

**Before the Board of Inquiry  
MacKays to Pekapeka Expressway Proposal**

**In the matter of**                      The Resource Management Act 1991

**In the matter of**                      Notice of requirement for designation and resource consent applications by New Zealand Transport Agency for the Mackays to Pekapeka Expressway proposal

**Applicant:**                              New Zealand Transport Agency (Requiring Authority)

**Statement of Evidence of Benjamin Rameka Ngaia  
on behalf of the Takamore Trustees**

5 October 2012

1. My name is Benjamin Rameka Ngaia.
2. I am the current chairperson of the Takamore Trustees.
3. I wish to be heard on my submission and to make a representation to the Board of Inquiry.
4. In my submission, I have already submitted details of the position of the Takamore Trustees on the Mackays to Pekapeka Expressway proposal, and in the paper "Supporting Documentation for Takamore Trust Submission on M2PP Expressway", and I wish to rely on that document in evidence to this Board of Inquiry.
5. I have also appended by Cultural Impact Report and I wish to rely on that report in evidence to this Board of Inquiry.
6. I wish to respond to the evidence which has been submitted by the applicant.
7. The cultural evidence of Amos Kamo (dated 7 September 2012) agrees that there will be adverse effects on cultural values through the

construction of the Expressway which cannot be avoided. He says that the adverse effects can be mitigated or remedied.

8. The Takamore Trustees are the kaitiaki of the Takamore waahi tapu and surrounding area. We take those responsibilities very seriously. When an expressway is to be constructed through the waahi tapu over which we exercise kaitiakitanga, we do not agree that the adverse effects can be "remedied or mitigated".
9. Amos Kamo focuses mainly on the consultation that has been undertaken with Takamore Trustees. We have already stated that we regarded the level and quality of the consultation with us as appropriate and reflected the importance of the Takamore area. However, we do not believe that consultation is the way in which you avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects. Consultation is a means to an end. It is a process to be better informed. It is NOT:
  - a. An exercise of kaitiakitanga; or
  - b. The expression of rangatiratanga; or
  - c. The expression of partnership;
  - d. Active protection of our taonga.
10. If the Expressway goes ahead through the proposed route, these are the effects:
  - a. We lose part of our waahi tapu;
  - b. We do not exercise our chiefly authority, our rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands and taonga, because a decision is made about our ancestral lands and taonga that we do not agree with;
  - c. We are unable to exercise our obligations of kaitiakitanga, our custodial responsibility, to those areas which are going to be affected (either by complete destruction because those areas are in the pathway of the proposed road, or by other adverse effects);
  - d. There is no "partnership" in this process. We have been "consulted" and had our views taken into account, like other affected parties.
11. In the applicant's evidence, I did not see much attention paid to the sites of cultural and archaeological significance in the Tuku Rakau area, and

particularly the Pukmahi Tamariki house site. I detailed this whare in my Cultural Impact Report on pages 16-17. It lies right in the path of the proposed road. I have read and support the evidence of Patricia Grace.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ben Ngaia". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "B".

5 October 2012

**Ben Ngaia**