

BLACK MOUNTAIN PROJECTS HERITAGE CONSULTANTS



Proposed lot layout Nov 2022



View of the survey area. Southern stock dam in the distance

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report 407 Crookwell Rd (40ha, Lot 70 DP1006688) and 457 Crookwell Rd (9.67ha, Lot 73 DP1006688), Kingsdale, NSW.

Report to Goulburn Mulwaree Council November 2022

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION	DATE	ISSUED BY
A	Draft for Review	18.04.21	РК
В	Revision	22.03.22	РК
С	Revision for ACHA format	20.06.22	РК
D	Revision to include 457 Crookwell Rd	17.11.22	РК
E			

ACRONYMS

ACHAR	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report
AHIMS	Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System
AHIP	Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit
AR	Archaeological Report
HNSW	Heritage NSW, part of the NSW Department of Premier & Cabinet
GPS	Global Positioning System
GSV	Ground Surface Visibility
LALC	Local Aboriginal Land Council
MGA	Map Grid of Australia
NPW	National Parks and Wildlife
PAD	Potential Archaeological Deposit
RAP	Registered Aboriginal Party
SU	Survey Unit

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
1 INTRODUCTION 1.1 PROPONENT AND PROPOSED ACTIVITY 1.2 STATUTORY CONTROLS 1.3 OBJECTIVES	1 1 1 3
2 DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA	4
 2.1 BOUNDARIES 2.2 DESCRIPTION AND PLAN OF THE AREA 2.3 ENVIRONMENT 2.4 LAND USE 	4 5 6 9
3 CONSULTATION PROCESS	11
 3.1 REQUIREMENTS 3.2 CONTEXT AND LIMITATIONS 3.3 REGISTERED ABORIGINAL PARTIES 3.4 RESULTS OF CONSULTATION 	11 11 12 12
4 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION	13
 4.1 ABORIGINAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT 4.2 AREAS OF ABORIGINAL HERITAGE SENSITIVITY 4.3 AHIMS SEARCH RESULTS 4.4 SURVEY METHOD 4.5 SURVEY RESULTS 	13 15 16 16 17
5 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUES	21
5.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL 5.2 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	21 23
6 IMPACTS OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY	23
6.1 PREVIOUS IMPACTS 6.2 IMPACTS TO ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUES	23 23
7 AVOIDING AND/OR MITIGATING HARM	24
8 RECOMMENDATIONS	24
8.1 MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS 8.2 ASSESSMENT STATEMENT	24 25
GLOSSARY, REFERENCES	33
APPENDIX A – ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION	37
APPENDIX B – AHIMS SEARCH RESULTS	38
APPENDIX C – SOME NON-ABORIGINAL FEATURES ON THE SUBJECT LAND (Separate file)	
APPENDIX D – ABORIGINAL SITE RECORD: IMPACTED CHERT BEDROCK (Separate file)	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proponent IPG Invest P/L is seeking approval for a Planning Proposal to rezone 407 Crookwell Rd (40ha, Lot 70 DP1006688) and 457 Crookwell Rd (9.67ha, Lot 73 DP1006688), Kingsdale, NSW (the subject land), to enable future subdivision. The subject land has been included within the Goulburn Mulwaree Council Urban Fringe Strategy, which the DPIE has endorsed.

As part of the Development Application, Goulburn Mulwaree Council requires advice about the potential of the proposal to *harm* Aboriginal places and objects pursuant to the *National Parks and Wildlife Act* (1974).

The objectives of this Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment report (ACHAR) are to:

- Determine whether any Aboriginal places or objects of significance are present in the subject land.
- Assess the impact of the subdivision works and their potential to *harm* Aboriginal objects or values protected under the NPW Act.
- Recommend whether further requirements must be met under clause 80C of the NPW Act including whether an application for an AHIP needs to be made for undertaking test excavations.

The assessment found:

- The subject land has a long history of human usage by Europeans over the last 200 years, including clearing, cultivation, rock excavation by bulldozer and building demolition. The survey trig near the sheds at 407 Crookwell Rd at is an historical example of early 20th century stone excavation/relocation.
- It would be certain that indigenous groups would have used any resources that are available, such as chert outcrops.
- The excavated chert bedrock appears to be an area used by Aboriginal people to source stone. The relatively high percentage (13 items) of primary flaking debris in the photographed sample of 50 chert items suggests the stone is likely to be Aboriginal and that chert exposures near the excavated bedrock should, as a precautionary measure, be registered as an impacted Aboriginal site. This has been registered ('Impacted Chert Bedrock' AHIMS no. 51-6-0915).
- There are other parts of the subject land raised in concerns by Shire Council staff where the evidence is less convincing (Appendix C). These are: Three chert stones moved by machinery or people at some point in time; Trees bearing scars that cannot be determined as Aboriginal in origin; Zones of weakness in basalt outcrops resulting in linear features; Curved lines on aerial photos. Explanations are likely to be frost spalling around central tors during the Late Pleistocene period; geomorphological (surface erosion) features and tractor blade formation of stone windrows around cleared areas of ground.

This assessment has:

- Identified and registered chert stone scatters near the impacted chert bedrock as an Aboriginal site, to be protected from harm in a conservation area.
- Assessed that much of the subject land has been impacted and is disturbed land under the meaning of clause 80B relating to section 87(4) of the NPW Act.
- Assessed the disturbed land as having low archaeological potential to contain Aboriginal sites and objects. Without land disturbance, potential could have been higher.

It is recommended that:

- The 'Impacted Chert Bedrock' AHIMS registered site south of the homestead be protected, as recommended on site by Pejar LALC, in a 'no excavation, no-build' environmental zoned conservation area. This could include the remnant trees. An 88B Instrument could be used for this.
- The historic survey trig (near the farm shed at 407 Crookwell Rd) to be retained for public appreciation, in any subdivision design of the subject land.

- The proposal does not require any further assessment relevant to Aboriginal sites or objects protected under the NPW Act.
- The proponent is aware that should Aboriginal objects be discovered during development works, all works in that area should cease and the proponent should contact Heritage NSW or a qualified archaeologist to seek some determination of the discovery and how to proceed.
- In the unlikely event that skeletal remains be discovered during earthworks, all works should cease and protocols consistent with Requirement 25 in the Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (2010) be implemented.

While the undertaking of this Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment acts as a defence against harming or disturbing Aboriginal objects without an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP), the undertaking of this assessment alone does not negate the need for an AHIP, should Aboriginal objects be disturbed. Investigations for an AHIP require preparation of an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment and must also be supported by Aboriginal consultation in accordance with the process outlined in the *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents* (2010).

DISCLAIMER

This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with relevant Federal, State and Local Government legislation. Black Mountain Projects accepts no liability for any damages or loss incurred as a result of use for any purpose other than that for which it was commissioned.

Copyright of the report remains the property of Black Mountain Projects. This report may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned.

RESTRICTIONS

Information contained within this report is culturally sensitive and should not be made available to the general public. Restricted information includes, but is not limited to:

- Maps, reference coordinates or images which locate Aboriginal places and objects.
- Location or detailed information regarding places of Aboriginal cultural significance, as expressed or directed by representative Aboriginal people.
- Other culturally appropriate restricted information as advised by Aboriginal representatives and traditional knowledge holders.

Information in the report covered by the above categories should be redacted before being made available to the general public. This information should only be made available to those persons with a valid need for access.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Black Mountain Projects acknowledges the assistance of the following people and organisations in the preparation of this report:

- Chris Parlett, owner of 407 Crookwell Rd;
- Bill Murray, owner of 457 Crookwell Rd;
- Kyle Moffitt, Archaeologist;
- Delise Freeman, Pejar LALC;
- Scott Coltman, IPG Invest P/L;
- David Kiernan, Planner, Goulburn Mulwaree Council;
- Brian Faulkner, Council Environmental Officer;
- Dr Mike Macphail, Assoc Prof of Geology, Archaeology and Natural History Dept, ANU;
- Dr Eric Savage, Geologist;
- Dr Johan Kamminga, Lithics Specialist;
- Mark Butz, Environmental Historian;
- Gilbert Flood, Southern Cross Surveyors.
- Greg Todd, Surveyor and subdivision designer.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. PROPONENT AND PROPOSED ACTIVITY

The proponent IPG Invest P/L is seeking approval for a Planning Proposal to rezone 407 Crookwell Rd (40ha, Lot 70 DP1006688) and 457 Crookwell Rd (9.67ha, Lot 73 DP1006688), Kingsdale, NSW (the subject land), to enable future subdivision. The subject land has been included within the Goulburn Mulwaree Council Urban Fringe Strategy, which the DPIE has endorsed.

The proponent has engaged Black Mountain Projects Pty Ltd to provide this advice and to prepare an Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment report (ACHAR) consistent with the requirements of the NPW Act set out in the *Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW* (2011). The archaeological survey that informs this report has been conducted in accordance with the *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (2010).

1.2 STATUTORY CONTROLS

Primary protection of Aboriginal heritage in NSW is established at the State level under the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 and to a lesser extent the NSW Heritage Act (1977). Heritage NSW and its parent department is responsible for protecting and conserving Aboriginal objects and declared Aboriginal places in NSW.

Aboriginal objects are defined in the NPW Act as any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises NSW, being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non-Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains.

Aboriginal places are defined in NPW Act as a place declared under s.84 of the NPW Act that, in the opinion of the Minister, is or was of special significance to Aboriginal culture. Such areas need not contain any Aboriginal objects but can only be gazetted with the approval of the Minister.

Part 6 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NPW Act) provides specific protection for Aboriginal objects and declared Aboriginal places by establishing offences of harm. Harm is defined to mean destroying, defacing, damaging or moving an object from the land. There are a number of defences and exemptions to the offence of harming an Aboriginal object or place. Aboriginal heritage may also be protected under Commonwealth and Local Government legislation being the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act and Local Environmental Plans respectively.

A number of policies or guidelines are relevant to assist proponents avoid *harming* Aboriginal objects in NSW. These policies are listed below in order of their consideration within a planning context or assessment of a given proposal or activity:

- Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents (2010)
- Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in NSW (2010)
- Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in NSW (2010)
- Guide to investigation, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal Cultural heritage in NSW (2011)

The *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in NSW* sets out reasonable and practicable steps which individuals and organisations need to take in order to:

- Identify whether or not Aboriginal objects are, or are *likely* to be, present in an area.
- Determine whether or not activities are *likely* to harm Aboriginal objects (if present).
- Determine whether further assessment or an AHIP application is required.

The Code of Practice also provides a generic due diligence process under Section 8 of the Due Diligence Code to be addressed by proponents. The basic sequential steps of the due diligence process require the proponent or their agent to consider the proposal and review whether:

- The activity or proposal will disturb the ground surface.
- The AHIMS database or other relevant databases record previously identified places.
- The activity or proposal occurs in areas where certain landscape features may indicate the presence of Aboriginal objects (on land that is not disturbed).
- Harm to Aboriginal objects or disturbance of the landscape feature can be avoided.
- An Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) and/or an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) is required.

The Due Diligence Code also discusses the common association between certain landscape features and the presence of Aboriginal objects as a result of Aboriginal people's use of those features. The Code defines the following landscape features (on land that is not *disturbed* land) and distance thresholds as indicating the *likely* presence of Aboriginal objects:

- Within 200m of waters, or
- Located within a sand dune system, or
- Located on a ridge top, ridge line or headland, or
- Located within 200m below or above a cliff face, or
- Within 20m of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth

Consequently, if the proposal or activity is within the defined proximity thresholds to one of these landscape features (on land that is not *disturbed*) then the Code considers that there is a *likely* probability that Aboriginal objects will occur within the area.

Due diligence may also be addressed through other forms of assessment providing they meet the basic requirements set out above. A Review of Environmental Factors or other assessment under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act) may also meet the requirements of the Due Diligence Code of Practice. While the undertaking of a due diligence process or equal assessment process acts as a defence against harming or disturbing Aboriginal objects without an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP), the undertaking of these activities does not negate the need for an AHIP should Aboriginal objects be disturbed.

An application for an AHIP must be supported by a consultation process set out in the *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents* (2010) and an Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment report that complies with the requirements set out in the *Guide to investigation, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW* (2011).

The *Code of practice for archaeological investigation of Aboriginal objects in NSW* (2010) also provides standards and methods for how this investigation has been conducted and reported.

1.3 **OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of this Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment are to:

- Determine whether any Aboriginal places or objects of significance are present in the subject land, being the proposed subdivision of Lot 70 DP1006688.
- Assess the impact of the subdivision works and their potential to *harm* Aboriginal objects or values protected under the NPW Act.
- Recommend whether further requirements must be met under clause 80C of the NPW Act including whether an application for an AHIP needs to be made for undertaking test excavations.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

2.1 BOUNDARIES

The subject land is two adjoining properties, 407 Crookwell Rd (40ha, Lot 70 DP1006688) and 457 Crookwell Rd (9.67ha, Lot 73 DP1006688), Kingsdale, NSW. The land was part of a 5,000 acre land grant to Hannibal Macarthur. It has been used for livestock grazing since the early 19th century to the present day. It is now on the town edge of Goulburn and is adjacent to a new suburb under construction. There are four stock dams on the properties, each associated with an ephemeral drainage line. Previous owners have bulldozed parts of the hill slopes to make sheep shelters and household refuse dumps. There is a 1970s house and four more recently constructed sheds. The subject land is located north of the City of Goulburn in the Goulburn Mulwaree Council LGA in the Parish of Goulburn, Zone 55 (UTM).



Figure 1. Boundaries of the subject land showing the subdivision design preserving biodiversity and heritage features (Source: Greg Todd, Southern Region Land Engineering - SRLE).

2.2 DESCRIPTION AND PLAN OF AREA

The subject land, 407 Crookwell Rd (40ha, Lot 70 DP1006688) and 457 Crookwell Rd (9.67ha, Lot 73 DP1006688) and its surrounding locality Kingsdale (also known as Kings Plains) was part of a 5,000-acre grant to Hannibal Macarthur in 1835. Both the Macarthurs and the 20th century owner Carl Tozer (and later his sons Greg and Doug) have family origins in the English sheep farming province of Devonshire. Both continued their family traditions by using the subject land for sheep grazing and cattle grazing.

Chris Parlett, current owner of 407 Crookwell Rd, recalled that Greg Tozer constructed the house and three stock dams, and sowed pasture improved crops. Most of the subject land was weed poisoned, ploughed, turned over, had a harrow run through it and then seeded. It was sown with curry crocks foot, rye grass and subterranean clover. The only remaining land was several rock outcrops, however even these may have been disturbed by the bulldozing. Stones had been removed from the ploughed land and grouped around trees. Greg Tozer kept a special breed of sheep which needed a lot of shelter and utilized a bulldozer to scoop sheep shelters out of the hillside and also bulldozed a few rubbish dumps. These sheep shelters were been cut out of the rock outcrops.

Chris Parlett purchased 407 Crookwell Rd in 1988, relocated one shed and built three others, finishing the last one in 2015. He partnered with a few friends to graze sheep.

Bill Murray, the current owner of 457 Crookwell Rd, recalled that Carl Tozer ran a business on the properties which involved pasture improvement and that his son Greg Tozer took over the grazing property until he subdivided in 1988 after his father's death, selling 407 Crookwell Rd to Chris Parlett and 457 Crookwell Rd to Bill Murray.

Bill Murray recalled approximate chronology for some of the land use features on his property:

- Windbreak (bisecting the property north-south) planted early 1980s.
- Gas and ethane pipeline (east to west on the property) pre-1988.
- Feed silo (west of the windbreak) approx 1960s.
- Tree protection fence, stock dam, horse stable (eastern side of the property) in 1990s.
- Temporary metal shed erected and removed in the 2000s.

The subject land (407 and 457 Crookwell Rd) includes four stock dams in drainage lines that might appear on aerial maps to be ephemeral watercourses. Water courses are generally accepted as a focus of past Aboriginal land use, as Aboriginal stone artefacts are likely to be found on flat areas next to the watercourse. Land above these drainage lines, however, is steep. The subject land is more than a kilometre distance from the nearest temporary water source of Sooley Creek.

The most visible feature is the high level of land disturbance. Almost two centuries of agricultural uses have altered this landscape. These activities have included vegetation clearing, cropping, mechanical excavation, grazing and pine tree planting. Land clearing,

cropping and excavation in particular, have resulted in accelerated sheet erosion and redeposit of soils.

Part of the land disturbance has been a major service line. The APA Melbourne to Sydney natural gas and ethane pipeline goes through both properties, its trenches resulting in a 25m wide easement over which no excavation, building or even tree planting is authorised to occur.

The resulting landscape is one of ground surface disturbance, except for a few remnant trees kept for stock shelter and a few rock outcrops. The resulting landscape is not a pristine hunter-gatherer landscape but a European settler landscape. So, although the subject land was undoubtedly part of the landscape used by Aboriginal people in the past, the likelihood of artefacts being found *in-situ* is low.



Figure 2: Boundaries of the subject land marking out biodiversity constraints and some of the localised land use impacts (Source: Greg Todd, Southern Region Land Engineering - SRLE).

2.3 ENVIRONMENT

The subject land is located on the Sooley Plains, north of Goulburn, along the boundaries of three minor landform features identified by the NSW Soil and Land Information System: Monastery Hill, Narrangarril Variant B, and Sooley.



Figure 3: Landform boundaries in the subject land (Source eSpade, NSW DPIE, 2022). Note the abbreviations: mhz (Monastery Hill), ngzb (Narrangarril Variant B), soz (Sooley). The SE portion of the subject land at the intersection of Chinamans Ln and Crookwell Rd is soz (Sooley).

Monastery Hill (mhz)

This is a landscape of low hills on Silurian metasediments and metamorphic volcanics. Local relief is 30-90m with slopes ranging from 3-10%. It contains <2% rock outcrop. Soils include Orthic Tenosols (Lithosols), Red Kurosols (Red Podzolic Soils) and Brown Chromosols (Yellow Podzolic Soils). Minor sheet erosion occurs.

Prior to land clearing for sheep and cattle grazing, the vegetation was open woodland. This has been almost completely cleared with only isolated stands remaining. Included in the few remaining trees are Eucalyptus melliodora (yellow box), E. mannifera (brittle gum), E. blakelyi (Blakely's red gum) and E. bridgesiana (apple box). Acacia decurrens (green wattle) and A. mearnsii (black wattle) are occasionally present as a mid-storey tree. The groundcover is often a mixture of natives and introduced pasture species including

Pultaneasp. (egg and bacon peas), Panicum sp (panic), Phalaris aquatica (phalaris), Joycea pallida (red-anther wallaby grass), Stipa sp. (speargrass), Plantago lanceolata (ribwort), Dianella sp. (flax lily), Whalenbergia sp. (bluebells) and Poa sp. (tussock grass).

Both improved and unimproved pastures are found in this landscape with minor urban development encroaching.

Narrangarril Variant B (ngzb)

This is a plains landscape on Quaternary alluvium and clay located within the Sooley Rises. Local relief is 1-10m in an altitude of 633-688m. Slopes are 3% with no rock outcrops recorded. Soils are classified as Vertisols (Black Earths).

This land has been completely cleared land for improved pasture, and is now used for grazing. Original trees may have included Eucalyptus melliodora (yellow box), E. bridgesiana (apple box), E. dives (broad-leaved peppermint), E. blakelyi (Blakely's red gum) and E.viminalis (ribbon gum). A mixture of introduced natives and pasture species now exist in the ground cover. These include Themeda australis (kangaroo grass), Paspalum dilatatum (paspalum), Phalaris aquatica (phalaris), Bothriochloa sp. (red grass), Poa sp. (tussock grass), Danthonia sp. (wallaby grass), Joycea pallida (red-anther wallaby grass), Dactylis glomerata (cocksfoot), Hypericiumperforatum (St John's wort), Lomandra multiflora (many-flowered mat-rush), Cardus nutans (nodding thistle) and Sisymbrium offincale (Indian hedge mustard).

Sooley (soz)

This landscape is characterised by foot slopes within low hills on Silurian and Devonian metasediments and metamorphic volcanics in the Sooley Rises. Local relief is 10-30m in an altitude of 622-712m. Slopes are 2-10% with rock outcrops covering <2%. Soils include Brown Kurosols (Yellow Podzolic Soils), Brown Chromosols (Soloths), Red and Brown Dermosols (No Suitable Group) and minor Yellow Sodosols (Solodic Soils). Localised salt scalding occurs along some drainage lines.

An open woodland community most likely existed prior to clearing. Remaining trees include Eucalyptus melliodora (yellow box), E. blakelyi (Blakely's red gum), E. mannifera (brittle gum) and E. bridgesiana (apple box). Ground cover is generally dominated by introduced pastures namely Phalaris aquatica (phalaris) mixed with others such as Hypochaeris radicata (catsear), Plantago lanceolata (ribwort), and Paspalum dilatatum (paspalum). Remaining natives in the groundcover include Themeda australis (kangaroo grass), Danthonia sp. (wallaby grasses), Juncus sp. (rush), and Bothriochloamacra (red grass). At least 90% of land has been cleared. Cattle and sheep grazing occur on both improved and voluntary pastures. Urban coverage occurs near Goulburn with associated fringe subdivision development.

Soils, Geology and Climate

The typical soil landscape at Kingdale is Sooley (PS-so). This is soil landscape occurs between Goulburn city and Sooley Dam. The landscape is geologically complex and includes texchenite intrusions, metamorphosed mudstones and limestone outcrops. It also has a complex soil distribution. Lithosols (Um5.51, Um6.21) have formed on crests and upper side slopes, and prairie soils (Db4.22, Uf6.22) have formed in the valleys. Nearer to the Sooley Dam, Terra Rossa soils (Dr4.13) have formed on the extensive limestone outcrop. Minor areas of rock outcrop occur.

This soil landscape has formed on two teschenite intrusions which have penetrated Upper Silurian sediments. The Upper Silurian sediments include an extensive outcrop of limestone. Local soils have formed *in situ* and from alluvial-colluvial material derived from the parent rock.

Kingsdale is in Climatic Zone 3D with an annual average rainfall around 640 mm. Peak rainfall occurs in summer. The climate is very cold in winter and subject to severe frosts, as well as to strong winds in summer that dry in soil.



Figure 4 – Sooley Soil Landscape Profile provided by eSPADE, NSW Government (2022).

2.4 LAND USE

Aboriginal Land Use

The Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Aboriginal Heritage Study (2012) provides an overview of Aboriginal land use in the area. The earliest recorded archaeological site near Goulburn is the Birrigai rock shelter located approximately 80km south east of the study area. Radiocarbon dates obtained from the site, show that Aboriginal people have lived in this region for at least 21,000 years (Flood 1996:33- 35), however, the majority of archaeologically excavated sites in the region date to within the last 3,000 to 5,000 years, when the local climate and environment became warmer (Flood 1980:3,18).

Charles MacAlister, who grew up in the Goulburn region in the 1830s noted the relationship between local indigenous groups and reported "three fairly numerous tribes" in the district which he called the Cookmai or Mulwarrie (Mulwaree), the Tarlo, and the Burra Burra (MacAlister 1907:82). Norman Tindale describes two major language groups within the Goulburn region at the time of European settlement: the Gandangara to the north of Goulburn, and the Ngun(n)awal to the south.

Aboriginal people in the Goulburn area were in frequent contact with surrounding groups due a lack of natural physical barriers (Smith 1992:3). As a result, frequent gatherings of indigenous people took place in Goulburn, with records of corroborees being held at Rocky Hill near the East Goulburn Church of England, the old railway quarry on the Wollondilly River, and Mulwaree Flats near the bridge at the brewery, as well as where the All Saints' Church in Eastgrove and Goulburn railway station are now located (Tazewell 1991:243; Wyatt 1972:111-112).

These gathering places are located near reliable water sources such as the Mulwaree River, and are habitat for a variety of wildlife, including fish, eels, fresh water mussels and water birds. Other food resources included kangaroos and wallabies and small marsupials such as possums and bandicoots. Emu, wild turkey, echidna, snakes, native bees and ants would have also supplemented the traditional diet (Bennett 1967 [1834]:173,301; Govett 1977 [1836-7]:29,32,34- 35,37; MacAlister 1907:88; Wyatt 1972:107; Koettig and Lance 1986:18).

Along the local river and stream banks, bulrushes were be collected in the spring and their starchy roots baked and eaten (Bennett 1967 [1834]:183; Gott 1999). In 1836, a Quaker missionary, James Backhouse, saw an Aboriginal woman eating sow-thistle (Backhouse 1843:441; Trott 1966). Govett also saw an Aboriginal man use an axe to cut into the bark of an apple-tree which grew on the alluvial flats near the river. A sweet, cider-like liquid flowed from the cut, which was collected and consumed (Govett 1977 [1836-7]:25). The white

secretions of insects were also collected from trees such as the Manna Gum (Aslanides 1983:2; Bennett 1967 [1834]:115,319-321).

In 1836, William Govett published a series of articles in *The Saturday Magazine* describing the Aboriginal people of the County of Argyle, and their customs. He noted that local people would sometimes hunt by setting grass fires in order to drive and spear kangaroos in large numbers. This technique also encouraged the regrowth of root and herb plants which could be eaten or used to draw kangaroos back to an area (Bennett 1967 [1834]:290; Govett 1977 [1836-7]:23).

Traditional land uses came to an end in the 1820s, when the woodlands were cleared for sheep and cattle grazing, with barbed-wire fencing partitioning the landscape from the 1860s (NPWS 2003:206). The change from a woodland to a grassland ecosystem, radically affected the biodiversity of the area and limited the traditional resources used by Aboriginal people. William Govett noted that:

The kangaroos have either been killed, or have fled in search of more retired forests. Sheep and cattle have taken their place, the emu and turkey are seldom seen, the millions of parrots have even become scarce ...(Govett 1977 [1836-7]:26).

Local Aboriginal people were devastated both by this loss of traditional resources and by introduced diseases. Surgeon George Bennet observed several Aboriginal people on the Gundary Plains with small-pox scars in the 1830s (Bennett 1967 [1834]:148). Francis Murphy of Bungonia reported in 1845 that the Aboriginal population in his area had diminished to 20-100 individuals, with survivors joining up with other people from the Goulburn district (Koettig and Lance 1986:14). Following the influenza epidemic of 1846-7, a local Aboriginal population of only 25 people was estimated by the Magistrate's bench (Tazewell 1991:244).

European Land Use

Europeans first arrived in the Goulburn region in 1798, when Governor Hunter sent John Wilson and two other men on an expedition to the southern tablelands of NSW. The men reached Mt Towrang without seeing or encountering any Aboriginal people (Flood 1980:30). Joseph Wild's expedition in 1820 to find Lake George opened the country to European settlement.

Pastoralists immediately began clearing the land and improving pastures for cattle and sheep grazing. These practices have altered the landscape through vegetation clearing, mechanical excavation, cultivation, cropping, grazing and tree planting. Land clearing and cultivation in particular, have resulted in disturbance of ground surface and churning of sediments, erosion and redeposit of soil. The resulting landscape is one of ground surface

disturbance and accelerated removal and redeposition of surface soils, including minor sheet erosion and scalding. So, although the subject land was undoubtedly part of the landscape used by Aboriginal people in the past, the likelihood of artefacts being found *insitu* is low.

Photos and field observations in the survey results section provide further details.

3 CONSULTATION PROCESS

3.1 REQUIREMENTS

Aboriginal consultation is an integral part of the process of investigating and assessing Aboriginal cultural heritage. Under the NPW Act, Aboriginal people who hold cultural knowledge about the area, objects and places that may be directly or indirectly affected by the proposal must be given the opportunity to be consulted. This is done through the process of investigating, assessing and working out how to manage the harm from the proposal. Consultation must adhere to requirements set out in clause 80C of the NPW Act where:

- an application for an AHIP will be made, or
- when undertaking test excavation according to the *Code of practice for archaeological investigation of Aboriginal objects in NSW*.

The relevant archaeological codes and guides only require Aboriginal consultation when impacts to Aboriginal heritage are envisaged. The *Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects NSW* (2010) does not require Aboriginal consultation. *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents* (2010) outlines how a statutory process of Aboriginal consultation is required when applications are made for permits to carry out archaeological excavations and impact Aboriginal sites (such permits are not being sought by this report).

3.2 CONTEXT AND LIMITATIONS

Although the NPW Act refers specifically to Aboriginal objects and places, the investigation requires a broader focus than just the objects or places. It also requires a knowledge and understanding of their context. Context is provided through consultation with Aboriginal people in order to reveal the meaning and significance of the objects and places. In consulting with Aboriginal people, the following limits on the use of existing information must be appreciated:

- Aboriginal people involved in previous studies or surveys may not have disclosed the existence of places with cultural heritage values as they may not have been under immediate threat when the earlier study was undertaken
- A report from AHIMS does not represent a comprehensive list of all Aboriginal objects or sites in a specified area as it lists recorded sites only and is mostly a record of survey effort.

3.3 REGISTERED ABORIGINAL PARTIES

The Pejar Local Aboriginal Land Council is the Registered Aboriginal Party (RAP) associated with this subject land. Following the principle that "the LALC speaks for country", a representative of the Pejar LALC accompanied the archaeologist in an inspection of the subject land, in order to provide comment on behalf of the local Aboriginal community.

3.4 **RESULTS OF CONSULTATION**

Refer to Appendix A.

4 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4.1 ABORIGINAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Two significant archaeological studies are relevant to the Goulburn Mulwaree LGA. Koettig and Lance (1986) prepared a planning study which identified areas of known or potential Aboriginal cultural and archaeological significance. Their report also included an analysis of site distribution patterns in the landscape in relation to environmental variables such as landform, geology, and distance from water (Koettig and Lance 1986:26). The general trends in site distribution identified by Koettig and Lance are summarised in the Goulburn Mulwaree Aboriginal Heritage Study (2012:30-32):

- Artefact scatters are the most common type of site in the region, and have been identified in all environmental contexts. They are most likely to occur on gentle, well-drained lower slopes within 100m of water. Artefact scatters at the junction of watercourses tend to be large, with high densities of stone artefacts. Underlying geology does not appear to be a significant factor in the location of this type of site.
- Quarries may be present on outcrops of raw stone materials suitable for artefact manufacture, many of which occur within the study area as localised, discrete outcrops of siliceous rocks (pebble beds, quartz veins or outcrops). Types of stone used in the manufacture of implements include chert, silcrete, quartz, quartzite and fine-grained volcanic rocks.
- Burial sites are rare, and historical sources indicate that they are most likely to be found on ridges and hill tops, in hollow trees, and in caves. In some cases, they may

also occur in sand bodies. Burials may be difficult to identify, as features that were used by Aboriginal people to mark graves, including carved trees and earth mounds, are unlikely to be preserved.

- Modified trees (scarred or carved) are rare, as scars are finite in age, only likely to be
 present on trees at least 80-100 years old. Moreover, natural vegetation in the
 Goulburn region has been altered by fire and forest clearance. Most of the recorded
 modified trees in the subject land have been destroyed in bushfires or removed to
 museums, such as the carved trees that were recorded at Yarra railway station and
 Armstrong's Paddock, Bungonia.
- Bora grounds are rare, and based on available site information and historical sources are most likely to be located on hill tops; however, their location cannot be predicted accurately.
- Shelters with art or deposit are found only in areas with suitable rock overhangs, such as sandstone outcrops with cavernous weathering. Large granite boulders and limestone rock shelters were also used as shelters.
- Grinding grooves are most commonly found near creek lines with suitable sandstone outcrops. Sandstone slabs were also transported into areas where there was no suitable stone.

Koettig and Lance's model was later field-tested by Fuller (1989), who surveyed a representative sample of environmental zones within the City of Goulburn. Fuller identified seventeen stone artefacts scatters and five isolated artefacts during the study. Two sites, located within 150m of an intermittent watercourse, also contained fragmented midden material, comprising mussel shell and shell from an unidentified species (Fuller 1989:5-6). Fuller's study located sites in all environmental zones, including those identified by Koettig and Lance as having low archaeological potential. Fuller's study contributed to a revised site distribution model for Goulburn (Figure 5); however, it should be noted that the distribution model remains somewhat generic, especially near water courses, and requires further refinement.

Other small scale archaeological studies have been carried out within Goulburn Mulwaree LGA, mostly in response to proposed developments (e.g. Koettig 1988; Navin Officer 2003; Williams 2004); linear surveys for infrastructure projects such as proposed roads, transmission lines and water supply schemes (e.g. Koettig 1983; Navin Officer 2010; Silcox 1995); and surveys over larger areas for a variety of purposes including proposed quarries, subdivisions, mining leases and State Recreation Area management (e.g. ERM 2006; McBryde 1975; Hughes 1984; Haglund 1986; Silcox 1988).

Most of these studies use the Aboriginal site distribution model proposed for the City of Goulburn by Koettig and Lance (1986) and later revised by Fuller (1989). This continues to be the predictive model used within the Goulburn Mulwaree LGA, with previously recorded

sites contributing to Aboriginal archaeological sensitivity mapping in the region. In interpreting these maps, it should be noted that the current distribution pattern is not a true representation of Aboriginal land use, but rather the result of sites discovered during small-scale development surveys. As a result, the map is biased towards water courses and developed parts of the LGA (Goulburn Mulwaree Aboriginal Heritage Study, 2012:32).



Figure 5 – Areas of Aboriginal heritage sensitivity in the north west section of Goulburn Mulwaree LGA (from the Goulburn Mulwaree Aboriginal Heritage Study, 2012:39).

4.2 AREAS OF ABORIGINAL HERITAGE SENSITIVITY

Based on the predictive model developed for the City of Goulburn by Koettig and Lance (1986) and later revised by Fuller (1989), the subject land is located in an area of "potential archaeological artefacts". This is a low-level model of archaeological sensitivity based on generalised topographic modelling that considers sensitivity to increase in proximity to water courses. It does not take into account localised land disturbances (eg. cultivation, paddock improvement and erosion) which will impact site potential.

The result of this conjectural model is half of the land in the LGA is mapped "sensitive". This obliges the local council to require many archaeological surveys. Moreover, this modelling is an invitation for consultants to propose test excavations almost everywhere (because everywhere above a watercourse is claimed to be "sensitive"). Test excavations often find few or no artefacts. This requires expensive permits and requires artefact relocation out of

its original site (a poor heritage protection outcome). Small artefact numbers are consistent with general background density (i.e. the density of stone artefacts across any landscape on the continent).

Test excavation, only in areas predicted to be "sensitive" does not contribute to knowledge because it relies on confirmation bias: Consultants excavate for artefacts in predicted areas. They can then find several artefacts in those predicted areas, thereby confirming the model. The crucial factor of ground disturbance (by two centuries of traditional farming practices and other activities) is not part of the topographic modelling. Levels of ground disturbance are best verified on site by an inspection on foot ("ground truthing"). Hence this survey report and recording of one site, to be protected from harm in a conservation area.

4.3 AHIMS SEARCH RESULTS

A search of the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System or AHIMS register was undertaken for the whole 40 ha subject land with a 200m buffer. The AHIMS Database search showed no previously recorded Aboriginal sites within the search area. The subject land is not within, either partly or wholly an area that has been declared an Aboriginal place.

An extensive AHIMS search with a search buffer of 1km revealed a total of 4 Aboriginal sites. These are all near the Wollondilly River, more than 500m from the subject land. All these registered sites are outside the subject land and are not harmed by the proposal.

Site cards for each of the registered sites were then obtained. See Appendix B for details of the AHIMS extensive search and site cards. The site cards document the nature of each registered site and the circumstances which resulted in it being recorded:

Site ref	Location	Stone artefacts	Area	Details
51-6-0051	50m north of Wollondilly R. on Iow undulating land	19	20m x 30m near river	Nicole Fuller. Goulburn City Archaeological Study (National Estate Grant), 1988.
51-6-0052	40m north of Wollondilly R. on low undulating land	24	175m x 175m near river	Nicole Fuller. Goulburn City Archaeological Study (National Estate Grant), 1988.
51-6-0294	Basal slope of spur, 60m from Wollondilly R.	5	9m x 1.5m exposure	P. Saunders. Proposed residential subdivision, Clyde St, Goulburn, 2005.
51-6-0045	Upper slope, 60m from Wollondilly R.	1	Isolated artefact	Justin Boney, Pejar LALC. 2006.

Summary of recorded sites (from site cards provided by AHIMS)

4.4 SURVEY METHOD

Peter Kabaila of Black Mountain Projects, accompanied by field assistant Amanda Gaunt conducted a site inspection of the subject land on Tuesday 9thApril 2021. The inspection was via a series of pedestrian transects.

Most of the subject land is grassed with less than 2% ground surface visibility, so the survey focussed on areas of exposure that may reveal archaeological materials and this methodology sometimes resulted in a meandering transect. The approximate first survey route is shown in red on the aerial image below, although this was supplemented by re-inspections.

Following this an inspection was made by council Environmental Officer Brian Faulkner with follow up pedestrian surveys by archaeologist Dr Peter Kabaila in the company of Delise Freeman (Pejar LALC); Brian Faulkner and David Kiernan (Shire Council); and Southern Cross Surveyors with Scott Coltman of Ironstone P/L.

Pedestrian surveys occurred on the following dates:

- 09.04.2021 pedestrian survey accompanied by Amanda Gaunt and land use history interview with owner Chris Parlett.
- 04.04.2022 site inspection by Brian Faulkner (council environmental officer).
- 10.05.2022 pedestrian survey accompanied by Brian Faulkner and David Kiernan (council planner).
- 16.05.2022 relocation of excavated chert bedrock with Delise Freeman (Pejar LALC) and further pedestrian survey.
- 24.05.2022 mapping and further pedestrian survey accompanied by Southern Cross Surveyors and Scott Coltman (IPG Invest P/L).
- 06.09.2022 pedestrian survey and interview with owner Bill Murray.



Figure 6 – Survey route approximation (outlined in red)

4.5 SURVEY RESULTS

This pedestrian survey included searching ground exposures, visiting rock outcrops and subsurface stone excavated by animal burrows. A search was made during survey for confirmed signs of Aboriginal stone working. This was to eliminate the more common agencies of stone fracture in places with a long history of European land use. These agencies include machine excavation, stone transport, ploughing, fire spalling, frost spalling, horse and cattle trampling and vehicle impacts. Processes such as heat, frost spalling and erosion can also cause fracture.

Ground surface visibility was low and European land use impacts were identified as generally high.

One geological source of chert was found on the subject land (impacted chert bedrock). It had been mechanically excavated with an estimated 20 m3 removed. The survey generally searched on the subject land and particularly near the chert source for confirmation of Aboriginal stone working in the form of:

- Formal Aboriginal stone implement types.
- Cores with diagnostic features of a striking platform and multiple flake scars.
- Flakes with diagnostic features of concoidal fracture **and** edge retouch (secondary flaking).

These were not found, either at the on the subject land or near the impacted chert bedrock.

Appendix D sets out complexities of European land use impacts, particularly mechanical excavation, for interpreting fractured rock. It also describes archaeological inspection of a scatter of fractured stone at the chert source which led to it being registered on AHIMS as an Aboriginal site.

Appendix C responds to local council staff concerns regarding some features on trees, transported stones and basalt outcrops. The survey concluded the features are not Aboriginal in origin.

A summary of the impacted chert bedrock Aboriginal site is:

- One geological source of chert was found on the subject land. Outcrops on the northern side of the subject land are basalt and there are sedimentary stone outcrops west of the homestead. Chert was an important prehistoric stone flaking material and so any fractured chert fragments require careful archaeological consideration.
- The main complicating factor was distinguishing between the large archaeological signature of relatively recent (c1970s-1980s) mechanical excavation and heavy vehicle movement across the subject land, from stone worked by hand.
- Situated on a south facing hill slope, this chert source was bulldozed c1970s by a previous owner to add stone to crossing points over the drainage line that feeds the

stock dam. The current owner Chris Parlett recalls conversations with the previous owner Greg Tozer and a mutual friend Tom Cooley, both of whom mentioned excavating the hillside at the chert bedrock. There are at least five excavations totalling at least 20 cubic metres of stone and soil. (The five excavation scrapes are: 5 x 1 x 0.3m, 3 x 1 x 0.3m; 10 x 2 x 0.5m, 2 x 2 x 0.5m, 2 x 2 x 0.3m, 10 x 2 x 0.3m).

- The picture is further complicated by excavated chert stone rubble have been transported from the geological source to assist crossing of a drainage line.
- Approximately 2 square metres of exposed ground near the chert source was found to contain many fragments of fractured chert on the surface. A statistical sample of 50 chert items from this exposure was photographed and referred to lithics expert Dr Johan Kamminga. (Identified natural fragments such as sedimentary gravels were excluded from the sample).
- Dr Kamminga's expert opinion was that the relatively high proportion (13 items) of primary flaking debris in the sample of 50 items, suggests the chert fragments are likely to be Aboriginal and that the chert source (despite having been mechanically excavated) should be registered as an impacted Aboriginal site, protected within an environmental conservation area.



Figure 8 – Survey views: 407 Crookwell Road



3 Central stock dam and pasture



Figure 8 – Survey views: 457 Crookwell Road







Typical soil compaction and low surface visibility.



1990s temporary horse stable constructed by Bill Murray.



Footings of demolished feed silo that predated Bill Murray's occupation, probably 1970s.

5 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUES

5.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

The survey assessed most the subject land, to have a high level of ground disturbance and to have a low archaeological potential.

At one location, however, the survey assessed that primary flaking debris, found near a mechanically excavated chert geological source, is probably Aboriginal in origin and should, as a precautionary measure, be registered as an Aboriginal site on AHIMS and protected in a conservation area.

There are other features on the subject land, raised by the local council Environmental Officer Brian Faulkner, where the evidence is less convincing. These include:

- Three chert stones which have been moved by machinery or people at some point in time;
- Trees bearing scars that cannot be determined as Aboriginal in origin. Any examples of remnant trees should in any case be retained (e.g. in an environmental zoned conservation area);
- Zones of weakness in basalt outcrops resulting in linear features;
- Curved lines in aerial photos. Explanations are likely to be frost spalling around central tors during the Late Pleistocene period; geomorphological features, surface erosion and tractor blade formation of stone windrows around cleared areas.

These non-Aboriginal features are analysed in Appendix C

As detailed in the survey results, by the end of the 20th century, a large part of the subject land had been highly impacted and was disturbed ground. This included substantial areas of disturbance by mechanical excavation. Other than a lithic scatter near a mechanically excavated chert source (which have been registered on AHIMS as a result of this survey), the survey did not locate any Aboriginal objects or sites within the subject land. No specific areas of Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) were identified or discernible.

The Due Diligence Code (and archaeology generally) recognises flat land above a watercourse as a landform likely to contain Aboriginal artefacts. But in order to establish such a landform as a potential archaeological deposit (PAD), archaeology requires evidence, such as exposed artefacts eroding out of the landform.

Also land above drainage lines associated with each of the three stock dams is steeply sloping and so is not the landform type described in the Due Diligence Code. These two characteristics signal that land above the stock dams, being also *disturbed* land, is unlikely to contain Aboriginal artefacts.

Vegetated parts of the subject land had low surface visibility (less than 2%). So the survey concentrated on areas of ground exposures and rock outcrops.

Numerous ground exposures were closely examined along the survey route. They were mainly rock outcrops but also included some areas of soil and decomposed gravels. No artefacts were found eroding out of these areas. The archaeological conclusion is that most of the subject land is not pre-European ground surface but disturbed ground.

One mechanically excavated geological source with fractured stone was submitted to the AHIMS register as an Aboriginal site.

The remainder of the subject land is assessed as low archaeological potential because it has been heavily impacted by European land use and is far from the nearest water source. This includes Greg Tozer's mechanical excavation and transport of over 300 m3 of rock at 407 Crookwell Rd. The nearest temporary water source is Sooley Creek, over a kilometre distance from the subject land.

Relic protections would still apply under law if Aboriginal objects are found.

Disturbed land

The Due Diligence Code (2010:18) defines *disturbed land* as the subject of a human activity that has changed the land's surface, being changes that remain clear and observable. Examples of disturbed land include ploughing, construction of rural infrastructure (such as dams and fences), construction of roads, trails and tracks (including fire trails and tracks and walking tracks), clearing vegetation, construction of buildings and the erection of other structures, construction or installation of utilities and other similar services (such as above or below ground electrical infrastructure, water or sewerage pipelines, stormwater drainage and other similar infrastructure) and construction of earthworks (Due Diligence Code 2010:18).

Aside from the registered site ('Impacted Chert Bedrock') south of the homestead and a scatter of remnant trees west of the homestead, the subject land is mostly cleared and largely devoid of native vegetation, exhibiting a range of disturbances resulting from earthmoving machinery, rural grazing and associated activity. Part of the land disturbance has been a major service line. A major pipeline traverses both properties, with a 25m wide easement over the APA Melbourne to Sydney natural gas and ethane trench lines.

The land is considered *disturbed land* within the meaning of the Code.

Likely

Likely is not defined within the Due Diligence Code. Likelihood of finding *Aboriginal objects* is generally discussed in terms of archaeological potential or *sensitivity*. An index of likelihood has been devised and is presented below. Probability and confidence indicators are those used by the Australian Army Intelligence Corps S2 Aide-Memoire. The approach is reminiscent of *levels of evidence* used in biomedical science.

Potential to contain Aboriginal objects. (Archaeological potential or "sensitivity").	Confidence("likelihood")	% Probability
Voryhigh	Almost	95% or
very nigh	certain/confirmed	greater
High	Probable	75%-95%
Moderate	Likely	50%-75%
Low	Possible	15%-50%
Very low	Unlikely/doubtful	15% or less

For the purposes of the Due Diligence Code, any ridgeline is considered *likely* to contain Aboriginal objects (and therefore of moderate or higher archaeological potential), unless it is *disturbed land*. Whilst the subject land includes a hill crest and may have acted as a focus point for Aboriginal occupation in the past, that area is also where the homestead and sheds have been constructed and is *disturbed* within the meaning of the Code. This means that any Aboriginal objects that may be present are likely to also be *disturbed* and unlikely to remain in-situ. It should also be noted that within the local area there are areas far more *likely* to contain Aboriginal objects resulting from Aboriginal occupation, such as higher order tributaries.

On the basis of this assessment and the extent of disturbance the subject land is assessed as having a low potential to contain Aboriginal objects.

For the purposes of the Due Diligence Code, any land within 200m of waters is considered *likely* to contain Aboriginal objects (and therefore of moderate or higher archaeological potential), unless it is *disturbed land*. Whilst the subject land includes land within 200m of an ephemeral drainage line and may have acted as a focus point for Aboriginal occupation in the past, the area is also *disturbed* within the meaning of the Code. This means that any Aboriginal objects that may be present are likely to also be *disturbed* and unlikely to remain in-situ. It should also be noted that within the local area there are areas far more *likely* to contain Aboriginal objects resulting from Aboriginal occupation, such as raised banks above permanent water sources. On the basis of this assessment and the extent of disturbance the subject land is assessed as having a low potential to contain Aboriginal objects.

5.2 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Other than the chert source registered on AHIMS by this survey, no Aboriginal objects or places have been identified in the subject land.

6 IMPACTS OF PROPOSAL

6.1 **PREVIOUS IMPACT ASSESSMENTS**

Chris Parlett the owner is seeking approval for a Planning Proposal to rezone a 40ha block at Lot 70 DP1006688, 407 Crookwell Rd, Kingsdale, NSW, to enable future subdivision. The site has been included within the Goulburn Mulwaree Council Urban Fringe Strategy, which the DPIE has endorsed.

No previous impact assessments related to the area of the proposal exist.

6.2 IMPACTS TO ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUES

The proponent has engaged Black Mountain Projects Pty Ltd and sought advice under the *Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW* (2011) to understand whether the works, being the proposed subdivision of the 40ha land parcel at Lot 70 DP1006688, have the potential to *harm* Aboriginal objects or values protected under the *NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act* (1974).

The assessment found:

- The subject land has a long history of human usage by Europeans over the last 200 years, including clearing, cultivation, rock excavation by bulldozer and building demolition. The early 20th century trig structure is one historical example of early stone excavation and relocation.
- It would be certain that indigenous groups would have used any resources that are available, such as chert outcrops.
- The excavated chert bedrock was likely used by Aboriginal people to source stone. The relatively high proportion (13 items) of primary flaking debris in the photographed sample of 50 chert items suggests the stone is likely to be Aboriginal and that the chert scatter should, as a precautionary approach, be registered as an impacted Aboriginal site. It has now been registered as an Aboriginal site ('Impacted Chert Bedrock', AHIMS no. 51-6-0915).
- There are other parts of the subject land raised in concerns by Shire Council staff where the evidence is less convincing (Appendix C). These are: Three chert stones moved by machinery or people at some point in time; Trees bearing scars that cannot be determined as Aboriginal in origin; Zones of weakness in basalt outcrops resulting in linear features; Curved lines on aerial photos. Explanations are likely to be frost spalling around central tors during the Late Pleistocene period; geomorphological (surface erosion) features and tractor blade formation of stone windrows around cleared areas of ground.

This assessment has:

- Identified and registered chert stone scatters near the impacted chert bedrock as an Aboriginal site, to be protected from harm by inclusion in a conservation area.
- Assessed that much of the subject land has been impacted and is disturbed land under the meaning of clause 80B relating to section 87(4) of the NPW Act.
- Assessed the disturbed land as having low archaeological potential to contain Aboriginal sites and objects. Without land disturbance, potential could have been higher.

7 AVOIDING AND/OR MITIGATING HARM

Other than the newly registered Aboriginal site (AHIMS 51-6-0915), there are no known Aboriginal objects or places in or near the subject land. As a result, the proposed development will not harm any known Aboriginal objects or places. Should Aboriginal objects or places be discovered during the course of development, refer to the recommendations below.

8 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The following management recommendations are based on the above conclusions and in accordance with the *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (2010). Should Aboriginal objects or places in the area of the proposal be discovered, more detailed investigation and an impact assessment will be required. Where an Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment does not indicate that there are (or are likely to be) Aboriginal objects, you can proceed with caution without an AHIP application.

On the basis of this assessment for Aboriginal objects and their protection under the *NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act* (1974) it is recommended that:

- The 'Impacted Chert Bedrock' registered Aboriginal site south of the homestead be protected, in consultation with Pejar LALC, within a 'no excavation, no-build' environmental zoned conservation area that includes remnant trees. An 88B Instrument could be used for this.
- The proposal does not require any further assessment relevant to Aboriginal sites or objects protected under the NPW Act.
- The proponent is aware that should Aboriginal objects be discovered during development works, all works in that area should cease and the proponent should contact Heritage NSW or a qualified archaeologist to seek some determination of the discovery and how to proceed.
- In the unlikely event that skeletal remains be discovered during earthworks, all works should cease and protocols consistent with Requirement 25 in the Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (2010) be implemented.

8.2 ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

I, Peter Rimgaudas Kabaila, Heritage Consultant, confirm that:

- I have conducted a visual inspection on the site of the proposed development.
- I have prepared this report, which has objectively assessed the proposed development against the *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (2010), *Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW* (2011) and *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents* (2010).

Peterkin Kuhn

Dr Peter Kabaila, Heritage Consultant, Black Mountain Projects Pty Ltd

GLOSSARY

Aboriginal object A statutory term, meaning: '... any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises NSW, being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non-Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains' (s.5 NPW Act).

Chert provisional identification term used by archaeologists for microcrystalline rocks with concoidal fracture (as petrological analysis would be the only way of providing firm identification).

Declared Aboriginal place A statutory term, meaning any place declared to be an Aboriginal place (under s.84 of the NPW Act) by the Minister administering the NPW Act, by order published in the *NSW Government Gazette*, because the Minister is of the opinion that the place is or was of special significance with respect to Aboriginal culture. It may or may not contain Aboriginal objects.

Subject land The land area in which the activity or works are being proposed. Usually part of the subject land where excavation and/or constructions are being proposed.

Harm A statutory term meaning '... any act or omission that destroys, defaces, damages an object or place or, in relation to an object – moves the object from the land on which it had been situated' (s.5 NPW Act).

Place An area of cultural value to Aboriginal people in the area (whether or not it is an Aboriginal place declared under s.84 of the Act).

Proponent A person proposing an activity that may harm Aboriginal objects or declared Aboriginal places and who may apply for an AHIP under the NPW Act.

Proposed activity The activity or works being proposed.

Subject land Area sampled by the pedestrian survey (usually the lot boundary). Excludes spot checks on neighbouring land.

REFERENCES

AHIMS. https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/awssapp

Aslanides, T. 1983. *Goulburn and Environs*. The Olive Press, Torrens.

Australian Museum Business Services. *Goulburn Mulwaree Aboriginal Heritage Study.* 2012. Prepared for the Goulburn Mulwaree Council.

Backhouse, J. 1843. *A narrative of a visit to the Australian colonies*. Hamilton, Adams, and Co., London.

Bennett, G. 1967 [1834]. *Wanderings in New South Wales, Batavia, Pedir Coast, Singapore, and China; being the journal of a naturalist in those countries, during 1832, 1833, and 1834.* Vol. 1. Ibotson and Palmer, London.

Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales. 2010. NSW Office of Environment and Heritage policy document.

Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects NSW. 2010. NSW Office of Environment and Heritage policy document.

ERM. 2006. *Marulan South Quarry Aboriginal Heritage Assessment*. Consultancy report to Boral Resources (NSW) Pty Ltd.

Flood, J. 1980. *The Moth Hunters: Aboriginal Prehistory of the Australian Alps*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra.

Flood, J. 1996. *Moth Hunters of the Australian Capital Territory: Aboriginal Traditional Life in the Canberra Region*. J. M. Flood, Canberra.

Fuller, N. 1989. *Goulburn City - An Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Site Location*. Report to Goulburn City Council.

Gott, B. 1999. "Cumbungi, Typha species: a staple Aboriginal food in southern Australia". *Australian Aboriginal Studies* (1):33-50.

Govett, W. R. 1977 [1836-7]. *Sketches of New South Wales: Written and Illustrated for The Saturday Magazine in 1836-37*. Gaston Renard Publisher, Melbourne.

Haglund, L. 1986. Archaeological survey of areas within Bungonia State Recreation Area likely to be affected by present and future recreational activities and associated development. Consultancy report to the Bungonia State Recreation Area Trust. Hughes, P. 1984. *An Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Subdivision Area at Eastgrove, Goulburn, NSW.* Consultancy report to the Council of the City of Goulburn, NSW.

Koettig, M. 1983. *Survey for Aboriginal and historic archaeological sites along the proposed Goulburn By Pass*. Consultancy report to the Department of Main Roads.

Koettig, M. 1988. *Survey for Aboriginal Sites in the Proposed Rural Subdivision at Tallong, NSW*. Consultancy report to MJS Keys Young Planners Pty Ltd.

Koettig, M. and Lance, A. 1986. *An Aboriginal Resources Planning Study for the City of Goulburn, New South Wales.* Report to the Goulburn City Council.

Long, A. (2005) *Aboriginal scarred trees in New South Wales: a field manual.* NSW Dept of Environment and Conservation.

MacAlister, C. 1907. *Old Pioneering Days in the Sunny South*. Charles MacAlister Book Publication Committee, Goulburn.

McBryde, I. 1975. *Report on Investigations at Lake Bathurst, Tarago, N.S.W*. Report to Burgess Bros.

Mitchell, P. 2002a. *Descriptions for NSW (Mitchell) Landscapes Version 2.* Based on descriptions compiled by Dr. Peter Mitchell for DECCW.

Mitchell, P. 2002b. *NSW Landscapes Mapping: Background and Methodology*. Prepared by Dr. Peter Mitchell for DECCW.

Navin Officer. 2003. *Pictura Tourist Complex Goulburn, NSW: Cultural Heritage Assessment*. Report to URS Australia Pty Ltd.

Navin Officer. 2010. *Highlands Source Project: Cultural Heritage Assessment*. Consultancy report to GHD.

Silcox, R. S. 1988, *Chatsbury Slate Quarry: Archaeological Survey of Proposed Mining Lease at Middle Arm, New South Wales*. Consultancy report to R.W. Corkery & Co. Pty. Ltd.

Silcox, R. S. 1995. *Archaeological survey of a proposed power route for a Telstra radio base station, 'Sunnyside', Goulburn, NSW*. Consultancy report to Urban Concepts.

Smith, J. 1992. *Aborigines of the Goulburn District*. Goulburn & District Historical Society, Goulburn.

Tazewell, S. J. 1991. *Grand Goulburn: First Inland City of Australia - A Random History*. The Council of the City of Goulburn, Goulburn.

Tindale, N. B. 1974. *Tindale's Catalogue of Australian Aboriginal Tribes*. http://www.samuseum.australia.sa.com/tindaletribes/

Trott, M. B. 1966. *Backhouse, James (1794-1869*). Australian Dictionary of Biography [Online edition]. Melbourne University Press. http://adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A010042b.htm

Williams, D. 2004. *An Archaeological Survey of DP1056874 and DP1060631, Tall Timbers, Goulburn, NSW*. Consultancy report to Greater Argyle City Council.

Wyatt, R. T. 1972. The History of Goulburn, N.S.W. Lansdowne Press, Sydney.

APPENDIX A – ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION

Aboriginal consultation log

Consultation with Delise Freeman, representing Pejar LALC.

Date	Request	Comm	Response
10.03.2022	Subject land inspection request.	Mobile call	LALC requested aerial image of the land parcel, owner contact details, address and AHIMs search results, and draft report to prepare for the site inspection.
16.03.2022	Mobile text message to confirm inspection. Subject land inspection with Delise Freeman	Meeting on subject land	LACL discussion with archaeologist and owner was wide ranging. No specific objections were raised.
16.03.2022	Email thanking Delise for site inspection. Emailed confirmation of inspection with attached draft of archaeologist's site notes.	Email	No response
23.03.2022	Draft ACHAR provided for comment.	Email	No response
06.05.2022	Follow up request for LALC response.	Email	No response
20.06.22	Reminder to invoice inspection.	Mobile call	LALC invoice for inspection received and paid



Black Mountain Projectss,

Invoice Date 20 Jun 2022 Invoice Number INV-0026 ABN 72 662 632 151 Pejar Local Aboriginal Land Council 80 Combermere Street PO Box 289. GOULBURN NSW 2580

Description	Quantity	Unit Price	GST	Amount AUD
LALC inspection on 16.03.2022 Lot 70 DP1006688, 407 Crookwell Road, Kingsdale (Chris Parlett owner)	1.00	850.00	10%	850.00
			Subtotal	850.00
		TOTAL (GST 10%	85.00
		то	TAL AUD	935.00

APPENDIX B - AHIMS SEARCH RESULTS



Black Mountain Projects Pty Ltd 5 Wangara St Aranda Australian Capital Territory 2614 Attention: Peter Kabaila Email: peterkabaila1@gmail.com Dear Sir or Madam:

AHIMS Web Service search for the following area at Lot : 70, DP:DP1006688, Section : - with a Buffer of 200 meters, conducted by Peter Kabaila on 14 March 2022.

The context area of your search is shown in the map below. Please note that the map does not accurately display the exact boundaries of the search as defined in the paragraph above. The map is to be used for general reference purposes only.



A search of Heritage NSW AHIMS Web Services (Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System) has shown that:





Your Ref/PO Number : 70 1006688 1KM Client Service ID : 667194 Date: 14 March 2022

Black Mountain Projects Pty Ltd 5 Wangara St Aranda Australian Capital Territory 2614 Attention: Peter Kabalia Email: peterkabalia1@gmail.com Dear Sir or Madam: AHIMS Web Service search for the following area at Lot : 70, DP:DP1006688, Section : - with a Buffer of 1000 meters, conducted by Peter Kabalia on 14 March 2022,

The context area of your search is shown in the map below. Please note that the map does not accurately display the exact boundaries of the search as defined in the paragraph above. The map is to be used for general reference purposes only.





Date: 14 March 2022

		AHIMS Web Services ((SWS)							Your Ref/PO Numb	er: 70 1006688 1km
NSW GOVERNMENT		Extensive search - Site list re	sport							Client S	ervice ID : 667618
iteID	SiteName		Datum	Cone	Easting	Northing	Context	Site Status **	SiteFeatures	SiteTypes	Reports
1-6-0051	GC15		AGD	55 7/	47270	6152930	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -	Open Camp Site	1578
	Contact		Recorders	Ms.N Fi	uller				Permits		
1-6-0052	GC16		AGD	55 7/	47150	6153100	Open site	Valid	Artefact : -	Open Camp Site	1578
	Contact		Recorders	Ms.N Fu	uller				Permits		
51-6-0294	WRA 1		AGD	55 7	46366	6153116	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 5, Potential		103490
									Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -		
	Contact Searle		Recorders	Ms.Tris	h Saunder.	S			Permits	3960	
51-6-0445	Clyde Steet Pipeline 3		AGD	55 7/	46822	6152996	Open site	Valid	Artefact : 1		
	Contact S Scanlo	n	Recorders	Pejar Lo	ocal Aborig	ginal Land Cou	ıncil		<u>Permits</u>		

• Site Status Valid - The site has been recorded and accepted onto the system as valid Valid - The site has been recorded and accepted onto the system as valid Destroyed - The site has been completely impacted or harmed usually as consequence of permit activity but sometimes also after natural events. There is nothing left of the site on the ground but proponents should proceed with caution. Partially Destroyed - The site has been completely impacted or harmed usually as consequence of permit activity but sometimes also after natural events. There is nothing left of the site on the ground but proponents should proceed with caution. Partially Destroyed - The site has been only partially impacted or harmed usually as consequence of permit activity but sometimes also after natural events. There might be parts or sections of the original site sill present on the ground Partially Destroyed - The site has been only partially impacted or harmed usually as consequence of permit activity but sometimes also after natural events. There might be parts or sections of the original site untered and accepted onto AHING as a valid site but after further investigations it was decided it is NOT an aboriginal site. Impact of this type of site does not require permit but Heritage NSW should be notified Not a site - The site has been originally entered and accepted onto AHING as a valid site but after further investigations it was decided it is NOT an aboriginal site. Impact of this type of site does not require permit but Heritage has notified

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/03/2022 for Peter Kabaila for the following area at Lot: 70, DP:DP1006688, Section : - with a Buffer of 1000 meters. Number of Aboriginal

sites and Aboriginal objects found is 4 This information is not guaranteed to be free from error omission. Heritage NSW and its employees disclaim liability for any act done or omission made on the information and consequences of such acts or omission.

Page 1 of 1

CARNE & WELCO	Vivotori .			N I K NI I K
Nat BOX N18 Stand	GROSVENOR STREET POST OFFI ard Site Recording Form	nd Wild CE, SYDNEY, NSW 200 n Revised 5/88	ife Service	51-6-00
1:250,000 map sheet:	Coulburn 250K 250K 147270 mE 61 25K 50K [1] elerence [1(25K) 50K [1] ble Elerence [1(25K) 50K [1] ble Elerence [1(25K) 50K [1] preterred] Elerence [1(25K) 50K [1] Elerence [1(25K	NPWS Code 15,]] 250K 250K 25K 100K [] 250K ame: 250K ame: 250K 100K [] 250K ame: 250K 2	HEAD OFFICE USE ON NPWS Site no: <u>51</u> Site types: OPEN Accessioned by: <u>AU</u> Data entered by: <u>RUHH</u> Owner/Manager: Address:	LY: 6-51_ Date: <u>0.8/7/8</u> Date: <u>11-7-89</u>
Portion no: Parish: Air photo refs. (for stereo pa	Other land category County: Argy 2	P	iotos taken? Yes No	
How to get to the site (refer t (Draw diagram on separate she	o permanent features, give best appr el.)	oach to site eg. from al	ove, below, along cliff.	
How to get to the site (refer t (Draw diagram on separate she Sace atte Other sites in locality? (rest	o permanent features, give best appr rel.) sched ~ map	oach to sile eg. from al ypes include: Sh	ove below, along clitt.	Krs.
How to get to the site (refer t (Draw diagram on separate she Suce office Other sites in locality? (resh Are sites in NPWS Register? Have artefacts been remove By whom?	No. Site T CeSNo. ed from site? Yes/No/don't know. Depo:	vpes include: Sh When? sited where?	oove, below, along clitt.	krs
How to get to the site (refer t (Draw diagram on separate she Size office Are sites in locality? (resh Are sites in NPWS Register Have artefacts been removi By whom? Is site important to local Abo Give contact(s) name(s) + a Contacted for this recording (Attach additional information s Verbal/written reference sou Collosm City	No. Site T Constraint features, give best appri- sched way No. Site T CesNo. ed from site? Yes/No/don't know. Depor origines? Yes/No/don't know. Depor origines? Yes/No/don't know. Depor origines? Yes/No/don't know. Depor Deport Depo	vpes include: 8th When? Siled where? 2014 Without Wind for R PO Box 6 COWRA Not COWRA Not	ove below, along clitt. one or refact exact agional Alboriaginal was 2794 ghion of Alboria	Kers Land Cours ymal Catalogue # C-1578
How to get to the site (refer t (Draw diagram on separate she Size office) Are sites in locality? (reg) Are sites in NPWS Register? Have artefacts been remove By whom? Is site important to local Abi Give contact(s) name(s) + si Contacted for this recording (Attach additional information s Verbal/written reference so Collow City Site Location . Checklist: surface visibility, damage/disturbance/ threat to site	o permanent features, give best apprivel.)	vpes include: Sh When? sited where? Soly Wilson Wirad in R PO Gol G Coulon NS mying report).	one or refact scall one or refact scall ogland Alboriginal warrow of Alboria	Kers Land Cours ynal Cetalogue C-1578
How to get to the site (refer t (Draw diagram on separate she Size office Are sites in locality? Are sites in NPWS Register Have artefacts been remove By whom? Is site important to local Abi Give contact(s) name(s) + i Contacted for this recording (Attach additional information s Verball/written reference soil Contacted for this recording (Attach additional information s	o permanent features, give best apprivel.)	ach to sile eg. from al ypes include: Sh When? sited where? Roly Wilson Wirod yr: R PO Box G COWRA AS nying report). col Wischer	one or refact scall egional Alboriginal warrow of Alboria	Kers Land Cours ynal Catalogue C-1578

.

SITE POSITION & ENVIRONMENT OFFICE USE ONLY: NPWS site no: 51-6-51 1. Land form a. beach/hill slope/ridge lop, etc: c. slope: b. site aspect: e. Describe briefly: The site is located d. mark on diagram provided or on your own sketch the position of the site: approximptely 50m north of the Wollandilly River on low undolating land. g. Land use/effect: Roughed poddack f. Local rock type Source: Wollowdilly River 2. Distance from drinking water: 50 m 3. Resource Zone associated with site (estuarine, riverine, forest etc): 4. Vegetation: 5. Edible plants noted: 6 Faunal resources (include shellfish): 7. Other exploitable resources (river pebbles, ochre, etc): Site type: DESCRIPTION OF SITE & CONTENTS. Note state of preservation of site & contents. Do NOT dig.disturb.damage site or contents. Stone artefact scatter The artefacts were found on the surface of a ploughed paddock in an area of 180 CHECK length, ' height c square metres. The field is roughly rectangular and extends from approximately 20m to deposit 150m from the Wollondilly River, and is approximately 30 m wide. The site is located grooves only in the portion of paddock nearest the river. The river banks, between the ploughed DEPOS area and the river, slope steeply and despite the presence of ground surface visibility texture depth, and exposure no artefacts were located here. content stone, c & distri stone ty types. Nineteen artefacts of the following types were located: flakes and flaked pieces of chert ART an decorat colours, (8), quartz (8) and silcrete (1); two blade cores of chert. The artefacts were difficult to locate as many bore a coating of dust which made them indistinguishable from the pigmen engravit ligures, patinals recently ploughed soil. Further artefacts are likely to occur in this location, however, these could only be detected following rainfall which would expose the artefacts. If BURIAL condition position more time had been available to examine the site further artefacts may have been associal found, both within and outside the site boundaries. TREES dead, la shape, position, size. patterns, axe marks, regrowth. OUARRIES: rock type. debris, recognisable artefacts, percentage quarried. OTHER SITES EG. structures (tish traps. stone arrangements, bora rings, mia mias) mythological sites, rock holes, engraved groove channels, contact sites Attach sketches etc. eg. plan & section of shelter, show relation between site contents. (missions massacres indicate north, show scale cemeteries) as appropriate Attach annotated photos (stereo where useful) showing scale, particularly for art sites.







		prober .			
	National P BOX NIER, GROSVENOR ST Standard Site Rec	arks and W REET POST OFFICE, SYDNEY, ording Form Revised	NSW 2000. T	EL (02) 237 6500	51-6-0052
1:250,000 map s AMG Grid refere Full reference - please include leading digits Scale of map used I Please use largest sc (125K) 50K, 100K n Site name: QCN NPWS District: Ne Reason for investige	theet: <u>Couldbur</u> <u>250K</u> <u>250K</u> tor grid reference [-1]2 tor grid reference [-1]2 tor grid reference [-1]2 <u>258</u> tor grid reference [-1]2 tor	me 6 15310 me 6 15310 sis 25K Sis 50K [] 100K [] date cality/property name. egion: South Ease no. where applicable): Arch. Shudy	ws соон 0 mN 250к 	HEAD OFFICE USE O NPWS Site no: <u>51</u> Site types: OFEA Accessioned by: <u>AU</u> Data entered by: <u>AU</u> Owner/Manager: Address:	NLY: - 6 - 52 Date: <u>08</u> [7]89 - Date: <u>31-7-18</u>
Portion no: Parish: Air photo refs. (for s	Oth Cou tereo pair)	er land category: inty: Arggie	Photo	s taken? Yes No	
How to get to the sit (Draw disgram on sep.	le (refer to permanent featur arate sheet.)	es, give best approach to site e	g. from above	, below, along ciff.	
How to get to the sil (Draw diagram on sep. See Other sites in localit Are sites in NPWS R	VY Yes No.	es, give best approach to site e	g. from above	, below, along ciff.	
How to get to the sil (Draw diagram on sep See Other sites in localit Are sites in NPWS R Have artefacts beer By whom?	V (Yes)No. Aregister? Yes)No.	es, give best approach to site e Site Types include No/don't know. When? Deposited where?	g. from above	, below, along ciff.	
How to get to the sil (Draw diagram on sep See Other sites in localit Are sites in NPWS F Have artefacts beer By whom? Is site important to I Give contact(s) nam Contacted for this re (Attach additional infor	le (refer to permanent featur arate sheet.) WY Yeg No. Register? Yeg No. In removed from site? Yes local Aborigines? Yes/No. res(s) + address(es) ecording Yes/No. rmation separately) If not, w	site Types include Site Types include No/don't know. When? Deposited where? don't know. Roly w Wirodo Court PO Bo thy not? Court	g from above	ibelow, along citt. Giorral Aborigin W 2794	val Lourd
How to get to the sil (Draw diagram on sep See Other sites in localit Are sites in NPWS F Have artefacts beer By whom? Is site important to I Give contact(s) nam Contacted for this rr (Attach additional infor Verbal/written refere Costor of Site Loco	te (refer to permanent leatur arate sheet.)	site Types include Site Types include No/don't know. When? Deposited where? don't know. Roly w Wiroda for not? PO Bo fty not? Ette of accompanying report). Specific of accompanying report. Specific of	g from above Dilson Dilson Cil Dilson Cil Cil Cil Cil Cil Cil Cil Cil Cil Cil	gioral Aborigin W 2794 on of Abori	val Lound Bival Catalogues C=1578
How to get to the sil (Draw diagram on sep See Other sites in localit Are sites in NPWS F Have artefacts beer By whom? Is site important to I Give contact(s) nam Contacted for this re (Attach additional infor Verbal/written refere Costor of Site Site Loco Checklist: surface visibility, damage/disturbance threat to site	le (refer to permanent leatur arale sheet.)	site Types include Site Types include /No/don't know. When? Deposited where? don't know. Roly W Wirddi Cow PO Bo fty not? cow? PO Bo fty not? cow? Site Types include Deposited where? Cow PO Bo fty not? cow? Site Types include No/don't know. When? Deposited where? Cow PO Bo fty not? cow? Site Types include No/don't know. When? Deposited where? Cow PO Bo fty not? cow? Site Types include No/don't know. When? Cow PO Bo fty not? cow? Site Types include No/don't know. When? Cow PO Bo Site Types include No/don't know. Roly W Site Types include No/don't know. When? Cow PO Bo Site Types include No/don't know. Roly W Site Types include Site Types include Site Types include Site Types include Site Types include Site Types include Site Site Types include Site Site Site Site Site Site Site Site	g from above	gional Aborigin W 2794	val Lound Bival Catalogues C=1578
How to get to the sil (Draw diagram on sep See Other sites in localit Are sites in NPWS F Have artefacts beer By whom? Is site important to I Give contact(s) nam Contacted for this rr (Artach additional infor Verbal/written refere Could for this rr (Artach additional infor Verbal/written refere Checklist: surface visibility, damage/disturbance threat to site	le (refer to permanent featur arate sheet.)	Site Types include Site Types include No/don't know. When? Deposited where? don't know. Roly w Wirddi Cown PO Bo fly not? com PO Bo fly not? com fly not? fly not? com fly not? fly not?	ecessary):	sional Abarigu Sional Abarigu W 2794 Son of Albaria	NPWS Report Givel Catalogue # C-1578

.

1

ł

SITE POSITION & EN	VIRONMENT	OFFICE USE ONLY: NPWS site no: 51-6-52.
1. Land form a beach	hill slope/ridge lop, etc:	b. site aspect: C. slope:
d. mark on diagram pro	wided or on your own sketch the position of	the site: e. Describe briefly: The site is located
		an low underland count
		approximately forwhorth
		of the wollowdilly River
		induced performent produced
2. Destands from deat	y. c.	3. ((
 Distance from drink 	ng water: Sc	Arce.
3. Resource Zone ass	ociated with site (estuarine, riverine, forest	tetc):
4. Vegetation:		
5. Edible plants noted		
6. Faunal resources (in	clude shellfish):	
7. Other exploitable re	sources (river pebbles, ochre, etc):	
Site type:	DESCRIPTION OF SITE & CONTENTS.	
Stone	Note state of preservation of site & conte	ents. Do NOT dig, disturb, damage site or contents.
arcefact		
scatter		
CHECKI Artofact	were found in a portion of th	e ploughed paddock nearest the river, in an are
length w Arteracts	were found in a portion of th	e ploughed paddock hearest the river, in an are
deposit, approxin	nately 175 metres x 175 metr	es. The soil contains numerous stones, rangin
grooves from cob	bles up to 20 centimetres in si	ze to gravel.
DEPOSI		
depth st This site	contains 24 artefacts made	of the following raw materials: silcrete (12
stone, ct including	one geometric microlith) che	rt (3) quartz (8) and volcanic (1) Only one con
& distrit Including	one geometric microlitit), che	and emergent these
types. made fro	om a low grade chert, is include	ed amongst these.
ART: are decorate		
colours,		
engravin Judging	by the location and contents of	of this site, and from the presence of another sit
figures, s budging	n a similar satting (site CC1E)	there is likely to be an almost continuous cost
BURIAL!	n a similar setting (site GC15)	, mere is intery to be an amost commodus scalin
condition of archa	eological material along the ba	anks immediately above the Wollondilly River (tr
associate river cha	annel is deeply incised at this	point, and is from 5-10m below the surroundir
dead, like landscap	be) between GC16 and Marsd	en Bridge.
shape, pi		rana maya na Tin M
regrowth.		
QUARRIES: rock type, debris, recognisable		
artelacts, percentage		
Quarried.		
structures (lish traps,		
stone arrangements, bora rings, mia mias),		
mythological sites, rock		
channels, contact sites	Attach sketches etc. eq. plan & section of	of shelter, show relation between site contents.
(missions massacres cemeteries) as	indicate north, show scale.	Change.
appropriate	Attach annotated photos (stereo where u	seful) showing scale, particularly for art sites.

1

1

L

. 1







information 🗌

,

ų

Aboriginal Sites Register of NSW NPWS, PO Box 1967, Hurstville NSW 2220 Standard Site Recording Form



New Recording 2 51-6-0294

		SITE	IDEN	TIFICA	TION			
Site name	WRA1					NPW	/S Site tber	51-6-0294
Owner/manager	Brian Walk	om						
Owner Address	132 Clyde	St, Goulburn,	NSW 25	80				
			LOC	ATION				
Location	Clyde Stree	st, Goulburn						
How to get to the site	Refer report	rt						
1:250,000 map name	GOULBUR	N				NPWS n	nap code	51
AMG Zone	55	AMG Easting	1 74	46366		AMG No	orthing	6153116
Method for grid reference	Hand-held	Hand-held GPS Map scale (If method = map) 1:25,000					Map name	KINGSVALE (AGD66)
NPWS District	QUEANBEYAN NPWS					NPWS 2	Zone	Southern Zone
Portion no.	3					Parish		Goulburn
	SITE DESCRIPTION							
Site type(s)	Artefact sc	Artefact scatter with PAD Site type code						
shelter, deposit, structure, element eg. tree scar, grooves in rock. DEPOSIT: colour, texture, estimated depth, etratigraphy, contents-shell, bone, stone, charcoal, density & distribution of these, stone types, artefact types. ART: area of decorated surface, motifs, colours, wet/dry pigment, engraving technique, no. of figures, sizee, patination. BURIALS: number & condition of bone, position, age, sex, associated artefacts. TREES: number, alive, dead. likely age, scar shape, position, size, patierns, axe marks, regrowth. QUARRIES: rock type, debris, recognisable artefacts, percentage quarried	chips.	m,, uark grey	SIICTEE)	наке (Z	241046	un, muk	y quartz 118K0	zex tox totninį, 2 quanz
Vereion: June 1998								



Aboriginal Sites Register of NSW NPWS, PO Box 1967, Hurstville NSW 2220 Standard Site Recording Form

Site recorded by	P. Saunders	Date of recording	28 February 2005
Address/institution	Archaeological Heritage Surveys, 6 Re	edgrave PI, Chapman ACT 2611	

Version: June 1998	Data entered by:	Date entered:	
--------------------	------------------	---------------	--

.

ccess office Use Outy Client on system
Client on system
ccess Client on system
Client on system
system
Client on system
map
Client on
system







