Appendix B

Heritage listings
### Heritage listings

#### B.1 RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register

#### Broughton Creek bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Item</strong></td>
<td>Broughton Creek Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item Number</strong></td>
<td>4309596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Item</strong></td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item Sub-Type</strong></td>
<td>Pre-1948 Concrete Beam Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>**** Princes Highway Broughton 2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government Area</strong></td>
<td>Kiama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner</strong></td>
<td>Roads and Traffic Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use</strong></td>
<td>Road bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Former Use</strong></td>
<td>Road bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Statement of significance

**Statement of significance**

As a recently widened bridge, the Broughton Creek Bridge has technical and aesthetic significance and the potential to contribute to an understanding of contemporary strategies for the continued use of older road infrastructure under changing demands. The original fabric embodies the design principles and construction techniques applied to modest concrete bridges during the period 1925-1948, being a sturdy structure of a standard concrete beam design, poured on site and neatly finished. The widened bridge represents an excellent, and possibly unique adaptation to achieve a wider deck without the need for additional piers, and has retained the spacious and clean lines of the original structure, with most of the original fabric unaltered and the views to and from the structure, which allow its interpretation have been maintained. Thus, although the bridge has been widened, it retains the capacity to demonstrate the key characteristics of bridges of its type and era.

**Date significance updated**

08 September 2004

#### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designer</strong></td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Builder</strong></td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction years</strong></td>
<td>**** - 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical description</strong></td>
<td>This bridge is set on a valley bottom with the stream running below on cobbles. The road curves tightly to the north of the bridge and the speed zoning is 90 kph. The bridge is a widened structure of three longitudinal beams which are simply supported at the central pier and curve down to frame compositely with the abutment walls. Each span has a cross girder at the pier. Widening of the bridge...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
has been effected by means of attaching cantilever deck to each side of the bridge. These cantilevers are supported by small composite cantilever beams which are tapered upward from the main beam. To assist in distributing the twisting effect of loads outside the main beams coming through the cantilevers, three rows of steel struts per span brace the main beams. The new deck edge supports a kerb and Thriebeam style guardrail. The central pier has two columns which frame into a cross girder which has a wider upper section to accommodate the two simply supported decks. The abutments, of wall type, have been extended to accommodate the new deck width, and gabion box walls have been used to stabilise the abutment fill.

Approximately 50 metres south of the bridge, a two cell cast in-situ box culvert services an overflow channel of the stream. This has had its end walls and wingwalls raised to allow for increased formation width.

**Physical Condition and/or Archaeological Potential**

- Original condition assessment: "The bridge is in very good condition." (Last updated: 20/08/2004.)

**Modifications and dates**

- The widening was carried out in 1994.
- Date condition updated: 17 April 2009

**History**

**Historical notes**

Broughton Creek Bridge is situated on the Princes Highway between Gerringong and Berry. It crosses Broughton Creek, which flows southwards into the Shoalhaven River. The area was once the territory of the Wodi-Wodi tribe, which occupied that whole district from Five Islands at Wollongong to the Shoalhaven. The Kiama Municipality is part of a narrow strip of coastal lowland bordered by the sea to the east and by the steep Illawarra Escarpment to the west. The sea gave the easiest access to the region initially and establishing roads over the other boundaries was not an easy task. Consequently, road development was delayed in the region. (Derbyshire & Allen, 1984, pp. 22, 26, 64; Regional Histories, 1996, pp. 175, 184, 186)

Kiama harbour was reached by George Bass in 1797. Oxley and Meehan reached Kiama overland in 1819, finding a natural harbour and lush rainforest, which was soon exploited by the cedar-cutters. Moving south from the Lake Illawarra area, the cedar-cutters progressed to the Gerringong district through the 1820s. Land grants on the rich alluvial soils followed and seven year 'clearing leases' were common. Under that system the lessee cleared the land; grew wheat, barley and potatoes and produced milk as well as selling as much timber as he could, then returned the cleared land to the owner. Kiama was originally favoured to be the pre-eminent town in the region by Surveyor General Oxley, who reserved a town site in 1826. The town, surveyed in 1838, thrived through the first half of the nineteenth century and became a Municipality in 1859. Gerringong town was laid out late in 1854, and although it had a poor harbour, it attracted stores, inns and churches. Berry and Bomaderry were laid out by the new owner of the Berry estate, John Hay, in 1890 and 1891 respectively. Berry was originally known as Broughton Creek (the creek being navigable up to the town) then in 1890, John Hay suggested it be re-named Broughton River. The creek appears to have been named after Broughton, an Aboriginal man who assisted Berry in his south-coast ventures, or may have been named by Throsby after his wife's family. (Regional Histories, 1996, p. 184, 186; The Australian Encyclopaedia, 1963, Vol 5, p. 182; Antill, 1982, pp. 6,11, 14, 85)

Dairying became the major enterprise in the district in the later nineteenth century, after rust defeated the region's wheat industry. From the 1860s to the 1890s the district developed as the Colony's major butter producer, with dairy farmers taking up land in Kiama, Kangaroo Valley and the Berry District in large numbers. (Regional Histories, 1996, 186, 188) Blue metal mining also took off in the 1880s in Kiama, the material much in demand in the booming railway construction industry, with 400 tons shipped daily to Sydney. The railway reached Kiama in 1887 and began to supplant the role of shipping in the butter and blue metal industries, and allowed for the transport of a fresh milk to the Sydney market. (Regional Histories, 1996, p. 185)

In 1830 settlers in Kiama petitioned the Colonial Secretary for the construction of an official road to end the constant dispute and frequent litigation as to the use of tracks.
Surveyor Mitchell initially opposed the idea, partly because of the difficulty and expense of forming a road over the cliffs that enclosed the Illawarra district. Mitchell eventually agreed and in 1833 stationed Surveyor Jacques in the district to make a detailed survey. Mitchell had first proposed that a direct road link be established between Sydney and the Illawarra in 1831 to provide an alternative to the circuitous route via Liverpool through Appin. He also recommended a road from Bong Bong (Moss Vale) along the ridge to a point between Kiama and Gerringong and a descent without difficulty to the coast. The direct route between Sydney and Wollongong followed by the Princes Highway was laid out by 1843, though it did not supplant the old route until about 30 years later. In 1843 the main track south passed though Albion Park and onto the village of Jamberoo, closer to the Escarpment than the coast. By 1865 the South Coast Road ran along the coast to Twofold Bay. The Kiama Independent of 6th June 1866, however, reported that the section of road between Gerringong and Crooked River was in terrible condition. (DMR, 1976, pp 36, 37, 48; Derbyshire & Allen, 1984, p. 64)

The approximate route of the current Princes Highway was declared the 'Main South Coast Road' through the Local Government Extension Act of 1906. The many small municipalities along the road depended heavily on volunteer support of local landholders in the upkeep of the road. An 'opening' and naming of the Princes Highway took place at Bulli in 1920 (DMR 1976, pp. 64 and map opposite). In 1928 the route was proclaimed a State Highway under the Main Roads Act, and was accorded due attention and expenditure by the Main Roads Board cum Department of Main Roads, which from 1925 had embarked on a statewide programme of improving roads to a standard to suit high speed automobile traffic. By 1932 the Princes Highway between Sydney and the Shoalhaven River had been improved and sections surfaced in bituminous macadam. The bridge over Broughton Creek, constructed slightly later, in 1935, is associated with this grand scheme of highway improvement. Over the following decades improvement works continued to the south, with 22 concrete bridges and several new deviations constructed between Nowra and Bateman's Bay by 1939. (DMR 1976, p. 160-1)

The Broughton Creek Bridge was constructed in 1935 to replace a timber truss bridge, probably constructed in the 1890s. By the late 1920s the timber bridge was in need of major repairs and in 1931 an investigation was begun into the construction of a new bridge on a short deviation. It was estimated that the cost would be in the region of 13,000 pounds, and plans were drawn up. In 1935 tenders were called, and McClean Construction Company was awarded the work, completing the bridge in the same year. A two cell reinforced box culvert was constructed in the southern approach. (RTA General File 1/236.194) The Broughton Creek Bridge was one of over 1,000 bridges built by the Main Roads Board cum Department of Main Roads during the period 1925-1940, adapting existing standards of bridge design to meet the requirements of improved motor vehicle performance - they were generally wider than previously with an improved load capacity. The principal types of bridges constructed during the period were: reinforced concrete beam; concrete slab; steel truss on concrete piers; and timber beam bridges. Concrete was favoured in many instances because it was perceived to be a low maintenance material (DMR, 1976, pp.169, 170). Based on RTA bridge database records, reinforced concrete beam or girder bridges were the most common form of concrete bridge construction to 1948, with more than 160 extant. They have been very popular in NSW, and elsewhere, providing an efficient and often aesthetically pleasing solution to a wide range of crossing types. Within the general group of beam bridges, the main longitudinal members have had various configurations ranging from a simple set of rectangular beams cast integrally with the deck, through beams with curved soffits, to flat soffit decks where the edge beams also form the bridge parapet or sidewall. These bridges on the state's main roads and highways, constructed to replace high-maintenance and aged timber bridges or open crossings, along with other road improvements, ushered in the age of comfortable motor transport and efficient road transport of goods and produce to which we are accustomed today.

The waterway allowance provided by the new bridge and culvert together amounted to just over half that of the old timber truss bridge. Problems with flooding were persistent, and became serious in 1950 when the curtain wall between the columns of the northern abutment was undermined, necessitating major repairs. In 1952 extensive scouring around the southern abutment resulted in the bridge's closure for four days. The extension of the bridge was mooted, but was not undertaken. Oak trees were cleared from beside the stream to help facilitate free flow of water. In the 1950s the old timber truss bridge was still in use by landowners, comprising part of the private access routes to their properties, a petition for assistance with its repair was submitted to the Department. The former bridge (upstream of current crossing) appears to have been demolished since that time (RTA General File 1/236.194)

Since 1994 the bridge has been widened. Core samples taken from the bridge had a
strength that exceeded expectations, and thus widening by means of a cantilevered
deck was possible. (RTA File1/236.194; 2)

### Listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Listing</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Gazette Number</th>
<th>Gazette Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Act - s.170 NSW State agency heritage register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment of significance

**Historical Significance**

The Broughton Creek Bridge's construction is associated with the grand scheme of highway improvement undertaken by the Main Roads Board cum Department of Main Roads in an attempt to bring the State's main roads up to the standard required by the modern motoring age emerging in the inter-war period. As a widened bridge, it represents the continual process of upgrading required in response to the increased volume, weight and speed of traffic on this busy highway.

**Historical Association**

****

**Aesthetic/Technical Significance**

The Broughton Creek Bridge embodies the design principles and construction techniques applied to modest concrete bridges during the period 1925-1948, being a sturdy structure of a standard concrete beam design, poured on site and neatly finished. The widened bridge represents an excellent adaptation to achieve a wider deck without the need for additional piers, and has retained the spacious and clean lines of the original structure, with most of the original fabric remaining unaltered, and the views to and from the structure, which allow its interpretation, have been maintained.

**Social Significance**

****

**Research Significance**

The bridge has the ability to contribute to an understanding of heritage conservation itself and to sympathetic approaches to the continued use and adaptation of older structures.

**Rarity**

This bridge is apparently unique in its method of widening which has minimised the impact of supporting the extra width on the basic structural support system..

**Representativeness**

Although widened, the bridge retains the capacity to demonstrate the key structural and aesthetic characteristics of reinforced concrete beam bridges of the period 1925-48.

**Integrity/Intactness**

Good

**Assessed significance**

Local

### References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Regional Histories of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Roads and Traffic Authority, (RTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTA General File 1/236.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Derbyshire, Jim and Dianne Allen</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Land Between Two Rivers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Antill, G. H. 1982 Settlement in the South

Written Department of Main Roads 1976 The Roadmakers: A History of Main Roads in New South Wales

Study details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Inspected by</th>
<th>Guidelines used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Study of Pre-1948 Concrete Beam Bridges (Sthn, Sth West, Sydney)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Burns and Roe Worley and Heritage Assessment And History (HAAH)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Custom fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTA Region</th>
<th>Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Number</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARMS File Number</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Number</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Management Plan</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Images

View on centreline under bridge showing main deck beams, cross beams and RHS cantilever stabilising struts. Pier is detailed for simply supported deck.
Overflow channel culvert showing raised head and wingwalls to suit road widening.

View north across overflow channel culvert with bridge in background having Thierail guardrail.
Oblique view of abutment showing deck beams curving to join the abutment wall. Also note abutment widening and gabion wingwalls. Cemented stonework protects toe of abutment wall.

View of bridge looking east
Cantilever widening, using tapered concrete cantilevers and reinforced concrete deck
B.2 Shoalhaven heritage inventory

Please note that despite datasheet references to the State Heritage Register and a SHI number, the inclusion of an item on the Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory does not necessarily mean that it is also included on the State Heritage Inventory or State Heritage Register.

Inventory copies kindly supplied courtesy of the Shoalhaven City Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage study No.</th>
<th>Item description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B004</td>
<td>Inter War Two Storey Brick Convent (St Patricks Convent, Berry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B005</td>
<td>Inter War Roman Catholic Church (St Patricks Church, Berry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B017</td>
<td>Victorian Carpenter Gothic style Hall (Uniting Church Hall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B061</td>
<td>Mark Radium Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B087</td>
<td>‘Mananga” Berry Estate Manager’s Farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B090</td>
<td>Weatherboard Overseers Cottage (143 North Street, Berry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B093</td>
<td>“Glen Devan” Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse (77 North Street, Berry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B094</td>
<td>Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B095</td>
<td>Avenue of 9 Poplar trees (Woodhill Mountain Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B120</td>
<td>“Glenvale” Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B177</td>
<td>“Oakleigh” Inter War Bungalow style Farmhouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
State Heritage Register

Item Name: Inter War Two Storey Brick Convent
Location: 80 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Address: 80 North Street
Suburb / Nearest Town: Berry 2535
Local Govt Area: Shoalhaven
State: NSW
Other/Former Names: St Patrick's Convent
Area/Group/Complex:
Aboriginal Area:
Curtilage/Boundary:

Item Type: Built
Owner: Religious Organisation
Admin Codes: 8004
Current Use:
Former Uses:

Group ID: 

Assessed Significance: Local
Statement of Significance: Excellent two storey Inter-War religious residence, purpose built as a rare example of a convent. Considerable contribution to the scale, form and continuity of the streetscape in conjunction with the nearby St Patrick's RC Church. Historic, social and aesthetic value to the local community. Local significance (Shoalhaven).

Historical Notes or Provenance: The first resident Catholic priest arrived in the Shoalhaven District in 1853. By 1872 Mass was celebrated at both Broughton Creek (Berry) and Coolangatta. The town of Berry was laid out in 1836 by David Berry. A new church was built in 1894 on the present site which served as both church and school until the Sisters of St Joseph moved in 1901. A convent was constructed adjoining the church in 1921, a priest's apartment being attached to the new building.

Themes: National Theme
S. Culture
State Theme
Religion
Local Theme
(note)

Designer:
Maker / Builder:
Year Started: 1921
Year Completed: 1921
Circa: No.
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
State Heritage Register

Item Name: Inter War Two Storey Brick Convent
Location: 80 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Physical Description: Two storey Inter-War period convent characteristic of rectories and similar structures erected throughout the Shoalhaven District in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Constructed of face brick with tiled hipped roof and gabled projection. The two storey verandah runs along two sides of the building from the gabled projection. Open eaves. Windows overhung with single large lights set in openings with brick soldier arches and brick sills. Gable decorated with battened fibre cement panels in similar manner to the detailing employed for the verandah balustrades/finials. Mature landscaping setting.

Further Comments: Historic Period: 1921-1925
Criteria f: This item is assessed as historically rare locally.
Criteria g: This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally. This item is assessed socially representative locally.

Integrity / Intactness:

References:

Author: U. L. Lidstone
Title: Historic Sites of Berry
Year: 1921

Studies:

Author: U. L. Lidstone
Title: Historic Sites of Berry
Number: 1921

Latitude: Location validity:
Longitude: Spatial Accuracy:
Map Name: Map Scale:
AMG Zone: Easting:
Northing: State Heritage Register

Date: 27/09/2011
Full Report:

This report was produced using the Heritage Inventory Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
### Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory

**State Heritage Register**

**Item Name:** Inter War Two Storey Brick Convent  
**Location:** 80 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related Items</td>
<td>St Patricks Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry</td>
<td>Date First Entered: 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This report was produced using the Heritage Registry software provided by the Heritage Office, NSW Department of Planning*
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
State Heritage Register

Item Name: Inter War Two Storey Brick Convent
Location: 80 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Inter War Two Storey Brick Convent
Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
Image Number: Roll: IPHS 5.35. Negative Number: 3, 4
Image Path:
Image File: 2390061.jpg
Thumb Nail Path:
Thumb Nail File: l_2390061.jpg
**Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory**

*State Heritage Register*

**Item Name:** Inter War Roman Catholic Church  
**Location:** 80 North Street, Berry (Shoalhaven)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address</strong></th>
<th>80 North Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburb/Nearest Town</strong></td>
<td>Berry 2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Govt Area</strong></td>
<td>Shoalhaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other/Former Names</strong></td>
<td>St Patrick's Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area/Group/Complex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aboriginal Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curtillage/Boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**User Codes:**  
- **Code 1:** B005  
- **Code 2:** 2336  
- **Code 3:** Y

**Assessed Significance:** Local

**Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:**  
Interesting economical interpretation of the Inter-War Gothic style of architecture in sympathetic materials. Social and historic value to the community. Local significance (Shoalhaven).

**Historical Notes or Provenance:**  
The present St Patrick's church building is the third RC church in Berry. The first served the community from c.1869 to c.1884 when the second church was built in the newly planned township of Berry. The second church served until 1935 when the foundations of the present building were laid, the Rev. M Sheehan on 24/11/1935. The church was completed at a cost of pounds 4000.

**Themes:**  
- National Theme  
- State Theme  
- Local Theme  
  - (none)

**Designer:**

**Maker/Builder:**

**Year Started:** 1935  
**Year Completed:** 1935  
**Circa:** No

**Physical Description:**  
Inter-War Gothic church of Romanesque proportions with lancet window and drip moldings. Revetted openings with stained glass windows. The rectangular form of the
# Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory

**State Heritage Register**

**Item Name:** Inter War Roman Catholic Church  
**Location:** 80 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

The building is divided into entrance area, nave and altar with associated sanctuary with a second side porch. The dominant north gable features a nominal 'rose' window, the main entrance being accentuated by stepping the door and flanking arches forwards of the main gable. The prominence of the gabled front is increased by white rendzina upper sections on each gable. Each gable is surmounted by a small cross.

**Physical Condition:**

**Modification Dates:** The lower cross has been removed

**Recommended Management:**

**Management:**

**Further Comments:** Historical Period: 1926-1956

- **Criteria a)**
- **Criteria b)**
- **Criteria c)**
- **Criteria d)**
- **Criteria e)**
- **Criteria f)**
- **Criteria g)** This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally. This item is assessed as socially representative locally.

**Integrity / Intactness:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author: M L Lidbetter</td>
<td>Historic Glass of Berry</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Plan Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude:</th>
<th>Longitude:</th>
<th>Spatial Accuracy:</th>
<th>Map Scale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location validity:</td>
<td>AMG Zone: Easting: Northing:</td>
<td>Name: Title: Number: Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Heritage Register**

Full Report with Images

*The document produced using the Urigong Computer Software produced by the Motorway Branch, Roads and Maritime Services*
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Item Name: Inter War Roman Catholic Church
Location: 80 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Related Items: Former St. Patrick's Convent (next door)

Listing Comments:

Custom Field Three:
Custom Field Four:
Custom Field Five:
Custom Field Six:

Data Entry: Date First Entered: 16/06/1990 Date Updated: 07/12/2002 Status: Partial

State Heritage Register
Full Report with Images

Date: 23/09/2011
Page 3
Inter War Roman Catholic Church

80 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Inter War Roman Catholic Church
Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
Image Number: Roll: 30 Negative Number: 11
Image Path:
Image File: 2390062.jpg
Thumb Nail Path:
Thumb Nail File: t_2390062.jpg

State Heritage Register
Date: 23/09/2011
Full Report with Images

This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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State Heritage Register

Item Name: Victorian Carpenter Gothic style Hall
Location: 69 Albert Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Address: 69 Albert Street
Suburb / Nearest Town: Berry 2535
Local Govt Area: Shoalhaven
State: NSW
DUAP Region: Illawarra & Macarthur
Historic region: Illawarra
Parish: COOLANGATTA
County: CAMBEN

Other/Former Names: Berry Uniting Church Hall
Area/Group/Complex: Group ID:
Aboriginal Area:
Curtilage/Boundary:

Item Type: Bull
Group: Religion
Category: Church Hall
Owner: Religious Organisation
Admin Codes: B017
Current Use:
Former Use:

Assessed Significance:

Local

Endorsed Significance:

Statement of Significance:
Locally rare example of a simple late nineteenth century Carpenter Gothic church building. Social and historic interest to the local community. Local Significance (Shoalhaven District)

Historical Notes or Provenance:

In 1833 David Berry donated land in the town of Berry for the Wesleyan Church. The congregation wasted no time in having a chapel erected. The Broughton Creek Wesleyan Church of weatherboard was reported to have been the first building to be erected on land legally acquired in the “new township” when it was officially opened by Rev J W Brown, of Kiama circuit, on Sunday 13th April 1834. A Sunday School had opened on 6 July 1833 in what was known as ”The Old Schoolroom” in the village on the ridge in Putman Street transferring to the new building when it opened.

The opening of the chapel was reported in the Shoalhaven Telegraph: The chapel is a neat weatherboard structure 43 x 23 feet on wooden block foundations in the designing management of which Mr William Boyd of the firm of English and Boyd. Broughton Creek was the leading chief spirit. It is built of stud and weatherboard, lined with clear pine and roofed with corrugated iron. The building is entered by a porch 8 x 4 with a door at each side. The principal entrance into the main building is by a 4 feet door opening in two parts. It is lighted through 8 spacious Gothic topped windows. 4 on each side, the place being built east and west.

The chapel is furnished with 24 pews, 12 on each side, and will seat up to 200 worshippers if required, and the officiating worshipper is provided with a light and handsome open armoire of varnished cedar, decorated with panels, and turned work and is reached by a flight of steps on each side. The communion rail is also of turned work, fixed with green rep.

State Heritage Register
Full Report with Images

Date: 05/08/2011

This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory

State Heritage Register

Item Name: Victorian Carpenter Gothic style Hall
Location: 69 Albert Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

The walls inside are painted a stone colour, and bordered with a tile paint up to about 4 feet above the floor. The height of the walls is 12 feet and the roof being half opened and celled. Outside the building is painted in a stone colour, and the gables of the roof and porch are decorated with large boards of unique design and finished with turned finials. Mr. Herbert Pettit was the contractor, and he has completed a very creditable piece of work.

The first parsonage was built on the Albert Street side of this building in 1850 at a cost of £422. The foundation stone for the new church was set in 1852 and four years later a new parsonage was erected adjacent to the old 1850 house, which was then demolished, its foundations may still be seen in the grounds.

When the new church was completed in 1932 the old chapel was used as a church hall until the new church hall was completed in 1955.

Themes: National Theme State Theme Local Theme
6. Culture Religion (none)

Designer: English & Boyd
Maker / Builder: William Boyd (Painter - Herbert Pettit)
Year Started: 1854 Year Completed: 1854 Circa: No

Physical Description: Representative Victorian Carpenter Gothic weatherboard church, with gabled roof and attached porch. Decorative timber bargeboards and frieze to porch. Painted arched windows, with simple tracery reflecting the 3 vertical divisions of the window. Shaped gable ventilators. Brick (1) footings.

Physical Condition:

Modification Dates: It is possible that bargeboard detailing has been lost from the main building. A small window has been added at the west end. Re-roofed with corrugated

Recommended Management: The building is deteriorating as a result of inadequate protection of the fabric in the following areas and should be rectified as a matter of urgency:

1. The weatherboard walls and floor structure are affected by rot from the proximity of the soil and ground dampness. The ground level around and under the building should be lowered as far as possible and an effective drainage system installed to the perimeter. All piers and corn caps should be inspected and rectified.

2. The eastern side of the roof is in urgent need of replacement and the resulting ramshackle ingress has caused damage to the internal fabric. Eaves gutters should be installed with downpipes to the stormwater which will improve the damp soil conditions around the building.


3. Deteriorating paintwork and rotted weatherboards are facilitating the spread of rot into stud wall framing. Window joinery is deteriorating through lack of protection and failing paintwork. The entire building should be repainted to a suitable heritage colour scheme. If early photographs are available they should be examined for clues as to the shading colours which may be able to be confirmed by paint scrapes of the existing fabric. The weatherboard lining beards to the rear annexe should be replaced with timber weatherboards in matching profile. Aluminium windows should be replaced in timber with 9 pane sashes to match the main hall. Early photographs may confirm the detail of the two gable targe boards, if not the detail may be similar to the fronted gable at the entry porch.

Management:

Further Comments: Historical Period 1878-1900

Criteria a)
Criteria b)
Criteria c)
Criteria d)
Criteria e)
Criteria f) This item is assessed as aesthetically rare locally. This item is assessed as historically rare locally.
Criteria g) This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as socially representative locally.

Integrity / Intractability:

References: Author Title Year
A C Na Ilawarra Regional Heritage Study Review 1993 1993
Mary L. Liddell Historic Sites of Berry
Freeman Murphy Wu Ilawarra Regional Heritage Study Review 1993 1993

Studies: Author Title Number Year
Freeman Murphy Wu Ilawarra Regional Heritage Study Review 8611 1993

Farral:
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| Item Name: | Victorian Carpenter Gothic style Hall |
| Location: | 69 Albert Street, Berry [Shoalhaven] |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Validity:</th>
<th>Spatial Accuracy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG Zone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Items:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listing Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Field Three:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Field Four:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Field Five:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Field Six:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Entry:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date First Entered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Updated:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Mark Radium Park
Location: Victoria Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Address: Victoria Street
Suburb / Nearest Town: Berry 2535
Local Govt Area: Shoalhaven
State: NSW
Other/Former Names: Eucalypts
Area/Group/Complex: Group ID:
Aboriginal Area: 
Curtinage/Boundary: Item Type: Landscape
Group: Parks, Gardens and T Category: Urban Park
Owner: Local Government
Admin Codes: 8061 Code 2: 2414 Code 3: Y

Assessed Significance: Local

Statement of Significance: Important contribution to Townscape. These trees are within an attractive natural parkland setting and act as an important entrance statement and rest area to the town of Berry. The area is of local cultural significance and was named after a local pony, the High Jump Champion of Australia between 1950 and 1955. Local Significance:

Historical Notes or Provenance: Mark Radium Park was established on the site of the old pound. The park was named after Jack McGee's pony 'Mark Radium', the High Jump Champion of Australia between 1938 & 1939.

Themes:
Designers:
Maker / Builder:
Year Started: Year Completed: Circa: No

Physical Description: Trees are approximately 20mm high on average with an average canopy diameter of 10m. The park is situated at the western end of Berry in a natural bush setting with an ornamental lake.

Physical Condition:

Modification Dates:
Recommended Management: Trees should be checked for pests and scab. The cuttable of each tree should extend to:

Date: 23/09/2011
Full Report with Images
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory

Item Name: Mark Radium Park
Location: Victoria Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

2 metres outside the drip line. No widening of Princes Highway or Victoria Street should occur within the property boundary of the park or curtilages. A vegetation survey and landscape management plan of the park should be prepared. All further work within the curtilage of the trees should be assessed by a qualified arborist. Seed stock should be collected for future replanting.

Management:

Further Comments:
Criteria a)
Criteria b)
Criteria c)
Criteria d)
Criteria e)
Criteria f)
Criteria g) This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as socially representative locally.

Integrity / Inaccessibility:

References:
Author: N. Sarra - Berry Garden Club

Studies:

Parcels:
Parcel Code: LotNumber: Section: Plan Code: Plan Number:

Latitude: Longitude:

Location reliability:
Map Name: Berry 3026 - 3 - N
Map Scale:

AMG Zone: Berry 3026 - 3 - N
Easting: Nothing:

Listings:
Name: Within a National Trust conservation area

Related Items:

Listing Comments:

Custom Field Three:
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## Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory

**Item Name:** Mark Radium Park  
**Location:** Victoria Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Four:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Data Entry: Date First Entered: 16/03/1999</th>
<th>Data Updated: 16/03/2001</th>
<th>Status: Partial</th>
<th>Custom Field Five:</th>
<th>Custom Field Six:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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Item Name: "Mananga" Berry Estate Manager’s Farmhouse
Location: A40 Princes Highway, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Address: A40 Princes Highway
Suburb / Neighbour Town: Berry 2535
Local Govt Area: Shoalhaven
State: NSW

Other/Fomer Names:
Area/Group/Complex:
Aboriginal Area:
Curtilage/Boundary:

Item Type: Built
Group: Residential buildings
Category: House
Owner: Private - Individual
Admin Codes: E087
Code 2: 8576
Code 3: Y

Current Use:
Former Use:

Assessed Significance:
State: Endorsed Significance:

Statement of Significance:
An excellent Federation Queen Anne style farmhouse in weatherboard designed by noted Sydney architect Howard Joseland. Historical interest as a household property, originally on the Berry Estate. Closely associated with the early private town of Broughton Creek. State significance (NSW).

Historical Notes or Provenance:
The first post office in Broughton Mill Creek was established on the site of the present house in 1861, in the home of Donald Stewart. Stewart’s home, by Broughton Creek, was named "Mananga", an Aboriginal word meaning "by the water". On his death in 1876, the post office moved to James Wilson’s store, nearby in Palman Street.

The Stewart family remained prominent in Broughton Creek. James Stewart was a business partner of James Wilson, and a Justice of the Peace in 1892. The present "Mananga" homestead was built for the Stewart family in 1894 by John Hay, manager of the Coolangatta Estate. When the Estate was broken up the Stewart family were able to purchase the house. "Mananga" was still owned by members of the Stewart family in recent years.

The house was possibly designed by Howard Joseland who designed many Federation buildings on the Berry Estate between 1863 and the early 1900s. The distinctive timber feature of "Mananga" resembles that on the Bomaderry residences "Greenleaves" (1899) and "Lynnym" (1890) which were designed by Joseland for the Berry Estate.

Theme:
National Theme: Settlement
State Theme: Accommodation (Housing)
Local Theme: (none)
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**Item Name:** "Mananga" Berry Estate Manager's Farmhouse  
**Location:** A40 Princes Highway, Berry [Shoalhaven]

**Designer:** Howard Josseland  
**Maker / Builder:**

**Year Started:** 1894  
**Year Completed:** 1894  
**Circa:** No

**Physical Description:** A weatherboard Federation Queen Anne style farmhouse featuring a complex iron roof with decorative timberwork to gables. Decoration has an Art Nouveau character. Hipped skillion verandah returning to sides. Timber posts and brackets.

**Physical Condition:**

**Modification Dates:** Little altered.

**Recommended Management:**

**Management:**

**Further Comments:** Historical Period: 1875-1910  
Architect/Designer: H. Josseland

**Criteria a)**

**Criteria b)**

**Criteria c)**

**Criteria d)**

**Criteria e)**

**Criteria f):** This item is assessed as aesthetically rare regionally (State). This item is assessed as historically rare locally.

**Criteria g):** This item is assessed as aesthetically representative regionally (State). This item is assessed as historically representative regionally (State).

**Integrity / Intactness:**

**References:**  
**Author:** Pararei Murphy  
**Title:** Shoalhaven Regional Heritage Study Review  
**Year:** September 1993

**Studies:**  
**Author:** Pararei Murphy  
**Title:** Shoalhaven Regional Heritage Study Review  
**Year:** 1993

**Date:** 23/09/2011
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**Item Name:** "Mananga" Berry Estate Manager's Farmhouse  
**Location:** A40 Princes Highway, Berry [Shoalhaven]

**Parcels:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Code</th>
<th>Lettumber</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Plan Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Latitude:**  
**Location validity:**  
**Map Name:** Berry 9028-3-N  
**Map Scale:** 1:25,000  
**AMG Zone:** Berry 9028-3-N

**Eastin:**  
**Lon:**  
**Spatial Accuracy:**  

**Listings:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Within a National Trust conservation area  
Royal Australian Institute of Architects register |

**Related Items:** Greenleaves, Lyburn, Coombing Park and the Berry School of Arts. The Berry-Roading Pastoral landscapes.

**Listing Comments:**

**Custom Field Three:**

**Custom Field Four:**

**Custom Field Five:**

**Custom Field Six:**

**Data Entry:**  
| Date First Entered: 16/05/1999 | Date Updated: 23/09/2011 | Status: Partial |

---
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**Item Name:** "Mananga" Berry Estate Manager's Farmhouse

**Location:** A40 Princes Highway, Berry [Shoalhaven]

**Images:**
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**Caption:** Berry Estate Manager's Farmhouse

**Copyright:**

**Image by:**

**Image Date:**
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**Image Path:**

**Image File:** 2390144a.jpg

**Thumb Nail Path:**
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Item Name: Weatherboard Overseer's Cottage
Location: 143 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Address: 143 North Street
Suburb/Nearest Town: Berry 2525
Local Govt Area: Shoalhaven
State: NSW
DUAP Region: Illawarra & Macarthur
Historic region: Illawarra
Other/Former Names: Former Burnett Farm
Area/Group/Complex: Group ID:
Aboriginal Area:
Curtailage/Boundary:
Item Type: Built
Owner: Private - Individual
Admin Codes: B330
Code 2: 346
Code 3: Y
Current Use: 
Former Uses: 
Assessed Significance: Local
Endorsed Significance:
Statement of Significance:
Built originally as an overseers residence, the cottage has representative significance as a surviving farm workers residence dating from 1917. It is generally in original condition except for the enclosure of verandahs and is a typical simple rural vernacular building of the period. Local significance (Shoalhaven).

Historical Notes of Provenance:
On the 14 February 1917 Lots 41, 43, 44 and 46 were purchased from the Berry Estate by Lady Alice Cannisters, wife of Sir Joseph Cannisters, KCVO, a solicitor of Sydney, and her unmarried elder, Rhoda Burnett. This property was near other Burnett purchases; Alexander Burnett Lots 38, 39, 40, 45, 47 & 50 and Jane Maria Burnett Lot 49. It appears that this cottage was erected as an overseer's cottage or shed on the family homestead circa 1917.

The Burnett family homestead was situated on Lots 43 & 44, at the rear of the present tennis courts burnt down in the 1970s. The entrance gates to the homestead still stand at the entrance to the sporting complex.

In 1946 Mr Conway and his daughter Maricia were occupying the cottage and in June 1961 Eric Standen, a general carrier, of Gambong owned the property. In March 1967 Henry (Harry) William Auld and his wife Phyllis 'Mavis' purchased the property. The property is still owned by Mavis Auld.

Themes: National Theme 4: Settlement
State Theme Accommodation (Housing)
Local Theme (none)
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**Item Name:** Weatherboard Overseer's Cottage  
**Location:** 143 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designer:</th>
<th>Year Completed:</th>
<th>Criteria: No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maker / Builder:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Started:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical Description:** Simple weatherboard and iron cottage, with gable roof and front verandah.

**Physical Condition:**

**Modification Dates:** Enclosure of front verandah and construction of skillion roofed extension to western end.

**Recommended Management:** Removal of verandah enclosure is recommended to restore the cottage to its original form.

**Management:**

**Further Comments:**

**Criteria:**
- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)
- e)
- f)
- g)

**Integrity / Intactness:**

**References:**
- Author
- Title
- Year
- Land Title Office NSW
- Certificates of Title

**Studies:**
- Author
- Title
- Number
- Title
- Year

**Parcels:**
- Parcel Code
- Lot Number
- Section
- Plan Code
- Plan Number

**Latitude:**

**Longitude:**

---
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Item Name: Weatherboard Overseer's Cottage
Location: 143 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Location validity:
Map Names: Berry 9029-3-N
AMG Zone: Berry 9029-3-N
Easting:
Nording:

Listings:
Related Items:
Listing Comments:
Custom Field Three:
Custom Field Four:
Custom Field Five:
Custom Field Six:

Data Entry:
Date First Entered: 10/03/1999
Date Updated: 19/02/2016
Status: Fertile
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| Item Name: | "GlenDevan" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse |
| Location: | 77 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven] |

| Address: | 77 North Street |
| Suburb/Nearest Town: | Berry 2535 |
| Local Govt Area: | Shoalhaven |
| State: | NSW |
| DUAP Region: | Illawara & Macarthur |
| Historic region: | Illawara |
| Parish: | COOLANGATTA |
| County: | CAMDEN |

| Other/Former Names: | Group ID: |
| Area/Group/Complex: | |
| Aboriginal Area: | |
| Curtilage/Boundary: | |

| Item Type: | Built |
| Group: | Residential buildings |
| Category: | House |
| Owner: | Roads and Traffic Authority |
| Admin Codes: | 3005 |
| Code 2: | 347 |
| Code 3: | Y |

| Current Use: | |
| Former Uses: | |

| Assessed Significance: | Local |
| Endorsed Significance: | |

**Statement of Significance:**

Representative asymmetrical Federation period weatherboard house with mature garden

**Historical Notes or Provenance:**

It is not known when this cottage was erected but it was built prior to 1894 when Dr Dawson and his family were in residence. The property was purchased from the Berry Estate by the widow of Dr Dawson on 4th February 1936. Dr Cecil Lucy Dawson had arrived in Berry in November 1894 to set up a surgery in the vacated office of surveyor John Swing. He had been practicing for the previous three years in Pambula, and was son of one of the oldest members of the legal profession in Sydney. Mr John Dawson had married Mathilda Wylie in 1852 in Pambula and their first child, Mabel was born there in 1853. More children were born after their move to Berry. Maisie in 1894, Cecil in 1896 and the twins Gilbert and Joy in 1905. Sadly Cecil died in March 1905. Dr Dawson died suddenly on 21 September 1917 aged 44 years.

The property was sold to William Henry Shute and his wife Elizabeth and they farmed the property for many years prior to Mr George Milliner owning it. There were several tenants of the farm until Mr and Mrs Arthur Balling, former tenants, purchased the property. At that time there was no garden only two date trees...there was no through road in those days. North Street ended at the laneway the next was all timber. Mrs Balling sold the property to Mr Gardner and now it is owned by the RTA.

**Themes:**

- National Theme: 4. Settlement
- State Theme: Accommodation (Housing)
- Local Theme: (more)
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Item Name: "GlenDevan" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: 77 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Designer:
Maker / Builder:

Year Started: 1915  Year Completed: 1915  Circ: Yes

Physical Description: Representative example of an asymmetrical Federation period weatherboard house with hipped roof and gabled projection. Shiltoor verandah, single rendered brick chimney. Mature garden including mature rainforest trees etc with later wall.

Physical Condition: Good original condition

Modification Dates: Verandah re-roofed. Chimney painted.

Recommended Management:

Management:

Further Comments: Historical Period: 1901-1925

Criteria a)
Criteria b)
Criteria c)
Criteria d)
Criteria e)
Criteria f)
Criteria g) This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally.

Integrity / Intactness:

References:

Author: Title: Year:
Land Title Office NSW (Kuppy) Certificate of Title Volume 1911 Folio 168
W. Footman Selling

Studies:

Author: Title: Number: Year:
Peters Freeman Pty Ltd Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1995-1998 0999 1999
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Full Report with Images

Date: 23/09/2011

This report was produced using the Heritage Guidelines software produced by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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**Item Name:** "GienDevan" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse  
**Location:** 77 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude:</th>
<th>Longitude:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location validity:</td>
<td>Spatial Accuracy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Name:</td>
<td>Map Scale:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG Zone:</td>
<td>Easting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing:</td>
<td>Nothing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listings: Name:</td>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Items:**

- **Listing Comments:**
- **Custom Field Three:**
- **Custom Field Four:**
- **Custom Field Five:**
- **Custom Field Six:**

**Data Entry:**
- Date First Entered: 12/05/1999
- Date Updated: 23/09/2011
- Status: Partial

---
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**Date:** 23/09/2011

Full Report with images

The report was produced using the Heritage Database software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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Item Name: "GlenDevan" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: 77 North Street, Berry [Shoalhaven]
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Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
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Image File: 2390150.jpg
Thumb Nail Path:
Thumb Nail File: t_2390150.jpg

State Heritage Register
Date: 23/09/2011
Full Report with Images
Page 4
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**Item Name:** Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes  
**Location:** Shoalhaven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>DLAP Region: Ilawara &amp; Macarthur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburb / Nearest Town:</td>
<td>Historic region: Ilawara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Govt Area:</td>
<td>Perilah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>County:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Former Names:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Area/Group/Complex:    | Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes |
| Aboriginal Area:       |                                  |

| Curtilage/Boundary:    |                                  |

| Item Type:             | Landscape                        |
| Group:                 | Farming and Grazing              |
| Category:              | Pastoralism                      |

| Owner:                 |                                  |

| Admin Codes:           | 6094                             |
| Code 2:                | Code 3: Y                        |

| Assessed Significance: | Endorsed Significance:           |

**Statement of Significance:**
The pastoral landscapes of Berry and Bolong are articulated by nineteenth and early twentieth century homesteads, dairy buildings and landscape plantings which illustrate European settlement of the area and the growth of the dairying industry. Buildings include examples of convict built structures, single storey Victorian residences, Federation style homesteads and vanascular forms which illustrate the archaeology of the dairying industry. Individual items are of State, Regional and Local significance. Important as a pastoral landscape which remains productive, has historic, social and aesthetic values and is contiguous with the Goolkan River and Kangaroo Valley Pastoral Landscapes. Regional significance (Ilawara Region).

**Historical Notes of Provenance:**
The Coolangatta Estate of Alexander Berry was established in 1822 with a grant of 4,950 hectares in the Shoalhaven District. In 1873 David Berry inherited the estate from his brother Alexander. Ten years later in 1883 David Berry appointed his cousin, John Hay, as manager. Between 1821 and 1865 over 145 miles of drains were cut to enable the reclamation of 6,100 hectares of swamp land. Alexander and David Berry founded the township of Broughton Creek (Berry) with villages established on both sides of the Shoalhaven River. These included Moro Meadow adjacent to the route of the Prince's Highway established in 1858 by A Berry. The death of David Berry in 1880 left the executors with the need to raise $50,000 pounds. As a consequence of this further drainage improvements were made to enable the sale of land.
The route of the railway to Bonniberry in 1893 followed the 1858 road. Commercial dairying began with the arrival of the cream separator in the 1880s when butter factories well established by the 1890s. Sub-divider of the Berry Estate following the death of David Berry benefited from the arrival of the railway, drainage and the new dairying technology. Many small dairy farms were established on the former Berry Estate over the 40 year period following the death of David Berry. Small dairy farms had developed concurrently on land surrounding the Berry Estate. Firstly on the accessible lower slopes, then the valleys and finally the upper slopes of the escarpment when the more marginal land became potentially profitable in the 1890s and 1900s. The dynamics of the milk industry (and the small farms) were affected in turn by the construction of a central milk factory at Berry in 1905, the introduction of the Newes Co-operative Dairy Co Ltd in 1912 and the introduction of refrigeration c.1910 which made possible delivery of milk to the Sydney market.

The dairy industry, and with it the Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes, developed in the twentieth century into an economic sub-system driven by metropolitan milk vendors. New technology to increase production rates has included winter feed yards, dairy skills and concrete feedlots.

During recent years many farms have changed to beef and other forms of pastoral activity with some farms increasing in size. Redundant homesteads and dairy buildings have been utilised by commuters wanting a rural lifestyle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes:</th>
<th>National Theme</th>
<th>State Theme</th>
<th>Local Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Economy</td>
<td>Environment - cultural lands</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Economy</td>
<td>Pastoralism</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Settlement</td>
<td>Accommodation (Housing)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Settlement</td>
<td>Land tenure</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Phases of Life:</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Designer:**

**Maker / Builder:**

**Year Started:**

**Year Completed:**

**Circa:** No

**Physical Description:** The Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes occupy the coastal plain north of the Shoalhaven River and eastern flanks of the Illawarra and Cambewarra Ranges. Sub-zones include the Cambewarra-Tapitali area, Bellawongrah and the catchment areas of Broughton Creek north of Berry. The latter are focussed around communities which developed outside the Berry Estate, Cambewarra, Tapitali, Burrawal, Woodhill and Broughton Vale. To the west the Bellawongrah community established itself along the ridge between Kangaroo Valley and the coastal plains.
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Shoalhaven

The scale and character are dependent on the subdivision of the Berry Estate which determined the location and form of dairy farms. Internal and external visual boundaries are created by modified and natural vegetation, roads, creeks and property boundaries which reflect the original pattern of subdivision and settlement. This pattern of small farms continues into the surrounding valleys and transitional areas modified by terrain and economics.

In the ranges every accessible pocket of land has been exploited to create a landscape with dramatic rapidly-changing visual components and views which contrasts with the horizontality of the coastal plain.

Continued dairying combined with slow change in the dairying industry has contributed to the survival of the underlying landscape patterns which encapsulate evidence of settlement and industry from the 1870s and earlier. The landscapes include examples of early vernacular buildings, farmscapes, early churches and public schools, nineteenth and twentieth century plantings. Victorian residences and a range of buildings, drainage schemes and structures which document settlement and land use patterns and the archaeology of the dairy industry in Shoalhaven.

Contiguous with the Crookhaven River and Kangaroo Valley Pastoral Landscapes.

Physical Condition:

Modification Dates: Aesthetic values to be managed in accordance with the general principles of the Visual Management Plan prepared by EDWAR in March 1994.

Recommended Management:

Historic parameters to be conserved:
Use - To be maintained as agricultural land.
Boundaries - These are defined by the limit of land clearing expressed in dairy farming and associated agricultural activity.
Land use and settlement patterns - The relationship of the agricultural areas to topography is a function of technology, economics and traditional farming practices. The scale and pattern of land use are dependent on the size of agriculture holdings determined by economics and subdivision of the larger estates in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Implicated in the location of farms, access roads, drainage canals, former rural communities identified by churches and schools and the associated farm structures and tree plantings.

Building Clusters - Comprising farm complexes and the associated farm structures and evidence of former rural communities identified by churches and schools.

Vegetation Patterns - Including remnant native vegetation, whether in pockets or defining the external boundaries, and in places these planked as windbreaks, garden elements or landscape elements.

Circulation Routes - The hierarchy of road and other transport and communication routes linking farms and outcrops with former and existing rural communities and towns and regional infrastructure created in response to economic and agricultural processes.
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The report was prepared using the Heritage database software produced by the heritage theme, EDWAR program.
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Shoalhaven

Archaeological sites are to be managed to retain their scientific and interpretive value.

Management:


Criteria a) - Criteria e)

Criteria f) This item is assessed as aesthetically rare regionally.
Criteria g) This item is assessed as historically representative regionally. This item is assessed as scientifically representative locally. This item is assessed as socially representative locally.

Integrity / Inactiveness:

References:

Author: Assoc. Prof. Tim Jow
title: Thematic History of Shoalhaven, 1985
Year: 1985

Author: Personil Murphy VU
Year: 1991

Studies:

Author: Personil Murphy VU
title: Warrnambool Region Heritage Study Review
Year: 1991

Parcela:

Latitude: Longitute: Spatial Accuracy: Map Scale:

Map Name: 5028-3-N 9029-3-S

AMG Zone: 5028-3-N 9029-3-S

Eastings: Northings:

Listings:
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Custom Field Three:

Date: 11/02/2010
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Item Name: **Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes**
Location: [Shoalhaven]

Image:

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
Image Number: Rol.: 16 Negative Number: 29-32
Image Path:
Image File: 2390151a.jpg
Thumb Nail Path:
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: [Shoalhaven]
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Shoalhaven
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This report was produced using the Heritage Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: [Shoalhaven]
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**Item Name:** Populus Nigra (9)

**Location:** Woodhill Mountain Road, Berry [Shoalhaven]

**Address:**

- Suburb / Nearest Town: Berry 2535
- Local Govt Area: Shoalhaven
- State: NSW

**CUAP Region:** Illawarra & Macarthur

**Historic region:** Illawarra

**Parish:** COOLANGATTA

**County:** CAMDEN

**Area/Group/Complex:** Lombardy poplar

**Aboriginal Area:**

**Curtilage/Boundary:**

**Item Type:** Landscape

**Group:** Parks, Gardens and Trees

**Category:** Trees of social, historic

**Owner:**

**Admin Codes:** 8008

**Code 1:** 14628

**Code 2:** Y

**Current Use:**

**Former Uses:**

**Assessed Significance:** Local

**Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:** Important contribution to Townscape. The poplars are typical of formal English plantings and form an important minor entrance from the northern rural districts and Kangaroo Valley. This road was once known as Broughton Road (Berry was first called Broughton in early settlement days). Local Significance.

**Historical Notes or Provenance:**

**Themes:**

- National Theme: 3. Economy
- State Theme: Environment - cultural lands
- Local Theme: (none)

**Designer:**

**Maker / Builder:**

**Year Started:**

**Year Completed:**

**Gcsa:** No

**Physical Description:** Average height of 25.0 metres and average canopy diameter of 4 metres.

**Physical Condition:**

---

State Heritage Register

For: Report with Images

The report was produced using the Heritage Facilities Advisory provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
Item Name: *Populus Nigra (9)*
Location: *Woodhill Mountain Road, Berry [Shoalhaven]*

**Modification Dates:**

**Recommended Management:** The curtilage around each tree should be 2 metres. There should be no widening of Woodhill Mountain Road within the curtilage zone of each tree. All future work within the curtilage zone should be assessed by an arborist. Collection of seed stock may be useful for future replanting. Any suckers should be removed to retain the main trees. Each tree should be checked for rust.

**Management:**

**Further Comments:**

**Criteria a)**

**Criteria b)**

**Criteria c)**

**Criteria d)**

**Criteria e)**

**Criteria f)**

**Criteria g)** This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally.

**References:**

**Studies:**

**Author**

**Title**

**Number**

**Year**

**Parcels:**

**Parcel Code**

**Lot Number**

**Section**

**Plan Code**

**Plan Number**

**Latitude:**

**Location validity:**

**Map Names:** Berry 3026-3-N

**AMG Zone:** Berry 3026-3-N

**Easting:**

**Nutting:**

**Listings:**

Within a National Trust conservation area

**Related Items:**

**Listing Comments:**

**State Heritage Register**

**Full Report with Images**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name</th>
<th>Populus Nigra (9)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Woodhill Mountain Road, Berry [Shoalhaven]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Three:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Four:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Five:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Six:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Entry:</th>
<th>Date First Entered: 10/03/1999</th>
<th>Date Updated: 10/11/2002</th>
<th>Status: Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Item Name: *Populus Nigra* (9)
Location: Woodhill Mountain Road, Berry [Shoalhaven]

Caption: *Populus Nigra* (9)
Copyright:
Image by:
Image Data:
Image Number:
Image Path:
Image File: 2390152a.jpg
Thumb Nail Path:
Thumb Nail File: l_2390152a.jpg
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Item Name: Populus Nigra (9)
Location: Woodhill Mountain Road, Berry [Shoalhaven]
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Copyright: 
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**Item Name:** "Glenvale" Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage  
**Location:** A371 Princes Highway, Broughton [Shoalhaven]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>DUAP Region</th>
<th>Historic region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A371 Princes Highway</td>
<td>Illawara &amp; Macarthur</td>
<td>Illawara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suburb / Nearest Town:** Broughton  
**Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven  
**State:** NSW  
**Other/Former Name:** "Glenvale", Former Berry Estate Tenant's Cottage

**Group / Complex:** Group 10: 
**Aboriginal Area:** 
**Curtailment/Border:** 
**Item Type:** Built  
**Group:** Residential buildings  
**Category:** Cottage  
**Owner:** Private - Individual  
**Admin Code:** B120  
**Code 2:** 45531  
**Code 3:** Y

**Current Use:**  
**Former Uses:**  
**Assessed Significance:** Local  
**Endorsed Significance:** 

**Statement of Significance:** "Glenvale" is representative of the larger mid to late nineteenth century Victorian Georgian style farmhouses associated with agriculture and dairying and an important early example of sawn timber slab construction. Major contribution to the Berry-Bulang pastoral landscape. Local significance (Shoalhaven District).

**Historical Notes or Provenance:** Built of sawn slabs from Berry's Broughton sawmill the Berry Estate cottage was erected circa 1850 for a tenant farmer. William Fletcher, a tenant, resided here for many years before moving to Jasper's Brush in the late 1890s. This property then became part of the Closer Settlement Act 1910 and reverted back to the crown. Ron Holands and his family stayed here circa 1914 and resided here for many years before selling to Alemann. Council of Berry Municipal Council.

**Thematic Statements:** 
- National Theme: Local Theme
- Economy
- Pastoralism (none)
- Settlement
- Accommodation (Housing) (none)

**Designer:** 
**Maker / Builder:** 
**Year Started:** 1850  
**Year Completed:** 1850  
**Date:** 23/06/2011  
**Full Report with Images:**

---

**Roads and Maritime Services**

**Non-Aboriginal (historic) assessment**
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Item Name: "Glenvale" Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Location: A371 Princes Highway, Broughton [Shoalhaven]

Physical Description: Large sawn slab residence and farmhouse with hipped, red pained, galvanised iron roof and enclosing verandahs. Sandstone brick chimneys rendered and detailed to resemble ashlar. Symmetrical Victorian Georgian front with central French doors and 2x2 sash windows on either side.

Physical Condition:

Modification Dates:
Recommended Management:
Management:

Further Comments: Historical Period: 1876-1900

Criteria a)
Criteria b)
Criteria c)
Criteria d)
Criteria e)
Criteria f) This item is assessed as historically rare locally.
Criteria g) This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally.

Integrity / Intactness:

References: Author: Berry Estate Trusts
Lands Title Office
Carolyn Ridg and Phil Breag

Studies: Author: B120

Parcels: Parcel Code: L016
LotNumber: Section: Plan Code: Plan Number:

Latitude:
Longitude:

Location validity:
Map Name: Berry 9028-3-N
Spatial Accuracy:
Map Scale: 1:25,000

State Heritage Register
Date: 23/09/2011
Full Report with images

This report was produced using the Heritage Database software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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Item Name: "Glenvale" Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Location: A371 Princes Highway, Broughton [Shoalhaven]

Non-Aboriginal (historic) assessment

Roads and Maritime Services

Princes Highway upgrade - Foxground and Berry bypass
Appendix K – Appendix B - 81

Non-Aboriginal (historic) assessment
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Item Name: "Gienvale" Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Location: A371 Princes Highway, Broughton [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
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This report was produced using the Heritage Database software provided by the Heritage Branch, DPMR Department of Planning
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Item Name: "Gienvale" Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Location: A371 Princes Highway, Broughton [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
Image Number:
Image Path:
Image File: 2390174b.jpg
Thumb Nail Path:
Thumb Nail File: 1.2390174b.jpg
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Item Name: "Glenvale" Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Location: A371 Princes Highway, Broughton [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
Image Number:
Image Path:
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Item Name: "Gleneale" Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Location: A371 Princes Highway, Broughton [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Colonial Vertical Timber Slab Cottage
Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
Image Number:
Image Path:
Image File: 2390174c.jpg
Thumb Nail Path:
Thumb Nail File: 12390174c.jpg
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This report was produced using the Heritage Database software produced by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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**Item Name:** "Oakleigh" Inter War Bungalow style Farmhouse

**Location:** Woodhill Mountain Road, Coolangatta (R) [Shoalhaven]

**Address:** Woodhill Mountain Road

**Suburb / Nearest Town:** Coolangatta (R)

**Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven

**State:** NSW

**DUAP Region:** Illawarra & Macarthur

**Historic region:** Illawarra

**Parish:** COOLANGATTA

**County:** CAMDEN

**Other/Former Names:** "Oakleigh"

**Area/Group/Complex:** Group ID:

**Aboriginal Area:**

**Curtailage/Boundary:**

**Item Type:** Built

**Group:** Residential buildings (Category: House)

**Owner:** Private - Individual

**Admin Code:** B177

**Current Use:**

**Former Uses:**

**Assessed Significance:** Local

**Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:**

Good example of an inter war farmhouse complete with representative twin sile in good condition. Local significance (Shoalhaven).

**Historical Notes or Provenance:**

Robert Virtue Boyd purchased 172 acres that became known as Oakleigh from the Berry Estate. In the 1850s R V Boyd was a member of the Boyd family that migrated from Donegal, Ireland in the 1860s and settled in the Woodhill and Broughton Vale areas. He was a JP and Mayor of Berry for the years 1864, 1865 and 1866. In 1866 he was reported to be leaving the district to take up farming activities on the Hunter. In 1911 he owned land along Broughton Creek south of Berry.

On 26 June, 1912 this farm, Portion 47, was purchased from the trustees of the Berry Estate by Alexander Burnett. He also purchased Lots 38, 39, 40, 45, 8, 50 at the same time. His wife, Jane Maria purchased part of Lot 49 in 1913, and his sisters, Alice Carruthers, wife of Sir Joseph Carruthers, and Rhoda Burnett purchased Lots 41, 43, 44 and part of Lot 48. In 1912 Carruthers was a friend and business associate of Sir John Alick Hay, Secretary for Lands 1899, Premier of NSW 1901-1906 and instrumental in the passing of the David Berry Hospital Act.

From 1914 to 1921 the McGehee family managed the property for Alexander Burnett. They milked 80 cows of mixed varieties. There was an orchard with figs and apples. Burnett visited regularly to pay the family and check the property. He paid Mr McGehee six pounds per week out of which the two sons received 10/- each.

The Burnett farm homestead was located south of this farm, across Bundowilah Creek.

**Date:** 23/09/2011

---

**State Heritage Register**

**Full Report with Images**

---

**Princes Highway upgrade - Foxground and Berry bypass**

**Appendix K – Appendix B - 86**

**Roads and Maritime Services**

**Non-Aboriginal (historic) assessment**
**Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory**

**State Heritage Register**

**Item Name:** "Oakleigh" Inter War Bungalow style Farmhouse

**Location:** Woodhill Mountain Road, Coolangatia (R) [Shoalhaven]

near where the tennis courts are now located. Sometime in the 1930s the house was burnt down to its foundations. Josiah Masters who was the owner of a Bundawalla farm bought the property in 1902 for his two sons and sons-in-law. The Masters kept stud Ayrshire cattle and farmed there until 1944 when they sold it to Jack Pomroy. Jack also grew crops and made silage. The farm was run by him and his son John. When Jack retired from farming and moved into Berry the farm was taken over by John. He sold off 123 acres in 1960 to the McIntosh family and Phil and Jan Maragahn (nee McIntosh) now reside on the property which is now used as a turf farm.

The house on Oakleigh had been burnt down when Master purchased the property so he purchased two rooms from the Commercial Hotel that was being renovated and used them in the construction of a new home. There is a fine Ficus obliqua growing by the cow huts, it is not a rainforest remnant but was probably planted in the 1950's by the Masters who were interested in gardening. (J & J Robson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes:</th>
<th>State Theme:</th>
<th>Local Theme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Pastoralism (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Settlement</td>
<td>Accommodation (housing) (none)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Designer:**

**Maker / Builder:**

**Year Started:**

**Year Completed:**

**Clue:** No

**Physical Description:** Inter war farmhouse with metal roof and encircling veranda on three sides. Fibre cladding to front gable, cement rendered chimney to front room.

**Physical Condition:**

**Modification Dates:**

**Recommended Management:**

**Management:**

**Further Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 23/05/2011

The report was produced using the Heritage Database software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Premier and Digital Government Services.
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Item Name: "Oakleigh" Inter War Bungalow style Farmhouse
Location: Woodhill Mountain Road, Coolangatta (R) [Shoalhaven]

Criteria e)
Criteria f)
Criteria g)

Integrity / Intactness:

References:
Author: Louis Files Office of NSW Volume 1977 Folio 18:
John Rehak
Miss Ann Dunn, 41 Victoria Street, Berry

Studies:
Author: N/A

Parcels:
Parcel Code: Lot/Number: Section: Plan Code: Plan Number:

Latitude:
Location validity: Spatial Accuracy:
Map Name: Berry 9023-3-N
Map Scale: 1:25,000
AMG Zone: Berry 9023-3-N
Easting: Nothing:

Listings:
Name: Within a National Trust conservation area

Related Items:
Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes

Listing Comments:
Custom Field Three:
Custom Field Four:
Custom Field Five:
Custom Field Six:

Data Entry:
Date First Entered: 1/05/1989
Date Updated: 23/09/2011
Status: Partial
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The report was produced using the Heritage Database software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
## B.3 Register of the National Estate

**Berry District, Princes Hwy, Berry, NSW, Australia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photographs</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>Register of the National Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Status</td>
<td>Indicative Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place ID</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place File No</td>
<td>1/11/102/0053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nominator's Statement of Significance

Scenic beauty of narrow undulating coastal plain, closely settled with dairy farms, bordered by the ocean and backed by rugged sandstone cliffs and steep forested slopes of the Illawarra escarpment. Fossil beds and other structures of the Gerringong volcanics. Vegetation varies from coastal heath to rainforest. Early Settlement (1820s) by Alexander Berry.

### Official Values Not Available

### Description

The area extends a Little south of Kiama some 30 km southward to Greenwell Point and embraces the coastline, the undulating coastal plain cut by small streams between ridges and isolated hills and the flood plain on both sides of the lower Shoalhaven River. It includes the steep benched slopes rising up to the escarpment of the Illawarra plateau which has an elevation of approximately 700 M. The area contains well-cared for homesteads and old buildings many of wide timber slab which contrast with modern silos and dairies. Stone walls and post and rail fences are also present. The Valley retains pockets of native rain forests some of which have regenerating TOONA AUSTRALIS and, fresh and saline wetlands. The area is reportedly a habitat for a variety of native fauna. The valley has a number of settlement centres with tourist resorts at Geroa and Shoalhaven Heads and service towns at Gerringong, Greenwell Point and Berry, the latter being substantially developed with a showground, parks and churches as the estate town for the Berry-Wollstoncraft-Hay estate of Coolangatta. A canal originally cut by Alexander Berry in 1822 between the Shoalhaven and Crookhaven rivers was the first canal constructed in Australia. A number of buildings within the area are recognised for their heritage significance and these are the Berry courthouse, Managa (Berry), St. Lukes church of England (Berry), Terrara House (terarra) and the Coolangatta estate comprising buildings, the David Berry monument, family cemetery and curtilage. The outstanding scenic quality of this area lies in its proximity to mountains and sea, and the lush pastures and peaceful setting of dairy farms and cattle grazing. The extensive alluvial flats on both sides of the Shoalhaven River contrast with the valleys and slopes below the escarpment. Picturesque views of the valley are experienced from popular viewpoints.

### History Not Available
Condition and Integrity

Good. Greatest Danger - rural subdivision.

Location

About 35,000ha, surrounding Berry, and extending from Kiama to Culburra, and from Cambewarra to the coast.

Bibliography

BERRY HISTORICAL SOCIETY. HISTORIC SITES OF BERRY. 1976.
WALKER, P. H. SOIL SURVEY OF THE SOUTH COAST. CSIRO GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF N.S.W. 1960.
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HISTORY

The land on which Berry is located was part of the Coolangatta Estate of Alexander Berry and Edward Wolstencorft. In 1812 George William Evans visited the district in order to survey it. He recorded the small river, Broughton Creek flowing through ‘the most beautiful meadow’ and noted the presence of fine cedar which, if combined with a navigable river, would make a beautiful settlement.

In 1822 Berry and Wolstencorft took up a 10,000 acre grant from Governor Brisbane in return for looking after 100 convicts. The area to the north of Broughton Creek and Broughton Mill Creek was purchased in October 1838.

The first European settlers—5 free sawyers employed by Alexander Berry—camped in this area and a Double Wharf was constructed at the junction of the two creeks, jutting out into the creeks allowing for berthing on both sides. A tannery was established soon after and by the 1840s a sawmill, powered by a waterwheel, was in operation.

By 1866 a village was taking shape on the ridges on either side of Broughton Mill Creek with a Post Office, school, and store to the east on Fulman Street with the tannery further east along Tannery Road on Broughton Creek. On the western side there was an inn and probably other buildings. With a population of 300 the area was declared a Municipality in 1868 at the instigation of Alexander Berry.

Alexander Berry died in 1873 and the estate passed to David, his younger brother who resided at the Coolangatta Homestead. David Berry surveyed the site and a town plan for Broughton Creek (Broughton Township, Sketch Plan 1883, see Figure 1) was drawn up on a square grid pattern as he and his first cousin once removed, John Hay, realised the settlement needed to have guidance for its future development. This covered an area on the western side of Broughton Mill Creek where many businesses and houses were already established. The grid plan gave no real consideration to the existing topography of hills and watercourses which delayed development in some parts. The subdivision pattern meant that houses had to be moved and businesses realigned along Queen Street in its new formation in 1879. Blocks of the original plan were later divided by centrally located east/west streets with the streets named after members of the Royal House of Whistler.

David Berry set aside land for an agricultural showground and for four churches. Church of England, Presbyterian, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic. He began negotiations with the government for permanent buildings such as a post office and courthouse. Community buildings were granted land. The banks purchased their land - the E.S. & A. Bank paid 560 pounds in March 1884 - and the town was achieving a substantial appearance when he died in 1889. In his honour, the town was named Berry in 1890. He had left large bequests in his will and long legal proceedings resulted. In 1913 much of the town was sold to raise money for his bequests (see Auction Plan Figure 2).

The town continued to flourish as a service centre for the area concentrating on sawmilling and dairying. In 1895 the railway arrived at Berry with the Bemboka to Bomaderry link providing a reliable means of transport for people and goods. In 1895 the Berry Central Butter Factory, set up by John Hay, was opened. In 1911 this became the Berry Rural Co-operative Society Ltd and was extended in 1913. It still contains a rural store and other rural service outlets. (See Figure 3)

By 1984 the population was 1,300 with the original town plan being expanded by additional blocks. Lately the town has added the roles of dormitory suburb and tourist attraction to its farming service centre function. Its popularity as a tourist destination has created new pressures and issues for the township.
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Careful planning and tree planting could combine to allow further development that is more sympathetic to the character of Berry especially in relation to the south eastern Princes Highway approach and views to and from the town.

The impact of highway traffic along the main (Queen) street is clearly a problem. The proposal for a bypass will address this issue but its impact needs to be minimised through skilful engineering and landscape design. The views out to the escarpment must still retain the impression of a rural landscape reaching as far as the escarpment. It is recommended that a Development Control Plan (DCP) be prepared for any development within the buffer zone. This should control the density, scale, form, landscaping, material, etc within this area. Obviously the preference would be to retain the area in its undeveloped state.

BOUNDARY OF LISTING

The boundary of the listing comprises three levels:

1. Visual boundary: This is the boundary of the National Trust’s Landscape Conservation Area. It places Berry in its regional context and incorporates views to horizon, surrounding rural landscape and the Illawarra Escarpment. (see Figure 4)

2. Subdivision boundary: relates to the town grid pattern and its development in the latter half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries. It has been extended across to join with the existing Fulman Street Heritage Conservation Area. (see Figure 13)

3. Buffer zone to recognise the importance of Berry’s rural setting and to protect the edges of the town within the rural lands surrounding it. This incorporates some creeks lines and flood prone lands. (See Figure 13)
Figure 2  Berry Auction Sale Plan, 21 February 1912 (Collection, Berry and District Historical Society)

Figure 3  Berry Rural Cooperative is adjacent to the railway line to the south of the town. (Susan Duyker, 2016)
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Figure 5. Plan of Berry township showing buildings and sites described in *Historic sites of Berry* (M. L. Lidbetter, 1993).

Figure 6. Shoalhaven LEIP 1983 heritage items and areas. Heritage items are outlined and hatched in red and the Pulman Street conservation area is outlined in green. (Shoalhaven City Council, 2010)
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Figure 9 View of escarpment along North Street, looking west. North Street defines the edge of town development and the beginning of rural lands. (Bob Clark 2010)

Figure 10 View to the Illawarra Escarpment over rural land looking west from North Street over land zoned for bypass. (Bob Clark 2010)
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Figure 12: Vista of escarpment looking north along Edward Street from the low ridge that runs through the town. Note the substantial street trees and bridge over the minor creek. (Susan Dwyer, 2010)

Figure 13: Proposed listing boundary. The Putman Street Heritage Conservation Area is edged with a solid line. The Subdivision boundary is dashed. The buffer zone is dotted. (Google Earth, 2010 with overlay by Bob Clark, 2010)
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Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure

1. Purpose

The unexpected archaeological finds procedure has been developed to provide a consistent approach on how to proceed in the event of uncovering an unexpected archaeological find (both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) during Roads and Maritime Services’ (RMS) activities. This includes RMS' heritage notification obligations under the following legislation: *Heritage Act 1977* (NSW), *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* (NSW), *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984* (Cth) and the *Coroner's Act 2009* (NSW).

This document provides relevant background information in Section 3, followed by the technical procedure in Sections 6 and 7. Associated guidance referred to in the procedure can be found in Appendices A-H.

2. Scope

This procedure assumes that an appropriate level of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment has been undertaken prior to project approval or determination. Such assessment would have identified all heritage items, including areas of archaeological potential, likely to be present within the project area.

However, in some cases, despite appropriate and adequate investigation, unexpected archaeological finds may be encountered during the project construction phase. When this happens, this procedure must be followed. This procedure provides direction on when to stop work, where to seek technical advice and how to notify the regulator, if required.

This procedure applies to all RMS construction and maintenance activities

This procedure applies to:

- The discovery of any unexpected archaeological find (usually during construction), where RMS does not have specific approval to disturb that find.
- All RMS projects that are approved or determined under Part 3A (including Transitional Part 3A Projects), Part 4, Part 5 or Part 5.1 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act), or any development that is exempt under the Act.

This procedure must be followed by all RMS staff, RMS alliance partners (including Local Council staff working under Road Maintenance Council Contracts, [RMCC]), developers under works authorisation deeds or any person undertaking Part 5 assessment for the purposes of RMS.

This procedure does not apply to:

- The legal discovery and disturbance of archaeological finds as a result of investigations being undertaken in accordance with OEH’s *Code of Practice for the Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in NSW* (2010); an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) issued under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act*
1974, or an approval issued under the Heritage Act 1977.

- The legal discovery and disturbance of archaeological finds as a result of investigations (or other activities) that are required to be carried out for the purpose of complying with any environmental assessment requirements under Part 3A (including Transitional Part 3A Projects) or Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act.
- The legal discovery and disturbance of archaeological finds as a result of construction related activities, where the disturbance is permissible in accordance with an AHIP2; an approval issued under the Heritage Act 1977; or the Minister for Planning’s conditions of project approval.

All new Construction Environment Management Plans (CEMPs) must make reference to and/or include this procedure (often included as a heritage sub-plan). Where approved CEMPs exist they must be followed in the first instance. Where there is a difference between approved CEMPs and this procedure, the approved CEMP must be followed. Where approved CEMPs do not provide sufficient detail on particular issues, this procedure should be used as additional guidance. When in doubt always seek environment and legal advice on varying approved CEMPs.

3. Types of unexpected archaeological finds and their legal protection

Project, field and environment staff will be critical to the early identification and protection of unexpected archaeological finds. Appendix A illustrates the wide range of archaeological discoveries found on RMS projects and provides a useful photographic guide to this early identification. Subsequent confirmation of archaeological discoveries must then be identified and assessed by technical specialists (usually an archaeologist).

An ‘unexpected find’ is any unanticipated archaeological discovery, for which RMS does not have existing approval to disturb.

These discoveries are categorised as either:

(a) Aboriginal objects
(b) ‘Non-Aboriginal’ unexpected finds
(c) Human skeletal remains.

The relevant legislation that applies to each of these categories is described below.

3.1 Aboriginal objects

Unexpected archaeological finds may include ‘Aboriginal objects’. The National Park and Wildlife Act 1974 protects Aboriginal objects which are defined as:

---

1 RMS’ heritage obligations are incorporated into either the conditions of heritage approval or within the RMS standard consultant’s brief for undertaking archaeological investigations.
2 RMS Procedure for Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation and investigation (2011) recommends that Part 4 and Part 5 projects that are likely to impact Aboriginal objects during construction seek a whole-of-project AHIP. This type of AHIP generally allows a project to impact known and potential Aboriginal objects within the entire project area, without the need to stop works. It should be noted that an AHIP may exclude impact to certain objects and areas, such as burials or ceremonial sites. In such cases, the project must follow this procedure.
3 This is considered to be any physical interference with the find such as manually picking it up and putting it back; moving it to another location near by, removing it from site; crushing or excavation it, or any other type of physical action that results in it being destroyed, defaced, damaged, harmed, impacted or altered in any way (this includes archaeological investigation activities).
"any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises New South Wales, being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains".

Examples of Aboriginal objects include stone tool artefacts, shell middens, axe grinding grooves, pigment or engraved rock art, burials and scarred trees.

**IMPORTANT!**

All Aboriginal objects are subject to statutory controls and protections.

If any impact is expected to an Aboriginal object, an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) is usually required from the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH). Also, when a person becomes aware of an Aboriginal object they must notify the Director-General of OEH about its location. Assistance on how to do this is provided in Section 7 (Step 5).

3.2 Non-Aboriginal unexpected finds

Non-Aboriginal unexpected finds may include statutory ‘relics’ or other non-statutory archaeological features (ie works).

The Heritage Act 1977 protects relics which are defined as:

"any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that relates to the settlement of the area that comprises NSW, not being Aboriginal settlement, and is of State or local heritage significance".

Relics may relate to past domestic, industrial or agricultural activities in NSW, and can include items such as bottles, items of clothing, pottery, building materials and general refuse.

**IMPORTANT!**

All relics are subject to statutory controls and protections.

If any impact is expected to a relic, a heritage approval is usually required from the NSW Heritage Council. Also, when a person discovers a relic they must notify the NSW Heritage Council of its location. Advice on how to do this is provided in Section 7 (Step 5).

Some non-Aboriginal archaeological features such as historic utilities and infrastructure are not considered to be ‘relics’; instead they are considered to be ‘works’. Examples

---

5 Except when Part 3A, Division 4.1 of Part 4 or Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act applies.
6 This is required under s69(A) of the National Park and Wildlife Act 1974 and applies to all projects assessed under Part 3A, Part 4, Part 5 and Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act, including exempt development.
7 Section 4(1) Heritage Act 1977.
8 Except when Part 3A, Division 4.1 of Part 4 or Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act applies.
9 This is required under s146 of the Heritage Act 1977 and applies to all projects assessed under Part 3A, Part 4, Part 5 and Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act, including exempt development.
of works that the RMS may encounter include former road infrastructure features and services, culverts, previous historic road formation, historic pavement, buried road retaining walls, tramlines, cisterns and conduits. Although an approval under the Heritage Act 1977 may not be required, the discovery of works must also be managed in accordance with this procedure.

3.3 Human skeletal remains

Human skeletal remains can be identified as either an Aboriginal object or non-Aboriginal relic depending on ancestry of the individual (Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal) and burial context (archaeological or non-archaeological). Remains are considered to be archaeological when the time elapsed since death is suspected of being 100 years or more. Depending on ancestry and context, different legislation applies.

As a simple example, a pre-contact archaeological Aboriginal burial would be protected under the National Park and Wildlife Act 1974, while a historic (non-Aboriginal) archaeological burial within a cemetery would be protected under the Heritage Act 1977. For these cases, the relevant heritage approval and notification requirements described in the above sections 3.1 and 3.2 would apply. In addition to the National Park and Wildlife Act 1974, finding Aboriginal human remains also triggers notification requirements to the Commonwealth Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Communities (SEWPC) under s20(1) of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984 (Cth).

**IMPORTANT!

All human skeletal remains are subject to statutory controls and protections.

All bones must be treated as potential human skeletal remains and work around them must stop while they are protected and investigated urgently.

However, where it is suspected that less than 100 years has elapsed since death, the human skeletal remains come under the jurisdiction of the State Coroner and the Coroners Act 2009 (NSW). Such a case would be considered a ‘reportable death’ and under legal notification obligations set out in s35(2), a person must report the death to a police officer, a coroner or an assistant coroner as soon as possible. This applies to all human remains less than 100 years old regardless of ancestry (i.e. both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal remains). Public health controls may also apply.

Guidance on what to do when suspected human remains are found is provided in Appendix F.

---

10 Under s19 of the Coroners Act 2009, the coroner has no jurisdiction to conduct an inquest into reportable death unless it appears to the coroner that (or that there is reasonable cause to suspect that) the death or suspected death occurred within the last 100 years.
4. Responsibilities

The following roles and responsibilities are relevant to this procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Definition/responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor (ACHA)</td>
<td>Provides Aboriginal cultural heritage advice to project teams. Acts as Aboriginal community liaison for projects on cultural heritage matters. Engages and consults with the Aboriginal community as per the RMS Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Sites Officer</td>
<td>Is an appropriately trained and skilled Aboriginal person whose role is to identify and assess Aboriginal objects and cultural values. For details on engaging Aboriginal sites officers, refer to RMS Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeologist (A)</td>
<td>Professional consultant, contracted on a case-by-case basis to provide heritage and archaeological advice and technical services (such as reports, heritage approval documentation etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project (on-call) Archaeologist</td>
<td>Professional consultant contracted for the implementation phase of a construction project to provide heritage and archaeological advice and technical services when required. Major projects with complex heritage issues often have a Project archaeologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager (PM)</td>
<td>Ensuring all aspects of this procedure are implemented. The PM can delegate specific site tasks to a construction environment manager, RMS site representatives or regional environment staff, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Environment Staff (RES)</td>
<td>Providing advice on this procedure to project teams. Ensuring this procedure is implemented consistently by supporting the PM. Supporting project teams during the uncovering of unexpected finds. Reviewing archaeological management plans and liaising with heritage staff and archaeological consultants as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Aboriginal parties (RAPs)</td>
<td>RAPs are Aboriginal people who have registered with the RMS to be consulted about a proposed RMS project or activity in accordance with OEH’s Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFS Environment Manager</td>
<td>Ensuring RFS field staff are aware of the RFS Escalation Protocol and RFS Unexpected Find Recording Form 418. Supporting the RFS Section Manager, where required, during the implementation of this procedure and ensuring reporting of unexpected finds through environment management systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFS Section Manager</td>
<td>Responding to escalated unexpected finds that have been uncovered during RFS maintenance works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure*
5. Acronyms

The following acronyms are relevant to this procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHIP</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASO</td>
<td>Aboriginal Site Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMP</td>
<td>Construction Environment Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSEWPC</td>
<td>Commonwealth Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRG</td>
<td>Environmental Planning and Regulatory Group. Please note at the time of finalisation EPRG became part of Environment Protection Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEH</td>
<td>Office of Environment and Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACHCI</td>
<td>Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Registered Aboriginal Party(ies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFS</td>
<td>Road and Fleet Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMCC</td>
<td>Road Maintenance Council Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Roads and Maritime Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Overview of the procedure

On discovering something that could be an unexpected archaeological find ('the find'), the project manager must implement the following procedure with the assistance of the regional environment staff and RMS heritage staff, where required.

There are eight steps in the procedure. These steps are shown briefly in Figure 1 below and explained in detail in Section 7.

![Diagram of the procedure]

**Figure 1:** Overview of steps to be undertaken on the discovery of an unexpected archaeological find.
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**Table 1:** Specific tasks to be implemented following the discovery of an unexpected find.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Guidance &amp; Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stop work, protect find and inform RMS environment staff</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Appendix A (Identifying Unexpected Archaeological Finds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Stop all work in the immediate area of the find and notify the PM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>RFS routine maintenance crews are required to follow the escalation protocol outlined in Appendix B and return to this procedure when directed by that protocol.</td>
<td>RFS Team Leader</td>
<td>Appendix B (RFS Escalation Protocol) Appendix C (RFS Find Recording Form 418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Take a number of photographs that captures the general context and specific detail of the find.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Appendix D (Photographing Unexpected Archaeological Finds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Inform relevant RMS regional environment staff, Senior Environmental Specialist (Heritage) and Regional Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor (where the find is thought to be an Aboriginal object).</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Appendix E (Key Environmental Contacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Delineate and protect the find with appropriate (high visibility) fencing, where practical.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>No further interference, including works, ground disturbance, touching or moving the find of any kind, must occur to the find or within the protected area.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Inform all site personnel of the protected area (a new environmentally sensitive zone).</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.8  | Where, at this stage, the find is reasonably suspected to be human remains proceed directly to notifying the local police who may take command of all or part of the site. Where the find does not involve human remains, continue progressing through this procedure. | PM | Appendix F  
(Uncovering Bones) |
| 1.9  | Report the find as a ‘Notifiable Event’ in accordance with the RTA Incident Classification and Reporting Procedure. Also implement any additional reporting requirements related to the project’s approval and CEMP. | PM/RES | RTA Incident Classification and Reporting Procedure |
| 2    | Contact and engage an archaeologist, and Aboriginal site officer where required | | |
| 2.1  | Contact the project (on-call) archaeologist to discuss the location and extent of the find and to arrange a site inspection, if required. The project CEMP contains contact details of the project archaeologist. | PM/RES | Also see Appendix E  
(Key Environmental Contacts) |
| 2.2  | Where there is no project archaeologist engaged for the project, engage a suitably qualified and experienced archaeological consultant to undertake a site inspection, conduct a preliminary assessment and prepare an archaeological management plan. Lists of consultants are available from online sources, including the yellow pages. Regional environment staff and RMS heritage staff can also advise on appropriate consultants. | PM/RES | Online lists of heritage consultants:  
- OFH List  
- AAGAI List |
| 2.3  | Where the find is likely to be an Aboriginal object, arrange for an Aboriginal sites officer to inspect the find. Generally, this person would be a sites officer from the relevant local Aboriginal land council. If an alternative contact person (ie a RAP) has been nominated as a result of previous consultation, then that person is to be contacted. | PM/ACHA | |
| 2.4  | If requested, provide photographs of the find taken at Step 1.3 to the archaeologist, and Aboriginal sites officer if relevant. | PM/RES | Appendix D  
(Photographing Unexpected Archaeological Finds) |
| 3    | Preliminary assessment and recording of the find | | |
| 3.1  | In a minority of cases, the archaeologist (and Aboriginal sites officer, if relevant) may | A/PM/ASO | Proceed to Step 8 |

**Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Guidance &amp; Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Arrange site access for the archaeologist and Aboriginal sites officer, if relevant, to inspect the find as soon as practicable. In the majority of cases a site inspection is required to conduct a preliminary assessment.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Subject to the archaeologist’s assessment (and the Aboriginal sites officer’s assessment, if relevant), work may recommence at a set distance from the find. This is to protect any other archaeological material that may exist in the vicinity, which has not yet been uncovered. Existing protective fencing established in Step 1.5 may need to be adjusted to reflect the extent of the newly assessed protective area. No works are to take place within this area once established.</td>
<td>A/PM/ASO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>The archaeologist (and Aboriginal sites officer, if relevant) may provide advice after the site inspection and preliminary assessment that no archaeological constraint exists for the project. Any such advice should be provided in writing by the archaeologist, (and Aboriginal sites officer if relevant) via email and confirmed by the project manager.</td>
<td>A/PM/ASO</td>
<td>Proceed to Step 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Where required, seek additional specialist technical advice (such as a forensic or physical anthropologist to identify skeletal remains). Regional environment staff and/or RMS heritage staff can provide contacts for such specialist consultants.</td>
<td>PM/RES</td>
<td>Appendix E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Where the find has been identified as a ‘relic’, ‘work’ or an ‘Aboriginal object’ the archaeologist should record the find on a proforma recording form.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>* Aboriginal site recording form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Non-Aboriginal site recording form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>The regulator can be notified informally by telephone at this stage by the archaeologist or project manager (or delegate). Any verbal conversations with regulators must be noted on the project file for future reference.</td>
<td>PM/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Guidance &amp; Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prepare an archaeological management plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The archaeologist must prepare an archaeological management plan (with input from the Aboriginal sites officer, where relevant) shortly after the site inspection. This plan is a brief overview of the following: (a) description of the feature, (b) historic context, if data is easily accessible, (c) likely significance, (d) heritage approval and regulatory notification requirements, (e) heritage reporting requirements, (f) stakeholder consultation requirements, (g) relevance to other project approvals and management plans etc.</td>
<td>A/ASO</td>
<td>Appendix G (Archaeological Advice Checklist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>In preparing the plan, the archaeologist with the assistance of regional environment staff must review the CEMP, any heritage sub-plans, any conditions of heritage approvals, any conditions of project approval (and or Minister’s Conditions of Approval) and heritage assessment documentation (eg Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report). This will outline if the unexpected find is consistent with previous heritage/project approval(s) and/or previously agreed management strategies. The project manager and regional environment staff must provide all relevant documents to the archaeologist to assist with this. Discussions should occur with design engineers to consider if re-design options exist and are appropriate.</td>
<td>A/RES/PM</td>
<td>Appendix G (Archaeological Advice Checklist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The archaeologist must submit this plan as a letter, brief report or email to the project manager outlining all relevant archaeological issues. This plan should be submitted to the project manager as soon as practicable. Given that the archaeological management plan is an overview of all the necessary requirements (and the urgency of the situation), it should take no longer than two working days to submit to the project manager.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>The project manager must review the archaeological management plan to ensure all requirements can reasonably be implemented. Seek additional advice from regional environment staff and RMS heritage staff, if required.</td>
<td>PM/RES/SES (H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Notify the regulator, if required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Review the archaeological management plan to confirm if regulator notification is required. It may state notification is not required.</td>
<td>PM/RES/SES (H)</td>
<td>Proceed to Step 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>If notification is required, complete the template notification letter.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Appendix H (Template Notification Letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Forward the draft notification letter, archaeological management plan and the site recording form to regional environment staff and Senior Environmental Specialist (Heritage) for review, and consider any suggested amendments.</td>
<td>PM/RES/SES (H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Forward the signed notification letter to the relevant regulator (ie notification of non-Aboriginal relics must be given to the Heritage Branch of OEH, while notification for Aboriginal objects must be given to the Environmental Protection and Regulation Group of OEH). Informal notification (via a phone call or email) to the regulator prior to sending the letter is appropriate. The archaeological management plan and the completed site recording form must be submitted with the notification letter. For Part 3A and Part 5.1 projects, the Department of Planning and Infrastructure must also be notified.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Appendix E (Key Environmental Contacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>A copy of the final signed notification letter, archaeological management plan and the site recording form should be kept on file by the project manager and a copy sent to the Senior Environmental Specialist (Heritage).</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>If requested by the regulator, arrange a site inspection of the find for them.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 **Implement archaeological management plan**

6.1 Modify the archaeological management plan to take into account any additional advice resulting from notification and discussions with the regulator. | A/PM |
6.2 Implement the archaeological management plan. Where impact is expected, this would include such things as a formal assessment of significance and heritage impact assessment, preparation of excavation or recording methodologies, consultation with registered Aboriginal parties, obtaining heritage approvals etc, if required. | PM/RAPs | PACHCI Stage 3 |
6.3 Where heritage approval is required contact regional environment staff for further advice and support material. Please note time constraints associated with heritage approval preparation and processing. Project scheduling may need to be revised where extensive delays are expected. | PM/RES |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Guidance &amp; Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>For Part 3A/Part 5.1 projects, assess whether heritage impact is consistent with the project approval or if project approval modification is required from the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. Seek advice from regional environment staff and Environment Branch specialist staff if unsure.</td>
<td>PM/RES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Where statutory approvals (or project approval modification) are required, impact upon relics and/or Aboriginal objects must not occur until heritage approvals are issued by the appropriate regulator.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Where statutory approval (or Part 3A/Part 5.1 project modification) is not required and where archaeological recording is recommended by the archaeologist, sufficient time must be allowed for this to occur.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Ensure short term and permanent storage locations are identified for archaeological material removed from site, where required. Interested third parties (e.g., museums or local councils) should be consulted on this issue. Contact regional environment staff and Senior Environmental Specialist (Heritage) for advice on this matter, if required.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Ensure all archaeological excavation and heritage recording are completed prior to RMS project work resuming.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Review CEMPs and approval conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Guidance &amp; Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Clarify regulator expectations around written authorisation to commence project work. This may relate to situations where human remains are found or when they request to review preliminary archaeological excavation reports or assessments prior to the resumption of RMS project work. Where this is not explicit in heritage approval conditions, expectations should be clarified directly with the regulator.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Update the CEMP, site mapping and project delivery program as appropriate with any project changes resulting from final heritage management (e.g., retention of heritage item, salvage of item). Updated CEMPs must incorporate additional conditions arising from any heritage approvals, and Aboriginal community consultation if relevant. Include any changes to CEMP in site induction material and update site workers during toolbox talks.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resume work</td>
<td>RES/A/PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Seek written clearance to resume project work from regional environment staff and the archaeologist (and regulator, if required). Clearance would only be given once all archaeological excavation and heritage recording (where required) are complete. Resumption of project work must be in accordance with the all relevant project/heritage approvals/determinations.</td>
<td>RES/A/PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>If required, ensure archaeological excavation reporting and other heritage approval conditions are completed in the required timeframes. This includes artefact retention repositories and/or disposal strategies.</td>
<td>PM/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Forward all heritage/archaeological assessments, heritage location data and its RMS ownership status to the Senior Environmental Specialist (Heritage). They will ensure all heritage items in RMS ownership and/or control are considered for the RMS S170 Heritage Register.</td>
<td>PM/SES(H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>If additional unexpected finds are uncovered this procedure must begin again from Step 1.</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Seeking advice

Advice regarding this procedure should be directed to regional environment staff in the first instance, and then RMS heritage staff, where required. RMS staff can contact RMS regional environment staff for advice on this procedure at any time. Contractors and alliance partners should ensure their own project environment managers are aware of and understand this procedure. Regional environment staff can assist non-RMS project environment managers with enquiries concerning this procedure.

!important!

RMS staff and contractors are not to seek advice on this procedure directly from OEH without first seeking advice from regional environment and heritage staff.

Technical archaeological advice regarding the unexpected find should be sought from the contracted archaeologist. Technical specialist advice can also be sought from heritage staff within Environment Branch to assist with the preliminary archaeological identification and technical reviews of heritage/archaeological reports.

9. Related information

Contact details: Manager, Environmental Policy, Environment Branch, 02 8588 5740
Effective date: 1 November 2011
Review date: Final + 12 months

This procedure should be read in conjunction with:

- RTA Incident Classification and Reporting Procedure.
- RMS Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation.
- RTA Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines.

This procedure replaces:

- Procedure 5.5 (“unexpected discovery of an archaeological relic or Aboriginal object”) outlined in the RTA’s Heritage Guidelines 2004.

Other relevant reading material:


---

## 10. List of appendices

The following appendices are included to support this procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Identifying Unexpected Archaeological Finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Road and Fleet Services Escalation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>RFS Unexpected Find Recording Form 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Photographing Unexpected Archaeological Finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Key Environment Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Uncovering Bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Archaeological Advice Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Template Notification Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Identifying Unexpected Archaeological Finds

The following images can be used to assist in the preliminary identification of a potential unexpected find (both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) during construction and maintenance works. Please note this is not a comprehensive typology.

Top left hand picture continuing clockwise: Stock camp remnants (Hume Highway Bypass at Tarcoola), Linear archaeological feature with post holes (Hume Highway Duplication), Animal bones (Hume Highway Bypass at Woomargama), Cut wooden stake, Glass jars, bottles, spoon and fork recovered from refuse pit associated with a Newcastle Hotel (Pacific Highway, Adamstown Heights, Newcastle area).
Top left hand picture continuing clockwise: Woodstave water pipe with tar and wire sealing (Horsley Drive); Tram tracks (Sydney); Brick lined cistern (Clyde); Retaining wall (Great Western Highway, Leura).
Top left hand picture continuing clockwise: Road pavement (Great Western Highway, Lawson); Sandstone kerbing and guttering (Parramatta Road, Mays Hill); Telford road (sandstone road base, Great Western Highway, Leura); Ceramic conduit and sandstone culvert headwall (Blue Mountains, NSW); Corduroy road (timber road base, Entrance Road, Wamberal).
Top left hand corner continuing clockwise: Alignment Pin (Great Western Highway, Wentworth Falls); Survey tree (MR7, Albury); Survey tree (Kidman Way, Darlington Point, Murrumbidgee); Survey tree (Cobbb Highway, Deniliquin); Milestone (Great Western Highway, Kingswood, Penrith); Alignment Stone (near Guntawong Road, Riverstone). Please note survey marks may have additional statutory protection under the Surveying and Spatial Information Act 2002.
Top left hand corner: Culturally modified stone discovered on Main Road 92, about two kilometres west of Sassafras. The rest of the images show a selection of stone artefacts retrieved from test and salvage archaeological excavations during the Hume Highway Duplication and Bypass projects from 2006-2010.
Appendix B

Road and Fleet Services Escalation Protocol

Road crews in RMS Road and Fleet Services (RFS) undertake routine maintenance works such as patching, cleaning, line marking and milling within the road reserve. In addition, these works are often undertaken at night on urban thoroughfares. A specific escalation protocol has been developed to ensure that disruption to traffic is minimised if an unexpected find is encountered when carrying out such maintenance works.

### Unexpected find uncovered

- **All:** Stop works in immediate area of find
- **All:** Notify Team Leader immediately

**Team Leader:** Photograph and record find using RFS Form 418

**Team Leader:** Is the find bones?

- **Yes**
  - **Section Manager:** Can works be amended to avoid impact upon find?
  - **Yes**
    - **Team Leader:** Ensure the find is physically covered to protect from future damage and resume project works with care.
  - **No**
    - **Section Manager:** Ensure find is secured* (e.g. fenced off and/or covered over) while ensuring road function is maintained. Liaise with Traffic Management Centre (TMC), if required.
  - **No / Unsure**
    - **Team Leader:** Contact Section Manager (or higher).

- **No**
  - **Section Manager:** Contact RES and proceed to Step 1.4 of the procedure and follow Appendix F (Uncovering Bones), where required.

**Team Leader:** Submit final RFS Form 418 to OSE and RFS Environment Manager the next working day, who will forward it to the regional environment staff and Senior Environmental Specialist (Heritage).

**Section Manager:** Submit final RFS Form 418 to OSE and RFS Environment Manager the next working day, who will forward it to the regional environment staff and Senior Environmental Specialist (Heritage). RES: proceed to Step 1.4 of the procedure and also decide if environmental assessment is required.

---

*Appropriate temporary covering of the find is something that protects it from further damage and that can be removed quickly the next day without damage from re-excavation. For example geofabric and loose, dry asphalt, or a metal plate. Certain unexpected finds (such as human remains) should not be covered with loose material as the re-excavation process is likely to cause further damage to the find. Fencing and immediate action is appropriate in these rare cases.
Appendix C

RFS Unexpected Find Recording Form 418
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Description of works being undertaken**  
(eg Removal of failed pavement by excavation and pouring concrete slabs in 1m x 1m replacement sections). | |
| **Description of exact location of find**  
(eg Within the road formation on Parramatta Road, eastbound lane, at the corner of Johnston Street, Annandale, Sydney). | |
| **Description of item found**  
(eg Metal tram tracks running parallel to road alignment. Good condition. Tracks set in concrete, approximately 10cms (100 mm) below the current ground surface). | |
| **Sketch**  
(Provide a sketch of the find's general location in relation to other road features so its approximate location can be mapped without having to re-excavate it. Also annotate this sketch with the location and direction of any photographs of the item taken). | |

**Action Taken** (Tick either A or B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Unexpected find will not be affected by maintenance works</th>
<th>B. Unexpected find will be affected by maintenance works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Describe if and how works were amended to avoid impact to the find and the action taken to cover the item.</td>
<td>B. Describe how works will affect the find. (eg Milling is required to be continued to 200 mm depth to ensure road pavement requirements are met. Milling to required depth would affect the top 50 mm of potential heritage pavement).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFS Unexpected Find Recording Form

Attach Photographs. (Take a number of close up and general photographs so anyone off site can understand the location of the find, the material it is made from and any distinguishing features).

Team Leader Signature

**Action:** Refer issue to Section Manager (or higher) immediately where ‘B’ has been ticked.

To be completed by Section Manager

**Describe any further considerations to amend project works to avoid unexpected find and if impact is still anticipated.**

**Describe action taken to secure site temporarily**

Section Manager Signature

**Action:** Escalate to environment and heritage staff where impact to item cannot be avoided.

Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure
Appendix D

Photographing Unexpected Archaeological Finds

**Removal of the find from its context (e.g. excavating from the ground) for photographic purposes is not permitted.**

Photographs of unexpected finds, in their original placement (*in situ*), assists heritage staff and archaeologists to identify ‘finds’ soon after being uncovered. Emailing good quality photographs to specialists can allow for better quality and faster heritage advice. The key elements that must be captured in photographs of the find include its position, the general find itself and any distinguishing features. All photographs must have a scale (ruler, scale bar, mobile phone, coin) and a note describing the direction of the photograph.

**Context and detailed photographs**

It is important to take a general photograph (Figure 1) to convey the location and setting of the find. This will add much value to the subsequent detailed photographs also required (Figure 2).

![Figure 1: Telford road uncovered on the Great Western Highway (Leura) in 2008.](image1)

**Photographing distinguishing features**

Where unexpected finds (e.g. artefacts) have a distinguishing feature, close up detailed photographs must be taken of this, where practicable. See Figures 3 and 4 for examples.

![Figure 3: Ceramic bottle artefact with stamp.](image2)

![Figure 4: Detail of the stamp allows ‘Tooth & Co Limited’ to be made out. This is helpful to a specialist in gauging the artefact’s origin, manufacturing date and likely significance.](image3)
Photographing bones

The majority of bones found on site will those of be recently deceased animal bones, often requiring no further assessment (unless they are in archaeological context). However, if bones are human RMS must contact the police immediately (see Appendix F for detailed guidance). Taking quality photographs of the bones can often resolve this issue quickly. Heritage staff in Environment Branch can confirm if bones are human or non-human if provided with appropriate photographs. Ensure that photographs of bones are not concealed by foliage (Figure 5) as this makes it difficult to identify. Minor hand removal of foliage can be undertaken as long as disturbance of the bone does not occur. Excavation of the ground to remove bone(s) should not occur, nor should they be pulled out of the ground if partially exposed. Where sediment (adhering to a bone found on the ground surface) conceals portions of a bone (Figure 6) ensure the photograph is taken of the bone (if any) that is not concealed by sediment.

Ensure that all close up photographs include the whole bone and then specific details of the bone (especially the ends of long bones, the epiphysis, which is critical for species identification). Figures 7 and 8 are examples of good photographs of bones that can easily be identified from the photograph alone. They show sufficient detail of the complete bone and the epiphysis.
Appendix E

Key Environmental Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunter region</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Officer</td>
<td>4924 0281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor</td>
<td>4924 0383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern region</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Officer</td>
<td>6640 1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor</td>
<td>6640 9305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern region</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Officer</td>
<td>4221 2765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor</td>
<td>4221 2767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West region</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Officer</td>
<td>6930 1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor</td>
<td>6937 1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney region</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Officer</td>
<td>8814 2516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor</td>
<td>8849 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western region</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Officer</td>
<td>6861 1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor</td>
<td>6861 1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Highway Office</td>
<td>Environmental Services Manager</td>
<td>6640 1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Highway Office</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Officer</td>
<td>6923 3419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and Fleet Services</td>
<td>Environment Manager</td>
<td>9508 7721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Branch</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Specialist, Heritage</td>
<td>8588 5754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heritage Regulators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Branch</th>
<th>Office of Environment and Heritage</th>
<th>Locked Bag 5020</th>
<th>Parramatta NSW 2124</th>
<th>Phone: (02) 9873 8500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Communities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GPO Box 787</td>
<td>Canberra ACT 2601</td>
<td>Phone: (02) 6274 1111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning and Aboriginal Heritage Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Protection and Regulation Group* (Metropolitan)</th>
<th>Office of Environment and Heritage</th>
<th>Locked Bag 914</th>
<th>Coffs Harbour NSW 2450</th>
<th>Phone: (02) 6851 5946</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Aboriginal Heritage Section Environment Protection and Regulation Group* (North East)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Environment and Heritage</td>
<td>Locked Bag 914</td>
<td>Coffs Harbour NSW 2450</td>
<td>Phone: (02) 6851 5946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environment and Conservation Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Protection and Regulation Group* (North West)</th>
<th>Office of Environment and Heritage</th>
<th>Dubbo NSW 2830</th>
<th>Phone: (02) 6863 5330</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Protection Section Environment Protection and Regulation Group* (South)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PO Box 733</td>
<td>Queanbeyan NSW 2620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project-Specific Contacts (complete as needed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/Alliance Environment Manager</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Environmental Officer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Archaeologist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Police Station</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEH: Environment Line</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131 555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note: at the time of finalising this procedure EPRG became part to the Environment Protection Authority (EPA), full title block was yet to be finalised.

Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure
Appendix F

Uncovering Bones

All matters relating to uncovering bones and RMS' human remains notification obligations should involve RMS regional environment and heritage staff. They will guide project managers through occurrences of uncovering bones.

This appendix provides project managers with advice (1) on what to do on first uncovering bones (2) the range of human skeletal notification pathways and (3) additional considerations and requirements when managing the discovery of human remains.

1. First uncovering bones

Stop all work in the vicinity of the find. All bones uncovered during project works should be treated with care and urgency as they have the potential to be human remains. Therefore they must be identified as either human or non-human as soon as possible by a qualified forensic or physical anthropologist. These specialist consultants can be sought by contacting regional environment staff and/or heritage staff at Environment Branch.

On the very rare occasion where it is instantly obvious from the remains that they are human, the project manager (or a delegate) should inform the police by telephone prior to seeking specialist advice. It will be obvious that it is human skeletal remains where there is no doubt, as demonstrated by the example in Figure 1. Often skeletal elements in isolation (such as a skull) can also clearly be identified as human. Note it may also be obvious that human remains have been uncovered when soft tissue and clothing are present.

Figure 1: Schematic of a complete skeleton that is 'obviously' human.12

Figure 2: Disarticulated bones that require assessment to determine species.

This preliminary phone call is to let the police know that the RMS is undertaking a specialist skeletal assessment to determine the approximate date of death which will inform legal jurisdiction. The police may wish to take control of the site at this stage. If not, a forensic or physical anthropologist must be requested to make an on-site assessment of the skeletal remains.

Where it is not ‘obvious’ that the bones are human (in the majority of cases, illustrated by Figure 2), specialist assessment is required to establish the species of the bones. Photographs of the bones can assist this assessment if they are clear and taken in accordance with guidance provided in Appendix D. Good photographs often result in the bones being identified by a specialist without requiring a site visit, noting they are nearly always non-human. In these cases, non-human skeletal remains must be treated like any other unexpected archaeological find.

If the bones are identified as human (either by photographs or an on-site inspection) a technical specialist must determine the likely ancestry (Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal) and burial context (archaeological or forensic). This assessment is required to identify the legal regulator of the human remains so urgent notification (as below) can occur. Preliminary telephone or verbal notification by the project manager or regional environment staff is considered appropriate. This must be followed up later by RMS formal letter notification as per Appendix H when a management plan has been developed and agreed to by the relevant parties.

2. Range of human skeletal notification pathways

The following is a summary of the different notification pathways required for human skeletal remains depending on the preliminary skeletal assessment of ancestry and burial context.

A. Human bones are from a recently deceased person (less than 100 years old).

☑ Action
A police officer must be notified immediately as per the obligations to report a death or suspected death under s35 of the Coroners Act 2009 (NSW). It should be assumed the police will then take command of the site until otherwise directed.

B. Human bones are archaeological in nature (more than 100 years old) and are likely to be Aboriginal remains.

☑ Action
The OEH (EPRG) and the RMS Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor (ACHA) must be notified immediately. The ACHA must contact and inform the relevant Aboriginal community stakeholders who may request to be present on site. Relevant stakeholders are determined by the RTA’s Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation.

C. Human bones are archaeological in nature (more than 100 years old) and likely to be non-Aboriginal remains.

☑ Action
The OEH (Heritage Branch, Conservation Team) must be notified immediately.
The simple diagram below summarises the notification pathways on finding bones.

After the appropriate verbal notifications (as described in B and C), the project manager must proceed through the *Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure* to formulate an archaeological management plan (Step 4). Note no archaeological management plan is required for forensic cases (A), as all future management is a police matter. Non-human skeletal remains must be treated like any other unexpected archaeological find and so must proceed to recording the find as per Step 3.6.

### 3. Additional considerations and requirements

Uncovering archaeological human remains must be managed intensively and needs to consider a number of additional specific issues. These issues might include facilitating culturally appropriate processes when dealing with Aboriginal remains (such as repatriation and cultural ceremonies). RMS ACHA can provide advice on this and how to engage with the relevant Aboriginal community. Project managers, more generally, may also need to consider overnight site security of any exposed remains and may need to manage the onsite attendance of a number of different external stakeholders during assessment and/or investigation of remains. Project managers may also be advised to liaise with local church/religious groups and the media to manage community issues arising from the find. Additional investigations may be required to identify living descendants, particularly if the remains are to be removed and relocated.

If exhumation of the remains (from a formal burial or a vault) is required, project managers should also be aware of additional approval requirements under the *Public Health Act 1991* (NSW). Specifically, RMS is required to apply to the Director General of NSW Department of Health for approval to exhume human remains as per Clause 26 of the *Public Health (Disposal of Bodies) Regulation 2002* (NSW). Further, the exhumation of such remains needs to consider health risks such as infectious disease control, exhumation procedures and reburial approval and registration. Further guidance on this matter can be found at the NSW Department of Health [website](http://www.health.nsw.gov.au).

In addition, due to the potential significant statutory and common law controls and prohibitions associated with interfering with a public cemetery, project teams are advised, when works uncover human remains adjacent to cemeteries, to confirm the cemetery’s exact boundaries.

---

13 This requirement is in addition to heritage approvals under the *Heritage Act 1977*. 

*Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure*
Appendix G

Archaeological Advice Checklist

The archaeologist must advise the project manager of an appropriate archaeological management plan as soon as possible after site inspection (see Step 4). An archaeological management plan can include a range of activities and processes, which differ depending on the find and its significance. In discussions with the archaeologist the following checklist can be used by the project manager and the archaeologist as a prompt to ensure all relevant archaeological issues are considered when developing this plan. This will allow the project team to receive clear and full advice to move forward quickly and in the right direction. Archaeological advice on how to proceed can be received in a letter or email outlining all relevant archaeological issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment and investigation</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Outcome/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment of significance</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment of heritage impact</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Archaeological excavation</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Archival photographic recording</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Heritage approvals and notifications               | Yes/No   |               |
| • AHIPs, Section 140, S139 exceptions etc         | Yes/No   |               |
| • Regulator relics/objects notification            | Yes/No   |               |
| • RMS’ S170 Heritage Register listing requirements| Yes/No   |               |
| • Compliance with CEMP or other project heritage approvals | Yes/No |               |

| Stakeholder consultation                           | Yes/No   |               |
| • Aboriginal stakeholder consultation requirements and how it relates to RTA Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation (PACHCI) | Yes/No |               |
| • Advice from regional environmental staff, Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor, RMS heritage team | Yes/No |               |

| Artefact management                                | Yes/No   |               |
| • Disposal strategy for non-Aboriginal relics or heritage material (eg former road pavement): short term and permanent storage locations (interested third parties should be consulted on this issue) | Yes/No |               |
| • Control Agreement for Aboriginal objects          | Yes/No   |               |

| Program and budget                                  | Yes/No   |               |
| • Time estimate associated with archaeological work. | Yes/No   |               |
| • Total cost of archaeological work.                | Yes/No   |               |
Appendix H

Template Notification Letter
Re: Unexpected archaeological find uncovered during Roads and Maritime Services project works.

I write to inform you of an unexpected archaeological [select: relic and/or Aboriginal object] found during Roads and Maritime Services construction works at [insert location] on [insert date]. Where the regulator has been informally notified at an earlier date by telephone, this should be referred to here.

This letter is in accordance with the notification requirement under [select: Section 140 of the Heritage Act 1977 (NSW) or Section 89A of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NSW)].

**NB:** On finding Aboriginal human skeletal remains this letter must also be sent to the Commonwealth Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Communities (SEWPC) in accordance with notification requirements under Section 20(1) of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984 (Cth).

[Provide a brief overview of the project background and project area. Provide a summary of the description and location of the find, including a map and image where possible. Also include how the project was assessed under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW) (eg Part 5). Also include any project approval number, if available.]

Roads and Maritime Services [or contractor] has sought professional archaeological advice regarding the find. A preliminary assessment indicates [provide a summary description and likely significance of the find]. Please find additional information on the site recording form attached.

Resulting from these preliminary findings, Roads and Maritime Services [or contractor] is proposing [provide a summary of the proposed archaeological approach (eg develop archaeological research design, seek heritage approvals and undertake archaeological investigation). Also include preliminary justification of such archaeological impact with regard to project design constraints and delivery program].

The proposed archaeological approach will be further developed in consultation with a nominated Office of Environment and Heritage [select either EPRG/Heritage Branch, Conservation Team] staff member.

Please contact me if you have any input on this approach or if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely

[Sender name and position]

[Attach the archaeological management plan and site recording form].
Appendix D

Test excavation procedure
Test excavation procedure

D.1 Introduction
This manual provides a set of notes and guidelines on excavation and recording prepared for work to be undertaken as part of a test excavation at G2B H14, Berry, New South Wales. The manual sets out general principles of excavation and explains the recording systems and some of the terms used. It is not designed for rigid adherence, as its application in the field will depend upon on several factors, for example, the numbers, experience and skill of field personnel, technical resources, time availability and field conditions.

D.2 Excavation units

Context
This is the smallest unit of excavation. The term is applied to any unit of excavated deposit. A context can be a unit of stratigraphy (a lens, layer, pit fill, etc.) or it can be an arbitrary unit within a larger natural layer. A context may therefore be bounded by the sides of an excavation square or by the walls of a room. A context should not cut across layer boundaries (that is, should not include more than one depositional unit). A context may be either:

- Stratigraphically defined by soil colour, texture, etc., and may be the make-up of a floor, an occupation layer, wall collapse, a wall, a pit, the fill of a pit (note that the fill and the pit are two distinct things) or a surface (ie an interface between layers).
- Arbitrarily defined as a regular parcel of deposit (sometimes called a spit or an excavation unit).

Contexts are numbered in a single running series for the whole excavation, as assigned by the Excavation Director, Dr Rebecca Parkes. There will be a context catalogue containing a single running series of numbers for each excavation. These numbers do not imply a stratigraphic or other order of relationship. The context provides the spatial and stratigraphic provenance for all finds and samples – all excavated material must be cross-referenced to a context.

Grid Square (usually referred to as a Square)
The direction of “Grid North” will be indicated at the beginning of excavations and is to be the basis for orientations in notes and diagrams. A North-South/East-West (NS-EW) 1 x 1 metre grid square will usually be the major spatial unit within the overall site grid. Test excavation areas will be identified within the overall site grid. For recording and processing, squares are referred to by an alphanumeric name using capital letters (for example, B2). When it is necessary to identify a grid square the convention is that the SW corner is used as the starting point – just as when using a topographic map (shown graphically on the next page).

Quadrats
Where appropriate, quadrats will be used as the minor spatial units within the site grid. Quadrats are subdivisions within a grid square. There are four quadrats in a grid square, each measuring 50 x 50 centimetres. Quadrats are identified by Roman numerals (that is, i, ii, iii, iv). These letters are always used in conjunction with the appropriate grid square label (for example, B2-iv).
**Room / feature**

If features are located which allow the sufficient definition of architectural units or rooms, these may be used as the boundaries for further excavation where appropriate. A room may of course contain several different contexts, cut across several grid squares, and may be divided into several quadrats. The use of a special identifier for rooms makes it easier to group excavated material from each architectural unit. Rooms are identified by letters (that is, A … Z, AA … ZZ, etc.).

**Example**

If an area being excavated is at site number ‘1’, grid square ‘B2’, and quadrat ‘iv’ then it is written as 1-B2-iv. This area is shown on the grid below in bold type. If a room has been identified then the capital letter(s) referring to it are included in the descriptor (for example, 1-A-B2-d).

![Site No. 1 grid](image)

In the above example, if the area being excavated has been allocated the context number 9, then the descriptor becomes 1-B2-d-9.

**Measurements**

Field measurements: metres to nearest one centimetre
Levels: centimetres to nearest one centimetre
Artefacts: millimetres to nearest one millimetre
Weight of bulk finds: grams to nearest one gram
Weight of individual finds: grams to nearest 0.1 gram
Standard scale: formal plans 1:20
formal section 1:10
artefacts 1:1
D.3 In the field

If in doubt ask the Excavation Director

Who does what will depend on the numbers of people available. Everyone will have to spend time at both heavy and fine digging, at sieving, and at aspects of recording. In addition, the character of the site will necessitate backfilling by hand. The strategy of excavation will vary. At the beginning – during the removal of any turf and topsoil a more robust (though not less careful) approach will be needed. When undisturbed deposits are excavated, a slower pace and finer skills are needed.

Recording is as important as excavating. Always ensure that records are kept up-to-date and that excavation does not run too far ahead of processing. Clean up any loose spoil before leaving your area – as even light rain will make it difficult to distinguish spoil from undisturbed deposits. It is also good practice to never loosen more deposit than can be cleaned up in less than a minute.

In all excavation neatness and cleanliness (of the site, records, tools, etc.) is essential. All excavated sections must be vertical, straight, and their integrity preserved; for instance never sit or stand on the edge of an excavated section, light footwear is essential and crouching when trowelling and brushing impacts less on excavated surfaces than kneeling or lounging.

Remember – you are not writing memos to yourself, but a formal record for other people to use. What is obvious to you needs clear explanation for others. (Note: all recording is to be done using a pen – blue or black biro – not a pencil.)

Basic steps

Together with the Excavation Director define the area and nature of new context. If appropriate, define internal divisions within the area of the context:

i. Fill in basic information on the CONTEXT FIELD RECORD sheet.

ii. Ensure that levels have been taken, appropriate photographs taken and any plans of the surface drawn. Ensure that records of such are complete.

iii. Begin excavation – tentatively at first. A smaller test may be made in one part of the area before extending the excavation over the whole context. (Note: nearly all excavation will be by trowel, brush, and hand-shovel). Continue to make appropriate additions to the CONTEXT FIELD RECORD as work progresses.

iv. As the excavation proceeds the location of artefacts recovered should be noted on the CONTEXT FIELD RECORD sheet.

v. Soil from the excavation should be sieved and artefacts recovered placed in the labelled bag for the area and context of excavation. Remember that, if you are excavating with care, most artefacts will be recovered during excavation, sieving is a ‘back-up’, not a ‘cure-all’.

vi. Photographs showing the progress of excavation may be taken, especially if structural features are being exposed. This will necessitate cleaning for photography and the removal of all extraneous equipment and especially people.

vii. When the context is finished, clean it up beautifully. Ensure that all sections and baulks are straight and vertical (use string and plumb-bobs to get it right). Photographs and final levels should be taken, appropriate plans drawn, all soil sieved and all finds given to the site recorder, and all notes written up – before beginning work on the next context.
Bags and labels

All finds – whether collected in the course of excavation or from the sieves – must be appropriately bagged and labelled.

The descriptor provided on the bag and label must correspond with the descriptor on the CONTEXT FIELD RECORD sheet. A new bag and label for the next context will not be provided to the excavator until the previous context has been fully completed (including documentation). The artefacts contained in these bags will be subject to further detailed off-site analysis and recording at the completion of the excavation.

Excavation recording and later analysis

There are several components in excavation recording and the later analysis of finds and determining stratigraphic sequences. Those relating to the excavation are:

- CONTEXT CATALOGUE – a simple list of context numbers, filled in as they are assigned, recording the location (grid square and quadrat) together with a brief description of and comments on the context. This catalogue is held and maintained by the Excavation Director.
- CONTEXT FIELD RECORD – this provides a uniform system so that basic data on each excavation unit (context) is recorded in the same way. A copy of this record and a detailed description of it are at Attachment B1. This record is to be completed by the excavator(s) of a context.
- PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD – running list of all photographs taken in the field. Among other details, for each photograph it records the site, type of camera and film type, development details, film and frame number, context, grid square and quarter, and a description of the subject. This record will be held and maintained by the Excavation Director.
- PLANS, ELEVATIONS AND SECTIONS – measured plans, elevations and sections provide greater precision than sketches on the context field record sheets and are part of the final documentation for the site. Anyone may be called on to draw plans, elevations and sections for any of the features at a site.

The recording components relating to post-excavation are:

- ARTEFACT CATALOGUES – record the types and details of all artefacts recovered from the excavations. The main categories are Ceramics, Glass, Metals, Building Material and Miscellaneous – each of which is divided into more detailed sub-categories. A list of the categories and sub-categories to be used is at Attachment B2. The categories shown in this attachment should be used to classify material both in the field and during later analysis. (Recording sheets for these categories together with detailed descriptions of each of the categories will be available for artefact analysis post-excavation).
- MATRIX DIAGRAMS – using information from the Context Field Records these diagrams may be developed post-excavation to show stratigraphic sequences at each site.
D.4 Concluding remarks

As mentioned at the outset, this manual provides general principles of excavation and explains the recording systems and some of the terms used. Each site is different and presents its own problems, the solutions for which may only be apparent on-site. However, the key points to remember from the above are:

- All excavated material must be cross-referenced to a context.
- Recording is as important as excavating. Always ensure that records are kept up-to-date and that excavation does not run too far ahead of processing.
- You are not writing memos to yourself, but a formal record for other people to use. What is obvious to you needs clear explanation for others; in addition, neatness and legibility are important.
- In all excavation neatness and cleanliness (of the site, records, tools, etc.) is essential.
- If in doubt ask!
## CONTEXT FIELD RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.:</th>
<th>Site Name:</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Context No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excavator:        Date:       /       /1999

### Dumpy readings (cm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Reduced Level (+/-)</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Reduced Depth Level (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datum</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Datum</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arrow indicates North

### Artefacts, samples and discard (as shown on sketch plan):

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Soil:

- Colour:
- Texture:
- Munsell No(s):
- Compaction:
- Ph Level:

### Excavation method:

### Sieve size:

### Stratigraphic relationships (Context Nos.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Cut By:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equals/Same as:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Cuts:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Abuts:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Context and Comments/Interpretation (if there is insufficient space then use the back of this form):

---

Princes Highway upgrade - Foxground and Berry bypass
Roads and Maritime Services
Non-Aboriginal (historic) assessment
Attachment D.1 (cont’d)

THE CONTEXT FIELD RECORD

The following provides a description of the requirements of the Context Field Record sheet.

Site No.: As allocated by the Excavation Director.
Site Name: As nominated by the Excavation Director.
Excavator: Initial(s) and Surname of excavator.
Date: Day/month/year.
Square: Alphanumeric reference to the 1 x 1 metre grid square.
Quadrat: Lower case letter identifying the quarter (either a, b, c, or d).
Context: Context number as allocated by the Excavation Director.

Sketch plan: Ensure plans are neat and legible, and that individual features are clearly labelled. Show features using the key at the lower right hand of the plan, and individual numbered finds (to be briefly described in the section below the sketch plan). Do not forget to include an arrow in the circle at the lower left of the plan to indicate north.

Dumpy readings: There is space for up to five measurements of height (each corner and the centre) at the start and conclusion of work. If more are needed, then record them in additional notes. Record heights in the appropriate place before and after excavation. The ‘end’ levels of one context will usually be the ‘start’ levels of another – but do not simply transfer the readings. A dumpy will be set up each day and will be used to standardise all site measurements. A reading will be taken on the datum before the heights are taken for any quarter – both before and after excavation. These readings are to be entered on the Context sheet. You will need to ‘reduce’ the level, or calculate the absolute height of your five points. A reduced level is simply your reading minus the datum reading. You should then calculate the depth of your excavation and enter it into the space provided.

Artefacts, samples and discard: Individual finds (eg coins, buttons, etc.) samples (eg charcoal sample, etc.) and discarded material (eg large amounts of brick debris, etc.) should be numbered on the sketch plan and brief details of each given in the space provided.

Soil: Colour/Munsell No: Your own description in words and the formal Munsell colour code (eg 10 YR 5/6 Reddish brown).
Texture: What the sediment is like (light crumbly, hard, rubbly, etc.).
Compaction: Has the soil been compacted through some process (eg once having a wall built on top of it, etc.).
Ph Level: the results of a Ph test (eg 5.5).

Excavation method: How was this context dug (shovel, trowel, etc.).
Sieve size: Indicate sieve size (eg five millimetre) and whether dry or wet sieving was done, or whether the soil could not be sieved and why.

Stratigraphic relationships: Shows the relationship of this context to others. The bold type box in the centre of the matrix should contain the same number as shown in the Context box at the top right-hand side of the Context sheet. The remaining boxes should show the numbers of the contexts immediately around your context.
### Attachment D.1 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under:</td>
<td>Enter the code number of contexts that are physically above your context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals/</td>
<td>Enter the code number of contexts that are stratigraphically the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as:</td>
<td>or which appear to be the same as contexts in arbitrarily separated excavation units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above:</td>
<td>Enter the code number of contexts that are physically below your context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut by:</td>
<td>Enter the code number of contexts that cut through your context (eg a pit dug from above it).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts:</td>
<td>Enter the code number for contexts cut by your context (eg lower, earlier contexts through which a pit is dug).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuts:</td>
<td>Enter the code number of contexts that adjoin, touch or border on your context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of context &amp; Comments/ Interpretation</td>
<td>What the context is and what it looks like. First consider the sediment matrix and then look at its contents. You need to consider the current status of the context (ie its integrity). Is there any evidence of disturbance (human, animal, insect, or tree roots)? Consider the likely origin, identification or mode of deposition of the context (collapsed wall, ash dump, pit fill, etc.). Is the material primary (material in original context of construction, use or discard), secondary (natural collapse and infill, post-depositional) or tertiary (deliberately re-deposited during the period of occupation, eg cleaning out of occupation debris, floor make-up, etc)? Comment, if appropriate, whether any material in the context has a fresh appearance or is weathered or abraded. Finally, what do you think gave rise to the context – how did it come about?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment D.2

#### LIST OF ARTEFACT CATEGORIES

(in alphabetical order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major categories</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building material</td>
<td>Brick, Mortar, Sandstone, Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware, Porcelain, Stoneware, Terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Container (eg bottles), Flat (eg window), Tableware (eg bowls, dishes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Container (eg tins), Nails, screws, etc., Structural (includes door/ window fittings), Tools, Transport &amp; storage (eg horse equipment, carriage components, barrel hoops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Ammunition, Bones, Charcoal, Clothing (includes buttons, buckles, etc.), Coins, Footwear, Leather, Personal adornment (eg beads), Rubber, Seeds and other botanical material, Smoking pipes, Toys, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples</td>
<td>Brick debris, Pollen, Soil, Other material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Test pit excavation descriptions
Test pit excavation descriptions

The test excavations at G2B H14 are summarised below on a trench by trench basis. However, in two cases (A64-C64 and E64-F64; B100 and D100-E100), nearby trenches are discussed as a single excavation area on the basis of the similarities in excavation contexts and questions.

E.1 Trench F20

Excavation in this area proceeded by stratigraphic context with removal of turf (Context 1), topsoil (Context 2), disturbed fill with alluvial cobbles (Context 9), transitional gravelly matrix with a decrease in cobbles (Context 15), followed by excavation of a darker mixed clay and loam matrix with charcoal and ash (Context 18) down to a natural yellow brown clay subsoil; excavation in Quadrat III also included removal of a pocket of dark brown clay (Context 26) below Context 18 and above the natural clay subsoil (Figure E.1).

![Figure E.1 Trench F20 at completion of excavation – north at top.](image)

E.2 Trench C24

This square was excavated as a single arbitrary context (43); excavation went to a depth of 220 millimetres along the eastern side of the square and 55-105 millimetres along the lower western side. The aim was to determine the context of the sandstone block visible on the surface on the southern side of the square. Excavation of Context 43 largely corresponded to the removal of modern fill and road base. It was revealed that the sandstone block visible on the surface, and a second fragment uncovered in Quadrat IV, were situated within the modern fill layer, and as such, were not in situ.
E.3 Trench F30-F31

Excavation of this trench began in F30, which was excavated stratigraphically in the following sequence: removal of turf (Context 1), excavation of brown loam topsoil (Context 2), removal of compact yellow-brown clay fill (Context 6), excavation of yellow-brown sandy clay (Context 11) above a cobbled surface. The adjoining square to the north (F31) was then excavated in two contexts: Removal of overburden (Context 13) above the yellow-brown sandy clay, excavation down to the cobbled surface (Context11).

The cobbled surface was, on average, at a depth of 20-30 centimetres below the current ground level; it extended across the majority of the trench, the only exception being a narrow strip along the western side, which had been disturbed by installation of a telecommunications trench (Figure E.2).

Figure E.2 Cobbled floor exposed at base of trench F30-31 (top)
Cross section of soil profile in trench F30-31 (bottom)
E.4 Trench F39-F40

Excavation in this trench began in F40, with turf removal (Context 1) and excavation of the modern, brown loam topsoil (Context 2). The gravelly clay fill was then removed (Context 5) to reveal a yellow-brown clay loam at a depth of between 10 centimetres and 15 centimetres. A possible posthole was also visible in the northwest corner of Quadrat I as a pocket of darker brown loam, approximately 15 centimetres across (Figure E.3).

Excavation in F39 was then conducted as an arbitrary context (Context 8) down to the yellow-brown layer identified in F40 below Context 5, with further sectioning across the western two-thirds of the square (Context 14) to reveal an old telecommunications trench (Figure E.4). This same trench was observed along the western margins of F30-F31 to the south and through B80 to the north.

Figure E.3 Possible post hole in F40-I, base of Context 5
Figure E.4  Telecommunications trench exposed at base of F39.

E.5  Trench C50

This square was opened up relatively early in the excavation sequence. Excavation began by stratigraphic context (Contexts 1 and 2, being turf removal and excavation of modern, brown loam topsoil) down to the compact gravelly fill that was encountered across the site. Excavation then proceeded as a section down to the natural clay subsoil, approximately 60 centimetres below the current ground surface. The section revealed that the gravelly fill continued to a depth of 30-40 centimetres, below which a sterile brown loam was encountered that graded into a darker clay loam above the yellow-brown clay subsoil (Figure E.5).
E.6 Trench C60-B61-C61

Excavation in this trench began in C60. Initially the entire square was excavated down through removal of the turf (Context 1) and the modern topsoil layer (Context 2) to reveal the gravelly clay fill beneath (average depth of 4-5 centimetres). The northern half of the square was then sectioned down through the fill (Context 7) to reveal a dark brown loam (Context 10) over a natural yellow-brown subsoil.

Upon identification of the original A-horizon below Context 7, squares B61 (Context 30) and C61 (Context 12) were excavated down to that layer (Figure E.6). A possible post hole and a piece of sandstone were identified below the fill in B61.

E.7 Trench A64-C64 (Quadrats III-IV) and E64-F64 (Quadrats III-IV)

These two trenches, either side of the telecommunications trench known to run north-south through the site, were sectioned down below the old A-horizon in order to reveal something of the original topography across the site. Excavation began in the east across squares E and F (Contexts 1, 16 and 19), which were taken down to a depth of 25-30 centimetres; equivalent to 5-10 centimetres below the old A-horizon in square E (Figure E.7).

The trench across squares A-C was then sectioned down as a single arbitrary context (Context 22). Excavation terminated at the yellow-brown clay subsoil, which was encountered at an average depth of 60-70 centimetres, becoming deeper towards the west. The interface between the gravelly fill and the old A-horizon varied in depth, but was generally around 20-30 centimetres below the current ground surface, tending to dip lower at the western end of the trench.
E.8 Trench C70

Excavation in this trench proceeded by stratigraphic context to an average depth of 8-10 centimetres. Following removal of turf (Context 1) and a layer of brown sandy silt (Context 3), the square was excavated down through a yellow-brown clay loam (Context 4) to the gravelly clay fill. Excavation did not progress any further in this location due to the presence of tree roots and the discovery that the old telecommunications trench ran through this square.

E.9 Trench C79-A80-D80

Excavation in this location began in square C80, which was excavated in stratigraphic contexts through removal of turf (Context 1), excavation of modern brown loam topsoil (Context 2), removal of gravelly clay fill (Context 28) and excavation of a dark brown compact loam (Context 31 – old A-horizon) that grades into a natural yellow-brown clay subsoil at a depth of 60-65 centimetres. Upon exposing the clay subsoil, a rectilinear pocket of brown loam was identified in Quadrat I (Figure E.8), which appears to be the base of a post hole.
Excavation was opened up to the east, west and south of C80 in order to check for the presence of additional post holes. Following turf removal (Context 1) in B80, this square was excavated down through the gravel fill to the original A-horizon, which had been partially disturbed by the old telecommunications trench. Squares C79 and D80 were then excavated in two contexts: Context 32 being removal of the modern topsoil and gravelly fill overburden (average depth of 20-35 centimetres), and excavation of Context 38 (recorded as Context 42 in D80), the dark brown clay loam (original A-horizon) overlying the yellow-brown subsoil (average depth of 55-60 centimetres). No post holes were observed in either of these squares, although substantial disturbance from cicada burrows was evidenced across C79, C80 and D80.

Square A80 (Context 39) was sectioned down to the clay subsoil, revealing a 20-30 centimetres cap of gravelly fill over a sterile dark brown loam, grading into a yellow-brown clay at a depth of 70 centimetres (Figure E.9). No evidence of additional post holes were observed in this square.

Figure E.8  Post hole evidenced at base of C80 (north at right).

Figure E.9  Soil profile at northern end of Trench A80-D80.
E.10 Trench A95-C95-B96-C96

This trench was excavated through a combination of stratigraphic contexts and arbitrary sections with the aim of identifying the original A-horizon and the nature of any cultural deposits overlying or cutting into that layer.

Excavation began in B95 with removal of the turf (Context 1) and excavation of overburden (Context 33) to reveal the old ground surface (dark brown clay loam at an average depth of 40-45 centimetres). Squares A95, B96 (Context 36) and C96 (Context 37) were excavated as single contexts down to this same layer, while C95 was excavated in two units: Context 32, being removal of overburden, and Context 35, being excavation down to the natural clay subsoil at an average depth of 55-60 centimetres.

No cultural features were identified in this trench; a small number of glass and metal artefacts were recovered from overburden layers.

E.11 Trench B100 and D100-E100

Excavation in this area began in E100 with removal of the turf (Context 1) followed by removal of the gravelly clay fill (Context 21) to reveal an in situ layer of charcoal and carbonised wood at a depth of 25 centimetres. This burnt layer did not extend across the northern portion of the square, so a section was excavated down to the clay subsoil (average depth of 50 centimetres) across the northern quadrats. The trench was then expanded to the west into D100, with excavation of a single context (Context 27) down to the burnt layer identified in E100. In the course of this process, evidence for disturbance was identified in the form of a 30 centimetre wide trench/burrow extending north south through the middle of the square. A layer of burnt clay was also identified on the western side of this trench, with what appears to be a possible posthole in the southwest corner of Quadrat III (Figures E.10, E.11 & E.12). It was also noted that a number of alluvial pebbles were removed from the fill layer across both squares.

![Figure E.10 Burnt clay and possible post hole with associated bottle glass fragments at base of D100-IV (north at right).](image-url)
Excavation was continued in B100 in order to establish whether the burnt features in D100-E100 extended further to the west. Initially the overburden was removed as a single context (Context 40) to reveal a yellow-brown sandy loam with modern debris, including milled timber and ceramic insulators, sitting in this loam. The sandy loam was then removed (Context 41) to reveal a charcoal rich clay layer, including a piece of carbonised wood across the northern half of the square. The southwestern portion of B100 (Quadrat III and Quadrat I up to the margin of the carbonised wood) was also sectioned down (Context 44) to the clay subsoil (depth of 65 centimetres) (Figure E.13 & E.14).

![Trench D100-E100, looking east.](image-url)
Figure E.12  Soil profile at northern end of Trench D100-E100

Figure E.13  Termination of excavations in B100, looking west.
E.12 Trench C110

Excavation in this trench progressed initially as a series of stratigraphic contexts down to a grey-brown silt layer at a depth of around 40-45 centimetres. The initial excavation sequence was as follows: turf removal (Context 1), excavation of silty-clayey gravelly fill (Context 20) and excavation of a disturbed clayey silt admixture matrix, with alluvial pebbles (Context 23) similar to those encountered in Trenches F20, F30-31 and F39-40 (Figure E.15).

Quadrats I and II were then sectioned down (Context 29) about 30 centimetres to the sterile yellow-brown clay subsoil. Sectioning revealed a narrow (1-2 centimetre) band of charcoal sandwiched between a grey brown silt lens and a clean dark grey-brown silt that graded into the yellow-brown clay.
E.13 Trench E120

Following removal of the turf (Context 1), this trench was sectioned down to the clay subsoil through removal of arbitrary Context 24, which cut through a relatively thick cap of gravelly clay fill (15-20 centimetres) and a dark charcoal rich clay loam grading into a sterile yellow-brown clay at an average depth of 60-70 centimetres below the current ground surface.