FINAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

15 Lower Fort Street,
Dawes Point NSW

Martin Carney, Ivana Vetta
& Kelly Strickland
Archaeological Management & Consulting Group

Global Projects NSW
On behalf of
Ms Melanie Tait

December 2019
Disclaimer

The veracity of this report is not guaranteed unless it is a complete and original copy.

This report may be inaccurate, incomplete, not original, or modified, if it appears in monochrome form and the signature below is a copy.

Martin Carney
Director
(mobile 0411 727 395)

Archaeological Management & Consulting Group
AEGIS HERITAGE Pty Ltd ACN 121 655 020
Ph (02) 9568 6093
Fax (02) 9568 6093
Mob 0411 727 395
E-mail amac@archaeological.com.au

Cover Image

Natural sandstone bedrock in western strip trench. Facing west.
AMAC Group, 20th August 2019, digital image 6340.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Issued by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28th August 2019</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Draft issued for client feedback</td>
<td>Kelly Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2019</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Proofread</td>
<td>Prue Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th December 2019</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Final version</td>
<td>Kelly Strickland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE OF FIGURES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSSARY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

1.2 STUDY AREA

1.3 AUTHOR IDENTIFICATION

1.4 STATUTORY CONTROLS AND HERITAGE STUDIES

1.4.1 NSW Heritage Act 1977 (as amended) 6

1.4.2 National Parks and Wildlife Act (1974) 6

1.4.3 Relevant Heritage Listings 8

1.5 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS

1.5.1 AMAC Group (September 2017) Archaeological Component, Permit Application S60 Heritage Act NSW 1977. 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point NSW 8

1.6 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 9

## 2.0 PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

2.1 BACKGROUND

2.1.1 Introduction

2.1.2 Methodology

2.1.3 General Method

2.1.4 Liaison and Site Safety

2.2 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 11

2.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING

2.3.1 Basement/ Lower Ground level – Underfloor Inspection 11

2.3.2 Archaeological Monitoring – Rear Yard 18

## 3.0 RESPONSE TO RESEARCH DESIGN & INTERPRETATION 23

3.1 INTRODUCTION 23

3.2 RESPONSE TO RESEARCH DESIGN 23

## 4.0 REVISED ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE 26

4.1 METHODOLOGY 26

4.2 IDENTIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANCE 27

4.3 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE 28

## 5.0 PERMIT COMPLIANCE 30

## 6.0 RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 32

6.1 RESULTS

6.1.1 Summary of Archaeological Excavation 32

6.1.2 Revised Statement of Significance 32

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS 32

6.3 ARTEFACTS, RECORDS STORAGE & PUBLIC INFORMATION 33

## 7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY 34

## 8.0 APPENDICES 35

8.1 HERITAGE DIVISION EXCAVATION PERMIT 35

8.2 UNIT LIST 42

8.3 SAMPLED ARTEFACTS 43
# Table of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1.1</td>
<td>Site location, approximately outlined in red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1.2</td>
<td>Aerial photograph showing the study site approximately outlined in red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1</td>
<td>Northeast corner of front room, small area of exposed natural sandstone bedrock (blue arrow). Facing east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.2</td>
<td>General photograph showing floor cavity of front room. Facing west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.3</td>
<td>Rear room, after removal of floorboards and joists. Facing east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.4</td>
<td>Detail of rear room space in front of stove, showing sandy loam fill [003]. Facing south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.5</td>
<td>Remnants of damp timber boards [007]. Facing north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.6</td>
<td>Floor cavity space of side Room 2/storage space. Facing north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.7</td>
<td>Floor cavity of hallway. Facing west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.8</td>
<td>Location of lift shaft, showing open corridor and former powder room (at left). Facing east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.9</td>
<td>Excavation for lift shaft, showing natural bedrock [006]. Facing west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.10</td>
<td>Photograph showing works area. Facing northeast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.11</td>
<td>General photograph showing cut [020] for PVC pipe [022]. Facing west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.12</td>
<td>Northwest corner of strip trenches, showing natural bedrock [023] and PVC pipe [022]. Facing west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.13</td>
<td>South end of western strip footing, showing natural bedrock [023]. Facing west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.14</td>
<td>Western strip footing, showing possible second service cut with redeposited crushed sandstone fill [024]. Facing east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.15</td>
<td>Western strip footing after completion of manual excavation, showing natural bedrock [023] and service cuts. Facing north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.16</td>
<td>Northern strip footing, showing natural bedrock [023] and modern cement piers from new fence at adjacent 15 Lower Fort Street. Facing northeast.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Summary of Archaeological Excavation

- On the 30th May and 20th August 2018 archaeological inspection and monitoring occurred.
- No significant underfloor deposits were identified in the lower ground/ floor basement level, nor were archaeological relics or features found in the excavated areas in the rear yard.

Revised Statement of Significance

- The western half of the rear yard still holds potential to retain archaeological data relating to John Nicholson’s 1826 Durham Cottage.
- If intact archaeological material of this type survives on the site, it has the potential to be of State significance.
- The western half of the rear yard also holds potential for deposition to survive relating to the 19th and 20th century tenants of Milton Terrace phase.
- This archaeological material type if surviving, would be considered of local significance.

Recommendations

- It is recommended that this report be submitted to the Heritage Division (now Heritage DPC) as the Final Archaeological Report to close out the archaeological conditions of the s60 excavation permit.
- Future archaeological investigation within the internal spaces of the dwelling is unnecessary.
- Any future works in the rear yard would require a revised archaeological assessment and permit application prior to any excavation works on site.

Records Storage & Public Information

- A copy of the report will be given to the client for safekeeping and will be lodged with the City of Sydney Local Library as a matter of public information.
- All paper records have been digitised and are archived at the AMAC Group Stanmore office.
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMAC</td>
<td>Archaeological Management and Consulting Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological feature</td>
<td>Archaeological material which is not considered a relic in terms of the NSW Heritage Act 1977. For example: postholes, artefact scatters, cesspits or rubbish pits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>Development Control Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Deposited Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former relic</td>
<td>A deposit, artefact, object or material evidence whereby the integrity of the relic is viewed to have been destroyed or disturbed to the point where it is no longer considered to hold any significance as a relic in terms of the NSW Heritage Act 1977.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Division</td>
<td>Formerly known as the Heritage Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Local Environment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>Land Titles Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPW Act</td>
<td>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEH</td>
<td>NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (formerly known as the DECCW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relic</td>
<td>Defined by the NSW Heritage Act (see Section 1.5.3) as: “any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that: (a) relates to the settlement of the area that comprises New South Wales, not being Aboriginal settlement, and (b) is of State or local heritage significance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S57</td>
<td>Refers to definition of Section 57 in the NSW Heritage Act 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S60</td>
<td>Refers to definition of Section 60 in the NSW Heritage Act 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S139</td>
<td>Refers to definition of Section 139 in the NSW Heritage Act 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S140</td>
<td>Refers to definition of Section 140 in the NSW Heritage Act 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHI</td>
<td>State Heritage Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR</td>
<td>State Heritage Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Archaeological material related to road and rail infrastructure which is not considered a relic in terms of the NSW Heritage Act 1977, however may retain an archaeological significance independent of the statutory definitions. The interpretation of a 'work' has been defined in consultation with the Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.1  Site location, approximately outlined in red.  

Figure 1.2  Aerial photograph showing the study site approximately outlined in red.  
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Global Projects NSW, on behalf of Ms Melanie Tait, has commissioned the Archaeological Management and Consulting Group to prepare a Final Archaeological Report for 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point. This report details the results of archaeological monitoring works in relation to redevelopment of the property. All works were completed in accordance with approved permit 2017/S60/172.

The report conforms to Heritage Office Guidelines for Archaeological Assessment.¹

1.2 STUDY AREA

The study site is that piece of land described as Lot 84 in Land Titles Office Deposited Plan 832148. The street address is known as 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point, in the Parish of St Phillip, County of Cumberland. The location of the proposed works is hereinafter referred to as the 'study site' (Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2).

1.3 AUTHOR IDENTIFICATION

This report was written by Kelly Strickland and reviewed by Martin Carney. Based on the results of archaeological monitoring works (see Section 2.0), the historical development of the site has not been reproduced here. For a complete historical summary of the site, please refer to the original archaeological assessment by AMAC Group (September 2017).

1.4 STATUTORY CONTROLS AND HERITAGE STUDIES

1.4.1 NSW Heritage Act 1977 (as amended)

The NSW Heritage Act 1977 affords automatic statutory protection to relics that form archaeological deposits or part thereof. The Act defines relics as:

Relic means any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that:
   (a) relates to the settlement of the area that comprises New South Wales, not being Aboriginal settlement, and
   (b) is of State or local heritage significance

Sections 139 to 145 of the Act prevent the excavation or disturbance of land for the purpose of discovering, exposing or moving a relic, except by a qualified archaeologist to whom an excavation permit has been issued by the Heritage Council of NSW.

1.4.2 National Parks and Wildlife Act (1974)

The National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (as amended) affords protection to all Aboriginal objects and is governed by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage. These objects are defined as:

¹ Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (1996).
any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating

to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises New South Wales, being

habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of

non-Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains.2

It is an offence to destroy Aboriginal objects or places without the consent of the

Director-General.3 Section 86 discusses ‘Harming or desecration of Aboriginal

objects and Aboriginal places’:

(1) A person must not harm or desecrate an object that the person knows is an

Aboriginal object. Maximum penalty:

(a) in the case of an individual-2,500 penalty units or imprisonment for 1 year, or

both, or (in circumstances of aggravation) 5,000 penalty units or

imprisonment for 2 years, or both, or

(b) in the case of a corporation-10,000 penalty units.

(2) A person must not harm an Aboriginal object. Maximum penalty:

(a) in the case of an individual-500 penalty units or (in circumstances of

aggravation) 1,000 penalty units, or

(b) in the case of a corporation-2,000 penalty units.

(3) For the purposes of this section, “circumstances of aggravation” are:

(a) that the offence was committed in the course of carrying out a commercial

activity, or

(b) that the offence was the second or subsequent occasion on which the

offender was convicted of an offence under this section.

This subsection does not apply unless the circumstances of aggravation were

identified in the court attendance notice or summons for the offence.

(4) A person must not harm or desecrate an Aboriginal place. Maximum penalty:

(a) in the case of an individual-5,000 penalty units or imprisonment for 2 years,

or both, or

(b) in the case of a corporation-10,000 penalty units.

(5) The offences under subsections (2) and (4) are offences of strict liability and the

defence of honest and reasonable mistake of fact applies.

(6) Subsections (1) and (2) do not apply with respect to an Aboriginal object that is

dealt with in accordance with section 85A.

(7) A single prosecution for an offence under subsection (1) or (2) may relate to a

single Aboriginal object or a group of Aboriginal objects.

(8) If, in proceedings for an offence under subsection (1), the court is satisfied that, at

the time the accused harmed the Aboriginal object concerned, the accused did not

know that the object was an Aboriginal object, the court may find an offence proved

under subsection (2).4

1.4.2.1 Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal

Objects in NSW

In October 2010 DECCW (now the Office of Environment and Heritage) introduced

the “Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in

NSW”.5 This code of conduct was released in response to changes in the NPW Act

which now states “A person must not harm or desecrate an object that the person

knows is an Aboriginal object” or that “A person must not harm or desecrate an

Aboriginal place” (NPW Act, Amendment 2010). Individuals or organisations who

are contemplating undertaking activities which could harm Aboriginal objects should

---

5 Office of Environment and Heritage,
consult this code or engage the services of an appropriately qualified archaeological consultant to carry out a Due Diligence study on any proposed development.

This code provides a process whereby a reasonable determination can be made as to whether or not Aboriginal objects will be harmed by an activity, whether further investigation is warranted, and whether the activity requires an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) application.

If through this or any other process which meets the standards of this code, such as the commission of an Environmental Impact Assessment, one has already taken reasonable steps to identify Aboriginal objects in an area subject to a proposed activity. Subsequently if it is already known that Aboriginal objects will be harmed, or are likely to be harmed by an activity, then an application should be made for an AHIP.

### 1.4.3 Relevant Heritage Listings

Table 1.1 provides a summary of all heritage listings related to the study site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Listing</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Milton Terrace’, 1-19 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point</td>
<td>State Heritage Register</td>
<td>0885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers Point &amp; Dawes Point Village Precinct Heritage Conservation Area</td>
<td>State Heritage Register</td>
<td>01682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers Point Conservation Area</td>
<td>State Heritage Register</td>
<td>00884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Group “Milton Terrace” including interiors and front fencing (State Listing)</td>
<td>Sydney Local Environment Plan 2012</td>
<td>I541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers Point/Dawes Point Conservation Area (Local listing)</td>
<td>Sydney Local Environment Plan 2012</td>
<td>C35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19 Lower Fort Street, Millers Point-Milton Terrace</td>
<td>National Trust of Australia</td>
<td>S11296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rocks Urban Conservation Area</td>
<td>National Trust of Australia</td>
<td>S10499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS

#### 1.5.1 AMAC Group (September 2017) Archaeological Component, Permit Application S60 Heritage Act NSW 1977. 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point NSW

Tropman & Tropman Architects, on behalf of Ms Melanie Tait, commissioned AMAC Group to complete an archaeological assessment, research design and archaeological excavation methodology as the archaeological component of a Section 60 permit application for renovation and redevelopment works at the study site.\(^6\)

Based on the assessed impacts and archaeological potential of the site, a program of archaeological inspection and monitoring was proposed for the basement/ lower ground level and rear yard. Section 2.0 of this document forms the physical results of archaeological monitoring at the study site.

\(^{6}\) AMAC Group (September 2017).
The approved archaeological excavation methodology also allowed for archaeological test excavation in the location of a future planned plunge pool. At the discretion of the client, archaeological test excavation did not occur in the rear yard.

1.6 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Ms Melanie Tait for her assistance during the inspection and monitoring phase. Francois Crespel, of Platre & Deco, for all his assistance during monitoring works. Mr Craig Jones of Global Projects NSW for his assistance during the reporting process.
2.0 PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

2.1 BACKGROUND

2.1.1 Introduction
Kelly Strickland, senior archaeologist of AMAC Group, inspected and monitored excavation works at 15 Lower Fort Street on 30th May 2018 and 20th August 2018. All archaeological works were undertaken in accordance with the approved excavation methodology as endorsed by permit 2017/S60/172.

2.1.2 Methodology
Standard archaeological excavation techniques utilised by this company and in accordance with the Heritage Division were employed throughout the excavation. The excavation and recording methodology are based on the AMAC Group Site Manual (2006).

The excavation methods for the site were tailored toward the retrieval of data and to collect the maximum data from each necessary excavation. The methods and work detailed here are not related to the proposed construction programme but works guiding it. These works will provide data, analysis and recommendations with which to guide the mitigation of destruction of archaeological resources in this and future development proposals.

Relics of State significance may be exposed, and potentially sampled, however no intention exists in this programme to remove on a comprehensive basis relics of state significance.

The excavation and recording methodology was based on the ‘Regentville Method’ devised for the Centre for Historical Archaeology at the University of Sydney.

2.1.3 General Method
The methods and work detailed here are not related to the proposed construction programme but works guiding it. These works provided data, analysis and recommendations with which to guide the mitigation of destruction of archaeological resources in development proposals.

2.1.4 Liaison and Site Safety
The excavation team was made up of archaeologists and a mechanical excavator operator. A copy of the assessment, the research design and methodology, and any conditions set out by the Heritage Division was available on site for any of the workers to consult.
2.2 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The study site is located within the ‘Harbour Foreshores’ of the physiographic region of the Sydney Sheet. Soil landscape maps indicate that the study site falls within the border of the Gymea (gy) soil landscape, which is extensively located across the Hornsby Plateau, along the foreshores of Sydney Harbour and the Parramatta and Georges Rivers. The overall geology of the profile encompasses Hawkesbury sandstone, a medium to coarse grained quartz sandstone with minor shale and laminate lenses. Dominant soil materials include:

- Gy1 – Loose, coarse sandy loam generally occurring as topsoil (A1 horizon).
- Gy2 – Earthy, yellowish-brown clayey sand, commonly occurring as subsoil over sandstone bedrock (B horizon). Texture may change gradually to a light sandy clay loam with depth.
- Gy3 – Earthy to weakly pedal, yellowish-brown sandy clay, usually occurring as subsoil (B or C Horizon on coarse sandstone). Strongly weathered sandstone fragments are common throughout this layer.
- Gy4 – Moderately to strongly pedal, yellowish-brown clay, occurring as subsoil on shale bedrock (B and C horizons). Red, orange and grey mottles are sometimes present at depth with shale and ironstone fragments throughout.

The expected soil profiles for crests include up to 30cm of gy1 overlying bedrock or less than 30cm of gy2, or occasionally overlying up to 30cm of gy3 and a total soil depth less than 50cm.

2.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING

2.3.1 Basement/ Lower Ground level – Underfloor Inspection

Kelly Strickland of AMAC Group monitored the removal of flooring and floor joists across the basement/ lower ground level of the c.1880 terrace on 30th May 2018. The following section provides a summary of findings per each room which was inspected for evidence of occupation material or underfloor deposition.

Front Room

The current floor surface were plywood boards [004] which had been laid directly on top of timber joists. It was clear from removal of the boards [004] that the joists had been replaced during the 20th century. Inspection of one corner of the room during removal of the floor joists showed a shallow layer of modern construction debris [005] containing timber offcuts, sheet board, modern rubbish (including plastic) and broken brick fragments. A 1938 half penny was also sitting on this layer (Appendix 8.3). This layer was sitting directly on top of the natural sandstone bedrock [006]. A comparison of the front half of the room (eastern end) and rear half of the room (western end) showed that the natural bedrock sits significantly higher at the eastern end of the terrace. This is also consistent with underfloor inspections or excavations.

---

7 Chapman and Murphy (1989), p. 64.
8 Chapman and Murphy (1989), p. 73.
10 Chapman and Murphy (1989), p. 73.
undertaken at number 5, 7 and 9 Lower Fort Street (also part of the Milton Terrace group). A few sandstone blocks were located in the centre of the room which clearly had been used in lieu of a floor joist to prop up the floor. An exposed service pipe ran through the front room and into the rear room which further indicates that the floor cavity had been significantly disturbed in the past. No occupation deposition was identified within the front room.

Figure 2.1  Northeast corner of front room, small area of exposed natural sandstone bedrock (blue arrow). Facing east. AMAC Group, 30th May 2018, digital image 4907.

Figure 2.2  General photograph showing floor cavity of front room. Facing west. Note ceramic service pipe next to fireplace and loose sandstone blocks used as a joists prop. AMAC Group, 30th May 2018, digital image 4952.
Rear Room

The current flooring consisted of tongue-in-groove floorboards [001], approximately 10cm in width and 2cm thick. Removal of the boards [001] and inspection of the underfloor cavity revealed an uneven and thick (5-10cm) layer of construction fill [002]. This construction layer [002] included wood chips, small fragments of sheet board/ asbestos fragments, broken bricks, plastic needle, a small amount of rodent bone, broken window glass, and two glass bottle fragments (Appendix 8.3). The small surface collection across fill [002] indicated that it formed a 20th century construction layer and some of these items were likely thrown in when the floor cavity was exposed for flooring replacement (for example, large brick fragments). Manual removal of this layer revealed a damp, mid-grey/brown sandy loam fill [003] with a smaller quantity of construction debris. This layer sat approximately 30cm below the current floor level of the room and the sandstone foundations of the c.1880 terrace was also visible at this level. No underfloor deposits related to occupation of the terraces was identified and no further excavation was required in this room.

Figure 2.3 Rear room, after removal of floorboards and joists. Facing east. AMAC Group, 30th May 2018, digital image 4927.
Figure 2.4 Detail of rear room space in front of stove, showing sandy loam fill [003]. Facing south. AMAC Group, 30th May 2018, digital image 4930.

Side Room 1 (east)

The timber flooring [007] in this small room/storage space was extremely damp. A layer of construction fill [008] was sitting directly on top of a compact, damp, orange coarse grained sand [009] with a huge amount of sandstone fragments throughout. This layer is believed to be the natural sandstone bedrock, its form slightly modified by the dampness of the location. No occupation deposits were identified within the floor cavity. A small number of unstratified artefacts, including fragments of a pink porcelain saucer and rat bone were collected from on top of the lowest visible course of sandstone wall footing which was protruding out from the wall (Figure 2.5), none of which were datable.

Figure 2.5 Remnants of damp timber boards [007]. Facing north. AMAC Group, 30th May 2018, digital image 4949.
Side Room 2 (west)

The second small room/storage space comprised of the same plywood flooring [004] as the front room, the flooring likely having been replaced at the same time. A shallow layer of construction/demolition fill [010] sat on top of a thick, yellow-orange crushed sandstone and building rubble layer [011]. Possibly forming part of the original construction layer to the c.1880 terrace, this layer was sitting directly on top of natural bedrock [006]. No artefacts or occupation deposits were identified within the floor cavity.

Figure 2.6  Floor cavity space of side Room 2/storage space. Facing north.
AMAC Group, 30th May 2018, digital image 4963.

Hallway

Tongue-in-groove floorboards [012] covered the hallway, most likely from the original c.1880 construction phase of the terrace. Removal of the floorboards showed that the floor cavity was deeper in this portion of the site compared to the front room, approximately 30-40cm below the current floor level, the sloping nature of the natural bedrock consistent with that inspected in the rear room (located to the south of the hallway). A thick layer of construction debris [013] sat across the surface of the floor cavity and included fragments of brick and sandstone, timber, rubbish (paper), a coat hanger and glass. No occupation deposits were identified at this level. Below [013] was a mottled beige-orange, compact crushed sandstone and sand layer [014]. Also containing some construction debris though smaller in size (brick, sandstone fragments, charcoal), this layer may have formed an earlier levelling fill. No further excavation was required in this space.
Figure 2.7  Floor cavity of hallway. Facing west.
AMAC Group, 30th May 2018, digital image 4984.
Lift Shaft

The location of the new lift shaft was in the rear northwest corner of the basement/lower ground floor level and will encroach on the former location of a powder room, as well as a current walkway corridor. As this area has functioned as a wet space, several services already ran through this location. The powder room contained a concrete slab and the corridor had brick paving [015] which had been washed over with cement. Archaeological monitoring was undertaken during excavation on the south side of the lift shaft location within the corridor space as this area had not been subject to service disturbance. Removal of modern brick paving [015] revealed a thick layer (15-20cm) of construction/demolition fill [016] with a small amount of building debris scattered throughout. Excavation of a small sondage through this fill layer [016] revealed the natural sandstone bedrock [006]. No relics were identified in this location and it was determined that excavation works for the lift shaft could continue without the supervision of an archaeologist.

Figure 2.8  Location of lift shaft, showing open corridor and former powder room (at left). Facing east. AMAC Group, 30th May 2018, digital image 4912.
2.3.2 Archaeological Monitoring – Rear Yard

Kelly Strickland of AMAC Group attended site on 20th August 2018 to archaeologically monitor excavation of strip footings for a new single storey rear wing extension to the c.1880 terrace (Figure 2.10). Due to site access constraints, the strip footings were manually excavated. Each strip footing was to measure approximately 40cm in width.

Though no known relics are located within the footprint of the new structure, excavation works commenced along the western strip footing as this footing fell in closest vicinity to c.1826 Durham Cottage and required monitoring. Below the current ground surface layer [017], a mottled sandy loam (from the current development works) was a bitumen and gravel surface [018]. Measuring between 7-10cm in depth, this layer formed a recent yard surface. Below this was a mottled brown-orange loamy fill [019] with a considerable amount of pebbles and rubble throughout. Approximately 18-22cm in depth, no artefacts were sighted within the fill and removal of this layer began to reveal the natural sandstone bedrock [023] (Figure 2.11 - Figure 2.13).

Once the rubble loamy fill [019] had been removed across the whole western strip trench, it was clear that the natural bedrock [023] had been cut through by modern services. A service trench cut [020] ran east-west through the western strip trench and measured approximately 80cm in width (Figure 2.12). The service cut [020] contained a loose gravel fill [021] which was covering a PVC sewer pipe [022]. Another depression on the southern end of the west strip footing may form another service trench cut (Figure 2.13). A broken up backfill [024] of larger sandstone fragments and coarse ground sand loosely filled a void between the natural bedrock, approximately 50cm in width (Figure 2.14). After approximately 70cm of fill [024] had been removed by the contractors to try and identify a service pipe, excavation ceased (Figure 2.12).
Excavation of the northern strip trench revealed the same fill layer sequence ([017], [018], [019]). The natural sandstone bedrock [023] was exposed approximately 30-35cm below the current ground surface and becoming increasingly shallower to the east which was consistent with the level of natural bedrock exposed during excavation of the lift shaft (Figure 2.16).

No relics or archaeological material was exposed during archaeological monitoring of the west or north strip trench, therefore, the area was signed off on by the archaeologist to continue excavation without archaeological supervision. Contractors were directed to follow the unexpected finds protocol for the remainder of excavation works for the southern strip trench. No archaeological material was exposed during the remainder of works.

**Figure 2.10** Photograph showing works area. Facing northeast.  
Note the orange spray paint showing corners of the strip trenches.  
AMAC Group, 20th August 2018, digital image 6320.

**Figure 2.11** General photograph showing cut [020] for PVC pipe [022]. Facing west.  
AMAC Group, 20th August 2018, digital image 6332.
Figure 2.12  Northwest corner of strip trenches, showing natural bedrock [023] and PVC pipe [022]. Facing west.
AMAC Group, 20th August 2018, digital image 6364.

Figure 2.13  South end of western strip footing, showing natural bedrock [023]. Facing west.
AMAC Group, 20th August 2018, digital image 6357.
Figure 2.14  Western strip footing, showing possible second service cut with redeposited crushed sandstone fill [024]. Facing east. AMAC Group, 20th August 2018, digital image 6351.

Figure 2.15  Western strip footing after completion of manual excavation, showing natural bedrock [023] and service cuts. Facing north. AMAC Group, 20th August 2018, digital image 6368.
Figure 2.16  Northern strip footing, showing natural bedrock [023] and modern cement piers from new fence at adjacent 15 Lower Fort Street. Facing northeast.
AMAC Group, 20th August 2018, digital image 6369.
### 3.0 Response to Research Design & Interpretation

#### 3.1 Introduction

The following is a response to the research design provided in the archaeological assessment by AMAC Group (September 2017) and has been developed based on the Heritage Council of NSW’s Historical Themes in order to guide the methodology for the proposed archaeological excavation of the site. The research design has been set out in accordance to these themes (Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1  Historical Themes concerning the study site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian Theme</th>
<th>NSW Theme</th>
<th>Study Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Building settlements, towns and cities</td>
<td>Towns, suburbs and villages</td>
<td>- Durham cottage c.1826 - c.1879 Milton Terrace phase - 20th century public housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Building settlements, towns and cities</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>- Services, cesspits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Building settlements, towns and cities</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>- Durham cottage c.1826 - c.1879-1880 Milton Terrace phase - Late 20th century rear wing extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Governing</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>- c.1903-c.2010s use of terrace as public housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Developing Australia’s cultural life</td>
<td>Domestic life</td>
<td>- Continual occupation of study site since c.1826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2 Response to Research Design

**General Questions**

These are general questions designed to consider the overall archaeological footprint of the study site. These questions can be considered in isolation or in conjunction with the subsequent chronology specific questions detailed further.

**Research Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At what level are archaeologically sensitive materials found?</td>
<td>No relics or archaeological material was identified at the study site during monitoring works. What became clear was the shallow depth of the natural bedrock across the locations which were monitored. Bedrock was as shallow as 10-15cm below the current ground surface in portions of the rear yard immediately behind the standing terrace, therefore, the majority of modern underground service trenches had been through the natural bedrock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What archaeological evidence is there of the features which are known to have existed on the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What evidence is there of previously unknown features?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the process of development affected earlier remains on the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What information can the relics on the site provide? How does this compare to information available from documentary sources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Building Settlements, Towns and Cities - Accommodation, Utilities and Towns, Suburbs and Villages

#### Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What can be learnt about the levelling activities that occurred on the site as part of the construction of Hickson Road?</td>
<td>Excavation works did not occur in the rear portion of the yard closest to Hickson Road, therefore it is still unclear if the construction of Hickson Road has impacted on the study site. The natural bedrock which was exposed during monitoring works had only been modified by modern services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What remains of Durham Cottage? At what depths were these relics identified? How was this building constructed? Are these features datable?</td>
<td>No works have occurred within the footprint of Durham Cottage. Monitoring works for the construction of a single storey extension occurred further east of Durham cottage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any relationship between Nicholson’s and Walker’s properties?</td>
<td>No archaeological relics or features were identified during monitoring and inspection works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any evidence for unknown features, such as wells and cesspits, not documented on any historical maps or plans?</td>
<td>No archaeological relics or features were identified during monitoring and inspection works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any unknown deposits, such as rubbish pits, exist in the rear yard? Do they demonstrate occupation of the site?</td>
<td>No occupation deposition was identified below the floor cavities of the terrace, nor were any rubbish pits or artefact scatters identified during archaeological monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree have 20th century services impacted the archaeological remains at the site?</td>
<td>As no archaeological material was uncovered at the study site it remains unclear as to how 20th century services have impacted on archaeological material. However, the shallow nature of the natural bedrock in contrast to the depth of exposed service trenches indicates the likelihood that services have created isolated impacts, where they cross through archaeological relics or features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Governing - Welfare

#### Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The study site was under the ownership of the NSW government from approximately 1903 and was used as public housing until its recent sale. Does any evidence exist in the archaeological record to demonstrate the shift in demographics relating to the occupants of the terrace?</td>
<td>No occupation deposition was identified below the floor cavities of the terrace, nor were any rubbish pits or artefact scatters identified during archaeological monitoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Developing Australia's Cultural Life – Domestic Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durham Cottage (c.1826-c.1879)</strong></td>
<td>Is there any evidence for occupation deposits (underfloor deposits) within the c.1826 Durham Cottage? At what depth do these occur? Do these deposits survive intact, if so, do they have the potential to provide data related to the occupants of the building? Would such data be comparable on a regional scale?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The c.1879 terrace has functioned as a domestic residence since its construction. Can any information be gathered from the archaeological remains regarding specific occupants of 15 Lower Fort Street from any occupation period? Are there any differences between the type of assemblage from the Durham Cottage phase (c.1826-c.1879) in comparison to assemblages dating to the Milton Terrace Phase (e.g. wealthy occupants vs. middle class)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the internal modifications and construction of Milton Terrace disturbed the archaeological record of the previous phase? Do any artefact scatters or rubbish pits survive in the rear yard of the terrace? Can they provide information regarding the different types of occupants? Do any underfloor deposits survive within the floor cavity of the ground floor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How has the later modifications of the study site for its conversion into public housing affected the archaeological record? Do any underfloor deposits relate to this occupation phase? Is there any differences among this assemblage in comparison to earlier ones? Can a complete stratigraphy regarding episodes of re-flooring within the lower ground/ basement level be obtained? Does other archaeological material, apart from underfloor deposits, provide evidence for domestic occupation of 15 Lower Fort Street during the 20th century? Have floor cavities been cleared or emptied during instances of re-flooring?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milton Terrace – Private ownership (c.1879-c.1903)</strong></td>
<td>No insitu occupation deposition (underfloor deposits, rubbish pits or artefact scatters) were identified or recovered from the study site during archaeological monitoring and inspection of the study site. A small number of unstratified artefacts were sampled from against the wall foundation of one of lower ground cupboard spaces, as well as sampled from among the construction debris of the floor cavity. No diagnostic fragments were sighted. Inspection of the underfloor cavity did not reveal evidence for any earlier, lower floor level though did indicate the fact that the floor cavity had been opened and accessed in at least two separate instances. Portions of the floor had been lifted at one point in time for services to be cut into the natural bedrock and laid down. It was also clear that some of the timber joists were not original which indicates that several segments of the floor had been removed and replaced. Exposure and possible clearing of the floor cavities during service upgrades and floor replacement could have contributed to the absence of underfloor deposits, though it is more likely that the presence of tongue-in-groove flooring would have prevented their accumulation in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 REVISED ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

4.1 METHODOLOGY

The current standard for assessment of significance of heritage items in NSW is the publication ‘Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and ‘Relics” produced by the Heritage Branch of the NSW Department of Planning (December 2009). This production is an update to the NSW Heritage Manual (1996), and the criteria detailed therein are a revised version of those of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, formulated in 1979, which was based largely on the Venice Charter (for International Heritage) of 1966.

Archaeological heritage significance can also be viewed in light of the framework set out by Bickford and Sullivan in 1984.\(^\text{11}\) Bickford and Sullivan, taking into consideration the “archaeological, scientific or research significance” of a site posed three questions in order to identify significance:

2. Can the site contribute knowledge which no other resource can?
3. Can the site contribute knowledge which no other site can?
4. Is this knowledge relevant to general questions about human history or other substantive problems relating to Australian history, or does it contribute to other major research questions?\(^\text{12}\)

These questions have been broadly used to shape the response to the heritage significance criteria as described in Section 6.2 and 6.3.

The criteria and the definitions provided by ‘Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and ‘Relics” have been adhered to in assessing the cultural significance of the potential archaeological site at 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point. An assessment of significance, under each of the criteria, is made possible by an analysis of the broad body of archaeological sites previously excavated both locally and elsewhere, in conjunction with the historical overview of the study site in particular.

The Criteria used to assess Heritage Significance in NSW are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion A</td>
<td>An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s or the local area’s cultural or natural history</td>
<td>State significant or locally significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion B</td>
<td>An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s or a local area’s cultural or natural history</td>
<td>State significant or locally significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion C</td>
<td>An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical</td>
<td>State significant or locally significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{11}\) Bickford and Sullivan (1984)

\(^\text{12}\) Bickford and Sullivan (1984), p.23-4
The following assessment deals only with sub-surface archaeological features and deposits. The built environment is not considered in this study.

4.2 IDENTIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological Research Potential (NSW Heritage Criterion E)

No archaeological relics or features were identified at the study site during archaeological monitoring and inspection. Therefore, no data was collected to contribute any information to the archaeological record of the site.

No excavation works occurred in the western half of the rear yard, to which archaeological evidence relating to Durham Cottage is believed to survive. Impact to this area of the site was intentionally avoided to prevent exposure of any relics associated with the c.1826 structure. In this way, the study site still holds potential to contain structural remains and deposits related to the use of Nicholson’s c.1826 Durham Cottage. There is also the potential for undocumented archaeological features in other unexcavated portions of the yard areas which may include features such as cesspits and yard deposits. Such data, should it remain intact, has the potential to provide information regarding the establishment of early estates in the Dawes Point area and such data is not available from any other resource. Archaeological deposits and features related to Durham Cottage and Nicholson’s use of the site are considered to have potential State significance according to Criterion E.

Associations with individuals, events or groups of historical importance (NSW Heritage Criteria A, B and D)

Though no occupation deposits were found within the floor cavity of the c.1880 terrace, potential still remains for occupation deposition to survive in the rear yard related to early 19th century occupants of Durham Cottage. Durham Cottage is associated with the early settlers John Nicholson and William Walker. It is understood that Nicholson occupied the site for a brief period and that the site was later occupied by members of the Walker family. Archaeological data in the way of underfloor deposits, yard and well deposits related to this early use of the site have
the potential to be directly related to these families providing unique information about their lives. Such deposits, should they survive intact, have and the potential to be of State significance according to Criterion B.

**Aesthetic or technical significance (NSW Heritage Criterion C)**

The site is believed to have been heavily engineered throughout the 19th century to compensate for the steep slope between Lower Fort Street and Hickson Road. Evidence of this levelling has the potential to demonstrate achievements in engineering, however, such evidence is unlikely to be unique. This potential still exists at the study site.

**Ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains (NSW Heritage Criteria A, C, F & G)**

Archaeological monitoring of part of the rear yard and inspection of floor cavities have revealed the absence of occupation material related to the late 19th and 20th century Milton Terrace phase. Unless archaeological evidence of this phase survives in the western half of the rear yard, it is unlikely that the site retains information regarding the various residents who occupied these dwellings throughout the late 19th and 20th century.

The study site still has potential to retain unique archaeological data relating to the 1820s residence which were in use until the late 1870s. Deposition associated with this use of the site would be representative of the early development of Dawes Point by wealthy merchants and for this reason, relics associated with this use, should they survive intact, would be considered State significant according to Criterion A.

Archaeological data related to this early occupation phase of Dawes Point and the Rocks is considered rare and unique. Such archaeological material, should it survive intact, has the potential to yield data related to the use and occupation of an early estate home which is not available from any other resource and therefore, would be considered State significant according to Criterion F. Archaeological remains related to the 1820s Durham cottage has the potential to be demonstrative of the early estate homes found in this area. As such, they have the potential to be of State significance according to Criterion G.

### 4.3 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

Though no archaeological material was identified during monitoring and inspection works, potential still exists for deposition to survive relating to the Milton Terrace phase in the western half of the rear yard, in the form of rubbish pits or yard deposits. Such data, although not rare, has the potential to contribute to our knowledge of the late 19th and 20th century tenants of this building retaining high research potential and therefore, would be considered to be of local significance. Any archaeological remains relating to tenants during this phase would be considered valuable to the study site itself, as no other portion of the site has retained this data.

The study site falls within one of the earliest residential developments to occur in the Dawes Point/ Millers Point region. The study site still holds potential to retain rare and unique archaeological data relating to John Nicholson’s 1826 Durham Cottage in the western half of the rear yard, which was not subject to excavation during these development works. Potential remains include structural wall footings,
occupation deposits, yard deposits or artefact scatters dating to the early 19th century. Archaeological material of integrity relating to this early occupation phase of the site is considered rare and is likely to retain significant research potential. Such data would provide a unique insight into some of the earliest residential occupants of Dawes Point, thus providing a record of the daily lives of wealthy early settlers and significantly contribute to the history of the Dawes Point area. Such archaeological material, should it remain intact on the site, has the potential to be of State significance.
5.0 **PERMIT COMPLIANCE**

All archaeological works carried out on the site were done in accordance with the s60 Permit 2017/S60/172 issued by the Heritage Division (now Heritage DCP) on behalf of the NSW Heritage Council. The following table, Table 6.1, summarises compliance to the permit conditions relevant to archaeology (see Appendix 8.1 for a complete copy of the permit).

**Table 5.1  Permit compliance – archaeological conditions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29. Historical Archaeology</th>
<th>No relics of local or State significance were identified during archaeological monitoring works at the study site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) All works shall be in accordance with the approved research design and methodology outlined in the Report entitled Archaeological Component Permit Application s60 Heritage Act 1977, Archaeological Assessment Research Design, Methodology and Heritage Impact Statement, 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point, NSW, prepared by AMAC, dated September 2017, except as amended by the following conditions:</td>
<td>Archaeological test excavation was not undertaken at the study site. No excavation works occurred in the western half of the rear yard, where relics related to Durham cottage is anticipated to exist insitu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This archaeological approval does allow the removal of any State significant relics. It allows harm to locally significant relics but only as required to undertake the proposed works. This approval covers:</td>
<td>The relevant delegates were notified of all archaeological monitoring works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. the archaeological testing in the rear yard to understand constraints for a proposed future plunge pool and landscaping works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. the archaeological monitoring, recording and removal of locally significant relics associated with the Milton Terrace occupation, but only as required to undertake the approved works. Impacts should be avoided and limited where possible. Where archaeological monitoring identifies evidence of state significant archaeology associated with the Durham Cottage phase of occupation, this cannot be removed through this approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The Heritage Council of NSW or its Delegate must be informed in writing of the start of the archaeological investigation at least five (5) days prior to the commencement of, and within five (5) days of the completion of on-site archaeological work.</td>
<td>No archaeological features or relics were identified at the study site during monitoring and inspection works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The Applicant must ensure that if substantial intact archaeological deposits and/or State significant relics not identified in Archaeological Component Permit Application s60 Heritage Act 1977, Archaeological Assessment Research Design, Methodology and Heritage Impact Statement, 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point, NSW, prepared by AMAC, dated September 2017, are discovered, work must cease in the affected area(s) and the Heritage Council of NSW must be notified. Additional assessment and approval may be required prior to works continuing in the affected area(s) based on the nature of the discovery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The Applicant must ensure that the nominated Excavation Director, Mr Martin Carney and nominated secondary excavation director, Ms Ivana Vetta, are present at the site</td>
<td>All monitoring and inspection works occurred in locations where archaeological relics were not expected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervising all excavation activity likely to expose relics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) The Applicant must ensure that the nominated Excavation Director, Mr Martin Carney and nominated secondary excavation director, Ms Ivana Vetta, take adequate steps to record in detail relics, structures and features discovered on the site during the archaeological works in accordance with current best practice. This work must be undertaken in accordance with the NSW Heritage Office guidelines, ‘How to Prepare Archival Records of Heritage Items’ (1998) and ‘Guidelines for Photographic Recording of Heritage Items’ (2006).</th>
<th>Though no relics, structures or features were identified during archaeological monitoring, the exposed site stratigraphy was recorded in detail (see Section 3.0).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| g) Analysis and Reporting  
The Applicant is responsible for the safe keeping of any relics recovered from the site. The Applicant must ensure that the nominated Excavation Director or an appropriate specialist, cleans, stabilises, labels, analyses, catalogues and stores any artefacts recovered from the site in a way that allows them to be retrieved according to both type and provenance. | A very small collection of unstratified artefacts scattered among the construction debris in one of the floor cavities were sampled as a reference during reporting, however, no insitu deposits were identified at the study site. |
| h) 500 word summary:  
The Applicant must ensure that a summary of the results of the field work, up to 500 words in length, prepared by the approved Primary Excavation Director, Mr Martin Carney, and the nominated secondary excavation director, Ms Ivana Vetta, nominated in the section 60 form is submitted to the Heritage Council of NSW for approval within one (1) month of completion of the field based archaeological activity. | A summary of the field work results was submitted to the Heritage Division (now Heritage DPC) in May 2019. |
| i) Final report:  
The Applicant must ensure that a final excavation report is prepared by the nominated Excavation Director, Mr Martin Carney, and the nominated secondary excavation director, Ms Ivana Vetta, to publication standard, within one (1) year of the completion of the field based archaeological activity unless an extension of time or other variation is approved by the Heritage Council of NSW. Further copies of the report should be lodged with the local library and/or another appropriate local repository in the area in which the site is located. | This document forms the final excavation report and its lodgement to the Heritage Division (now Heritage DPC) provides a sign off of the archaeological conditions of the s60 excavation permit. |
6.0 RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 RESULTS

6.1.1 Summary of Archaeological Excavation

Archaeological inspection and monitoring occurred on two days, 30th May 2018 and 20th August 2018. Five internal spaces of the lower ground floor/ basement level were inspected for evidence of underfloor deposits. This included the front room, rear room, hallways and two small side rooms/ cupboard spaces. No significant underfloor deposits were identified within any of the floor cavities, the majority of these contained a layer of construction debris sitting directly on top of natural bedrock which appeared shallower towards the front of the house. Archaeological monitoring also occurred during excavation for the lift shaft. No archaeological relics or features were identified in these locations.

Archaeological monitoring also occurred during manual excavation of three strip trenches for the construction of a new single storey extension in the rear yard. No archaeological relics or features were identified, the natural sandstone bedrock was also considerably shallow in this location, only 10-15cm below the current ground surface on the north side and slightly deeper on the west side.

6.1.2 Revised Statement of Significance

The study site falls within one of the earliest residential developments to occur in the Dawes Point/ Millers Point region. The study site still holds potential to retain rare and unique archaeological data relating to John Nicholson’s 1826 Durham Cottage in the western half of the rear yard, which was not subject to excavation during these development works. Archaeological material of integrity relating to this early occupation phase of the site is considered rare and is likely to retain significant research potential, providing a record of the daily lives of wealthy early settlers and significantly contribute to the history of the Dawes Point area. Such archaeological material, should it remain intact on the site, has the potential to be of State significance.

Potential still exists for deposition to survive relating to the Milton Terrace phase in the western half of the rear yard, in the form of rubbish pits or yard deposits. Such data, although not rare, has the potential to contribute to our knowledge of the late 19th and 20th century tenants of this building retaining high research potential and therefore would be considered to be of local significance.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that this report be submitted to the Heritage Division (now Heritage DPC) as the Final Archaeological Report to close out the archaeological conditions of the s60 excavation permit.

Future archaeological investigation within the internal spaces of the dwelling is unnecessary. No excavation works occurred within the western rear half of the yard, where it is anticipated that structural relics associated with the c.1826 Durham cottage survive in situ. Any future works in the rear yard would require a revised archaeological assessment and permit application prior to any excavation works on site.
6.3 ARTEFACTS, RECORDS STORAGE & PUBLIC INFORMATION

A copy of the report will be given to the client for safekeeping. All paper records have been digitised and are archived at the AMAC Group Stanmore office. No insitu occupation deposits or significant artefacts were identified at the study site. The small sample of 20th century artefacts collected from non-significant fills within the floor cavities has been cleaned and photographed as a reference (Appendix 8.3). These artefacts will be retained by AMAC for a period of six months after submission of the report to Heritage DPC and then discarded. A copy of this report will be lodged with the City of Sydney Local Library as a matter of public information.
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## 8.0 APPENDICES

### 8.1 HERITAGE DIVISION EXCAVATION PERMIT

![Heritage Council Logo]

**Mr Tasman Storey**  
Design Principal  
Tropman & Tropman Architects  
55 Lower Fort Street  
MILLERS POINT NSW 2000

Via email: tropman@tropmanarchitects.com.au

Dear Mr Storey

APPLICATION UNDER S60 OF THE HERITAGE ACT 1977  
MILTON TERRACE, 1-19 LOWER FORT STREET; MILLERS POINT, STATE HERITAGE REGISTER NO 69685

**RE:** Chelsea, 15 Lower Fort Street, Millers Point  
**Proposal:** Alterations and additions  
**Section 60 Application No:** 2017/69/172, received 18 September 2017  
**Information received with the application:** As per Condition No. 1  
**Additional information requested:** Yes requested 22/9/2017  
**Additional information received:** Yes received 4/10/2017

As delegate of the Heritage Council of NSW (the Heritage Council), I have considered the above Section 60 application. Pursuant to section 63 of the Heritage Act 1977, approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **All work shall comply with the information contained within:**

   a. **Architectural Drawings prepared by Tropman & Tropman Architects, dated September and October 2017**, as listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwg. No.</th>
<th>Drawing Title</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A000-[03]</td>
<td>Project Title Sheet</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A100-[03]</td>
<td>Existing Basement &amp; Ground Floor Plan</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A101-[03]</td>
<td>Existing Level 1 &amp; 2 Floor Plan</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A110-[03]</td>
<td>Existing Elevations</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A150-[03]</td>
<td>Proposed Basement Floor Plan</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A151-[03]</td>
<td>Proposed Ground Floor Plan</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A152-[03]</td>
<td>Proposed Level 1 Floor Plan</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A153-[03]</td>
<td>Proposed Level 2 Floor Plan</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A154-[03]</td>
<td>Proposed Roof Plan</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A150-[04]</td>
<td>Proposed Elevations</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


e. Sketch of amended proposal for the addition provided by Tasman Storey on 27/10/2017.

EXCEPT AS AMENDED by the conditions of this approval:

2. A suitably qualified and experienced conservation architect shall be engaged to provide design and detailed advice, and oversees the project through all stages.

   Reason: To avoid any potential impact on the heritage significance of the subject item.

3. Approval is also subject to the outcome of archaeological investigations.

   Reason: To avoid any potential impact on the heritage significance of the subject item.

4. The early timber floor in space 16.1.2 shall be retained in situ and conserved.

   Reason: To minimise physical impacts.

5. Original flagstones, including the patina of wear of the sandstone flagstones, must be retained in the restoration. Where the path is un-trafficked because of excessive wear, flagstones may be refinished to reduce pitting. Flagstones may only be replaced to match the existing where they are damaged beyond repair.

   Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.

6. Bathroom/Kitchen/Laundry fitouts shall be designed and detailed to avoid any physical impacts on significant fabric such as wall finishes, ceilings, windows, flooring, skirting etc. Where required, new wall linings shall be installed independent of significant fabric and utilised for fixing any tiles and fittings.

   Reason: To minimise physical impacts and to facilitate future removal, if desired.

7. Detailed documentation of the revised rear addition must be provided for the approval of the delegate of the Heritage Council prior to the issuing of the Construction Certificate.

   Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.

8. A full schedule of materials and finishes is to be provided for approval of the delegate of the Heritage Council prior to issuing of the Construction Certificate.

   Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.
9. Replacement rainwater goods shall be of sympathetic material and detailing.
   Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.

10. Services such as plumbing, electrical, air-conditioning shall reuse existing service points and reticulation, as much as possible, or be accommodated within existing or new cavities to avoid impact on significant fabric. There shall be no damage to or chasing in of significant fabric and fixings shall be minimised.
    Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.

11. All work shall be carried out by suitably qualified tradespeople preferably with knowledge and practical experience in conservation and repair of similar heritage items.
    Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.

12. Significant building fabric and elements are to be protected from potential damage during the works, especially demolition works. Protection systems must ensure historic fabric is not damaged or removed.
    Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.

13. No significant fabric shall be removed, unless deteriorated beyond repair, in which case, only patch replacement of the deteriorated fabric may be carried out with like-for-like material.
    Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.

14. Kitchen in space 15.2.4 is retained, new kitchen joinery must be either free-standing or attached to new separate stud walls with minimal fixings to fabric of exceptional or high significance.
    Reason: To minimize impact on significant fabric.

15. Removal of the Frangipani Tree is not approved.
    Reason: Removal is not in accordance with the endorsed CMP.

16. The advice of an appropriately qualified and experienced heritage professional must be obtained in relation to the design of the new French doors on the front elevation at basement level. Doors must be designed to fit the existing openings and significant stonework to be retained in situ and conserved.
    Reason: To ensure works are sympathetic to the heritage significance of the site.

17. The installation of sound insulating glass to the inside of the front ground floor windows and the inside of the first floor balcony infill windows, to achieve noise reduction, is approved subject to details demonstrating existing windows, including window joinery, fittings and glazing, will be retained and conserved, being submitted and approved by the delegate of the Heritage Council.
    Reason: To minimize impact on significant fabric.

18. Significant joinery in space 15.1.2 and 15.3.4 is to be retained in situ behind the false walls.
    Reason: To minimize impact on significant fabric.
19. The new internal openings in the rear room on the basement level (spaces 15.1.1, 15.1.6 and 15.1.7), shall be square openings, 1800mm wide x 2100mm high maximum. 
Reason: To minimize physical impacts and to facilitate interpretation of the significant internal layout.

20. Detailed plans of the proposed addition are to be provided prior to the issuing of the construction certificate for the approval of the delegate of the Heritage Council.
Reason: To avoid any potential impacts on the heritage significance of the subject item.

21. Any approval of the new addition to locate the new kitchen is contingent on the removal of the kitchen in space 15.2.2 and the reopening of the verandah. Details of conservation works to the verandah will need to be submitted prior to the issuing of the Construction Certificate for approval by the delegate of the Heritage Council.
Reason: To ensure works are sympathetic to the heritage significance of the site.

22. There is to be no demolition of original brickwork associated with the rear elevation to accommodate access to the proposed rear addition.
Reason: To minimize physical impacts to significant fabric.

23. Any significant fabric, such as joinery, removed as part of these works is to be salvaged, tagged and stored in an appropriate manner on site.
Reason: To allow for reuse or restoration.

24. The skylight is approved subject to details of the materials/finishes, designed to visually blend with the roof.
Reason: To minimize visual impacts.

25. Before re-painting occurs, an agreement must be reached between the owners of 1-17 Lower Fort Street as to an appropriate colour scheme for the terrace Group. Details of any agreed colour scheme for the repainting of 15 Lower Fort Street should be provided to the delegate of the Heritage Council for approval.
Reason: To ensure a consistent paint scheme across the terraces.

26. Refurbishment of the Laundry in space 16.1.2 and 16.1.5A is subject to the removal of the laundry and sink in space 15.1.5.
Reason: To ensure works are sympathetic to the heritage significance of the site.

27. If retained, details of any refurbishment works to the exterior of the infilled verandah at ground level are to be provided to the delegate of the Heritage Council prior to issuing of the Construction Certificate. As discussed with the Applicant the existing window is to be replaced with two narrow windows matching the proportions of the adjacent window at ground floor level.
Reason: To ensure works are sympathetic to the heritage significance of the site.

28. A detailed assessment and details for any structural works specific to the insertion of the lift in no.15, additional to the removal of the floors/ceilings, is to be submitted to the delegate of the Heritage Council for approval prior to the issuing of the Construction Certificate. There is to be no physical impact on significant fabric, additional to the removal of the floors/ceilings.
The final footing design of the rear extension and the final lift shaft location with any associated services must be designed based on the results of archaeological investigation in the rear yard. If remains of state significant archaeology are confirmed within the level required for the new concrete slab, this footing will require redesign. This footing layout must be supplied with the results of archaeological investigations in accordance with condition 29 of this consent. The footing plan will require approval of the Heritage Council or its delegate prior to construction.

Reason: To minimise impacts to potential state significant archaeology in the rear yard.

29. HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

a) All works shall be in accordance with the approved research design and methodology outlined in the Report entitled Archaeological Component Permit Application s60 Heritage Act 1977, Archaeological Assessment Research Design, Methodology and Heritage Impact Statement, 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point, NSW, prepared by AMAC, dated September 2017, except as amended by the following conditions:

b) This archaeological approval does allow the removal of any State significant relics. It allows harm to locally significant relics but only as required to undertake the proposed works. This approval covers:

i. the archaeological testing in the rear yard to understand constraints for a proposed future plunge pool and landscaping works.
ii. the archaeological monitoring, recording and removal of locally significant relics associated with the Milton Terrace occupation, but only as required to undertake the approved works. Impacts should be avoided and limited where possible. Where archaeological monitoring identifies evidence of state significant archaeology associated with the Durham Cottage phase of occupation, this cannot be removed through this approval.

c) The Heritage Council of NSW or its Delegate must be informed in writing of the start of the archaeological investigation at least five (5) days prior to the commencement of, and within five (5) days of the completion of on-site archaeological work.

d) The Applicant must ensure that if substantial intact archaeological deposits and/or State significant relics not identified in Archaeological Component Permit Application s60 Heritage Act 1977, Archaeological Assessment Research Design, Methodology and Heritage Impact Statement, 15 Lower Fort Street, Dawes Point, NSW, prepared by AMAC, dated September 2017, are discovered, work must cease in the affected area(s) and the Heritage Council of NSW must be notified. Additional assessment and approval may be required prior to works continuing in the affected area(s) based on the nature of the discovery.

e) The Applicant must ensure that the nominated Excavation Director, Mr Martin Carney and nominated secondary excavation director, Ms Ivana Vetta, are present at the site supervising all excavation activity likely to expose relics.
f) The Applicant must ensure that the nominated Excavation Director, Mr Martin Carney and nominated secondary excavation director, Ms Ivana Vetta, take adequate steps to record in detail relics, structures and features discovered on the site during the archaeological works in accordance with current best practice. This work must be undertaken in accordance with the NSW Heritage Office guidelines, ‘How to Prepare Archival Records of Heritage Items’ (1998) and ‘Guidelines for Photographic Recording of Heritage Items’ (2005).

g) Analysis and Reporting
The Applicant is responsible for the safe-keeping of any relics recovered from the site. The Applicant must ensure that the nominated Excavation Director or an appropriate specialist, cleans, stabilises, labels, analyses, catalogues and stores any artefacts recovered from the site in a way that allows them to be retrieved according to both type and provenance.

h) 500 word summary:
The Applicant must ensure that a summary of the results of the field work, up to 500 words in length, prepared by the approved Primary Excavation Director, Mr Martin Carney, and the nominated secondary excavation director, Ms Ivana Vetta, nominated in the section 60 form is submitted to the Heritage Council of NSW for approval within one (1) month of completion of archaeological field work.

i) Final report:
The Applicant must ensure that a final excavation report is prepared by the nominated Excavation Director, Mr Martin Carney, and the nominated secondary excavation director, Ms Ivana Vetta, to publication standard, within one (1) year of the completion of the field based archaeological activity unless an extension of time or other variation is approved by the Heritage Council of NSW. Further copies of the report should be lodged with the local library and/or another appropriate local repository in the area in which the site is located.

Reason: To identify and manage historical archaeological relics of both local and State significance within the subject site proposed through these changes. These conditions will manage the resources and its investigation before, during and following these works.

30. ABORIGINAL OBJECTS
Should any Aboriginal ‘objects’ be uncovered by the work, excavation or disturbance of the area is to stop immediately and the Office of Environment & Heritage is to be informed in accordance with Section 88A of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (as amended). Works affecting Aboriginal ‘objects’ on the site must not continue until the Office of Environment and Heritage has been informed. Aboriginal ‘objects’ must be managed in accordance with the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.

Reason: This is a standard condition to identify to the Applicant how to proceed if Aboriginal objects are unexpectedly identified during works.
COMPLIANCE

31. If requested, the Applicant and nominated Heritage Consultant may be required to participate in audits of Heritage Council approvals to confirm compliance with conditions of consent.

Reason: To ensure completion of the works in accordance with the approved plans and to improve the approvals process through a better understanding of the implementation of conditions of approval.

DURATION OF APPROVAL

32. This approval shall be void if the activity to which it refers is not substantially commenced within five years after the date of the approval, or within the period of consent specified in any relevant development consent granted under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, whichever occurs first.

Reason: To comply with legislation.

ADVICE

Your attention is drawn towards the powers of entry and inspection under s.143 of the Heritage Act 1977 for authorised persons. If entry and inspection are required, reasonable notice will be provided as per the Act. The owner could voluntarily agree to allow non-authorised persons, such as Heritage Division (Office of Environment and Heritage) staff who are acting in a supporting role to the authorised persons, to enter their property for the purpose of inspection. Owners may also voluntarily grant permission to take photographs, take samples or request records.

Reason: Section 143 of the Heritage Act 1977, allows people authorised by the Minister to enter and inspect, for the purposes of the Act, with respect to buildings, works, relics, moveable objects, places or items that is or contains an item of environmental heritage. Reasonable notice must be given for the inspection.

It should be noted that an approval under the Heritage Act 1977 is additional to that which may be required from other Local Government and State Government Authorities in order to undertake works.

If you have any questions regarding the above matter please contact Ms Liliana Duran, Heritage Assessment Officer at the Heritage Division, Office of Environment and Heritage, on telephone 02 9873 8611, or by e-mail liliana.duran@environment.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Timothy Smith

TIM SMITH OAM
Director Heritage Operations
Heritage Division
Office of Environment and Heritage
As Delegate of the Heritage Council of NSW
DATE: 31 October 2017

Helping the community conserve our heritage
## 8.2 UNIT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Terrace-rear room</td>
<td>Current timber flooring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Terrace-rear room</td>
<td>Construction fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Terrace-rear room</td>
<td>Mid grey-brown sandy loam fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Terrace-front room</td>
<td>Plywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Terrace-front room</td>
<td>Construction fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>Sandstone bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Terrace - side room 1</td>
<td>Damp timber flooring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Terrace - side room 1</td>
<td>Construction fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Terrace - side room 1</td>
<td>Orange sand with crush sandstone nodules (B horizon?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Terrace - side room 2</td>
<td>Mid grey-brown loamy construction fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Terrace - side room 2</td>
<td>Thick, yellow-orange crushed sandstone and rubble layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Terrace - hallway</td>
<td>Tongue-in-groove timber floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Terrace - hallway</td>
<td>Construction debris and rubble fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Terrace - hallway</td>
<td>Mottled orange-beige compact crushed sandstone layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Lift shaft</td>
<td>Brick paving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Lift shaft</td>
<td>Construction/demolition fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>Current yard surface (demolition material from development work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>Thin bitumen surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>Mottled brown-orange loamy fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>Cut for PVC sewer pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>Gravel packing fill in cut [020]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>Sewer pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>Natural sandstone bedrock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 SAMPLED ARTEFACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampled Artefacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Pink and white porcelain saucer with a “Victoria Czecho-Slovakia” base mark.**
  c.1918 – 1939 mark.
  Part of artefact scatter found on top of wall foundation inside room 1.
  AMAC, 28th August 2019, digital image 9100. |
| **Fragments of rodent bone and clear glass.**
  Part of artefact scatter found on top of wall foundation inside room 1.
  AMAC, 28th August 2019, digital image 9104. |
| **“COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA – ONE HALF PENNY”**
  Unit [005] (front room).
  AMAC, 28th August 2019, digital image 9112. |

Unit [005] (front room).

AMAC, 28th August 2019,
digital image 9117.

Blue plastic needle,
fragments of rodent and animal bone.

Unit [002] (rear room).

AMAC, 28th August 2019,
digital image 9121.

Green tinted glass base: “...OHN KILNE”, believed to be jar base from John Kilner and Sons pre-1870. Body fragment of an olive-green beer/wine bottle.

Unit [002] (rear room)

AMAC, 28th August 2019,
digital image 9123.
Detail of green tinted glass base: “...OHN KILNE”. Believed to be jar base from John Kilner and Sons pre-1870.

Unit [002] (rear room)

AMAC, 28th August 2019, digital image 9128.