to have survived until 1926 when it was replaced with a new structure in the same location. The replacement wharf was opened in 1927 and seems to have been in use until it was renovated in the 1980s (Alridge 2015).

This chronology is supported by the available photographs which show the water front of Russell. Examination of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century photographs has indicated that there was a small building with a hipped roof on the south side of the wharf which is very close to the location of the proposed steps on the wharf's southern side. Plate 8 clearly shows that this building is supported on piles set into the beach. It has not been possible to determine the construction date for this building and it is assumed to be a 20th century structure. It is likely that this building is the Northern Steam Ship Company's office at Russell which is indicated on the 1924 survey plan (Figure 12) of the foreshore at Russell.

Plate 10 which was taken in 1952 shows that the building with the hipped roof has been extended, or has another building with a gabled roof placed very close to it on the western side. This arrangement matches that shown on Figure 12, so it is assumed that this gabled

roof building was a Customs office. Plate 10 also shows that a retaining wall was in place on the south side of the wharf by 1952. It is probable that the current concrete retaining wall (Plate 13), with timber shuttering marks, on the south side of the wharf is the structure shown in Plate 10.




Plate 13: The current concrete retaining wall located to the immediate south of the Russell wharf

During the site visit no traces of piles relating to the two buildings at the shore end of the wharf were visible within the beach material. However there were a series of three small timber piles visible at the low water mark on the north side of the current wharf (Plate 14). It is not possible to determine what these timber piles were for, but they may represent an unrecorded boatshed which pre-dates the construction of the Government wharf. These timber piles fall outside the area of the proposed upgrade works and will not be affected by the planned steps.

A series of large timber piles with remnant copper sheathing were visible at the low tide mark beneath the current wharf and the alignment of piles continued into the sea (Plate 15). These piles appeared to have been cut off horizontally close to the level of the beach gravel and it is interpreted that they are either the remnants of either the 1870s Government wharf or the 1926 replacement wharf. These piles are also outside the area of the proposed upgrade works and will not be affected by the planned steps.





Plate 14: The small timber piles located at the low tide mark to the north of the current Russell wharf



Plate 15: The remaining piles visible below the current Russell wharf

Examination of the previous archaeological excavations which have been carried out in the vicinity of the wharf indicated that there is the potential for stratified archaeological deposits on the shore side of the current retaining wall. No archaeological test pits were

excavated as part of this assessment due to the tarmac surface on the shore side of the wharf and no test pits were excavated on the beach because the loose beach gravel made this unfeasible. As a result it is unclear how much modern material has been built up behind the concrete retaining wall to raise the ground level to match the road height of The Strand.

### **Constraints and Limitations**

This archaeological report is an assessment of archaeological effects and values and does not include an assessment of Maori cultural values. An assessment of Maori cultural values can only be made by tangata whenua.

No archaeological testing was carried out on the shore side of the retaining wall to determine the actual stratigraphy or if there is modern disturbance as the surface is covered with tarmac and there is reasonable cause to suspect that even test excavations have the possibility of exposing archaeological material.

It was also not possible to carry out any testing within the gravel beach material to determine if there are stratified deposits containing archaeological material or early timber piles below the upper end of the beach due to the loose gravel.

There is a period of approximately 20 years between Plate 4 and Plates 6 & 8 being taken for which there are no publically available photographs to illustrate the area around the shore end of the wharf and to determine a construction date for the building located to the south side of the shore end of the wharf.

Similarly there is a gap of 40 years between Plates 6 & 8 and Plate 10 where there are no publically available historic photographs to illustrate the area around the shore end of the wharf, so it is not possible to determine exactly when the concrete retaining wall to the south of the wharf was constructed.

### **Archaeological Values**

The archaeological significance and value of the area to be affected by the proposed works will be measured using the following criteria which look at the site on an intra / inter- site level:

#### **Condition:**

How complete is the site? Has the site suffered any modification or damage? If so, to what extent and how much of the site survives?

- The area which will be impacted upon by the proposed works is within an urban area and has been modified through time. There are no standing pre-1900 structures within the subject area
- The area to the immediate north east of the current wharf has been excavated under archaeological supervision by Best in 1995 to enable the installation of an in ground fuel tank.
- Bests excavation indicated that there were stratified deposits containing pre-1900 artefacts to the immediate north east of the wharf and pre-1900 artefacts have eroded from the foreshore to the south of the wharf. However it was also apparent that there had been modern disturbance to the top 0.7m within the southern part of the Bests excavation area.



- It is considered that there will be surviving in-ground pre-1900 archaeological deposits, related to Q05/1186, on the shore side of the concrete retaining wall to the south of the current wharf.
- The presence of a concrete retaining wall would suggest that there has been disturbance associated with the construction of the wall and that imported material will have been deposited behind the wall, above any surviving pre-1900 archaeological deposits, to create the current level surface.

**Rarity / Uniqueness:**

How common is this site type at a local, regional or national level? Does it display any unique features, associations or artifacts?

- The historic settlement at Russell is regionally significant and is recognized by the Heritage Precincts which are defined on the Far North District Plan.
- The potential for archaeological deposits, similar to those found by Best in the immediate vicinity of the subject area are locally and regionally significant.

**Contextual value:**

How does this site function at both an intra and landscape level? Does this site exist in isolation or form part of an archaeological landscape? How does this site compare to the sites of the same type?

- Any archaeological features or deposits uncovered during the course of the proposed works would form part of an intensive archaeological landscape which extends along the length of the waterfront at Russell. The archaeological deposits, based on previous investigations in the local area will date from the 1840s to present day, reflecting the historic occupation of Russell during the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Best 1995, Maingay 2002 & 2003).
- Any information recovered during the course of onsite works will contribute to a growing archeological knowledge of Russell and how it functioned as a settlement.

**Information Potential:**

Is there information relating to the history of New Zealand that can be recovered through archaeological scientific methods? What type of information can be recovered and by what methods?

- It is not believed that there will be any remains of pre-1900 structures within the beach which will be affected by the lower ends of both the proposed north and south steps. It is possible that remnants of the piles for the buildings shown on Figure 13 and Plates 6, 8 & 11 may be encountered to the south side of the wharf, but these structures are likely to be post-1900 in date.
- The excavations for the supports for the upper end of the proposed steps on the south side of the wharf are to be placed against the seaward side of the current concrete retaining wall and will be located within beach material or within the area already disturbed by the construction of the wall itself. Any pre-1900 artefactual material which may be present within this area would be considered to be out of its primary context, lessening its archaeological value.
- The proposed works to remove the current set of steps to the south of the have the potential to expose previously undisturbed archaeological deposits relating to Q05/1186, which was identified by Best to the immediate north east of the wharf,

and have the potential to provide dating evidence for the stratified layers which contain archaeological material.

- The installation of the proposed new bench seating and seating boulders is currently designed to be 200mm deep. The excavations carried out by Maingay in Cass street indicated that the current road surface was made up of approximately 80mm of tarmac above 120mm of road base (Maingay 2002), if this depth of road material is also present on The Strand the required excavations for the proposed seating are not considered deep enough to expose pre-1900 archaeological layers on the shore side of the wharf.
- The proposed landscaping at the north side of the wharf will involve the importing of new fill material and will not involve any excavation. As such these works have no potential to recover archaeological information.

#### **Amenity Value:**

What public amenity value does this site have? Is it in public or private ownership? Can telling the story of this site provide for a better understanding of heritage that will contribute to the local, regional or national understanding of the place?

- The Russell wharf is located at the heart of Russell and is a visible and widely visited landmark which is owned by FNDC. Any archaeological or historic information about the wharf at Russell arising from the proposed works could easily be presented to the public through interpretive signage, contributing to the wider understanding of Russell.

#### **Cultural Associations:**

Does this site have any cultural associations for tangata whenua or paheka New Zealand?

- Based on the available historic information there are no known cultural associations to the Russell wharf for tangata whenua.
- Tangata whenua may hold their own cultural values for the wharf and surrounding area and should be approached independently to provide comment.
- Any in-ground pre-1900 archaeological features or deposits which may be exposed are expected to relate to the 19<sup>th</sup> century occupation at Russell. To date no pre-European Maori archaeological sites have been identified within the Strand area of Russell. Rewa's Pa is located further south along the Strand, within the area of present day Russell Museum.
- Given this it is likely that any potential archaeological features, deposits or artifacts will relate to the 19<sup>th</sup> century occupation at Russell.
- The wharf at Russell has strong associations to the local community and interest in the future of the wharf has been indicated by the Russell Museum (Alridge 2015).

These points are summarized on the table below:

Site	Value	Condition
Proposed upgrade works for the shore end of the Russell Wharf	Condition	<b>Moderate:</b> Based upon this assessment and nearby archaeological investigations there is reasonable cause to suspect that archaeological deposits will survive under The Strand, although there is likely to have been some 20 <sup>th</sup> century disturbance.
	Rarity / Uniqueness	<b>Moderate:</b> Portions of the proposed works, although small in scale, have the potential to expose archaeological material relating to the pre-1900 settlement at Russell which is locally and regionally significant.
	Contextual Value	<b>High:</b> Any exposed archaeological material would have a high contextual value as it would form part of the wider historic settlement of Russell, which is recognized as an intensive archaeological landscape. The subject works are also within the area of The Strand Heritage Precinct.
	Information Potential	<b>Low:</b> The information potential of the proposed works is quite limited due to the small scale of the works and the fact that the majority of the proposed upgrades are not considered to have an impact on potential archaeology.
	Amenity Value	<b>High:</b> The Russell Wharf is owned by FNDC and is a widely visited landmark which is within The Strand Heritage Precinct. There is considerable potential to present archaeological and historic information to the public.
	Cultural Associations	<b>Moderate:</b> No known cultural associations to the Russell wharf for tangata whenua. There is a cultural association to the wharf for the current residents of Russell as it is a notable landmark which represents the history of the town.

Table 2: Values Assessment Table

### Historic Heritage Values

The following values have been assessed in specific regard to the proposed removal of the concrete steps to the south side of the wharf. The assessed values are intended to satisfy the requirements for the assessment of historic heritage under the *Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)* which are not addressed by the above archaeological assessment.

Site	Value	Condition
Proposed upgrade works for the shore end of the Russell Wharf	Aesthetic	<b>Low:</b> The proposed upgrade works are within The Strand Heritage precinct and have been designed to comply with the Russell Design Guidelines (Salmond Reed n.d). The removal of the steps from the south end of the current concrete retaining wall, on the south side of the wharf, will have a minimal aesthetic impact as the majority of the retaining wall is being left in-situ.

Proposed upgrade works for the shore end of the Russell Wharf, continued	Architectural	<b>Low:</b> The majority of the proposed works will have no impact on buildings or standing structures. The removal of the steps from the south end of the current concrete retaining wall, on the south side of the wharf, will have a minimal architectural impact as the retaining wall has no associations to notable architects or designers and is of low architectural merit.
	Cultural	<b>Moderate:</b> The wharf at Russell and the street scape around its shore end have no known cultural associations to Tangata Whenua. The north end of Kororāreka Bay does have a recorded Wahi Tapu site, Te Hikuwai, but this is beyond the area of the proposed works. The wharf at Russell is a significant heritage feature in relation to the town and there are cultural associations for the local residents.
	Historic	<b>Low:</b> The wharf at Russell is significant to the history of the town and relates to character of the town as a maritime service center. The proposed works will not detract from this historic value.
	Technological	<b>Moderate:</b> The majority of the proposed works will have no impact on buildings or standing structures. The removal of the steps from the south end of the current concrete retaining wall, on the south side of the wharf, would offer an opportunity to examine municipally constructed concrete structures from the mid-20 <sup>th</sup> century.

Table 3: Historic Heritage Assessment Table

### Assessment of Effects

The current wharf at Russell is a 20<sup>th</sup> century structure, but it is located in the same position as the Government wharf which was built in 1876. The proposed works are to be carried out on the shore end of the wharf, in an area which has previously been proven to contain stratified archaeological deposits.

The majority of the proposed works have been designed to have a minimal footprint and will not impact on areas where there is cause to suspect that archaeological features or deposits are present. It is considered that the proposed works within the beach, to the north and to the south of the wharf will not impact on archaeology as they are to be placed within a dynamic beach environment. The only caveat to this is that the remnants of piles relating to buildings, which appear to be 20<sup>th</sup> century in date, which had formerly been placed to the south of the wharf may be exposed during the proposed works.

The installation of the proposed bench seating and seating boulders is unlikely to impact any potential archaeology as the planned footings are only to be 200mm in depth and are unlikely to be deep enough to reach pre-1900 archaeological layers. Similarly the

landscaping works proposed to the north of the wharf are not planned to involve any invasive earthworks and will import material to create a level grass area behind the proposed steps. Any other landscaping such as the removal of existing bollards/timber posts to the north side of the wharf are likely to take place within the footprint of a previous archaeological excavation carried out in 1995, and as such will have no impact on archaeological features or deposits.

The proposed design indicates that the current steps to the south of the concrete retaining wall on the southern side of the wharf will be removed and replaced with retaining boulders backed by imported topsoil. It is considered that the works to remove the current concrete steps have the potential to impact on stratified archaeological layers associated with Q05/1186.

### **Site Management**

Based upon this archaeological assessment coupled with the designed scope of the proposed works, Heritage Survey Consultants professional archaeological advice would be that the majority of the proposed upgrade works can proceed under an accidental discovery protocol. An example accidental discovery protocol has been included as Appendix 2.

The exception to this is for the removal of the concrete steps to the south of the current wharf. In this area it is recommended the removal of the steps and any earthworks required for the installation of new boulder retaining is undertaken with an issued archaeological authority from Heritage New Zealand and are monitored by an archaeologist.

The archaeological monitoring of these earthworks would allow for the recording and investigation of any exposed archaeological deposits or features. This recording work would be carried out whilst on site works are occurring. This method would help avoid any significant delays to the project, but also allow FNHL to comply with the requirements of the *Heritage New Zealand Act 2014*. If it becomes apparent during the archaeological monitoring that no archaeological features / deposits exist or are likely to exist then monitoring by an archaeologist shall cease and an Accidental Discovery Protocol observed.

It is currently unclear how the footings for the proposed steps are to be installed within the beach in front of the retaining wall on the south side of the wharf and to the north side of the wharf. If machinery is required to drive onto the beach it is important that HNZPT be consulted prior to this occurring so that an access route and methodology is agreed on to avoid impact on any areas of potential archaeology which are outside of the areas assessed under this Archaeological Assessment of Effects.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

#### **Site Summary**

Heritage Survey Consultants were commissioned by FNHL to undertake an archaeological assessment of effects for the proposed upgrade works at the shore end of the Russell wharf. The majority of the proposed works will have no archaeological impact; however the removal of the current steps to the south of the wharf and their replacement with retaining boulders has the potential to expose archaeological deposits or features.

Due to this an Archaeological Authority is required as per the *Heritage New Zealand Act 2014*. Archaeological monitoring of this section of the proposed works will allow for the recovery of information about any existing stratified archaeological deposits or features that would otherwise be removed by the necessary earthworks.

Heritage Survey Consultants  
Russell Wharf Upgrade Archaeological Assessment of Effects

Examination of the historic photographs and previous archaeological investigations on The Strand and Cass Street indicates that until the 20<sup>th</sup> century the area immediately behind the beach at Russell sloped down from The Strand to the beach without any retaining structures. The stratigraphy recorded during Bests 1995 excavation clearly shows that the archaeological layers he exposed followed this topography and sloped down toward the beach. Between 1912 and 1952 a concrete retaining wall was constructed to the south of the wharf and the earlier topography was modified to create a leveled area contiguous with The Strand.

#### Recommendations

- That FNHL applies for an archaeological authority to undertake the removal of the current steps to the south of the wharf and the earthworks required to establish new boulder retaining. An application should be made under section 44 of the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* (HNZPT Act).
- The applicant should allow for a minimum of 25 working days for HNZPT to process and grant an archaeological authority, if the authority application is deemed suitable to be accepted. Once the authority has been issued under section 58 of the HNZPT Act a 15 working day appeal period must be observed before on site works may commence. Failure to do so is a breach of the HNZPT Act.
- Heritage Survey Consultants recommend that the earthworks required to remove the existing steps to the south of the wharf and to replace them with retaining boulders be archaeological monitored to record any archeological features, deposits or artifacts that may be uncovered during the course of the proposed works.
- The applicant must allow sufficient time for the onsite archaeological works to be undertaken.
- Heritage Survey Consultants recommend that the contractors on site are briefed about the potential to encounter archaeological features or deposits during works and their obligations under the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014*.
- If machinery needs to access the beach, HNZPT should be consulted to arrange an appropriate access point and methodology to ensure that potential archaeology outside the area covered by this assessment of effects is not inadvertently damaged.

## References

- Alridge, S. 2015. *Russell Wharf*. Russell Museum. Accessed 1 August 2015.  
<http://russellmuseum.org.nz/russell-wharf/>
- Auckland Star. 1924. Page 6 Advertisements Column 1. Auckland Star, Volume LV, Issue 154, 1 July 1924, Page 6. Available from Papers Past [August 2015]
- Best, S. 1995. *Installation of New Diesel Tank, The Strand Russell, By Caltex Oil (N.Z.) Limited. Archaeological Investigation of Site (Q05/1186)*. Archaeological Report for Base Associates Ltd
- Best, S. 2010. *Russell Police Station Site. Archaeological Monitoring of Foundation Work and Drainage Work*. Archaeological Report for NZ Police
- Callaghan, E. 2011. *Archaeological Assessment of a Proposed Wharf Upgrade, Russell Wharf, Russell, Bay of Islands*. Archaeological Assessment for Far North Holdings Ltd
- King, M. 1949. *Port in the North: A Short History of Russell*. Russell Centennial Historic Committee. Russell.
- King, M. 1992. *A Most Notable Anchorage. A Story of Russell and The Bay of Islands*. Northland Historical Publications Society. Kerikeri.
- Lee, J. 1983. *The Bay of Islands*. Hodder and Staunton. Auckland.
- Maingay, J. 2002. *Archaeological Monitoring of a Cable Trench at The Strand, Russell*.
- Maingay, J. 2003. *Archaeological Monitoring of a Drainage Trench at Cass Street, Russell*. Archaeological Report for Russell 2000 Trust
- Nevin, D. 1999. *Russell Police Station Russell, Northland. Archaeological Survey*. Archaeological Assessment for NZ Police.
- Salmond Reed Architects. n.d. *Far North District Council. Russell Design Guidelines*. Accessed 1 August 2015. <https://www.fndc.govt.nz/services/the-far-north-district-plan/heritage/Russell-Heritage-Design-Guidelines.pdf>

## Resources consulted

- FNDC Far North Maps GIS viewer
- National Library of New Zealand Photographic Catalogue
- NZAA online portal Archsite
- Quickmap NZ Property Information
- Russell Museum

APPENDIX ONE

NZAA Site Record Forms

NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION <b>SITE RECORD FORM (METRIC)</b> Metric map number: NZMS 260 Metric map name: Bay of Islands Metric map edition: 1st; 1983	NZAA METRIC SITE NUMBER: Q05/1186 DATE VISITED: 28-30 October 1995 SITE TYPE: Historic midden SITE NAME: MAORI OTHER:																										
Grid Reference Easting <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"><tr><td>2</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>0</td></tr></table> Northing <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"><tr><td>6</td><td>6</td><td>5</td><td>9</td><td>2</td><td>5</td><td>0</td></tr></table>		2	6	1	2	8	5	0	6	6	5	9	2	5	0												
2	6	1	2	8	5	0																					
6	6	5	9	2	5	0																					
1. Aids to relocation of site ( <i>attach a sketch map</i> ): At end of Russell wharf, where wharf meets the Strand																											
2. State of site and possible future damage: Under tarseal; danger from roadworks																											
3. Description of site ( <i>Supply full details, history, local environment, references, sketches, etc. If extra sheets are attached, include a summary here</i> ): The site was encountered when Caltex Oil NZ installed a diesel fuel tank for the yachties. It consisted of a black charcoal rich layer containing European artifacts, and sloped towards the beach.  A leg iron was also found, but not in the layer itself. The excavation report covers the details (Best 1995; on file at DOC Whangarei and Auckland)																											
4. Owner: Far North District Council      Tenant/Manager: Address:      Address:																											
5. Nature of information ( <i>hearsay, brief or extended visit, etc.</i> ): 2 days excavation Photographs ( <i>reference numbers</i> ): In excavation report Aerial photographs ( <i>reference numbers, and clarity of site</i> ): NA																											
6. Reported by: Simon Best      Filekeeper: <i>Andrew</i> Address: 547 Scenic Drive, Auckland      Date: <i>17/5/96</i>																											
7. New Zealand Historic Places Trust (for office use) <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;"> <table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>                     Type of site                      Local environment today                      Land classification                 </td> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;"> <table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>                     present condition and future danger of destruction                      Local body                 </td> </tr> </table>		<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table> Type of site Local environment today Land classification													<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table> present condition and future danger of destruction Local body												
<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table> Type of site Local environment today Land classification													<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 25px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table> present condition and future danger of destruction Local body														



NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION NZAA METRIC SITE NUMBER: Q05/1289  
**SITE RECORD FORM (METRIC)** DATE VISITED: 31.7 - 6.8.2001  
 Metric map number: NZMS 260 Q05 SITE TYPE: Historic rubbish pits NII  
 Metric map name: Bay of Islands SITE NAME: MAORI  
 Metric map edition: 1 (1983) OTHER: YY

Grid Reference Easting 2612850 Northing 6659220

1. Aids to relocation of site (*attach a sketch map*): In Cass Street, Russell, on the seaward slope of the road.

2. State of site and possible future damage: Under tarseal; damage likely from future roadworks

3. Description of site (*Supply full details, history, local environment, references, sketches, etc. If extra sheets are attached, include a summary here*): Three features were uncovered; a large rubbish pit from the 1850s, a smaller wood lined pit filled in the 1870s/80s, and a possible early retaining wall at the seaward end of the excavations.

4. Owner: Crown  
Address:

Tenant/Manager: Far North District Council  
Address: Kaikohe

5. Nature of information (*hearsay, brief or extended visit, etc.*): Excavation  
Photographs (*reference numbers*): Best 2002  
Aerial photographs (*reference numbers, and clarity of site*):


6. Reported by: Simon Best  
Address: 547 Scenic Drive, Waiatarua  
Auckland 1208

Filekeeper: *Adrian*  
Date: *11/8/05*

7. New Zealand Historic Places Trust (for office use)

H	A	Type of site
		Local environment today
A	A	Land classification


A	C	present condition and future danger of destruction
M	A	



**NZAA Site Number Q05/1487**

Status Approved

Historic wharf, recorded from documentary sources.



Site inspected by on

NZTM Coordinates E 1701925 N 6097337

Source of spatial data On Screen

**Finder Aid** The site is located at Russell in the Bay of Islands. The site is situated at approximately the mid-point of Russell Beach and extends out into the sea for a distance of approximately 100m.

**Site Type** Transport/ communication

**Features** Wharf/ jetty

**Description** Updated: 22/11/2011 - NZTM E1701925 / N6097337 (On Screen). The site located on or within the seafloor and extends to approximately 5-7m above the seafloor (1-2m above sea level). The site consists of what appears to be the Russell wharf shown in a photograph dating to 1890 (D.Beere), which shows the wharf with a number of structures located on the wharf itself. This matches the reconstruction from old land plans undertaken by McLean and Maingay in 1988, which shows three structures located on the wharf (Preliminary Notes on Archaeological Features of Early Pioneer Settlement at Russell, in the Bay of Islands). The earliest reference to a wharf at Russell is from a John Kinder image dated 1858 (Watercolour entitled Kororareka, Bay of Islands- 1858) A wharf is also shown in a photograph by Matthew Moresby, also dated 1858. A further wharf was constructed after 1858 as Thomas Kemp (watercolour entitled 1866 Bay of Islands) and John Kinder (photograph) record two wharves at Russell in 1866 and 1868 respectively. By the 1890s a wharf had been constructed in what appears to be the position and location of the existing Russell Wharf, and the Beere photograph shows the remains of wharf piles in the foreground to the south of the existing wharf which are possibly the remains of the 1850s and 1860s wharves recorded by Kinder, Moresby and Kemp. The wharf superstructure above sea level is in reasonable to poor condition. The area of the historic wharf under the existing wharf is located on, or in, the seafloor and is unable to be assessed. In an area adjacent to an existing section of wharf (which post-dates 1900AD) being looked at for up-grading by Far North Holdings Ltd. See also: Report: Callaghan, E. 2011. Archaeological Assessment of a Proposed Wharf up-grade at Russell, Bay of Islands. Unpublished Client Report. Auckland: Northern Archaeological Research Ltd. Updated by: Callaghan, Elisabeth.

**Name**

**Ethnicity** Non Maori

**Period** Colonial 1840-1900

**Associated Sites**

**Condition**

**Condition Notes**

**Land Use**

**Threats**

**Site Documents**

Name	Status
Russell Wharf Upgrade Archaeological Assessment of Effects	

## APPENDIX TWO

### Accidental Discovery Protocol

Archaeological features and remains can take the form of burnt and fire cracked stones, concentrations of charcoal, rubbish heaps (Middens) including shell, bone and/or 19th century glass and ceramics (crockery, plates, dishes or tableware) bricks or brick fragments, artefacts of Maori and early European origin, or human burials. Attention should also be paid to buried timber structures, especially on the foreshore of Russell.



HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND  
POUHERE TAONGA

#### Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeological Discovery Protocol


In the event that an unidentified archaeological site is located during works, the following applies;

1. Work shall cease immediately at that place and within 20m around the site.
2. The contractor must shut down all machinery, secure the area, and advise the Site Manager.
3. The Site Manager shall secure the site and notify the Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist. Further assessment by an archaeologist may be required.
4. If the site is of Maori origin, the Site Manager shall notify the Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist and the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative of the discovery and ensure site access to enable appropriate cultural procedures and tikanga to be undertaken, as long as all statutory requirements under legislation are met (*Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, Protected Objects Act*).
5. If human remains (koiwi tangata) are uncovered the Site Manager shall advise the Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist, NZ Police and the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative and the above process under 4 shall apply. Remains are not to be moved until such time as iwi and Heritage New Zealand have responded.
6. Works affecting the archaeological site and any human remains (koiwi tangata) shall not resume until Heritage New Zealand gives written approval for work to continue. Further assessment by an archaeologist may be required.
7. Where iwi so request, any information recorded as the result of the find such as a description of location and content, is to be provided for their records.
8. Heritage New Zealand will determine if an archaeological authority under the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* is required for works to continue.


It is an offence under S87 the *New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* to modify or destroy an archaeological site without an authority from Heritage New Zealand irrespective of whether the works are permitted or a consent has been issued under the Resource Management Act.

Heritage New Zealand Regional archaeologist contact details:

Brooke Jamieson  
Regional Archaeologist  
Heritage New Zealand, Northland Office  
PO Box 836  
KERIKERI 0245 Phone (09) 407 0473 Email [bjamieson@heritage.org.nz](mailto:bjamieson@heritage.org.nz)







TYPICAL  
J 157




SCALE 1:100



Scale 1:100



Russian Walnut and Upgrade  
Aug 2014





Aug 2014

# RUSSEN WHARF UPGRADE

## NORTH END OVER FUEL TANKS

