

HammondCare Wahroonga, 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga

Historical Archaeological Assessment

Report to HammondCare

November 2022



@ artefact

Artefact Heritage ABN 73 144 973 526 Suite 56, Jones Bay Wharf 26-32 Pirrama Road Pyrmont NSW 2009 Australia

+61 2 9518 8411 rf office@artefact.net.au

Document history and status

Revision	Revision type	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date approved	Date issued
1	First draft	JW	AY	16/11/2022	16/11/2022
2	Second draft				
3	Final				

Last saved:	
File name:	НАА
Project name:	HammondCare Wahroonga, 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga
Author:	Elanor Pitt, Jenny Winnett
Project manager:	Jenny Winnett
Project number:	
Name of organisation:	Artefact Heritage
Document version:	Draft V1

© Artefact Heritage Services

This document is and shall remain the property of Artefact Heritage Services. This document may only be used for the purposes for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of the Engagement for the commission. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

Disclaimer: Artefact Heritage Services has completed this document in accordance with the relevant federal, state and local legislation and current industry best practice. The company accepts no liability for any damages or loss incurred as a result of reliance placed upon the document content or for any purpose other than that for which it was intended.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project overview

Artefact has been engaged by HammondCare to undertake a Historical Archaeological Assessment as part of the redevelopment of part of the site at 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga

This assessment will be submitted to the Department of Planning and Environment in support of a State Significant Development Application for the redevelopment of part of the site for the purposes of delivering additional community health services, seniors housing and upgraded palliative care facilities that will contribute to the broader operation of the 'Neringah Hospital.'

Key findings

This assessment has found that the subject site has low-nil potential to contain legible archaeological remains that would meet the threshold of a local significance.

The proposal would require excavation throughout the study area, including bulk excavation and remediation works.

Based on the site's nil-low potential to contain archaeological remains, the works are unlikely to result in archaeological impacts.

Recommendations

Given the unpredicted nature of subsurface archaeological remains, it is recommended that the proposed works proceed in accordance with the following actions:

Mitigation measure	Description
Unexpected Finds Procedure	An unexpected finds procedure should be implemented for all excavation works. It is recommended that the procedure include the following steps:
	Cease all activity within the vicinity of the find
	 Leave the material in place and protect it from harm
	• Take note of the details of the find and its location, taker a photograph in situ,
	preferably with a scale
	 Inform the site manager/area supervisor, who would then inform the
	superintendent/principal
	 A suitably qualified archaeologist should be contacted to assess the significance
	of the find and determine management requirements.
	If the find is identified as being a significant archaeological 'relic,' the following steps should be undertaken:

HammondCare Wahroonga, 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga Historical Archaeological Assessment

Mitigation measure	Description		
	 Heritage NSW, Department of Premier and Cabinet (Heritage NSW) would be notified on discovery of a 'relic,' in accordance with Section 146 of the NSW <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> Further archaeological mitigation and/or approvals may be required prior to works recommencing. 		
	All relevant construction staff, contractors and subcontractors must be made aware of their statutory obligations for heritage to ensure no archaeological remains are impacted during the proposed works without appropriate mitigation measures in place.		
Aboriginal archaeology	Excavation works should proceed under the unexpected finds procedure outlined in the ACHAR for the project. Should Aboriginal objects be uncovered during the construction program, works should		
	cease immediately, and Heritage NSW is to be notified in accordance with Section 89A of the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i> . Further approval would be required to impact, harm or remove Aboriginal objects.		
Modifications and amended scope	Any modifications, including minor corrections, clarifications, amendments, or additional works beyond the scope of those works assessed in this report would require further archaeological assessment.		

CONTENTS

1.0	Int	roduction	.1
1.1		Project background	. 1
1.2	:	Study area	. 1
1.3		Proposed development	3
1.4		Statutory context	3
1	.4.1	Heritage Act 1977	3
1	.4.2	Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979	4
1	.4.3	Development Control Plan	6
1.5		Approach and methodology	8
1.6		Previous reports and investigations	8
1.7		Limitations	8
1.8		Author identification and acknowledgements	8
2.0	Hi	storical context	.9
2.1		Introduction	9
2.2		Historical summary	9
3.0	As	sessment of archaeological potential1	9
3.1		Introduction	19
3.2		Previous relevant investigations	19
3	.2.1	"Grosvenor Heights", Wahroonga Archaeological Assessment (Godden Mackay, 1998)	19
	.2.2 Ierita	'Aeolia' 4 Munderah Street Wahroonga, NSW. 2076 Heritage Assessment & Statement age Impact (NBRS&P, 2002)	
	.2.3 Iowa	"Rippon Grange", 35 Water Street, Wahroonga Conservation Management Plan (Rod rd & Associates, 2007)	20
3.3		Land use summary	20
3.4	:	Summary of archaeological potential	22
4.0	As	sessment of archaeological significance	24
4.1		Basis for assessment	<u>2</u> 4
4.2		NSW Heritage criteria for assessing significance related to archaeological sites and relics	<u>2</u> 4
4	.2.1	Archaeological significance assessment	25
4.3		Summary statement of archaeological significance	28
5.0	As	sessment of development impact	30
5.1		Description of proposed development	30
5.2		Development impacts	35
5.3		Recommended mitigation	35
6.0	Сс	onclusions and recommendations	36
6.1		Conclusions	36
6.2		Recommendations	36

7.0	References	
-----	------------	--

FIGURES

Figure 1: Map showing the location of the study area (Source: Artefact, 2022)
Figure 2: Listed heritage curtilages in the vicinity7
Figure 3. Undated parish map of Gordon, showing the study area (Source: HLRV)
Figure 4: 1906 subdivision plan 'Wahroonga at the railway station.' Source State Library of NSW Z/SP/W1/32
Figure 5: 1929 Sydney Water Survey. Source: Sydney Water Archives 12
Figure 6: Blackwattle Survey Sheets (undated: Blackwattle sheets were in use from 1908 to 1953 and were continuously updated throughout that period). Source: Sydney Water Archives
Figure 7: Blackwattle Survey Sheets (undated: Blackwattle sheets were in use from 1908 to 1953 and were continuously updated throughout that period). Source: Sydney Water Archives
Figure 8. Aerial view of study area, 1930 (Source: NSW Spatial Service)
Figure 9. Aerial view of study area, 1947 (Source: NSW Spatial Service)
Figure 10. Aerial view of study area, 1961 (Source: NSW Spatial Service)
Figure 11. Aerial view of study area, 1991 (Source: NSW Spatial Service)
Figure 12: Outline of the site, with the portion of the site subject to the SCC shaded dark red (R4 zone) (HammondCare)
Figure 13: Map showing the proposed impact area within The Site (HammondCare)
Figure 14. Plan of proposed development area (Bickerton Masters)
Figure 15: Elevations of the proposed development (Bickerton Masters)

TABLES

Table 1: Grading of archaeological potential	19
Table 2: Land use summary	20
Table 3: Archaeological potential	22
Table 4: Heritage criteria for assessing significance	24
Table 5. Significance assessment for archaeological remains within the study area.	25
Table 6: Summary of archaeological potential and significance	29

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project background

Artefact has been engaged by HammondCare to undertake a Historical Archaeological Assessment (HAA) as part of the redevelopment of portion of the site at 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga, New South Wales (NSW).

This HAA will be submitted to the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) in support of a State Significant Development Application (SSD-45121248) for the redevelopment for the purposes of delivering additional community health services, seniors housing and upgraded palliative care facilities that will contribute to the broader operation of the 'Neringah Hospital.' The extent of the site is shown in Figure 1 below.

This report has been prepared to respond to the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for SSD-45121248 that were issued on 24 June 2022:

20. Environmental Heritage

Where there is potential for direct or indirect impacts on the heritage significance of environmental heritage, provide a Statement of Heritage Impact and Archaeological Assessment (if potential impacts to archaeological resources are identified), prepared in accordance with the relevant guidelines, which assesses any impacts and outlines measures to ensure they are minimised and mitigated

1.2 Study area

The study area is located at 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga, in the Parish of Gordon, County of Cumberland. The study area comprises Lot 1 DP960051, Lot 1 DP1199937 and Lot 52 DP2666 (known as 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga, NSW 2076) and Lot B 369438 (known as Archdale Park) (Figure 1).

The study area is bounded by a Sydney Water Reservoir to the south, Neringah Avenue South to the east, Woonona Avenue to the west and mixed residential and commercial development to the north.



Figure 1: Map showing the location of the study area (Source: Artefact, 2022).

1.3 Proposed development

The SSDA seeks approval for the demolition of the existing 3-4 storey hospital building and the construction a new building presenting as 4-5 storey structure to Neringah Ave South and as an extension to the current stage 1 'Wahroonga' building. The proposal is for seniors housing comprising of 31 additional aged care and palliative care places and 57 seniors housing dwellings, community healthcare services, 90 plus parking spaces within the basement parking and associated community facilities, landscaping and public domain works. Archdale Walk is a pedestrian connection that would be upgraded as part of the proposal.

1.4 Statutory context

In relation to historical archaeology, the site/study area is subject to the following statutory and nonstatutory controls:

- Heritage Act 1977 (NSW)
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
 - Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2015
 - o Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan (DCP) 2022

1.4.1 Heritage Act 1977

The NSW *Heritage Act 1977* (Heritage Act, Act) is the primary item of State legislation affording protection to items of environmental heritage in NSW. The Heritage Act is designed to protect both listed heritage items, such as standing structures, and potential archaeological remains or relics.

Under the Heritage Act, 'items of environmental heritage' include places, buildings, works, relics, moveable objects and precincts identified as significant based on historical, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic values. State significant items are listed on the NSW State Heritage Register (SHR) and are given automatic protection under the Heritage Act against any activities that may damage or affect its heritage significance.

1.4.1.1 State Heritage Register (SHR)

The SHR was established under Section 22 of the Heritage Act and is a list of places and objects of particular importance to the people of NSW, including archaeological sites.

To carry out activities within the curtilage of an SHR-listed item, approval must be sought under a Section 60 of the Act. In some circumstances where works are minor in nature and assessed to have minimal impact on the heritage significance of the SHR-listed item, they can be undertaken under a Section 57(2) Exemption¹ or in accordance with agency or site-specific exemptions.

The study area is not listed on the SHR and is not located adjacent to any items listed on the SHR.

The study area is located in the vicinity of the following item on the SHR:

• 'The Briars' Dwelling House, 14 Woonona Avenue, Wahroonga, SHR 00274.

¹ Heritage Council of New South Wales, 2021. *Standard Exemptions for Works Requiring Heritage Council Approval.*

1.4.1.2 Section 170 registers

Under the Heritage Act all government agencies are required to identify, conserve and manage heritage items in their ownership or control. Section 170 (S170) requires all government agencies to maintain a Heritage and Conservation Register that lists all heritage assets and an assessment of the significance of each asset. They must ensure that all items inscribed on its list are maintained with due diligence in accordance with State Owned Heritage Management Principles approved by the Government on advice of the NSW Heritage Council. These principles serve to protect and conserve the heritage significance of items and are based on NSW heritage legislation and guidelines.

The study area is **not** listed on any S170 Registers.

The following item on the Sydney Water S170 Register is located adjacent to the study area:

 Wahroonga Reservoir No.3 (WS 0125), 137, Pacific Highway, Wahroonga, Sydney Water item number 4575768

1.4.1.3 Relics Provisions

The Heritage Act also provides protection for 'relics', which includes archaeological material or deposits. Section 4 (1) of the Heritage Act (as amended in 2009) defines a relic as:

"...any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that:

- (a) relates to the settlement of the area that comprises New South Wales, not being Aboriginal settlement, and
- (b) is of State or local heritage significance"

Sections 139 to 146 of the Heritage Act prevent the excavation or disturbance of land known or likely to contain relics, unless under an excavation permit. Section 139 (1) states:

A person must not disturb or excavate any land knowingly or having reasonable cause to suspect that the disturbance or excavation will or is likely to result in a relic being discovered, exposed, damaged or destroyed unless the disturbance is carried out in accordance with an excavation permit.

Excavation permits are issued by the Heritage Council of NSW, or its Delegate, under Section 141 of the Heritage Act for impacts to relics not listed on the SHR or under Section 63 for impacts within SHR curtilages. An application for an excavation permit under Section 140 of the Heritage Act must be supported by an Archaeological Research Design (ARD)prepared in accordance with the NSW Heritage Council's archaeological guidelines. Minor works that would have a minimal impact on archaeological relics may be granted an excavation exception under Section 139 (4) or an exemption under Section 57 (2) of the Heritage Act.

As the proposal is subject to Part 5.2 (State significant infrastructure) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act), the provisions of the Heritage Act'. However, notification on discovery of archaeological relic underSection146 of the Heritage Act is still active.

1.4.2 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

The EP&A Act establishes the framework for cultural heritage values to be formally assessed in the land use planning and development consent process. The EP&A Act requires that environmental impacts are considered prior to land development; this includes impacts on cultural heritage items and places as well as archaeological sites and deposits. The EP&A Act requires that Local Governments prepare planning instruments (such as Local Environmental Plans [LEPs] and Development Control Plans [DCPs]) in accordance with the Act, to provide guidance on the level of environmental assessment required.

When a project is approved as an SSD or SSI under s5 of the EP&A Act, the conditions and provisions of other state and local instruments are turned off and approved works are undertaken in accordance with relevant Instruments of Approval.

1.4.2.1 Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015

LEPs are prepared by Councils in accordance with the EP&A Act to guide planning divisions for LGAs. The aim of LEPs in relation to heritage is to conserve the heritage significance listed within Schedule 5 - Environmental heritage.

Heritage items listed on the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015 are managed in accordance with the provisions of *Section 5.10 Heritage conservation* of the LEP. Under *Clause 5.10 (5) Heritage assessment:*

The consent authority may, before granting consent to any development:

- (a) on land on which a heritage item is located, or
- (b) on land that is within a heritage conservation area, or

I on land that is within the vicinity of land referred to in paragraph (a) or (b),

require a heritage management document to be prepared that assesses the extent to which the carrying out of the proposed development would affect the heritage significance of the heritage item or heritage conservation area concerned.

Under Clause 5.10 (7) Archaeological sites

The consent authority must, before granting consent under this clause to the carrying out of development on an archaeological site (other than land listed on the State Heritage Register or to which an interim heritage order under the Heritage Act 1977 applies)—

(a) notify the Heritage Council of its intention to grant consent, and

(b) take into consideration any response received from the Heritage Council within 28 days after the notice is sent.

The following item listed on Schedule 5 of the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015 is located within the study area:

• 'Woonona House,' located at 3 Woonona Avenue, Wahroonga, item number 11009.

The following item listed on Schedule 5 of the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015 is located adjacent to the study area:

 -Sydney Water Reservoir - Wahroonga,' 1635 Pacific Highway, Wahroonga, item number 1972.

The following items listed on Schedule 5 of the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015 are located in the vicinity of the study area:

- 'Warrina' Dwelling House, 8 Woonona Avenue, Wahroonga, item number 11010.
- 'The Briars' Dwelling House, 14 Woonona Avenue, Wahroonga, local item number I1011.

1.4.3 Development Control Plan

The Ku-ring-gai DCP 2022 is a supporting document that compliments the provisions contained within the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015 and provides specific design detail in regard to sympathetic development on, or in the vicinity of, items listed on Schedule 5 of the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015.

Part 19 of the Ku-ring-gai DCP 2022 provides sympathetic considerations for development within or in the vicinity of heritage listed items and conservation areas. Section 19E provides controls for development within heritage items and 19F provides controls for development in the vicinity of heritage items. These controls include ensuring that the character, bulk, scale and height of new development does not unreasonably overshadow a nearby heritage item, that colouring and texture of new materials of a new development is sympathetic to a heritage item, and that views of a heritage item should not be obscured from the point of view of areas of public domain. However, the DCP provides no controls for archaeological remains within or within the vicinity of heritage items.



Figure 2: Listed heritage curtilages in the vicinity

1.5 Approach and methodology

This report was prepared in accordance with the principles and procedures established by the following documents:

- Archaeological Assessments (NSW Heritage Office, Department of Urban Affairs & Planning 1996)
- The Burra Charter (The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance) (Australia ICOMOS 2013)
- Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and Relics (Heritage Branch 2009)
- *Historical Archaeology Code of Practice* (Heritage Office 2006)

1.6 Previous reports and investigations

A Heritage Impact Assessment, Hammondcare Wahroonga, 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga was prepared by NBRS in November 2022.

An Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHAR) Report 4 -12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga was separately prepared by Artefact Heritage in November 2022.

1.7 Limitations

This report provides an assessment of historical (non-Aboriginal) archaeological remains and their values only.

This report uses historical documentation prepared by third party heritage professionals. Additional historical research in the form of cartographic research has been undertaken to supplement this existing information.

1.8 Author identification and acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Elanor Pitt (Heritage Consultant), with review and input from Jenny Winnett (Principal), both of Artefact Heritage Services.

Artefact Heritage acknowledges the assistance of Robert Allen, HammondCare, and Jeannette Komi, Sydney Water Archives.

2.0 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

2.1 Introduction

The following historical summary is based on the historical research included in the ACHAR prepared by Artefact Heritage. It has been supplemented with additional cartographic research undertaken during preparation of this HAA.

2.2 Historical summary

An undated nineteenth century Gordon Parish map shows that the present study area is situated within the former estate of former convict Thomas Hynes.² His was the largest original land grant in Wahroonga. The first Europeans to move to Wahroonga were sawyers assigned to Hyndes as extensive bush clearance took place across the Hornsby Shire prior to orchards being established across the area.³

Urban settlement in Wahroonga consisted of grand federation mansions and small weatherboard cottages until the 1920s, when subdivision and 'infill' took place as Sydney's population grew.⁴ Aerial imagery shows that two structures already existed on the southern portion of the study area, now the south carpark, by 1930, while the northern section was still covered in vegetation (Figure 7). The block on which the study area stands was bounded by the Pacific Highway (which would not be named until the following year) to the south and the North Shore railway line to the north. In 1937, Wahroonga Reservoir No. 3 was constructed on the land immediately south of the study area, connecting the water mains of Pymble and Ryde to Wahroonga. A third structure was built on the southern portion of the study area by 1943 between the existing pre-1930 buildings.

Residential development around the site had intensified by the late 1940s, and the existing vegetation in the northern portion of the study area gave way to the construction of two additional structures (Figure 9). By 1961, the main Neringah Hospital building as well as a cluster of smaller associated structures had been constructed on the study area and most of the trees had been removed from the site (Figure 9). Extensions to the building south of the main hospital structure were added between 1961 and 1965, and trees were planted along the south-eastern footpath that bounds the study area. The site remained largely unchanged for the remainder of the twentieth century (Figure 11). At some point after 2005, the pre-1930 structures south of the hospital and the late-1940s buildings north of the hospital were removed to facilitate the construction of the south and north carparks respectively.

Archdale Park is visible on aerial photographs from 1978 onwards (Figure 10). In the years prior to this, the land which Archdale Park is situated on was used for residential development (Figure 7, Figure 8, Figure 9).

² Rowland, J., 2008. 'Wahroonga'. *The Dictionary of Sydney*. Accessed:

https://dictionaryofsydney.org/entry/wahroonga#ref-uuid=d3b8cc3e-6c96-9306-2cdf-de1a234f8fcc (14/11/2022). ³ Rowland, J., 2008. 'Wahroonga'. *The Dictionary of Sydney*.

⁴ Rowland, J., 2008. 'Wahroonga'. *The Dictionary of Sydney*.



Figure 3. Undated parish map of Gordon, showing the study area (Source: HLRV).



Figure 4: 1906 subdivision plan 'Wahroonga at the railway station.' Source State Library of NSW Z/SP/W1/32



Figure 5: 1929 Sydney Water Survey. Source: Sydney Water Archives

Document Path: D:\GIS\GIS_Mapping\22119 2-12 Neringah Avenue South Wahroongah\MXD\22119_ArchPotOverlays_Landscape_v1_221116.mxd

Figure 6: Blackwattle Survey Sheets (undated: Blackwattle sheets were in use from 1908 to 1953 and were continuously updated throughout that period). Source: Sydney Water Archives



Figure 7: Blackwattle Survey Sheets (undated: Blackwattle sheets were in use from 1908 to 1953 and were continuously updated throughout that period). Source: Sydney Water Archives







Figure 8. Aerial view of study area, 1930 (Source: NSW Spatial Service).



Figure 9. Aerial view of study area, 1947 (Source: NSW Spatial Service).



Figure 10. Aerial view of study area, 1961 (Source: NSW Spatial Service).



Figure 11. Aerial view of study area, 1991 (Source: NSW Spatial Service).

3.0 ASSESSMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

3.1 Introduction

This section discusses the study area's potential to contain historical archaeological resources. The potential for the survival of archaeological remains is significantly affected by activities which may have caused ground disturbance. This assessment is therefore based on consideration of current ground conditions, and analysis of the historical development of the study area.

'Archaeological potential' refers to the likelihood that an area contains physical remains associated with an earlier phase of occupation, activity, or development of that area. This is distinct from 'archaeological significance' and 'archaeological research potential'. These designations refer to the cultural value of potential archaeological remains and are the primary basis of the recommended management actions included in this document.

The archaeological potential of a site is presented in terms of the likelihood of the presence of archaeological remains, considering the land use history and previous impacts at the site. This evaluation is presented using the following grades of archaeological potential:

Grade	Definition
High	Evidence of multiple phases of historical development and structures with minimal or localised twentieth century development impacts, and it is likely the archaeological resource would be largely intact
Moderate	Analysis demonstrates known historical development and some previous impacts, but it is likely that archaeological remains survive with some localised truncation and disturbance
Low	Research indicates little historical development, or where there have been substantial previous disturbance and/or truncation which may not have removed deep subsurface features entirely
Nil	No evidence of historical development or use, or where previous impacts would have removed all archaeological evidence

Table 1: Grading of archaeological potential

3.2 Previous relevant investigations

3.2.1 "Grosvenor Heights", Wahroonga Archaeological Assessment (Godden Mackay, 1998)

An Archaeological Assessment and Statement of Heritage Impact was prepared in 1998 by Godden Mackay(now GML Heritage) for "Grosvenor Heights", 153-165 Grosvenor Street, Wahroonga, located 2km to the north of the study area.⁵ The report notes that the site was used for timber-getting and orchards,⁶ like the rest of Wahroonga, but assessment of the archaeological potential of these phases is not assessed. The report only assesses the potential and significance of the archaeological items related to the 1883 Trigonometrical Station and the quarry, used from 1915 onwards ⁷ The report identifies the Trig Station pillar, recovery points for the Trig. Point and cuts into the bedrock

⁵ Godden Mackay, 1998. "Grosvenor Heights", Wahroonga Archaeological Assessment. Report prepared for Chanrich Properties Pty Ltd, November 1998.

⁶ Godden Mackay, 1998. "Grosvenor Heights", Wahroonga Archaeological Assessment. Report prepared for Chanrich Properties Pty Ltd, November 1998, pp. 5-6.

⁷ Godden Mackay, 1998. "Grosvenor Heights", Wahroonga Archaeological Assessment. Report prepared for Chanrich Properties Pty Ltd, November 1998, pp. 17-18.

demonstrating the quarry face and exploration for suitable stone. These elements are identified as items of low, local significance.⁸

3.2.2 'Aeolia' 4 Munderah Street Wahroonga, NSW. 2076 Heritage Assessment & Statement of Heritage Impact (NBRS&P, 2002).

A Heritage Assessment and Statement of Heritage Impact was prepared in 2002 by Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners Architects Ply Ltd (NBRS&P) for 'Aeolia' 4 Munderah Street, Wahroonga, located 500m to the south of the study area. The report notes that the land was within Thomas Hyndes' 1838 640 acre grant in the south Wahroonga area and that in 1840, Hyndes released a large portion of land to John Terry Hughes, a prominent merchant and brewer, who subsequently mortgaged the land to Adolphous Young in the same year. The report also notes that in 1845, the land was conveyed to John Brown, a timber merchant and orchardist.⁹ Following these phases, the site was used for residential development. However, the report does not assess the archaeological potential or significance of these phases and simply states that the 'remnant site provides limited potential for archaeological investigation based on known evidence of its former use and layout'.¹⁰

3.2.3 "Rippon Grange", 35 Water Street, Wahroonga Conservation Management Plan (Rod Howard & Associates, 2007)

A Conservation Management Plan (CMP) was prepared by Rod Howard & Associates in 2007 for "Rippon Grange", 35 Water Street, Wahroonga, located 1km to the north-east of the study area. The CMP does not assess the potential for archaeological remains related to the early phases of the site, which comprised timber-getting and orcharding, nor early evidence relating to the early use of the 1898 house, "Rippon Grange".¹¹ The CMP only considers the archaeological sites of the early twentieth-century plunge pool and the c.1928 fish pond, which were infilled in 1951-2, associated with the continued use of the 1898 house on the site.¹² The CMP assesses these archaeological items as possessing little significance.

3.3 Land use summary

The European occupation of the study area has been divided into four phases of historical activity, which are outlined in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Land use summary

Phase	Discussion
Phase 1: Early exploration, land grants, timber-getting and orchards (c.1788-1846)	 There is no documentary evidence for specific uses of the study area during this time. No known structures occupied the study area during this phase.

⁸ Godden Mackay, 1998. "Grosvenor Heights", Wahroonga Archaeological Assessment. Report prepared for Chanrich Properties Pty Ltd, November 1998, pp. 26-32.

⁹ Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners Architects Ply Ltd, 2002. '*Aeolia' 4 Munderah Street Wahroonga, NSW.* 2076 *Heritage Assessment & Statement of Heritage Impact.* Report prepared for Sue O'Reilly at the request of Glendinning Associates. March 2002, p. 30.

¹⁰ Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners Architects Ply Ltd, 2002. '*Aeolia' 4 Munderah Street Wahroonga, NSW. 2076 Heritage Assessment & Statement of Heritage Impact.* Report prepared for Sue O'Reilly at the request of Glendinning Associates. March 2002, p. 30.

¹¹ Rod Howard & Associates, 2007. "Rippon Grange", 35 Water Street, Wahroonga Conservation Management Plan. Report prepared Department of Community Services. for pp. 9-10.

¹² Rod Howard & Associates, 2007. "Rippon Grange", 35 Water Street, Wahroonga Conservation Management Plan. Report prepared Department of Community Services. for pp. 90-91, 129.

Phase	Discussion
	 Following the early exploration, the first Europeans to move to Wahroonga were sawyers assigned to Thomas Hyndes and his 1822 land grant as extensive bush clearance took place across the Hornsby Shire. Orchards were planted in the cleared areas following tree removal.
	 Orchards were planted in the cleared areas at this time. The merchant and brewer, John Terry Hughes, was officially granted the land in 1842, but filed for insolvency in 1843.
	 Ephemeral structures, including informal housing/camps, saw pits, storage structures or cess pits, may have been constructed in association with the orchards and timber getters. Refuse deposits may also be associated with the orchards and timber getters.
	 The land may have been modified by the removal of trees, planting of orchards and construction of informal camps and sites.
	 There is no documentary evidence for specific uses of the study area during this phase and no recorded structures occupied the study area.
	 Subdivisions of the area started in 1846, following Hughes' mortgage of the land to speculator, Adolphus William Young, with further subdivisions throughout the 19th century.
Phase 2: Subdivisions (1846-1911)	 The timber merchant and orchardist, John Brown, bought a parcel of land including the study area 1855. It is likely orcharding continued into this phase. The land is also associated with Peter Kershler from 1872 to 1885 and Andrew Gibson Blomfield from 1885 to 1888.
	 A land agent, Andrew Armstrong, bought the land in 1888, subdivided the land and sold it as The Wahroonga Estate from December 1889. In 1895, the land of the study area was transferred to the tea merchant, James Robinson Love. The land was further subdivided in 1906.
	 Although a number of people owned the land over this period, it is unclear if any of them modified the land other than minor earthworks as part of the subdivisions.
	 Following the construction of a new house along the eastern side of the study area on Lots 55-56 (4-6 Neringah Avenue) by the builder John Mair in 1912, Margaret and Andrew Reid lived there together until Margaret's death in 1934. Andrew Reid lived there with his housekeeper, Farrell, until his death in 1939.
	 Andrew Reid was a partner in James Hardie and Co, a company which initially supplied machinery and chemicals to tanneries and later specialised in the supply of fibre-cement. The Reid house, originally named 'The Haining' but renamed Neringah in 1920/1921, was constructed from fibre-cement with half-timbering decorative features.
Phase 3: Residential development (1912-1940)	 A (still extant) brick house was constructed at 3 Woonona Avenue at the south- western corner of the study area in c.1915 to 1920 for the well-known educationalist, Professor Alexander Mackie and his wife Annie. Their children, Margaret and John Mackie, grew up in the house and became influential in Australian Education.
	 Houses at 2 Neringah Avenue and 5-7 Woonona Avenue were also constructed between 1912 and 1929 during this phase.
	 The north-eastern portion of the study area along Neringah Avenue exhibited mature trees during this period, while the north-western portion at 9 Woonona Avenue was cleared by 1930 and a house constructed by 1943.
	 Landscape modifications at this time included residential landscaping, planting of trees, foundation trenches and construction of houses.
Phase 4: Institutional use	 The eastern side of the study area was used for the Neringah Convalescent home from 1940 to 1948, a hostel for ex-service university students from
of Neringah (1940- Present)	 1948 to 1952 and Neringah Home of Peace Hospital from 1955 onwards. By 1940, the study area (lots 52, 53, 54, 55 and 56) was transferred from Donald Chisholm Cameron, Andrew Thyne Reid and John Thyne Reid to the Red Cross Society. In 1954, the land passed to members of the Anglican

Phase	Discussion
	ministry. In 1971, Home of Peace Hospitals Limited became the registered proprietor.
	 During this time, ex-soldiers lived in multiple buildings across the study area until 1952. From 1955, the study area was used by doctors, nurses and patients.
	 In 1940, new structures appeared in the middle of the study area to supplement the existing buildings, while a large new hospital building was constructed in the north-eastern portion in c.1956. Infill buildings were also constructed in the centre of the study area at this time.
	 From 2013 to 2015, the house and hospital buildings in the north-western portion of the study area were demolished. The area was excavated and a new hospital building was constructed between 2015 and 2016 in this area.
	 The house at 2 Neringah Avenue at the south-eastern corner of the study area was demolished in c.1994 and was left as a landscaped area.
	 - 'Neringah' and the associated structures at 4-6 Neringah Avenue were demolished in 2015 and a carpark was established in the area in 2016.
	 Landscape modifications at this time included landscaping, construction of hardstands, planting of trees, foundation trenches, large scale excavation and construction of hospital buildings.

3.4 Summary of archaeological potential

Based on the review of the information obtained from historical sources, previous archaeological works in the local area and the current condition of the site, it can be concluded that the study area has potential to contain historical archaeological remains. Table 2 below provides a summary of the type of the anticipated archaeological remains and their likelihood of survival relative to the phase of historical development they are associated with.

Phase of development	Feature or activity	Description of potential remains	Degree of survival
Phase 1: Early exploration, land grants, timber-getting and orchards (c.1788- 1846)	associated with low intensity land use and land clearances,	Remains would be highly ephemeral and likely removed during later occupation phases. Remains could include evidence of burning, tree stumps and roots, tree boles, archaeobotanical remains, informal tracks, fence posts, isolated artefacts or artefact scatters, field drains or landscape modification. Ephemeral structures, including post holes from temporary timber huts, storage structures or saw pits, and/or refuse deposits. Later significant ground disturbance is likely to have removed the archaeological resource.	Nil-low

Table 3: Archaeological potential

HammondCare Wahroonga, 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga Historical Archaeological Assessment

Phase of development	Feature or activity	Description of potential remains	Degree of survival
Phase 2: Subdivisions (1846-1911)	Land clearing, landscaping/excavations for subdivisions.	Remains would be highly ephemeral and likely removed during later occupation phases. Remains could include tree boles, fence posts, isolated artefacts or artefact scatters, informal tracks, field drains or landscape modification. Later ground disturbance is likely to have removed or truncated the archaeological resource.	Nil-Low
Phase 3: Residential development (1912-1940)	Construction and use of housing, ancillary structures and landscaping.	Remains could include brick, sandstone or concrete foundations, foundation trenches, services, tree boles, timber fence post holes, botanical remains of gardens and hardstands. Artefactual scatters or deposits would be unlikely.	Moderate-High
Phase 4: Institutional use of Neringah (1940-Present)	Construction and use of institutional structures, continued use and adaptation of earlier houses, new ancillary structures and landscaping.	Remains would include brick or concrete foundations, foundation trenches, services, botanical remains of gardens and hardstands. Artefactual scatters or deposits would be unlikely.	High

4.0 ASSESSMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

4.1 Basis for assessment

Heritage or 'cultural' significance is defined in the 'Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter)' as: 'Aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present and future generations'.

Determining the cultural significance of a place or an item assists in identifying what characteristics of the place contribute to that significance. The assessed significance forms the basis for identification of appropriate management measures associated with any work that may impact heritage and archaeological items of significance.

Assessing heritage significance (NSW Heritage Office, as amended 2001) was developed as part of the NSW Heritage Manual to provide the basis for an assessment of heritage significance of an item or place. The seven heritage criteria are:

Table 4: Heritage criteria for assessing significance

Heritage criterion	Description
A – Historical Significance	An item is important in the course or pattern of the local area's cultural or natural history.
B – Associative Significance	An item has strong or special associations with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in the local area's cultural or natural history.
C – Aesthetic or Technical Significance	An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in the local area.
D – Social Significance	An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in the local area for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.
E – Research potential	An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of the local area's cultural or natural history.
F – Rarity	An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of the local area's cultural or natural history.
G - Representativeness	An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW's cultural or natural places of cultural or natural environments (or the cultural or natural history of the local area).

4.2 NSW Heritage criteria for assessing significance related to archaeological sites and relics

The specific nature of archaeological resource necessitates that they be assessed independently from aboveground and other heritage elements because of the challenges associated with the often unknown nature and extent of buried archaeological remains and judgment is usually formulated based on anticipated attributes. To facilitate assessment of archaeological significance, the NSW Heritage Branch (now Heritage NSW) arranged the seven heritage criteria into four groups as follows:

The NSW Heritage Criteria for Assessing Significance related to Archaeological Sites and Relics are listed below:¹³

- Archaeological Research Potential (NSW Heritage Criterion E)
- Associations with individuals, events or groups of historical importance (NSW Heritage Criteria A, B & D)
- Aesthetic or technical significance (NSW Heritage Criterion C)
- Ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains (NSW Heritage Criteria A, C, F & G).

This section assesses the heritage significance of the known or potential archaeological remains outlined in Section 3.0. As with other types of heritage items, archaeological remains should be managed in accordance with their significance. Assessment of archaeological significance is undertaken in accordance with 2009 *Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and 'Relics'*.^{'14}

In addition, the following questions posed by Bickford and Sullivan are considered as part of the Archaeological Research Potential (NSW Heritage Criterion E):

- Can the site contribute knowledge that no other resource can?
- Can the site contribute knowledge that no other site can?
- Is this knowledge relevant to general questions about human history or other substantive questions relating to Australian history, or does it contribute to other major research questions?

4.2.1 Archaeological significance assessment

Archaeological significance assessments have been prepared for historical phases for which potential archaeological remains have been identified.

Criteria	Discussion
Archaeological Research Potential (NSW Heritage Criterion E)	 There is nil to low potential for archaeological remains associated with the Phase 1 (c.1788-1846) timber getting and orcharding within the study area. Remains would be highly ephemeral but could include evidence of burning, tree stumps and roots, tree boles, archaeobotanical remains, informal tracks, fence posts, saw pits, isolated artefacts or artefact scatters, field drains, landscape modification, post holes from temporary timber structures, or refuse deposits. If any such remains were to survive, they would likely be heavily disturbed or truncated and would therefore be unlikely to possess archaeological research potential. Such truncated remains of Phase 1 are therefore unlikely to be able to contribute knowledge that no other resource or site can. Such remains are unlikely to be directly relevant to general questions about human history or other substantive questions relating to Australian history.

Table 5. Significance assessment for archaeological remains within the study area.

¹³ NSW Heritage Branch, 2009. Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and 'Relics', pp. 11-13.

¹⁴ NSW Heritage Branch, 2009. Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and 'Relics'.

Criteria	Discussion
	Due to the nil to low archaeological potential, archaeological remains associated with Phase 1 would be unlikely to meet this criterion. However, intact remains would be likely to meet the threshold for local significance
	 There is nil to low potential for archaeological remains associated with the Phase 2 subdivisions (1846-1911) within the study area. Remains would be highly ephemeral and were likely removed or heavily disturbed during later occupation phases. Remains could include tree boles, fence posts, isolated artefacts or artefact scatters, informal tracks, field drains or landscape modification. Remains of Phase 2 are therefore unlikely to be able to contribute knowledge that no other resource or site can. The remains are unlikely to be able to answer general questions about human history or substantive questions relating to Australian history. Truncated remains from Phase 2 would not possess research potential, but substantially intact remains may meet the threshold for local significance.
	Phase 2 would be unlikely to meet this criterion. However, intact remains may meet the threshold for local significance.
	 There is moderate to high potential for archaeological remains associated with the Phase 3 residential development (1912-1940) construction and use of housing, ancillary structures and landscaping.
	 The remains would likely comprise brick, sandstone or concrete foundations, foundation trenches, services, tree boles, timber fence post holes, botanical remains of gardens and hardstands. Artefactual scatters or deposits would be unlikely.
	 The remains relating to the early twentieth-century residential development of Wahroonga would be unlikely to contribute knowledge that no other resource or site can, as contemporaneous built fabric and historical records are well attested. The remains are unlikely to be able to answer general questions about human history or substantive questions relating to Australian history.
	Archaeological remains associated with Phase 3 would not meet the threshold for local or State significance for this criterion.
	 There is high potential for archaeological remains associated with the Phase 4 Institutional use of Neringah (1940-Present) construction and use of institutional structures, continued use and adaptation of earlier houses, new ancillary structures and landscaping.
	 The remains would likely comprise brick or concrete foundations, foundation trenches, services, botanical remains of gardens and hardstands. Artefactual scatters or deposits would be unlikely.
	 The remains relating to the late twentieth-century institutions of Wahroonga would be unlikely to contribute knowledge that no other resource or site can, as contemporaneous built fabric and records are well attested. The remains are unlikely to be able to answer general questions about human history or substantive questions relating to Australian history.
	Archaeological remains associated with Phase 4 would not meet the threshold for local or State significance for this criterion.
Associations with individuals, events or groups of historical	 The study area is associated with Thomas Hyndes and his sawyers from 1822 to 1842, the merchant and brewer, John Terry Hughes, from 1842 to 1843, during Phase 1 (c.1788-1846). Remains would be highly ophemoral and were likely removed or beavily disturbed during
importance (NSW Heritage Criteria A, B & D)	 Remains would be highly ephemeral and were likely removed or heavily disturbed during later occupation phases. Remains could include tree boles, fence posts, isolated artefacts or artefact scatters, informal tracks, field drains or landscape modification.

Criteria	Discussion
	 Although any remains relating to the timber-getting and orchards may not be directly relatable to the owners, it is more likely that remains from camp sites or storage facilities would be associated with the sawyers and orchard workers. The study area is therefore associated with individuals, events or groups of historical importance to the local Wahroonga area. Any potential archaeological remains from Phase 1 would be unlikely to demonstrate a particular or special connection with Thomas Hyndes or John Terry Hughes, but may demonstrate a connection with the workers on the land.
	Archaeological remains associated with Phase 1 would reach the local significance threshold under this criterion if present with sufficient integrity.
	 During Phase 2 (c.1846-1911), the study area is associated with speculator, Adolphus William Young, from 1846 to 1855, the timber merchant and orchardist, John Brown, from 1855 to 1872, Peter Kershler from 1872 to 1885 and Andrew Gibson Blomfield from 1885 to 1888.
	 Remains would be highly ephemeral and were likely removed or heavily disturbed during later occupation phases.
	 Although any remains relating to the subdivisions may not be directly relatable to the owners, it is more likely that earthworks and artefact scatters would be associated with the workers, surveyors and labourers.
	 The study area is therefore associated with individuals, events or groups of historical importance to the local Wahroonga area. Any potential archaeological remains from Phase 2 would be unlikely to demonstrate a particular or special connection with land owners, but may demonstrate a connection with the workers on the land.
	Archaeological remains associated with Phase 1 would reach the local significance threshold under this criterion if present with sufficient integrity.
	 During Phase 3 (1912-1940), the study area is associated with John Mair, Margaret and Andrew Reid and Reid's housekeeper, Farrell, as well as Professor Alexander Mackie, and his wife Annie and their children, Margaret and John Mackie, who were influential in Australian Education.
	The Reid house at 4-6 Neringah Avenue, originally named 'The Haining' but renamed Neringah in 1920/1921, was constructed from fibre-cement with half-timbering decorative features. As Andrew Reid was a partner in James Hardie and Co, a company which specialised in the supply of fibre-cement, the remains of the house would be able to be associated with Reid and the company. However, this association is unlikely to meet the threshold for local significance due to the twentieth- century date and the likely lack of related artefactual deposits, which would otherwise be able to demonstrate uses of the different rooms/areas.
	 As the c.1915 to 1920 brick house at Woonona Avenue at the south-western corner of the study area associated with the well-known educationalists of the Mackie family is still extant, only the yard areas are likely to contain archaeological remains and these are likely to only comprise foundations or isolated artefacts. Such remains would be unlikely to be able to demonstrate a particular or special connection with the Mackie family.
	Archaeological remains associated with Phase 3 would not meet the threshold for local or State significance for this criterion.
	 During Phase 4 (1940-Present), the study area is associated with the Red Cross and members of the Anglican ministry, as well as ex-service patients and university students, doctors, nurses and patients. The nature of the remains from Phase 4, including brick or concrete foundations,

The nature of the remains from Phase 4, including brick or concrete foundations, foundation trenches, services and botanical remains of gardens and hardstands, are likely to be standard features dating to the second half of the twentieth century and early twenty-first century. Such remains would be unlikely to demonstrate a particular or special connection with particular or special connection with individuals, events or groups in the local area.

Criteria	Discussion
	Archaeological remains associated with Phase 3 would not meet the threshold for local or State significance for this criterion.
Aesthetic or technical significance (NSW Heritage Criterion C)	 The potential remains from Phases 1 to 4 would be unlikely to embody distinctive characteristics or changes in technology that are not otherwise known or well-presented elsewhere. Remains from Phases 1 and 2 have nil to low potential and, if present, would be likely truncated or disturbed. Such remains of the orchards, timber-getting and subdivisions would be unlikely to demonstrate aesthetic or technical significance. Although it is recognised that exposed <i>in situ</i> archaeological remains may have distinctive/attractive visual qualities, only rarely are these considered 'important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW'.
	Archaeological remains associated with Phases 1 to 4 would not meet the threshold for local or State significance for this criterion.
Ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains (NSW Heritage Criteria A, C, F & G).	 The potential remains from Phases 1 (c.1788-1846) and 2 (c.1846-1911), would be unlikely to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains due to their nil to low potential and likely truncated and disturbed nature, if present. Although Phases 1 and 2 are significant phases in the history of Wahroonga, such late remains would be unlikely to demonstrate information on the history of the local area that is not available from other sources.
-,-,-	Archaeological remains associated with Phases 1 and 2 would not meet the threshold for local or State significance for this criterion.
	 Although the residential development of Phase 3 (1912-1940) and the institutional use of Neringah of Phase 4 (1940-Present) are significant phases in the history of Wahroonga, such late remains would be unlikely to demonstrate information on the history of the local area that is not available from other sources.
	Archaeological remains associated with Phases 3 and 4 would not meet the threshold for local or State significance for this criterion.

4.3 Summary statement of archaeological significance

The potential remains from Phases 1 (c.1788-1846) and 2 (c.1846-1911) related to timber-getting, orcharding and subdivisions of the study area have been assessed as having nil to low potential. However, if remains from this period were found to be substantially intact, such remains may meet the threshold for local significance for their research value and association with the land owners, sawyers, orchardists, surveyors and labourers. It is unlikely that such archaeological remains would be able to meet the local threshold for aesthetic or technical significance or ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remain due to a lack of integrity. **The archaeological resource pertaining to Phases 1 (c.1788-1846) and 2 (c.1846-1911) have the potential to reach the local significance threshold if present with sufficient integrity.**

The potential remains from Phase 3 (1911-1940) related to the residential development of the study area have been assessed as having moderate to high potential. Although the remains would be associated with the Reid and Mackie families, such remains would be unlikely to be able to demonstrate a particular or special connection. The archaeological resource would be unlikely to contribute knowledge that no other resource or site can and therefore would have little research potential. Likewise, the remains would be unlikely to demonstrate aesthetic or technical significance

or ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains. The archaeological resource pertaining to Phase 3 (1911-1940) would not meet the threshold for local significance.

The potential remains from Phase 4 (1940-Present) related to the institutional use of Neringah as a convalescent home, hostel and hospital have been assessed as having high potential. However, due to their late date, such remains would be unlikely to meet the threshold for local significance through their lack of archaeological research potential, aesthetic or technical significance or ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains that is not otherwise attested by other sources. Despite the association associations with individuals, events or groups of historical importance, including the Red Cross, members of the Anglican ministry, as well as ex-service patients and university students, doctors, nurses and patients, such remains would be unlikely to directly demonstrate a special connection. The archaeological resource pertaining to Phase 4 (1940-Present) would not meet the threshold for local significance.

Overall, the study area is unlikely to contain archaeological remains or relics that would meet the threshold for local or State significance.

Phase of development	Feature or activity	Potential	Significance
Phase 1: Early exploration, land grants, timber-getting and orchards (c.1788- 1846)	Archaeological features associated with low intensity land use and land clearances, as well as temporary camps or storage facilities.	Nil-low	Local (if present with sufficient integrity)
Phase 2: Subdivisions (1846-1911)	Land clearing, landscaping/excavations for subdivisions.	Nil-Low	Local (if present with sufficient integrity)
Phase 3: Residential development (1912-1940)	Construction and use of housing, ancillary structures and landscaping.	Moderate-High	Nil
Phase 4: Institutional use of Neringah (1940-Present)	Construction and use of institutional structures, continued use and adaptation of earlier houses, new ancillary structures and landscaping.	High	Nil

Table 6: Summary of archaeological potential and significance

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

5.1 Description of proposed development

The SSDA seeks approval for the following:

- Site preparation works comprising:
 - Demolition of the Neringah Hospital building, kiosk, and existing at-grade carparks;
 - Clearing of nominated vegetation on the proposed development areas;
 - Bulk earthworks including basement excavation; and
 - Remediation works where necessary across the site.
- Construction and use of an integrated seniors housing and health services facility across two buildings ranging from 4-5 storeys above ground, comprising:
 - 2 basement levels containing minimum of 130 spaces car parking spaces and service dock;
 - 12 residential aged care facility beds (extension to existing Stage 1 provision);
 - 18 palliative care hospice beds (Schedule 3 health services facility);
 - Community healthcare services, including outpatient palliative care, centre for positive aging and Hammond at Home;
 - 57 seniors housing dwellings;
 - On-site administration, amenities, and ancillary operations spaces.
- Ground level and on-building landscaping works, including the provision of a through site pedestrian link connecting Archdale Park and Balcombe Park;
- Public domain works, specifically, regrading of part of the pedestrian walkway known as 'Archdale Walk' to provide accessible connection; and
- Extension and augmentation of infrastructure and services as required.

See the relevant maps and plans below in Figure 12 to Figure 15.



Figure 12: Outline of the site, with the portion of the site subject to the SCC shaded dark red (R4 zone) (HammondCare)



Figure 13: Map showing the proposed impact area within The Site (HammondCare)

The Site

Proposed Development





Figure 14. Plan of proposed development area (Bickerton Masters).

Figure 15: Elevations of the proposed development (Bickerton Masters)



5.2 Development impacts

The proposal would require excavation throughout the study area, including bulk excavation and remediation works. It is therefore assumed that surviving archaeological resources within the study area would be removed or impacted during proposed site works.

However, the study area has been assessed as having nil-low potential to contain an archaeological resource with the potential to reach the local significance threshold and is unlikely to contain archaeological 'relics.'

It is not anticipated that the development would impact on significant archaeological remains.

5.3 Recommended mitigation

It is recommended that an unexpected finds procedure is put in place for the duration of the project.

Unexpected finds procedures are a set protocol for the identification and management of an archaeological find not expected to be located in an area or of a different type than that what has been anticipated. Typically, the procedures involve halting works in the area of the discovery, temporary protection of the find, and contacting a suitably qualified archaeologist for assessment and further management advice.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusions

This HAA has been prepared in support of a State Significant Development Application (SSD-45121248) redevelopment of part of the site at 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga for the purposes of delivering additional community health services, seniors housing, as well as upgraded palliative care facilities that will contribute to the broader operation of 'Neringah Hospital.'

The HAA has found that the subject site has low-nil potential to contain legible archaeological remains that would meet the threshold of a local significance.

The proposal would require excavation throughout the study area, including bulk excavation and remediation works.

Based on the site's nil-low potential to contain archaeological remains, the works are unlikely to result in archaeological impacts.

6.2 Recommendations

Given the unpredicted nature of any subsurface archaeological remains, it is recommended that the proposed works proceed in accordance with the following actions:

Mitigation measure	Description
Unexpected Finds Procedure	An unexpected finds procedure should be implemented for all excavation works. It is recommended that the procedure include the following steps:
	 Cease all activity within the vicinity of the find Leave the material in place and protect it from harm Take note of the details of the find and its location, taker a photograph <i>in situ</i>, preferably with a scale Inform the site manager/area supervisor, who would then inform the superintendent/principal A suitably qualified archaeologist should be contacted to assess the significance of the find and determine management requirements.
	 If the find is identified as being a significant archaeological 'relic,' the following steps should be undertaken: Heritage NSW, Department of Premier and Cabinet (Heritage NSW) would be notified on discovery of a 'relic,' in accordance with Section 146 of the NSW <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> Further archaeological mitigation and/or approvals may be required prior to works recommencing. All relevant construction staff, contractors and subcontractors must be made aware of their statutory obligations for heritage to ensure no archaeological remains are impacted during the proposed works without appropriate mitigation measures in place.

HammondCare Wahroonga, 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga Historical Archaeological Assessment

Mitigation measure	Description
Aboriginal archaeology	Excavation works should proceed under the unexpected finds procedure outlined in the ACHAR for the project. Should Aboriginal objects be uncovered during the construction program, works should cease immediately, and Heritage NSW is to be potified in accordance with Section 89A of
	cease immediately, and Heritage NSW is to be notified in accordance with Section 89A of the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i> . Further approval would be required to impact, harm or remove Aboriginal objects.
Modifications and amended scope	Any modifications, including minor corrections, clarifications, amendments, or additional works beyond the scope of those works assessed in this report would require further archaeological assessment.

7.0 REFERENCES

- Artefact Heritage Services, 2022. 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report. Report prepared for HammondCare.
- Australia ICOMOS 2013. The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for places of cultural significance. Australia ICOMOS, Burwood.
- Godden Mackay, 1998. "Grosvenor Heights", Wahroonga Archaeological Assessment. Report prepared for Chanrich Properties Pty Ltd, November 1998.
- Heritage Council of New South Wales, 2021. Standard Exemptions for Works Requiring Heritage Council Approval.
- NBRS, 2022. *Heritage Impact Statement HammondCare Wahroonga 4-12 Neringah Avenue South, Wahroonga*. Report prepared for HammondCare Wahroonga, November 2022.
- Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners Architects Ply Ltd, 2002. 'Aeolia' 4 Munderah Street Wahroonga, NSW. 2076 Heritage Assessment & Statement of Heritage Impact. Report prepared for Sue O'Reilly at the request of Glendinning Associates. March 2002, p. 30.
- NSW Department of Planning and Environment, 2022. *Planning Secretary's Environmental* Assessment Requirements Seniors Housing Neringah Seniors Housing & Hospital. SSD-45121248. Date of issue: 24/06/2022.
- NSW Government, 2022. 'NSW Government Gazette Government Gazette of the State of New South Wales Number 59–Planning and Heritage Friday'. *Government Gazette*. 18 February 2022. Accessed: https://gazette.legislation.nsw.gov.au/so/download.w3p?id=Gazette_2022_2022-59.pdf (14/11/2022).

NSW Heritage Branch, 2009. Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and 'Relics'.

NSW Heritage Branch, 2009. Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and 'Relics'.

- NSW Heritage Office, 1996. Archaeological Assessment Guidelines.
- NSW Heritage Office, 2002. Statements of Heritage Impact. Update to the NSW Heritage Manual.
- Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) (former), Heritage Division, 2009. Assessing Significance for Archaeological Sites and 'Relics'.

Rod Howard & Associates, 2007. "Rippon Grange", 35 Water Street, Wahroonga Conservation Management Plan. Report prepared for the Department of Community Services. for pp. 9-10.

- Rowland, J., 2008. 'Wahroonga'. *The Dictionary of Sydney*. Accessed: https://dictionaryofsydney.org/entry/wahroonga#ref-uuid=d3b8cc3e-6c96-9306-2cdf-de1a234f8fcc (14/11/2022).
- Sydney Water, 2010. 'Wahroonga Reservoir No.3 (WS 0125)'. Accessed: https://www.sydneywater.com.au/water-the-environment/what-we-are-doing/heritageconservation/heritage-search.html (14/11/2022).



Artefact Heritage

ABN 73 144 973 526 Suite 56, Jones Bay Wharf 26-32 Pirrama Road Pyrmont NSW 2009 Australia +61 2 9518 8411 office@artefact.net.au www.artefact.net.au