AUSTRAL ARCHAEOLOGY PTY LTD ABN: 55 629 860 975 Info@australarch.com.au www.australarchaeology.com.au



CATHERINE FIELD REZONING CATHERINE FIELD NEW SOUTH WALES

PRELIMINARY HISTORICAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

FINAL REPORT SPRINGFIELD RD PTY LTD

1 February 2022

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Project:	Catherine Field Rezoning	
Services required:	Preliminary Historic Heritage Assessment	
Client:	Springfield Rd Pty Ltd	
Prepared by:	Stephanie Moore, Dominique Bezzina, William Andrews	
Project number:	21148	

DOCUMENT HISTORY AND APPROVAL STATUS

Version No.	Version Type	Issue Date	Authored by	Approved by	Date Approved
1	Draft	17/12/2021	S. Moore, W. Andrews, D. Bezzina	S. Moore	17/12/2021
2	Final	01/02/2022	S. Moore, W. Andrews, D. Bezzina	S. Moore	01/02/2022

DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES

Version No.	Quantity	Issue date	Issued to
1	1	17/12/2021	Springfield Rd Pty Ltd
2	1	01/02/2022	Springfield Rd Pty Ltd

Copyright and Moral Rights

No part of this document may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means without prior permission from a representative of Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd. Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd also reserves the right to use documents and materials produced for this project for future presentations or publications, if required.

In the preparation of this report historical sources and other reference materials are acknowledged in text citations and in a separate section at the end of the report. Reasonable effort has been made to acknowledge and obtain permission from the relevant copyright owners.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Austral Archaeology (Austral) has been commissioned by Springfield Rd Pty Ltd (the Proponent) to undertake a Preliminary Historical Heritage Assessment (PHHA) as part of a planning proposal for rezoning of the land north of Springfield Road, south of Catherine Fields Road and west of Camden Valley Way, Catherine Field, New South Wales (NSW). This advice is intended to assist Springfield Rd Pty Ltd in determining their obligations regarding the *NSW Heritage Act 1977* (Heritage Act) and to determine whether the project will involve activities that may harm historic (European) heritage objects or places.

The study area consists of the following allotments

- Lots 100 and101 DP1173578
- Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8 DP203127
- Lots 30 and 31 DP1175280
- Lot 100 DP1149669
- Lots 2, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131 DP27602
- Lot 20 DP1171869
- Lots 1301 and 1302 DP736633
- Lots 1 and 2 DP861247

- Lots 1331 and 1332 DP826048
- Lots 2, 3 and 4 DP518472
- Lots 301 and 302 DP709378
- Lot 101 DP547859
- Lots 204, 205, 206, 207 and 208 DP259147
- Lots 4001, 4002 and 4003
 DP1121133
- Lot 302 DP716446
- Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 DP215520

The location of the study area is shown in Figure 1.1, Figure 1.2 and Figure 1.3.

The purpose of this PHHA is to assess the potential impact from the development on the significance of any built heritage or archaeological values that may be present within or in the vicinity of the study area. The report will provide suitable management recommendations should impacts to heritage values be anticipated.

IDENTIFIED HERITAGE VALUES

This assessment has shown that the study area has low potential to contain historical archaeological remains or historic heritage values. The study area is within proximity of a number of listed heritage sites, including the historic homesteads of 'Gledswood', 'Raby' and 'Oran Park. The nature of rural residential development over time has changed, altering the landscape surrounding these sites. The proposal will result in further alterations to this landscape; however, the historic properties are at such a distance from the study area that there will be no resulting visual impacts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- 1. As this PHAA has identified no areas of historical archaeological potential and no historic heritage sites. As such, works can move ahead as planned with no further heritage requirements.
- The Heritage Act contains provisions for the unintentional disturbance of archaeological relics. Under Section 146 of the Act, the Heritage Council must be immediately notified in the event of relics being unintentionally located or disturbed. Works may be required to cease, pending consultation and further research.



CONTENTS

EXEC	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		
CON	TENT	S	IV
1.	INTE	RODUCTION	1
	1.1	UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT REQUIREMENTS	1
	1.2	ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES	2
	1.3	PROJECT TEAM AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
	1.4	LIMITATIONS OF THE REPORT	2
	1.5	ABBREVIATIONS	3
2.	HIST	ORICAL CONTEXT	8
	2.1	PRE-EUROPEAN OCCUPATION	8
	2.2	SETTLEMENT IN THE CAMDEN REGION	8
	2.3	SETTLEMENT IN THE STUDY AREA	8
3.	SITE	INSPECTION	16
4.	HIST	ORICAL LANDUSE AND SENSITIVITY	18
	2.4	SENSITIVITY MAPPING	18
5.	DISC	CUSSION	20
6.	REC	OMMENDATIONS	21
	7.1	RECOMMENDATIONS	21
7.	REF	ERENCES	22
FIGU	RES		
Figure	e 1.1	Location of the study area	4
Figure	e 1.2	Detailed aerial of the study area	5
Figure	e 1.3	Cadastral boundaries	6
Figure	e 1.4	Heritage items in relation to the study area	7
Figure	e 2.1	Crown plan R6.276 showing the study area	11
Figure	e 2.2	Camden parish map showing the study area	12
Figure	e 2.3	1947 Historic aerial imagery	13
Figure	e 2.4	1975 Historical aerial imagery	14
Figure	e 2.5	2005 Historic aerial imagery	15
Figure	e 3.1	Areas subject to survey	17
Figure	e 3.2	Summary of land-use / archaeological sensitivity	19



1.INTRODUCTION

Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd (Austral) has been engaged by Springfield Rd Pty Ltd (the Proponent) to provide a Preliminary Historical Heritage Assessment (PHHA) as part of a planning proposal for rezoning of the land north of Springfield Road, south of Catherine Fields Road and west of Camden Valley Way, Catherine Field, New South Wales (NSW).

The study area consists of the following allotments:

- Lots 100 and101 DP1173578
- Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8 DP203127
- Lots 30 and 31 DP1175280
- Lot 100 DP1149669
- Lots 2, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131 DP27602
- Lot 20 DP1171869
- Lots 1301 and 1302 DP736633
- Lots 1 and 2 DP861247
- Lots 1331 and 1332 DP826048
- Lots 2, 3 and 4 DP518472
- Lots 301 and 302 DP709378
- Lot 101 DP547859
- Lots 204, 205, 206, 207 and 208 DP259147
- Lots 4001, 4002 and 4003 DP1121133
- Lot 302 DP716446
- Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 DP215520

The location of the study area is shown in Figure 1.1, Figure 1.2 and Figure 1.3.

The study area is bounded by Camden Valley Way to the southeast, Springfield Road to the southwest, Catherine Fields Road to the northeast, and the proposed alignment of Rickard Road to the northwest.

The study area is currently zoned 'RU4 – Primary Production Small Lots' and 'R5 – Large Lot Residential', under the *Camden Local Environmental Plan 2010* (Camden LEP 2010). The proposed works involved rezoning of the subject land to allow residential and associated urban development. The Planning Proposal will zone the study area under the Growth Centres SEPP, and the zoning mapping will be informed by the Indicative Structure Plan (in preparation).

The construction of the subdivision will involve removal of all existing vegetation, bulk earthworks to level the ground, trenching for the installation of underground infrastructure and construction of houses, roadways and walking tracks. All these activities have the potential to harm any subsurface heritage should it be present within the study area.

1.1 UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Austral understands that the project will be assessed under Part 4 of the *Environmental Planning* and Assessment Act 1979. A PHAA has been undertaken to determine whether any historical heritage values are likely to be present within the study area and which may be impacted as part of the planning proposal. The study area does not contain any heritage items that are listed in the State Heritage Register or the *Camden Local Environmental Plan 2010* (Camden LEP). However, there are three heritage items listed in proximity to the study area on both the Camden LEP and State Heritage Register. The items are shown in Figure 1.4 and listed below:

• Gledswood – LEP No. 181 – State Heritage Inventory No. 5051540



- Raby LEP No. 182 State Heritage Inventory No. 5052613
- Oran Park LEP No. 1137 State Heritage Inventory No. 5052417

In order to understand the archaeological potential within the study area, this report provides an assessment of the potential historical archaeological resource through a review of documentary sources. The historical research that forms the basis of this assessment included an inspection of title documents, Crown plans and historical aerial images available through NSW Department of Lands. Research was also undertaken through the National Library of Australia, NSW State Library and NSW State Archives. This process has quantified the nature, extent and significance of any historical heritage values that may be present within the study area. In particular, whether any relics may be present that may require approvals under Section 140 under the *NSW Heritage Act 1977* as part of the proposed development.

The report is underpinned by the philosophy of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the *Burra Charter: Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013* (Burra Charter), the practices and guidelines of Heritage NSW and the requirements of the Camden LEP and the *Camden Development Control Plan 2019*.

1.2 **ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of this preliminary historical heritage assessment is to assess the potential impact from the development on the significance of any heritage values that may be present within or in the vicinity of the study area. The report will provide suitable management recommendations should impacts to heritage values be anticipated.

The objectives of this report are to:

- Identify any potential historical heritage and/or archaeological values within or in the vicinity
 of the study area;
- Assess the impact of the proposed works on any identified heritage values; and
- Make appropriate management and mitigation recommendations.

1.3 **PROJECT TEAM AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The project team has been led by Stephanie Moore (Senior Archaeologist, Austral) who has managed the project and provided input into the assessment approach and management recommendations. The assessment was authored by William Andrews (Archaeologist, Austral) and Dominique Bezzina (Graduate Archaeologist, Austral). Stephanie Moore (Senior Archaeologist, Austral) reviewed the draft report for quality assurance and technical adequacy.

1.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE REPORT

This assessment includes an assessment of archaeological values to support the rezoning application being made by the proponent. The report must be read in conjunction with the rezoning application as it refers to supporting documentation not included within this report. It does not include an assessment of Aboriginal cultural heritage that may be present within the study area (please see (Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd 2022).

The results, assessments and judgements contained in this report are constrained by the standard limitations of historical research and by the unpredictability inherent in archaeological zoning from the desktop. Whilst every effort has been made to gain insight to the historical values of the study area, Austral cannot be held accountable for errors or omissions arising from such constraining factors.



1.5 **ABBREVIATIONS**

Austral	Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd
Burra Charter	Burra Charter: Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance 2013
CBD	Central Business District
CHL	Commonwealth Heritage List
DCP	Development Control Plan
DPC	Department of Premier and Cabinet
EPA Act	Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
EPBC Act	Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999
EPI	Environmental Planning Instrument
Heritage Act	NSW Heritage Act 1977
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
IHO	Interim Heritage Order
LEP	Local Environmental Plan
LGA	Local Government Area
NHL	National Heritage List
NPW Act	National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974
The Proponent	Springfield Rd Pty Ltd
RNE	Register of the National Estate
SHI	State Heritage Inventory
SHR	State Heritage Register
Study Area	Proposed Catherine Field rezoning area, as identified in Figure 1.1

The following are common abbreviations that are used within this report:

Refer also to the document Heritage Terms and Abbreviations, published by the Heritage Office and available on the website: <u>http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/heritage/index.htm</u>.



AUSTRAL

ARCHAEOLOGY

Figure 1.1 - Location of the study area

21148 - Springfield Road, Catherine Field - ACHDDA



AUSTRAL

ARCHAEOLOGY

Figure 1.2 - Detailed aerial of the study area

21148 - Springfield Road, Catherine Field - ACHDDA

Source: NSW LPI Aerial

Drawn by: ARH Date: 2021-12-13



Source: NSW LPI Aerial

Drawn by: WA Date: 2021-12-16



AUSTRAL

ARCHAEOLOGY

Figure 1.4 - Heritage items in relation to the study area

21148 - Springfield Road, Catherine Field - PHHA

Source: NSW LPI Aerial

Drawn by: WA Date: 2021-12-16



2. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The following historical background is designed to contextualise a site-specific history which will aid in the understanding of the heritage values of the study area. This work will provide a useful and concise summary of the history of the study area.

2.1 PRE-EUROPEAN OCCUPATION

The study area was originally inhabited by Aboriginal people who spoke the Darug language (Attenbrow 2003, p.32). The clan thought to live in the area went by the name of the Muringong (Karskens 2009). Aboriginal occupation of the Cumberland Plains and Nepean River Valley extends back well into the Pleistocene, or 10,000 years ago. Currently, the oldest accepted date for an archaeological site in the Sydney region is a date of about 14,700 years Before Present (BP), which was obtained from 'Shaws Creek Rockshelter K2', located to the north of Penrith (Attenbrow 2003, p.20). Relatively early dates were also obtained by McDonald *et al* (1996) for artefact bearing deposits at open site RS1 (AHIMS #45-5-0982) on Mulgoa Creek, Regentville, but the reliability of these dates is uncertain (McDonald. et al. 1996, pp.61–62).

The pre-contact population numbers for the study area are not known and, due to smallpox and influenza epidemics preceding the arrival of European settlers into the region (Attenbrow 2003, p.21), it is unlikely that the early European explorers were able to successfully grasp the traditional population size.

While early contact between Aboriginal people and Europeans in the area was initially neutral, a combination of a long drought and an influx of Aboriginal people pushed off neighbouring lands resulted in escalating violence throughout 1814 to 1816 (Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd 2011). The inevitable conclusion was reached in 1816 when troops under the command of Captain Wallis caused the death of several Aboriginal people camped at Cataract Gorge (Heritage Concepts 2007, p.13).

Following the massacre, the number of Aboriginal people in the Maldon area remained low, with 63 Aboriginal people being reported as living at Stonequarry in 1838, and only 80 Aboriginal people reported at Picton in 1862 (AECOM Australia Pty Ltd 2010, p.14). Despite these unfortunate setbacks, there were reports of Aboriginal people in the Camden area still hunting using traditional methods and camping along the Nepean River right up to the late nineteenth century (AECOM Australia Pty Ltd 2010, p.14, Atkinson 1988, p.7).

2.2 SETTLEMENT IN THE CAMDEN REGION

The first Europeans to enter the area surrounding Catherine Field were escapees, and they were not human. A group of 6 cattle had shot from the government camp and into the bush, in search of greener pastures. The cattle remained lost for the next 8 years, with no search party able to find them. An exploration into the area to the southwest of Sydney stumbled upon the cattle in 1795, grazing on the western banks of the Nepean, with the group having grown to 60 head. The area became known as the 'Cowpastures' and the cattle were left to breed, numbering 5,000 by 1811 (Karskens 2009, pp.285–287).

The first major settler in the area was John Macarthur who traded his many other grants for a single 5,000-acre (2023.4 ha) grant on the Cowpastures in 1805 (Karskens 2009, p.140). Macarthur subsequently named the area Camden. With a powerful man like Macarthur moving to the area, a string of grants given to high profile citizens along the Nepean River followed (Eco Logical Australia 2016, p.15).

2.3 SETTLEMENT IN THE STUDY AREA

The study area falls within the land that was once part of a large 1,230 acre (497.8 ha) grant awarded to Garnham Blaxcell in 1815 (Primary Application 1746). Blaxcell was a merchant from Suffolk, England. He came to Australia as part of the Navy in 1802 and quickly curried favour with those in charge. He played an active role in the rebellion against Governor Bligh and became one of Australia's richest merchants in its aftermath. Seeing an opportunity in 1810, Blaxcell along with business partners D'Arcy Wentworth and Alexander Riley struck up a deal with Governor



Macquarie to build a hospital for free, in return for the right to import spirits into the colony. Whilst they did complete construction of the hospital it was highly criticised as a failure, due to the building being unsuitable for use as a hospital. This building has since been converted to the NSW Parliament house (Dunlop 2006).

The property that makes up the study area was named "Curtis Park" in 1815 and was likely run by managers (NSW LPI Primary Application 1746). Blaxcell was well known to be uninterested in farming and it is unlikely that the study area was an integral part of his landholdings. He was more closely associated with other properties such as the Drainwell Estate in Granville, a farm in Petersham, a large house in Sydney, a windmill in Pyrmont and a warehouse in George Street (Dunlop 2006).

When Blaxcell received the grant he was already under quite a bit of financial pressure. He had decided to start new businesses and industries in New Zealand, which stretched his generous coffers. When these didn't succeed he began to become indebted to other people within the colony, losing his "Drainwell Estate" to surgeon Thomas Jamison. Blaxcell defaulted to the Government in 1817, with his liabilities outweighing his assets. He secretly organised passage back to England to attempt to run from his debts but died in Batavia (Jakarta, Indonesia) on the passage home (Dunlop 2006).

It appears that struggling with his debt, Blaxcell had mortgaged the Curtis Park property to William Broughton, the dutiful commissary of the early colony. Broughton was a staunchly moral man, who often came into trouble with the corrupt when he attempted to right their wrongs. After years of loyal public servitude, Broughton was given a 1,000 acre (404.7 ha) grant in Appin called "Lachlan Vale" in 1811, where his main residence was located (Parsons 2006). The financial situation that Blaxcell was in allowed Broughton to take ownership of the property in 1817. Broughton died not long after in 1821 and the ownership of the property was transferred to his executors D'Arcy Wentworth, James Birnie and his wife Charlotte Broughton. Part of the study area was then sold to George Molle through the lease and release system in 1839 (NSW LPI Primary Application 1746).

George Molle was a soldier and lieutenant-governor of Scottish decent who arrived in New South Wales in 1814. He and his wife had a son named William Macquarie on the voyage to Australia (Macmillan 2006). George Molle was given a 500 acre (202.3 ha) grant in 1817 named "Catherine Field", directly to the north-west of Blaxcell's grant. Having a fraught public life, opposing Governor Macquarie, Molle did not hang around in Australia very long, passing away in 1823 in India (Macmillan 2006). It appears that Molle's son, William Macquarie was in charge of his affairs in Australia after his death, and continued to expand the original lands awarded to his father, gaining the "Curtis Park" estate from Broughton (NSW LPI Primary Application 1746).

It appears that the property was being rented out to tenants by 1848, with an advertisement describing the property as:

TO BE LET ... The well watered lands of Curtis Park and Catherine Fields, either jointly or separately; the former containing about 1,230 acres, the later about 550 acres, situate (sic) on the north side of the Cowpasture Old Road, within about four miles of Campbelltown. (The Sydney Morning Herald, Saturday 18 November 1848, Page 4)

There is no mention of any structures on the property to rent, suggesting that the property was not extensively used as a farm and was most likely used for agistment. A crown plan with no date of survey but assumed to be from a similar time (based on the names of the properties) depicts buildings along the Cowpastures Old Road, the study area is shown with no buildings within it. The closest structures "Molles Main" is shown further to the south along the Cowpastures Old Road (Figure 2.1).

Tracing ownership through this time period was difficult, however a Parish map from the late 1800s shows the owner of the property to be a E. L. Moore (Camden Parish Map, 1st Edition,Figure 2.2). This property must have been handed down to his son Stanley Moore, a prominent diary farmer in the Camden area. It appears at this time the two grants to Blaxcell and Molle were combined and the entire property referred to as "Catherine Fields", and the "Curtis Park" estate ceased to exist.

In 1928, after Stanley Moore's death, the "Catherine Fields" property was sold to C. H. Underwood, of Tolldale, near Gunning (*Camden News*, Thursday 8 March 1928, pg. 1). The advertisement for the sale describes the following buildings on the property at the time:



BUILDINGS: Slab Cottage, 2 rooms; Clab Cottage, 3 rooms (iron roof); old Slab and Iron Cottage, 3 rooms; 2 open sheds. (The Sydney Morning Herald, Friday 3rd February 1928, Page 4)

Aerial imagery from 1947 shows only two structures remaining within the Catherine Fields property, both are clearly located outside the boundaries of the current study area (Figure 2.3). Both buildings are located to the north of the study area with a shed 1.7km away and a small cottage and gardens slightly closer at 750 metres away. No structures of any note can be seen within the study area, just a dam, tracks and what appear to be crops along the north-eastern boundary. As such, all the buildings, except 2 from the above notice have been demolished. It is not clear if the removed cottages were located within the study area, but from the later aerial imagery this is thought to be unlikely. By 1975, the study area has been subdivided into small rural lots and many new dams and buildings have been constructed (Figure 2.4). The study area has remained relatively consistent from 1975 to 2005, with the only changes being differing land uses such as the planting of orchards and market gardens, and the construction of new structures (Figure 2.5).



AUSTRAL

ARCHAEOLOGY

Figure 2.1 - Crown Plan R6.276 showing the study area

21148 - Springfield Road, Catherine Field - PHHA

Source: Crown Plan R6.276

Drawn by: ARH Date: 2021-12-15



Figure 2.2 - Camden parish map showing the study area

21148 - Springfield Road, Catherine Field - PHHA

Source: NSW HLRV

Drawn by: WA Date: 2021-12-16





21148 - Catherine Field - PHHA

ARCHAEOLOGY







3. SITE INSPECTION

A visual inspection of the study area was undertaken by Stephanie Moore (Senior Archaeologist, Austral) on Monday 6 December 2021. The inspection was limited to properties within the study area for which an access agreement is in place (Figure 3.1). These properties were utilised as a representative sample of the study area during the physical inspection, with results supplemented by desktop research.

The physical inspection was undertaken on foot, using meander transects where access was available across the properties. Paddocks containing livestock were avoided and efforts were made to stay some distance from occupied residences.

The survey area contains a number of modern residences and outbuildings, each surrounded by landscaping features including gardens, pools and tennis courts. Outside residences, the study area predominantly consists of grassed paddocks and yards, some containing livestock. There are also a number of artificial dams throughout the survey area. The properties are bounded by fences and, in some instances, screening vegetation. Significant ground disturbance has occurred as a result of the construction of these features.

No historic heritage items or areas of historical archaeological potential were identified during the survey.





4. HISTORICAL LANDUSE AND SENSITIVITY

An assessment of archaeological potential usually considers the historic sequence of occupation in comparison to the structures which are currently extant, as well as the impact that the more recent constructions and works would have had on earlier occupation phases and, as such, the likely intactness of the archaeological resource. This, in turn, is tied in with the extent to which a site may contribute knowledge not available from other sources to current themes in historical archaeology and related disciplines.

Regarding the assessment of the study area, the archaeological potential depends upon the anticipated likelihood for the survival of buried structural fabric and cultural deposits as well as an estimation of archaeological integrity. Structural fabric refers to what is generally regarded as building or civil engineering remnants. Cultural deposits refer to archaeological deposits, i.e., deposited sediments containing artefacts etc.

Having analysed the historical evidence in the previous chapters, the following section presents a summary of the potential for a physical archaeological resource to be present in the study area, that is, its archaeological sensitivity/potential. As a rule, archaeological sites first redeveloped in either the 19th or early 20th century can also retain evidence of occupation from earlier periods. It is also very common that such evidence can be recovered even when sites have been redeveloped or disturbed by modern construction activity. Based on the detailed background history, the following general predictive statements can be made:

- The study area appears to have been used as an outer paddock for most of its European use. As such, there is a **low** potential for any remains to be present that relate to the use or owners of the land from the first land grants.
- Whilst there is evidence that there were structures built in the wider land grant, there was no evidence found that any were constructed within the study area. As such there is a **low** potential for archaeological material relating to these structures to be present within the study area.
- Potential for historical heritage items is **low**, as historic research has indicated there were no structures within the study area during its early European use.

4.1 SENSITIVITY MAPPING

The results of previous sections are depicted in an archaeological sensitivity map (Figure 3.2). This map shows the degree of predicted historical archaeological potential within the study area. The map forms the basis for the conclusions and management recommendations outlined in this assessment. However, one key point to note is that potential does not equal significance, and areas of even moderate archaeological potential may not contain material that is considered significant.





5. DISCUSSION

This assessment has shown that the study area has low potential to contain historical archaeological remains or historic heritage values. The study area is within proximity of a number of listed heritage sites, including the historic homesteads of 'Gledswood', 'Raby' and 'Oran Park. The nature of rural residential development over time has changed, altering the landscape surrounding these sites. The proposal will result in further alterations to this landscape; however, the historic properties are at such a distance from the study area that there will be no resulting visual impacts.



6. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that:

- 1. As this PHAA has identified no areas of historical archaeological potential and no historic heritage sites. As such, works can move ahead as planned with no further heritage requirements.
- 2. The Heritage Act contains provisions for the unintentional disturbance of archaeological relics. Under Section 146 of the Act, the Heritage Council must be immediately notified in the event of relics being unintentionally located or disturbed. Works may be required to cease, pending consultation and further research.



7.REFERENCES

Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd 2022, Catherine Field Rezoning, Catherine Field, New South Wales. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Due Diligence Advice.

Australia ICOMOS 2013, *The Burra Charter: the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*, Australia ICOMOS, Burwood, VIC.

Burke, H & Smith, C 2004, The Archaeologists handbook, Allen & Unwin, NSW.

Heritage Council of New South Wales 2009, *Assessing significances for historical archaeological sites and 'relics'*, Heritage Branch, NSW Dept. of Planning, Parramatta, N.S.W., viewed 30 January 2019, http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/03_index.htm.

Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs & Planning 1996, 'Statements of Heritage Impact',

<https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/heritagebranch/heritage/hmstatementsofhi.pdf>.

Murray, T, M, A 2002, "Casselden Place Development: Archaeological Investigation Works Phases 1 and 2, Full Research Design", report for Godden Mackay Logan Pty Ltd in association with Archaeology Program La Trobe University and Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd.'

NSW Heritage Office 2001, 'Assessing heritage significance', viewed 1 May 2016, http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/heritagebranch/heritage/listings/assessingheritagesignificance.pdf>

Schacht 2010, 'Towards a Thematic Research Framework in Australian Historical Archaeology', *Australasian Historical Archaeology*, , no. 28, pp. 61–76.