

## 18 Historic heritage

### 18.1 Project changes

None of the Project changes will increase the predicted impacts to items of historic heritage value or their context as presented in the EA (Chapter 19 and Appendix Q).

### 18.2 Response to submissions

#### 18.2.1 Impacts of the Project on historic heritage items

##### **Submission**

I-28

##### **Issue**

One submission comments that the inclusion of \$70 million for historic heritage impacts is too low, and questions the method used to determine this value, and states that some costs are missing. The impacts to Lahey's Creek cemetery are provided as an example, particularly the loss of its ambience.

##### **Response**

The benefit-cost analysis presented in the EA (Appendix R) assumed that the cost of historic heritage impacts is 'insignificant' (EA Appendix R, Table 2.3) as the Project will have no impact on five of the 13 identified heritage items and the remaining eight will be protected by management measures (EA Appendix R, Section 2.4.2).

The Project layout was altered to avoid direct impacts on Laheys Creek cemetery. The cemetery area will be fenced and water management measures implemented to prevent direct impacts to the cemetery. These measures and ongoing monitoring of the cemetery will be further described in the conservation management plan for the cemetery and the Historic Heritage Management Plan (EA Appendix Q Section 6.3.1).

During the construction of the B-OOP W waste rock emplacement, the surrounding landscape will be changed from one that is dominated by agriculture to one that is dominated by mining. However, the waste rock emplacement will be completed by Year 8 and rehabilitation started. This will eventually return a landscape that is compatible with the current landscape.

#### 18.2.2 Residences

##### **Submission**

I-28

##### **Issue**

One submission comments: "Some houses, bought up and useless, are said to be likely to deteriorate and 'require' demolition. What they do require, is maintenance for reuse after or during mine operation."

## Response

CHC-owned houses that can be used as a residence or for another non-residential use will generally be maintained. Where this is not the case, they may be demolished rather than allowing them to deteriorate slowly. Yukon Paradise may require demolition if it is not used. If demolition is required, archival recording will be completed before demolition commences (EA Appendix Q Section 6.3.8).

### 18.2.3 Nature of mounds in the PAA

## Submission

NA-2

## Issues

OEH comments “[n]umerous large earthen mounds were found to occur in the Project area, and this was previously reported to OEH by the Proponent. OEH undertook a short site visit with the Proponent in January 2012 to investigate the nature of these mounds.

There are a number of possible explanations for their origin, which may span either natural or historical heritage. The Proponent states that a precautionary approach was adopted when considering the nature of these mounds in assuming “that they are old, unused Malleefowl mounds” (p. 94) (EA Appendix H). Although the Proponent acknowledges alternative origins of these mounds (the “result of past clearing activities where mounds were built-up by piling and burning of tree stumps” (p. 94) (EA Appendix H), OEH consider that a proper assessment of the potential significance of them is warranted”.

## Responses

These mounds may be evidence of past land use activities by settlers in the area. The practice of piling and burning tree stumps was common particularly during the extensive clearing of land that occurred throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, there is no evidence available to link the mounds directly with a particular person or time. It is unclear whether these features are natural or artificial and they cannot be directly linked to European land uses.

A historic heritage assessment of the mounds based on the Heritage Branch *Assessing heritage significance* guidelines (Heritage Office 2006) and which assumes the mounds are artificial, is provided below.

- a) An item is important in the course or pattern of NSW’s (or the local area’s) cultural or natural history (Historical Significance).

The mounds have incidental and unsubstantiated connections with the historical process of agriculture and the establishment of settlement which would have occurred during European settlement. The activity of burning trees was common and does not represent a process which is of historical importance.

- b) An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons of importance in NSW’s (or the local area’s) cultural or natural history (Associative Significance).

The mounds cannot be linked with any person important to NSW or the local area.

- c) An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW (or the local area) (Aesthetic Significance).

The mounds do not have an aesthetic quality which would warrant its inclusion as a historic item.

- d) An item has a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW (or the local area) for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (Social Significance).

The mounds are not considered important to the NSW or local community. They may have been valued by landholders however this is unsubstantiated in the written or oral history records for the area.

- e) An item has the potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW's (or the local area's) cultural or natural history (Research Significance).

The mounds may provide information on the practices of early settlers however this knowledge can be readily obtained for other resources and archaeological sites.

- f) An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW's (or the local area's) cultural or natural history (Rarity).

The mounds do not possess rare features.

- g) An item is important in demonstrating the principle characteristics of a class of NSW's (or the local area's), cultural or natural places or environments (Representativeness).

- h) The mounds do not represent a class of cultural or natural places.

If the mounds are artificial, they are not historically significant at a local or state level under any of the criteria. As such, no further assessment or management is proposed.

If the mounds are old Malleefowl nests (as assumed by the Ecological assessment), they were abandoned long ago. As such it is not believed that further assessment will provide additional ecological information or require additional management measures.

### 18.3 Conclusion

The proposed Project changes will not change the historic heritage assessment as presented in the EA. CHC will continue to proactively manage historic heritage by applying the management measures and commitments previously proposed for the Project. Therefore, it is not proposed to modify the proposed management measures or statement of commitments regarding historic heritage.

