

26 February 2026

Meighan Woods
Development Manager
Commercial & Mixed-Use Development
Mirvac Projects Pty Ltd

Dear Meighan,

RE: SEED Stage 1B (SSD-99079487) – Aboriginal Heritage Consistency Report

This Aboriginal Heritage Consistency Report has been prepared by Artefact to accompany a State Significant Development Application (SSDA) SSD-99079487 which supports the staged development of SEED Stage 1.

The SEED Stage 1 Concept Proposal (SSD-19618251) and detailed stage development identified as the Stage 1A Development has been approved on 4 February 2026. SEED Stage 1 (SSD-19618251) establishes a Concept Masterplan for seven (7) industrial buildings and a cafe, subdivision at 1669-1723 and 1669A Elizabeth Drive Badgerys Creek. SEED Stage 1A includes site preparation works the bulk earthworks, road construction, construction and operation of two (2) warehouse buildings (Warehouses 2 and 6).

Mirvac is seeking approval for a new DA for the construction and operation of Warehouses 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8, a café and regional stormwater basin at 1669-1723 and 1669A Elizabeth Drive Badgerys Creek. This forms the second stage of development works envisaged under the SEED Stage 1 Concept Proposal (SSD-19618251) and is referred to as the "SEED Stage 1B".

A concurrent modification application to SEED Stage 1 Concept Proposal and SEED Stage 1A (SSD-19618251) is proposed to update civil design elements and to align with proposed design for SEED Stage 1B.

The legal description of the site as it pertains to SEED Stage 1B is outlined below:

- 1669-1732 Elizabeth Drive, Badgerys Creek – Lot 100, DP1283398
- 1669A Elizabeth Drive, Badgerys Creek – Lot 741, DP 810111

The SEED Stage 1B Development seeks approval for the following:

- Construction of the following warehouse buildings for the purpose of warehouse and distribution centres (including warehouse building GFA, ancillary office GFA, hardstand areas for loading/unloading/vehicular manoeuvring and on-lot car parking):
 - Warehouse 1 (Lot 1) comprising 4,130sqm of GFA and **31** car parking spaces;
 - Warehouse 4 (Lot 4) comprising 8,990sqm of GFA and **55** car parking spaces;
 - Warehouse 5 (Lot 5) comprising 6,840sqm of GFA and **42** car parking spaces;
 - Warehouse 7 (Lot 7) comprising 40,410sqm of GFA and **183** car parking spaces;
 - Warehouse 8 (Lot 8) comprising 21,370sqm of GFA and **98** car parking spaces; and

- Operating hours for Warehouse Buildings 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 for 24 hours, 7 days a week.
- Estate café comprising 300sqm of GFA, 24 car supporting parking spaces as part of the Edge Amenity node. Operating hours for the Estate café from 5am to 5pm, 7 days a week;
- Construction of Sydney Water Regional Stormwater Basin SC09 (through a Developer Works Agreement with Sydney Water Corporation (**SWC**) which will eventually be acquired by SWC);
- Landscaping, including on-lot landscaping and amenity areas, street reserve landscaping and estate amenity nodes;
- Construction of some new on-lot retaining walls to manage level differences between development lots; and
- Estate wayfinding signage.

This proposal concerns the construction and operation of remaining warehouse buildings established under the SEED Stage 1 Concept Masterplan and further to the site preparation works approved under the Stage 1A Development approval.

Modifications to SEED Stage 1

- Re-distribution of warehouse and ancillary office GFA across Warehouse Buildings 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 to align with the proposed SEED Stage 1B designs (net-zero change to the total GFA across these warehouse buildings);
- Minor increase to the café GFA by 150sqm for consistency with SEED Stage 1B requirements;
- Refinement to the approved levels and retaining walls for consistency with SEED Stage 1B requirements. This includes adjustment to Lot 8s FFL as well as refinements to the design of some approved retaining walls;
- Update to the cumulative stormwater management strategy for SEED to reflect changes to the intended development outcome at the Aspect Industrial Estate (AIE) site that is being progressed under a separate application; and
- An optional contingency to modify the interim evaporation basin within the SEED Stage 2 land.

The development sought as part of this proposal and the development under SSD-19618251 will deliver a unified, staged development of the overall Precinct.

Consistency with SEED Stage 1

SEED Stage 1 (SSD-19618251) sought to establish a Concept Masterplan for seven (7) industrial buildings and a cafe, subdivision and detailed development (Stage 1) works at 1699-1723 Elizabeth Drive, Badgerys Creek. SEED Stage 1 identifies 1669C Elizabeth Drive in the operational footprint of the masterplan; however, no works are proposed within the allotment. Development of this allotment will be undertaken by Endeavour Energy.

The development sought as part of this proposal and the development under SSD-19618251 will deliver a unified, staged development of the overall Precinct. The project will be prepared to align and remain cognisant with the construction, access, traffic and other cumulative environmental considerations across both the proposed developments.

Purpose of this Report

This report has been prepared in response to the requirements contained within the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) dated 8 December 2025 and issued for the SSDA (SSD-99079487). Specifically, this report has been prepared to respond to the SEARs requirement and government agency comments issued below.

Relevance to SEARs

The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for the Stage 1B works states the following in regard to Aboriginal heritage:

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage – provide an addendum to the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report prepared for SSD-19618251 developed in consultation with Registered Aboriginal Parties, including an assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and the results of any further archaeological work undertaken.

The proponent contacted Heritage NSW to determine whether an Aboriginal Heritage Consistency Report would be sufficient to assess the Aboriginal cultural heritage impacts of the proposed Stage 1B works given that the project area has previously been assessed through the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) prepared to support the Stage 1A SSD Concept Proposal (SSD-19618251). Heritage NSW provided a response saying that they agreed with the proposed approach (Appendix C); however, they also stated that Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) that had previously registered their interest in the project should be allowed the opportunity to review the Consistency Report and comment upon any assessed impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage.

The purpose of this assessment is to determine whether the Stage 1B works will result in additional impacts to Aboriginal heritage beyond those identified through the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) prepared by Artefact to support the SSD application for the SEED Stage 1A Concept Proposal (SSD-19618251). This report addresses the following:

- The consistency of Aboriginal heritage impacts of the Stage 1A works with the Stage 1B works; and,
- The impacts and recommended management measures in Stage 1A ACHAR, and whether additional impacts as part of the Stage 1B works are expected, and if further management is required.
- Results of the test excavation at the South Creek Crossing transmission works site (AHIMS ID 45-5-6086)
- Information on a site card update to ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259) recently submitted by KNC

This Consistency Report will have been sent to the RAPs for the project to allow them to comment on the assessed impacts of the Stage 1B works. This consultation will be completed by 23 March 2026

and this report will be updated. It is noted that all RAPs have been part of the consultation process for the Stage 1A assessment and approval so have in effect approved management measures and impacts for all Aboriginal heritage items in the Stage 1 study area. The consultation for Stage 1B is being undertaken to inform RAPs of the Stage 1B development and that its impacts will be consistent with those already approved and to meet the SEARs in regards to RAP consultation. Records of this consultation and any comments received from RAPs will be documented as part of the consultation process.


SEED Stage 1A – SSD-19618251

General information

The SEED Stage 1 Concept Proposal (SSD-19618251) has been progressed subject to a separate, detailed stage development identified as the Stage 1A Development which has been approved on 4 February 2026. SEED Stage 1A includes site preparation works the bulk earthworks, road construction, construction and operation of two (2) warehouse buildings (Warehouses 2 and 6).

Stage 1A works and the location of Aboriginal sites within the works area are shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Overlay of SEED Stage 1A works against known sites



Aboriginal heritage

Artefact prepared an ACHAR to support the SSD application for the Stage 1A works (Artefact 2025). A total of 11 Aboriginal sites were identified within the SSD-19618251 study area, comprised of five artefact scatters, five isolated artefacts, and one area of potential archaeological deposit (PAD) (Figure 1: Overlay of SEED Stage 1A works against known sites):

- Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 02 (EP AS 02 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5236), EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-6009) have been assessed as demonstrating high archaeological significance;
- Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 01 (EP IF 01 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5232) and Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 02 (EP IF 02 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5231) have been identified as demonstrating moderate archaeological significance;
- Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 01 (EP AS 01 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5233), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 03 (EP IF 03 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5230), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 04 (EP IF 04 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5331), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 06 (EP IF 06 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5659), and ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259) have been identified as demonstrating low archaeological significance; and,
- Elizabeth Precinct PAD 03 (EP PAD 03 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) has not yet been subject to testing and is of unknown archaeological significance.

The ACHAR determined that EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) would not be impacted by the proposed works under SSD 19618251. The proposed works SSD-19618251 would impact the following identified Aboriginal sites (Figure 1):

- EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
- EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
- EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
- EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
- EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
- EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
- EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)
- EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)
- ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)
- EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-6009)

Based on these findings, the ACHAR recommended that:

- Salvage excavation of EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236), EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-6009) take place;
- Surface artefact sites must be subject to artefact collection prior to the commencement of ground disturbing works:
 - EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
 - EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)

- EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
- EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
- EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
- EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
- ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259); and,
- EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) would not be impacted by the proposed works, therefore no archaeological investigation would be required. Due to proximity to the boundary of the works area, the boundary of this site must be marked on construction and environmental site plans, and barrier fencing should be established outside of the perimeter of the site to physically protect it.

Additional works within the project area

Additional works and heritage assessment have been conducted within the Stage 1 works area to facilitate the development of SEED and regional infrastructure. Through works conducted by KNC as part of the Upper South Creek Advanced Water Recycling Centre (SSI-8609189), the extents of AHIMS ID 45-5-5295 were expanded and incorporate more land within the SEED Stage 1 works footprint. A portion of the newly expanded was destroyed through the SSI works and an additional portion will be accounted for in the Stage 1 SSD salvage excavation methodology.

Further heritage assessments have been conducted within the Stage 1 works area as part of proposed plans to undertake upgrades to Elizabeth Drive and install an interim signalised intersection to support SEED. An ACHAR was prepared to support an application for an AHIP for harm to EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236) and ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259) through the proposed intersection and road upgrade works. In order to mitigate some of this harm to Aboriginal cultural heritage, the ACHAR recommended that salvage excavations of EP AS 02 and a collection of surface artefacts at ED AFT 1 occur prior to the commencement of ground disturbing works. The AHIP application process for the intersection and road upgrade works is currently on-going.

Additionally, as part of the on-going heritage assessments for the installation of an electrical transmission line to support the operation of the SEED, Artefact identified a new Aboriginal site which partially extends into the Stage 1 works area: EEP South Creek Crossing AS01 (AHIMS ID 6086). The transmission line site was located within the extents of EEP S2 PAD1 and EEP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234). Archaeological test excavations were conducted within the area that would be impacted by the transmission line works, and a total of 42 Aboriginal objects (all stone flakes) were retrieved. The presence of these objects led to the site being registered on AHIMS as EEP South Creek AS01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-6086). The transmission line works are seeking approval under a Part 5 Approval Summary Environment Report by Endeavour Energy, as per the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. This site and Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659) will be salvaged and removed under an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) prior to Stage 1B impacts and will therefore not form part of the approval for the Stage 1A or 1B works.

Proposed SEED Stage 1B – SSD-99079487

Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs)

This report has been prepared in response to the requirements contained within the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) dated 8 December 2025 and issued for the

SSDA (SSD-99079487). Specifically, this report has been prepared to respond to the SEARs requirement and government agency comments issued below.

SEARs requirement	Deliverable	Change in assessment for proposed works
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage		
Provide an addendum to the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report prepared for SSD-19618251 developed in consultation with Registered Aboriginal Parties, including an assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and the results of any further archaeological works undertaken.	Consistency letter for justification	Proposed Stage 1B works are consistent with the ACHAR for Stage 1A (SSD-19618251) works.

State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts—Western Parkland City) 2021 – Chapter 4 – Western Sydney Aerotropolis (WPC SEPP)

The following consideration relates to Aboriginal heritage assessment.

Statutory Reference	Relevant Consideration	Response
4.26 Heritage conservation	Requirement for consent Development consent is required for the following— demolishing or moving any of the following or altering the exterior of any of the following (including, in the case of a building, making changes to its detail, fabric, finish or appearance)— a heritage item, an Aboriginal object, a building, work, relic or tree within a heritage conservation area, altering a heritage item that is a building by making structural changes to its interior or by making changes to anything inside the item that is specified in Schedule 2 in relation to the item,	Aboriginal objects have been located within the Stage 1 study area but have been managed under the Stage 1A consent. This has included detailed assessment, Aboriginal consultation, test excavation and salvage excavation which is currently being completed. A clearance memo will be provided for Stage 1A once salvage excavations are completed on March 2026 and the entire study area will be cleared for

Statutory Reference	Relevant Consideration	Response
	disturbing or excavating an archaeological site while knowing, or having reasonable cause to suspect, that the disturbance or excavation will or is likely to result in a relic being discovered, exposed, moved, damaged or destroyed,	development in regards to Aboriginal heritage in accordance with the Stage 1A CoA.
	disturbing or excavating an Aboriginal place of heritage significance,	
	erecting a building on land—	
	on which a heritage item is located or that is within a heritage conservation area, or	
	on which an Aboriginal object is located or that is within an Aboriginal place of heritage significance,	
	subdividing land—	
	on which a heritage item is located or that is within a heritage conservation area, or	
	on which an Aboriginal object is located or that is within an Aboriginal place of heritage significance.	

Aerotropolis Precinct Plan Assessment

The following consideration relates to Aboriginal heritage assessment.

Control	Relevant Consideration	Response
4.3 Aboriginal Culture & Heritage – Recognising Country	RC2 Development applications that propose disturbance to the landscape in areas of moderate, high or very high Aboriginal sensitivity on Figure 4, or include known Aboriginal cultural or archaeological sites, are required to include an assessment of impacts on archaeological and or cultural heritage values and significance. Where specific measures are required to mitigate or avoid impacts, applications are to include a cultural heritage management plan or conservation management plan prior to the issue of a construction certificate.	Aboriginal heritage assessment and archaeological management has been undertaken across the Stage 1B study area under the Stage 1A approval and no impacts will results from the Stage 1B works.
	RC3 Modified trees (carved or scarred) and grinding grooves are to be protected and preserved in situ, and management plans are to be prepared to demonstrate how these items are to be retained and protected.	No modified trees will be impacted


Aerotropolis Phase 2 DCP Assessment

Performance outcome	Action	Response
PO3 The archaeological potential of sites is to be determined as part of detailed site investigations. Aboriginal archaeological sites are conserved, and significant archaeological remains are protected and interpreted.	Any land with the potential to contain archaeological remains is to be subject to detailed investigations and assessment to determine the level of archaeological intervention required. Intervention may include the following: a. Unexpected finds procedure; b. Monitoring during works; or Formal salvage excavation.	Aboriginal objects have been located within the Stage 1 study area but have been managed under the Stage 1A consent. This has included detailed assessment, Aboriginal consultation, test excavation and salvage excavation which is currently being completed. A clearance memo will be provided for Stage 1A once salvage excavations are completed on March 2026 and the entire study area will be cleared for development in regards to Aboriginal heritage in accordance with the Stage 1A CoA.

AHIMS search results

An updated search of the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) was conducted on 29 January 2026 to determine whether any additional Aboriginal sites had been recorded within the Stage 1B works area that might be impacted by the proposed works (Appendix A). The extensive AHIMS search conducted as part of the Stage 1A ACHAR identified that there were eleven registered AHIMS sites within the assessed area, of which ten would be impacted by the proposed Stage 1A works. As demonstrated in Figure 2, which reflects the proposed Stage 1B works against the area impacted by the Stage 1A works and the location of AHIMS sites according to the most recent extensive search, no additional AHIMS sites would be impacted by the Stage 1B works.

Figure 2: Stage 1B plans overlaid against the Stage 1A works area and registered AHIMS sites



Aboriginal heritage

As outlined above, the Stage 1A works would involve harm to various Aboriginal sites within the project area, and archaeological management including salvage excavations, surface collection and exclusion zones have been proposed to mitigate and manage these impacts. As a result of the Stage 1A works and the recommended archaeological management, the Aboriginal objects identified within the works area will be removed and the impact area for Stage 1B will be cleared for Aboriginal heritage constraints.

As a result, Stage 1B will not result in harm to Aboriginal objects

Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

The Stage 1B works will result in no changes to the degree of impact to Aboriginal heritage across the study area in comparison to the Stage 1A works (SSD-19618251).

Aboriginal heritage recommendations

The impact to Aboriginal heritage as a result of the proposed Stage 1B works would not result in any additional impacts to those identified in the ACHAR for the Stage 1A works. As such this letter and the existing ACHAR will fulfill any requirement for the assessment of impacts to Aboriginal heritage for the Stage 1B works.

The recommendations for Aboriginal heritage management from the ACHAR for the Stage 1A works would apply for the proposed Stage 1B works.

Aboriginal stakeholder consultation

To allow RAPs the opportunity to comment on the assessed Aboriginal cultural heritage impacts of the Stage 1B works, a copy of this report was submitted to all registered parties on 23rd February 2026 with comments requested by 23rd March 2026. A record of this correspondence is contained within Appendix B. A summary of the received comments is contained in the table below.

Individual / Organisation	Comment	Action
---------------------------	---------	--------

APPENDIX A: AHIMS RESULTS

SiteID	SiteName	Datum	Zone	Easting	Northing	Context	Site Status **	SiteFeatures	SiteTypes	Reports
45-5-2551	CGD6	AGD	56	292700	6251900	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -	Open Camp Site	
	Contact	Recorders		Dominic Steele Archaeological Consulting				Permits		
45-5-2309	BC/ED1	AGD	56	292260	6249550	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -	Open Camp Site	3346
	Contact	Recorders		Helen Brayshaw				Permits		
45-5-0215	South Creek	GDA	56	293632	6250442	Open site	Valid	Grinding Groove : -	Axe Grinding Groove	362
	Contact	Recorders		Ms.Laila Haglund,Mr.Matthew Kelleher,Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd (Ge				Permits		
45-5-0496	Fleurs1 Fleurs Radio Telescope	GDA	56	293855	6250920	Open site	Partially Destroyed	Artefact : -	Open Camp Site	961,1018,9843 5
	Contact	Recorders		University of Sydney,Mr.Matthew Kelleher,Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd				Permits		
45-5-0528	Fleurs 2 (Fleurs Prospect)	AGD	56	292650	6251150	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -	Open Camp Site	1018
	Contact	Recorders		Richard Wright				Permits	5434	
45-5-2667	B90	AGD	56	291800	6248760	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105389
	Contact	Recorders		Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd				Permits		
45-5-2710	DUKE 9	AGD	56	292500	6251800	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		1345,1539,473 7
	Contact	Recorders		Dominic Steele Archaeological Consulting				Permits		
45-5-2816	IF/1	AGD	56	292300	6251750	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		4737
	Contact	Recorders		Dominic Steele Archaeological Consulting				Permits		
45-5-5240	Elizabeth Drive AFT 2	GDA	56	292088	6249612	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders		Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd,Miss.Kristen Taylor,Mr.Matthew Kelleher,K				Permits		
45-5-2768	B41	AGD	56	292100	6249010	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105389
	Contact	Recorders		Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd				Permits		
45-5-3106	Kemps Creek (KC PAD 1)	GDA	56	295063	6249614	Open site	Valid	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1, Artefact : 1		97456,98064
	Contact	Recorders		Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management see GML,Mr.Matthew Kelleher,Kellehe				Permits		
45-5-4006	artefact scatter PAD 2007-4	GDA	56	295786	6248524	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders		Extent Heritage Pty Ltd - Pyrmont - Individual users,Doctor.Alan Williams,Mr.Mattl				Permits		
45-5-4748	M12 A2	GDA	56	292624	6251214	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders		Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd,Mrs.Nicola Hayes				Permits		
45-5-4749	M12 A4	GDA	56	293785	6251051	Open site	Destroyed	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders		Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd,Mrs.Nicola Hayes,Mr.Matthew Kelleher,]				Permits		
45-5-4750	M12 A3	GDA	56	292725	6251214	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders		Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd,Mrs.Nicola Hayes				Permits		
45-5-4747	M12 A1	GDA	56	292194	6251184	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders		Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd,Mrs.Nicola Hayes				Permits		

SiteID	SiteName	Datum	Zone	Easting	Northing	Context	Site Status **	SiteFeatures	SiteTypes	Reports
45-5-5095	B153	GDA	56	292169	6249253	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105389
	Contact	Recorders	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd, Miss. Jasmine Fenyvesi							
45-5-5096	B152	GDA	56	292043	6249416	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd, Miss. Jasmine Fenyvesi							
45-5-5097	B151	GDA	56	291950	6249517	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd, Miss. Jasmine Fenyvesi							
45-5-5079	B155	GDA	56	292110	6248827	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105389
	Contact	Recorders	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd, Miss. Jasmine Fenyvesi							
45-5-5080	B156	GDA	56	291953	6248581	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105389
	Contact	Recorders	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd, Miss. Jasmine Fenyvesi							
45-5-5104	PAD 2 (Not a site)	GDA	56	294516	6249243	Open site	Not a Site	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd, Miss. Jasmine Fenyvesi, Mr. Matthew Kelleher							
41-5-0014	M12-AS-04	GDA	56	294361	6250957	Open site	Destroyed	Artefact : 1		
	Contact	Recorders	Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - Newcastle, Miss. Chelsea Jones, Mr. Matthew Kelleher							
45-5-5172	B170	GDA	56	292275	6249513	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd, Miss. Jasmine Fenyvesi							
45-5-5058	B121	GDA	56	292147	6248734	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 1		105389
	Contact	Recorders	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd, Mrs. Jo Dibden							
45-5-5259	Elizabeth Drive AFT 1	GDA	56	293377	6249426	Open site	Partially Destroyed	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd, Miss. Kristen Taylor, Mr. Matthew Kelleher, Mr. Matthew Kelleher							
45-5-5230	Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 03 (EPIF 03)	GDA	56	293375	6249980	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont, Ms. Jennifer Norfolk							
45-5-5231	Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 02 (EPIF 02)	GDA	56	293466	6250004	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont, Ms. Jennifer Norfolk							
45-5-5232	Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 01 (EPIF 01)	GDA	56	293416	6249892	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont, Ms. Jennifer Norfolk							
45-5-5233	Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 01 (EPAS 01)	GDA	56	293412	6249873	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont, Ms. Jennifer Norfolk							
45-5-5293	Badgerys Creek West (BCW)	GDA	56	292300	6251255	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		
	Contact	Recorders	Mr. Andrew Costello, Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - North Sydney							
45-5-5294	Badgerys Creek East (BCE)	GDA	56	292790	6251200	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		

SiteID	SiteName	Datum	Zone	Easting	Northing	Context	Site Status **	SiteFeatures	SiteTypes	Reports
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Mr.Andrew Costello,Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - North Sydney							<u>Permits</u> 5434
45-5-5298	BWB	GDA	56	291887	6249830	Open site	Partially Destroyed	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Mr.Neville Baker,Sydney Water - Parramatta,AECOM Australia Pty Ltd - Sydney,Mr.							<u>Permits</u>
45-5-5303	Kemps North West (KNW) PAD	GDA	56	295455	6250265	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Mr.Andrew Costello,Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - North Sydney							<u>Permits</u>
45-5-5304	PCP-8	GDA	56	292790	6251200	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Mr.Andrew Costello,Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - North Sydney							<u>Permits</u>
45-5-5305	Range Road (RR)	GDA	56	292790	6251200	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Mr.Andrew Costello,Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - North Sydney							<u>Permits</u>
45-5-5306	South Creek East (SCE)	GDA	56	293940	6251020	Open site	Destroyed	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Mr.Andrew Costello,Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - North Sydney,Mr.Matthew K							<u>Permits</u>
45-5-5307	South Creek West T1 (SCW T1)	GDA	56	293590	6250980	Open site	Partially Destroyed	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - North Sydney,Mr.Andrew Costello,Mr.Matthew K							<u>Permits</u> 5409,5434
45-5-5308	South Creek West T2 (SCW T2)	GDA	56	293360	6251085	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 1, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : 1		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Mr.Andrew Costello,Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd - North Sydney							<u>Permits</u> 5434
45-5-5316	MRP-OS1	GDA	56	294413	6252254	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105397
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	EMM Consulting - Individual users,Ms.Taylar Reid							<u>Permits</u>
45-5-5234	Elizabeth Precinct PAD 03	GDA	56	293924	6249724	Open site	Valid	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Ms.Jennifer Norfolk							<u>Permits</u> 5409
45-5-5235	Elizabeth Precinct PAD 02	GDA	56	293927	6249529	Open site	Not a Site	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Artefact Heritage and Environment -							<u>Permits</u>

SiteID	SiteName	Datum	Zone	Easting	Northing	Context	Site Status **	SiteFeatures	SiteTypes	Reports
45-5-5236	Elizabeth Precinct PAD 01	GDA	56	293200	6249565	Open site	Valid	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -, Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Artefact Heritage and Environment -							Permits
45-5-5330	Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 05 (EP IF 05)	GDA	56	293287	6249478	Open site	Destroyed	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Ms.Alyce Haast,Mr.Matthew Kelleher							Permits
45-5-5331	Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 04 (EP IF 04)	GDA	56	293336	6249535	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Ms.Alyce Haast							Permits
45-5-5624	Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 03	GDA	56	293235	6250047	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Artefact Heritage and Environment -							Permits
45-5-5625	Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 04	GDA	56	293305	6250048	Open site	Not a Site	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Artefact Heritage and Environment -							Permits
45-5-5623	50 Martin Rd PAD	GDA	56	293227	6248977	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		105389,10586 1
	Contact	Recorders	Kayandel Archaeological Services,Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Ar							Permits 5429
45-5-5696	LR01	GDA	56	292420	6248348	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105867
	Contact	Recorders	City Plan Services - Sydney,Ms.Fenella Atkinson,Coast History & Heritage ,Mr.Jakub							Permits
45-5-5697	LR02	GDA	56	292433	6248429	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105867
	Contact	Recorders	City Plan Services - Sydney,Mr.Jakub Czastka							Permits
45-5-5698	LR03	GDA	56	292425	6248480	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105867
	Contact	Recorders	City Plan Services - Sydney,Mr.Jakub Czastka							Permits
45-5-5699	LR04	GDA	56	292423	6248497	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105867
	Contact	Recorders	City Plan Services - Sydney,Mr.Jakub Czastka							Permits
45-5-5700	LR05	GDA	56	292413	6248501	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105867
	Contact	Recorders	City Plan Services - Sydney,Mr.Jakub Czastka							Permits
45-5-5701	LR06	GDA	56	292327	6248526	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105867
	Contact	Recorders	City Plan Services - Sydney,Mr.Jakub Czastka							Permits
45-5-5702	LR07	GDA	56	292254	6248496	Open site	Valid	Hearth : -		105867
	Contact	Recorders	City Plan Services - Sydney,Mr.Jakub Czastka							Permits
45-5-5663	30-40 Martin Road Artefact Scatter 01	GDA	56	293326	6249023	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Doctor.Michael Lever,Mr.Matthew K							Permits 5409
45-5-5644	BNW	GDA	56	292470	6251665	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Mr.Neville Baker,Sydney Water - Parramatta							Permits 5434
45-5-5659	Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 06 (EP IF 06)	GDA	56	293803	6249967	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders	Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pyrmont,Mr.Gareth Holes							Permits 5409

SiteID	SiteName	Datum	Zone	Easting	Northing	Context	Site Status **	SiteFeatures	SiteTypes	Reports
45-5-5660	Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 05 (EP AS 05)	GDA	56	293129	6249371	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pymont,Mr.Gareth Holes		Permits		
45-5-5679	KC PAD 2	GDA	56	293691	6252166	Open site	Valid	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Austral Archaeology, Miss. Peta Rice		Permits		
45-5-5680	KC PAD 1	GDA	56	293770	6252350	Open site	Valid	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Austral Archaeology, Miss. Peta Rice		Permits		
45-5-5733	EDU Badgerys Creek IF 1	GDA	56	292396	6249614	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Mr. Matthew Kelleher, Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd (Generic users)		Permits		
45-5-5734	EDU South Creek AFT 1	GDA	56	293731	6249390	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Mr. Matthew Kelleher, Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd (Generic users)		Permits		
45-5-5703	PADLR	GDA	56	292270	6248400	Open site	Valid	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		105867
	Contact	Recorders				City Plan Services - Sydney, Ms. Fenella Atkinson, Coast History & Heritage , Mr. Jakub		Permits		
45-5-5750	MR AS 1	GDA	56	294489	6252262	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105397
	Contact	Recorders				Austral Archaeology, Austral Archaeology, Miss. Peta Rice, Miss. Kara Oakley-Smith		Permits		
45-5-5752	MR IF 2	GDA	56	294719	6252318	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		105397
	Contact	Recorders				Austral Archaeology, Austral Archaeology, Miss. Peta Rice, Miss. Kara Oakley-Smith		Permits		
45-5-5921	McGarvie Smith Farm Badgerys Creek AFT 2	GDA	56	291987	6250278	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Mr. Matthew Kelleher, Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd (Generic users)		Permits		
45-5-5922	McGarvie Smith Farm Badgerys Creek AFT 1	GDA	56	292055	6250855	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Mr. Matthew Kelleher, Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd (Generic users)		Permits		
45-5-5923	Lawson Road Badgerys Creek AFT 1	GDA	56	292508	6249053	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Mr. Matthew Kelleher, Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd (Generic users)		Permits		
45-5-5878	South Creek Exeter House TRE 1	GDA	56	293652	6250445	Open site	Valid	Modified Tree (Carved or Scarred) : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Mr. Matthew Kelleher, Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd (Generic users)		Permits		
45-5-6003	285 Aldington Road AS01	GDA	56	295759	6251613	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Biosis Pty Ltd - Wollongong, Mrs. Samantha Keats		Permits		
45-5-6009	EEP2024 AS01	GDA	56	293268	6250881	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	Contact	Recorders				Artefact Heritage and Environment - Pymont, Mr. Ryan Taddeucci		Permits		
45-5-6082	930MR-PAD-02	GDA	56	295413	6251964	Open site	Valid	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		

<u>SiteID</u>	<u>SiteName</u>	<u>Datum</u>	<u>Zone</u>	<u>Easting</u>	<u>Northing</u>	<u>Context</u>	<u>Site Status **</u>	<u>SiteFeatures</u>	<u>SiteTypes</u>	<u>Reports</u>
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>						<u>Permits</u>		
45-5-6086	EEP South Creek Crossing AS01	GDA	56	294116	6249963	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>						<u>Permits</u>		
45-5-6034	55 Lawson Road PAD 01	GDA	56	292424	6249200	Open site	Valid	Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>						<u>Permits</u>		
45-5-6062	285 Aldington Road IF06	GDA	56	295786	6251698	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -		
	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Recorders</u>						<u>Permits</u>		

** Site Status

Valid - The site has been recorded and accepted onto the system as valid

Destroyed - The site has been completely impacted or harmed usually as consequence of permit activity but sometimes also after natural events. There is nothing left of the site on the ground but proponents should proceed with caution.

Partially Destroyed - The site has been only partially impacted or harmed usually as consequence of permit activity but sometimes also after natural events. There might be parts or sections of the original site still present on the ground

Not a site - The site has been originally entered and accepted onto AHIMS as a valid site but after further investigations it was decided it is NOT an aboriginal site. Impact of this type of site does not require permit but Heritage NSW should be notified

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 29/01/2026 for Sammuel Sammut for the following area at Datum :GDA, Zone : 56, Eastings : 291786.0 - 295788.0, Northings : 6248327.0 - 6252372.0 with a Buffer of 0 meters.. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 76

This information is not guaranteed to be free from error omission. Heritage NSW and its employees disclaim liability for any act done or omission made on the information and consequences of such acts or omission.

APPENDIX B: CONSULTATION RECORDS

APPENDIC C: CORRESPONDENCE WITH HERITAGE NSW

Sammuel Sammut

From: Alison Lamond (Heritage NSW) <support@zendesk.environment.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 17 December 2025 1:21 PM
To: Meighan Woods
Subject: Request #65522 has been updated: SEED STAGE 1B (SSD-99079487), 1669-1723 Elizabeth Drive, Badgerys Creek), Heritage NSW (ERS1B2A)

Your request has been updated. To add additional comments, reply to this email.

Hello Meighan,

Thank you for reaching out to Heritage NSW. It is understood that you are seeking advice regarding your proposed approach to address the Aboriginal cultural heritage (ACH) SEARs for SEED STAGE 1B (SSD-99079487). Based on the information provided we understand that:

- The subject area for the proposal is associated with an existing Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment report (ACHAR) that has been prepared for the SEED Stage 1A concept application (SSD-19618251) which is currently at RTS stage 9 hereafter referred to as Stage 1A).
- The SEARs issued for SEED STAGE 1B (SSD-99079487) requires:
 - *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage – provide an addendum to the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report prepared for SSD-19618251 developed in consultation with the Registered Aboriginal Parties, including an assessment of the impacts of the proposed development and the results of any further archaeological works undertaken.*
- To address the ACH SEARs for SEED STAGE 1B (SSD-99079487), you are proposing to prepare an Aboriginal heritage consistency report to assess whether the proposed SEED Stage 1B (SSD-99079487) works will result in additional impacts to Aboriginal heritage than that identified in the Stage 1A ACHAR. Where this consistency report identifies additional impacts (direct or indirect), it is proposed that additional management and mitigation measures would be developed in consultation with the existing Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) established for Stage 1A.

As the land has recently been assessed under the ACHAR for Stage 1 (SSD-19618251), and Aboriginal community consultation remains ongoing, **Heritage NSW generally agrees with your proposed approach.** However, we provide the following **additional advice** to ensure that the ACH SEARs for SEED STAGE 1B (SSD-99079487) are adequately addressed:

1. Recommendations for RAP consultation.

While Heritage NSW supports the use of existing RAP group established for Stage 1A, we require that consultation with RAPs is continuous throughout the assessment and application process. Under our policy and guidelines, breaks in consultation of over six months may not constitute continuous consultation. Additional consultation will be required for the current Stage 1B proposal.

A project update letter must be provided to existing RAPs and should be accompanied by the following supporting documents:

- A copy of the existing Stage 1A ACHAR
- A copy of the Aboriginal heritage consistency report which will form an Addendum to the Stage 1A ACHAR. The consistency report must include but not limited to:

- Details of the Stage 1B proposal and its relationship to the existing SSD-19618251 application
- A summary of the outcomes of the existing Stage 1A ACHAR
- Updated AHIMS and heritage register searches, noting that these must be no older than 12 months at the time of EIS submission as per the requirements of the Code of Practice
- Description of the Stage 1B proposed works
- Updated impact assessment
- Revised management recommendations, including a comparison with those proposed under SSD-19618251
- Updated mapping

1. Requirements for the EIS Stage:

At the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) stage, the following is to be submitted to DPHI/Heritage NSW:

- A copy of the Aboriginal heritage consistency report (with the existing Stage 1A ACHAR included as an appendix). Note that, where any Aboriginal salvage works are completed under a future approval of SEED Stage 1A Concept Proposal (SSD-19618251) the status of these works (including the status of AHIMS sites) must clearly be articulated in the Stage 1B EIS documentation.
- Evidence of additional consultation with RAPs regarding the Stage 1B proposal, including a consultation log and copies of all correspondence sent and received.

Please include a copy of this advice in the Aboriginal heritage consistency report for SEED STAGE 1B (SSD-99079487).

Regards,

Alison Lamond

Heritage NSW

Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW)

T: 02 9873 8500 E: heritagemailbox@environment.nsw.gov.au

<https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/topics/heritage>

Locked Bag 5020 Parramatta, NSW 2124

Monday to Friday, 09:00am - 05:00pm

[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

Heritage NSW will be closed from Thursday 25 December 2025 to Friday 9 January 2026.

The Christmas closedown encourages all areas of the government sector to shut down over the Christmas and New Year period.

Please note that our phone, email and digital channels like the Heritage Management System (HMS) will be unattended during the closedown period. Heritage NSW will not be undertaking usual services during this time, but we look forward to assisting you when we return in 2026.

We will reopen and resume normal services from 9am, Monday 12 January 2026.

We thank each and every one of our customers and stakeholders for their support during 2025 and hope you have an enjoyable end of year festive period.

We acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands and seas upon which we work, walk and live and pay respects to Elders past present and emerging.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email is a service from Heritage NSW. Delivered by [Zendesk](#)

On 10 December 2025 at 1:20:08 am UTC, Simmone Horton support@zendesk.environment.nsw.gov.au wrote:

Your request has been updated. To add additional comments, reply to this email.

Dear Meighan

Thank you for your email regarding **SEED Stage 1B SSD-19618251**.

Your enquiry has been forwarded to the **Major Projects Team**, who will review the matters and respond shortly if a response is required.

If you have any other questions in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact our team.

Your Reference Number: ZD 65522

Kind Regards,

Simmone Horton

Heritage NSW

Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW)

T: 02 9873 8500 E: heritagemailbox@environment.nsw.gov.au

<https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/topics/heritage>

Locked Bag 5020 Parramatta, NSW 2124

Monday to Friday, 09:00am - 05:00pm

[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

Heritage NSW will be closed from Thursday 25 December 2025 to Friday 9 January 2026.

The Christmas closedown encourages all areas of the government sector to shut down over the Christmas and New Year period.

Please note that our phone, email and digital channels like the Heritage Management System (HMS) will be unattended during the closedown period. Heritage NSW will not be undertaking usual services during this time, but we look forward to assisting you when we return in 2026.

We will reopen and resume normal services from 9am, Monday 12 January 2026.

We thank each and every one of our customers and stakeholders for their support during 2025 and hope you have an enjoyable end of year festive period.

We acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands and seas upon which we work, walk and live and pay respects to Elders past present and emerging.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email is a service from Heritage NSW. Delivered by [Zendesk](#)

On 10 December 2025 at 12:20:51 am UTC, Meighan Woods meighan.woods@mirvac.com wrote:

Hi Kosta and Nicole

I hope you are well. Our Project Team had previously been in touch regarding an application DA24/0775 that relates to a site located at 1669-1723 ELIZABETH DRIVE, BADGERYS CREEK

Forgive me if you are not the correct contact, or perhaps you could put me in touch with the correct person.

I am reaching out in relation to a separate application to the same site, referred to as Stage 1B (SSD-19618251). I have attached a letter from Artefact who are our Heritage Consultant (attach 1).

We are seeking advice as to how we should be assessing the Heritage requirements for this application. Rationale for this query is that Mirvac are currently in RTS phase of a Stage 1A application (SSD-19618251), The Stage 1B application is a follow on SSDA which includes the construction and operation of five warehouse/distribution buildings (warehouse 1, 4, 5, 7 & 8), and a café consistent within the concept plan assessed under the Stage 1A application.

As the necessary reports have been prepared under Stage 1A the attached letter is seeking confirmation from Heritage NSW if an Aboriginal Heritage Consistency Report should be prepared to assess if the proposed SEED

Stage 1B (SSD-99079487) works will result in additional impacts to Aboriginal heritage already identified through the completion of the ACHAR for SEED Stage 1A Concept Proposal (SSD-19618251). Based on a preliminary overlay of the proposed plans against the known site, if it unlikely that SEED Stage 1B works will pose additional impacts beyond those proposed by Stage 1A. However, where the Aboriginal Heritage Consistency Report identified that SEED Stage 1B (SSD-99079487) will result in additional impacts (direct or indirect) to Aboriginal heritage, additional management and mitigation measures would be developed. These additional management and mitigation measures would be in consultation with the Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) identified through consultation completed for SEED Stage 1A Concept Proposal (SSD-19618251).

If Heritage NSW could please review and confirm the appropriate approach that would be greatly appreciated.

For information, please refer to the attached documentation for initial advice:

- i. SEARS
- ii. Proposed Stage 1B works (this application SSD-99079487)
- iii. Proposed Stage 1 A Concept Masterplan (application SSD-19618251)

Please reach out if you need any further details.

Many thanks,
Meighan

Meighan Woods
Development Manager
Commercial & Mixed Use Development

T: +61 2 90808836 M: +61 422693393
Level 28, 200 George Street Sydney NSW 2000 Australia

Electronic data transmission disclaimer



*Issued by ratings agency Equifax in relation to Mirvac Constructions Pty Ltd licenced builder in NSW.

Acknowledgement of Country | Mirvac acknowledges Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the Traditional Owners and Custodians of the lands and waters of Australia. We recognise that we all live, work and play on Traditional lands of the oldest continuing culture and pay our respect to Elders past and present.



'Collaborating on Country'
created by Riki Salam (Mualgal, Kaurareg, Kuku Yalanji), We Are 27 Creative.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) named and may contain confidential and/or privileged information.

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and then delete it immediately.

Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender except where the sender expressly and with authority states them to be the views of the NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water.

PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL

APPENDIX D: STAGE 1A ACHAR

Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct – Stage 1 (SSD- 19618251)

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage
Assessment Report

Penrith LGA

Report to Mirvac Projects Pty Ltd

FINAL

March 2025



Artefact Heritage and Environment

ABN 73 144 973 526

Suite 56, Jones Bay Wharf

26-32 Pirrama Road

Pymont NSW 2009

Australia

+61 2 9518 8411

office@artefact.net.au

Document history and status

Revision	Date issued	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date approved	Review type	Revision type
1	23 April 2020	Duncan Jones	Sandra Wallace	24 April 2020	Internal review	Draft
2	1 May 2020	Russell Hogan - Mirvac	Alyce Haast	1 May 2020	Client review	Draft
3	2 June 2020	Duncan Jones	Sandra Wallace	5 June 2020	Internal consistency review	Draft
4	13 Sep 2021	Julia McLachlan	Josh Symons	14 Sep 2021	Internal consistency review	Draft
5	10 December 2021	Duncan Jones	Duncan Jones	10 December 2021	Post-stakeholder review	Draft
6	10 November 2022	Sandra Wallace	Sandra Wallace	10 November 2022	Internal review	Draft
7	23 March 2023	Sandra Wallace	Sandra Wallace	27 March 2023	Updated masterplan	Draft
8	18 March 2024	Ryan Taddeucci	Josh Symons	11 April 2024	Updated masterplan	Draft
9	12 April 2024	Meighan Woods	Meighan Woods	29 April 2024	Client review	Draft
10	24 December 2025	Ryan Taddeucci	Ryan Taddeucci	5 February 2025	Post-stakeholder review	Draft
11	5 February 2025	Meighan Woods	Meighan Woods	6 February 2025	Client review	Final
12	3 March 2025	Ryan Taddeucci	Ryan Taddeucci	3 March 2025	Minor revisions	Final v2

Last saved:	3 March 2025
File name:	ACHAR-240066-Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1-FINAL v2-250303
Author:	Lily Hackett & Gareth Holes
Project manager:	Ryan Taddeucci
Name of organisation:	Artefact Heritage and Environment Pty Ltd
Name of project:	Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct
Name of document:	Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct – Addendum Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report
Document version:	Final

© Artefact Heritage and Environment

This document is and shall remain the property of Artefact Heritage and Environment. 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 and Environment 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

Mirvac Projects (Mirvac) is seeking approval for a development at 1669 – 1732 and 1669a Elizabeth Drive, Badgerys Creek (the study area). The project was declared State Significant Development and was issued the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) SSD-19618251. The proposal includes a concept masterplan, development for the study area for the proposed construction of 7 warehouses with service roads, hardstand, construction of an earth bund to form an interim evaporative basin, open space and amenity nodes.

An analysis of the AHIMS data, review of relevant archaeological reports and desktop research into the environmental character of the local and regional area was conducted to create a predictive model for Aboriginal potential within the study area. These predictions were tested through the completion of five archaeological surveys, utilising 10 survey units and a test excavation program. The combination of desktop and field investigation resulted in:

- A total of 12 Aboriginal sites have been identified within the Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1 (SSD-19618251) study area, comprised of five artefact scatters, six isolated artefacts, and one area of PAD:
 - Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 02 (EP AS 02 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5236), EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending) have been assessed as demonstrating **high archaeological significance**
 - Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 01 (EP IF 01 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5232) and Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 02 (EP IF 02 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5231) have been identified as demonstrating **moderate archaeological significance**
 - Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 01 (EP AS 01 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5233), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 03 (EP IF 03 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5230), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 04 (EP IF 04 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5331), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 05 (EP IF 05 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5330), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 06 (EP IF 06 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5659), and ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259) have been identified as demonstrating **low archaeological significance**
 - Elizabeth Precinct PAD 03 (EP PAD 03 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) has not yet been subject to testing and is of **unknown archaeological significance**
- The proposed works would impact the following identified Aboriginal sites:
 - EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
 - EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
 - EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
 - EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
 - EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)
 - EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
 - EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
 - EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)
 - EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)
 - ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)
 - EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending)

- EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) would not be impacted by the proposed works.

Based on these findings, the following recommendations are made

- It is recommended that salvage excavation of EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236), EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending) take place.
- If harm is unavoidable, the following surface artefact sites must be subject to artefact collection prior to the commencement of ground disturbing works:
 - EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
 - EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
 - EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
 - EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
 - EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
 - EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)
 - EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
 - ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)
- EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) would not be impacted by the proposed works, therefore no archaeological investigation would be required. Due to proximity to the boundary of the works area, the boundary of this site must be marked on construction and environmental site plans, and barrier fencing should be established outside of the perimeter of the site to physically protect it.
- If changes are made to the proposal that would result in impacts to areas not assessed by this report, additional Aboriginal heritage assessment would be required.
- Consultation with the RAPs would continue throughout the life of the project to facilitate involvement in the proposed salvage works, long term management of retrieved Aboriginal objects and the assessment of unexpected finds.

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Project brief.....	1
1.2	Description of the study area.....	1
1.3	Objectives	1
1.4	Statutory framework	2
1.5	Secretary’s Environmental Assessment Requirements	2
1.6	Limitations and constraints	2
1.7	Authorship and acknowledgements	3
2.0	Summary of consultation.....	5
2.1	Aboriginal stakeholder consultation.....	5
2.2	Stage 1: April – May 2019	5
2.2.1	Agency letters	5
2.2.2	Advertisement.....	5
2.2.3	Registration of Aboriginal parties.....	5
2.3	Review of draft ACHAR methodology and test excavation methodology: November – December 2019	6
2.4	Participation in test excavation: January 2020	8
2.5	Review of draft ACHAR: May 2020	9
2.6	Project update 1 and 2: November 2020 and May 2021.....	10
2.7	Second RAP review of draft ACHAR report: September – October 2021	10
2.8	Third RAP review of draft ACHAR report: November – October 2022.....	11
2.9	Updates to maintain consultation: February 2024.....	11
2.10	Amended test excavation methodology: September – October 2024.....	11
2.11	Fourth RAP review of draft ACHAR report: December 2024 – January 2025	12
2.12	Ongoing consultation	12
3.0	Summary and analysis of background information	13
3.1	Historical background and land use	13
3.2	Archaeological background	18
3.3	AHIMS search.....	23
3.4	Environmental background.....	24
3.4.1	Geology and soils	24
3.4.2	Hydrology and vegetation	25
3.5	Regional predictive models	29
4.0	Summary of field investigations.....	31
4.1	Survey – March 2019	31
4.2	Test excavation – February 2020.....	32

4.3	Survey – April 2020	33
4.4	Survey – August 2021	33
4.5	Survey – October 2022.....	33
4.6	Survey – March 2024	34
4.7	Survey – September 2024.....	35
4.8	Test excavation – December 2024.....	35
4.9	Summary	36
5.0	Cultural heritage values	39
5.1	Methodology	39
5.1.1	Cultural landscape	39
5.1.2	Types of values.....	39
5.2	Identified Aboriginal cultural heritage values	40
6.0	Significance assessment	41
6.1	Significance assessment criteria	41
6.1.1	Historic value	41
6.1.2	Aesthetic value	42
6.1.3	Socio/cultural value	42
6.1.4	Scientific value.....	42
7.0	Impact assessment.....	46
7.1	Proposed works	46
7.2	Aboriginal heritage impact	48
7.3	Ecological Sustainable Development principles.....	50
7.3.1	The integration principle	50
7.3.2	The precautionary principle	50
7.3.3	The principle of intergenerational equity	50
7.4	Cumulative impacts	51
8.0	Management and mitigation measures	52
8.1	Guiding principles	52
8.2	Options to avoid or mitigate harm.....	52
8.2.1	Archaeological salvage.....	53
8.2.2	Site conservation	54
8.3	Ongoing consultation with Aboriginal stakeholder groups	54
8.4	Changes to the project area	54
9.0	Archaeological Salvage Excavation methodology	55
9.1	Research questions	55
9.2	Excavation approach and methodology	56
9.2.1	Sample strategy.....	56
9.2.2	Excavation procedure	57

9.2.3	Sieving and artefact recovery	57
9.2.4	Residue and use-wear analysis.....	57
9.2.5	Soil sampling method	58
9.2.6	Human remains	58
9.3	Surface collection	59
9.4	Post-fieldwork tasks.....	60
9.4.1	Analysis of recovered material	60
9.4.2	Reporting	61
9.4.3	Site Recording Forms	62
9.5	Temporary and long-term care and management of retrieved Aboriginal objects	62
10.0	Conclusion	63
11.0	References	65
Appendix A – Test Excavation Report 2025		A
Appendix B – EEP Stage 2 ASR 2024		B
Appendix C – ACHAR 2022.....		C
Appendix D – Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence Report 2024		D
Appendix E – Consultation records		E

FIGURES

Figure 1: Study area	4
Figure 2: 1955 Aerial image	15
Figure 3: 2002 Aerial image	16
Figure 4: 2011 Aerial image	17
Figure 5: Area of PAD identified by Brayshaw. Location of PAD indicated by number in a circle (1995)	21
Figure 6: Potentially sensitive landscapes (illustrated by dashed line) within the Penrith LGA approximate location of current study area in red	22
Figure 7: AHIMS extensive search	27
Figure 8: AHIMS detail search	28
Figure 9: Survey units.....	37
Figure 10: AHIMS Sites and PADs within greater project boundary	38
Figure 11: Master plan (Mirvac, 11 February 2025)	47
Figure 12: Impact of the proposed works on AHIMS sites located within the study area	49

TABLES

Table 1: SEARs requirements.....	2
Table 2: Summary of RAP review comments.....	6
Table 3: RAP representatives participating in test excavations.	8
Table 4. Summary of Aboriginal stakeholder comments on the draft ACHAR.....	9
Table 5: Summary of comments on draft revised ACHAR.....	10
Table 6: Summary of comments on draft revised ACHAR.....	11
Table 7: Summary of comments on draft amended test excavation methodology	11
Table 8: Summary of comments on draft revised ACHAR – version 4	12
Table 9: Previous archaeological studies near the study area.....	18
Table 10: Frequency of site features in AHIMS search results	23
Table 11: Comparison of soils from Geotech (PSM Consulting 2024) and Test Excavation (Artefact 2020a).....	26
Table 12: Summary of archaeological investigations.....	31
Table 13: Summary of archaeological features identified in each survey unit, March 2019.	32
Table 14: Summary of archaeological features identified in each survey unit, August 2021.....	33
Table 15: Summary of archaeological features identified in each survey unit, October 2022.	34
Table 16: Summary of archaeological features identified in each survey unit, March 2024.	34
Table 17: Cultural heritage values identified for the study and surroundings.	40
Table 18: Significance assessment for sites within the study area.	44
Table 19: Impact assessment	48
Table 20: Summary of recommendations	52

NOTE ON LANGUAGE IN QUOTES

A number of quotes used in this report come from documents written in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by European observers. They have been included because they provide information on the lives of Aboriginal people in the region, though the language used and views expressed by these writers can be offensive and distressing.

GLOSSARY OF TECHNICAL TERMS

ACHAR	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report
AHIMS	Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System
AHIP	Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit
ALR Act	<i>Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983</i>
Artefact Heritage	Artefact Heritage Services Pty Ltd
ATR	Archaeological Technical Report
ATSIHP Act	<i>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984</i>
BP	Before Present (that is 1950)
CHL	Commonwealth Heritage List
Code of Practice	Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales
Consultation Requirements	Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010
DECCW	Department of Environment Climate Change and Water (now Heritage NSW, DCCEEW)
EP&A Act	<i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>
EPBC Act	<i>Environment Protection and Diversity Conservation Act 1999</i>
GPS	Global Positioning System
Guide	Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW (OEH 2011)
ha	hectares
Heritage NSW, DCCEEW Environment and Water	Heritage NSW, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the
km	Kilometre
LALC	Local Aboriginal Land Council
LEP	Local Environmental Plan
LGA	Local Government Area
m	metres
mm	millimetres
NPW Act	<i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i>

NTSCorp	Native Title Service Provider for Aboriginal Traditional Owners in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory
OEH	Office of Environment and Heritage (now Heritage NSW, DCCEEW)
PAD	Potential Archaeological Deposit
RAP	Registered Aboriginal Party

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project brief

Mirvac Projects (Mirvac) is seeking approval for a development at 1669 – 1732 and 1669a Elizabeth Drive (Figure 1), Badgerys Creek (the study area). The project was declared State Significant Development and was issued the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) SSD-19618251. The proposal includes a concept masterplan, development for the study area for the proposed construction of 7 warehouses with service roads, hardstand, construction of an earth bund to form an interim evaporative basin, open space and amenity nodes.

1.2 Description of the study area

The study area (Figure 1) is located north of Elizabeth Drive, at 1669 – 1732 Elizabeth Drive (Lot 100, DP 1283398) and 1669a Elizabeth Drive (Lot 741, DP 810111). The study area extends into a portion of the road corridors of Elizabeth Drive and Martin Road. The study area is within the Penrith Local Government Area (LGA) and the Western Sydney Priority Growth Area and the Badgerys Creek Precinct of the Western Sydney Aerotropolis. The study area is located within the boundaries of Deerubbin Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC) and Gandangara LALC and within the Parish of Claremont within the County of Cumberland. The area north of Elizabeth Drive is within Deerubbin LALC, and the area south of Elizabeth Drive is within Gandangara LALC. Wianamatta-South Creek runs along the eastern and southeastern boundary of the study area. The study area is presently a rural property and forms part of a sub-precinct of the broader EEP.

1.3 Objectives

The objectives of this report include:

- Assess the Aboriginal cultural heritage values of the study area, including archaeological and community cultural values, and the significance of identified values
- Identify Aboriginal cultural heritage values that may be impacted by the works including consideration of cumulative impacts, and measures to avoid significant impacts
- Ensure appropriate Aboriginal community consultation in the assessment process
- Identify and describe any recommended further investigations, mitigation and management measures required.

This report includes:

- A description of the scope of the project and the extent of the study area
- A description of Aboriginal community involvement and consultation with the Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs)
- A significance assessment of the study area, including a description of identified cultural and archaeological values
- A description of the statutory requirements for the protection of Aboriginal heritage
- An impact assessment for recorded Aboriginal sites and areas of archaeological potential

- Provision of measures to avoid, minimise, and if necessary, offset the predicted impacts on Aboriginal heritage values
- A description of the proposed works extent and recommended mitigation measures

1.4 Statutory framework

This report has been prepared in accordance with the following:

- Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW (The Guide) (OEH 2011)
- Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (the Code of Practice) (DECCW 2010a)
- Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (Consultation Requirements) (DECCW 2010b)

1.5 Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements

The project was declared a State Significant Development (SSD) and was issued SEARs on 15 June 2021 (amended 31 August 2022 and 26 August 2024). The requirements specific to Aboriginal heritage, and where these are addressed in this report, are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: SEARs requirements.

Requirements	Report reference
Heritage	
Identify and describe the Aboriginal cultural heritage values that exist across the development and document in a complete Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR)	This report is an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report. Aboriginal cultural heritage values are identified and described in Section 5.0.
Consultation with Aboriginal parties including local Aboriginal Council must be undertaken and documented in the ACHAR	Consultation with Aboriginal parties was undertaken in accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (Consultation Requirements) (DECCW 2010b). The consultation process is summarised in Section 2.0 and documentation is provided in Appendix E.
A description of the impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage values and associated mitigation measures must be included in the ACHAR.	The impacts from the proposal are described in 7.0 Section Management and mitigation measures are outlined in Section 8.0.

1.6 Limitations and constraints


Background research completed to inform the development of this report was limited to existing and publicly accessible sources of information. The findings of archaeological assessments cited in the

report were not independently verified except where inconsistencies within the documents were identifiable.

1.7 Authorship and acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Lily Hackett (Heritage Consultant, Artefact Heritage), Katherine Douglas (Graduate Heritage Consultant), and Ryan Taddeucci (Principal, Artefact Heritage), with review and technical support provided Josh Symons (Technical Director, Artefact Heritage). Artefact would like to acknowledge the input from the Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) for the project.

Figure 1: Study area



2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION

2.1 Aboriginal stakeholder consultation

Aboriginal community consultation has been completed in accordance with the Consultation Requirements (DECCW 2010a) and the *National Parks and Wildlife Regulation 2019*. A consultation log has been maintained which details all correspondence with the registered Aboriginal parties for the ACHAR. The consultation log and copies of correspondence are included in the appendices. The below consultation was complete as part of the previous ACHAR (Artefact 2022, Appendix C). Because this is an addendum ACHAR for the same project, consultation for this ACHAR will continue from Stage 4.

2.2 Stage 1: April – May 2019

2.2.1 Agency letters

In accordance with Section 4.1.2 of the Consultation Requirements, Artefact Heritage corresponded with the following organisations by email on 18 April 2019. Details of Aboriginal people who may hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the Aboriginal significance of Aboriginal objects and/or places within the local area were requested:

- Office of Environment and Heritage (now Heritage NSW)
- Deerubbin LALC
- The Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983
- National Native Title Tribunal
- NTSCORP
- Penrith City Council
- Greater Sydney Local Land Services

2.2.2 Advertisement

In accordance with Section 4.1.3 of the Consultation Requirements, an advertisement was placed in the Koori Mail and the Liverpool Leader on 24 April 2019 inviting the participation of Aboriginal people who may hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the Aboriginal significance of Aboriginal objects and/or places within the local area.

2.2.3 Registration of Aboriginal parties

In accordance with Section 4.1.3 of the Consultation Requirements, invitations to register an interest in the project were sent by email or letter to all those people identified on 2 May 2019. As a result of the interest letters and the advertisement, 25 individuals/organisations responded. They included the following:

- Amanda Hickey Cultural Services
- Murra Bidgee Mullangari Aboriginal Corporation
- Butucarbin Aboriginal Corporation
- Didge Ngunawal Clan

- Darug Aboriginal Land Care
- Merrigarn
- Yulay Cultural Services
- Woronora Plateau Gundangara Elders Council
- Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation
- A1 Indigenous Services
- Darug Land Observations
- Barking Owl Aboriginal Corporation
- Widescope
- BH Heritage Consultants
- Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants
- Barraby Cultural Servies
- Yurrandaali Cultural Servies
- Kawul Cultural Services
- Wurrumay Cultural Services
- Goobah
- Cullendulla
- Biamanga
- Murramarang
- Darug Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessments
- Deerubbin LALC

In accordance with Section 4.1.6 of the Consultation Requirements, a list of the Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) was issued to Heritage and Deerubbin and Gandangara LALC on 30 May 2019.

2.3 Review of draft ACHAR methodology and test excavation methodology: November – December 2019

The draft test excavation methodology was issued to RAPs on 4 November 2019 with comments requested by 2 December 2019. The draft ACHAR methodology was issued to RAPs on 8 November 2019 with comments requested by 9 December 2019.

Comments were received from 11 RAP groups regarding the test excavation or ACHAR methodology. All comments were in general supportive of the proposed test excavation and assessment methodology. Additional comments relevant to the ACHAR methodology are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Summary of RAP review comments

Person/RAP group	Comment	Artefact response
Vicki Slater/ Kawul Cultural Services	Thanks for providing test excavation methodology	Noted

Person/RAP group	Comment	Artefact response
Paul Boyd & Lilly Carrol/ Didge Ngunawl Clan	DNC is happy with the methodology and eager for survey and test excavation. DNC have experience in area with Navin Officer and Neville Baker	Noted
Justine Coplin/ Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation	Support recommendations set out in the report	Noted
Ryan Johnson/ Murra Bidgee Mullangari Aboriginal Corporation	Supports ACHAR methodology	Noted
Ryan Johnson/ Murra Bidgee Mullangari Aboriginal Corporation	Supports the test excavation methodology	Noted
Glenda Chalker/ Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants	Requested hard copy of the test excavation methodology	Provided
Glenda Chalker/ Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants	Confirmed receipt of hardcopy of methodology	Noted
Glenda Chalker/ Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants	Provided feedback on test excavation methodology. Recommended test excavation only employ wet sieving. Noted that many colonial homesteads were built on Aboriginal Campsites. Suggested that historic heritage investigations consider the potential of Aboriginal objects being present	It is anticipated that all material excavated will be wet sieved. The area proposed to be subject to non-Aboriginal excavation has not been identified as an area of Aboriginal archaeological potential. An unexpected finds policy has been incorporated into the Non-Aboriginal testing program in the event that Aboriginal objects are recovered from test excavation.
Justine Coplin/ Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation	Support recommendations set out in the report. Would like surface collection to be added to the methodology	Surface collection cannot be undertaken during test excavation under the code of practice. This comment will be noted for inclusion in the ACHAR report and may be recommended as a mitigation measure
Amanda Hickey/ Amanda Hickey Cultural Services	Holds strong cultural knowledge towards the land of western Sydney. Have stories of land and significant sites throughout western Sydney. Interested in fieldwork	Noted
Lee Field/ Barraby Cultural Services	Reviewed and agreed with the proposed ACHAR assessment methodology	Noted

Person/RAP group	Comment	Artefact response
Lee Field/ Barraby Cultural Services	Supports the test excavation methodology for the project	Noted
Bo Field/ Yurrandaali Pty Ltd	Supports ACHAR methodology	Noted
Arika Jalomaki/ Yulay Cultural Services	Reviewed ACHAR methodology and supported it	Noted
Basil Smith/ Goobah	Supports the test excavation methodology for the project	Noted
Carolyn Hickey/ A1 Indigenous Services	Supports test excavation methodology and would like to be involved in field work	Noted
Carolyn Hickey/ A1 Indigenous Services	Supports assessment methodology and would like to be involved in field work	Noted

2.4 Participation in test excavation: January 2020

From the 28 January 2020, invitations to participate in fieldwork were sent out to several RAP groups who had provided feedback during the initial stages of the consultation process. Table 3 identifies the RAP representatives who participated in the test excavations.

Table 3: RAP representatives participating in test excavations.

Personnel	Organisation
Ian Davies	Barraby Cultural Services
Arika Jalomaki	Wurrumay Pty Ltd
Adam King	Didge Ngunawal Clan (DNC)
Mark Dutton	Goobah
Amanda Hickey	Amanda Hickey Cultural Services
Brayden McDougall	A1 Indigenous Services
Steven Knight	Deerubbin LALC
Shelley Weldon	Deerubbin LALC

Personnel	Organisation
Lana Wedgewood	Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation
Tylah Blunden	Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation
Rebecca Chalker	Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants Aboriginal Corporation
Daniel Chalker	Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants Aboriginal Corporation

2.5 Review of draft ACHAR: May 2020

A copy of the draft ACHAR (Artefact Heritage 2020) was sent to the RAPs on 1 May 2020 with comments due by 30 May 2020. At the end of the consultation period, three RAP groups commented on the findings. A summary of these comments is provided in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Summary of Aboriginal stakeholder comments on the draft ACHAR

Person/ RAP group	Comment	Response
Glenda Chalker/ Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants	Queried whether silcrete cobbles identified within ACHAR were recorded as manuports Noted that PAD 03 should not be impacted and should be fenced prior to earthworks. Noted that PAD 03 is likely to contain subsurface material. Suggests that the PAD extent is extended to the elbow of the creek. Requests clarity regarding the environmental protection area. Noted that cumulative impacts could accumulate to the total loss of Aboriginal heritage in this area. Noted preservation of PAD 03 will allow for intergenerational equity. Recommended excavated artefacts should be reburied within the PAD03 area	Silcrete cobbles identified during survey were not recorded as manuports as they were located within the portion of the study area which had been subject to landform modification associated with the placement of a large amount of fill across portions of survey unit 1. This has been further clarified in the discussion of survey unit 1 within the ACHAR PAD03 will be demarked prior to earthworks. The environmental protection area encompasses PAD 03 and is inclusive of the entire portion of the study area outside of the AHIP application area Comments on cumulative impact and intergenerational equity have been noted Artefacts are proposed to be reburied within the vicinity of PAD 03 within the environmental protection area. As PAD 03 is not located within the proposed AHIP area, actions which may result in harm to Aboriginal objects which may be located within PAD 03 cannot be undertaken.

Person/ RAP group	Comment	Response
Justine Coplin/ Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation	Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation notes that a high amount of groups were consulted, with many groups consulted not from the local area. Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation do not support the input of any groups who are not from the local area. Supports the remainder of the report	In accordance with Section 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 of the Consultation Requirements, consultation must occur with all groups that express interest in the project. These concerns have been noted.
Carolyn Hickey/ A1 Indigenous Services	Has reviewed the draft ACHAR and supports the document	None required

2.6 Project update 1 and 2: November 2020 and May 2021

An update on the status of the project was issued to all RAPs on 13 November 2020. The update advised that lodgement of an AHIP application was pending the receipt of applicable development consent. On 10 May 2021, a project update was issued to all RAPs noting that the proponent was investigating alternative approval pathways.

2.7 Second RAP review of draft ACHAR report: September – October 2021

The project approval pathway was modified to be consistent with an SSD application with changes to the proposed development. SEARs for the SSD were issued on 15 June 2021 which required an ACHAR for the proposed development. As such, the ACHAR was updated to reflect these changes.

The updated ACHAR was issued to RAPs on 15 September 2021 for review and comment for a 28-day period. Comments received by RAPs during this additional 28-day review period are provided in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Summary of comments on draft revised ACHAR

Person/RAP group	Comment	Artefact response
Lilly Carroll/ Didge Ngunawal Clan	The RAP group was happy to provide cultural knowledge of the area for the project	No response required
Steven Hickey/ Widescope	The RAP group supported the recommendations outlined in the ACHAR	No response required
Basil Smith/ Goobah	The RAP group supported the findings and recommendations of the updated ACHAR	No response required

2.8 Third RAP review of draft ACHAR report: November – October 2022

Following amendment to the SEARs on 22 August 2022 and a revision to the extent of the study area, the ACHAR was updated. The updated ACHAR was issued to RAPs on 15 November 2022 for review and comment for a 28-day period. Comments received by RAPs during this additional 28-day review period are provided in Table 5 below.

Table 6: Summary of comments on draft revised ACHAR

Person/RAP group	Comment	Artefact response
Glenda Chalker, Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants	The RAP group requested a hard copy of the report	No response required
Basil Smith, Goobah	The RAP group asked to be kept informed	No response required
Ryan Johnson, Murra Bidgee Mullangari Aboriginal Corporation	The RAP group endorsed the recommendations in the updated ACHAR	No response required

2.9 Updates to maintain consultation: February 2024

In February 2024 an update on the status of the project was issued to all RAPs. The update provided a description of amendment to the proposed works and to re-establish consultation.

2.10 Amended test excavation methodology: September – October 2024

As a result of the amended design, a test excavation methodology was prepared and issue to the RAPs on 18 September 2024 requesting submissions by 16 October 2024. At the end of the review period two responses were received, summarised in Table 7.

Table 7: Summary of comments on draft amended test excavation methodology

Person/RAP group	Comment	Artefact response
Arika Jalomaki/ Wurrumay Pty Ltd	Read and agrees with the methodology	No response required
Lilly Carrol/ Didge Ngunawl Clan	Read and agrees with the methodology	No response required

2.11 Fourth RAP review of draft ACHAR report: December 2024 – January 2025

On 24 December 2024 a draft version of this ACHAR was issued to the RAPs requesting comment by 28 January 2025. At the end of the review period one response was received, summarised in Table 7.

Table 8: Summary of comments on draft revised ACHAR – version 4

Person/RAP group	Comment	Artefact Heritage response
Lilly Carrol/ Didge Ngunawl Clan	Happy with the methodology and submissions	No response required

2.12 Ongoing consultation

In accordance with Section 4.4.5 of the Consultation Requirements, the finalised version of this ACHAR for Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1 (State Significant Development – 19618251) will be issued to the RAPs. Consultation with the RAPs would continue throughout the life of the project to facilitate involvement in the proposed salvage works, long term management of retrieved Aboriginal objects and the assessment of unexpected finds.

3.0 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Information provided in this section has been summarised from the previous phases of reporting completed by Artefact Heritage for the project. See Appendice A – C for additional information.

3.1 Historical background and land use

The historical period in New South Wales began with European land settlement in 1788 when Governor Philip claimed possession of the land now known as Australia, on behalf of the British Government. The documentary evidence relating to this period helps us to better understand the patterning of European settlement and to contextualise its material remains.

Elizabeth Drive dates from the early 1800s and was originally constructed as a ‘corduroy’ road, using round logs as a base. It was established to provide access to the areas’ land grants and was originally known as the Orphan School Road as it extended west from the Orphan School in what is now Bonnyrigg. Its name was later changed to Mulgoa Road, in reference to its western extent, but subsequently changed again in 1952 to honour the visit of Queen Elizabeth II.

In 1809 James Badgery was granted 840 acres, which was revised to 640 following Macquarie’s cancellation of the original grant and re-issuance of the grant in 1812. The grant lies between Badgerys Creek and Wianamatta-South Creek, north of Elizabeth Drive. He built the homestead and named the property Exeter Farm after the place in England near where he was born.

The European settlement at Exeter Farm resulted in the eviction of Aboriginal people within Badgerys lands although there is no reported evidence to suggest that this involved bloodshed. It is further suggested that a small Aboriginal group were permitted by Badgerys to camp on Wianamatta-South Creek (Hardy 1989: 19).

Governor Macquarie visited Exeter Farm in November 1810 on his first inspection of the interior of the colony noting in his journal that:


Called first at Badgery's Farm close on the left Bank of the South Creek, where I was much pleased to find a good Farm House built, a good Garden, and a considerable quantity of ground cleared

In the 1880s Exeter Farm was subdivided as enclaves of small 30 to 40 acre leased acreages. From the 1920s under the provisions of the Soldier Settlement Act 1919 further portions of James Badgery’s early grant were divided. Exeter Farm was at that time in the ownership of the Stivens family, who later sold a portion of Exeter Farm to Ern Kent. In the 1930s, Kent sold his property to Peter Nobbs, who moved into the homestead with his family to pursue dairying (Donald and Gulson 1996).

Aerial imagery from 1955 onwards indicates that the area was predominantly used for farming and animal grazing. The 1955 aerial image shows three buildings within the study area and their associated ancillary structures (Figure 2). The area appears largely cleared with a few remnant stand of trees predominately in the western portion of the site. It is clear that portions of the study area were subject to agricultural practices as is evidenced by the clear boundaries of crop rows particularly in the eastern portion of the site. Several dams are visible in the early aerial images. Land-use in the study area remains fairly static throughout the 1960s through to the 1990s. By 2002, new animal enclosures are visible in the northern portion of the study area and an additional dam is constructed within the confluence of a natural drainage channel in the southeast (Figure 3).


Between 2009 and 2011 the site underwent a considerable change with a large quantity of fill deposited in the northeast portion of the study area (Figure 4). Anecdotal evidence indicates that some landowners at this time were taking in large quantities of soil in need of disposal from other areas. To the west of the study area is a landfill site known as the Cleanaway Kemps Creek Resource Recovery Park. This landfill site was established, by Suez, in the early 1990s and was originally the site of a shale and clay quarry (Suez 2020). Select Civil contracting service has been operating the Suez Resource Recovery Park Kemps Creek since 2011 (Select Civil, 2019). The operation of the Suez Resource Recovery Park by Select Civil coincides with the importation of fill within the study area shown in the 2011 aerial image (Figure 4). By 2012, a small heavy vehicle parking area was established in the southern portion of the study area but otherwise the site remains relatively undeveloped to the present day. In 2021 Cleanaway entered into an agreement with Suez to purchase post collection waste assets in Sydney, this included the non-putrescible landfill at Kemps Creek.

Figure 2: 1955 Aerial image




Document Path: C:\Users\MDouglas\OneDrive - Artefact Heritage Services Pty Ltd\GIS\GIS_Mapping\240066_Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1 - Temp Berm & Basin\MXD\240066_Historical Overlays_v5_120225.mxd

Figure 3: 2002 Aerial image



Document Path: C:\Users\MDouglas\OneDrive - Artefact Heritage Services Pty Ltd\GIS\GIS_Mapping\240066_Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1 - Temp Berm & Basin\MXD\240066_Historical Overlays_v5_120225.mxd

Figure 4: 2011 Aerial image



Document Path: C:\Users\MDouglas\OneDrive - Artefact Heritage Services Pty Ltd\GIS\GIS_Mapping\240066_Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1 - Temp Berm & Basin\MXD\240066_Historical Overlays_v5_120225.mxd

3.2 Archaeological background

A number of archaeological investigations have been completed in the vicinity of the study area. These have generally been associated with the development of infrastructure and urban release projects. The following discussion presents a review of the most recent and relevant studies and aims to provide contextual information for the current study area. These are summarised in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Previous archaeological studies near the study area

Report	Summary
Elizabeth Drive Upgrade Archaeological Survey for Aboriginal Sites (Brayshaw 1995)	Brayshaw investigated Aboriginal heritage for the Elizabeth Drive upgrade as part of the greater Sydney West Airport site. It was found that much of the Elizabeth Drive road easement had been disturbed as part of the previous road works. Several potential archaeological deposits (PADs) (Figure 5) and two artefact scatters were identified north of Elizabeth Drive. One area of PAD was identified within the study area within the southeast portion of the study area.
Environmental Impact Statement for the Second Sydney Airport (Navin Officer 1997)	An Aboriginal cultural heritage study was conducted as part of the Environmental Impact Statement for the site options of the second Sydney airport directly south of the current study area. The study identified that most site types were likely to be located in close proximity to water (within 50 m). Sites located near permanent water sources were likely to yield high artefact densities comprised of complex assemblages. A total of 110 sites were recording during this survey.
Lithic Artefact Distribution in the Rouse Hill Development Area, Cumberland Plain in NSW (White and McDonald 2010)	White and McDonald reviewed several years of systematic test excavations within the Rouse Hill Development Area (RHDA), located approximately 20km to the north east of the study area, they found that artefact density and distribution correlates with topography and stream order. Highest artefact density was found on terraces and lower slopes associated with 4 th and 2 nd order streams. The upper slopes were found to have sparse artefact distribution, however artefacts were still found in this landscape. Artefacts were found in all tested areas with no distinct site boundaries were identified, the report found that most of the RHDA could be regarded as a cultural landscape.
Penrith DCP 2014	The Penrith DCP is a non-statutory supporting document that compliments the provisions in the Penrith LEP 2015. The objectives of the document in relation to Aboriginal heritage is to 'preserve items and sites of Aboriginal archaeological significance located within the city of Penrith. The DCP includes a sensitivity map (Figure 6) has been created to guide whether archaeological assessment is required to be undertaken as part of a development application. The sensitivity map is based on assessment undertaken for the Aboriginal Resource Planning study completed for identifies the lands surrounding Wianamatta-South Creek and its tributaries as sensitive. This area of sensitivity includes the entirety of the current study area.

Report	Summary
Western Sydney Airport ACHAR (Navin Officer 2016)	An Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment and test excavations were conducted west side of Badgerys Creek for the Western Sydney Airport. The assessment area included land directly south of the study area. 23 new Aboriginal sites were recorded. The sites included isolated artefacts, artefact scatters, and grinding grooves.
Four predictive models to describe Aboriginal lithic artefact site patterning of the Cumberland Plain (Owen, TD and Cowie DR 2017).	Owen and Cowie identified four predictive models for the distribution of Aboriginal sites within the Cumberland Plain. The first predictive model is known as the Stream Order model and was developed by White and Macdonald (2010). The stream order model identified proximity to watercourses as an important indicator of Aboriginal potential with higher order streams tending to have higher densities of artefacts. The second predictive model known as the Economic Resource model (Evans 2003), focused on the location of high value food or other resources and predicts that archaeological deposits would be formed within or adjacent to these economic zones. The third predictive model is the Activity Overprinting model developed by Baker (2000), which proposes that many Aboriginal sites are the result of repeated occupation and use of an area, and that the archaeological assemblage of one site may not be reflective of other nearby site. The final predictive model is the Domiciliary Spacing model (Mommott 2007), focuses on the internal distribution of 'domiciliary' spaces within an Aboriginal campsite and may be used in the modelling of internal site structure.
Upper South Creek Advanced Water Recycling Centre ACHAR (KNC 2021)	KNC prepared an ACHAR for new wastewater infrastructure to service the South Western and Western Sydney Aerotropolis Growth Areas. The development extended along Elizabeth Drive approximately 600m south of the study area. The ACHAR identified a number of landscape features as indicating potential for Aboriginal sites including: Raised landforms adjacent to creeks, Permanent water and Sandstone exposures. Culturally modified trees were assessed as being few in number in the local area due to the practice of tree clearance by European colonisers. It was also found that surface Aboriginal objects were not predictive of the sub surface deposits, which were different in density, nature and extent.
CSR Advanced Manufacturing Hub, ATR (Artefact 2021)	Artefact completed test excavation 2km south of the study area. A total of 32 artefacts were recovered which were interpreted as the repeated occupation by several small groups of Aboriginal people. Excavation recovered a clay ball retainer hearth which was dated to 2,056 ± 20 BP (Wk-48125). Excavation confirmed that the highest density of artefacts was found within close proximity to the creek line.

Report	Summary
Northern Gateway Phase 1 1953-2109 Elizabeth Drive, Badgerys Creek – ACHAR Update (Artefact 2022a)	The Northern Gateway Phase 1 (NGP1) project has a large study area located at closest 630m northwest of the current study area. Artefact (2022a) provided letter advice on heritage assessment steps that would be required to progress approvals of the proposal following changes to design. The proposal had previously been the subject of an ACHAR (Baker 2021) the results of which are summarised here. Baker (2021) had identified six artefact sites within NGP1, being four surface and subsurface deposits, and two surface scatters. These sites were not registered on AHIMS by Baker 2021. Sites were low density artefact deposits in the vicinity (within 300m) of Cosgroves and Oakey Creeks, interpreted by Baker (2021) as satellite camping areas where artefact density was higher, and ranging locations where artefact density was lower. Artefact (2022) recommendations were for salvage excavation and surface collection.
Western Sydney Sustainable Road Resource Center, ACHAR (Artefact 2022b)	The study area of Artefact (2022) was located 2.5km south of the current study area and was located immediately west of Wianamatta-South Creek. As at the current study area, the eastern (larger) part of the Artefact (2022b) study area was located on South Creek soils with Blacktown soils to the west. As a result of site survey, a level and slightly elevated terrace adjacent to Wianamatta-South Creek was identified as PAD. This location was not proposed to be impacted by development. Recommendations were made for the protection of the PAD.
30-40 Martin Road, Badgerys Creek, ATR (Artefact 2023b)	Artefact Heritage carried out archaeological survey and test excavation at a location adjacent to and elevated above Wianamatta-South Creek to the east, 1km south of the current study area. Similar to the study area, 30-40 Martin Road is located on Blacktown soils to the west, and South Creek soils to the east. Landform included undulating plain that was not deemed as PAD, and a level raised plateau adjacent to Wianamatta-South Creek which was defined as 30-40 Martin Rd PAD, AHIMS Site ID 45-5-5623. Land further than 200m from Wianamatta-South Creek and which was located on Blacktown Soil was not defined as part of 30-40 Martin Rd PAD, AHIMS Site ID 45-5-5623. A total of 35 lithic artefacts were retrieved, being 31 (89%) silcrete, and four (11%) mudstone. Artefact density in test pits did not correspond to proximity to Wianamatta-South Creek. The artefact assemblage consisted primarily of distal flake fragments (n=10, 28.57%) followed by complete flakes (n=9, 25.71%). No cores were identified during analysis. As a result, site 30-40 Martin Rd Artefact Scatter 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5663) was listed as a low-density and moderately disturbed subsurface artefact scatter that did not warrant salvage excavation. Implications of this report for the current study area include that proximity to permanent water, on raised level ground, and location on South Creek soils are not in themselves necessarily indicators of archaeological potential.

Figure 5: Area of PAD identified by Brayshaw. Location of PAD indicated by number in a circle (1995)





Figure 6: Potentially sensitive landscapes (illustrated by dashed line) within the Penrith LGA
approximate location of current study area in red



3.3 AHIMS search

NOTE: The location of Aboriginal sites is considered culturally sensitive information. It is advised that this information, including the AHIMS data appearing on mapping below must be removed from this report if it is to enter the public domain.

An extensive search of the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) database was undertaken on the 11 December 2024 (AHIMS search ID 959594). An area of approximately 4km x 4km surrounding the study area was included in the search. The AHIMS search provides archaeological context for the area and identifies whether any previously recorded Aboriginal sites are located within or near the study area. The parameters of the search were as follows:

GDA 1994 MGA 56	291786.0 – 295788.0 m E 6248327.0 – 6252372.0 m S
Buffer	0 m
Number of sites	69

A total of 69 Aboriginal sites were identified in the extensive AHIMS search area (Figure 7), with 12 of these sites located within the study area (Figure 8):

1. EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
2. EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
3. EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
4. EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
5. EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)
6. EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
7. EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
8. EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)
9. EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)
10. EP AS 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5625)
11. EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234)
12. ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259).

The nature and characteristics of the sites located within the study area is discussed further in Section 4.0 below.

The majority of site features recorded within the AHIMS search area (Table 10) were lithic artefacts (n=48, 69.57%) and artefacts sites with associated PADs (n=10). A Hearth, Modified Tree and Grinding Groove were identified within the search area. A large proportion of sites are clustered around water courses. However, sites are also concentrated on elevated landforms.

Table 10: Frequency of site features in AHIMS search results

Site feature	Frequency	Percentage
Artefact	48	69.57%
Artefact, PADs	10	14.49%
PAD	8	11.59%

Site feature	Frequency	Percentage
Hearth	1	1.45%
Modified Tree	1	1.45%
Grinding Groove site	1	1.45%
Total	69	100.00%

3.4 Environmental background

3.4.1 Geology and soils

The study area is located within the central portion of the Cumberland Plain, a large low-lying and gently undulating landform in the Sydney Basin. The formation of the basin began between 300 to 250 million years ago when river deltas gradually replaced the ocean that had extended as far west as Lithgow (Pickett and Alder 1997). The oldest, Permian layers of the Sydney Basin consist of marine, alluvial and deltaic deposits that include shales and mudstone overlain by Coal Measures.

The geology of the area is characterised by the Triassic Wianamatta group which consists of black to dark grey shale and laminate on top of Medium to coarse-grained quartz sandstone, very minor shale and laminate. The landform of the study area is the result of local bedrock weathering. The underlying geology is the Hawkesbury Sandstone that was laid down as river sediments and is described as medium to coarse grained quartz sandstone, this is overlain by the finer sedimentary material caps of Ashfield Shale.

The eastern section of the study area associated with the Wianamatta-South Creek floodplain contains the Wianamatta-South Creek fluvial soil landscape. This landscape usually contains floodplains, valley flats and drainage depressions of the channels on the Cumberland Plain. The soils are often very deep layered sediments over bedrock or relict soils. Plastic clays or structured loams occur in and immediately adjacent to drainage lines. red and yellow podzolic soils are most common on terraces with small areas of structured grey clays, leached clay and yellow solodic soils (Bannerman & Hazelton 1990).

The central and western portions of the study area are comprised of the Blacktown Residual soil landscape which has shallow to moderately deep hard setting mottled texture contrast soils, red and brown podzolic soils on crests grading to yellow podzolic soils on lower slopes and in drainage lines. These nutrient-poor soils are highly erodible and hence are extremely susceptible to disturbance.

A small section of the study area (southwest) is comprised of the Berkshire Park alluvial soils. This landscape is the result of three depositional phases of Tertiary alluvial/colluvial origin. The lowest deposit is the St Marys formation, overlain by the Rickabys Creek gravel formation, which is of varying thickness and, in turn, is topped by the Londonderry Clay formation. All of these formations are derived from sandstone and clay. Erosion of the surface has led to exposure of all three formations in different locations. The soils of Berkshire Park are weakly pedal orange heavy clays and clayey sands, which are often mottled, ironstone nodules are also common. Large silcrete boulders occur in sand/clay matrix Solods, usually on flats and in small drainage lines. Lower in the landscape where drainage conditions are poor, thin layers of dark brown sandy loams and brown a-pedal sandy clay loams are the surface material. Sand may occur in splays or as slugs of sediment within drainage lines. Laterite is often exposed at or near the surface in drainage lines or on crests.

PSM consulting undertook borehole investigations on behalf of Mirvac in support of the EEP Stage 1 and Stage 2 works (PSM Consulting 2024). These works comprised of 35 Boreholes spread across Lot 100, DP 1283398 and Lot 741, DP 810111. The investigation found that a consistent sequence of topsoil up to 0.25m depth, overlying natural clay could be seen across the study area, with imported gravel fill seen between these layers, no evidence of surviving topsoil was seen beneath the imported fill, have demonstrated that the topsoil was removed prior to the deposition of fill. A review of the borehole sequence in comparison to that seen during the test excavation indicates that the 'Natural Soil' seen in the boreholes is equivalent to the archaeologically sterile B horizon seen during the test excavation (Table 11).

3.4.2 Hydrology and vegetation


The study area is located within the Upper Wianamatta-South Creek catchment associated with undulating hills and drainage lines. The study area is bordered by Wianamatta-South Creek in the east with several ephemeral first order drainage lines across the study area feeding directly into the creek line. Several additional high order creek lines are located within the vicinity of the study area including Badgerys Creek approximately 400 m west of the study area and Kemps Creek approximately 2.1 km east.

The vegetation in the study area has been impacted by urban development and land management practises. The study area would have once been covered by open Cumberland Plain Woodland, which is typical of the Wianamatta Group shale geology. Tree species would have included Forest Red Gum (*Eucalyptus tereticornis*), Sydney Blue Gum (*E. saligna*) and Grey Box (*E. moluccana*). The understory would likely have consisted of grass species, including spear grass, and shrub species such as blackthorn. The areas along Wianamatta-South Creek have been frequently inundated as reflected by the vegetation. Common tree species include *Angophora subvelutina* (broad-leaved apple), *Eucalyptus amplifolia* (cabbage gum) and *Casuarina glauca* (swamp oak). Still water species such as *Eleocharis sphacelata* (tall spike rush), *Juncus usitatus* and *Polygonum* spp. occur where channels are silted up. On more elevated streambanks a tall shrubland of *Melaleuca* spp. (paperbarks) and *Leptospermum* spp. (tea trees) may occur. However much of this soil landscape has been previously cleared and is now dominated by exotic species such as *Rubus vulgaris* (blackberry) and other weeds (eSPADE 2022).

Table 11: Comparison of soils from Geotech (PSM Consulting 2024) and Test Excavation (Artefact 2020a).


Borehole geological unit	Description	Thickness (m)	Deposit from test excavation test area 1	Description	Thickness (m)	Deposit from test excavation test area 2	Description	Thickness (m)
Topsoil	Clay, high plasticity, brown to dark brown grey, rootlets observed	0.05-0.25	A1 Horizon	Dark brown clayey loam, with grass rootlets.	0.015	A Horizon	Dark brown clayey loam, with grass rootlets.	0.038
			A2 Horizon	Orange brown clayey loam, with grass rootlets and ironstone gravels	0.01			
Fill	Clay/ gravelly clay: medium to high plasticity, pale brown to dark grey, gravel is sub rounded to angular	0.6-4.2	Not Seen			Not Seen		
Natural Soil	Clay, high plasticity brown grey to grey mottled red	1.3-8.8	B Horizon	Sticky orange brown clay	>0.1	B Horizon	Red clay	>0.02

Figure 7: AHIMS extensive search



Document Path: C:\Users\MDouglas\OneDrive - Artefact Heritage Services Pty Ltd\GIS\GIS_Mapping\240066_Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1 - Temp Berm & Basin\MXD\240066_AHIMSExtensive_v5_120225.mxd

Figure 8: AHIMS detail search



Document Path: C:\Users\MDouglas\OneDrive - Artefact Heritage Services Pty Ltd\GIS\GIS_Mapping\240066_Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1 - Temp Berm & Basin\MXD\240066_AHIMSdetail_v5_120225.mxd

3.5 Regional predictive models

Archaeological investigation across the Cumberland Plain has been comprehensive over the past 30 years, including survey, excavation and desktop analysis studies. This varied and intensive investigation has led to the development and continual refinement of a predictive model for Aboriginal occupation within the region.

Regional studies have been undertaken on the large Growth Centres of the northwest and southwest of the Cumberland Plain, west of the Sydney Basin. White and McDonald (2010) have contributed to the debate over site prediction by discussing the nature of Aboriginal site distribution, interpreted through lithic analysis of excavated sites in the Rouse Hill Development Area (White and McDonald 2010). The Rouse Hill Development Area is located about 25 km north of the current study area. The watercourses in the development area (Caddies Creek and Second Ponds Creek) derive from the same source as Wianamatta-South Creek and are of a similar stream order. The soil landscapes are also reflective of those in the current study area, the Wianamatta-South Creek Soil Landscape along the high order watercourses and associated remnant Blacktown Soil Landscape. The study gave rise to the commonly referred Stream Order Model which provides a sound basis for archaeological investigations in the Cumberland Plain. The paper provides a spatial and distributive analysis of Aboriginal objects in relation to freshwater resources and along varying landform units. The findings of this study highlighted the relationship between proximity to freshwater and landscape with archaeological evidence of Aboriginal activities. The study found that artefact densities were most likely to be greatest on terraces and lower slopes within 100 m of freshwater resources (White and McDonald 2010). The predictive model identified that ridgelines and crests located between drainage lines will contain archaeological evidence though usually representative of background scatter (White and McDonald 2010).

While White and McDonald's (2010) predictive model can be seen as an indicative model of the archaeology of the Cumberland Plain, a more recent study has been conducted by Godden Mackay and Logan (GML 2012) at the East Leppington Precinct approximately 11 km south of the current study area. The study utilised the Stream Order Model developed by White and McDonald (2010) in their investigations and three different and complementary models to explain their findings. The Stream Order Model is a regional based model and doesn't consider the small-scale intra-landform variations that can affect the predictions of this model.

Owen and Cowie (2017) describe three other models that can be used to more accurately describe archaeological probability within the landscape. The Economic Resource Model, Activity Overprinting Model and Domiciliary Spacing Model. These models were used as the basis of predictive modelling within the East Leppington precinct assessment 18 kilometres south of the current study area. Post excavation analysis considered that the combination of these models provided a good understanding of the over-arching archaeological potential of the East Leppington landscape.

The Economic Resource Model identifies locations with substantial resources (such as food and knapping sources) as economic zones. The model identifies a correlation between the relative yield of the economic zone and the distance that sites are likely to be away from the economic zone. Site locations are also considered to relate to changes in 'textures' across the landscape which may include changes in landform. Varying landforms within the influence of an economic zone can then be ranked according to their suitability for repeated occupation. Substantial creek lines are considered high resource zones due to the richness in flora and fauna. The model suggests that the evidence of Aboriginal activities will decrease with distance from these resource rich nodes.

The Activity Overprinting Model was used to explain the density of sites at increasing distances from the creek and Domiciliary Spacing Model was used to describe the features and spatial variation of a site.

In conjunction with these models, an understanding of the soil landscape and the nature and prevalence of cultural material within these contexts is important in the predictive model process. Deposits that contain cultural material are likely to exist within the Blacktown soil landscapes however, these are deposits are generally not stratified. Blacktown soils retrieve cultural material in A Horizon deposit which generally extend approximately 300 mm below the ground surface.

Every predictive model has its limitations and constraints and should be used as a guiding factor for future investigation and as a tool to further current understanding of the cultural environment.

4.0 SUMMARY OF FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

Artefact has completed five phases of archaeological survey and two test excavation programs across the Greater Project Boundary between 2019 and 2024 (Table 12). In total 10 survey units were investigated during the surveys, defined based on landforms and scope of works (Table 12). Full reports for these studies are included as Appendices A – D.

Table 12: Summary of archaeological investigations

Assessment	Date	Scope	Report
Archaeological survey	20 March 2019	Survey to investigate area of proposed works, (survey units 1-4).	ACHAR 2022 - Appendix C
Archaeological test excavation	17 February to 6 March 2020 (13 days)	Aboriginal archaeological test excavation program of EP PAD 01 and EP PAD 02.	ACHAR 2022 - Appendix C
Supplementary archaeological survey	18 March 2019 and 9 April 2020	Survey to investigate newly registered AHIMS sites within proximity to the study area, (survey units 1-4).	ACHAR 2022 - Appendix C
Addendum archaeological survey	27 August 2021	Survey of an additional area of proposed works, (survey unit 5)	ACHAR 2022 - Appendix C
Addendum archaeological survey	31 October 2022	Survey of an additional area of proposed works, (survey unit 6).	ACHAR 2022 - Appendix C
Archaeological survey (Lot 741, DP 810111)	18 October 2023	Survey of an additional area of proposed works – Lot 741, DP 810111 (survey unit 7-10).	EEP Stage 2 ASR 2024 – Appendix B
Visual inspection	11 September 2024	Visual inspection of the Upper South Creek Advanced Water Recycling centre for Sydney Water project area, State Significant Infrastructure (SSI) 8609189. The purpose of this inspection was to verify the validity of sites located within the SSI 8609189 project area that may have been destroyed under that consent.	Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence Report 2024 – Appendix D
Supplementary archaeological test excavation	9-16 December 2024	Aboriginal archaeological test excavation program of EEP S2 PAD 02 and EEP S2 PAD 03.	Test Excavation Report 2025 – Appendix A

4.1 Survey – March 2019

The survey resulted in the identification of four surface artefact sites and three areas of archaeological potential summarised in Table 13 below.

Table 13: Summary of archaeological features identified in each survey unit, March 2019.

Survey Unit	Aboriginal site	Site description	Assessed significance
Survey unit 1	EP AS 01 AHIMS ID 45-5-5233	Two silcrete artefacts located within a raised artificial terrace	Low
	EP IF 01 AHIMS ID 45-5-5232	Single retouched utilised piece located within a raised artificial terrace	Moderate
	EP IF 02 AHIMS ID 45-5-5231	Grey chert proximal flake fragment identified as a scraper within a raised artificial terrace	Moderate
	EP PAD 03 AHIMS ID 45-5-5660	Area of potential associated with alluvial flats directly adjacent to Wianamatta-South Creek	Unknown
Survey unit 2	EP PAD 02 AHIMS ID 45-5-5237	Area of potential associated with spur landform located above the confluence of two drainage lines	Unknown
Survey unit 3	EP PAD 01 AHIMS ID 45-5-5235	Area of potential on a raised crest landform associated with a wide ridgeline	Unknown
	EP IF 03 AHIMS ID 45-5-5230	Single platform core located within a dam wall	Low
Survey unit 4	None	None	None

4.2 Test excavation – February 2020

Archaeological test excavations were conducted within EP PAD 01 and EP PAD 02 in February 2020. Archaeological test excavation was conducted across both PADs, as it was identified they would be impacted by the proposal. This included excavation of the mapped extent of EP PAD 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236) and EP PAD 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5235).

Excavation within Elizabeth Precinct test area 1 (EP 1 – correlating with an area focussed on the EP PAD 01) included the excavation of 58 excavation units (excavation unit = 50 centimetres by 50 centimetres) across the full extent and immediate surrounds of EP PAD 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236). Elizabeth Precinct test area 2 (EP 2 – correlating with an area focussed on EP PAD 02) included the excavation of 30 excavation units across the full extent and immediate surrounds of EP PAD 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5235).

The test excavation program recovered 89 artefacts from a total of 22 m² of excavation. Two artefact concentrations were identified across the two test areas investigated. Analysis of the soil characteristics across both test excavation areas identified a continuous sub-surface deposit with similar artefact types identified across both test areas. Based on this assessment, the artefact deposit was assessed as being part of one large site extent recorded as Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter

02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236). In addition to the subsurface artefacts recovered, two additional surface artefact sites (EP IF 04 and EP IF 05) were located within the test excavation area and archaeologically recorded. In accordance with the Code of Practice these artefacts were not collected during the test excavation program.

4.3 Survey – April 2020

During preparation of the ACHAR two AHIMS searches were conducted, the first on 18 March 2019 and the second on 9 April 2020. When the second 2020 search was undertaken, an additional Aboriginal site, Elizabeth Drive (ED) AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259) was identified immediately adjacent to the southern property boundary of the study area. Archaeological survey and review of the AHIMS site card determined that the extent of ED AFT 1 was limited to the Elizabeth Drive corridor, on an embankment directly to the north of Elizabeth Drive and approximately 2m to the south of the study area property fence line. Due to the presence of a newly identified Aboriginal site in close proximity to the study area, a supplementary archaeological survey was undertaken. Three orange silcrete artefacts were identified, consisting of one whole retouched flake, one partial core fragment and one flake fragment.

4.4 Survey – August 2021

An addendum archaeological survey was undertaken to inspect an additional portion of land that was not previously included within the study area boundary (survey unit 5). That area is approximately 45m wide by 800m in length on the northernmost boundary of the study area. Two artefact scatters with an area of associated archaeological potential and one isolated find were identified. The results of the August 2021 fieldwork program are summarised in Table 14, below.

Table 14: Summary of archaeological features identified in each survey unit, August 2021.

Survey Unit	Aboriginal site	Site description	Assessed significance
Survey unit 1	EP AS 03 AHIMS ID 45-5-5624	Six silcrete artefacts located on a ridge/ crest landform	High
	EP AS 04 AHIMS ID 45-5-5625	four silcrete artefacts located within an upper slope landform	High
	EP IF 06 AHIMS ID 45-5-5659	Single complete silcrete flake located within a lower gradual slope landform within a disturbed context	Low

4.5 Survey – October 2022

An addendum archaeological survey was undertaken to inspect an additional portion of land not previously included within the study area boundary. That area is approximately 495m in length and 110m in width on the southernmost boundary extending along the Elizabeth Drive and Martin Road corridors. AHIMS site 45-5-5259 is located within the survey area however none of the artefacts identified previously were identified. An artefact scatter was identified during archaeological survey (EP AS 05). EP AS 05 comprised two artefacts, one red silcrete flake and one quartz flake. The results of the October 2022 fieldwork program are summarised in Table 15, below.

Table 15: Summary of archaeological features identified in each survey unit, October 2022.

Survey Unit	Aboriginal site	Site description	Assessed significance
Survey unit 1	ED AFT 1 AHIMS ID 45-5-5259	Artefact scatter within Elizabeth Drive Road corridor, not relocated	Low
	EP AS 05 AHIMS ID 45-5-5660	Two complete flakes, one silcrete one quartz, artefacts located within disturbed road corridor	Moderate

4.6 Survey – March 2024

An archaeological survey was undertaken for the additional Lot 741, DP 810111. The full report detailing the outcome of the survey is included as Appendix B. The survey area was divided into four survey units and confirmed the presence of the registered sites inside the study area and identified five additional sites (EEP S2 IF1, EEP S2 PAD1, EEP S2 PAD2, EEP S2 PAD3 and EEP S2 PAD4). The survey re-visited the existing grinding groove site (AHIMS ID 45-5-0215) and determined that the recorded location on AHIMS was incorrect, in addition three areas of PAD, and one isolated find were identified. Whilst the original artefacts were not visible, additional artefacts were identified associated with EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EP AS 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5625). The results of the March 2024 fieldwork program are summarised in Table 16 below.

Table 16: Summary of archaeological features identified in each survey unit, March 2024.

Survey Unit	Aboriginal site	Site description	Assessed significance
Survey unit 7	EP AS 03 AHIMS ID 45-5-5624	Two silcrete artefacts located within a raised artificial terrace	High
	EP AS 04 AHIMS ID 45-5-5625	Grey chert proximal flake fragment identified as a scraper within a raised artificial terrace	High
	EEP S2 PAD2 AHIMS ID pending	Area of potential associated with alluvial flats directly adjacent to Wianamatta-South Creek	Unknown
Survey unit 8	None	None	None
Survey unit 9	EEP S2 PAD3 AHIMS ID pending	Area of potential on a raised crest landform associated with a wide ridgeline	Unknown
Survey unit 10	South Creek AHIMS ID 45-5-0215	Grinding grooves, location updated	High

Survey Unit	Aboriginal site	Site description	Assessed significance
	EP AS 03 AHIMS ID 45-5-5624	One additional silcrete core identified within vehicle track	High
	EP AS 04 AHIMS ID 45-5-5625	Two additional silcrete cores identified within vehicle track	High
	EEP S2 PAD1 AHIMS ID pending	Large PAD extending across area adjacent to the Wianamatta-South Creek	Unknown
	EEP S2 PAD4 AHIMS ID pending	Area of PAD associated with grinding grooves	Unknown
	EEP S2 IF1 AHIMS ID pending	Ground stone tool, located close to the grinding grooves	Moderate

4.7 Survey – September 2024

Concurrently with Artefact's investigation, Kelleher Nightingale Consulting Pty Ltd (KNC) prepared an ACHAR for the proposed wastewater infrastructure associated with the Upper South Creek Advanced Water Recycling centre for Sydney Water (KNC 2021). Sydney Water have established a work zone corridor on the south and western boundaries of the study area and have commenced works under the consent of State Significant Infrastructure (SSI) 8609189.

Artefact completed a visual inspection of the portions of the study area impacted by the Sydney Water works under SSI-8609189 on 11 September 2024. The inspection determined that the portions of EEP S2 PAD01 (AHIMS ID Pending), EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236) and EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) within the Sydney Water works footprint had been destroyed as a result of the works. The partial destruction of these sites occurred as a result of excavations to install services, the introduction of hardstand surfaces, the movement of plant, stockpiling of materials, and disturbance to ground surfaces and upper stratigraphic layers caused by uncontrolled runoff from the works. While it could not be found during the site inspection, based on the placement of the Sydney Water works, it is also likely that EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330) has been destroyed.

4.8 Test excavation – December 2024

Archaeological test excavation was conducted in December 2024 across two test areas across the areas of archaeological potential which would be impacted by the proposal. This included excavation of the mapped extent of EEP S2 PAD 02 and EEP S2 PAD 03. The full report detailing the test excavation program is included as Appendix A.

Test excavations within EEP S2 PAD 02 have confirmed the presence of Aboriginal objects across the entire proportion of the PAD subject to archaeological investigation. As a result, the portion EEP S2 PAD 02 known to contain Aboriginal object has been identified as an artefact scatter and is henceforth referred to as EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending). A total of four artefacts were retrieved from the 1.75 square metres that were excavated within EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending), resulting in an artefact density of 2.29 per square metres. The concentration of artefacts was distributed between TP2, TP3 and TP4. The total weight of artefacts retrieved amounts to 8.48 grams, with the average weight of each artefact is 2.12 grams. The largest artefact was (5.52 grams) was obtained from PAD02TP4.

Test excavations within EEP S2 PAD 03 have confirmed the presence of Aboriginal objects across the entire proportion of the PAD subject to archaeological investigation. As this land encompasses, EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EP AS 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5625), the three sites have been consolidated into a single site, EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624). A total of 202 artefacts were retrieved from the 5.75 square metres that were excavated within EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) resulting in an artefact density of 35 artefacts per square metre. The highest concentration of artefacts were retrieved from PAD03TP7 which yielded 29 artefacts for a density of 14.5 artefacts per square metres. The second highest concentrations of artefacts were retrieved from PAD03TP5 which yielded 28 artefacts for a density of 14 artefacts per square metre and PAD03TP8 with 25 artefacts.

4.9 Summary

These assessments have resulted in the identification of 12 sites within the study area (Figure 10):

1. EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
2. EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
3. EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
4. EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
5. EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)
6. EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
7. EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
8. EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)
9. EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)
10. EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234)
11. ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)
12. EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending).

Figure 9: Survey units





Figure 10: AHIMS Sites and PADs within greater project boundary



5.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUES

5.1 Methodology

The cultural assessment in this report includes information collected through desktop assessment, Aboriginal community consultation and fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the Consultation Requirements. This information was collected by Lily Hackett (Heritage Consultant, Artefact Heritage).

5.1.1 Cultural landscape

The World Heritage Convention of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) defines a cultural landscape as one which has ‘powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent’ (UNESCO 1991). The relationship between Aboriginal Australians and the land is conceived in spiritual terms rather than primarily in material terms (Andrews et al 2006). Aboriginal cultural knowledge has been defined as:

Accumulated knowledge which encompasses spiritual relationships, relationships with the natural environment and the sustainable use of natural resources, and relationships between people, which are reflected in language, narratives, social organisation, values, beliefs and cultural laws and custom (Andrews et al 2006).

Aboriginal cultural knowledge was traditionally bequeathed through oral traditions from generation to generation. Within all Aboriginal communities there was a time of dislocation and upheaval associated with the arrival of colonial settlers. This widespread disruption resulted in much of the detailed knowledge and understanding of many of the elements of the cultural landscape being lost from the Aboriginal community, nonetheless many Aboriginal people maintain a strong connection to the land of their ancestors and collectively possess a wealth of knowledge passed down through the generations.

5.1.2 Types of values

Aboriginal people hold significant knowledge about traditional use of land before and after contact. The landscape which encompasses the study area has cultural value of importance to the Aboriginal community. The Aboriginal community collectively holds values and knowledge that relate to:

- Traditional values: these are passed down by family and community as part of ancient tradition.
- Historical values: these are passed down by family and community and relate to the eras since colonisation; these may include information gained from historical source documents.
- Contemporary values: these are values of modern importance and relevance for Aboriginal stakeholder groups.

There is often no clear separation between these values, and they collectively co-exist with equal importance in forming the value that Aboriginal people place on landscape, cultural heritage, intangible heritage, and particular landforms or parts of the landscape.

5.2 Identified Aboriginal cultural heritage values

Table 17 provides a summary of the Aboriginal cultural heritage values associated with the study area.

Table 17: Cultural heritage values identified for the study and surroundings.

Cultural heritage value	Description	Source
Archaeological evidence of Aboriginal occupation	Aboriginal people have expressed a strong view that sites and deposits associated with the archaeological record of Aboriginal occupation at Badgerys Creek were of high cultural value to Aboriginal people.	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2016
Undeveloped nature of Badgerys Creek	The area is regarded as having characteristics which would have made it of significance in the traditional life of Aboriginal people of the pre-colonial past and, as such it should be retained in as natural state as possible The intangible cultural values of the landscape and its surviving biota were valued for their association with traditional culture and lore, and the sense of the place and social identity derived from them.	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2016
Wianamatta-South Creek	Dually named Wianamatta meaning mother place in the Dharug language. Wianamatta-South Creek contains intrinsic Aboriginal cultural values. Historic record includes reference to Darug ceremonies held along banks of Wianamatta-South Creek at the Mamre estate approximately eight km north of current study area	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2016

6.0 SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT

A significance assessment of the scientific, social, historic and aesthetic values of the study area is included below.

6.1 Significance assessment criteria

An assessment of the cultural heritage significance of an item or place is required in order to form the basis of its management. The Guide (OEH 2011: 10) provides guidelines, in accordance with the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013) for significance assessment with assessments being required to consider the following criteria:

- Social values – does the area have a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons
- Historic values – is the area important to the cultural or natural history of the local area and/or region and/or state
- Scientific values - does the area have the potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of the cultural and natural history of the local area and/or region and/or state
- Aesthetic values – is the area important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics in the local area and/or region and/or state.

Scientific values should be considered in light of the following criteria:

- Research potential - does the evidence suggest any potential to contribute to an understanding of the area and/or region and/or state's natural and cultural history?
- Representativeness - how much variability (outside and/or inside the subject area) exists, what is already conserved, how much connectivity is there?
- Rarity - is the subject area important in demonstrating a distinctive way of life, custom, process, land-use, function or design no longer practised? Is it in danger of being lost or of exceptional interest?
- Education potential - does the subject area contain teaching sites or sites that might have teaching potential?

It is important to note that heritage significance is a dynamic value.

6.1.1 Historic value

Historic values refer to the association of the place with aspects of Aboriginal history. Historic values are not necessarily reflected in physical objects, but may be intangible and relate to memories, stories or experiences.

While the settlement of Exeter Farm resulted in the eviction of Aboriginal people within Badgerys land there is some suggestion that Badgerys permitted small Aboriginal groups to camp along Wianamatta-South Creek (Hardy 1989:19). This is supported by the presence of glass artefacts within the study area which demonstrate the use of the site by Aboriginal people in the post contact period. While the use of the site has not been identified as relating to specific Aboriginal person, story or

memory the presence of evidence for post contact use of a site is relatively rare in the local context. Consequently, the study area is considered to contain moderate historic value.

6.1.2 Aesthetic value

Aesthetic values refer to the sensory, scenic, architectural and creative aspects of the place. These values may be related to the landscape and are often closely associated with social/cultural values.

The study area maintains aesthetic value associated with the rural undeveloped nature of the study area which exhibits a number of landscape features consistent with the precontact landscape. Of particular relevance is the western portion of the study area which affords a good outlook towards surrounding landscape features including Wianamatta-South Creek and its tributaries. The study area is considered to contain moderate aesthetic values.

6.1.3 Socio/cultural value

The Consultation Requirements specifies that the social or cultural value of a place must be identified through consultation with Aboriginal people.

No specific areas of cultural significance were identified by RAP representatives during the field survey or test excavation program. The Aboriginal objects identified across the site however, are considered to contain cultural significance as part of a wider cultural landscape and as physical evidence of the use of the area by Aboriginal people.

6.1.4 Scientific value

The study area contains 12 sites which range from low to high scientific significance. While the presence of glass artefacts demonstrate that the study area was associated with Aboriginal use in the post contact period these artefacts cannot directly associate the site with specific historical events, activities or people. Consequently, the study area is considered to contain moderate historic value. The study area maintains aesthetic value associated with the rural undeveloped nature of the study area which exhibits a number of landscape features consistent with the precontact landscape. Of particular relevance is the western portion of the study area which affords a good outlook towards surrounding landscape features including Wianamatta-South Creek and its tributaries. The study area is considered to contain moderate aesthetic values. A summary of the archaeological significance of sites identified is discussed below and presented in Table 18 below.

6.1.4.1 Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)

EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232) is comprised of an isolated silcrete artefact located within a surface exposure associated with animal grazing. The artefact is comprised of a retouched utilised piece which is considered to be moderately rare within the regional context and exhibit moderate representative values as an example of the artefact type. The artefact itself is also considered to demonstrate moderate education potential. The location of the artefact indicates the artefact is located in an area which has been filled and disturbed, demonstrating limited research potential. Given the disturbed context the artefact's research potential is considered to be limited to the value of the artefact itself and subsequently considered to be low on a regional scale.

6.1.4.2 Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)

EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231) is comprised of an isolated chert artefact located within a vehicle track exposure. The artefact has been retouched along its right, left and proximal margins and was identified as a scraper. The tertiary reduction of the artefact associated with the retouch identifies the object as requiring several steps in its production. It is considered to be moderately rare with the region and exhibit moderate representative values as an example of the artefact type. The artefact

itself is also considered to demonstrate moderate education potential. The location of the artefact indicates that the artefact is located with an area which has been filled and is subsequently within a disturbed context which exhibits limited research potential.

6.1.4.3 Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)

EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230) is comprised of an isolated silcrete artefact located on a dam wall. The location of the artefact indicates that the artefact is located in a disturbed context which exhibits limited research potential. As a silcrete core the artefact is considered to be a common example of the artefact type in the region and therefore exhibits low rarity values. Given the relative lack of easily identified features the artefact is not considered to be a good example of its type. The artefact is therefore considered to exhibit low representative values and education potential when compared to the wider region.

6.1.4.4 Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)

EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331) is an isolated silcrete proximal flake fragment located on the surface of a moderately disturbed context. As a silcrete flake, the artefact is considered to be a common example of the artefact type in the region and therefore exhibits low rarity values. The artefact is not considered to be a good example of its type based on its lack of easily identifiable features. The artefact is therefore considered to exhibit low representative values and education potential when compared to the wider region.

6.1.4.5 Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)

EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330) is a silcrete isolated surface artefact located within an erosion scour within an existing drainage line landform. The site is considered to be subject to moderate disturbance associated with fluvial forces during rainfall events. Based on the site's location within a drainage line it is considered to contain limited research potential. As an isolated find, the site is considered to be common in the local region and contain low representative values. The artefact is not considered to be a good example of its type based on its lack of easily identifiable features. The artefact is therefore considered to exhibit low representative values and education potential when compared to the wider region.

6.1.4.6 Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)

EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659) is comprised of an isolated chert complete flake artefact located on an informal dirt track. The artefact is located within an area that has been subject to a largescale filling event and is considered to be within a highly disturbed context. As such, the artefact exhibits limited research potential. As a chert flake the artefact is considered to be a common example of the artefact type in the region and therefore exhibits low rarity values. The artefact is considered to be a common example of its type. The artefact is therefore considered to exhibit low representative values and education potential when compared to the wider region.

6.1.4.7 Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)

EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233) is comprised of an artefact scatter with two silcrete artefacts located within a surface exposure associated with animal grazing. The artefacts are comprised of one complete flake and one single platform core. The location of the artefact indicates that the artefact is located with an area of fill and is subsequently within a disturbed context which exhibits limited research potential. As a silcrete core and complete flake, the artefacts are considered to be a common example of the artefact type in the region and therefore exhibit low rarity values. Given the relative lack of easily identified features the artefacts are not considered to be a good example of its type. The artefacts are therefore considered to exhibit low representative values and education potential when compared to the wider region.

6.1.4.8 Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)

EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236) is a low-density artefact scatter located across a low crest and slope landform. Artefacts associated with the site exhibit a high level of variety including a high proportion of

formal tools, the use of several raw material types and heat treatment. The assemblage is considered to be highly representative of a variety of land use which is considered to be rare in the local context. Given the variety of artefact types represented, the assemblage is considered to contain high education potential associated with the morphology of the artefact assemblage.

Glass artefacts which were worked by Aboriginal people have been identified in the test excavation assemblage. This is indicative of post-1788 Aboriginal and European contact during the early nineteenth century and is considered of high scientific significance.

Possible post-depositional disturbance from reduces the research potential of the site.

6.1.4.9 Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)

EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) is a high-density artefact scatter. The surface scatter has a variety of artefacts that exhibit attributes of various reduction sequences including a core and complete flakes. The assemblage is considered to be highly representative of a variety of land use which is considered to be rare in the local context. Given the variety of artefact types represented, the assemblage is considered to contain high education potential associated with the morphology of the artefact assemblage. The site is considered to be moderately disturbed associated with livestock trampling and subsequent erosion. The limited site integrity reduces the research potential for the site.

6.1.4.10 Elizabeth Precinct PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234)

Areas of PAD identified within the study area are assessed as demonstrating unknown archaeological significance. This assessment is due to the fact that these features are located in areas with limited surface visibility and the nature, extent and significance cannot be determined without further investigation. Further investigation would include archaeological test excavation in accordance with the Code of Practice.

6.1.4.11 Elizabeth Drive AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)

ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259) is a silcrete artefact scatter located within the Elizabeth Drive road corridor. The site is located within a disturbed context associated with its location within a road reserve which has been impacted by a gas main and road construction in this location. The site card suggests that several of the artefacts are associated with a knapping floor event which would be moderately representative of sites within the wider region. However, based on the disturbed nature of the site, it is considered that the artefacts contain limited research potential and education potential. Silcrete artefact scatters are common within the wider region and subsequently the site is considered the contain low rarity values.

6.1.4.12 EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending)

EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending) is a low-density artefact scatter. The assemblage is considered to be highly representative of a variety of land use which is considered to be rare in the local context. Given the variety of artefact types represented, the assemblage is considered to contain high education potential associated with the morphology of the artefact assemblage. The site is considered to be moderately disturbed associated with livestock trampling and subsequent erosion. The limited site integrity reduces the research potential for the site.

Table 18: Significance assessment for sites within the study area.

Site name/ AHIMS ID	Research potential	Representative value	Rarity	Education potential	Overall significance
EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

Site name/ AHIMS ID	Research potential	Representative value	Rarity	Education potential	Overall significance
EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low
EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)	Moderate	High	High	High	High
EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)	Moderate	High	High	High	High
EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low
EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending)	Moderate	High	High	High	High

7.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 Proposed works

The Concept Plan (Figure 11) proposes and outlines the framework for the staged development of EEP Stage 1 (SSD-19618251) for an industrial estate, comprising seven (7) industrial buildings (warehouse and distribution centres or general industrial use) including ancillary offices, dock offices, café and associated infrastructure including roads, stormwater and utilities, with landscaping. The Concept Plan applies across Lot 100 DP1283398 and part Lot 741 DP81011.

The Stage 1A Development, the first development works of the EEP Stage 1 Concept Plan, comprises:

- site preparation works;
- site servicing and infrastructure works including stormwater infrastructure and road works;
- subdivision of Lot 100 DP1283398 and Lot 741 DP81011;
- construction of Warehouse 2 and Warehouse 6 for the purpose of warehouse and distribution centres or general industrial use;
- construction of hardstand areas for loading/unloading and vehicle manoeuvring;
- construction of on-site car parking;
- landscaping, including on-lot landscaping and street reserve landscaping;
- estate signage comprising a main estate entry signage and signage zones; and
- operation hours of 24 hours, 7 days a week.

The site plan illustrates the Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct, divided into Stage 1 (Lot 100, DP 1283398) and Stage 2 (Lot 741, DP 810111). Stage 1 features several large warehouses (1-6) and a central access road. Stage 2 includes a large cleared area for future development, a temporary batter works zone, and a clearaway facility. The plan also shows the Wianamatta-South Creek, a proposed 1.5m high berm, and various infrastructure elements like roads, easements, and parking areas. A legend on the left defines symbols for boundaries, setbacks, and services. A title block at the bottom provides project details and dates.

LEGEND

- Estate Boundary
- Realigned Boundary Between Stage 1 & Stage 2
- Lot Boundary
- Road Boundary
- Building Setback
- Landscape Setback
- Building Above Outline
- Substation Indicative Location
- FS Fire Services
- FB Fire Brigade Truck Parking
- RT Rainwater Tank
- AC AC Plant Indicative Location
- ES External Stair
- EC Electrical Charging Parking Bay
- EC+ Canopy Electrical Charging Parking Bay (with canopy)
- EW Retaining Wall

STAGE 2 LOT 741 DP 810111
(SUBJECT TO FUTURE PLANNING APPLICATION)

STAGE 1 LOT 100 DP 1283398

ELIZABETH ENTERPRISE PRECINCT
LOT 100 DP 1283398 + LOT 741 DP 810111
BADGERYS CREEK NSW

ELIZABETH ENTERPRISE PRECINCT

SSDA MASTERPLAN + EXTENT OF TEMPORARY BERM, STAGE 1

19.02.25 1:3000@A1 1:5000@A3 202566 MP 02.6 B


7.2 Aboriginal heritage impact

Construction of the warehouses and associated infrastructure will involve extensive ground disturbing works. No works are proposed to be carried out beyond the flood line extent adjacent to Wianamatta-South Creek, the remainder of the study area will be subject to bulk earthworks. A summary of the impacts to identified Aboriginal sites is outlined in Table 19.

Table 19: Impact assessment

Site name/ AHIMS ID	Type of harm	Degree of harm	Consequence of harm
EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234)	None	None	No loss of value
ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value
EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending)	Direct	Total	Total loss of value

Figure 12: Impact of the proposed works on AHIMS sites located within the study area



7.3 Ecological Sustainable Development principles

The Guide (OEH 2011) specifies that Ecological Sustainable Development (ESD) principles must be considered when assessing harm and recommending mitigation measures in relation to Aboriginal objects.

The following relevant ESD principles are outlined in Section 3A of the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*:

- Decision-making processes should effectively integrate both long term and short term economic, environmental, social and equitable considerations (the ‘integration principle’)
- If there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation (the ‘precautionary principle’)
- The present generation should ensure that the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of future generations (the ‘principle of intergenerational equity’).

7.3.1 The integration principle

Decision-making processes should effectively integrate both long term and short term economic, environmental, social and equitable considerations (the ‘integration principle’). This ACHAR demonstrates regard for the integration principle by considering Aboriginal heritage values and impacts from the project during the planning phase of the project.

7.3.2 The precautionary principle

If there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, lack of full scientific confidence should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation (the ‘precautionary principle’). Numerous surface and subsurface AHIMS sites are located within the study area. To ameliorate the uncertainty associated with the area of archaeological potential, archaeological test excavations have been conducted. The combination of predictive models and the results of the test excavation have been used to assess the probable nature of the archaeological record within the study area.

Investigation is ongoing and will involve test excavation to establish the significance of the any subsurface artefacts should these be found. Until test excavations have been completed and the results incorporated into this ACHAR, the precautionary principle has not been addressed.

7.3.3 The principle of intergenerational equity

The present generation should ensure that the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of future generations (the ‘principle of intergenerational equity’).

Further archaeological investigations through salvage excavations have been recommended to mitigate against impacts to the remaining sites within the study area provide further information about the variance in Aboriginal land use across varied landscapes in the Badgerys Creek region.

7.4 Cumulative impacts

Badgerys Creek is subject to several large development projects which will result in a substantial cumulative impact to the Aboriginal cultural heritage of the region.

The Western Sydney International Airport site at Badgerys Creek extends over approximately 1700 hectares with adjacent lands progressively scheduled for resumption and development over the next 50 years. At least 70 Aboriginal sites have been identified across the airport site with additional heritage investigation identifying additional Aboriginal objects as part of project mitigation measures (Navin Officer 2016). While effort has been made to preserve sites through environmental conservation areas and movement of topsoil, it is expected that a large portion of these sites will be impacted or relocated as part of construction.

Options assessment of the proposed M12 route resulted in the identification of a number of surface and subsurface sites through a combination of archaeological survey and test excavation. A total of 19 Aboriginal sites are located within the construction footprint of the M12 route that will be subject to impact as part of the program including several sites to the north of the current study area (Jacobs 2019).

The Elizabeth Precinct proposal would result in impact to a further 12 sites within the wider Badgerys Creek region. While resulting in a comparatively small cumulative impact when compared to the impacts of the Badgerys Creek airport site and the M12 project, the increase with never-the-less result in an increase to the cumulative destruction of Aboriginal cultural heritage in the region.

The Wianamatta-South Creek portion of the study area will not be harmed by the proposal and will not impact PAD 03 (see Table 19).

8.0 MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

8.1 Guiding principles

The overall guiding principle for cultural heritage management is that where possible Aboriginal sites should be conserved.

Where unavoidable impacts occur then measures to mitigate and manage impacts are proposed. Mitigation measures primarily concern preserving the heritage values of sites beyond the physical existence of the site. The most common methods involve detailed recording of Aboriginal objects, archaeological test and salvage excavations, artefact analysis and, where appropriate, reburial of Aboriginal objects in a location determined by the RAPs.

Mitigation measures vary depending on the assessment of archaeological significance of a particular Aboriginal site and are based on its research potential, rarity, representatives and educational value. In general, the significance of a site would influence the choice of preferred conservation outcomes and appropriate mitigation measures, usually on the following basis:

- Low archaeological significance – conservation where possible. SSD Conditions of Approval would be required to impact the site before work can commence
- Moderate archaeological significance – conservation where possible. If conservation was not practicable, further archaeological investigation would be required such as salvage excavations or surface collection in accordance with the SSD Conditions of Approval.
- High archaeological significance – conservation as a priority. Where all other practical alternatives have been discounted mitigation measures such as comprehensive salvage excavations in accordance with the SSD Conditions of Approval would be required.

Sites of unknown scientific value should be conserved where possible. Where conservation is not practical further investigation under the Code of Practice will be required to confirm the presence of Aboriginal objects and gather enough information to assess significance. Test excavation is not a mitigation measure, it is an investigatory action required to gather enough information to inform the development of appropriate mitigation measures.

8.2 Options to avoid or mitigate harm

It is considered unlikely that localised portions of the study area could be preserved based on the requirement for substantial cut and fill works to level the site for the proposed works.

The proposed does not include land within the 1:100 flood boundary, resulting in no harm to Elizabeth Precinct PAD 03 (see Table 19).

A summary of the recommendations is discussed below and summarised in Table 20.

Table 20: Summary of recommendations

Site name/ AHIMS ID	Recommendation
EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)	If harm is unavoidable surface collection of artefacts is recommended.

Site name/ AHIMS ID	Recommendation
EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)	If harm is unavoidable surface collection of artefacts is recommended.
EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)	If harm is unavoidable surface collection of artefacts is recommended.
EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)	If harm is unavoidable surface collection of artefacts is recommended.
EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)	If harm is unavoidable surface collection of artefacts is recommended.
EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)	If harm is unavoidable surface collection of artefacts is recommended.
EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)	If harm is unavoidable surface collection of artefacts is recommended
EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)	Site has been partially destroyed. Salvage is required to mitigate total loss of value.
EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)	If harm is unavoidable salvage of artefacts is recommended.
EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234)	No action required as site will not be impacted
ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)	If harm is unavoidable surface collection of artefacts is recommended.
EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending)	If harm is unavoidable salvage of artefacts is recommended.

8.2.1 Archaeological salvage

Where harm to Aboriginal sites is avoidable, SSD consent must be in place to authorise harm. Archaeological salvage of artefacts from EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236), EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending) must take place prior to authorised harm. EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236) has been subject to partial impact and salvage is recommended to mitigate further loss of value.

The following surface artefact sites would be collected prior to the commencement of any ground disturbing works in the study area:

- EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
- EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
- EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
- EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
- EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)
- EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
- EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)

- ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)

A methodology for salvage through excavation and surface collection is included below in Section 9.0.

8.2.2 Site conservation

The current assessment has identified that EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) would not be impacted by the proposed works. However, due to proximity to the boundary of the works area the boundary of this site would be marked on construction and environmental site plans, and barrier fencing established outside of the perimeter of the site to physically protect it.

8.3 Ongoing consultation with Aboriginal stakeholder groups

Consultation with the RAPs would continue throughout the life of the project, as necessary. Ongoing consultation with the RAPs will take place where required, namely regarding the reburial of retrieved artefacts and in the event of any unexpected Aboriginal objects being identified during works.

8.4 Changes to the project area

Advice provided within this ACHAR is based upon the most recent information provided by the proponent at the time of writing. Any changes made to the project should be assessed by an archaeologist in consultation with the RAPs. Any changes that may impact on Aboriginal sites not assessed as part of the project may warrant further investigation and result in changes to the recommended management and mitigation measures.

9.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SALVAGE EXCAVATION METHODOLOGY

9.1 Research questions

The research questions are designed to focus the field work and analysis on particular aspects of archaeological investigation and therefore maximise the research value gained from the non-renewable resource of the archaeological record.

Question 1: Can salvage excavation identify the spatial extent of identified artefact concentration deposits

The study area at the Elizabeth Precinct site has been extensively farmed since the early nineteenth century. Ploughing and planting activities have repeatedly modified the soil, with ample evidence of soil mixing and vertical movement of soil horizons identified during the test excavation program. The precise extent of horizontal soil movement is less well known, and the presence of discrete areas of concentrated artefacts implies that some degree of spatial integrity of artefact distribution exists. Salvage excavation would aim to define outer boundaries of the areas of artefact concentrations in order to attempt to correlate the deposition of artefacts with Aboriginal activities in that area.

Question 2: Is there evidence of *in situ* single or overlapping knapping events?

No evidence has been identified for a single or overlapping knapping event. One of the aims of the salvage program would be to identify any whether the artefacts retrieved could have resulted from one or more knapping events. This would include further investigation of possible artefact use and manufacturing activities identified during analysis of the test excavation assemblage.

This information may include data on depth of retrieved artefacts, differences in raw material, differing treatment of the raw material (i.e. heat treatment), and conjoin analysis. This information would be discussed in the context of previous predictive models for the distribution of archaeological material in the local and regional context.

Question 3: Is there further evidence of contact sites which could provide information on interaction between Aboriginal people and early European settlers?

Glass artefacts identified at the Elizabeth Precinct site have been knapped into formal stone tools and were made of early nineteenth century bottle glass. While it is known that Aboriginal people camped on Badgery's property following the appropriation of their land, direct evidence of this through glass artefactual material is comparatively rare. Should a larger assemblage of glass artefacts or repurposed European material be identified in the area near the original artefact concentrations, information regarding tool use, material selection and Aboriginal and European contact may be discernible.

Question 4: Do recovered artefacts provide microscopic evidence of manufacture and use?

Should artefacts be identified during manual archaeological excavation, opportunities to collect them without sieving exist, which would ensure that potential residues of plant material from their original use may be retained. Collection of artefacts *in situ* during excavation also limits the degree of handling of artefacts, which can allow microscopic examination of surface damage to be analysed to infer past working practices.

Use-wear and residue studies of suitably sampled stone tools may allow correlations between artefact morphologies and specific uses for these tools. These analyses may have the capacity to provide corroboration to theoretical models of tool use and human occupation at the Elizabeth Precinct site.

Question 5: How do the results of the test and salvage excavations compare to the results of other sub-surface investigations in the regional context?

Archaeological test and salvage excavation programs have been conducted at the Western Sydney International Airport site directly to the south of the study area, as well as across the Bringelly and Badgerys Creek regions in general. While these sites are located within similar undulating plain landform contexts, artefact assemblages show a high degree of diversity. Opportunities to compare and contrast excavation and artefactual information between the Elizabeth Precinct site and nearby sites would occur.

The results of test excavation would be discussed in relation to the findings of previous sub-surface investigations in the region. Comparative information would include intactness of deposit, degree of truncation, and nature and frequency of retrieved Aboriginal objects.

Question 6: What information can the retrieved assemblage provide on land-use patterns in the local context?

The comparative results of test excavation and the results of other sub-surface investigations in the area would be discussed in terms of Aboriginal land-use strategies of the local region. This would include a discussion of raw material conservation techniques, artefact types and size and weight characteristics of the assemblage.

9.2 Excavation approach and methodology

9.2.1 Sample strategy

Salvage excavation would consist of contiguous 1m² excavation pits totalling up to 100m² of targeted manual excavation within EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236), EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending). At a minimum one test excavation pit from each site would be expanded to a 5 m x 5 m open area. The nominated pit would need to be confirmed following the SSD approval and review of site conditions as overlapping works may result in the destruction of the nominated location prior to the commencement of salvage. The selection of the pit for expansion would be based on the following:

- Highest count of Artefacts retrieved during test excavations
- Diversity of material and artefact types
- Integrity of the excavation location

The decision to cease or continue with investigations would be made by the supervising archaeologist based on the following variables:

- High density of artefacts
- Rare or unusual artefact types
- Unusual raw material types and changes in raw material types
- Archaeological features such as hearths and/ or middens
- Cultural material with potential for scientific dating

- Any other features identified by the supervising archaeologist and Aboriginal stakeholder representatives

A salvage excavation is considered to constitute an action that will harm an Aboriginal site. Therefore, salvage excavations outside the approval boundary would be a breach of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*. To minimise the risk of excavations occurring beyond the approvals area, it is recommended that a surveyor mark the boundary of the work zone prior to the commencement of the salvage excavations.

9.2.2 Excavation procedure

All excavation would be undertaken manually, using shovels and trowels, etc, by a team of archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders. Excavation would occur in arbitrary 100 mm spits, which would provide vertical control, especially if a conjoin analysis is to be performed.

Excavation would continue for each excavation unit until a culturally sterile layer was reached (in this case, basal Wianamatta clay), but would not exceed a maximum depth of 1.5 m for safety reasons. All excavation unit lower horizons and vertical excavation walls would be trowel cleaned to remove all loose soil.

Each excavation pit would be given an alphanumeric label for identification purposes. All excavated pits would be recorded in detail including photographs, level readings, plans and context sheets. Stratigraphic sections detailing the stratigraphy and features within the excavated deposit would also be drawn.

9.2.3 Sieving and artefact recovery

All material recovered from excavation would be sieved through a 3 mm sieve mesh. Due to the high clay fraction of the soil, all material would be wet sieved wherever possible. Artefacts identified during manual excavation would not be wet sieved if they are selected for inclusion in future residue or use-wear analysis (see Section 9.2.4 below).

All recovered stone artefacts would be placed in resealable bags (excavation unit [EU] bags) labelled with the corresponding excavation unit information (site name, transect number, salvage pit ID, and spit number). An inventory of the artefacts and excavation units should be produced in the field to establish a chain of custody. The inventory would also note which excavation units contain artefacts. Artefacts may to be taken off site to be analysed in detail by relevant specialists.

9.2.4 Residue and use-wear analysis

Special attention would be given for recovering artefacts *in situ* during manual excavation. Artefacts which are identified during manual digging could be bagged individually, with adhering soil material (i.e. not dry cleaned or scrubbed) into double re-sealable specimen bags. Artefacts which would be selected for potential residue analysis would be at the discretion of the excavation supervisor. Artefacts which were recovered from wet sieving would not be sampled for residue analysis due to contamination concerns and the likelihood that water would have damaged or removed adhering sediments.

During post-excavation analysis, the excavation supervisor would select artefacts to be sampled for microscopic use-wear analysis, in coordination with the artefact analyst. Preference would be given to undertake use-wear analysis of those artefacts which were collected *in situ* with adhering sediment

(and potential residue). Residue and use-wear studies, should they be conducted, would be provided to external expert consultants for analysis.

9.2.5 Soil sampling method

Palaeo-environmental samples for potential OSL dating, radiocarbon ¹⁴C dating, pollen analysis or particle analysis will be undertaken if suitable material is identified during excavations. Any samples will be decided by the supervising archaeologist. The validity of processing samples will be analysed on site.

During salvage excavation, samples of organic material suitable for radiometric dating (charcoal, bone, shell, wood) will be collected for the dating of archaeological deposits. The number of samples sent for dating will be determined on the suitability of the sample and the significance of the site.

Samples will be collected as follows:

- Samples will be collected using clean nitrile gloves and placed in clean plastic sample bags
- Samples will be removed to the relevant temporary keeping place and dried out to avoid fungal growth during transport
- Samples will be packaged within hard plastic cases for transport to a radiocarbon dating laboratory.

Investigations by a geomorphologist will be an integral part of the excavation program. Investigations by a geomorphologist will likely include auguring, and the collection of soil and sediment samples from auguring locations.

Pollen analysis samples will be taken from any suitable natural soil deposits that contain a high humic content. Samples will be collected in a resealable labelled bag. Particle analysis provides higher-level characterisation than simple visual description and would substantially increase the degree to which the stratigraphic process can be determined. Samples for particle analysis will be taken from a representative section at one test pit location (more if changes in stratigraphy are evident across testing area) at 50 mm increments. Samples will be collected in resealable labelled bag.

The procedure for the extraction of OSL samples requires that the samples are extracted in the absence of green-blue spectrums of light. Where stratigraphic layers are identified suitable for OSL dating, these samples must be extracted under a red light. A geomorphologist would be involved in the investigation process to facilitate the retrieval of samples for OSL dating.

9.2.6 Human remains

If suspected human skeletal remains are uncovered at any time throughout the excavation program, the following actions will be followed:

- Cease all excavation activity
- Do not further disturb or move the remains
- Notify NSW Police

An Aboriginal community representative must be present where it is reasonably suspected burials or human remains may be encountered. If human remains are unexpectedly encountered and they are thought to be Aboriginal, the Aboriginal community must be immediately notified.

Recording of Aboriginal ancestral remains must be undertaken, or reviewed by, a specialist physical anthropologist or other suitable qualified person.

Archaeological reporting of Aboriginal ancestral remains must be undertaken, or reviewed by, a specialist physical anthropologist or other suitable qualified person, with the intent of using respectful and appropriate language and treating the ancestral remains of Aboriginal people rather than as scientific specimens.

9.3 Surface collection

The following surface artefact sites would be collected prior to the commencement of any ground disturbing works in the study area:

- EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
- EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
- EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
- EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
- EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)
- EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
- EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
- ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259).

Surface collection will be undertaken using the following method:

- Artefact collection will be undertaken by a team comprising an archaeologist and RAP representatives
- Artefact locations will be marked on the ground and recorded with a hand-held non-differential GPS prior to collection
- Collected artefacts will be catalogued on site by the team, with recorded attributes as listed for the test and salvage excavation analysis
- Artefacts will be labelled and bagged according to site, and then managed along with the assemblage recovered from the test and salvage excavation
- A short report will be completed, analysing the results of the surface collection with those of the test excavation and salvage excavation, in particular with regard to artefact density and distribution, and the character of the assemblage. The reporting may be included in the salvage excavation report
- An Aboriginal Site Information Recording Form (ASIRF) would be submitted for all sites subject to surface collection.

9.4 Post-fieldwork tasks

9.4.1 Analysis of recovered material

The post-excavation analysis would be designed to address the research objectives and specific research questions, along with other relevant questions that may arise based on the results of the excavation. Results of analysis would be presented in relation to comparative site data where possible and where useful in addressing the research questions. Post-excavation analysis may include (but not be limited to):

- Lithic Analysis: cataloguing of all cultural material recovered, including measurements, weight, raw material, reduction and tool identification. A program of conjoin analysis, and investigation of usewear/residue analysis may also be considered.
- Geomorphology: collection of soil samples during excavation, where suitable, to assist in understanding the site formation and post-depositional disturbance.
- Palaeo-environmental: this analysis can utilise the material from the geomorphological samples and should include the investigation of pollen and phytoliths to understand the past vegetation and climate of the region prior to, and during periods of Aboriginal visitation and occupation.
- Chronology: OSL and/or radiocarbon samples should be collected, where suitable, during the program and should bracket any cultural materials recovered from each open area excavation to provide a strong chronology for the deposit.

The aim of this work is to both adequately document, analyse and record the cultural deposits and assemblages for future generations, and to build upon the findings of the archaeological test excavation analysis.

It is anticipated that most, if not all, of the objects recovered from excavation will be stone artefacts. These will be analysed by a suitably qualified archaeologist. A number of standard attributes will be recorded for every artefact:

- Heat damage
- Post-depositional weathering
- Material type
- Artefact type
- Platform surface type
- Platform type
- Length in mm
- Width in mm
- Thickness in mm.

A number of additional attributes beyond those required by Heritage NSW (previously referred to as Office of Environment and Heritage) will also be recorded for each artefact, including:

- Flake fragment category (complete, proximal fragment, distal fragment etc)
- Type of cortex and amount of cortex on dorsal surfaces of flakes

- On retouched flakes, various observations of the retouched edges, including retouch type, invasiveness, height of retouch scars
- On cores, various observations including number of core rotations, the orientation of different platforms to one another, whether the core is bipolar or not
- On ground artefacts such as axe/hatchet heads or grindstones, various observations such as size of the ground area, angle of ground edges.

Photographs will be taken of a representative sample of artefacts, to create a visual record of the general types of artefacts within the assemblage. Atypical artefacts or artefacts of high significance will also be photographed. Images will be taken from several orientations, following procedures for archival-quality artefact photography (Fisher, 2009; Prokop, 1985).

Further analytical techniques might be employed on a sub-sample of artefacts if it is judged that these techniques have the potential to yield information. Further techniques might include functional analysis through examination of residues or use-wear, for example. Any such analyses would be carried out by a suitably qualified specialist.

Any Aboriginal artefacts that are not made from stone will be analysed using appropriate techniques. Analysis would conform to the requirements of the Code of Practice. Specific analysis procedures would be decided following excavation and would be made from an assessment of the types of artefacts recovered, the materials from which they are made, their condition of preservation, and the information that could be obtained from them.

9.4.2 Reporting

An Aboriginal Archaeological Salvage Excavation Report detailing the results of the archaeological excavation program would be prepared once excavation, artefact recording, and any other analytic activities are concluded. The excavation report would provide details on the established extent and scientific significance of any Aboriginal archaeological material retrieved during the excavation process. The salvage report would also address the research questions proposed in this document.

The reporting would be developed to fulfil any future development consent conditions in relation to the archaeological salvage, to provide input into management plans (if required) and any interpretive outcomes from the project. The report would be developed in accordance with Heritage NSW guidelines (as current best practice), and may include the following broad sections:

- A short summary.
- Describe Aboriginal consultation undertaken during the project.
- Provide details of the Aboriginal objects which were partially or completely harmed (i.e. recovered through the excavations) during the works.
- Provide a description of the methods and results of the any excavations.
- Comment on the effectiveness of the mitigation measures (i.e. salvage excavations).
- Comment on the effectiveness of any management plan if in place.
- The current and proposed long term location of any Aboriginal objects recovered.
- Details the results of any analysis of recovered Aboriginal objects.
- Ensure the necessary Site Impact Recording Forms are lodged with AHIMS at completion of the project.

9.4.3 Site Recording Forms

Following the completion of the salvage program, artefact analysis and reporting; a site card update or Aboriginal Site Impact Recording Form (ASIRF) will be lodge with the AHIMS database.

9.5 Temporary and long-term care and management of retrieved Aboriginal objects

The temporary repository of any retrieved artefacts will be in a locked cupboard on the premises of the archaeological consultant.

Long term management of the Aboriginal objects would involve the reburial of the artefact assemblage within portion of land that would not be disturbed by future works. Reburial will be undertaken in accordance with the Requirement 26 of the Code of Practice. The reburial will be undertaken using the following method:

- In preparation for reburial, artefacts will be placed in resealable bags labelled with excavation unit and artefact number information. Excavation unit and artefact number information will also be recorded on an archival standard label in each resealable bag.
- Copies of documentation related to the project will also be prepared for reburial including:
 - The artefact catalogue
 - A copy of the ACHAR, ATER, ASR and short report completed following surface collection
 - Copies of site cards and ASIRFs submitted to the AHIMS database following test excavation, salvage excavation and surface collection for each site
- Artefacts and reburial documentation will be sealed in an impervious container which will be labelled with permanent marker or engraved
- Reburial will be undertaken by a team comprising of an archaeologist(s) and RAP representatives
- The reburial location will be recorded using a non-differential GPS with burial site features including burial depth, location in relation to other permanent features and a photographic record maintained of the reburial.

Following reburial, a site card will be submitted for the reburial location with ASIRFs submitted for all sites which have had Aboriginal objects reburied.

10.0 CONCLUSION

The following recommendations are based on consideration of:

- Statutory requirements under the NPW Act
- The interests of the Aboriginal stakeholder groups
- The likely impacts of the project.

It was found that:

- A total of 12 Aboriginal sites have been identified within the Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1 (SSD-19618251) study area, comprised of five artefact scatters, six isolated artefacts, and one area of PAD:
 - Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 02 (EP AS 02 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5236), EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending) have been assessed as demonstrating **high archaeological significance**
 - Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 01 (EP IF 01 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5232) and Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 02 (EP IF 02 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5231) have been identified as demonstrating **moderate archaeological significance**
 - Elizabeth Precinct Artefact Scatter 01 (EP AS 01 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5233), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 03 (EP IF 03 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5230), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 04 (EP IF 04 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5331), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 05 (EP IF 05 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5330), Elizabeth Precinct Isolated Find 06 (EP IF 06 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5659), and ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259) have been identified as demonstrating **low archaeological significance**
 - Elizabeth Precinct PAD 03 (EP PAD 03 - AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) has not yet been subject to testing and are of **unknown archaeological significance**
- The proposed works would impact the following identified Aboriginal sites:
 - EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
 - EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
 - EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
 - EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
 - EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)
 - EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
 - EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
 - EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236)
 - EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624)
 - ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)
 - EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending)
- EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) would not be impacted by the proposed works.

The following recommendations are made:

- It is recommended that salvage excavation of EP AS 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5236), EP AS 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5624) and EEP2024 AS01 (AHIMS ID pending) take place
- If harm is unavoidable, the following surface artefact sites must be subject to artefact collection prior to the commencement of ground disturbing works:
 - EP AS 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5233)
 - EP IF 01 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5232)
 - EP IF 02 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5231)
 - EP IF 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5230)
 - EP IF 04 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5331)
 - EP IF 05 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5330)
 - EP IF 06 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5659)
 - ED AFT 1 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5259)
- EP PAD 03 (AHIMS ID 45-5-5234) would not be impacted by the proposed works, therefore no archaeological investigation would be required. Due to proximity to the boundary of the works area, the boundary of this site should be marked on construction and environmental site plans, and barrier fencing established outside of the perimeter of the site to physically protect it.
- If changes are made to the proposal that would result in impacts to areas not assessed by this report, additional Aboriginal heritage assessment would be required.
- Consultation with the RAPs would continue throughout the life of the project to facilitate involvement in the proposed salvage works, long term management of retrieved Aboriginal objects and the assessment of unexpected finds.

11.0 REFERENCES

- Artefact Heritage 2019a, CSR Advanced Manufacturing Hub - *Archaeological Technical Report*. Report to CSR
- Artefact 2020a Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1: Archaeological Test Excavation Report. Report to Mirvac Projects Pty Ltd.
- Artefact 2020b Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1: Archaeological Technical Report. Report to Mirvac Projects Pty Ltd.
- Artefact 2023 Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 1: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report. Report to Mirvac Projects Pty Ltd.
- Artefact 2024 Elizabeth Enterprise Precinct Stage 2: Aboriginal Technical Report. Report to Mirvac Projects Pty Ltd
- Attenbrow, Val (2010). *Sydney's Aboriginal past: investigating the archaeological and historical records*. Sydney, N.S.W., University of New South Wales Press.
- Bannerman, S. M. & Hazelton, P.A. 1990. Soil Landscapes of Penrith 1:100,000 Sheet. Soil Conservation Service of New South Wales. Sydney.
- Brayshaw 1995, Elizabeth Drive Upgrade Archaeological Survey for Aboriginal Sites
- Donald and Gulson 1996, A Little Bit of Country: an Oral History of Badgerys Creek, Alken Press, Sydney
- Hardy, B. 1989 From the Hawkesbury to the Monaro: The story of the Badgerys Family, Kangaroo Press.
- Hiscock and Attenbrow 2005, Australia's Eastern Regional Sequence revisited: Technology and change at Capertee 3. British Archaeological Reports. International Monograph Series 1397. Oxford: Archaeopress
- JMcD CHM 2005, Archaeological Salvage Excavations of Eight Archaeological Landscapes in Second Ponds Creek Valley Rouse Hill Development Area
- JMcD CHM 2006. Archaeological Subsurface Investigations at SEPP59 EC3/1 (#45-5-3201) and EC 3/2 (#45-5-3202) Wonderland Surplus, Old Wallgrove Road, Eastern Creek, Report to Australind
- JMcD CHM 2007, Archaeological Investigation of the Turner Road and Oran Park Precincts within the South West Growth Centre, Camden, NSW. Report to APP on behalf of the Growth Centres Commission and Camden City Council
- Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd (1997). *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage: Proposal for a Second Sydney Airport at Badgerys Creek or Holsworthy Military Area*.
- Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd (2016). *Western Sydney Airport: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment*. Report to GHD.
- Ngara Consulting 2003, Archaeological Assessment of Aboriginal Heritage: Reservoir Entry Lands: Prospect, report for Connybeare Morrison

- Owen and Cowie, 2017. "Four predictive models to describe Aboriginal lithic artefact site patterning on the Cumberland Plain". In *Journal of the Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists* (Vol 5: 1-13).
- Peterson 1976. Tribes and Boundaries in Australia. Social Anthropology Series No 10. AIAS Canberra
- Pickett J. W. & Alder J. D. 1997. Layers of Time: The Blue Mountains and their Geology. New South Wales Department of Mineral Resources, Sydney
- PSM Consulting 2024 Geotechnical Investigation Report EEP Stage 2.
- Select Civil, 2019. Kemps Creek Resource Recovery Park. Accessed on 1 Sep 2021 at <https://selectcivil.com.au/projects/kemps-creek-resource-recovery-park/>
- Suez, 2020. Western Sydney Aerotropolis planning package – consultation response. Accessed on 3 Sep 2021 at https://shared-drupal-s3fs.s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/master-test/fapub_pdf/00-Western+Sydney+Aerotropolis/636%20-%20Suez%20-%20PUBLISH.PDF
- Tindale 1974. Aboriginal Tribes of Australia. Their Terrain, Environmental Controls, Distribution, Limits and Proper Names. ANU Press, Canberra
- Turbet, P., 2011, *First frontier: The occupation of the Sydney region 1788-1816*, Rosenberg Publishing, Kenthurst.
- White, Beth and McDonald, Jo (2010). "Lithic Artefact Distribution in the Rouse Hill Development Area, Cumberland Plain, New South Wales." *Australian Archaeology* (Number 70): 29-38.

APPENDIX A – TEST EXCAVATION REPORT 2025

APPENDIX B – EEP STAGE 2 ASR 2024

APPENDIX C – ACHAR 2022

APPENDIX D – ABORIGINAL HERITAGE DUE DILIGENCE REPORT 2024

APPENDIX E – CONSULTATION RECORDS



artefact

Artefact Heritage and Environment

ABN 73 144 973 526

Suite 56, Jones Bay Wharf

26-32 Pirrama Road

Pymont NSW 2009 Australia

+61 2 9518 8411

office@artefact.net.au

www.artefact.net.au