Nicola Weimann  
Environment and Planning Manager  
Planning and Environment Services  
Integrated Planning | Infrastructure Services  
Transport for NSW  

19 February 2019

Dear Ms Weimann,

Re. Results of non-Aboriginal archaeological monitoring of geotechnical investigation for the Parramatta Light Rail Project

This report has been prepared for Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW) and the Heritage Division of the Office of Environment and Heritage. It presents the results of non-Aboriginal (historic) archaeological monitoring undertaken at a number of geotechnical investigation locations throughout Parramatta, Camellia and Rosehill for the Parramatta Light Rail (PLR) project. Archaeological management was required to ensure that archaeological remains would not be impacted by the works, as State Significant Infrastructure (SSI) approval had not yet been provided.

This report was authored by Jenny Winnett (Excavation Director, Artefact Heritage), who also undertook the archaeological monitoring program. Review was provided by Dr Sandra Wallace (Principal, Artefact Heritage). The geotechnical investigation works were undertaken by Coffey.

1.1 Project Background

TfNSW is in the process of constructing the PLR. The preferred corridor was announced by the NSW Government in December 2015, which runs from Westmead to Strathfield via the Parramatta CBD, incorporating the Parramatta North urban renewal area, Camellia, Telopea, Rydalmere, and Sydney Olympic Park. A light rail line would also branch from Camellia to Carlingford.

In 2017 Artefact Heritage, on behalf of TfNSW, prepared an archaeological assessment and Work Method Statement (WMS) to support an Exception Notification (1B) under Section 139(4) of the Heritage Act NSW 1977 (Heritage Act) for geotechnical and utility investigations throughout Parramatta. These investigations were required to inform the next stage of the PLR project. The exception was endorsed by NSW Heritage Division under delegated authority on the 27 February 2017 (Appendix A).

The WMS outlined a methodology to archaeologically test a number of bore hole locations, and to monitor and test geotechnical test pit locations. The WMS identified BH’s 16, 17, 18, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159 160 and TP’s 53, 57 and 59 would be subject to archaeological monitoring. A further three testing locations (TP 53, 57 and 59) were included in the WMS as requiring archaeological management but were not specifically identified in the s139 exception endorsement. These locations were also monitored. The monitoring component of the work commenced in March of 2017. Subsequent to the s139 exception endorsement, several of the proposed bore hole locations were

---
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removed from the project scope and all geotechnical test pits requiring archaeological testing were put on hold. This results reporting was delayed as clarification around whether on hold testing works would take place was not obtained until April 2018, when it was confirmed that the works had been removed from the scope by TfNSW for financial reasons.

Overall, the scope of the archaeological program was limited. A summary of archaeological management adopted for the project is included in (Table 1).

**Table 1: Summary of archaeological management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Statutory requirements (s139 exception/WMS)</th>
<th>Archaeological management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH 16</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitored 15/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH 17</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitored 07/04/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH18</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitored 29/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH155</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH156</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH157</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH158</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH159</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH160</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP53</td>
<td>Monitoring (WMS)</td>
<td>Monitored 07/04/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP57</td>
<td>Monitoring (WMS)</td>
<td>Monitored 17/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP59</td>
<td>Monitoring (WMS)</td>
<td>Monitored 18/05/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 60</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 61</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 65</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 66</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 67</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 68</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 69</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Removed from scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Site Location

The study area consisted of three locations east of the Parramatta CBD and three locations in Camellia / Rosehill (Figure 1). The testing locations were predominantly within or adjacent to road or rail corridors (including the corridor of the former George Street tram line), including Grand Avenue North, Grand Avenue and Tramway Avenue.
Figure 1: Location of the study area. Source Land and Property Information NSW.
1.3 Historical background

An overview of the historical development of the PLR study area was included in the Non-Aboriginal Archaeological Assessment produced for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). A summary of historical context relevant to the results of the geotechnical investigation has been included here, with a focus on the development of land to the east of the Parramatta CBD, today known as Rosehill and Camellia.

1.3.1 First Settlement: 1788-1809

After Sydney was colonised in 1788, Governor Phillip started exploration for arable farming land to the west of the coast. The Parramatta River was first explored in April 1788, and by November of that year a fortified camp or redoubt had been founded on the small hill that overlooks the river in the present-day Parramatta Park. Phillip named this site Rose Hill after the Secretary to the British Treasury and an experimental government farm was established on the riverbanks. It was hoped that the fertile soils at this location would produce a generous crop to sustain the colony, which was threatened by starvation. The effort required to make the ground suitable for cultivation, including the removal of trees, was substantial, especially considering the lack of animals and supplies to supplement convict labours. Tree stumps were burnt in places and the charcoal produced worked into the clayey topsoil by hand. By 1789, the government farm had provided viable yields of grain and was the first successful farm established in the colony.

Originally, convicts were sent to the settlement which was located at the Crescent, now Parramatta Park. The Government Farm included a house for Edward Dodd (Governor Phillip’s personal servant), with a barn and granaries. The convicts had huts with gardens in which they lived.

A government house was built near the farm. This prompted the development of the town of Parramatta, which was laid out in 1790. The town was planned along a long street now called George Street, linking Government House to the landing place, on land previously used for crops. George Street was lined with convict huts, a granary, stores and military barracks. The inhabitants were encouraged to cultivate the land on their allotments.

The plan for the town of Rose Hill was the first effective town plan of the colony. In 1790, Watkin Trench described the progress of the town in his journal, including the construction of convict huts along High Street:

> It contains at present 32 houses completed, of 24 feet by 12 each, on a ground floor only, built of wattles plaistered [sic] with clay, and thatched. Each house is divided into two rooms, in one of which is a fire place and a brick chimney. These houses are designed for men only, and ten is the number of inhabitants allotted to each; but some of them now contain 12 or 14, for want of better accommodation. More are building; in a cross street stand nine houses for unmarried women; and exclusive of all these are several small huts where convict families of good character are allowed to reside...

A number of allotments also fronted South Street. Allotments that fronted High Street and South Street, before their intersection with Church Street, backed onto Back Lane. The boundaries of
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these allotments, as they lie within the modern street grid, are difficult to confirm due to irregularities in the early mapping. These huts date to the earliest phase of convict hut building in 1790, and it is likely that, when first constructed, they were uniform in appearance. It is possible that more ad hoc construction occurred throughout the lifespan of the buildings, as they were made more suitable for habitation and additional spaces and structures added to the earlier buildings. Written records from the time suggest that the huts were used as reception centres for convicts, rather than permanent accommodation. It is therefore possible that modifications were required as the number of convicts passing through Parramatta increased into the early 1800s.

Analysis of plans from this time is somewhat problematic, as many were drawn schematically, and therefore do not necessarily provide an accurate representation of the early settlement. Many of the early plans provide an overview of the settlement, or at least the idealised version of the settlement, at the time. The layout of settlements of this type was designed to create a landscape that communicated the concept of order, with a hierarchy of settlement centred on the military and government presence on higher ground, overlooking the huts on lower ground. This sense of military order was reinforced through repeated patterns of structures, and the strict organisation of living spaces.

Historic illustrations indicate that huts were constructed of timber and were associated with generous allotments that appear to be cultivated. At this time the southern side of Macquarie Street had not yet been cleared or cultivated. As these huts were constructed during the early phase of occupation, they are likely to have been largely uniform in alignment, size and appearance.

From 1790 leases were granted to emancipated convicts and free settlers to establish businesses. By 1800, 19 of these leases had been granted, and a further 55 were granted between 1800 and 1809. At this time it was reported that many of the huts had fallen down or were in a state of disrepair. It is unknown whether the convict huts within the study area were leased to free settlers.

On 2 June 1791 Governor Philip renamed it Parramatta using the local name used by the Burramattagal. Initially the river was the main form of transport to and from Parramatta, but an overland track between Parramatta and Sydney was cleared through the bush between 1789 and 1791. This track formed the basis for ‘the road to Parramatta’, which was laid out in 1797.

Later, under administration by Governor Lachlan Macquarie (1809-1821), Parramatta’s town plan was revised. New streets were laid out, such as Macquarie Street, and older streets were renamed. Macquarie had a convict barracks built in Macquarie Street, and convicts were moved from town allotments into the barracks.

1.3.2 Rosehill and Camellia

1.3.2.1 Early years: 1788-1883

Little is known regarding the development of the area east of the Parramatta CBD during this period, primarily as it was outside the boundaries of the new town.

In 1793, John Macarthur was granted 100 acres on the north side of Duck Creek. It was on this land that Macarthur established Elizabeth Farm. It was not long before Macarthur had expanded the farm by grant and purchase and by 1798 the farm was over 500 acres in size and grazed approximately 50 head of cattle, a dozen horses and 1000 sheep. The majority of the geotechnical investigation locations were located within what was originally the northern portion of Macarthur’s land.
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1.3.2.2  Elizabeth Farm subdivision and development: 1883-1937

In 1883 and again in 1886, Elizabeth Farm was subdivided. A sales plan of the 1883 subdivision indicates that by this time the land between the asylum and Alfred Street was occupied by gardens and Purchase Street had been laid out. It was hoped that the subdivision and selling of the Elizabeth Farm allotments would allow for greater residential development in the area. The allotments offered were relatively large for their time, generally measuring approximately 66 feet wide. However, the planned residential development did not prove to be economically viable. Maps dated to 1895 indicate that only two houses were located along the south side of George Street between Purchase and Alfred Streets and by 1928 it is reported that there were still relatively few structures within the area. With residential development of the eastern portion of the subdivision proving to be unviable, the majority of the land grants were purchased by industrial companies such as the Australian Kerosene Oil and Mining Company in 1886, Wunderlich Tile Works in 1915 and the Australian Branch of the Goodyear Tyre and Rubber Company in 1926. Industrial yards and warehouses were developed on these properties during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 1885, the railway line was extended to Camellia Station, and by c.1896 the rail bridge over the Parramatta River had been built and the line was extended north to Carlingford.

In 1881 a special Act was passed to allow the development of a privately owned tramway between the Duck River Wharf and Parramatta. The tramway was built by Charles Jeanneret, owner of the Parramatta River Steamers and Tramway Company to provide a direct link between Sydney and Parramatta via the waterway. The line was opened in 1884 and by the following year the company was advertising 8 daily services to Parramatta. By 1895 this had been reduced to 6 services and in 1928 regular passenger ferries ceased to operate on upper reaches of the river. The route of the tramline survives as Grand Avenue, a wide street alignment with former tram alignment in the centre, now used as car and truck bay.

1.3.2.3  Modern development (1938-present)

Following WWII, the precinct continued to undergo residential and industrial development. Following the pattern from the previous phase, residential development was mainly only present to the west of Arthur Street. In 1943, most of the former buildings of the asylum were no longer present and the number of houses along the south side of George Street and north side of Tramway Avenue was relatively low. These areas have since been built up and now feature low-medium density houses and apartments along the street fronts.

East of Arthur Street, land use continued to be industrial. Numerous additional warehouses and yards have since been constructed, and in the later portion of the twentieth century James Ruse Drive was upgraded to its present state.

---
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1.4 Archaeological results

1.4.1 Methodology

The geotechnical investigations work involved intrusive ground investigations to provide characterisation of the geology, terrain and subsurface conditions. The aspects of the investigative works requiring archaeological monitoring included the following:

- vacuum or manual excavation (NDD) for the first 500mm to 1m at BH locations to ensure there are no buried utilities
- drilling of 6 boreholes (100 mm in diameter) to a minimum depth of 10 metres within rock material.

Following the completion of works, all excavated areas were backfilled and disturbed areas restored to their pre-works condition.

1.4.2 Bore hole 16

Bore hole 16 (BH16) was located within the original easement of the George Street tram line, immediately east of the intersection of Tramway Avenue and Arthur Street, Parramatta (Figure 4). At the time of excavation, the area was in use as an informal parking area for surrounding warehousing and business.

The 2017 assessment identified this location as having nil-low potential to contain locally significant relics associated with early agricultural practises associated with Elizabeth Farm, and moderate potential to contain locally significant remains associated with the former George Street tram line.

Archaeological monitoring of this location was undertaken on 15 March 2017.

The borehole was excavated through a mixed dark brown clayey sand topsoil to a depth of approximately 500mm. The clay content of the topsoil increased at depth. Underlying the topsoil was a grey brown silty clay subsoil, interpreted as being alluvium associated with the original alignment of Clay Cliff Creek (currently represented by a concrete canal approximately 50 metres to the east of BH16). This deposit extended to a depth of 12.5 metres. The bore hole was excavated to a final diameter of 100mm and depth of 24 metres into underlying shale and sandstone bedrock. No archaeological remains were identified at this location.

Figure 2: Drill rig and general area  Figure 3: Sample showing top and sub soils
1.4.3 Bore hole 17

Bore hole 17 (BH17) was located within the original easement of the George Street tram line, immediately west of the intersection of Grand Avenue North with James Ruse Drive, Rosehill (Figure 4). At the time of excavation, the area was an asphalted drive in front of the Rosehill Bowling Club.

The 2017 assessment identified this location as having nil-low potential to contain locally significant relics associated with early agricultural practises associated with Elizabeth Farm, and moderate potential to contain locally significant remains associated with the former George Street tram line.
The borehole location was monitored on 7 April 2017. The borehole was excavated through 100mm of asphalt. The fill immediately underlying the asphalt consisted of a mixed dark grey brown sandy gravel fill, extending to a depth of 900mm. Underlying the fill was a mixed brown grey sandy clay and sands, interpreted as being alluvium associated with the original alignment of Clay Cliff Creek (currently represented by a concrete canal approximately 100 metres to the west of BH17). The alluvium deposit extended to a depth of 14.8 metres. The bore hole was excavated to a final diameter of 100mm and depth of 24.5 metres through the underlying sandstone bedrock.

No archaeological remains were identified at this location.

1.4.4 Bore hole 18

Bore hole 18 (BH18) was located within the original easement of the George Street tram line, approximately 40 metres east of the intersection of Grand Avenue North and James Ruse Drive, Rosehill (Figure 4). At the time of excavation, the area was grassed road verge.

The 2017 assessment identified this location as having nil-low potential to contain locally significant relics associated with early agricultural practices associated with Elizabeth Farm, and moderate potential to contain locally significant remains associated with the former George Street tram line.

The borehole location was monitored on 29 March 2017.

Excavation commenced through brown sandy gravel topsoil, to a depth of 200mm. Underlying the topsoil was a mixed brown grey sandy clay subsoil. A compact plastic mottled red and grey clay, alternating with bands of sandy clay, was encountered at a depth of 1.0 metre, this was interpreted as being alluvium, likely associated with the original alignment of Clay Cliff Creek (currently represented by a concrete canal approximately 140 metres to the west of BH17). The alluvium deposit extended to a depth of 14.5 metres. The bore hole was excavated to a final diameter of 100mm and depth of 24.5 metres through the underlying sandstone bedrock. No archaeological remains were identified at this location.
1.4.5 Test pit 53

Test pit 53 (TP53) was located west of the intersection Grand Avenue North and Grand Avenue, north of the Rosehill Racecourse (Figure 9). At the time of excavation, the area was an asphalted carpark adjacent to the Camellia Railway Station.

The 2017 assessment identified this location as having nil-low potential to contain locally significant relics associated with early agricultural practises associated with Elizabeth Farm, and moderate potential to contain locally significant remains associated with the former George Street tram line.

Monitoring of the NDD was undertaken on 7 April 2017. The uppermost layers of the borehole consisted of 50mm of asphalt with underlying sandy gravel fill extending to a depth of approximately 600mm. The works at this location were then halted. As no historical archaeological remains were identified in this location, which was found to be disturbed through the introduction of the car park and construction of the rail line, boring recommenced on the 31 May 2017 under the unexpected finds procedure.

No archaeological remains were identified at this location.

Figure 9: Location of TP53

1.4.6 Test pit 57

Test pit 57 (TP57) was located within the original easement of the George Street tram line, immediately south of the intersection of Grand Avenue and Thackeray Street, Camellia (Figure 10). At the time of excavation, the area was a gravelled layby used for truck parking.

The 2017 assessment identified this location as having nil-low potential to contain locally significant relics associated with early agricultural practises associated with Elizabeth Farm, and moderate potential to contain locally significant remains associated with the former George Street tram line.
Monitoring of the NDD was undertaken on 17 March 2017. Excavation paused at this time due to the presence of a 300mm layer of unexpected concrete. Monitoring of the bore hole at this location recommenced on the 6 April 2017. Following removal of the concrete layer, silty clay fill was removed to a depth of 1.8 metres. This fill overlay a mottled orange and red silty clay, possibly alluvial, which extended to 3 metres. At this point boring was terminated and no archaeological remains were identified at this location.

Figure 10: Location of TP57

Figure 11: Overview of location

Figure 12: NDD slit trench
1.4.7 Test pit 59

Test pit 59 (TP59) was located within the original easement of the George Street tram line, within the road verge on the southern side of Tramway Avenue, Parramatta (Figure 13).

The 2017 assessment identified this location as having nil-low potential to contain locally significant relics associated with early agricultural practises associated with Elizabeth Farm, and moderate potential to contain locally significant remains associated with the former George Street tram line.

Monitoring of borehole excavation was undertaken on 18 May 2017. The topsoil/fill in this location consisted of a brown clayey sand extending to a depth of 100mm. The topsoil/fill came down directly onto alluvium layers consisting of bands of sandy and silty clay extending to a final depth of 2.5 metres. The borehole was terminated at a final depth of 3.0 metres, within the underlying orange yellow sand.

No archaeological remains were identified at this location.

Figure 13: Location of TP59

Figure 14: Overview of location

Figure 15: Upper layer of sandy clay alluvium
1.5 Response to Research Questions

A research design was included in the 2017 WMS. This research design was limited in scope, reflecting the overall low archaeological potential of the works area. The subsequent reduction in scope of the investigation further limits the ability of the archaeological program to contribute meaningfully to research in Parramatta. Responses have been included below:

- What level of subsurface disturbance can be identified within existing road corridors? How has utility construction and road construction impacted or truncated potential archaeological deposits?

**Response:** The limited extent of the footprint of the excavated material at all monitored borehole locations makes it difficult to make assumptions about disturbance. It is likely that the construction of road, rail and carparking areas has required levelling of the ground surface, resulting in the removal of historical stratigraphy in most areas observed. TP 57 was the most notable example of an area that had been subject to considerable horizontal truncations. Areas within the former tram alignment which have not been subject to road construction, i.e. BH 16 and BH17 displayed slightly more intact stratigraphy, but, overall, this cannot be substantiated within the limited scope of the archaeological program.

- Are assessments of nil-low potential based on analysis of historical plan overlays accurate? Do non-documentated structures survive in the archaeological record?

**Response:** As the scope of the proposed geotechnical investigations were considerably reduced none of the test trenches were excavated. These areas had slightly higher potential to contain archaeological remains not related to the George Street tramway and adopting horizontal excavation would have provided considerably more information for archaeological analysis. Overall, the assessment of nil-low potential was accurate for the locations monitored, and no non-documentated structures or remains were identified during the program.

1.6 Conclusions

No archaeological remains were identified during monitoring of the PLR Geotechnical investigation program. This document will be submitted to NSW Heritage Division to satisfy the reporting conditions of the s139 exception.

If you have any queries or comments regarding this report, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards,

Jenny Winnett
Principal
Artefact Heritage
E: jenny.winnett@artefact.net.au
P: 02 9518 8411
Appendix A – Exception endorsement

Ms Leah Henderson
Environment Manager
Transport for NSW
Level 7, 8-12 Castlereagh Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000
Email: leah.henderson@transport.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms Henderson

NOTIFICATION OF AN EXCEPTION UNDER S139(4) OF THE HERITAGE ACT 1977

Proposal: Parramatta Light Rail Geotechnical Investigations: Road corridors of Church Street, Noller Parade and Hawkesbury Road, Parramatta.

Reference is made to an exception notification form and supporting material received from you on 20 December 2016 and as amended with additional information on three occasions seeking to undertake the above works. It is noted that these works are being undertaken under Exception 18: The excavation or disturbance of land will have a minor impact on archaeological relics including the testing of land to verify the existence of relics without destroying or removing them.

The proposed works were assessed as documented by the report/drawings titled:
- Covering Letter dated 9 November 2015 entitled ‘Re: Application for a Section 139(4) Exception – Parramatta Light Rail geotechnical and contamination investigation works, prepared by Artefact.
- Letter report dated 9 November 2016 entitled ‘Re: Parramatta Light Rail preliminary heritage assessment for proposed geotechnical and contamination investigation works’ prepared by Artefact Heritage services to Jacobs.
- Email dated 13 January 2017 entitled ‘Re: PLR – s139 exception – geo tech investigations from Leah Henderson to Felicity Barry.

Under delegated authority an exception from the need for an excavation permit is endorsed, in accordance with section 139(4) of the Heritage Act 1977 and the relevant criteria have been addressed.

Please note this exception is endorsed, subject to the following general conditions. Acceptance of these statutory conditions by the Applicant is a requirement of this exception:

1. If any Aboriginal objects are discovered on the site, excavation or disturbance is to cease and the Office of Environment & Heritage is to be informed in accordance with Section 89A of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (as amended).
2. This exception does not allow the removal of State significant relics.
3. Where substantial intact archaeological relics of State or local significance, not identified in the archaeological assessment or statement required by this exception, are unexpectedly discovered during excavation, work must cease in the affected area and the Heritage Council must be notified in writing in accordance with section 146 of the Heritage Act 1977. Depending on the nature of the discovery, additional assessment and possibly an excavation permit may be required prior to the recommencement of excavation in the affected area.
4. Anything done pursuant to this exception must be specified, supervised and carried out by people with knowledge, skills and experience appropriate to the work.
It should be noted that this endorsed exception covers only those proposed works described in the application including: Boreholes proposed with monitoring of borelogs in Archaeological Management Units (AMUs) AMUs 2965 and 2972. Geotechnical test pits preceded and guided by a protocol of archaeological investigation at AMUs: 3229; 3155; 3018 and 3031. Any additional archaeological investigations will require a further approval.

It is further understood and expected (as outlined in the supporting information) that the TINNSW Unexpected Finds Protocol will ensure if relics are identified in geotechnical test pits which are not to be monitored under this process, the protocol in the supporting AWMS will apply.

This exception does not signify approval for any other activity on the site. In addition, an endorsement for an exception to the need for an archaeological permit under the Heritage Act 1977 is additional to those that may be required from other local, State or Australian Government authorities. Inquiries about any other approvals needed should, in the first instance, be directed to the local council, State or Australian Government where appropriate.

This application is supported on the basis that the archaeological monitoring/testing will be undertaken for 100% of the time by the Excavation Director, Ms Jenny Winnett. Any change in this protocol will require additional consideration and approval under the Heritage Act 1977. You are reminded the excavation report is due within 6 months of the completion of the archaeological investigation works.

The Heritage Division recommends TINNSW consider including a level of independent peer review/oversight for any future archaeological works necessary for the Parramatta Light Rail Project.

Inquiries on this matter may be directed to Felicity Barry, Senior Archaeologist at the Heritage Division, Office of Environment & Heritage, on (02) 9995 6914 or via email at Felicity.Barry@environment.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Katrina Stankowski
A/Manager, Listings
Heritage Division
Office of Environment and Heritage

(On behalf of the Executive Director)

Cc: Dr Sandra Wallace, Artefact Heritage Services E: sandra.wallace@artefact.net.au
    Mr Tim Green, TINNSW, tim.green@transport.nsw.gov.au