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CONVENTIONS

Where land is located by Parish and Portion number, the location will be given in brackets, as follows:

(COUNTY, PARISH, portion number, acres).

For example:


In most cases, this will be abbreviated to Parish and Portion number alone, where the county is Argyle.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.

The Archaeological Management Plan for the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area was commissioned by Goulburn Mulwaree Council on 29 April 2009.

The purpose of the study is to identify, assess the significance and prepare heritage listings for the items of archaeological significance in the local government area. The report also makes recommendations on the management and conservation of archaeological sites within the current planning framework.

The Archaeological Management Plan is divided into 3 volumes.

Volume 1. Historical Themes.

This volume identifies the significance of the archaeological sites, up to the cut-off date (1860) imposed by the Brief (Appendix 1). It makes a provisional assessment of their level of significance (World, National, State and Local) in order to make recommendations for the themes, which should be given priority in listing, management and conservation.

In summary, the following themes should be given a first level of priority for heritage listing:

1. Pastoral Settlement – sites dating from the 1820s to 1840s.
2. Transport and Communications – sites associated with convict road gangs and stockades.
3. Towns and Villages – sites associated with the administration of the Penal System, namely Old Goulburn and Bungonia.

The listing of sites associated with Pastoral Settlement should be extended beyond the 1840s to include the later development of these estates. The sites should be considered in the context of the historical landscape of each estate.

The archaeological resources of the major town and villages of the local government area (Old Goulburn, Goulburn, Bungonia and Marulan) should be assessed to an extent sufficient to provide protection to the archaeological resource and enable the conservation and management of these sites.
A second level of priority should be given to the assessment and listing of the other archaeological sites and themes identified in this volume, including:

1. Hotels and Inns.
2. The smaller villages of the local government area.
3. Industrial sites, including the Currawang (Currowong) copper mines, goldmines and associated settlements.
5. Housing.

The cut-off date of 1860 has resulted in the exclusion of a number of archaeological sites and themes, particularly the consideration of later mining settlement, railway construction camps, later industrial sites as a whole and the archaeological sites associated with closer settlement from the mid 1850s onwards. The full time span of archaeological significance should be considered in any future study, particularly taking note of the remarks made in Chapter 2 (Chapter 2.3. What is an archaeological site?).

Volume 2. Site survey, significance, conservation and management.

The three main themes of

1. Pastoral Settlement,
2. Transport and Communications, and
3. Towns and Villages

have been selected for detailed study in the second stage of the Archaeological Management Plan.

In Volume 2, Chapter 4, the new theme of ‘The Penal System’ is introduced to further define the significance of the sites under investigation.

The themes are therefore regrouped as follows:

1. Pastoral Settlement – ‘The Landscape of the Assigned Servant’ in the County of Argyle, first opened to settlement by Governor Macquarie.
2. Penal System – Roads (including Macquarie’s Road and Mitchell’s Great South Road), bridges and river crossings.
3. Penal System – Convict Stockades at Towrang and Wingello.
5. Towns and Villages, many with institutions associated with the Penal System.
Al the above themes belong to the current state listing priorities for Convict and Governor Macquarie associated sites.¹

The Archaeological Management Plan assesses a large number of sites associated with these themes as possessing National or State significance.

The study provides a framework for the assessment, conservation and management of these heritage items and archaeological sites.

The Map Series
The Map Series is the key to locating sites belonging to every theme. The Map Series is found in Volume 3, Appendix 1.

First locate in which part of the Local Government Area the site is listed. Go to the key plan highlighted in blue below. Then go to the correct key map for each site listing.

The key maps for locating archaeological sites are highlighted in red below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1</th>
<th>1. Goulburn Mulwaree LGA</th>
<th>1.1. LGA Boundaries and Detail Map Series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Pastoral Settlement, Late 1810s to 1840s-1850s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Parish Boundaries and Names. Overlay onto Pastoral Settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Pastoral Settlement – archaeological and other heritage sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Road Network, from 1817 onwards to 1840s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towrang Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6. Listings for Pastoral Settlement 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7. Listings for Pastoral Settlement 02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For State government heritage listing priorities, see: http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/07_subnav_19_02.htm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series 1.1</th>
<th>Wingello Plan Series 1.1</th>
<th>Goulburn Plan Series 1-3.</th>
<th>1. Old Goulburn</th>
<th>1.1 Basemap.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains (SR Map 2781).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains (SR Map 2781) – Tracing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains c.1830 (SR Map 2780)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains c.1830 (SR Map 2780) – Tracing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goulburn</td>
<td>2.1 Basemap.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Plan of the Town of Goulburn, c.1833 (SR Map 2790).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Plan of the Town of Goulburn, c.1833 (SR Map 2790) – tracing in black outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Plan of Goulburn reserve and Village Allotments, 5 December 1836 (SR Map 2803) – selective tracing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Plan of Goulburn, including the Old Township, 1859 (SR Map 3483).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goulburn Suburbs</td>
<td>3.1 Basemap, showing Municipal Boundary, 1859.</td>
<td>3.2 Stages of Town development, 1840s-1850s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Main Roads shown on plans from 1820s-1850s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4. Archaeological and other heritage sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungonia Detail Plan Series 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marulan Detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Archaeological Site Categories.

There are three Archaeological Site Categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Categories of Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Further details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sites inspected for this study or previously by others (existing listings, site survey by others, etc). The physical existence of these sites has been proven beyond doubt.</td>
<td>1. Sites already listed in one or more heritage listing databases. 2. Sites not already listed, but inspected as part of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others: for which there is historical documentation (available within the budget of this study).</td>
<td>3. Sites where historical documentation has been gathered as part of this study (note that minimum research was possible within the scope and budget of this study). 4. Sites identified for inspection during site survey, but not actually inspected within the time frame available to this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others: for which the predictive model has not been tested.</td>
<td>5. Other sites within the area of pastoral settlement shown on the County Maps in Baker’s Atlas, 6. Areas within the Town and Village precincts known to be developed, but not researched or identified within the scope of this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 These sites may have been inspected by others, but have not resulted in listings in a searchable database available to this study.
**Recommendations consistent across all themes.**

Existing heritage items on the Goulburn Mulwaree LEP 2009 are not generally provided with an additional Inventory Sheet in the Archaeological Management Plan.

Nonetheless they are included in the recommendation of the Archaeological Management Plan.

Recommendations for all sites are uniform across each theme. They are to list each item as a heritage item at the appropriate level:

1. National.
2. State.
3. Local.

The conservation management plan / archaeological management plan should be the basis of all conservation and management of heritage items and archaeological sites in the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area.

The draft User’s Guide explains how to integrate the recommendations of the Archaeological Management Plan into planning procedures.

**National and State heritage items at risk.**

An important feature of these recommendations is the identification of a large number of historical farms and farm buildings (of National and State significance) that are at risk. Without immediate action, they will be lost within one generation (30 years). A ten-fold increase in the current grant programme (at both local, State and Federal government levels) for at least 10 years is recommended to overcome this crisis.

Due to budgetary constraints, this study has been able to identify and assess only a small portion of the total number of historical farms and properties belonging to the theme of Pastoral Settlement. This work should continue for a number of reasons:

1. Important properties of National or State significance have been excluded or assessed only at a basic level (as Archaeological Site Category 2b) (see Chapter 3.4).
2. This important heritage is at severe risk, as described in Chapters 3.6.4 and 14.10.1.2.
3. No protection of heritage is provided without listing.
4. The partial survey to date does not allow the formulation of comprehensive recommendations for conservation and management, adding to the risk.

5. Without comprehensive survey of this National or State significant resource, supplementary archaeological management plans or Cultural Landscape Studies will likewise be unable to make comprehensive recommendations for conservation and management.

This continuing process should therefore be given the highest priority.

**Recommendations for other archaeological themes.**

Due to budgetary limited of the Archaeological Management Plan, as well as the cut-off date of 1860, not all archaeological sites or themes were considered.

This means that ‘relics’, as defined by the Heritage Act will also be distributed outside those areas at present identified as archaeological sites. This does not remove the obligation under the Act to obtain an excavation permit to disturb ‘relics’, even if they are inadvertently disturbed or located on properties not included in this Archaeological Management Plan.

The following themes were not included in the site survey for this archaeological Management Plan.

1. Aboriginal
2. Exploration.
3. Hotels and Inns.
4. Industrial Sites.
6. Cemeteries.
7. Housing.
8. All themes, post 1860s

These themes should be the subject of a supplementary or stand-alone Archaeological Management Plans. Some of the themes may be grouped together for convenience. In order to make funds go further, where possible the supplementary archaeological management plans should rely on the framework established by this study.
Cultural Tourism.

This Archaeological Management Plan has highlighted some of the opportunities for Education and Cultural Tourism. Heritage and archaeological sites are a resource that is at present poorly utilised for these purposes and many important opportunities are awaiting recognition. They have the potential to bring great benefits, not only to the local community, but to the State as a whole.

Volume 3. Appendices.

Appendix 1. Plan Series
Appendix 2. Pastoral Settlement – Inventory of Sites.
Appendix 3. Database for Pastoral Settlement – Parish Portion Details and Documentation.
1 INTRODUCTION.

The background to the project was described in Volume 1, Chapter 1.

The following historical and archaeological themes were investigated in Volume 1:
1. Aboriginal settlement.
2. Exploration.
3. Pastoral Settlement.
4. Transport and Communications.
5. Towns and Villages.
6. Industrial Sites.
8. Cemeteries.
9. Housing.

The discussion in Volume 1, Chapters 12 and 13, resulted in a recommendation to utilize the available funding to investigate the following themes in Volume 2, namely:
1. Pastoral Settlement – sites dating from the 1820s to 1840s.
2. Transport and Communications – sites associated with convict road gangs and stockades.
3. Towns and Villages – sites associated with the administration of the Penal System, namely Old Goulburn and Bungonia (as well as Marulan).

The listing of sites associated with Pastoral Settlement should be extended beyond the 1840s (the end of convict transportation in NSW) to include the later development of these estates. The sites should be considered in the context of the historical landscape of each estate.

The archaeological resources of the major town and villages of the local government area (Old Goulburn, Goulburn, Bungonia and Marulan) should be assessed to an extent sufficient to provide protection to the archaeological resource and enable the conservation and management of these sites.

The Goulburn Mulwaree Council, their heritage Advisor, Dr. Jennifer Lambert Tracey and the NSW Heritage Branch, all decided to support the above recommendations, contained in Volume 1, Chapter 13.
The available funding does not allow for the thorough analysis of these themes, but sufficient will be included to make clear the extent and significance of the archaeological resources.

When funding becomes available, the assessment and listing of the other archaeological sites and themes identified in Volume 1 should also be undertaken, namely:

1. Hotels and Inns.
2. The smaller villages of the local government area.
3. Industrial sites, including the Currawang (Currowong) copper mines, the range of goldmines and associated settlements.
5. Housing.

The cut-off date of 1860 has resulted in the exclusion of a number of archaeological sites and themes, particularly the consideration of later mining settlement, railway construction camps, later industrial sites as a whole and the archaeological sites associated with closer settlement from the mid 1850s onwards. The full time span of archaeological significance should be considered in any future study, particularly taking note of the remarks made in Chapter 2 (Chapter 2.3. What is an archaeological site?).

The three main themes of

4. Pastoral Settlement,
5. Transport and Communications, and
6. Towns and Villages

belong to the current state listing priorities for Convict and Governor Macquarie associated sites.3

---

3 For State government heritage listing priorities, see: http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/07_subnav_19_02.htm
2 WHAT DO WE WANT TO KEEP?

The reality is that what survives from our past has been cared for. Places that no longer survive as standing buildings or structures have for whatever reason had no one to care for them.

Many archaeological sites result from abandonment, but also to some extent require a level of care to leave them undisturbed and intact. Sometimes they may only require to be forgotten, to allow them to survive.

If we are to ensure that our heritage survives into the future, we need to take a more active role. Our heritage is dependant on simple economic facts. If a building or structure can be used or occupied, money will be spent on maintenance. If it cannot be used, then an active choice must be made to conserve its values, in spite of economics or with the benefit of new economic models.

In the best cases, like Goulburn Brewery, the Goulburn Waterworks, Riversdale and the Goulburn Railway Heritage Centre, efforts have been made by the local community, private owners, the government, the National Trust and volunteer organisations to conserve highly significant heritage items.

The efforts of landholders, some of whom have been on the land for generations, others who have recently purchased historical properties, have resulted in the conservation of a wide range of historical places and archaeological sites.

But in spite of these essential endeavours, this will not alone save our heritage. In my survey of the sites associated with the three themes, pastoral settlement, convict road building and historical towns and villages I have seen places in various stages of disrepair and collapse. I have seen historical cemeteries where graves have subsided into wombat holes with bones scattered around for all to see. Concerned owners have allowed me to inspect buildings, structures and ruins around historic homesteads. Associated farm buildings have collapsed or are deteriorating, so that our heritage is disappearing.

Some may say that it is the responsibility of owners to keep their property in a satisfactory state of maintenance, but in these hard economic times, the answers are not so easily forthcoming for conserving our heritage.
Consultants in heritage and archaeology, like myself, spend much time, visiting properties and identifying significant sites. This is not an esoteric interest, but reflects a general interest and concern for our past among large sections of the community. In fact, though many heritage items are located on private property, it is a heritage we all value.

Often we do not realise the value of the buildings, structures, ruins and archaeological sites. Because many are behind locked gates, we do not perceive the struggles of owners trying their best to conserve their heritage. The purpose of this study is to make known the value of the places that survive, so that informed decisions can be made by owners and others on what to conserve and cherish.

The question is, do we want these places to survive, the farms and associated farm buildings, relating to the pastoral settlement of the area from then late 1810s to the 1840s, the end of convict transportation, and onwards.

The surviving sites have been maintained by their owners from generation to generation. Many of these farm buildings have been rendered obsolete, due to the mechanisation of farming in the early to mid 20th century. The current generation therefore finds it difficult to justify the expense of ongoing maintenance.

Do we want to keep these historic homesteads? Or do we want to keep the farm buildings that go with these homes, so that the next generation can see just what it was like to live on one of these properties?

It is important to think ahead one generation, 30 years, because not much will survive unless we take active steps right now to put in place the framework of community, local, state and federal government support, to ensure that it does survive. The buildings left without maintenance will collapse, subdivision will irrevocably change the pastoral landscapes of the Wollondilly, the Mulwaree Ponds, Lake Bathurst, Bungonia and Marulan.

This is a decision for the community to make. It cannot be imposed from government. If you value where you live, take active steps to protect it. What government can do is to provide a framework to assist in conservation and the protection of what you value personally and as a community. The community also collectively needs to put its money behind what it values. It is appropriate for local government or another
independent body to administer this use of funds and to determine how it will be spent. An extended system of grants to conserve historic farm buildings is one of the recommendations of this study.

I don’t want this to sound like the Treasurer in the year before an election, but the reality is that the community needs to do this, if the next generation is to experience what we value or indeed fail to value now, but will cherish in future. The wind changes; Riversdale has just recently (October 2009) formed a fundraising committee. Progress may be made in small steps. We may need to lose something of value for all of us to all react, but the time will come.

I have not yet touched on the below ground archaeological sites that are located in the Goulburn Mulwaree area. Volume 1 of this study was insufficient to encompass more than an outline of the significant themes relating to archaeological sites. Yet, here we have a resource that, if studied in a scientific manner, will reveal the past to us and bring alive those people whose hands achieved so much.

What survives of the past is heavily biased. The best buildings remain, not the humble abodes. The ways of life partly revealed by historical documents, but fleshed out with the objects they used and the structures they built and worked around, provide us with the clearest insight into the past ways of life of the generations that have gone before us. Do we want a fabricated past, or some semblance of truth? If we do want to know the truth, then we need not only the surviving buildings, but also the historical documents and also the archaeological sites. The educational values, the potential benefits of cultural tourism have been left under developed and utilised. You have places of National and State significance on your doorstep for the education of your children and for the general enjoyment of all, including the income from visitors from both Sydney and Canberra.

It is the decision of the community, whether you want to keep what you value or allow it to change irrevocably, by failing to recognise, keep and value what has survived to our own generation.

This archaeological management plan provides a basic framework to assist the community in achieving this goal. With the sound foundations of a framework to conserve and manage our heritage we can build for the future. Pascal has often been quoted: ‘We know the truth not only by the reason, but also by the heart.’
3 PASTORAL SETTLEMENT.

The background to the pastoral settlement of the Goulburn Mulwaree area is outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 5.

The important issue we now need to address is how we can locate a broad spectrum of the archaeological sites and buildings that belong to this theme. We do not just want to keep the best places, but those that belonged to all levels of society. We want to retain or recover a balanced understanding of pastoral settlement, not only the homesteads and their outbuildings, but also the shepherd’s huts and pens, the stockyards and outstations, sometimes on Crown land.

How do we do this? The detailed process was outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 5.

The Local Government Area covers 3,232 square kilometres, a vast area for site survey of archaeological sites. We need to use a method to narrow down the search area. This is called a predictive model.

3.1 Predictive model for Pastoral Settlement.

There are several components to the predictive model to narrow down the search area for places associated with pastoral settlement. An overview of the geographical spread of pastoral settlement is provided by Baker’s Atlas, dated from 1843-1846.4

The Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area lies partly within the Counties of Argyle, Camden and Murray. Baker’s Atlas shows the land alienated from the Crown and granted or purchased by individuals or groups up to 1843-1836.

---

County of Argyle.
County of Camden.
County of Murray.
Does this series of maps show the total resource for the study of pastoral settlement up to the 1860s, which is the end of our period of study? More importantly does it show the total resource of those pastoral stations, worked by convict labour? The answer is a qualified yes (see Volume, Chapter 5.1 for a more detailed explanation).

Baker's Atlas is unlikely to provide evidence for activities on Crown land, namely the huts and stockyards, shepherd's huts and pens or 'sheep stations', but this has been countered to a limited extent by the use of the surveyor's fieldbooks and another important map, namely the Map of the Environs of Bungonia. Together these sources show some of the land granted between the 1840s and 1860s, as well as a number of sheep and cattle runs.

The information on these historical maps, plans and documents was transcribed onto modern maps, through the intermediary medium of historical county and parish maps (see Volume 3, Appendix 3 for County Maps).

### 3.2 Database for pastoral properties.

A database was then prepared for all parish portions included on these maps (see Volume 3, Appendix 3). The database was used to correlate all relevant documentation available to this overview study. Time and budget constraints result in only the basic documentation being collected. This includes:

1. **Inventory Number.**
2. **County.**
3. **Parish.**
4. **Portion number.**
5. **Acreage.**
6. **Grantee Last Name.** The last name of the grantee is usually in UPPER CASE for 1841 Census returns, which have been incorporated into the database from Volume 1, Table 5.1). Where multiple or different grantees are given in the various sources, duplicate entries will be provided for each grantee named.
7. **Grantee First name.**
8. **Property Name and other information provided on historical County or Parish maps (selected editions only).**
9. **Homestead – see below for terminology used in this field.**

---

5 Environs of Bungonia, withdrawn from Office use on 2 May 1889. Source. SR Map 1484.
10. Notes. Selected historical references and questions to be resolved by research and site survey – see below.

11. Located – This field relates to the 1841 Census, where there were difficulties in relating the census household returns to the portion of land. The correlation could be by name of grantee or name of property or locality. The issues relating to the geographical identification of households in the 1841 Census was discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 5.

12. 1828 Census individual return and estate number.6

13. 1841 Census, Household return number.

14. Topographic Map name and the features shown on the maps. Information shown on aerial photographs was also noted in this field. Google maps were used in most cases, although the 1941 coverage for Goulburn was made available at a late stage in the study.

15. LEP 2009 Listing – number of item. Because of changes to the local council boundaries, some sites are now outside the LGA.

16. State Heritage Register.

17. Other Listings – limited to National or Commonwealth Listing.

The following fields were recorded during site survey.

18. Name.
19. Street Number.
20. Street Name.
22. Local Government Area.
23. Description – House.
24. Description – Other Buildings
25. Description – Penal System.
26. Description – Layout and Landscape.
27. Condition, whether a standing building, ruin, or archaeological site (good condition or with evidence of disturbance).
28. References – Author and year for publication, fully referenced in the Bibliography.

3.3 Additional notes on specific database fields.

3.3.1 The Homestead field – a predictive model.

What are our expectations about the number of homesteads? Let us assume that there is one house for each portion or for each group of portions, granted to one individual. There are a number of exceptions to this hypothesis, but where an individual is only granted one portion, then that is usually going to be the portion with a residence upon it. One exception might be if adjoining or neighbouring land was managed jointly with another grantee, in which case there may only be one homestead. This may have been the case with Cardross, possibly being managed from Maxton.

Where a grantee held a larger number of portions, the same hypothesis can be used and tested, though site survey and even basic historical research has indicated the presence of two or more homesteads or households on at least some of these larger landholdings. The Bradley family is an example where a number of households are located on what appears to be one property, including at Lansdowne and at Gundary, though this may be an example of the process whereby the next generation built their own homesteads. Robert Futter had his home at Lumley Park, Bungonia, but there was also a farm on his grant at Spring Ponds, Bungonia. The Chisholm family had several homesteads, Kippilaw, Cardross and Wollogorang.

There are three other factors, which should be taken into account. The second generation of a family would often build their own homesteads on the same or adjacent holdings. Alternatively, as the income from farming and grazing increased, so a landholder might build a better house. For example there are many documented instances where landholders resided in bark huts or slab buildings, before constructing their colonial Georgian or later Victorian houses in favoured locations. This process of improvement continued well into the latter half of the 19th century and early to mid 20th century, for example Inveralochy and Cardross. Mummel (now Kimpton Park) is another example, where the old house was demolished and another one built in the 1930s.

Finally it is possible for a land grant to be sold to another person, who then builds a homestead for himself.

But the basic hypothesis of one home per farm (comprising one or more portions granted to one individual) holds true enough as a predictive tool. The following terminology is therefore used in the database.
1. Yes, where an identified homestead is located on a portion of land.
2. Other, where an identified homestead is located on another portion of land belonging to the grantee. This does not indicate the absence of other archaeological sites or improvements. There can be more than one homestead on a farm, as indicated above. Once the location of the residence is known, one entry will convert to a Yes and all the others to Other.
3. Possible – where a grantee only holds on portion in the study area. There is a high likelihood that a farmstead will be located on this portion, for example, the grant to Mary Shiel (Argyle, Jerrara, 68), near Bungonia, where the existing house is clearly of early colonial date.
4. 1 of 2 or more possibles – where a grantee holds a number of portions, a homestead is likely to be located on one of these portions.
5. x refers to all 1841 Census Entires and other non applicable entries.
6. Where is? When a large number of portions are granted to one individual, there is occasional uncertainty as to the location of the main homestead. In some cases, the main homestead is also beyond the boundaries of the Local Government Area. Further research will resolve the location of the principal homestead, but this research has in some cases been beyond the budget of the study.

This predictive model has assisted in the identification of several sites, and has also provided confirmation for others.

### 3.3.2 The Notes field.

The Notes field is used to correlate a number of historical sources. A number of abbreviations or conventions are used.

1. Detail 128, refers to the Parish Map named in the Parish field and the plan of the portion number in the first edition of the parish map available online at the Parish Map preservation Project. In other cases information is included on the county maps, but is again referenced to the parish portion.
2. References to aerial photography are most often to Google Maps.7
3. References to surveyor’s fieldbooks, predominantly to Surveyor Larmer, are referenced as fieldbook, followed by folio number and usually date (example, FB 468, F 6, 1838).

---

7 Google maps. [http://maps.google.com/](http://maps.google.com/)
4. Subdivision plans are available from the Mitchell Library, State Library of NSW and also the National Library of Australia. Some of these are illustrated in Volume 1, Chapter 7).

5. Bungonia Environs Plan.8

6. Where a parish map indicates a Primary Grant, the regulations required improvement to the property before the granting of any additional land.9 This information is a strong pointer to historical settlement.

The parish maps sometimes indicate homes, fencelines, schools, post offices, churches and burial grounds. If a parish map reveals one portion as a ‘primary grant’, then we can be almost certain of historical improvements, like a house and outbuildings, because the historical regulations required improvement before another grant could be purchased.

However a number of other historical documents provide a treasure trove of information. The fieldbooks of surveyor James Larmer are an example. There is also a very useful map of Bungonia and Environs, which plots similar information to the field books, including huts, paddocks, cultivation paddocks, fencelines, sheep stations and even homesteads.

3.3.3 The Topographic Map field.

These maps provide a wealth of information. Tell-tale property names, which have had continuous use since the early days, provide clues, but changes to a significant number of property names mean that we cannot easily locate some households from the 1841 Census. Local knowledge is indispensable for some cases. Also on the topographic maps we can locate the most likely homestead site from a group by being familiar with preferred locations, particularly adjacent to watercourses, on the first higher ground above flood level. Then there is the layout of buildings on the map, the remnant tracks and roads, the exotic vegetation and windbreaks. All this can be

---

8 SR Map 1484.
9 Regulations published in the Sydney Gazette on 31 March 1825 required improvements to be made to land granted, rather than purchased. Land granted had to be improved within 3 years to a sliding value, according to acreage of land granted. Later regulations provided even more stringent requirements for land granted, rather than purchased. After 1831, free land grants were only given to persons retiring from the Navy, Marines or Army. Manning Clark. Select Documents in Australian History, 1788-1850. Angus and Robertson, Sydney. 1955: Vol. 2:228ff.
further refined using aerial photography. On early aerial photographic coverage (1940s to 1950s), it is even possible to see the concentrations of cultivation paddocks around the old homesteads, before more extensive cultivation was made possible with mechanisation.

3.4 Categories of site identification.

A large proportion of the above documentation had to be prepared before site survey, in order to make the large task manageable at least to a limited extent. Nonetheless many properties could not be visited and the information gathered still requires site survey or ‘ground truthing’. Nonetheless sufficient information has been gathered to indicate the presence of ‘relics’, significant at a local or state level on the basis of this limited research, even without site survey.

As a result of this research and site survey, the site identification process falls into three categories (see below).

3.5 Results of site survey.

The research necessary before site survey has been described above. The database is included in Volume 1, Appendix 1 and has been updated where additional sites have been identified through site survey.

Numerous sites have been recorded, some already known, but others not recognised until now.

Most of the sites are located within the area of pastoral settlement shown on the County Maps in Baker’s Atlas. A small number of sites are located outside this area, but the sources for these additional sites indicate that they were likely settled before 1860.10

The identification of sites falls into a number of stages.

1. Sites already listed in one or more heritage listing databases. In many cases these sites have been inspected as part of this study.

10 The surveyor field books are all dated. The Plan of the Environs of Bungonia was withdrawn from use in the Department of Lands on 2 May 1889. Source. SR Map 1484. To validate the latest date for information on this map it is necessary to research the date of grant or purchase of those portions not already shown on the Baker’s Atlas of 1843-1846. This task is outside the scope of research for this study.
2. Sites not already listed, but inspected as part of this study.
3. Sites where historical documentation has been gathered as part of this study (note that minimum research was possible within the scope and budget of this study).
4. Sites identified for inspection during site survey, but not actually inspected within the time frame available to this study.
5. Other sites within the area of pastoral settlement shown on the County Maps in Baker’s Atlas, but not researched or identified within the scope of this study.

These stages of identification can be further divided into three principal categories.

1. Sites inspected for this study or previously by others (existing listings, site survey by others, etc). The physical existence of these sites has been proven beyond doubt.
2. Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others:
   a. for which there is historical documentation (available within the budget of this study).
   b. for which the predictive model has not been tested.

These site categories are best summarised in table format.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Categories of Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Further details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sites inspected for this study or previously by others (existing listings, site survey by others, etc). The physical existence of these sites has been proven beyond doubt.</td>
<td>1. Sites already listed in one or more heritage listing databases. 2. Sites not already listed, but inspected as part of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others: for which there is historical documentation (available within the budget of this study).</td>
<td>3. Sites where historical documentation has been gathered as part of this study (note that minimum research was possible within the scope and budget of this study). 4. Sites identified for inspection during site survey, but not actually inspected within the time frame available to this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others: for which the predictive model has not been tested.</td>
<td>5. Other sites within the area of pastoral settlement shown on the County Maps in Baker’s Atlas, but not researched or identified within the scope of this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of site survey and historical research are shown in graphic format on the LGA Plan Series, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1</th>
<th>1. Goulburn Mulwaree LGA</th>
<th>1.1 LGA Boundaries and Detail Map Series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Pastoral Settlement, Late 1810s to 1840s-1850s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Parish Boundaries and Names. Overlay onto Pastoral Settlement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 These sites may have been inspected by others, but have not resulted in listings in a searchable database available to this study.
1.4 Pastoral Settlement – archaeological and other heritage sites.

1.5 Road Network, from 1817 onwards to 1840s.

1.6 Listings for Pastoral Settlement 01

1.7 Listings for Pastoral Settlement 02

3.6 Analysis of results of site survey.

Site survey was completed during October and November 2009. For the theme of Pastoral Settlement a total of 51 sites were inspected and recorded. Time did not allow for an exhaustive survey, nor was it possible in the time available to arrange for site visits to each property. Nonetheless my sincere thanks go to those property owners, who gave up their time to take an archaeologist around their houses and farm buildings. Without exception, people have been very generous with their hospitality, although rightly cautious to first establish credentials.

The pastoral properties are listed below (in order of county and parish name)(see Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.6 for major property names):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Maxton Park Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Baw Baw</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Lockyersleigh Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Billyrambija</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Longreach Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Billyrambija</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Mummel Wesleyan Chapel and Cemetery (Merilla Uniting Church and Cemetery)</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bredalbane</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Kippilaw Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bredalbane</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Kippilaw Chapel and cemetery</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bredalbane</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site survey was completed on the following dates: 24 – 31 October and 6-8 November 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Archaeological site of Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bredalbane</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Cardross Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bredalbane</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Ruined house site and other archaeological remains.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bredalbane</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Lumley Park Farm complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bungonia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Inverary Gaol, part of Reevesdale Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bungonia</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Reevesdale Farm Complex and Inverary Gaol</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Bungonia</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Inveralochy Estate and Farm Complex. Holy Cross Seminary. Society of Saint Pius X.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Covan</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Inveralochy Estate and Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Covan</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>St. John’s Church, Lake Bathurst (Private Village of Tarago), 1860.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Covan</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Wynella House and Garroorigang Farm Complex, including Barn</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Bois Chere Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Property name</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Burrungurroolong House and Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Bois Chere Hotel Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>Bonnie Doon house and outbuildings and ribbon development along Old Hume Highway.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Former Oliver Goldsmith Inn Hotel Complex, now Joppa house and grounds.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Garroorigang Hotel Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>Site of Gillespie’s Manufactory Industrial Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>Private Village of Tirrannaville, including Chapel and cemetery, houses and public school</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>Malton Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>Rossiville Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>Brisbane Meadow Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Inverary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>Caarne or Carne. Archaeological site of Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Inverary</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>Inverary Park Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Inverary</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>Wylora Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Jerrara</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>Springfield Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Mangamore</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Property name</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>Wandi, Robert Plumb’s Inn. Hotel and Farm complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Marulan</td>
<td>5 (6?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>Glenrock Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Marulan</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>Rotherwood Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Mullengullenga</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>The Morass (Bundong) Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Mullengullenga</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>Kimpton Park (Mummel) Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Mummel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>Kimpton Park (Mummel) Farm Complex and Private Village</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Mummel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Rosemount Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Mummel</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>Kingsdale Hotel Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Narrangarril</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>Kingsdale Limestone Quarries. Industrial complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Narrangarril</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>Norwood Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Narrangarril</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>Goulburn Police Academy. Site of Kenmore House and Farm Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Narrangarril</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>Kyle Farm Complex, ruins of homestead and outbuildings.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Nattery</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>Tirranna Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Terranna</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>Pelican Inn Hotel Complex.</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Terranna</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>Site of Paton’s Inn and coach stage Hotel Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Terranna</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The listings include:

1. Farm complexes.
2. Chapels, churches and cemeteries.
3. Archaeological sites of Farm complexes.
4. Gaols on farm properties.
5. Industrial sites.
6. Hotels and Inns.
7. Buildings, structures and archaeological sites associated with ‘ribbon development’ along main roads.
8. Private villages.

Riversdale, the National Trust property in Old Goulburn, has not been included in this inventory of Pastoral Settlement, because it is more correctly included in Towns and Villages. The site commenced at Mat Healy’s (or Healey’s) Hotel, servicing the needs of the Headquarters of the Mounted Police in Old Goulburn (See Chapter 5).

Why include churches, industrial sites, gaols, hotels, ‘ribbon development’ and private villages in what is a study of Pastoral Settlement? The answer is simple. These sites relate to the processes of development of the pastoral properties throughout the 19th and 20th centuries.

As the labour force on the pastoral properties grew, there was a need for private villages, churches, chapels, cemeteries, public schools and post offices; and of course housing. These elements, surviving in the landscape, speak of a large rural community, employed in labour, trades and other services, associated both with the large properties, but also with the spread of closer settlement from the 1850s onwards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Property name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>Lansdowne Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Towrang</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>Glenrock Farm Complex. Archaeological site of Sheep Station</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Uringalla</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>Wingello Park Farm Complex</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Uringalla</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>Caoura Farm Complex</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Bumballa</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only a sample has been included in the listings. They are the ones that are associated with the properties inspected as part of this study. They are included to demonstrate that they form part of a whole landscape of Pastoral Settlement, which should not be obscured, simply because individual heritage listings do not reveal this relationship.

Likewise, along the main roads, especially the Great South Road around Goulburn, there is both historical and physical evidence for ‘ribbon development’ along the highways. Yalla is a prime example. But the listings for individual hotels hide the fact that this ‘ribbon development’ included housing, churches and other services for the traveller. This ‘ribbon development’ was formed in many cases by subdivision of pastoral properties along these transport and communication corridors. Elsewhere, hotels are not isolated items in the landscape, but reveal both the presence of communication routes, but also a much larger rural population than is present today.

A gaol must be an unexpected item in the landscape, until it is realised that places like Inverary Gaol and other places of confinement formed a distinctive part of the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’. This is the theme that describes the administration of the Penal System of farm labour and the enforcement of law and order among the community in the period of Transportation up to 1841 in New South Wales (see Chapter 5).

Finally some industrial sites are included, again as a sample to indicate how subdivision of pastoral properties led to other forms of development. On Kingsdale, Limestone Quarries were developed after subdivision, also the Kingsdale Hotel, partly to serve this industrial community but also the passing traveller. Closer to Goulburn, along the Mulwaree Ponds, there was industrial development from an early date. Goulburn Brewery is a prime example of an intact industrial complex, dating from the 1830s onwards, a site that should be much more widely recognised for its national significance: it was part of Lansdowne.

Just as there is a view that the Elgin Marbles should be returned to the Parthenon, so it would be a good idea to consider the issues of returning the steam engine, now in the Powerhouse Museum, to its original location in this building. The expertise to conserve a steam engine is well within the ability of the Goulburn community, as indicated by the success of the Goulburn Waterworks and Railway Roundhouse.

Further upstream, this study has identified the sites of two industrial complexes, namely Thorn’s and Gillespie’s Manufactories, on either side of the Mulwaree Ponds,
just upstream of Thorn’s Bridge on the Braidwood Road. They are located on subdivisions of Garroorigang and Brisbane Grove.

Before the reader asks why not all churches, chapels, cemeteries, industrial sites or hotels were listed as part of this study, please refer to Volume 1, Chapter 13, where priorities were established in the listing process within the available budget.

3.6.1 Pastoral Properties.

In order to record and assess the mass of evidence available for Pastoral Settlement, it has been necessary to complete an overview of the principal characteristics of the theme and not the individual details of each property, which would be a life’s work in itself.

The site survey therefore sought to make a brief inventory of the major items on each property. In this process there was not time enough to inspect all the sites in the database, but only a selection. While this study has sought to assess the whole range of settlement, nonetheless it has to be admitted that the time for site survey did not allow success in this endeavour. The major heritage items by right have to take priority.

Nonetheless an attempt was made to prove the predictive models used in this study:

1. The predictive model for the location of homesteads indicated that one homestead should be located on each farm. Thus the single grant to Mary Shiel, near Bungonia (ARGYLE, JERRARA, 68, 300 acres), was a ‘probable’ for a house site. This example had surprising results and is listed as Wylora Farm Complex.

2. Time and access did not allow more than one reference to a ‘sheep station’ to be checked. Even then the site was well away from the road. All that could be established is that the terrain remains undisturbed and the site could well survive (ARGYLE, URINGALLA, 231, 740 acres). This site proves that development on large pastoral properties was not limited to the main residence (Glenrock), but spread over the whole property. This finding has distinct ramifications for the listing process and curtilages (see Chapter 14.10.2).

3. A number of larger properties were located because of historical documentation, later supplemented by local knowledge. Wingello Park, Longreach, and Kyle are examples. Kyle was in fact already listed, but this did not dampen the excitement of discovery when historical evidence and site
survey finally indicated that they were one and the same site (ARGYLE, NATTERY, 5, 300 acres).

### 3.6.2 The inventory of sites.

The inventory summarises the results of site survey. The brief analysis that follows will establish the grounds for determining levels and grading of cultural significance.

Several characteristics of pastoral properties were described:

1. The sequence of houses or archaeological sites of houses.
2. The range of surviving farm buildings, or archaeological sites of farm buildings.
4. The cultural landscape of each property.

The multiple choice answers for each of the above features is simply listed below with brief notes:

#### 1. Main buildings or structures.

The basic categories of main building or structures included in site survey:

- Chapel.
- Cemetery – Family cemeteries and general cemeteries.
- House.
- Hotel.
- Manager’s House.
- Public School – but only as a separate site. See Schoolhouse for education on pastoral properties.
- Private Village.

Stages of development.

- House – Stages 1-5.

This reveals the several stages of construction on pastoral properties as they became established and made their owners wealthy or otherwise. In each case, they are a history lesson in themselves.

A simple description of architectural style.

- Farm – Vernacular – Regional British derivation.
Cottage – Vernacular. (rectangular building, hipped roof, central door and symmetrical pair of windows).

Colonial Georgian – in most cases, the beautiful double fronted houses showing an adaptation to the Australian climate by incorporating wrap around verandahs.

Georgian.

Victorian.

Victorian Italianate.

Federation.

Californian Bungalow.

20th Century.

This brief summary of architectural style provides the evidence of how these pastoral properties have prospered over time, with landholders replacing their more primitive structures by building new houses when their wealth and circumstances allowed. Australia has indeed lived off the back of the Merino, but also the various breeds of cattle.

There is a basic description of building materials for the main house only.

Brick.

Brick or stone.

Stone. Rubble stone construction or dressed stone.

Render, sometimes obscuring type of construction.

Slab.

Weatherboard.

Lath and Plaster.

Pise.

Wooden construction rarely survives. Where it does survive, the greatest efforts should be made to conserve these buildings for future generations. There are some prime examples at Lansdowne and Inverary Park. Pise likewise is unusual, for example at Kimpton Park (Mummel). Timber farm buildings will be discussed separately below.

Buildings, attached to the house:

Other buildings.

Detached kitchen.

Kitchen wing.

Servant’s Quarters.
2. Description - Other Buildings.
Here follows a brief list of the type of buildings to expect on a pastoral property.

2a. Staff housing.
   Cottage
   Worker’s cottage.
   Hut.
   Men’s hut.
   Shearers’ quarters.

2b. Main farm buildings
   Barn.
   Barn and Stable.
   Stable.
   Coachhouse.
   Coachhouse and Stable.
   Saddlery and tack room.
   Ballroom – as a separate building, associated with the staging of coaches in the one instance at Lansdowne.
   Woolshed.
   Shearing shed.
   Wool washery.
   Shed for merino rams.
   Granary.
   Granary and flour store.
   Gatelodge.
   Weighbridge.
   Chicken shed.
   Shed.
   Outbuildings.
   Sandstone gateposts.

2c.. The trades.
   Blacksmith’s shop or smithy.
   Workshops for other trades.

2d. Mills.
   Windmill.
Horse powered mill.
Millstones, grindstones.
Milling equipment and grindstones in situ.
Associated machinery and equipment in situ.

2e. **Food preservation and production.**
   Dairy or cool room.
   Meat Shed.
   Building complex – cider making.
   Honey house.

2f. **Other domestic duties.**
   Laundry.

2g. **Religion and education.**
   Jewish Synagogue.
   Schoolhouse.

2h. **Methods of water conservation.**
   Water trough.
   Well.
   Water tank.
   Cistern.
   Dam.
   Dam and causeway.

2i. **Industrial sites.**
   Limestone quarry.
   Lime kiln.
   Brick kilns.

2k. **Agriculture or stock control.**
   Paddocks – fenced, as indicated on historical plans.

This aspect of pastoral settlement would repay further attention. Historical and modern aerial photography reveal the presence of cultivation paddocks adjacent to pastoral properties, often on low lying meadows. Several instances are mentioned in the ‘Notes’ field, prepared before site survey.
2m. Communications.
   Bridge abutments.
See also Layout and landscape below.

2n. The great pastimes.
   Racecourses.
   Grandstands.
   Grandstands, raided earthen banks.
   Armoury – guns for hunting.

3. Layout and Landscape.
   Courtyard layout of house and outbuildings.
   Rectilinear Farm Layout, often around fenced and tree lined enclosures.
   Exotic Plantings.
   Formal gardens.
   Pastoral Landscape.
   Old road routes.
   Grid layout of private villages.

3.6.3 Landscape setting.
What does not become apparent until site survey is the landscape that goes with this important period of pastoral settlement from the late 1810s to the 1840s and beyond. The early landholders wanted prime grazing land for their cattle and sheep. They valued highly the thinly timbered grasslands of the principal watercourses. In all cases they selected land near to permanent water.

The early settlers therefore picked the prime land out of the natural landscape, which closed it off for those who came later. In many cases they described it as open parkland, as on the large country estates they had left behind in the British Isles. In trying to recreate this landscape in the Antipodes, they created a cultural landscape that is so distinctive today: open grassland and vistas, the clearance of native vegetation, except as scattered trees or clumps of trees, or along road corridors; conifer wind-brakes against the cold west winds of Winter; concentrations of exotic tree and plant species around homesteads; hawthorn, originally used as hedges, but now feral; willows, poplar, and other deciduous trees; Robinia pseudoacacia for drought fodder, now highly characteristic as a marker of historical settlement. One of
the issues in preserving the farms and outbuildings is also how to conserve their landscape setting.

### 3.6.4 Frequency of each characteristic of Pastoral Settlement.

Within the time available it is not possible to describe these buildings and structures in more detail. It is sufficient to include a table to show how often these items occur or survive on pastoral properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main categories, buildings, structures, features.</th>
<th>Number of sites with these items.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Main building or structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s House.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Village</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House – Stage 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House – Stage 2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House – Stage 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House – Stage 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House – Stage 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm – Vernacular – Regional British derivation.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage – Vernacular.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Georgian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Italianate.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Californian Bungalow.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th Century.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick or stone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone. Stone rubble.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, dressed.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Render</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherboard.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lath and Plaster.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pise.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other buildings.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached kitchen.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen wing.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant’s Quarters.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Description - Other Buildings.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2a. Staff housing.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker’s cottage.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hut.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s hut.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearers’ quarters.</td>
<td>4 (not all recorded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2b. Main farm buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn and Stable.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachhouse.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachhouse and Stable.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddlery and tack room.</td>
<td>1 (not all recorded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolshed.</td>
<td>4 (not all may have been recognised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearing shed.</td>
<td>6 (not all recorded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool washery.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed for merino rams.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granary.</td>
<td>2 (not all may have been identified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granary and flour store.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate lodge.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighbridge.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken shed.</td>
<td>1 (not all may have been recorded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuildings.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. The trades.</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s shop or smithy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. The trades.</td>
<td>Workshops for other trades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Mills.</td>
<td>Windmill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Mills.</td>
<td>Horse powered mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Mills.</td>
<td>Millstones, grindstones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Mills.</td>
<td>Milling equipment and grindstones in situ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Mills.</td>
<td>Associated machinery and equipment in situ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. Food preservation and production.</td>
<td>Dairy or cool room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. Food preservation and production.</td>
<td>Meat Shed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. Food preservation and production.</td>
<td>Building complex – cider making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. Food preservation and production.</td>
<td>Honey house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f. Other domestic duties.</td>
<td>Laundry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g. Religion and education.</td>
<td>Jewish Synagogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g. Religion and education.</td>
<td>Schoolhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h. Methods of water conservation.</td>
<td>Water trough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h. Methods of water conservation.</td>
<td>Well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h. Methods of water conservation.</td>
<td>Water tank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h. Methods of water conservation.</td>
<td>Cistern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h. Methods of water conservation.</td>
<td>Dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h. Methods of water conservation.</td>
<td>Dam and causeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i. Industrial sites.</td>
<td>Limestone quarry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i. Industrial sites.</td>
<td>Lime kiln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i. Industrial sites.</td>
<td>Brick kilns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k. Agriculture or stock control.</td>
<td>Paddocks – fenced, as indicated on historical plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Note that category 2j and 2l are avoided, because of easy confusion with 2i and 2l (number).
| plans. |  
| Historical documentation or aerial photographic evidence | 3 (sample only). |

| 2m. Communications. |  
| Bridge abutments. | 1 |

| 2n. The great pastimes. |  
| Racecourses. | 2 |
| Grandstands. | 1 |
| Grandstands, raided earthen banks. | 1 |
| Armoury – guns for hunting. | 1 |

| 3. Layout and Landscape. |  
| Courtyard layout of house and outbuildings. | 4 (surviving buildings may not reveal original layout in some cases. |
| Rectilinear Farm Layout, often around fenced and tree lined enclosures. | 11 |
| Exotic Plantings. | 36 |
| Formal gardens. | 13 |
| Pastoral Landscape. | 34 |
| Old road routes. | 15 (not recorded in every case). |
| Grid layout of private villages. | 1 (not recorded in every case). |

The inventory has only recorded the building materials of the main houses on each farm complex. Masonry is the most common surviving building material. Slab, weatherboard or lath and plaster are highly unusual survivals and are limited to two sites, namely Lansdowne and Inverary Park. Lansdowne is well known, the early timber framed and slab house at Inverary Park is not recognised at all.

The house at Inverary Park that is recorded in the published listings is for the second house built in the 1830s. It is known that Dr. Reid lived in a slab cottage prior to this date. Until this study it was assumed it had long been demolished, the site on an adjacent property. However a brief inspection of what was thought until now to be an house built for a son or estate manager, revealed a colonial Georgian house, double fronted, with front and back verandah, side skillions and box rooms flanking the front verandah. The house faces east, not north like the 1830s house.

---

14 Personal communication. Mr. Phillip Broadhead, 31 October 2009.
The building materials for the house date the structure:

1. Nail types – hand made, up to 1860s.
2. Pit sawn timbers throughout, to mid 19th century.
3. Timber framed slab construction.
4. Slabs clad in weatherboard externally, lath and plaster within.
5. Rubble stone construction of skillions, but with later addition of timber frame, weatherboard, with wire nails, post 1860s.
6. Shingle roof, under corrugated iron, i.e., before 1860s.
7. Absence of bricks in primary construction, implies construction before the 1840s, when brick was made available on the property. Bricks are found only in the fireplace of the later of the two detached structures, with the brick type dated from 1840s-1880s. There is no brickwork in the original detached building.
8. Form of building similar to early colonial examples, like Elizabeth Farm, Parramatta.

If the dating of this house, now in a ruinous, but still sound condition, can be confirmed by more detailed inspection and recording, together with historical research, it is likely to be one of the earliest timber houses in New South Wales, dating from 1824.

Rachel Roxburgh, relates the following:

‘The Doctor [referring to Dr. David Reid], says [William] Riley (rather sniffily), ‘intends building a mansion as soon as he can afford it’, to replace the reputedly ‘miserable hovel’ where he lives with his family, ‘sacrificing present comfort and ease to future ostentation.’ This dates Inverary Park some time between 1831 and 1840, when Dr. Reid died.’15

The earlier house therefore dates from c.1824 to c.1840. I seem to have a propensity for the discovery of ‘miserable’ buildings, first the ‘miserable hut’ at Camden Park, now the ‘miserable hovel’ at Inverary. What else can an archaeologist ever want!

Pise construction is also rarely used on the pastoral properties. Examples survive in outbuildings at Kimpton Park (Mummel), but also for the workers’ cottages on the Limestone Quarries on Kindsdale.

15 Roxburgh & Baglin, 1874: 415.
The construction of surviving farm buildings is similarly mostly of brick and stone. Timber has rarely survived in the principal farm buildings, for example at:

- Lockyersleigh (blacksmith’s shop, and a one off example of a ‘men’s hut’),
- Reevesdale (stables, sheds and blacksmith’s shop),
- Lumley Park (Woolshed, stables and coachhouse, worker’s cottage, etc),
- Burrungurroolong (barn, late 19th century),
- Inverary Park (stables and former blacksmith’s shop),
- Springfield (Mill and later stables),
- Wandi (slab shed),
- Caoura (stables attached to barn).

The list is short and will get shorter, without a sustained effort to conserve and provide adequate funding in terms of grants and loans.

The steam-powered mill at Goulburn Brewery and the Horse-Mill at Springfield are of course the only two to survive out of the six recorded from the 1830s in the Goulburn area. Both these sites are therefore to be valued beyond measure (see Volume 1, Chapter 8).

3.7 **Grading of significance for Pastoral Settlement.**

The framework for determining the grading of significance is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 12.3).

The statement of significance has already demonstrated the State, if not National level of significance of the theme of Pastoral Settlement, as well as also the theme of the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’ (See Volume 1, Chapter 12).

Sites belonging to the theme of Pastoral Settlement are graded in Chapter 12.7.

3.8 **Pastoral Settlement. The relationship between grading and level of significance.**

See Chapter 12.7.
### 3.9 Notes on related sites.

Associated properties are usually given the grading of significance, which applies to the main listing for the estate or farm complex, especially where they are in close geographical location and clearly part of the one original estate. This includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main site</th>
<th>Associated sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimpton Park (Mummel) Farm Complex</td>
<td>Mummel Wesleyan Chapel and Cemetery (Merilla Uniting Church and Cemetery).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimpton Park (Mummel) Farm Complex and Private Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological site of Farm Complex (association to be demonstrated by further research).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kippilaw Farm Complex</td>
<td>Kippilaw Chapel and cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reevesdale Farm Complex and Inverary Gaol</td>
<td>Inverary Gaol, part of Reevesdale Farm Complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveralochy Estate and Farm Complex</td>
<td>Inveralochy Estate and Farm Complex. Holy Cross Seminary. Society of Saint Pius X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirranna Farm Complex</td>
<td>Burrungurroolong House and Farm Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Village of Tirrannaville, including Chapel and cemetery, houses and public school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pelican Inn Hotel Complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverary Park Farm Complex</td>
<td>Inverary Gaol, part of Reevesdale Farm Complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrock Farm Complex (to be re-assessed after site survey).</td>
<td>Glenrock Farm Complex. Archaeological site of Sheep Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansdowne Farm Complex</td>
<td>Goulburn Brewery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The existing conservation area for the two sites recognises this relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where the items are widely spaced and the other site is related to another theme, the grading may be separated, as in the cases described below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main site</th>
<th>Associated sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockyersleigh Farm Complex</td>
<td>Kyle Farm Complex, ruins of homestead and outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although Kyle was associated with Lockyersleigh, further research is needed to demonstrate the date of that association. For the present, it is assumed the properties were developed separately as they were granted to different individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardross Farm Complex</td>
<td>Ruined house site and other archaeological remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This site is associated with ‘ribbon development’ (Towns and Villages) along the South Road and separated by time and space from the early mill and house site at Cardross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This theme of Towns and Villages is assessed separately from the theme of Pastoral Settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynella House and Garroorigang Farm Complex, including Barn.</td>
<td>This farm complex dates before subdivision in 1859, though the barn is a later addition, believed to be 1870s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The other sites on this estate all relate to subdivision and are of a later date, except for the Garroorigang Hotel Complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Former Oliver Goldsmith Inn Hotel Complex, now Joppa house and grounds, postdates subdivision, but the revised curtilage includes the sheep wash pens for Wynella or Garroorigang Farm, predating 1859.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Site of Gillespie’s Manufactory Industrial Complex postdates subdivision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.10 On the Fringe. ‘The Landscape of the Dispossessed’**

While it is true that the large pastoral stations pushed out in a South and Easterly direction from the Wollondilly River, Mulwaree Ponds, Marulan and Bungonia, the south east of the County of Argyle was the Landscape of the Dispossessed in more...
ways than one. I am not talking of the larger stations, like Kooringaroo or The Morass, but the evidence provided by the Bungonia Environs Plan and the surveyor’s fieldbooks.

Let us look at the evidence in a little more detail, though not time was too short to undertake site survey.

The evidence indicates that this was the location of the far-flung sheep and cattle stations of the larger pastoral stations, but also the isolated huts and small farms of the dispossessed. They were the ones, who were particularly excluded from the prime land until a major change was made with the Act for the Alienation of Crown Lands in 1861 (commonly known as the Crown Land Alienation Act, or one of the two Robertson Land Acts.)¹⁶ This single Act did more than anything else to assuage the demands of the person with limited resources, seeking to get onto the land, with favourable government terms that allowed for instalment payment of the purchase price as improvements were made. This is not to say that the system was not rorted by the large landholders, using the processes of ‘dummying’, but the law did provide a stimulus to a process that had commenced long before, now given more urgency by the much greater population returning from the gold rushes of the 1850s to a more sedentary life on the land.

But what of the situation before the gold rushes? Charles MacAlister, in his *Old Pioneering Days in the Sunny South*, published in 1907, gives first hand experiences of the efforts of the magistrates and landholders to exclude the man of limited means from the prime land of the Wollondilly River and the Mulwaree Ponds. Having resigned as manager of Strathaird over an argument about the ill-treatment of the convicts, demanded by the owner, the author’s father stayed on Crown land at the Gap, nearer to Goulburn, while contemplating future employment. He was served with a notice of trespass on land ‘rented’ by Dr. Lithgow of Kenmore Station and was hauled before the magistrates, Captain Rossi and Mr. Stewart, only to be found guilty and fined £10 or provided with an equivalent term of confinement at H.M. pleasure. The good Samaritan in this case was another magistrate, Dr. David Reid of Inverary, Bungonia, who was beloved of all classes for his generosity and fairness.¹⁷

There were 3 households at the Tarlon or Tarlo Gap in the 1841 Census. There was Charles MacAlister himself, Edward Crook and Thomas Stillwell (Household returns 78, 83 and 84. See Volume 1, Chapter 5, Table 5.1). It would be interesting to research what additional trouble these small settlers were given by the authorities. Were they squatters on Crown land or did they lawfully own the land they lived on?

Nonetheless the trend was obvious. The large landholders sent their convict shepherds and stockmen into the wilderness to run their stock, while the small settlers were pushed to the fringe. Charles MacAlister was one of those outsiders and it is intriguing to find that the Tarlo Gap was one such refuge for the dispossessed, even amidst the large pastoral farms and stations (Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.7).

Here is the evidence. The Bungonia Environs Plan, parish maps and the surveyor’s fieldbooks reveal the following picture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of improvement</th>
<th>Number of portions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hut or huts</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation paddock or paddocks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddock or paddocks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building or buildings</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosure or enclosures</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, as in river flats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Station</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More important than the number of occurrences of these sites is their location (see Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.7). While the evidence is selective, it does illustrate the change in settlement pattern in the SE part of the County of Argyle, near the Shoalhaven Gorges (see database in Volume 3, Appendix 3)\(^{18}\)

\(^{18}\) References to the main areas of settlement are excluded from the table and plan.
The sheep stations are found in the more settled areas, for example on the outlying land at Glenrock or in the hilly area between the Mulwaree Ponds and Lake George. More surprising are the two conjoined sheep stations near Yarralaw in the rougher country to the east. Here one would expect stockmen and cattle, as is evidenced, by the huts, enclosure and buildings along the western side of the Shoalhaven Gorges. While the larger landholders were active with cattle in this rougher county, there are also the huts and small paddocks of the small settlers, even before the closer settlement of the 1850s onwards.

Richard Cartwright was written out of history and his grant cancelled when he was convicted of criminal activity. He was one of the outsiders. Other small settlers were located at Boro, on the southern boundary of Argyle. Further research and site survey is necessary to bring the lives of the ex convicts, small settlers and others to light.

There is one reference to a ‘Post Station’ near Cullulla, a reference to the coach route along the South Road from Bungonia to Braidwood.

Note how the concentration of huts near Tarago suggests a settlement in the 1840s, at the junction of one branch of the South Road (Lumley Road), with the road south from Goulburn (Braidwood Road) (Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.7).

What does this historical documentation from the surveyor’s fieldbooks and the Bungonia Environs Plan allow us to do? First of all it provides us with a means of correcting the bias inherent in the existing listings of heritage properties, by providing examples of some of the most humble dwellings or the more ephemeral of settlement types, like the shepherd’s huts and sheep stations. The evidence (at least partially) removes the bias. We obtain a better understanding of the settlement pattern and the workings of the early pastoral stations, whereby major homesteads also had outlying sheep stations or even ran cattle and sheep on neighbouring Crown land. We begin to find out about the ‘Landscape of the Dispossessed.’

20 MacAlister, Charles 1907. Old Pioneering Days in the Sunny South. Chas.
These ephemeral traces are not insignificant. We might normally equate them to later closer settlement. But the fact is that many of these sites are related to the earlier period of Convict Transportation and the Landscape of the Assigned Servant. They are highly significant and should be considered at a level of State significance until proven otherwise.
3.11 Figures.

Photographs are provided for the following sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Lockyersleigh Farm Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Burrungurroolong House and Farm Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>Springfield Farm Complex 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>Kimpton Park (Mummel) Farm Complex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Photograph Folder, Volume 2
4 TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS.

The background to transport and communication in the Goulburn Mulwaree area is outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 6.

In Volume 1, Chapter 13, the scope of research and site survey was narrowed down to ‘sites associated with convict road gangs and stockades’.

The study therefore includes the sequence of roads constructed from Sydney to the Goulburn and Bungonia areas. It also extends to the routes used to move stock up from the Illawarra by the pioneer settlers.

The study includes the convict road gangs and stockades, providing the labour to construct the Great South Road.

The scope of this study did not allow for a full investigation of Hotels and Inns, except as incidental to site survey for the above categories.

The convict stockades form only one element of the Penal System, as it was administered in the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area. The subject of transport and communications will therefore be fully considered under a new chapter heading of the ‘Penal System’ (Volume 2, Chapter 5).
5 THE PENAL SYSTEM.

The structure and the administration of the ‘Penal System’ in the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area can be divided into two categories. The most obvious sites are the convict stockades, providing labour for road construction, at Towrang and Wingello (located on the Hume Highway and not at the Village of Wingello). This category also includes the roads built by the convicts, but also for convenience the roads and tracks used by the original settlers to bring their stock up from the Illawarra.

The other category of sites relate to the assigned servants on the pastoral stations and farmsteads. There are a series of sites associated with the administration of this part of the ‘Penal System’. It has recently been called the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant.’

The archaeological significance of the ‘Penal System’ will therefore be discussed under three headings:

1. Roads, bridges and river crossings.
2. Convict Road Gangs and Stockades.
3. The Landscape of the Assigned Servant.

5.1 Roads, Bridges and River Crossings.

The background to roads, bridges and communications in the Goulburn Mulwaree area is outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 6.

The work undertaken by members of the Goulburn and District Historical Society and others in identifying the various road routes provides a most useful and important resource in understanding the development of road communication into the Goulburn Mulwaree area. In most cases this research and site survey has not been repeated for this study, but where evidence has been revealed by site survey, historical documentation and aerial photographs, the routes have been revised. This is especially the case for the approach of the roads to Goulburn, where new evidence is available for the Macquarie Road, Riley’s Road and the Great South Road (see further discussion below) (Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.5 and Goulburn Suburbs Detail Plan Series 3.3).
The very first track came up from the Illawarra (Cedar Track) from what was then known (somewhat romantically) as the Kangaroo Ground (Kangaroo Valley). The lower portion of this track is now submerged under Tallowa Dam, but emerges on its northern shore as a fire trail up to Marulan via Caoura and Tallong. This track provides important historical associations with cedar getting in the Illawarra as well as the movement of stock by the pioneers, thereby circumventing the need for a Cowpasture Permit, as required by regulations approved by Governor Macquarie in 1817 (see Volume 1, Chapter 5). (Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.5).

Tom Bryant has provided a succinct summary and map of the various routes of the roads construction to Argyle and Goulburn (Figure 6.4 in Volume 1). This material has been updated by the Goulburn District Historical Society.

1. The South or Argyle Road, c.1818 to c.1833.
2. Macquarie’s Government Road, 1820 to c.1825.
3. Riley’s Road, 1822-c.1839.
4. Mitchell’s Great South Road, progressively opened from 1830 to c.1843.

It should be realised that the early communication routes often went from property to property, especially where no hotels or inns had been built. To trace the early road routes it is often necessary to divert from the trafficable road routes today onto private property. Around the older homestead complexes there are fossilised relics of some of these road routes in the surviving farm access roads. This is a highly significant area of research, which should be followed up in future studies.

For the purposes of the Archaeological Management Plan, it is necessary simply to record these road routes and identify as heritage items those areas where discernable fabric survives. The older road routes are often only visible as linear cuts into hill slopes, sometimes marked on historical maps and parish maps. The only part of the Macquarie’s Government Road, 1822 to c.1839, now listed, is therefore Wild’s Pass (LEP 2009, Item 305). This is an evocative site where the road reaches the top of the Cookbundoon Range by zigzags, personally described by Governor Macquarie in his journal on 22 October 1820. This is quoted in Volume 1, Chapter 6.

---

21 See Volume 1, Appendix 3, Goulburn and District Historical Society. GMAP7 notes.
23 Information provided by Roger Bayley, Goulburn and District Historical Society.
The Great South Road, 1830-1843, constructed according to the plans of Surveyor General, Sir Thomas Mitchell, is the route that has produced Towrang and Wingello Stockades and their associated sites (see Volume 2, Chapter 5.2).

Site survey and historical documentation have provided additional material on the road routes. The Village of Tarago now appears to be earlier than expected. It was located on the new line of road from Goulburn to the South (Braidwood Road), where it crossed the earlier route from Bungonia to Lake Bathurst and then onto the eastern shore of Lake George (Lumley Road) (see Volume 1, Chapter 6) (Goulburn Mulwaree Plan Series 1.7).²⁴

There is some controversy regarding the bridge abutments over the Mulwaree Ponds on Bungonia Road. They are located between Goulburn Brewery and Lansdowne Bridge (LEP 2009. Items 108 and 109) on the north side of the road. Lansdowne Bridge, with its timber truss, was built in 1902. There was a toll house on the south side of the bridge and west bank of the Mulwaree Ponds, now marked by a clump of trees. The stone and brick bridge abutments on the north side of the road cross a former channel of the Mulwaree Ponds. The brick type, with its rectangular frog, would normally be dated from the 1840s to 1880s, if found in Sydney. Goulburn, with its competitive brickworks, was probably keeping up with the introduction of technology, so similar dating may apply.²⁵

²⁴ Robert Dixon. 1837. ‘This Map of the Colony of New South Wales Exhibiting the Situation and Extent of The Appropriated Lands, including the Counties, Towns, Village Reserves, Etc, Compiled from Authentic Surveys etc is respectfully dedicated to Sir John Barrow Bart, President of the Royal Geographic Society Etc Etc Etc Etc, by His Obliged Humble Servant Robert Dixon. Engraved by J. & C. Walker. SR Map 4617.
²⁵ For the brickworks and their competition, see Warwick Gemmell. And So We Graft From Six To Six. The Brickmakers of New South Wales. Angus & Robertson, North Ryde. 1986: 82.
Historical maps indicate that the Great South Road entered Goulburn, either by a causeway on the site of the Fitzroy Bridge (1854) (between Grafton Street and Bridge Street, on the Old Hume Highway), or by the crossing near Lansdowne on Bungonia Road. The bridge abutments could therefore relate to the ‘Great Road from Sydney to the Murrumbidgee’ or Yass Plains as it by-passed the town, though in most cases this route is shown on maps dating to the 1830s, not 1840s onwards (Volume 1, Figure 7.3, 7.4, 7.7).

Another possibility is that the abutments relate to the road from Goulburn to Windellama (Windellama Road). This road is recorded in the 1832 Post Office Directory. It branched from the road from Inverary, Bungonia to Lake Bathurst at 128 miles from Sydney.26 It was described as:

‘128 [miles] Mrs. Birnie’s farm. On the right, a path leads across Goulburn plains, by Bulamalito, towards the township of Goulburn.’27

Hopefully by the 1840s it was more than a path! This incidentally is the earliest record, located by this study, for a route between Bungonia and Goulburn. It was hardly direct.

This unresolved issue has also led to further research on the road routes into Goulburn from Sydney. Historical documentation, parish maps and topographic maps, coupled with aerial photography now reveal that Riley’s Road crossed the route of the later Great South Road at Towrang. Riley’s Road is followed by Carrick Road and then by farm track to the south of Towrang. The track then turns west and can be followed on maps and aerial photographs to the south of Governors Hill, entering Goulburn via Lansdowne. The Great South Road was to first to cross Governors Hill and enter Goulburn from the north-east via the causeway to Grafton Street. The first road, Macquarie’s Road, entered Old Goulburn via the ford (near the abandoned railway

26 By modern roads the distance from Macquarie Place, Sydney to this junction is between 126 and 140 miles (203-224 kms). The time it takes now is 3 hours instead of over 12-14 days by bullock team in good conditions (10 miles a day). Pers. Comm. Roger Bayley, Goulburn and District Historical Society.
bridge) and then ran along the west bank of the Mulwaree Ponds before continuing as the Braidwood Road (Goulburn Suburbs Detail Plan Series 3.3).

Time limitations did not allow for the site survey of any remains of the Fitzroy Bridge (1854). Nonetheless the Great South Road or the Old Hume Highway exhibits ‘ribbon development’ along the highway as it enters Goulburn from the north, so the site of the bridge is included in the study area for Goulburn itself (see Volume 2, Chapter 6.2).

5.2 Convict Road Gangs and Stockades.

The convict stockades are indeed site complexes (Volume 3, Wingello Plan Series 1.1 and Towrang Plan Series 1.1).

Towrang (1833-1843) is the larger site. It comprises numerous elements, some of which are outside the current listings.

1. Stockade.
2. Military Quarters (sites of 6 buildings)
4. Stockyard.
5. Powder Magazine.
6. Site of garden or cultivated area.
7. Cemetery with grave markers (outside listed area).
8. Archaeological features and remains in creek bank and elsewhere.
9. Great South Road formation.
10. Sandstone Bridge (Towrang Bridge, keystone 1839, David Lennox ?).
11. Sandstone road culverts.
12. ‘Thyssen’s Folly, a bridge.
13. Various road formations at junction of Great South Road with Towrang Road and Carrick Road (Riley’s Road, 1822 – c.1839).
14. Site of building and fenced enclosure on south bank of Wollondilly River, west of Towrang Road (FB 497. F120).
15. Danganelly Homestead, 1859.
16. Site of Harrow Inn.

Wingello (1835-1843?), which is the lesser known of the two, comprises:

1. Stockade.
2. Huts.
4. Cemetery with grave markers.
5. Sentry Rock.
6. Flogging Tree.
7. Road formation, including cutting and stone embankment (Old Hume Highway).
8. Hotel site, with substantial remains. (White Horse Inn).
9. Several sites are marked by exotic plantings, including the ‘Flogging Tree’ at the Lock Up.

The remains at Wingello Stockade are not listed. Those at Towrang are listed as items 345, 346, 347 and 349 in the LEP 2009. A number of the sites at Towrang are outside the listed areas.

In both cases the sites should be listed as a group of archaeologically sensitive precincts with ample curtilages. The curtilage of these precincts should be determined through more detailed study (Volume 3, Towrang Plan Series 1.1 and Wingello Plan Series 1.1).

Substantial damage to both sites has been incurred by several factors:
1. Laying of telecommunication cables through both site.
2. Damage to grave markers, including vandalism.
3. Erosion of archaeological remains, especially at Towrang.
4. Exposed artifact scatters at Towrang. Where artifacts are exposed, loss of evidence may occur by their removal by visitors or even by unlawful excavation.

Recommendations regarding the rectification of short and long term issues are included in this report (see Chapter 14).

5.3 The Landscape of the Assigned Servant.

What is the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’? The pastoral settlements of the County of Argyle (in large part the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area),

28 The concept of the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’ was introduced in Volume 1, Chapter 5.1. The concept was expanded to include the site of Old Goulburn (Volume 1, Chapter 7.2), pastoral settlement, the Mounted Police, the gaols and justice system (Volume 1. Chapter 12.2). The total extent of the Landscape of the Assigned Servant in New South Wales was discussed in Volume 1, Chapter 12.
from the late 1810s until the 1840s, relied on convict labour for their workforce, with few exceptions. Convicts provided all types of labour and skills, from the lowly unskilled labourer to the highly skilled ‘mechanic’ (tradesman in today’s terms), the household servants and other staff.

Taking the regulations in force in 1832 as a guide, landholders had to apply for convicts on the prescribed form, to be delivered to the Board for the Assignment of Servants, at the Council Chambers, Macquarie Street, Sydney. If they were not resident in Sydney, they applied through the local Bench of Magistrates with applications addressed to the Assignment Board. If they were not resident in Sydney, they also had to employ agents to act on their behalf.

When the ships arrived with their human cargo, applications for each type of convict were processed as far as possible. Male convicts were to be collected from the Principal Superintendent of Convicts, Hyde Park Barracks, Macquarie Street, Sydney. Female convicts were collected from the Matron of the Female Factory, Parramatta. Female convicts were not permitted to be conveyed by stage coach or other form of public conveyance, unless accompanied by a ‘careful’ person.

When they reached their destination in the County of Argyle, their conduct was managed by the property holder, an overseer or manager. While most may have served their term quietly and usefully to their masters, and indeed been treated well, there was the whole range of humane and inhumane treatment, by both masters and servants, to contend with. Individual cases would form a lifetime’s study.

Any misconduct was reported to the local magistrates and their case heard when the magistrate did his rounds of the various properties. Alternatively, the convicts could be imprisoned in a gaol, before trial at the courthouse. The Mounted Police controlled the convict population and maintained the force of the law among the general population, both colonial and Aboriginal.

In two instances the bias of the current listings for the Penal System was noted. The Landscape of the Assigned Servant has been partly ignored in favour of more dramatic evidence of penal institutions (Volume 1, Chapter 5.1 and Chapter 12.2).

The administration of the assigned servants and the institutions or sites associated with the system may therefore be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Administration and Private Enterprise</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Buildings and Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bench of Magistrates.</td>
<td>Residence of Magistrate, or Courthouse, when built.</td>
<td>Homesteads of the landholder / magistrate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lock Up or Gaol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mounted Police Establishment in Old Goulburn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mounted Police Barracks, etc. See detailed description below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Landholders</td>
<td>The Farms and Stations of Pastoral Settlement</td>
<td>Farm complexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Places of confinement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Gaols on the farms of magistrates.

In the early days of settlement in the Goulburn area, the administration of the Law was based at and around the residences of the magistrates. Historical research and site survey have identified three sites where gaols or lock ups were located at or near the residences of magistrates. The most obvious example is Inverary Gaol, at Bungonia, which is actually located on the adjacent property of Reevesdale, because this was the route of the South or Argyle Road. Dr. Reid (1777-1840), the magistrate, lived at Inverary.30 The second example is at Rossiville, near Goulburn, because Francis Rossi (1776-1851) was also a magistrate.31 There is also another gaol at Lansdowne, the property of the Bradley family. Further research should be undertaken to verify the identification of these gaols on magistrate’s properties.

The recognition of gaols or lock ups on or adjacent to the farms of the magistrates is not widely known and should be further investigated. It adds another dimension to the

30 See the entry in the online version of the Australian Dictionary of Biography. http://www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A020329b.htm
31 See the entry in the online version of the Australian Dictionary of Biography. http://www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A020354b.htm
buildings and structures already associated with the farms and stations associated with pastoral settlement. (see Volume 2, Chapter 3.6.2, Pastoral Settlement).

5.5 The Mounted Police Barracks in Old Goulburn

The Mounted Police Barracks and Old Goulburn is described in a number of historical sources and plans.

‘...we reached the Goulburn Plains, then the scene of the Chief Police Station in the Southern district, and therefore a place to be religiously avoided by the escaped convicts and desperadoes of the time.

The situation of the locality, jointly recommended in 1828 by Mr. Lithgow…and Captain McAlister, as suitable for a central penal station, had early found favour with the Authorities, and in 1833, the late Mr. James Hoddle (the Pioneer Surveyor of Argyle) made a survey of the locality for the village reserve. The survey included a large area of what is now called the Old Township, and several blocks of the present City of Goulburn, and the first town lots in the new settlement were sold by Government order in 1833.

At the time of our arrival [1833] the existing landmarks had nothing of the urban beauty or grandeur about them. They were simply a small shingled gaol or lock up of four cells (built in 1830); a little rough-hewn courthouse, where the chief magistrates of the time – viz. Dr, Gibson (of Tirranna), Lachlan McAlister (of Strathaird) and later old Captain Rossi; Mr. Stewart (of Stewarts, now Grunsells gardens), and Mr. Allman, sat in stern judgment on the hapless culprits brought before them; and near by were the bark-roofed quarters of the officers and the humpies of the Mounted Police...

Within a stonethrow of the Courthouse, Mat Healy – the pioneer publican of Goulburn – ran his licensed shanty [on the site of Riversdale, the National Trust property],….Close by Mat Healey’s hotel, Messrs. Moses and Benjamin – Goulburn’s oldest firm of storekeepers – had just started a flourishing store…
A few hundred yards from the store stood a blacksmith’s shop, where the horses of the police were shod and medicined; while a good mile away from the original settlement one Jack Cole – a good type of the old enduring breed of sawyers – was building another public-house on the present site of Mandelson’s Hotel. But we must not forget Mat Healey’s famous stable – the first stone building ever erected in Goulburn, and which is yet standing…as one of the out-buildings on Mr. Twynam’s property [Riversdale]. This old stable should have a little of the odour of sanctity, or, at least, the “odour of baptism,” attached to it, as it was used several times as a christening “font” by some of the visiting clergy of the old days.

The half dozen buildings referred to formed the nucleus of Goulburn in 1833, and sheltered its two score [40] citizens.’32

This succinct description of Old Goulburn and the one hotel standing on the new site of Goulburn on the corner of Sloane and Clinton Streets is valuable for the list of buildings at Old Goulburn, but also the penal purpose of the establishment. In summary it included:

1. The Mounted Police Establishment - ‘Chief Police Station in the Southern district’.
2. Gaol - ‘a small shingled gaol or lock up of four cells (built in 1830).’
3. Courthouse - ‘a little rough-hewn courthouse.’
4. Officers and police quarters - ‘near by were the bark-roofed quarters of the officers and the humpies of the Mounted Police.’
5. Hotel to service the Mounted Police Establishment, travellers and townsfolk - ‘Mat Healy – the pioneer publican of Goulburn – ran his licensed shanty.’ (Riversdale, National Trust).
6. General Store – ‘Messrs. Moses and Benjamin – Goulburn’s oldest firm of storekeepers – had just started a flourishing store.’
7. Blacksmith’s shop or smithy – ‘blacksmith’s shop, where the horses of the police were shod and medicined.’

The description of the Mounted Police Establishment, which was located directly to the east of Riversdale, is embellished by historical maps and plans. The plan of May

1829 shows the layout of the old township, with its streets and allotments. It also shows the gaol, the veteran allotments and huts, as well as ‘Garie’s Paddock’ (later identified as the paddock for the Mounted Police horses).33

The plan of c. 1830 shows more details.34 By this time a number of allotments were granted to individuals. The Police Stables located on what is now identified as the ‘Proposed Site for Police Barracks’, a large reserve including the eastern side of the Old Township.

The Police Stables are located between Mat Healy’s allotments (Riversdale) and the gaol, while another building is shown between the stables and gaol. Further south, within the Police Reserve are the Officers Quarters in an enclosure with two buildings identified as stables. The Barracks are located directly to the east, with a Lock Up, a larger Stables building, and between this group a little black rectangular building, labelled ‘Black Hole’. This is a reference to the Black Hole of Calcutta, a notorious incident, which took place on 19 June 1756. What infernal punishment may have been meted out in what appears to be a solitary cell!

The level of mortality is all too plain to see. To the south of the Police Paddock, the ‘Church of England Burial Ground’ is marked out with another enclosure on its east side, marked ‘graves, addition to’, as if there were not enough space already. The fence around the burial ground differs from the allotment shape, but this site survives today as the Saint Saviours Cemetery, Cemetery Street, Goulburn (LEP 2009. Item 111). At the southern extremity of the Mounted Police Reserve, H.M. Prison at Goulburn (LEP 2009. Item 239) now takes its place, a remarkable continuity of use, while the former Mounted Police Establishment is used as a yard attached to the north side of the prison, with large steel framed sheds and numerous demountable classrooms for future educational use elsewhere, as and when required.

The Mounted Police Establishment speaks of a very dark and harsh past. It is located directly to the east of Riversdale and directly to the north of the present Prison. If this is not an opportunity for history, education, cultural tourism as well as a realistic and accurate understanding of the convict past, then we must all be blind! What an

33 Township of Goulburn Plains, May 1829. SRMap 2781. Note that the gaol, although built in 1830 (see Charles MacAlister’s description above), is shown on a plan originally surveyed in 1829.
34 Plan of the Township of Goulburn Plains, c.1830. SRMap 2780.
addition that would make to the world heritage nomination for Australian Convict Sites. In Goulburn indeed, just 2 hours from Sydney!

Charles MacAlister marked the passing of convict transportation with the words:

‘The old township had by this time (1840-1845) lost its grip of the situation; The Head Quarters of the Penal Police had been removed…’

The government invested in public works in Goulburn from the earliest date. A second Gaol and Lockup was built on Auburn Street (on the site of the present Courthouse) in 1836. A commencement on building the existing Gaol was made in 1838. Badly constructed and with limited facilities when completed in 1848, the Gaol underwent extensive repair and improvements during the following years.

These buildings in Goulburn itself replaced those in Old Goulburn, though the Mounted Police Barracks remained for many years and can be seen on plans dating to the late 1850s and perhaps later (Figure 7.12).

The important issue to remember is that the former Gaol and Courthouse on Sloane Street, the existing gaol in Old Goulburn were commenced during the period of Convict Transportation and are therefore directly associated with the Penal System.

5.6 Places of confinement on farms and pastoral stations.

There are numerous oral historical traditions of places of confinement for convicts at farms or pastoral stations. These are not the same as the gaols at Inverary / Reevesdale at Bungonia, or at Lansdowne or Rossiville, near Goulburn. They are rooms or spaces within buildings surviving from the penal period. The bars on the window are a common feature of rooms for which there is oral evidence of


confinement. However one would normally expect to see bars on windows in cellars or in storerooms attached to coach houses or stables. While it may not have been easy to escape from a cellar with a substantial floor above, it would have been easier to break through the rafters, battens and shingles of a storeroom. The gaols on the properties of magistrates have high walls, narrow doors and few if any windows (Inverary Gaol).

Nonetheless it is to be expected that landholders had to have places of temporary confinement for convicts, who misbehaved or broke the law, before they could be transferred to the Mounted Police Establishment at Goulburn or one of the other abovementioned gaols.

The oral historical traditions of places of confinement for convicts at farms or pastoral stations should be fully investigated. This detailed research could not be undertaken with the resources available to this study. It would be useful to find out what was the accepted pattern of confining or dealing with convicts on properties, when they misbehaved or broke the law. These places of confinement are listed in the inventory of site survey for Pastoral Settlement (see Volume 2, Chapter 3.6.2. Also Volume 3, Appendix 2) (Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.5).
5.7 Figures

Photographs are provided for the following sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory / Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Convict Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Towrang Stockade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Wingello Stockade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>The Head Quarters of the Mounted Police, Old Goulburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Places of Confinement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Photograph Folder, Volume 2
6 TOWNS AND VILLAGES.

6.1 Introduction.

The background to towns and villages in the Goulburn Mulwaree area is outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 7.

In Volume 1, Chapter 13, it was recommended that, ‘the archaeological resources of the major town and villages of the local government area (Old Goulburn, Goulburn, Bungonia and Marulan) should be assessed to an extent sufficient to provide protection to the archaeological resource and enable the conservation and management of these sites.’

A little more background is needed. Previously most archaeological management plans have been completed for towns and cities. They are, in order of date of commission, Parramatta, Millers Point, The Rocks and Millers Point, Sydney CBD, Port Macquarie, Richmond, Liverpool, Newcastle and Parramatta PHALMS (see Volume 1, Chapter 2). In most cases these studies were on a town allotment basis, with each one being assessed. If we change the situation to an archaeological management plan for 3,232 square kilometres of a local government area, it is clearly not possible to study any of the towns and villages in the Goulburn Mulwaree Council Area on a lot by lot basis. Instead a different approach has been adopted.

We will use another predictive model. As with pastoral settlement, we can predict where the archaeological sites will be located by research of historical documentation, together with maps and plans. Much of this background material has been included in Volume 1, Chapter 7.

We will use this documentation to draw a line around the major urban and village sites, in order to draw attention to the likelihood of locating ‘significant relics’ within these areas, when undertaking works either requiring planning consent or otherwise causing ground disturbance. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 2, archaeological sites may also include standing buildings and should not just be confined to below ground remains and ruins. A good example is Goulburn Brewery, where archaeological investigation has included an understanding of the standing building (Volume 1, Chapter 2, Figures 2.1 and 2.2).
To reinforce this point, all the city, town and village sites in this study not only comprise ‘significant relics’, but also other forms of heritage items. As with the other themes studied in this report, each property or site may contain:

2. Works.
3. Relics.
4. Moveable objects.
5. Precincts.

This basic categorisation of environmental heritage also includes ruins, structures, archaeological sites (where relics will be located) and the like.

Where individual sites are located within the boundaries of the archaeological precincts or conservation areas proposed in this archaeological management plan, they are not provided with individual listings. For example, Riversdale, a highly significant site in Old Goulburn is not separately listed in this report, because it is within a proposed archaeological conservation area.

Likewise Goulburn Brewery is not listed in this study, because it is already a heritage item (LEP 2009, Item 109). It is also an industrial site that is outside the themes considered in Volume 2 of this archaeological management plan.

In order to conserve and manage the archaeological significance of sites already listed in the Goulburn Mulwaree LEP 2009, all sites predating 1860 (the cut-off date for this study) should be considered to possess archaeological significance (scientific significance) until assessed in detail. All industrial archaeological sites should be considered to possess archaeological significance, irrespective of date range. (See Volume 1, Chapters 12 and 13 for other archaeological sites not included in this above discussion).

We will now discuss the towns and villages, which were well established before 1860, the (artificial) cut-off date for this study. They comprise Goulburn, Bungonia and Marulan. During site survey it also became apparent that some of the other villages in the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area may have commenced before 1860. These will be discussed in turn.
6.2 Goulburn.

The foundation of Goulburn took place in 1828, when a decision was made for the Head Quarters of the Mounted Police at what is now called Old Goulburn. This suburb of modern Goulburn has already been described in Volume 2, Chapter 5, The Penal System.

The development of the town from 1828 onwards has been discussed in detail in Volume 1, Chapter 7. This documentation has been summarised in graphic format in plans prepared for this study. The plan series is listed below (see Volume 3, Appendix 1 for plans):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goulburn Plan Series 1-3.</th>
<th>1. Old Goulburn</th>
<th>1.1 Basemap.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains (SR Map 2781).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains (SR Map 2781) – Tracing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains c.1830 (SR Map 2780)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains c.1830 (SR Map 2780) – Tracing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goulburn.</td>
<td>2.1 Basemap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Plan of the Town of Goulburn, c.1833 (SR Map 2790).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Plan of the Town of Goulburn, c.1833 (SR Map 2790) – tracing in black outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Plan of Goulburn reserve and Village Allotments, 5 December 1836 (SR Map 2803) – selective tracing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Plan of Goulburn, including the Old Township, 1859 (SR Map 3483).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 Archaeological and other heritage sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goulburn Suburbs</td>
<td>3.1 Basemap, showing Municipal Boundary, 1859.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Stages of Town development, 1840s-1850s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Main Roads shown on plans from 1820s-1850s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4. Archaeological and other heritage sites.

These plans reveal:
1. The sequence of development in Old Goulburn from 1828 to the 1830s (Goulburn Series 1).
2. The sequence of development in Goulburn, Old Goulburn and suburbs from the 1830s to 1860s (Goulburn Series 2 and 3).
3. The key maps for understanding the stages of development of Goulburn from a Mounted Police Establishment in 1828 to a fully fledged municipality in 1859, and ‘the first inland city’ in 1863 (Goulburn Series 1.1-1.5 and Goulburn Series 3.2).

The key to understanding the distribution of archaeological sites, both above and below ground, is the plan series of the stages of the development of the town. The development of Old Goulburn is shown in Goulburn Series 1.1-1.5. The plan that summarises the later development is Goulburn Series 3.2.

The development of Old Goulburn was confined to the area to the north of Wilmot Street, bounded on the other sides by the Wollondilly and the Mulwaree Ponds. The south boundary of the Mounted Police Barracks and the early cemetery are on the south side of Murac Street, which otherwise formed the southern limit of the township of Old Goulburn (Goulburn Series 1.1-1.5).

Town allotments in Goulburn itself were sold off from 1833 onwards. The town developed in a series of stages.
1. The new location for the Township comprised the area of the current city centre, bounded by Sloane, Clinton, Cowper and Bradley Streets, with one additional block, bounded by Sloane, a south-easterly extension of Goldsmith Street, Alfred Street, on the south side of the railway and Bradley Streets. But, even in the 1830s there was outlying development (Goulburn Series 2.2 and 2.3).
2. The later development of the town up to 1860 is shown in Goulburn Series 3.2. It comprises:
3. Extent of Town Allotments to 1859.
4. Suburban Development by the 1840s
5. Suburban Development by the 1850s.
6. Reserves for Town Extension in 1859, and
Where is the archaeology going to be located? It will be located in all areas developed up to 1860 (the cut-off date for this study). In terms of the new relics provisions of the Heritage Act, the archaeology will be more broadly located where relics of significance at a local or state level are distributed. The full distribution of ‘relics’ within the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area is outside the scope of this study, as the cut-off date is 1860.

To return to the question in hand, the archaeology of Goulburn itself will be located in areas developed by 1860. Historical documentation and site survey reveal that the following areas will contain ‘relics’ (Goulburn Series 3.2):

1. Extent of Town Allotments to 1859.
2. Suburban Development by the 1840s
3. Suburban Development by the 1850s.

Although more extensive evidence may reveal otherwise, research available to this study suggests that one area will not contain many ‘relics’:

5. Reserves for Town Extension in 1859 (Goulburn Series 3.2).

These areas were freely used by the town population for a number of purposes, but there is no evidence available to date to suggest there was any development on this land prior to 1859.

‘Relics’ are likely to be spread throughout the ‘Extent of Town Development to 1859’ (Goulburn Series 3.2). For the other towns and cities where archaeological management plans have been prepared, there has always been a sequence of historical maps and plans, which showed the location of buildings on each town allotment. This is not the case for Goulburn. For the period up to 1860, we have to rely on the scanty evidence for buildings on the important maps, but the most important evidence is Jevon’s Social Map of Goulburn, dated to 1859, which shows the range of buildings, but only on a sketch plan (Volume 1, Figure 7.13). As far as possible, the buildings on Jevon’s sketch plan have been located within each block boundary in Goulburn, but could not be specifically located on individual town allotments without detailed

---

38 Note – The copy of Social Map held by the Local Studies Section, Goulburn Library is a composite of Jevons Plan of 1859 and Lansdowne’s Survey of the 1860s. The original map should be consulted in the State Library. William Stanley Jevons. Remarks upon the Social Map of Sydney, 1858’, bound with 3 maps, 1854-1859. State Library of NSW. B 864.
research. This evidence, together with the extent of blocks, already divided into allotments by 1859 was used to define the boundary of the archaeological conservation area in Goulburn (Goulburn Plan Series 2.5 and 2.6 and Goulburn Plan Series 3.3 and 3.4).

‘Relics’ in other areas may be distributed in only a number of locations. The scope of this study has not allowed for more precise location details to be defined in ‘Suburban Development by the 1840s’ and ‘Suburban Development by the 1850s’, though several sites are already known in the areas of suburban development through (Goulburn Plan Series 3.2):

1. Current listings for sites, dating up to the 1860s.
2. Current listings for industrial sites of any date.
4. Sites located through research and site survey for this study (Goulburn Series 2.2 to 2.6 and Goulburn Series 3.3 and 3.4).

The Garroorigang subdivision plan is highly significant in locating pre 1859 development on this land to the south of the historical town. We can clearly see what was there before 1859, and later subdivision plans reveal those developments that post-dated subdivision.39 There is less evidence for the area of the Brisbane Grove or other Subdivisions.

Underlying the suburban areas shown in Goulburn Plan Series 3.4 is the extent of pastoral settlement shown on Baker’s Atlas of 1843-1846 (LGA Plan Series 1.2). This is a final safeguard for archaeological sites, where insufficient research was allowed by the scope of this study. These areas should be researched to define areas of ‘relics’ before development.

The above discussion can be summarised in another format, namely the categories of archaeological sites already recognised for Pastoral Settlement (Volume 2, Chapter 3). The table is repeated below:

---

### Categories of Archaeological Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Categories of Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Further details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sites inspected for this study or previously by others (existing listings, site survey by others, etc). The physical existence of these sites has been proven beyond doubt.</td>
<td>1. Sites already listed in one or more heritage listing databases. 2. Sites not already listed, but inspected as part of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others: for which there is historical documentation (available within the budget of this study).</td>
<td>3. Sites where historical documentation has been gathered as part of this study (note that minimum research was possible within the scope and budget of this study). 4. Sites identified for inspection during site survey, but not actually inspected within the time frame available to this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others: for which the predictive model (of Town Development) suggests presence of sites and ‘relics’</td>
<td>5. Other sites within the area of pastoral settlement shown on the County Maps in Baker’s Atlas, 6. Areas within the Town and Village precincts known to be developed, but not researched or identified within the scope of this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendations for each category of archaeological site are included in Volume 2, Chapter 14.8 following).

### 6.3 Bungonia and Marulan.

The same processes of investigation have been carried out for Bungonia and Marulan.

---

40 These sites may have been inspected by others, but have not resulted in listings in a searchable database available to this study.
In these cases a line has been drawn around the town or village development areas. These are defined by historical maps and plans in both cases. For Bungonia the energy of the Bungonia and District Historical Society has enabled a greater number of sites to be recognised.

The plan series is simple (see Volume 3, Appendix 1):

| Bungonia Detail Plan Series 1.1 |
| Marulan Detail Plan Series 1.1 |

The categories of archaeological site are the same as for Goulburn (see Volume 2, Chapter 6.2).

The recommendations for each category of archaeological site are included in Volume 2, Chapter 14.8 following).

6.4 Smaller Settlements.
This archaeological management plan has recognised that there were other places in the Goulburn Mulwaree Council area (the County of Argyle) that had become small settlements by the cut-off date of 1860 (see Volume 1, Chapter 7.6). Some became fully-fledged villages after 1860. They have been difficult to identify, because of the scanty sources available to this study for these early dates. They include:

1. The Tarlo Gap.
2. Lake Bathurst, previously the Private Village of Tarago (Bongaralaby).
3. Tarago, previously Sherwin’s Flat.
4. The Village Reserve at Tarlo.
5. Windellama.
6. Timberlight.

To locate each of these smaller settlements, go to Volume 3, Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.1. They have been identified as Archaeological Site Category 2a.

In most cases they either relate to pastoral settlement or an avoidance of it (see Chapter 3.10). Two of the settlements were associated with gold mining in the 1850s and later (Windellama and Timberlight).
6.5 Figures

Photographs are provided for the following sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory / Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Bungonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Marulan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Photograph Folder, Volume 2
7 INDUSTRIAL SITES.

The discussion in Volume 1, Chapters 12 and 13, resulted in a recommendation to utilize the available funding to investigate specific themes.

The background to Industrial Sites in the Goulburn Mulwaree area is outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 8.

The theme of Industrial Sites was excluded from further study within the budget of the Archaeological Management Plan.

Industrial Sites are only considered in relation to the major themes studied in Volume 2.

The theme of Industrial Sites should be the subject of a supplementary Archaeological Management Plan.
8 MINERAL EXTRACTION.

The discussion in Volume 1, Chapters 12 and 13, resulted in a recommendation to utilize the available funding to investigate specific themes.

The background to Mineral Extraction in the Goulburn Mulwaree area is outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 9.

The theme of Mineral Extraction was excluded from further study within the budget of the Archaeological Management Plan.

Mineral Extraction is only considered in relation to the major themes studied in Volume 2.

The theme of Mineral Extraction should be the subject of a supplementary Archaeological Management Plan.
9 CEMETERIES.

The discussion in Volume 1, Chapters 12 and 13, resulted in a recommendation to utilize the available funding to investigate specific themes.

The background to Cemeteries in the Goulburn Mulwaree area is outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 10.

The theme of Cemeteries was excluded from further study within the budget of the Archaeological Management Plan.

Cemeteries are only considered in relation to the major themes studied in Volume 2.

The theme of Cemeteries should be the subject of a supplementary Archaeological Management Plan.
10 HOUSING.

The discussion in Volume 1, Chapters 12 and 13, resulted in a recommendation to utilize the available funding to investigate specific themes.

The background to Housing in the Goulburn Mulwaree area is outlined in Volume 1, Chapter 11.

The theme of Housing was excluded from further study within the budget of the Archaeological Management Plan.

Housing is only considered in relation to the major themes studied in Volume 2.

The theme of Housing should be the subject of a supplementary Archaeological Management Plan.
11 POST 1860S ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES.

The cut-off date of 1860 has resulted in the exclusion of a number of archaeological sites and themes, particularly the consideration of later mining settlement, railway construction camps, later industrial sites as a whole and the archaeological sites associated with closer settlement from the mid 1850s onwards. The full time span of archaeological significance should be considered in any future study, particularly taking note of the remarks made in Volume 1, Chapter 2.3. ‘What is an archaeological site?’.

‘Relics’, as defined by the revised Heritage Act will be distributed in locations in addition to those already identified in this archaeological Management Plan. This is because the budget for this study has resulted in the available resources being concentrated on three main themes, to the exclusion of others (see Volume 1, Chapters 12 and 13). The cut-off date of 1860 has also excluded other ‘relics’.

The theme of Post 1860s Archaeological Sites should be the subject of a supplementary Archaeological Management Plan.
12 CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE.

12.1 Current assessment criteria.

In this chapter the cultural significance of the subject site is assessed according to standard criteria.

The State Heritage Register and the State Heritage Inventory were established under Part 3A of the Heritage Act (as amended in 1998) for listing of items of environmental heritage.\(^{41}\) The State Heritage Register list items, which are of state heritage significance, while the State Heritage Inventory includes items of local heritage significance.\(^ {42}\) A number of items listed on the State Heritage Inventory are also of state heritage significance.

To be assessed for listing on the State Heritage Register (state significance) or State Heritage Inventory (local or regional significance) an item will, in the opinion of the Heritage Council of NSW, meet one or more of the following criteria.\(^ {43}\)

Criterion a. An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history or
An item is important in the course, or pattern, of the local area’s cultural or natural history;

\(^{41}\) \textit{environmental heritage} means those places, buildings, works, relics, moveable objects, and precincts, of state or local heritage significance (section 4, \textit{Heritage Act, 1977}).

\(^{42}\) \textit{state heritage significance}, in relation to a place, building, work, relic, moveable object or precinct, means significance to the State in relation to the historical, scientific cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic value of the item (section 4A(1), \textit{Heritage Act, 1977}).

\(^{43}\) Guidelines for the application of these criteria have now been prepared by the NSW Heritage Office. See inclusion and exclusion guidelines in: NSW Heritage Office. 2000. Assessing Heritage Significance. A NSW Heritage Manual Update. See also: Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. Heritage Assessments. pp. 4-7.
### Criteria for Inclusion and Exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Guidelines for Inclusion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Guidelines for Exclusion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shows evidence of a significant human activity.</td>
<td>has incidental or unsubstantiated connections with historically important activities or processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is associated with a significant activity or historical phase.</td>
<td>provides evidence of activities or processes that are of dubious historical importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintains or shows the continuity of a historical process or activity.</td>
<td>has been so altered that it can no longer provide evidence of a particular association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion b.** An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history, or an item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in the cultural or natural history of the local area;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Guidelines for Inclusion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Guidelines for Exclusion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shows evidence of significant human occupation.</td>
<td>has incidental or unsubstantiated connections with historically important people or events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is associated with a significant event, person or group of persons.</td>
<td>provides evidence of people or events that are of dubious historical importance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion c.** An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW, or an item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in the local area;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Guidelines for Inclusion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Guidelines for Exclusion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shows or is associated with creative or technical innovation or achievement.</td>
<td>is not a major work by an important designer or artist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is the inspiration for a creative or technical innovation or achievement.</td>
<td>has lost its design or technical integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is aesthetically distinctive.</td>
<td>its positive visual or sensory appeal or landmark and scenic qualities have been more than temporarily degraded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has landmark qualities.</td>
<td>has only a loose association with a creative or technical achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exemplifies a particular taste, style or technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion d.** An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons, or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Guidelines for Inclusion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Guidelines for Exclusion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in the local area for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines for Inclusion</th>
<th>Guidelines for Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• is important for its associations with an identifiable group.</td>
<td>• is only important to the community for amenity reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is important to a community’s sense of place.</td>
<td>• is retained only in preference to a proposed alternative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion e. An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history, or:
An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of the local area’s cultural or natural history;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines for Inclusion</th>
<th>Guidelines for Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• has the potential to yield new or further substantial scientific and/or archaeological information.</td>
<td>• only contains information that is readily available from other resources or archaeological sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is an important benchmark or reference of its type.</td>
<td>• the knowledge gained would be irrelevant to research on science, human history or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provides evidence of past human cultures that is unavailable elsewhere.</td>
<td>• has little archaeological or research potential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion f. An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history, or:
An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of the local area’s cultural or natural history;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines for Inclusion</th>
<th>Guidelines for Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• provides evidence of a defunct custom, way of life or process.</td>
<td>• is not rare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrates a process, custom or other human activity that is in danger of being lost.</td>
<td>• is numerous but under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shows unusually accurate evidence of a significant human activity.</td>
<td>• is the only example of its type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is the only example of its type.</td>
<td>• demonstrates designs or techniques of exceptional interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shows rare evidence of a significant human activity important to a community.</td>
<td>• shows rare evidence of a significant human activity important to a community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion g. An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s cultural or natural places; or cultural or natural environments, or
An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of the local area’s cultural or natural places; or cultural or natural environments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines for Inclusion</th>
<th>Guidelines for Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• is a fine example of its type.</td>
<td>• is a poor example of its type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• has the principal characteristics of an important class or group of items.</td>
<td>• does not include or has lost the range of characteristics of a type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• has attributes typical of a particular way of life, philosophy, custom, significant process, design, technique or activity.</td>
<td>• does not represent well the characteristics that make up a significant variation of a type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is a significant variation to a class of items.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is a part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is outstanding because of its integrity or the esteem in which it is held.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An item is not to be excluded from the Register or Inventory on the ground that items with similar characteristics have already been listed on the Register or Inventory.

The NSW Heritage Manual provides for three levels of significance, namely local, regional and state. While the new criteria have abandoned the use of the term “regional”, nonetheless the use of the term is still considered beneficial to differentiate between items of local and regional significance, even though both categories are only appropriate for listing on the State Heritage Inventory or Local Environment Plan (LEP).

In criteria a to g, where an item is deemed to be of local significance, the words “local area” should be substituted for “NSW”.
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12.2 Previous assessment criteria, 1996.

In 1996 the assessment criteria were standardised by the Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning in the *NSW Heritage Manual*.\(^{44}\) These previous assessment criteria are summarised below for reference purposes. Some practitioners may still prefer to use the three criteria relating to level of significance, namely local, regional and state, although there is only provision to use the levels local and state under the current guidelines.

Where there is an equivalence between the current and previous guidelines, a letter (a-g) referring to the current criteria is placed against the previous definition.

**Nature of significance.**

**Historical significance (evolution and association) (criteria a and b).** An item having this value is significant because of the importance of its association with, or position in the evolving pattern of our cultural history.

**Aesthetic significance (scenic / architectural qualities / creative accomplishment) (criterion c).** An item having this value is significant because it demonstrates positive visual or sensory appeal, landmark qualities and/or creative or technical excellence.

**Technical / research significance (archaeological, industrial, educational, research potential and aesthetic significance values) (criterion e).** Items having this value are significant because of their contribution or positive contribution to an understanding of our cultural history or environment.

**Social significance (contemporary community esteem) (criterion d).** Items having this value are significant through their social, spiritual or cultural association with a recognisable community.

\(^{44}\) Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. *NSW Heritage Manual.*
Degree of significance.

**Representativeness (criterion g).** Items having this value are significant because they are fine representative examples of an important class of significant items or environments.

**Rarity (criterion f).** An item having this value is significant because it represents a rare, endangered or unusual aspect of our history or cultural environment.

**Level of significance.**

**Local.** Comprises items significant in a local historical or geographical context or to an identifiable contemporary local community.

**Regional.** Comprises items significant in a regional historical or geographical context or to an identifiable contemporary regional community.

**State.** Comprises items significant in a state-wide historical or geographical context or to an identifiable contemporary state-wide community.45

12.3 Grading of significance.

The NSW Heritage Manual describes the methodology for grading of significance for items within a place. This has been further described in “Assessing Heritage Significance”, published by the NSW Heritage Office in 2000.46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Rare or outstanding item of local or state significance.</td>
<td>Fulfils criteria for local or state listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High degree of intactness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item can be interpreted relatively easily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 The above assessment criteria were extracted verbatim from Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. Heritage Assessments. pp. 4-7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High degree of original fabric. Demonstrates key element of the item’s significance. Alterations do not detract from significance.</td>
<td>Fulfils criteria for local or state listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Altered or modified elements. Elements with little heritage value, but which contribute to the overall significance of the item.</td>
<td>Fulfils criteria for local or state listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Alterations detract from significance. Difficult to interpret.</td>
<td>Does not fulfil criteria for local or state listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive</td>
<td>Damaging to the item’s heritage significance</td>
<td>Does not fulfil criteria for local or state listing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12.4 Technical / research significance and archaeological significance.

The term ‘archaeological significance’ may be defined as the extent to which a site may contribute knowledge, not available from other sources, to current themes in historical archaeology and related disciplines. Archaeological significance is included in Criterion E of the current criteria for assessment.

In the assessment of archaeological significance, several factors or criteria have to be taken into account. Questions include:

- Does the site contribute knowledge not available from other sources? In this respect, the preservation of the site, the availability of comparative sites, and the extent of historical documentation should be considered.
- Does this knowledge contribute meaningfully to current research themes in historical archaeology and related disciplines? The level of this

---

47 This definition is based upon the following references: A. Bickford, & S. Sullivan, 'Assessing the research significance of historic sites', in S. Sullivan, & S. Bowdler, Site survey and significance assessment in Australian archaeology. Dept. of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, ANU, Canberra, 1984, pp. 19-26.; S. Sullivan, & S. Bowdler, Site survey and significance assessment in Australian archaeology, Dept. of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, ANU, Canberra, 1984, passim.
contribution may be assessed on the same basis as other aspects of cultural significance, for example, locality, region or state.

It is clear that the determination of archaeological significance is closely related and, in fact, dependent upon the development of current research themes in historical archaeology. Research themes will be discussed in this study, thereby giving the historical archaeologist a framework or starting point from which future research and site assessment may proceed.

12.5 The heritage significance of the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area.

The statement of significance for the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area is prepared in accordance with the current assessment guidelines. It focuses on the primary themes selected for site survey in Volume 1, Chapters 12 and 13 and Volume 2, Chapter 1.

These themes are:
1. Pastoral Settlement – sites dating from the 1820s to 1840s.
2. Transport and Communications – sites associated with convict road gangs and stockades.
3. Towns and Villages – sites associated with the administration of the Penal System, namely Old Goulburn and Bungonia (as well as Marulan).

A new theme was introduced in Volume 2, Chapters 4 and 5, namely the Penal System. This theme includes:
1. Roads, bridges and river crossings.
2. Convict Road Gangs and Stockades.
3. The Landscape of the Assigned Servant.

Two of these themes were previously considered under the heading of Transport and Communications, while the Landscape of the Assigned Servant recognises the importance of the Penal System in providing farm labour, trades and services for Pastoral Settlement during the period of Convict Transportation up to 1841 in New South Wales (see Volume 2, Chapter 5 for a more complete description).

The themes can therefore be regrouped as follows:
1. Pastoral Settlement – ‘The Landscape of the Assigned Servant’ in the County of Argyle, first opened to settlement by Governor Macquarie.

2. Penal System – Roads (including Macquarie’s Road and Mitchell’s Great South Road), bridges and river crossings.

3. Penal System – Convict Stockades at Towrang and Wingello.


5. Towns and Villages, many with institutions associated with the Penal System.

Criterion a. An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history

The sites associated with the great pastoral expansion of the 1820s to 1840s in New South Wales should be placed in the context of the Penal System. This includes not only the body of sites that form the farms themselves, but also those places associated with the government administration of the assignment system, namely the courthouses, lockups, the Mounted Police and other military establishments. This may generally be termed the Landscape of the Assigned Servant.

Some have already voiced concerns that in the rush to list the convict past on the World Heritage registers, so aspects of the convict system have been left behind because of their seemingly mundane nature.48 We can now see that the Landscape of the Assigned Convict forms an important part of the overall system.

How far and wide did this Landscape of the Assigned Servant spread in New South Wales? The geographical location of this landscape is defined by the County of Cumberland, the Illawarra, the South Western Districts, the Bathurst Region and the Hunter Valley (Volume 1, Figures 11.1 and 11.2).49 Within the South Western Districts, the most prominent areas of settlement were Bungonia, the Goulburn Plains, the Limestone Plains and the Yass Plains. The County of Argyle was the hub of this great period of pastoral expansion, and Goulburn became the most prominent gateway to the South, and a significant place of administration of the convict population of the Goulburn Plains.


Other sites associated with the Penal System are the convict built roads, bridges and culverts, the lockups and stockades.

Individual sites are all assessed as possessing State significance, while others already possess National heritage listings (see Volume 1, Table 12.1 and Table 12.2). Collectively the body of sites that form the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’ will possess National heritage significance and some would be worthy of adding to the World Heritage Listing.

In addition, those sites associated with the Penal System, namely the Great South Road, the Stockades at Towrang and Wingello, the Headquarters of the Mounted Police at Old Goulburn, the various courthouses and gaols, the places of confinement of the pastoral stations, will together possess National heritage significance and some would be worthy of adding to the World Heritage Listing.

Sites associated with the later evolution of the pastoral estates may be of State of Local archaeological significance.

Inns and Hotels were constructed along the main transport routes and also in the newly emerging town and village centres. While Inns and Hotels was not a priority theme for the Archaeological Management Plan, a number has been recorded in relation to the Penal System, the Great South Road, the early years of Goulburn and on the pastoral stations. The majority of hotels should be considered as possessing a Local level of significance, unless they are directly associated with the period of convict transportation, when they may be considered to possess State significance. Thus, for example, Mat Healy’s hotel, that served the Mounted Police in Old Goulburn, should be considered as a site of State significance (Riversdale, NT). So too the sites of any hotels that served the convict stockades at Towrang or Wingello (for example, the ‘Harrow’), or hotels along the Great South Road.

The early township of Old Goulburn grew up around the Headquarters of the Mounted Police from 1829 onwards. A new site was chosen for Goulburn in 1832. It grew up in the shadow of the Penal System, but was nourished by the business of the surrounding farms and the travelling public. The Bungonia area was the first to be settled in Argyle and possessed its own facilities for Penal Administration, but it was soon overtaken by Goulburn. Marulan grew up at the junction of the Great South Road in the 1830s, where the routes to Bungonia and Goulburn parted.
Many of the archaeological sites within Goulburn, Bungonia and Marulan should be considered to possess Local significance, unless they are associated with the other themes of this study, like the Penal System or are prominent or rare survivals, like Goulburn Brewery. Other industrial sites are recognised on the pastoral stations, including the very rare survival of a horse driven mill at Springfield.

(From to funding constraints, the themes of Industrial sites, Mining, Cemeteries and Housing were not given priority in this Archaeological Management Plan).

*Criterion b. An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history*

Many of the sites in this study have close associations with prominent individuals and groups within the Colony of New South Wales. The magistrates, the road engineers, the surveyors, the pastoral settlers are many of them familiar names. Many have their biographies in the Australian Dictionary of Biography (ADB) or have books written on their achievements. A biography in the ADB should automatically confer a National or State level of significance on that person (if that is possible) and will add to the National or State significance of any site with which they are closely associated. Many of these individuals made a contribution at a National or State level, while others lived their lives within the local community.

Nonetheless there is a distinct division between the haves and the have-nots in the Colonial society of the Goulburn Plains. The way the convicts were exploited as a cheap form of labour, often sent into the wilderness as shepherds and stockholders, has been highlighted in the different settlement pattern of the south east of the County of Argyle, nearer the Shoalhaven Gorges. Those of the free, who were also dispossessed by the wealthy in the divided society of the time, also found refuge in what has been termed the ‘Landscape of the Dispossessed’. Surprisingly this included Charles MacAlister, the author of *Pioneering Days in the Sunny South*, who found little refuge from authority at The Tarlo Gap.

*Criterion c. An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW,*

The convict built roads, even the humble zigzags of Macquarie’s Road or the greater engineering works of Thomas Mitchell or even David Lennox on the Great South Road spring to mind as great engineering works of their day, ones that have endured over many years.
Goulburn Brewery stands out for its intact condition, demonstrating the traditional technologies of brewing and flour milling. But on the pastoral properties are some of the greatest examples of traditional technology and building styles. Perhaps two examples will suffice. The 1820s slab house at Inverary, predating the lovely colonial Georgian house, still stands as a ruin, but in a sound condition. It has awaited discovery for a long time. The other enduring example of traditional technology is at Springfield, the horse driven mill still ready to grind flour, if only the labour force would return after 170 years. Springfield as a whole is a farm complex that demonstrates so clearly how the best and biggest of the farming and pastoral estates grew from the 1820s onwards, until mechanisation drove the large labour force away. Lockyersleigh is another example of the traditional technology of farming and pastoralism.

Other sites possess landmark qualities. Kippilaw stands out for its beautiful garden setting in the Pastoral Landscape of the Wollondilly, though many of the farms along the Wollondilly and Mulwaree Ponds are a part of this Pastoral Landscape. The string of farms from Marulan to Bungonia and south also sit in a distinct Pastoral Landscape. Lockyersleigh, viewed from the Carrick Road, coming south from Brayton, is one of the most breath-taking Pastoral Landscapes and settings in the whole council area.

Criterion d. An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons,

People have lived in Goulburn and its surrounds for many generations. Some claim to be the seventh generation still working the farms their forefather’s were granted by Governors Macquarie and Brisbane. This community, both rural and urban, has remained intact for many generations by intermarriage and the inheritance of farms and properties, far and wide. They value their history, the farms and the buildings, the landscapes, but above all the communities they live in. They are the ones that have predominantly held in their hands the future of this valuable heritage – and may they long continue to do so.

Criterion e. An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history,

The great wealth of archaeological and other heritage sites is difficult to encompass in a few words. The analysis of the pastoral stations carried out for this study merely skims the surface of the wealth of information that is contained therein. The study of the road system, as it evolved from the very first Cedar Track up from the Illawarra
Coast, right the way through to the Great South Road is a broad area of research. Only through detailed study do we realise that the early roads went from farm to farm and pub to pub or stage to stage on a coach route. Some of the farms preserve traces of these road and stage coach routes, while other large farms have the relict road system as farm tracks still readily discernable. The cities, towns and villages of the council area reveal how the urban communities have grown, why they came into existence, whom they served and the facilities they offered. This theme is a study in itself in human geography, history and archaeology.

Criterion f. An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history.

What is uncommon about the archaeology and heritage of the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area? The wealth of sites associated with the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’, the Penal System and the ‘Landscape of the Dispossessed’ is rare. We don’t often realise the dispossessed in a landscape. We know of the large pastoral stations, then towns and villages, but you won’t read about the small settlers, there even in the 1820s to 1840s, who were forced to live on the fringe. They were the ones, whose voice was finally heard in the 1861 Robertson Land Acts. To see them in the landscape at this early date is rare.

Goulburn Brewery is rare, an intact example of a brewery and flour-mill dating from the 1830s. The intact mill at Springfield, together with large group of intact farm buildings and farmhouses, is rare. The Pastoral Landscape is rare. The way that the evolution of the farm properties can be read in the landscape is rare. The foundation of Goulburn as the Headquarters of the Mounted Police is rare. The survival of the urban landscape in Goulburn and Bungonia is rare.

Criterion g. An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s cultural or natural places; or cultural or natural environments,

Now what is rare also demonstrates the principal characteristics of a way of life, or work, or convict labour, or incarceration, or engineering, or farming, or town settlement (The Penal System, the Landscape of the Assigned Servant, the Pastoral properties, the first roads, Inns and Hotels, the early towns and villages). It also demonstrates how people worked together on large pastoral properties, or how people were rejected and flung to the fringes of society (the shepherds and stockmen, the small settlers of the Convict Period, the Landscape of the Dispossessed).
Let this heritage of the Goulburn Mulwaree Council area be more widely known!

12.6 Summary of statement of significance.

The statement of significance for the study area reveals that the site is of local significance for all criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Historical.</td>
<td>National and State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Historical association.</td>
<td>National and State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Aesthetic</td>
<td>National and State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Social</td>
<td>National and State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Scientific</td>
<td>National and State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Rarity.</td>
<td>National and State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Representativeness.</td>
<td>National and State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.7 Grading of archaeological sites within the study area.

The methodology outlined in Chapter 12.3 is used to grade the sites identified in this study.

Each theme is graded against specific criteria, as in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading: Exceptional</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Little or Intrusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rare or outstanding item of local or state significance.</td>
<td>High degree of original fabric. Demonstrates key element of the item’s significance. Alterations do not detract from significance.</td>
<td>Altered or modified elements. Elements with little heritage value, but which contribute to the overall significance of the item.</td>
<td>Does not fulfil criteria for local or state listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological sites survive in good condition, but may also be partly disturbed.</td>
<td>Archaeological sites survive in good condition, but may also be partly disturbed.</td>
<td>Archaeological sites survive in good condition, but may also be partly disturbed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading: Exceptional</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Little or Intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong historical associations</td>
<td>Historical associations</td>
<td>Weak historical associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Settlement.</td>
<td>A wide range of farm infrastructure or related sites survive in good condition (standing buildings).</td>
<td>A range of farm infrastructure or related sites survive in good condition (standing buildings or ruins).</td>
<td>A limited range of farm infrastructure or related sites survive in good condition (standing buildings or ruins).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The infrastructure includes items in most categories, including 1, 2a-2n and 3, whether as standing buildings or archaeological sites (see Chapter 3.6.2).</td>
<td>The infrastructure includes items in several categories, including 1, 2a-2n and 3, whether as standing buildings or archaeological sites</td>
<td>The infrastructure includes items in some of the categories, including 1, 2a-2n and 3, whether as standing buildings or archaeological sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Bridges Convict Stockades</td>
<td>A wide range of Penal System or Road Construction infrastructure or related sites survive in good condition (standing buildings or road formation).</td>
<td>A range of Penal System or Road Construction infrastructure or related sites survive in good condition (standing buildings or ruins or road formation).</td>
<td>A limited range of Penal System or Road Construction infrastructure or related sites survive in good condition (standing buildings or ruins or road formation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original route well defined or able to be followed through the landscape with the assistance of maps and aerial photography.</td>
<td>Either original route well defined or able to be followed through the landscape with the assistance of maps and aerial photography.</td>
<td>Original route not well defined nor able to be followed through the landscape with the assistance of maps, aerial photography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closely associated with Pastoral Settlement</td>
<td>Associated with Pastoral Settlement</td>
<td>Little association with Pastoral Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Grading: Exceptional</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Maxton Park Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Lockyersleigh Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Longreach Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Mummel Wesleyan Chapel and Cemetery (Merilla Uniting Church and Cemetery)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Kippilaw Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Kippilaw Chapel and cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Archaeological site of Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Cardross Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Ruined house site and other archaeological remains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Lumley Park Farm complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sites belonging to each theme are graded according to the above criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Grading: Exceptional</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Inverary Gaol, part of Reevesdale Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Reevesdale Farm Complex and Inverary Gaol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Inveralochy Estate and Farm Complex. Holy Cross Seminary. Society of Saint Pius X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Inveralochy Estate and Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. John’s Church, Lake Bathurst (Private Village of Tarago), 1860.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Wynella House and Garroorigang Farm Complex, including Barn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Bois Chere Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Burrungurroolong House and Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Bois Chere Hotel Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonnie Doon house and outbuildings and ribbon development along Old Hume Highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Former Oliver Goldsmith Inn Hotel Complex, now Joppa house and grounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Garroorigang Hotel Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site of Gillespie’s Manufactory Industrial Complex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Grading: Exceptional</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>Private Village of Tirrannaville, including Chapel and cemetery, houses and public school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>Malton Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>Rossiville Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>Brisbane Meadow Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>Caarne or Carne. Archaeological site of Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>Inverary Park Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>Wylora Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>Springfield Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>Wandi, Robert Plumb’s Inn. Hotel and Farm complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>Glenrock Farm Complex (to be re-assessed after site survey).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>Rotherwood Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>The Morass (Bundong) Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>Kimpton Park (Mummel) Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>Kimpton Park (Mummel) Farm Complex and Private Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Rosemount Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>Kingsdale Hotel Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>Kingsdale Limestone Quarries. Industrial complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>Norwood Farm Complex (to be re-assessed after detailed site survey).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>Goulburn Police Academy. Site of Kenmore House and Farm Complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Grading: Exceptional</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyle Farm Complex, ruins of homestead and outbuildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>Tirranna Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>Pelican Inn Hotel Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site of Paton’s Inn and coach stage Hotel Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>Lansdowne Farm Complex (this site is associated with Goulburn Brewery).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenrock Farm Complex. Archaeological site of Sheep Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wingello Park Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caoura Farm Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Cedar Track, 1817 onwards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td></td>
<td>The South or Argyle Road, c.1818 to c.1833.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie’s Government Road, 1820 to c.1825.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wild’s Pass, part of Macquarie’s Government Road, 1820 to c.1825.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riley’s Road, 1822-c.1839.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>Mitchell’s Great South Road, progressively opened from 1830 to c.1843.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Abutments, Bungonia Road, Lansdowne, 1840s-1880s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site of Toll House, Bungonia Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>Wingello Stockade (1835-1843?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061</td>
<td>Towrang Stockade (1833-1843)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Grading: Exceptional</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>The Mounted Police Establishment in Old Goulburn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>Old Goulburn, all town allotments to north of Murac Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>Riversdale, NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>Goulburn – Archaeological Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>Goulburn Brewery</td>
<td>All other sites marked on Goulburn Detail Plan Series 2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All other heritage listings in Goulburn or suburbs, pre dating 1860, or where land was alienated or in government use prior to 1860.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All other heritage listings in Goulburn or suburbs, which are related to the theme of Industry (outside the scope of this AMP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All other heritage listings in Goulburn or suburbs, which are related to Cemeteries (outside the scope of this AMP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>Bungonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>Marulan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the level and grading of significance are separate items in the process of assessing significance, it is recommended that those sites of exceptional grading should be considered for listing at the National level.

All the other sites directly associated with the themes of Pastoral Settlement, the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’, the ‘Landscape of the Dispossessed’ or the Penal System (relating to the period of Convict Transportation up to 1841 in NSW) should be considered as State significant. This will dramatically upgrade the level of significance of a number of sites.
For the themes of Pastoral Settlement, the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’, the ‘Landscape of the Dispossessed’ or the Penal System (relating to the period of Convict Transportation up to 1841 in NSW), the following recommendations are made:

1. All sites of exceptional grading should be listed at a National level of significance.

2. All remaining sites in this inventory should be listed at State level, except those of moderate grading in Chapter 12.7.

Sites in cities, towns and villages should also be of National or State significance, where there is a direct association with these themes.

Sites within the area of Pastoral Settlement, for which there is historical documentation relating to improvements dating before the end of Transportation in 1841, should also be listed as State significant until site survey and recording can be completed and a more detailed assessment can be made (Sites in Categories 2a and 2b).
13 CONSERVATION STANDARDS, PROCEDURES AND POLICIES.

13.1 The NSW Heritage Act and historical archaeology

The Heritage Act contains various legal measures to protect historical archaeological resources.

Where historical research has revealed the location of historical settlement, experience has shown that the discovery of relics is highly likely once the soil is disturbed. When relics are revealed the Heritage Council must be notified. This may involve delay until appropriate arrangements can be made to record the archaeological remains. As a result, developers and others are normally advised that excavation permits must be obtained prior to undertaking works, which involve excavation or the disturbance of historical sites. In this way most delays can be avoided.

The definition of ‘relics’ under the NSW Heritage Act has recently been changed, as follows:

The new definition is:

‘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.’

Section 139 of the Heritage Act provides that:

c). A person must not disturb or excavate any land knowing or having reasonable cause to suspect that the disturbance or excavation will or is likely to result in a relic being discovered, exposed, moved, damaged or destroyed unless the disturbance or excavation is carried out in accordance with an excavation permit.

\textit{d). A person must not disturb or excavate any land on which the person has discovered or exposed a relic except in accordance with an excavation permit.}

If a site is the subject of an order under Section 130, an Interim Heritage Order, or is listed on the State Heritage Register, approval for an excavation permit is required under Section 60 of the \textit{Heritage Act}.

If a site is not the subject of an order under the \textit{Heritage Act} and is not listed on the State heritage Register, an excavation permit is required, in accordance with Section 140.

Section 146 of the \textit{Heritage Act} requires that the accidental discovery of relics should be reported to the Heritage Council of NSW.

\begin{quote}
A person who is aware or believes that he or she has discovered or located a relic (in any circumstances, and whether or not the person has been issued with an excavation permit) must:
\begin{enumerate}
\item [e).] within a reasonable time after he or she first becomes aware or believes that he or she has discovered or located that relic, notify the Heritage Council of the location of the relic, unless he or she believes on reasonable grounds that the Heritage Council is aware of the location of the relic, and
\item [f).] within the period required by the Heritage Council, furnish the Heritage Council with such information concerning the relic as the Heritage Council may reasonably require.
\end{enumerate}
\end{quote}

When an item of heritage significance comes under the ownership or control of a public authority, the authority is required to record it in a Heritage and Conservation Register, under section 170 of the \textit{Heritage Act}. The purpose of the provision is to alert the authority whenever works are proposed, which might affect the item.

\subsection{13.2 Standard exemptions and exceptions under the \textit{Heritage Act}.}

Certain activities on sites listed on the NSW Heritage Register do not require permit application. These standard exemptions under section 57 of the Heritage Act were published in 1999 by the NSW Heritage Office.
On other archaeological sites, whether or not listed on the NSW Heritage Inventory, there are various situations where an application can be made for a permit exception. Permit exceptions under section 139 of the Heritage Act were published in 2002 by the NSW Heritage Office. Permit exceptions may be made in the following circumstances:

1. Where an archaeological assessment has been prepared in accordance with Guidelines published by the Heritage Council of NSW which indicates that there is little likelihood of there being any relics in the land or that any relics in the land are unlikely to have State or local heritage significance.

2. Where the excavation or disturbance of land will have a minor impact on the archaeological resource.

3. Where the excavation or disturbance of land involves only the removal of fill which has been deposited on the land.

These exemptions and exceptions have been recently updated and are available on the Heritage Office web site.

Apart from the Heritage Act, the requirements of all other legislation are outside the scope of this report.

13.3 Standard procedures and guidelines.

Before consideration of these individual themes, it is appropriate to understand the standard procedures and guidelines for assessing the significance, conservation and management requirements for archaeological and other heritage sites, in general and in advance of proposed developments.

The standard procedure for heritage items, other than archaeological sites, is the preparation of a conservation management plan. For archaeological sites, it is the archaeological management plan.

---

For section 140 applications: regulations available from NSW Heritage Office.
Likewise the standard procedure for assessing the impact of a proposed development on heritage items, other than archaeological sites, is the heritage impact statement or statement of heritage impact. For archaeological sites it is the archaeological assessment report.

The framework for all four types of report is in general outline very similar. Nonetheless each type of report has its own standard guideline documentation.\(^53\)

The heritage impact statement and archaeological assessment report may be used to assist in obtaining planning consent. The archaeological assessment report is used to obtain an excavation permit or permit exemption / exception under the Heritage Act for archaeological investigation.

### 13.4 Interpretation and display.

The ICOMOS Burra Charter states that “the cultural significance of many places is not readily apparent, and should be explained by interpretation. Interpretation should enhance understanding and enjoyment, and be culturally appropriate.”\(^54\)

Opportunities for the interpretation and display of the site should be investigated both during and after the completion of archaeological investigation. Even though many of the remains may be removed there are various strategies whereby artifacts and

\(^53\) Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. Statements of Heritage Impact.
Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. NSW Heritage Manual.
Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. Heritage Assessments.
J. S. Kerr’s ‘The Conservation Plan.’
The ICOMOS Burra Charter.
Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. Archaeological Assessment Guidelines.
archaeological remains may be conserved and put on display, thereby achieving a public outcome for the archaeological investigation.

Provision should be made to display the evidence and contribution of the site recovered by historical research and archaeological excavation.

An interpretation plan should be prepared after the completion of archaeological excavation, in order to design and construct appropriate displays for the site.

13.5 Conservation in situ.

The NSW Heritage Office states in *Archaeological Assessments* that conservation in situ may be appropriate under certain circumstances:

“An archaeological assessment may conclude that the most appropriate management action for the archaeological remains is conservation in situ. This may be because the archaeological features are of such significance or research value that they warrant retention or conservation in the place where they were found.

The procedures for determining appropriate conservation and management actions for such sites are the same as for any other item of environmental heritage.”

The ICOMOS *Burra Charter*, the standard guidelines for heritage conservation, also recommends conservation in situ for heritage items:

**Article 9.1** The physical location of a place is part of its cultural significance. A building, work or other component of a place should remain in its historical location. Relocation is generally unacceptable unless this is the sole practical means of ensuring its survival.

**Article 28.1** Disturbance of significant fabric for study, or to obtain evidence, should be minimised. Study of a place by any disturbance of the fabric, including archaeological excavation, should only be

---

55 Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. Archaeological assessments.
undertaken to provide data essential for decisions on the conservation of the place, or to obtain important evidence about to be lost or made inaccessible.

Article 28.2 Investigations of a place, which requires disturbance of the fabric, apart from that necessary to make decisions, may be appropriate provided that it is consistent with the policy for the place. Such investigations should be based on important research questions which have potential to substantially aid our knowledge, which cannot be answered in other ways and which minimise disturbance of the significant fabric.56

The ICOMOS Burra Charter seeks to minimise disturbance of fabric by archaeological investigation, revealing the assumption that the heritage item is to be conserved, rather than subject to redevelopment. The destruction of an archaeological site by redevelopment is therefore outside the scope of the Burra Charter guidelines.

Nonetheless the archaeological assessment guidelines make it clear that items of heritage significance, particularly State significance, may warrant conservation in situ.

14 **RECOMMENDATIONS.**

14.1 **Users’ Guide to the Archaeological Management Plan.**

The purpose of this Users’ Guide to the archaeological Management Plan in this chapter is twofold:

1. To provide a simple Users’ Guide for Town Planners and the General Public, but also
2. To enable Council to integrate the archaeological Management Plan with its standard procedures.

The Users’ Guide in this chapter will differ from the Final Users’ Guide, because in this chapter recommendations will be made alongside the Users’ Guide on how to integrate the archaeological Management Plan into Council’s standard procedures.

The Users’ Guide in this chapter is divided into 3 columns:

1. The Users’ Guide.
2. Recommendations on integration into Council procedures.

The Users’ Guide is also divided into 2 parts:

1. Town Planning interface.
2. General Public interface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meet with persons proposing DA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek professional heritage advice before meeting or have Heritage Advisor at meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake Stages 2 and 3 below, before meeting, where possible, or arrange another meeting when Stages 2 and 3 are completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note that the location of Caoura Barn is incorrect in the LEP 2009. It is located on Caoura Road, near the junction of Burkitt Road and is not located at Tallong.</td>
<td>Recommendation – correct the location of Caoura Barn in LEP 2009, maps and text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Check geographical location of property, subject to DA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate same property on mapping of Archaeological Management Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify category of archaeological site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the correct procedures for identification, assessment, conservation and management of archaeological sites. See recommendations of AMP.</td>
<td>This process will be streamlined by integrating the mapping and sites of the Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) into Council’s GIS System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AMP uses historical property identifiers – County, Parish, Portion and Acreage. Nonetheless AMP mapping precisely locates each item in accordance with the mapping used in the LEP 2009.</td>
<td>The task of providing current property identifiers, street number, Lot and DP numbers was beyond the budget of the AMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation – Integrate AMP listings into Council GIS System.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation – Add address details, street number, Lot and DP number to AMP listings or add AMP archaeological site categories to Council GIS System. See main recommendations for more details.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advise DA proponents of heritage listings (LEP 2009) as well as archaeological sites (AMP 2009-2010). Advice on heritage items should be integrated, so that DA proponents treat all aspects of heritage as a single process.</td>
<td>The purpose of this procedure is to ensure that the conservation and management of all heritage items is established before the design process. This will provide the best opportunity to integrate heritage into proposed development and will have the best outcomes for both property owners and the community at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise DA proponents that: 1. Heritage Impact Statements. 2. Archaeological Assessment Reports. 3. Conservation Management Plans, and 4. Archaeological Management Plans should be prepared and submitted before the design process is initiated. Encourage archaeological investigation prior to design process to assist with integrating archaeological sites into proposed development through: 1. Conservation in situ. 2. Interpretation and display.</td>
<td>If the design process is completed before the heritage conservation and management procedures, then the impacts on the heritage item are largely unavoidable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation – change standard procedures to require heritage conservation and management documentation is prepared before the design process is initiated by DA proponents.</td>
<td>Recommendation – publicise this change of council procedures to ensure the community is fully aware of Council requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Users’ Guide - Town Planning Interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remember an excavation permit under the NSW Heritage Act is required for all archaeological excavation, or other works likely to disturb ‘relics’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advise DA proponents that:
1. Heritage items should be conserved and managed.
2. Archaeological sites should be conserved within new developments.
3. All heritage items, including archaeological sites, should be integrated into new development.
4. Conservation in situ may be a requirement.
5. Interpretation and display of archaeological sites and heritage items will be required in all new development.

5. Upon receiving conservation and management documents, seek professional heritage advice – Heritage Advisor.

Meet with client to determine design options for DA. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that all heritage items, including archaeological sites are integrated into the proposed development.

Remember to indicate requirements for conservation in situ, as well as benefits of completion of archaeological
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>investigation prior to design, as above.</td>
<td>The purpose of this procedure is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assess DA when received for compliance with heritage and conservation procedures.</td>
<td>1. To avoid duplication in the preparation of archaeological assessment reports and other conservation documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Record all heritage and archaeological reports against each property, indicating: 1. Report references. 2. Archive location of reports. 3. For archaeological reports in particular, record  • Extent of historical research – does it cover adjacent properties? If so, record this reference also against the records for other properties.  • Extent of archaeological investigation. Does any archaeology survive on the site post excavation? If so, make sure it is clearly stated on the property record to ensure consideration in any future DA.  • Extent of conservation in situ, as well as interpretation and display. This information should be recorded on a property file. This information should also be recorded in a way that assists Council in integrating Interpretation and Display throughout the LGA.</td>
<td>2. To make recovery of documentation a straightforward activity. 3. To ensure that archaeological sites are conserved in any future development. 4. To ensure that Interpretation and Display of cultural heritage within the LGA is carried out in an integrated fashion. 5. To promote cultural tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ensure all heritage and archaeological reports are kept in a permanent archive.</td>
<td>Recommendation – Establish procedures within Council for recording heritage and conservation works against property files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies Section) for all conservation and archaeological reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation - Ensure that Council retains archival master copies as well as reports available to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation – consider making available electronic copies of conservation and archaeological reports on Council or Library Website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Ensure that all heritage and archaeological reports clearly state:
   1. Geographical coverage of detailed historical research.
   2. Site locations.
   3. Extent of surviving archaeological remains post excavation.
   4. Extent of conservation in situ.
   5. Provisions for Interpretation and Display.
And also comply with standard guidelines.
### 14.1.2 Users’ Guide – General Public Interface.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use LEP 2009 to establish location of heritage items. Use hard copy of LEP 2009 or Council website.</td>
<td>Recommendation – The AMP should be made available on Council’s website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) to establish location of archaeological sites Use hard copy of AMP or Council website.</td>
<td>Recommendation – the LEP 2009 and the AMP should be integrated to streamline public access to both documents. Recommendation. Council should consider the risk to archaeological sites from unlawful excavation and plundering before publication of site locations. Council should seek the advice of the NSW Heritage Branch before any publication of the AMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meet with Council and Heritage Advisor prior to: 1. Design of proposed development. 2. DA submission. Fully understand all heritage requirements. Prepare heritage and conservation documents before design and DA submission. Where possible, undertake archaeological investigation prior to design process to assist with integrating archaeological sites into proposed development through:</td>
<td>The purpose of this procedure is to ensure that the conservation and management of all heritage items is established before the design process. This will provide the best opportunity to integrate heritage into proposed development and will have the best outcomes for both property owners and the community at large. If the design process is completed before the heritage conservation and management procedures, then the impacts on the heritage item are largely unavoidable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| investigation prior to design process to assist with integrating archaeological sites into proposed development through:  
  2. Interpretation and display. | unavoidable.  
Recommendation – change standard procedures to require heritage conservation and management documentation is prepared before the design process is initiated by DA proponents.  
Recommendation – publicise this change of council procedures to ensure the community is fully aware of Council requirements. |
| Remember an excavation permit under the NSW Heritage Act is required for all archaeological excavation, or other works likely to disturb ‘relics’. | |
| Be aware that:  
  1. Heritage items should be conserved and managed.  
  2. Archaeological sites should be conserved within new developments.  
  3. All heritage items, including archaeological sites, should be integrated into new development.  
  4. Conservation in situ may be a requirement.  
  5. Interpretation and display of archaeological sites and heritage items will be required in all new development. | |
| 5. Present conservation and management documents to Council. | |
| Meet with Council to determine design options for DA. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that all heritage items, including archaeological sites are integrated into the proposed development. | |
### Users’ Guide – General Public Interface.

**Recommendations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remember to consider requirements for conservation in situ, as well as completion of archaeological investigation prior to design, as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Present DA to Council, ensuring that all heritage requirements have been fully considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Keep copies of all conservation and archaeological reports in a safe place to ensure they are available for future reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of these records should be transferred to new owners on sale of property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an insurance policy, ensure Council has copies of all conservation and archaeological reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14.2 Recommendations arising out of Users’ Guide.

The following recommendations arise directly from the Users’ Guide.

It is recommended that:

#### 14.2.1 Correction to the Goulburn Mulwaree LEP 2009.

1. The location of Caoura Barn should be corrected in the LEP 2009, maps and text.
14.2.2 Integration of AMP into Council’s GIS System.

2. The AMP listings should be integrated into Council GIS System. Note that it should be sufficient in the first instance simply to record the Category of Archaeological Site for each property, whether Category 1, 2a or 2b, onto the GIS system, because this will in large part determine planning and conservation procedures.

3. The following address and cadastral details should be added to the archaeological listings by Council, including:
   - Street number and Street name.
   - Lot and DP numbers.
   Alternatively the Category of Archaeological Site (Category 1, 2a or 2b) should be added to each property in Council’s GIS System. See Archaeological Site Categories.

14.2.3 Change to standard procedures for considering heritage and archaeological items prior to DA.

4. Council should change its standard procedures to ensure that heritage conservation and management documentation is prepared before the design process is initiated by DA proponents.

5. Council should publicise this change of council procedures to ensure the community is fully aware of Council requirements.

The purpose of the above procedure is to ensure that the conservation and management of all heritage items is established before the design process. This will provide the best opportunity to integrate heritage into proposed development and will have the best outcomes for both property owners and the community at large. (If the design process is completed before the heritage conservation and management procedures, then the impacts on the heritage item are largely unavoidable).

14.2.4 Availability of the AMP.

6. The AMP should be made available on Council’s website.

7. The LEP 2009 and the AMP should be integrated to streamline council and public access to both documents.

8. Council should consider the risk to archaeological sites from unlawful excavation and plundering before publication of site locations. Council should
seek the advice of the NSW Heritage Branch before any publication of the AMP.

14.2.5 Record keeping for heritage and archaeological reports.

9. Council should establish procedures for recording heritage and conservation works against property files.

10. Council should establish a permanent repository in Council Library (Local Studies Section) for all conservation and archaeological reports, if this has not already been done.

11. Council should ensure that the Permanent repository (Local Studies Section of Public Library) retains archival master copies as well as reports available to the public.

12. Council should consider making available electronic copies of conservation and archaeological reports on the Council or Library Website.

14.3 Short, medium and long term recommendations.

This archaeological management plan will make a series of recommendations. Some of them will require immediate action to prevent a loss of heritage, while others can be considered in the medium to long term as the Goulburn Mulwaree Council, together with the communities they serve, decide on future directions in the conservation and management of its cultural heritage.

It is proposed to define the timeframes for the recommendations, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Short Term</td>
<td>1 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medium Term</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Long Term</td>
<td>4-5 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of this five-year period, this Archaeological Management Plan should itself be reviewed, so that it fully meets the requirements for conservation and management of archaeological and other heritage sites for the next period of 5 years.

All the following recommendations for individual themes are summarised at the end of the report and divided into these three short, medium or long-term categories.
14.4 Locating a Site and establishing its Archaeological Site Category.

The Map Series is the key to locating sites belonging to every theme. The Map Series is found in Volume 3, Appendix 1.

First locate in which part of the Local Government Area the site is listed. Go to key plan highlighted in blue below. Then go to the correct key map for each site listing.

The key maps for locating archaeological sites are highlighted in red below.

Archaeological sites belong to a specific theme or number of themes in the Archaeological Management Plan. A knowledge of these themes is also helpful in locating sites. The main themes are:

1. Pastoral Settlement,
2. Transport and Communications, and
3. Towns and Villages

Listings for Pastoral Settlement are located on the plans in red. Sites closer to Goulburn are also shown on the Goulburn Plan Series in red.

Sites associated with Roads are shown on the plans in orange. The convict stockades are shown on Towrang Plan Series 1.1 and Wingello Plan Series 1.1 respectively. The Headquarters of the Mounted Police in Old Goulburn is shown on the Old Goulburn Plan Series 1.1 to 1.5.

Sites belonging to the Towns and Villages are shown on the key plan in blue below. While this plan will refer you on to other plans for Old Goulburn, Goulburn, Bungonia and Marulan, this is the only plan, which shows the smaller settlements, including:

1. The Tarlo Gap.
2. Lake Bathurst, previously the Private Village of Tarago (Bongaralaby).
3. Tarago, previously Sherwin’s Flat.
4. The Village Reserve at Tarlo.
5. Windellama.
6. Timberlight.
Some of the historical evidence for these settlement is shown graphically on Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.7. Listings for Pastoral Settlement 02. (Refer to Chapter 14.10.10 for recommendations for the small settlements).

The main plans showing sites in Towns and Villages are:
For Goulburn.
2.6 Archaeological and other heritage sites.
3.4. Archaeological and other heritage sites.
For Bungonia and Marulan:
Bungonia Detail Plan Series 1.1
Marulan Detail Plan Series 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1</th>
<th>1. Goulburn Mulwaree LGA</th>
<th>1.1. LGA Boundaries and Detail Map Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Pastoral Settlement, Late 1810s to 1840s-1850s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Parish Boundaries and Names. Overlay onto Pastoral Settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Pastoral Settlement – archaeological and other heritage sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Road Network, from 1817 onwards to 1840s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6. Listings for Pastoral Settlement 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7. Listings for Pastoral Settlement 02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towrang Plan Series 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wingello Plan Series 1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goulburn Plan Series 1-3.</th>
<th>1. Old Goulburn</th>
<th>1.1 Basemap.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains (SR Map 2781).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains (SR Map 2781) – Tracing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains c.1830 (SR Map 2780)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5. Old Goulburn. Plan of the Township, Goulburn Plains c.1830 (SR Map 2780) – Tracing.

2. Goulburn.

2.1 Basemap.

2.2. Plan of the Town of Goulburn, c.1833 (SR Map 2790).

2.3. Plan of the Town of Goulburn, c.1833 (SR Map 2790) – tracing in black outline

2.4 Plan of Goulburn reserve and Village Allotments, 5 December 1836 (SR Map 2803) – selective tracing.

2.5 Plan of Goulburn, including the Old Township, 1859 (SR Map 3483).

2.6 Archaeological and other heritage sites.

3. Goulburn Suburbs

3.1 Basemap, showing Municipal Boundary, 1859.

3.2 Stages of Town development, 1840s-1850s.

3.3. Main Roads shown on plans from 1820s-1850s.

3.4. Archaeological and other heritage sites.

Bungonia Detail Plan Series 1.1

Marulan Detail Plan Series 1.1

14.5 The Archaeological Site Categories.

For the major themes in this study it has been necessary to formulate categories of archaeological site, based on the level of identification.

For some themes this has not been so important, because of the limited number of sites. For example, the two Convict Stockades at Towrang and Wingello are clearly identified and belong in Category 1 below. However it is still the case that sites
associated with the stockades may be less clearly identified and fall into Categories 2a or 2b. So the same Categories of archaeological Site Identification apply throughout.

The level of identification for site categories remains consistent across all themes. Details vary in the details column, so the reader is referred to the details column for each theme in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Categories of Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Further details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | Sites inspected for this study or previously by others (existing listings, site survey by others, etc). The physical existence of these sites has been proven beyond doubt. | 1. Sites already listed in one or more heritage listing databases.  
2. Sites not already listed, but inspected as part of this study. |
| 2a       | Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others: for which there is historical documentation (available within the budget of this study). | 3. Sites where historical documentation has been gathered as part of this study (note that minimum research was possible within the scope and budget of this study).  
4. Sites identified for inspection during site survey, but not actually inspected within the time frame available to this study. |
| 2b       | Sites that have not been inspected for this report or by others: for which the predictive model has not been tested. | 5. Other sites within the area of pastoral settlement shown on the County Maps in Baker’s Atlas,  
6. Areas within the Town and Village precincts known to be developed, but not researched or identified within the scope of this study. |

57 These sites may have been inspected by others, but have not resulted in listings in a searchable database available to this study.
14.6 Listings already included in the Goulburn Mulwaree LEP 2009.

Where individual sites are located within the boundaries of the archaeological precincts or conservation areas proposed in this archaeological management plan, they are not provided with individual listings. For example, Riversdale, ((LEP 2009, Item 302), a highly significant site in Old Goulburn is not separately listed in this report, because it is within a proposed archaeological conservation area.

Likewise Goulburn Brewery is not listed in this study, because it is already a heritage item (LEP 2009, Item 109). It is also an industrial site that is outside the themes considered in Volume 2 of this archaeological management plan.

In order to conserve and manage the archaeological significance of sites already listed in the Goulburn Mulwaree LEP 2009:

1. All sites predating 1860 (the cut-off date for this study) should be considered to possess archaeological significance (scientific significance) until assessed in detail.
2. All industrial archaeological sites should be considered to possess archaeological significance, irrespective of date range.
3. All of the above sites will fall into Archaeological Site Category 1.

The same procedures for conservation and management of these heritage items and archaeological sites apply (see Chapter 14.8).

The same process of assessment, conservation and management is common across all the themes of this Archaeological Management Plan (see Chapter 14.9).

See Volume 3, Chapter 14.12 for recommendations for all other archaeological sites, not included in this Archaeological Management Plan.

14.7 Recommendations relating to the Levels of Significance.

For the themes of Pastoral Settlement, the ‘Landscape of the Assigned Servant’, the ‘Landscape of the Dispossessed’ or the Penal System (relating to the period of Convict Transportation up to 1841 in NSW), the following recommendations are made:

3. All sites of exceptional grading should be listed at a National level of significance.
4. All remaining sites in this inventory should be listed at State level, except those of moderate grading in Chapter 12.7.

Sites in cities, towns and villages should also be of National or State significance, where there is a direct association with these themes.

Sites within the area of Pastoral Settlement, for which there is historical documentation relating to improvements dating before the end of Transportation in 1841, should also be listed as State significant until site survey and recording can be completed and a more detailed assessment can be made (Sites in Categories 2a and 2b).

14.8 Recommendations for Listing all Archaeological Site Categories.

It is recommended that:

1. Sites in Category 1 should be listed on the State Heritage Register (for state significant sites) or on the Local Environment Plan (LEP 2009) (for local significant sites).

2. Sites in both Category 2a and Category 2b should remain on the inventory of this archaeological management plan until they can be assessed by further historical research and site survey.

3. If further research and site survey of Category 2a and 2b Archaeological Sites demonstrates the presence of archaeological sites or other heritage items, they should then be listed at the appropriate level, as described above.

See Recommendations for continuing the process of identification and assessment in Chapter 14.11.

14.9 Recommendations for Assessment, Conservation and Management of all Archaeological Site Categories.

The same process of assessment, conservation and management is common across all the themes of this Archaeological Management Plan. These are described below.
14.9.1 Recommendations for the conservation and management of all sites of National or State significance.

A conservation management plan / an archaeological management plan should be prepared for each National and State significant heritage item or archaeological site.

1. The conservation management plan / an archaeological management plan should be integrated with the business plans for the enterprises now undertaken on these items or sites.

2. The conservation management plan / an archaeological management plan should also provide the framework against which all development applications are assessed.

3. Once the conservation management plan / archaeological management plan is approved, each development application may then be assessed by means of a heritage impact statement / archaeological assessment report against the conservation policies and management frameworks already in place.

4. The conservation management plan / archaeological management plan should also provide the framework for assessing all proposals for
   • Interpretation and Display.
   • Cultural Tourism, museums and interpretation centres.

The curtilages of heritage items is considered separately in Chapter 14.10.2.

14.9.2 Recommendations for the conservation and management of all sites of local significance.

The framework used for National and State significant sites also applies to heritage items and archaeological sites of local significance. There is an expectation that the conservation management plan / archaeological management plan documents would be less complex and more straightforward. This would also apply to the respective heritage impact statement / archaeological assessment report documents.

Owners of heritage items of local significance should not have to prepare a conservation management plan / archaeological management plan, until they require a DA or wish to undertake works likely to disturb ‘relics’.

The standard guidelines for the preparation of these documents make provision for all types of site, whether State or Local, small or large (See Chapter 13.3).
The processes of excavation permit application also take into account minor as well as major impacts, when applications are made (see Chapter 13.1 and 13.2).

14.10 Recommendations for individual themes.

14.10.1 Pastoral Settlement.

The large pastoral properties identified in this study are subject to a number of threats, resulting from:

1. The passage of time.
2. The change from manual labour and horsepower to highly mechanised and efficient agri-businesses.
3. The shift of a large proportion of the former farm population away from the rural areas.
4. The redundancy of many of the traditional building types.
5. The increasing popularity of historical farms or ‘hobby farms’ as country residences for urban professionals.
6. The new ‘closeness’ of the Goulburn area to Sydney and Canberra, brought about by improved roads and communications.
7. The trend towards subdivision of farms for ‘hobby farming’, but also to house the growing urban population of Goulburn and suburbs.
8. Change from broad scale sheep or cattle grazing to other pastoral or agricultural enterprise.

Managing change is the means whereby we can conserve what we value from the past and still move forward with new enterprises and directions.

14.10.1.1 The Pastoral Landscape.

The first characteristic of Pastoral Settlement is the landscape it has created from the late 1810s and 1820s onwards. It is a landscape that is characteristic of cattle and sheep farming and is quite distinct from the dairy farming landscapes on the South Coast and North Coast of New South Wales. With changes in modern usage, the landscape is also likely to change.

---

Threats to this landscape are:

1. Changing agricultural or grazing practices.
2. Subdivision into smaller farms.

While these changes will not take place immediately and overnight, it is necessary that the significant pastoral landscapes should be conserved and managed along with the farms that created this landscape.

It is recommended that a Cultural Landscape Study should be completed in the short to medium term (1-3 years) in order to identify, assess, manage and conserve this characteristic Pastoral Landscape. This study should not only address the broader landscape issues, but also the usage of exotic and other plantings, gardens, windbreaks and landscapes around the individual farms. The study should ensure that the traditional use of exotic conifer plantings for windbreaks in not adapted as perimeter privacy screening, as this will permanently change the pastoral landscape. The study should ensure that significant views and vistas from and to farm properties are maintained.

14.10.1.2 Historical farms and farm buildings at risk.

The historical farms identified in this study possess a wide range of elements, including:

1. Homes and houses.
2. Farm buildings.
3. Other works.
4. Archaeological sites, ruins and relics.
5. Exotic plantings and gardens.

They are indeed farm complexes or establishments.

The conservation of these farm complexes is threatened by:

2. Redundancy of buildings.
3. High cost of maintenance.
4. Decline in profits from agriculture and grazing.

Due to budgetary constraints, this study has been able to identify and assess only a small portion of the total number of historical farms and properties in the local government area. It is clear that a large number of the farm buildings on these historical properties have already been lost. A similarly large proportion of the
remaining houses and farm buildings are at risk through inadequate maintenance or abandonment. Others are well maintained.

This challenge needs to be met in two important ways:

1. The process of identification and assessment should continue, so that the scale of this threat can be fully understood and counteracted with timely recommendations for conservation and management (See Chapter 14.11).

2. A substantial increase should be made by all levels of government and other organisations in the amount of grant funding available to conserve significant farm properties. Where spending is now in the tens of thousands, this funding needs to increase tenfold and be sustained for a number of years (10 years is suggested in the first instance).

This recommendation for additional grant funding is both a short (1 year) and long term priority. Within a generation (30 years) we will have lost a large proportion of the buildings and farm complexes now at risk, unless immediate action is taken.

The rarity of timber farmhouses and farm buildings is a case in point. There is a strong bias towards the survival of masonry structure, because timber buildings have been lost, either through neglect, bush fire or insect infestation. It is less easy to lose a masonry building. This bias will worsen unless immediate action is taken. See the listings for properties with timber buildings to focus on this conservation crisis.

The crisis is not limited to timber buildings, because a substantial number of stone buildings are at risk. Attention is drawn to masonry buildings, rather than brick structures, because the skills required to conserve stone buildings (qualified stonemasons) are scarcer than those for brickwork (builders and bricklayers with conservation qualifications and experience). Nonetheless both brick and stone buildings are at risk because of the cost of conservation and the scarcity of qualified trade skills.

One obvious recommendation is to encourage the development of a skills base by providing employment in the conservation of timber, brick and stone farmhouses and farm buildings of National and State significance. This skills base should exist and be promoted within the local government area, just as the expertise for maintaining steam engines is highly developed in Goulburn at the Waterworks and Railway Roundhouse. The best practice is to retain this skills base and not lose it and then have to redevelop it.
The increase in the grants programme should therefore be tied in with trade apprenticeships at the local educational institutions.

14.10.1.3  Conservation and management frameworks for all major (national and state significant) pastoral properties.

See Chapter 14.9.

The curtilages of pastoral properties are considered separately in Chapter 14.10.2.

The Inventory of Sites associated with Pastoral Settlement is found in Volume 3, Appendix 2. A List of these sites is included in Volume 2, Chapter 3.6.2.

All sites associated with Pastoral Settlement and the Landscape of the Assigned Servant (all those established on land granted before the end of Transportation in 1841, or originally belonging to those properties) are of National or State significance (see Volume 2, Chapter 3.8).

14.10.1.4  Continuing the process of identification and assessment of significant sites relating to Pastoral Settlement.

This archaeological management plan has only begun the process of identification and assessment of sites related to Pastoral Settlement. The extent of site survey that could be completed for a limited budget has resulted in three levels of identification (See Chapters 3.4 and 14.5).

The process of identification and assessment should be continued as a supplement to this archaeological management plan. This task should be completed as a high priority.

If a development application is received for a property identified as Category 2a or 2b, before the property can be identified and assessed in the process described above, then the impact on any archaeological site or heritage item should be assessed through a heritage impact statement or archaeological assessment report in the usual manner. It will also be necessary to prepare the conservation management plans / archaeological management plans on which the heritage impact statement /
archaeological assessment reports rely for their conservation and management recommendations (see standard procedures in Chapter 14.9).

14.10.1.5 The assessment of archaeological sites on pastoral properties.
Archaeological ‘relics’ are likely to be present on all the pastoral properties identified in this archaeological management plan.

Archaeological investigation can be used to inform conservation questions and issues in the way outlined in the ICOMOS Burra Charter (see Chapter 13.6). Archaeological investigation may also be required in advance of development proposals or can be undertaken for research purposes.

Where archaeological investigation is required on the larger pastoral properties (National or State significant sites), the assessment of the proposal should be integrated with existing conservation management plans / archaeological management plans. In the absence of these conservation documents, both a conservation or archaeological management plan should be prepared in tandem with an archaeological assessment report for excavation permit application (see Chapter 14.9 for standard procedures).

14.10.2 Considering curtilages.
A significant proportion of existing listings within the Goulburn Mulwaree LEP 2009 do not provide sufficient curtilages to adequately protect the heritage items listed. Some examples will suffice to indicate the issues, which should be addressed.

Some of the road formation and sandstone culverts at Towrang (western portion) are not within the listed heritage item, at least in so far as is shown on the plans accompanying the LEP 2009. The burial ground is also excluded. Where the road formation is listed, the boundary is directly at the south side of the road, which does not provide any protection for the historical bush setting of the road. The one road culvert on the north side of the Hume Highway is poorly protected from inadvertent damage by roadworks, because it is not fenced off or otherwise protected. It is recommended that the existing listings should be extended and a minimum curtilage should be provided to keep open future opportunities to interpret and display this highly significant site (see Detail Plan 1.2 for Towrang).
With pastoral properties, the selection of curtilages is inconsistent. Some properties are protected as a whole (Lumley Park at Bungonia, or Lockyersleigh, north of Marulan), while even adjacent heritage items have minimal curtilages (Inverary Park, Bungonia, or Glenrock, at Marulan). It is probable that the most significant heritage item at Inverary Park is outside the boundary of the listed item.

The dam and sheep wash area on the Mulwaree Ponds at Springfield is outside the area of the heritage item, though obviously an important aspect of farming activities in the past.

To ensure the protection of the broad range of heritage items relating to pastoral settlement it is recommended that the curtilages of heritage items should be reviewed and updated where necessary.

The issue of curtilages has been raised because the focus of the archaeological management plan is on pastoral settlement and identifying the range of sites associated with it. The cultural landscape as a whole therefore becomes a much more important consideration and is elevated above and beyond the basic need to conserve the buildings and structures themselves. For example, is it sufficient to conserve the farm complex at Kippilaw without listing the Chapel that belongs to the farm or the shearing shed, which is just across the property boundary? The sites of chapels, public schools, pubs and post offices, seemingly now in isolated rural locations tell us of a much more populated landscape around these large farms, when physical labour and horsepower were the way things were done.

The preparation of conservation plans for state significant pastoral properties should allow for the extension of curtilages beyond the physical fabric into the surrounding landscape, thereby allowing a more balanced understanding of these properties as they developed through time (see Chapter 3).

The identification of the site of a sheep station on an isolated part of the land originally belonging to Glenrock is a case in point. Only the buildings on Glenrock are listed as LEP 2009, Item 314. In itself this rules out the protection of any sites located in the surrounding landscape: but, more importantly, it totally ignores the possibility of the sheep station on ARGYLE, URINGALLA 231, 740 acres, not a small landholding in itself and certainly not an insignificant site (State significant)
If we wish to understand our past, then we need to conserve and protect the historical landscapes on which these important sites may survive. If not, we will increasingly have only the iconic items to visit and be none the wiser. We need to start by identifying the curtilages of these pastoral properties in an adequate manner.

Based on the above discussion, the following table is an incomplete list of those heritage items with inadequate curtilages. The curtilages of these heritage items have been extended on the mapping for this study (Volume 3, Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series. 1.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Item name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrick</td>
<td>Lockyersleigh, Ruins of Kyle</td>
<td>1412 Carrick Road Lot 2, DP</td>
<td>574255 Local</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrick Road Lot 2, DP</td>
<td></td>
<td>84966</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungonia</td>
<td>Inverary Park</td>
<td>710 Inverary Road</td>
<td>7002, DP 1025594</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungonia</td>
<td>The Parsonage</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungonia</td>
<td>Caarne Historic Site</td>
<td>Lookdown Road Part</td>
<td>67, DP 750020</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungonia</td>
<td>Brisbane Meadows</td>
<td>393 Lookdown Road</td>
<td>2, DP 794232</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrick</td>
<td>&quot;Lockyersleigh&quot; Homestead,</td>
<td>1092 Towrang Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>Barn (1870)</td>
<td>99–241 Mazamet Road</td>
<td>23, DP 774636</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marulan</td>
<td>&quot;Glenrock&quot; Homestead, Outbuildings</td>
<td>248 Highland Way</td>
<td>204, DP 870194</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Arm</td>
<td>&quot;Norwood&quot; Homestead, Outbuildings</td>
<td>94 Norwood Road, off Middle Arm Road</td>
<td>Part Lot 2, DP 210912</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkesbourne</td>
<td>&quot;Kippilaw&quot; Homestead, Gardens</td>
<td>Gurrundah Road</td>
<td>2, DP</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirranaville</td>
<td>Burrungurroolong Homestead,</td>
<td>Braidwood Road</td>
<td>Part Lot 9, DP 979798</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardens, Stables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality</td>
<td>Item name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Property Description</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Item no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirranaville</td>
<td>“Tirranna” Homestead, Gardens, Gibson Family Cemetery, Veterans Allotments</td>
<td>Braidwood Road</td>
<td>Part Lot 1, DP 979370; Lots 35 and 36, DP 750015</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirranaville</td>
<td>Tirranna Public School, Church, Cemetery</td>
<td>Braidwood Road</td>
<td>Lot 342, DP 750015; Part Lot 311, DP 750015</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirranaville</td>
<td>“Springfield” Homestead, Outbuildings, Gardens</td>
<td>Braidwood Road</td>
<td>Part Lot 9, DP 750028</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirranaville</td>
<td>“Pelican” Homestead, Shearing Shed</td>
<td>Braidwood Road</td>
<td>Lot 1, DP 807719; Lot 2, DP 832905</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towrang</td>
<td>“Danganelly” Farmhouse 59</td>
<td>Towrang Road</td>
<td>Lot 2, DP 1061682</td>
<td>Local*</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.10.3 Roads, bridges and river crossings.

For most of the road routes identified in this report, there is little to no surviving fabric, other than earthworks, like cuttings or terracing into the slope. The main exception is the Great South Road, for which substantial road formation works were undertaken, together with elaborate bridges and culverts. While additional fabric may be identified in future, it is suggested that the most substantial fabric is well known.

The zigzags at Wild’s Pass survive on the side of the Cookbundoon Range, but it would be difficult to actually identify any fabric, earthworks or stonework associated with this road, even at this dramatic point, described by Macquarie in 1820. The fact that the road route survives, including the zigzags, is sufficient justification for its existing listing, its association with Governor Macquarie making it of State, not local significance.

It is possible to trace the early roads for many kilometres. They often follow surviving tracks or roads, except where crossing properties or large pastoral stations. Here the

59 Uncertain if this site relates to Pastoral Settlement of the 1820s to 1840s period.
roads went direct to the farms themselves and then continued on the other side. In many cases, these roads have now been diverted away from these private properties and follow more direct routes. The historical properties, like Lockyersleigh, Glenrock and Reevesdale, are good examples of this process and preserve the fossilised road routes as farm access tracks.

In other cases road routes are traceable using historical maps and survey plans, modern maps and aerial photographs. Road routes can often be seen as avenues of trees, embankments or cuttings. The most significant road routes, as identified in this archaeological management plan should be conserved as corridors and linear features in the landscape. They should be listed in general as local heritage items on the LEP 2009, with the specific sites listed as National or State significant precincts, sites or corridors.

These road routes should be used as a key element in the development of cultural tourism.

The specific sites with important fabric or historical associations, like Wild’s Pass, the bridge, culverts and road formation at Towrang, the road cutting and embankment at Wingello should be listed as heritage precincts in combination with other associated sites. Since the above three sites are all of National or State significance, because of their fabric or historical associations, they should each be listed on the State Heritage Register. See also Convict Stockades.

14.10.4 Convict Stockades.

The most significant sites in the local government area for understanding the use of convict labour in road construction are the two convict stockades at Towrang and Wingello.

The stockade and associated elements at Wingello are not yet listed. Some individual elements at Towrang are listed, others are not. The plans, which accompany the LEP 2009 would suggest that some of the road culverts are not listed. The burial ground also appears to be left out.

It is recommended that larger encompassing heritage precincts or complexes should be listed at both Towrang and Wingello to incorporate all the relevant heritage items, including those that relate to the later use of the sites after the stockades were closed.
These sites are of State, if not National significance and should be listed on the State Heritage Register, as well as through any Commonwealth or National listing process. When preparing these listings, attention should be given to assessing the curtilage, to protect the historical setting of the Great South Road, the stockade and other elements (see Chapter 14.10.2).

At both Towrang and Wingello, some of the archaeological remains and heritage items are at risk and action should be taken immediately to investigate those remains at risk and retard erosion.

An archaeological assessment report should be prepared for the immediate works at Towrang and an excavation permit obtained for the minor excavation works and remedial works to retard erosion.

At Wingello, the small burial ground has been severely disturbed by wombat excavations. This is just one of the cemeteries in the Goulburn Mulwaree LGA that requires conservation. Two solutions are possible:

1. Prepare a composite conservation management plan for the minor cemeteries in the LGA, so that conservation works can be carried out in a planned framework.
2. Prepare archaeological management plans for both Towrang and Wingello Stockades, as recommended below.

Archaeological management plans should be prepared for both Towrang and Wingello Stockades. These plans should also investigate:

1. The interpretation and display of the archaeological remains and other heritage items. (The archaeological displays at Towrang are now out of date and the signage worn out).
2. The establishment of museums and interpretation centres for cultural tourism at both locations.

The listing for Wild’s Pass should be included in the archaeological management plans for Towrang and Wingello as a related site.

The preparation of the Interpretation Plan component of these studies should be integrated with the Mounted Police Headquarters at Old Goulburn.
14.10.5 The Mounted Police Headquarters at Old Goulburn.

The selection of a site for the Mounted Police Headquarters at Old Goulburn in 1828 was integral to:

1. The administration of the convicts on the pastoral properties.
2. The establishment of Goulburn, and
3. The maintenance of law and order.

As with Towrang and Wingello, an archaeological management plan should be prepared.

It is important that an archaeological management plan for the Headquarters of the Mounted Police at Old Goulburn should be prepared without delay. The archaeological management plan should include the whole of Old Goulburn, including its streets and allotments.

The goal is to pre-empt any future DA with regard to Old Goulburn, so that the archaeology, heritage, interpretation and display of the ‘Township of Goulburn Plains, 1829, is not compromised in any way. This is a site of National significance.

This plan should investigate:

1. The interpretation and display of the archaeological remains and other heritage items.
2. The establishment of a museum and interpretation centre for cultural tourism.
3. The integration of the Mounted Police Headquarters Site with Riversdale National Trust Property.
5. The relationship between the Mounted Police headquarters and the adjacent Goulburn Prison.
6. The role of the Mounted Police Headquarters Site in the interpretation and display of other sites in Old Goulburn.
7. Means of mitigating the impact of adjacent development on the historical setting of both Riversdale and the Mounted Police Headquarters Site.

Old Goulburn also lies within a proposed Archaeological Conservation Area. See Chapter 14.10.7 for recommendations relating to this Archaeological Conservation Area.
14.10.6 Other aspects of the Landscape of the Assigned Servant.
Recommendations for other aspects of the Landscape of the Assigned Servant can be found in the sections on Pastoral Settlement and Towns and Villages (see Chapters 14.10.1 and 14.10.7 respectively).

14.10.7 Towns and Villages.
This archaeological management plan has identified Goulburn, Bungonia and Marulan as the main towns and villages in the study area for the period up to 1860. Because this study investigated the whole of the local government area, it was not possible to assess each town allotment in these town and village centres. In each of these three centres, the area of historical settlement has been identified. Within these areas, ‘relics’ are likely to be found during development or earthmoving.

The Categories of Archaeological Site identified in the Towns and Villages is the same for all the other themes (see Chapter 14.5).

To locate a site or Archaeological Site Category within Old Goulburn, Goulburn, Bungonia or Marulan, use the same procedure, as described in Chapter 14.4.

The same procedures for conservation and management of these heritage items and archaeological sites apply (see Chapter 14.9).

14.10.8 Old Goulburn.
It is important that an archaeological management plan for the Headquarters of the Mounted Police at Old Goulburn should be prepared without delay. The archaeological management plan should include the whole of Old Goulburn, including its streets and allotments.

The goal is to pre-empt any future DA with regard to Old Goulburn, so that the archaeology, heritage, interpretation and display of the ‘Township of Goulburn Plains, 1829, is not compromised in any way. This is a site of National significance.
14.10.9 Bungonia.
The village of Bungonia was laid out on a grid pattern. Some of these roads are now closed. It is recommended that no further buildings be approved on land that once formed the roads (closed roads) of the small village. The purpose of this recommendation is to preserve the identity of the original grid layout of the village.

14.10.10 Other small settlements.
This archaeological management plan has recognised that there were other places in the Goulburn Mulwaree Council area (the County of Argyle) that had become small settlements by the cut-off date of 1860 (see Volume 1, Chapter 7.6). Some became fully-fledged villages after 1860. They have been difficult to identify, because of the scanty sources available to this study for these early dates. They include:

1. The Tarlo Gap.
2. Lake Bathurst, previously the Private Village of Tarago (Bongaralaby).
3. Tarago, previously Sherwin’s Flat.
4. The Village Reserve at Tarlo.
5. Windellama.
6. Timberlight.

To locate each of these smaller settlements, go to Volume 3, Goulburn Mulwaree LGA Plan Series 1.1. They have been identified as Archaeological Site Category 2a. The same procedures for conservation and management of these heritage items and archaeological sites apply (see Chapter 14.9).

In most cases they either relate to pastoral settlement or an avoidance of it (see Chapter 3.10). Two of the settlements were associated with gold mining in the 1850s and later (Windellama and Timberlight).

14.11 Recommendations for continuing the process of identification and assessment of Pastoral Settlement.
Due to budgetary constraints, this study has been able to identify and assess only a small portion of the total number of historical farms and properties belonging to the theme of Pastoral Settlement.

This work should continue for a number of reasons:
1. Important properties of National or State significance have been excluded or assessed only at a basic level (as Archaeological Site Category 2b) (see Chapter 3.4).

6. This important heritage is at severe risk, as described in Chapters 3.6.4 and 14.10.1.2.

2. No protection of heritage is provided without listing.

3. The partial survey to date does not allow the formulation of comprehensive recommendations for conservation and management, adding to the risk.

4. Without comprehensive survey of this National or State significant resource, supplementary archaeological management plans or Cultural Landscape Studies will likewise be unable to make comprehensive recommendations for conservation and management.

This continuing process should therefore be given the highest priority.

14.12 Recommendations for other archaeological themes.

Due to budgetary limited of the Archaeological Management Plan, as well as the cut-off date of 1860, not all archaeological sites or themes were considered.

This means that ‘relics’, as defined by the Heritage Act will also be distributed outside those areas at present identified as archaeological sites. This does not remove the obligation under the Act to obtain an excavation permit to disturb ‘relics’, even if they are inadvertently disturbed or located on properties not included in this Archaeological Management Plan.

The following themes were not included in the site survey for this archaeological Management Plan.

1. Aboriginal
2. Exploration.
3. Hotels and Inns.
4. Industrial Sites.
6. Cemeteries.
7. Housing.
8. All themes, post 1860s
These themes should be the subject of a supplementary or stand-alone Archaeological Management Plans. Some of the themes may be grouped together for convenience. In order to make funds go further, where possible the supplementary archaeological management plans should rely on the framework established by this study.


All conservation and management documents become redundant in a short time. This is due to changes in legislation, planning frameworks, the levels of threat and also the needs of the community.

As in the case of LGA Heritage Studies, the archaeological Management Plan should be reviewed every five years.

14.14 Cultural Tourism.

This archaeological Management Plan has highlighted some of the opportunities for Education and Cultural Tourism. Heritage and archaeological sites are a resource that is at present poorly utilised for these purposes and many important opportunities are awaiting recognition. They have the potential to bring great benefits, not only to the local community, but to the State as a whole.

14.14.1 Existing resources.

The existing resources should be used as a basis for expanding cultural tourism.

The sites currently open to the public include:

1. Goulburn Brewery.
2. The Railway Roundhouse.
3. The Waterworks, Goulburn, and
4. Riversdale, Goulburn (National Trust).

Farmstays and other accommodation on heritage properties include:

1. The Pelican.
2. Garroorigang.
3. Lansdowne Farmstead.
5. Mandelson’s.
6. Coolavin Hotel.
7. and others.

**14.14.2 Thematic Approach.**

The archaeological Management Plan has recommended a thematic approach.

An obvious theme is the Penal System and the development of museums and interpretation centres at the Mounted Police Headquarters in Old Goulburn, as well as at both Towrang and Wingello Stockades.

These sites and this theme should be linked with Riversdale, the National Trust property in Old Goulburn, as well as the former Gaol and Courthouse site in Goulburn itself. The existing prison also started its life during the period of Convict Transportation before 1841. It too is associated with the Penal System at its beginning.

Other penal sites are located in Bungonia, the site of the courthouse and lock up.

Many of the sites associated with the Penal System are located on private properties, including parts of Towrang and Wingello, as well as the gaols. Private owners may or may not wish to have the general public tramping over their properties and invading their privacy.

Possible solutions include farm stays, where those in residence have the opportunity to see the archaeological sites and other heritage items in a controlled manner. Other solutions include occasional guided tours by established groups, like the Goulburn and District Historical Society and the National Trust.

There are enough sites associated with Pastoral Settlement that are accessible from roads, but still on private property. Good views of Kippilaw can be obtained from Kippilaw Chapel, while the Barn at the Morass (Bundong) is visible from the road. There are many other sites.

The historical road routes can be used as tourist drives and the small towns and villages have the potential to provide centres for cultural tourism, including Bungonia, Lake Bathurst and Tarago. The Pastoral Landscapes of the Wollondilly
River, Mulwaree Ponds, Wollogorang provide rare opportunities to experience the historical landscape associated with the early farms.

The framework for proceeding to develop these Educational and Cultural Tourism opportunities has already been described for Towrang and Wingello Stockades (see Chapter 5.2).

In summary, conservation management plans / archaeological management plans should be prepared for each heritage and archaeological site as a framework for all future work to develop Education or Cultural Tourism. Interpretation Plans can be incorporated into the preparation of these conservation management plans / archaeological management plans, in order to:

1. The interpretation and display of the archaeological remains and other heritage items.
2. The establishment of museums and interpretation centres for education and cultural tourism.

**14.15 Summary of recommendations. and the goals of the Archaeological Management Plan.**

The recommendations of this Archaeological Management Plan are divided into a short, medium and long term timetable, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Short Term</td>
<td>1 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medium Term</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Long Term</td>
<td>4-5 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The short-term recommendations seek to establish the Archaeological Management Plan as an integrated part of Council procedures.

They also seek to complete the process of identification of heritage items and archaeological sites. Not only are a significant proportion of sites at risk, but they also have largely unrecognised potential to enrich our cultural environment.

Identification is the first step of several, as briefly summarised below. The time frames may vary, but the goals should be the same.
The first step in the process is identification of heritage items and assessing significance. Immediate works may have to be undertaken for those at risk, in order to retard deterioration (1 Year).

The second step is formulating conservation and management requirements for each heritage item (2-3 Years), including steps 3 and 4 below.

The third step is undertaking sufficient conservation works to return items to a sound condition (2-3 Years and 4-5 Years, as required).

The fourth step is to determine the appropriate use or re-use of heritage items and archaeological sites. Can these properties contribute to Education or Cultural Tourism?

This 4 point process provides the background to the timing of the recommendations in the table below.

However this is not simply an issue of farm buildings at risk, but the question of how heritage and archaeology can make a contribution in the Goulburn Mulwaree Council Area as a whole. The goal of the Archaeological Management Plan is not just to conserve and manage the archaeological sites, but to seek to make them contribute knowledge and understanding of our past, to seek to make them bear fruit in terms of education and cultural tourism.

Archaeological investigation will play an important role in this process of integrating heritage and archaeological sites into existing and proposed development, thereby enriching both our urban and rural surroundings.

The goals of the Archaeological Management Plan are further described in Volume 1, Chapter 2 and Volume 2. Chapter 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Recommendations – 1 Year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Users’ guide for AMP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Short Term Recommendations – 1 Year.

The location of Caoura Barn should be corrected in the LEP 2009, maps and text.

Integrate AMP into Council procedures.

The AMP listings should be integrated into Council GIS System. Note that it should be sufficient in the first instance simply to record the Category of Archaeological Site for each property, whether Category 1, 2a or 2b, onto the GIS system, because this will in large part determine planning and conservation procedures.

The following address and cadastral details should be added to the archaeological listings by Council, including:
- Street number and Street name.
- Lot and DP numbers.

Alternatively the Category of Archaeological Site (Category 1, 2a or 2b) should be added to each property in Council’s GIS System. See Archaeological Site Categories

The LEP 2009 and the AMP should be integrated to streamline council and public access to both documents.

Council should change its standard procedures to ensure that heritage conservation and management documentation is prepared before the design process is initiated by DA proponents.

Council should publicise this change of council procedures to ensure the community is fully aware of Council requirements.

Council should consider the risk to archaeological sites from unlawful excavation and plundering before publication of site locations. Council should seek the advice of the NSW Heritage Branch before any publication of the AMP.

The AMP should be made available on Council’s website, subject to advice re publication of site locations.

Council should establish procedures for recording heritage and conservation works against property files.
**Short Term Recommendations – 1 Year.**

Council should establish a permanent repository in Council Library (Local Studies Section) for all conservation and archaeological reports, if this has not already been done.

Council should ensure that the Permanent repository (Local Studies Section of Public Library) retains archival master copies as well as reports available to the public.

Council should consider making available electronic copies of conservation and archaeological reports on the Council or Library Website.
Short Term Recommendations – 1 Year.

Old Goulburn.

It is important that an archaeological management plan for the Headquarters of the Mounted Police at Old Goulburn should be prepared without delay. The archaeological management plan should include the whole of Old Goulburn, including its streets and allotments.

The goal is to pre-empt any future DA with regard to Old Goulburn, so that the archaeology, heritage, interpretation and display of the ‘Township of Goulburn Plains, 1829, is not compromised in any way.

This is a site of National significance.

An archaeological management plan should be prepared for the Mounted Police Headquarters at Old Goulburn. This plan should investigate:

1. The interpretation and display of the archaeological remains and other heritage items.
2. The establishment of a museum and interpretation centre for cultural tourism.
3. The integration of the Mounted Police Headquarters Site with Riversdale National Trust Property.
5. The relationship between the Mounted Police headquarters and the adjacent Goulburn Prison.
6. The role of the Mounted Police Headquarters Site in the interpretation and display of other sites in Old Goulburn.
7. Means of mitigating the impact of adjacent development on the historical setting of both Riversdale and the Mounted Police Headquarters Site.

Bungonia.

The village of Bungonia was laid out on a grid pattern. Some of these roads are now closed. It is recommended that no further buildings be approved on land that once formed the roads (now closed roads) of the small village.

The purpose of this recommendation is to preserve the identity of the original grid layout of the village.
**Short Term Recommendations – 1 Year.**

### Cultural Landscape Study

A Cultural Landscape Study should be completed in the short to medium term (1-3 years) in order to identify, assess, manage and conserve the characteristic Pastoral Landscapes associated with the early colonial farms and farmsteads.

### Grant Funding for conservation of heritage items.

A substantial increase should be made by all levels of government and other organisations in the amount of grant funding available to conserve significant farm properties.

Where spending is now in the tens of thousands, this funding needs to increase tenfold and be sustained for a number of years (10 years is suggested in the first instance).

Priority should be given to timber farms and timber farm buildings and stone farm buildings, which are at risk.

The priorities may change in the medium to long term.

Grant funding should be restricted to heritage items of National or State significance in the first instance.

The conservation management plan / archaeological management plan should be the basis for all conservation works, other than those that are urgent.

The preparation of conservation management plans / archaeological management plans for National and state significant items is therefore a medium term recommendation (See below).

The process of identification and assessment of sites related to Pastoral Settlement should be completed as a supplement to this archaeological management plan.

This task should be completed as a high priority.

The comprehensive analysis of heritage at risk should be completed as a matter of urgency, so that these heritage items can be integrated into the process of conservation management plans / archaeological management plans for National and state significant items and then eligibility for the grants programme.
**Short Term Recommendations – 1 Year.**

At both Towrang and Wingello, some of the archaeological remains and heritage items are being damaged. Action should be taken immediately to recover the remains being lost, but also to stabilise what is left intact.

An archaeological assessment report should be prepared and an excavation permit obtained for the minor excavation works to recover evidence being lost and remedial works to retard erosion at Towrang.

At Wingello, the small burial ground has been severely disturbed by wombat excavations. This is just one of the cemeteries in the Goulburn Mulwaree LGA that requires conservation (also Bungonia Cemetery). Two solutions are possible:

3. Prepare a composite conservation management plan for the minor cemeteries in the LGA, so that conservation works can be carried out in a planned framework.

4. Prepare archaeological management plans for both Towrang and Wingello Stockades, tasks included in Medium Term Recommendations.
Medium Term Recommendations. 2-3 Years.

Sites in Category 1 should be listed on the State Heritage Register (for state significant sites) or on the Local Environment Plan (LEP 2009) (for local significant sites).

Sites in both Category 2a and Category 2b should remain on the inventory of this archaeological management plan until they can be assessed by further historical research and site survey.

If further research and site survey of Category 2a and 2b Archaeological Sites demonstrates the presence of archaeological sites or other heritage items, they should then be listed at the appropriate level, as described above.

Create new heritage and archaeological precincts for Towrang and Wingello Stockades, ensuring all heritage items are protected within an ample curtilage.

Prepare archaeological management plans to provide a conservation and management framework for these sites. These plans should also determine the extent of the proposed curtilages, and also provide frameworks for:

1. The interpretation and display of the archaeological remains and other heritage items. (The archaeological displays at Towrang are now out of date and the signage worn out).

2. The establishment of museums and interpretation centres for cultural tourism at both locations.

The listing for Wild’s Pass should be included in the archaeological management plans for Towrang and Wingello as a related site.

The preparation of the Interpretation Plan component of these studies should be integrated with the one also to be prepared for the Mounted Police Headquarters at Old Goulburn.

Conservation and management frameworks for each major National and State significant sites should be established using conservation management plans / an archaeological management plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Medium Term Recommendations. 2-3 Years.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A conservation management plan / an archaeological management plan should be prepared for each National and State significant heritage item or archaeological site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conservation management plan / an archaeological management plan should be integrated with the business plans for the enterprises now undertaken on these items or sites.

The conservation management plan / an archaeological management plan should also provide the framework against which all development applications are assessed.

Once the conservation management plan / archaeological management plan is approved, each development application may then be assessed by means of a heritage impact statement / archaeological assessment report against the conservation polices and management frameworks already in place.

The conservation management plan / archaeological management plan should also provide the framework for assessing all proposals for

1. Interpretation and Display.
2. Cultural Tourism, museums and interpretation centres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A legitimate use of heritage grant funding should be the preparation of conservation management plans / archaeological management plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Cultural Landscape Study should be completed in the short to medium term (1-3 years) in order to identify, assess, manage and conserve the characteristic Pastoral Landscapes associated with the early colonial farms and farmsteads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Medium Term Recommendations. 2-3 Years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council should encourage the development of a skills base by providing employment in the conservation of timber, brick and stone farmhouses, farm buildings and other heritage items of National and State significance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This skills base should exist and be promoted within the local government area, just as the expertise for maintaining steam engines is highly developed in Goulburn at the Waterworks and Railway Roundhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best practice is to retain this skills base: not lose it and then have to redevelop it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase in the grants programme should therefore be closely related to trade apprenticeships at the local educational institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A significant proportion of existing listings within the Goulburn Mulwaree LEP 2009 do not provide sufficient curtilages to adequately protect the heritage items listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curtilages of heritage items should be reviewed and the LEP 2009 updated where necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preparation of conservation management plans / archaeological management plans for National and State significant heritage items should include the reassessment of curtilages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long Term Recommendations. 4-5 Years.
**Long Term Recommendations. 4-5 Years.**

Archaeological Management Plans should be prepared for the themes not included in this study:

- 9. Aboriginal
- 10. Exploration.
- 12. Industrial Sites.
- 15. Housing.
- 16. All themes, post 1860s

These themes should be the subject of a supplementary or stand-alone Archaeological Management Plans.

Some of the themes may be grouped together for convenience. In order to make funds go further, where possible the supplementary archaeological management plans should rely on the framework established by this study.

A more detailed Archaeological Management Plan should be prepared for Goulburn and Old Goulburn.

This study should be prepared on a lot by lot basis.

Benefits will include:

1. More precise identification of heritage and archaeological sites within the urban areas.
2. Better understanding of the potential to include heritage in existing and new development
3. Forward planning for the integration of archaeology, history, education interpretation and display on heritage sites within Goulburn and the whole of the Goulburn Mulwaree Local Government Area.
4. Realise the benefits of interpretation and display in existing and new developments through a wide range of methods.
## Recommendations. End of five Year Period

This Archaeological Management Plan should itself be reviewed, so that it fully meets the requirements for conservation and management of archaeological and other heritage sites for the next period of 5 years.
BIBLIOGRAPHY.

To be completed.
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PREVIOUS HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS, HELD BY THE LIBRARY, HERITAGE BRANCH, NSW DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING.

To be completed.
APPENDIX 1. GOULBURN MULWAREE ARCHAEOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN – PLANNING INPUTS.

Susan Jackson-Stepowski.
**Goulburn Mulwaree Archaeological Management Plan**

**Authorship**


**Town Planning Inputs**

The objective of the town planning section of the Goulburn-Mulwaree Archaeological Management Plan [AMP] is to identify options for future management mechanisms to retain significance of archaeological ‘places’ up to circa 1860. Noted in the AMP section ‘13. Summary and recommendations’ is:-

> The … level of significance of archaeological sites in the Mulwaree Goulburn local government area is not intended to be exhaustive. Its purpose is to highlight those themes that should be given priority in heritage listings. [draft p167]

**Method**

The following tasks were undertaken
- consult with other professionals on the Project team
- consult with representative from the NSW Heritage Branch
- synopsis of implications raised in the Draft AMP
- recommend options for land use regulation

Input into this section of the AMP has been restricted by minimal time and budget allocations. Also limited were inputs regard to :-
* on-going changes with planning and regulatory frameworks
* where an archaeological place may be
  - in or affect a ‘cultural landscape’, particularly places such as linear routes e.g. theme transport
  - in a possible ‘buffer zone’ required to protect the setting and context of a ‘place’.

**Legislative matters**

There has been a suite of rapid legislative changes over the recent past. This report does not discuss these changes in detail, nor how the planning system works. Rather it notes observations derived from various secondary documents pertinent for the AMP.

**NSW Heritage Amendment Act 2009**

The overall objective of the 2009 Act was to implement the principal recommendations of the 2007 Heritage Act Review by the Independent Expert Panel. Several changes have blurred the ICOMOS Burra Charter separate steps of ‘identifying’ significance from ‘managing’ significance.

A brief background is below, being pertinent to archaeology in particular.


The recently proclaimed Heritage Amendment Act (#34) implements the principal recommendations of this review and received assent on 9 June 2009, and was proclaimed on 16 October.

One of the changes to the former Heritage Act has been the move from the arbitrary 50 year age-based definition for archaeology, to one based on significance where relics have to demonstrate local or State significance.
Under the former Act a 'relic' had been defined as any deposit which related to the European settlement of NSW and was 50 years old or more. The Independent Review Panel considered that this broad definition captured too many items - many of which would not generally be considered part of the State's archaeological heritage.

The [new] approach brings archaeological heritage management more consistently within the management of other heritage items, which is based on an assessment of significance.

In NSW the heritage system will continue to be based on three critical management stages: (1) investigate significance, (2) assess significance, and (3) manage significance (The NSW Heritage Manual, 1996). These fundamental processes will continue to apply to archaeological sites and associated relics.

After an assessment of the important values of the archaeological site or 'relic' is made, or potential of a site is made, then appropriate options to manage those items and places can be identified.

Note also, the relics provisions were/are triggered by the 'likelihood' of existence, e.g. if there is an archaeological management plan, or if you are in an historic area, etc. Section 146 still applies and requires (whether you have a permit or not), that the Heritage Council is notified if relics are found. This means that sites do not have to be already listed or identified to be covered.

The Act amendments reinforce that there are two levels of heritage significance in the NSW heritage management system: Local or State. The Department of Planning will issue guidelines on how to assess archaeology of local and State significance.

* 'State heritage significance', in relation to a place, building, work, relic, moveable object or precinct, means significance to the State in relation to the historical, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic value of the item (Section 4A).

* Local heritage significance', in relation to a place, building, work, relic, moveable object or precinct, means significance to an area in relation to the historical, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic value of the item (Section 4A).

Fundamentally, the archaeological management system in NSW will be unaltered - Permits will continue to be issued in accordance with Heritage Council policies that ensure that disturbance of sites and 'relics' occurs in accordance with appropriate professional assessment, standards and procedures. The current s.139 and s.60 approvals processes will continue to occur at archaeological sites and deposits in NSW

Where works deal with ‘relics’, rather than ‘works’, these changes need to be considered in all current applications.

State Heritage Register [SHR]
• A SHR listing must meet more than one criterion (except if it is of particular significance).
• The Minister can list an item on the SHR if the Minister considers it to be of State significance after considering a recommendation of the Heritage Council, and considered:
  - whether long-term conservation is necessary,
  - reasonable or economic use of the item, and
  - financial hardship to the owner.

---

1 Tim Smith, Deputy Director, Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning posted on the TICCIH n Oz e-group on 26 October 2009, circulated to the TICCIH-in-Oz e-group July 2009
Owners do not have to be individually notified in the proposed SHR listing of large precincts (e.g. towns or suburbs). Notification will take place via newspaper advertisements. The Department of Planning will consider other measures as necessary.

It has long been the practice to issue ‘exemptions’ for specified works for places on the SHR.

Heritage Listings by Local Government

- Councils can refer proposals to list heritage items in their LEPs to an independent hearing and assessment panel (‘IHAP’) where an owner has objected to listing. This is intended to enable an independent review of proposed heritage listings. Such a referral would occur after the draft LEP has been exhibited and before its finalisation by a council.

Conservation Management Plans [CMP]

- The Heritage Council can endorse a conservation management plan for items listed on the State Heritage Register.
- Certain works in an endorsed CMP can then be carried out without Heritage Council approval (see also SHR ‘exemptions’ note above).
- The Heritage Council will also be required to consider endorsed CMPs when considering applications for development.

Comment:
- It is unknown as yet, and assumed, that an AMP could be similarly endorsed if of State significance.
- Local councils are similarly encouraged to endorse CMPs and Conservation management Strategies [CMS] for places in an LEP heritage schedule.

Stop Work Order

- The Minister or the Chair of the Heritage Council can issue a ‘stop work’ order if an item on the State Heritage Register or subject to an interim heritage order is being or is about to be harmed and where a prior approval under the Act has not been obtained.
- The order will last for 40 days and give the Minister or the Heritage Council time to commence other action, such as seeking a Court order.

NSW Planning and Assessment Amendment Act 2008

Integrated Development Applications

- The EP&A Act has been amended to enable integrated development applications to be made by State Agencies, but only where it requires an approval to carry out work under the Heritage Act. Comment: State Agencies no longer need to comply with LEP provisions
- A local council is now prevented from refusing a development application on heritage grounds if an approval under the Heritage Act by the Heritage Council has been given in respect of the same development.
- The Heritage Act and assessments under the EP&A Act are ‘turn-off’ for specified sites and lands, e.g. some lands owned by State Agencies, subject to the Federal education building programme for school works and Dept of Housing activities.

Council documents

Time and budget constraints did not enable a review of the Council’s regulatory framework, including its LEP, land classifications (inclusive of areas defined as ‘sensitive’ or subject to flood), exempt and complying, section 94 contributions plan, social plan, flood mitigation, open space strategy, as well as the Council’s Asset Register and its on-going management of its assets, including engineering and maintenance works.

Contact with NSW Heritage Branch
Branch officers are reluctant to comment on the planning implications of the AMP without first seeing a draft document. They recommend Council Officers organise a meeting with both a Heritage Branch planner and archaeologist together, and the consultant, to discuss how to manage and further this Project.

A pending meeting agenda should also discuss:-
- Places identified belonging to State agencies, including those that may be under current or re-defined s170 Registers under the NSW Heritage Amendment Act
- Places identified belonging to institutions and corporations
- Places that may be subject to Part 3A of the EP&A Act, and/or excluded by other legislations e.g. quarrying activities and haulage roads
- Table 12.1 ‘List of sites with State significance’, and
- Table 12.2 ‘List of sites with national significance’ for possible referral to the Commonwealth Department of Environment, Water and Heritage, responsible for the Australian National List and the Australian Commonwealth List

AMP groups of ‘places’
Archaeological elements within the Study Area are grouped as follows.

Pastoral settlements
Include elements such as homestead complexes and groups, farm houses, gardens, outbuildings, above and below ground ruins, fence lines, landscape setting, isolated cemeteries and lone graves, etc. as well the evolution of estates

Management of pastoral settlements is closely linked with cultural landscapes below.

Linear routes and Convict stockades
e.g. Wild’s Pass, Macquarie Road, Wingello Stockade and village reserve around Lake Bathurst, Tarago and Tarlo e.g. Baker’s map 1843-46

Individual sites
The majority of individual sites relate to linear routes. Isolated sites also include several industrial sites e.g. mines and mineral extraction, flour mills, water management, brickworks and breweries. Another historic theme relates to cemeteries.

Urban areas:
  a) Goulburn Conservation Area including the Central Business District and some residential zoned land

  b) Northern extension of the Goulburn Conservation Area to include, for example,
     - Mitchell’s ‘Plan of the Town of Goulburn’ 1833,
     - Hoddle’s ‘Expanded plan of the Town of Goulburn’ 1833,
     - ‘Plan of Township of Goulburn’ 1833 with added information showing how the railway cut across the southern end causing street realignments after 1869,
     - ‘Plan of Goulburn and villa allotments’ 1836,
     - Glebe extension 1840,
     - Baker’s Map 1843-46, etc

  c) Villages’ grid layout and boundaries as established by:-
     for Bungonia e.g. Baker’s Map of County of Argyle’ 1843-46,
     for Marulan e.g. Mitchell ‘Design for Marulan’ 1833, and Baker’s Map 1843-46
d) Other settlements, e.g.
   for Norwood e.g. subdivision plan 1880
   for Kingsdale e.g. subdivision plan 1880
   for Mummel e.g. subdivision plan 1857

Cultural landscapes:
The majority of pastoral settlements relate to terrain, such as river valleys and flood plains. This has implications for ‘expanded curtilages’, views and vistas that should be retained and conserved.

Threats to AMP places
In consultation with the project team, the potential threats were identified.

The following table notes identified threats and options to conserve significance according to the AMP groups.

The Table is in no order of action. Further action should be prioritised according to immediate, short and longer term threats to a ‘place’.
Threats and options to conserve significance of archaeological sites prior to c1860 with the Goulburn-Mulwaree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Pastoral settlements 1820s-1840s and evolution of estates</th>
<th>Cultural landscape</th>
<th>Linear routes, associated places and convict stockades</th>
<th>Individual sites, inc. industrial, agri-industrial, residential and cemeteries</th>
<th>Urban areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ‘place’ not being on a statutory list</td>
<td>List as a ‘complex’ or ‘group’ item on LEP schedule, with listing heading clearly stating ‘group’ or ‘complex’, and all elements named in the Statement of Significance</td>
<td>Undertake a cultural landscape study of identified ‘places’ whose conservation relies in whole on place, as an immediate priority</td>
<td>- List as a ‘complex’ or ‘group’ item on LEP schedule, with listing heading clearly stating ‘group’ or ‘complex’, and all elements named in the Statement of Significance - List key sectors - List the entire road corridor/reservation</td>
<td>List as an item on LEP schedule</td>
<td>Boundaries be extended to include identified AMP range * Goulburn Conservation Area boundaries be extended to include the original settlement and the later c1850s infill along the original road route * Bungonia: create a conservation area * Marulan: expand the conservation area to include historic archaeology SEE NOTE 6 below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessibility or inability to assess or record a ‘place’</td>
<td>Until a place is assessed, for whatever reasons, it should remain on the AMP map as an indicative place</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto, and Whilst considerable research has been undertaken by the Historical Society, ‘lines of roads’ need to be independently assessed and verified Lines of road include verge elements May require co-operative approach as a joint project with adjoining LGAs</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of significance arising from surrounding cultural landscapes, views and vistas</td>
<td>High priority to retain key views and vistas</td>
<td>High priority to retain key views and vistas</td>
<td>High priority to retain key views and vistas</td>
<td>High priority to retain key views and vistas</td>
<td>High priority to retain key views and vistas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE NOTE 4 below

SEE NOTE 6 below
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Pastoral settlements 1820s-1840s and evolution of estates</th>
<th>Cultural landscape</th>
<th>Linear routes, associated places and convict stockades</th>
<th>Individual sites, inc. industrial, agri-industrial, residential and cemeteries</th>
<th>Urban areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closer settlement patterns and subdivision, e.g. hobby farms and/or linear divisions sited within the landscape</strong></td>
<td>High priority Check landuse maps SEE NOTE 4 below</td>
<td>High priority Check landuse maps SEE NOTE 4 below Concerns raised about unknowing and indiscriminate linear divisions, e.g. planting of visual and wind barriers, corridors of street trees, that would prevent the understanding of the colonial cultural landscape and interrelationships with routes and early estates</td>
<td>High priority Check landuse maps SEE NOTE 4 below Engineering works to be made aware of historic archaeology e.g. if road works or change of road corridor or alignment</td>
<td>High priority Check landuse maps SEE NOTE 4 below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of individual assessments and/or management documents, such as via CMPs or CMSs</strong></td>
<td>SEEK NOTE 5 below</td>
<td>SEEK NOTE 5 below</td>
<td>SEEK NOTE 5 below</td>
<td>SEEK NOTE 5 below</td>
<td>SEEK NOTE 5 below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost incurred in providing heritage impact statements including an archaeological survey</strong></td>
<td>OPTION: seek to keep this to $500+GST, most land parcels in would be insignificant; as an assessment is undertaken for each parcel of land, this parcel, be coloured to indicate that it is clear of historic archaeology SEE NOTE 1 below</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exempt and complying codes for all landuses, inc. - any disturbance of the soil or - impacts on earlier</strong></td>
<td>Undertake an immediate review, having a high priority, for both State and Council Policies as to how these may impact upon the AMP groups, including a test of Policies</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Pastoral settlements 1820s-1840s and evolution of estates</td>
<td>Cultural landscape</td>
<td>Linear routes, associated places and convict stockades</td>
<td>Individual sites, inc. industrial, agri-industrial, residential and cemeteries</td>
<td>Urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural / industrial activities</td>
<td>applied to an example from each of the AMP groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further clarification of matters that arise from the State-wide Exempt and Complying SEPP for residential, commercial and rural works be investigated. Where conflicts the Council seek an ‘exclusion’ from those clauses of the SEPP based on its Archaeological Management Plan for sites prior to 1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with State Agencies and other institutions</td>
<td>SEE ALSO above under heading NSW Heritage Branch</td>
<td>SEE ALSO above under heading NSW Heritage Branch</td>
<td>SEE ALSO above under heading NSW Heritage Branch</td>
<td>SEE ALSO above under heading NSW Heritage Branch</td>
<td>SEE ALSO above under heading NSW Heritage Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of what ‘heritage’ listing means, entails or implies</td>
<td>Develop a Fact Sheet and include the more common questions and answers, brief background to the AMP, and why it is important to the history of NSW and LGA</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of agri-industrial and industrial layers within the LGA</td>
<td>Develop a Fact Sheet and include the more common questions and answers, brief background to the AMP, and</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Pastoral settlements 1820s-1840s and evolution of estates</td>
<td>Cultural landscape</td>
<td>Linear routes, associated places and convict stockades</td>
<td>Individual sites, inc. industrial, agri-industrial, residential and cemeteries</td>
<td>Urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>why it is important to the history of NSW and LGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE NOTE 2 below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural tourism</td>
<td>Develop a Fact Sheet for free distribution at the Tourist Office and key sites throughout the LGA, including the five AMP groups</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Council policies, practices, corporate knowledge, and asset management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For parts in the public domain</th>
<th>For parts in the public domain</th>
<th>For parts in the public domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A policy be resolved by the Council to guide all Council works and operations in the public domain to ensure - corporate knowledge of AMP places - AMPs places are included on the Asset Register - all works, including sub contractors and foremen are fully briefed and know about AMP places and how to undertake works in the vicinity</td>
<td>A policy be resolved by the Council to guide all Council works and operations in the public domain to ensure - corporate knowledge of AMP places - AMPs places are included on the Asset Register - all works, including sub contractors and foremen are fully briefed and know about AMP places and how to undertake works in the vicinity</td>
<td>A policy be resolved by the Council to guide all Council works and operations in the public domain to ensure - corporate knowledge of AMP places - AMPs places are included on the Asset Register - all works, including sub contractors and foremen are fully briefed and know about AMP places and how to undertake works in the vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convict Stockade places on maps 345, 346 and 349 be included on Council’s Asset Register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notations**

|          | Known and indicative historic archaeological places prior to 1860 to be a layer inserted | ditto | ditto | ditto | ditto |

**Internal Council policies, practices, corporate knowledge, and asset management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For parts in the public domain</th>
<th>For parts in the public domain</th>
<th>For parts in the public domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A policy be resolved by the Council to guide all Council works and operations in the public domain to ensure - corporate knowledge of AMP places - AMPs places are included on the Asset Register - all works, including sub contractors and foremen are fully briefed and know about AMP places and how to undertake works in the vicinity</td>
<td>A policy be resolved by the Council to guide all Council works and operations in the public domain to ensure - corporate knowledge of AMP places - AMPs places are included on the Asset Register - all works, including sub contractors and foremen are fully briefed and know about AMP places and how to undertake works in the vicinity</td>
<td>A policy be resolved by the Council to guide all Council works and operations in the public domain to ensure - corporate knowledge of AMP places - AMPs places are included on the Asset Register - all works, including sub contractors and foremen are fully briefed and know about AMP places and how to undertake works in the vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convict Stockade places on maps 345, 346 and 349 be included on Council’s Asset Register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Threats and Associated Cultural Landscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Pastoral settlements 1820s-1840s and evolution of estates</th>
<th>Cultural landscape</th>
<th>Linear routes, associated places and convict stockades</th>
<th>Individual sites, inc. industrial, agri-industrial, residential and cemeteries</th>
<th>Urban areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>into the section 149 Certificates, in a similar manner as criteria applicable for Exempt &amp; Complying development overlays</td>
<td>see also Great North Road world heritage nomination including management of linear and buffer zones</td>
<td>see also Historic Roads and Routes PhD by Sue Rosen</td>
<td>see also ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Miscellaneous

- The original colour copy of an archaeological assessment and archaeological impact statements to be accessioned into the Council’s Local Studies Library, under closed access, and copies housed with the Council’s development assessment section for future staff reference.

### NOTE 1: Endorsement and mapping of Archaeological Impact Statements

- **To lessen requirements upon property owners, where an initial archaeological assessment has been undertaken for a parcel of land, and that assessment has been accredited by the local heritage advisor as being of a standard undertaken according to current best practice, this assessment then be:**
  - attached to the property file for future reference when assessing future applications on that parcel of land
  - attached to the inventory sheet for future reference as a trigger when assessing future applications on that parcel of land
  - included in a non-publicly accessible field in the Council property information system

- **AND**
  - Subsequent to an initial accredited archaeological assessment of a parcel of land that has been accredited by the local heritage advisor, future applications for that parcel of land, but outside a known zone of archaeological potential, may be dealt with under draft Standard Instrument clause 5.10(3) (a) (i) and (ii) - i.e. deemed to be minor and not to adversely affected, and therefore no further archaeological assessment required
NOTE 2: Guide to owners, applicants and private certifiers

• To assist owners and applicants, an "Archaeological Guide" be drafted for those lands known or indicative of containing historic archaeology prior to 1860.
• The Guide should detail what will be required to be lodged with any development application, such as site specific historical research and archaeological impact statement.
• The Guide should be explicit and very clear about exempt and complying development that can not apply to such lands
• The Guide should be circulated to those persons operating more frequently as private certifiers within the LGA, and a clear notation / tag for private certifiers be inserted on the Council web site.
• The Guide should list above ground structures which may be considered as having historic significance for residential, commercial or rural situations
• The Guide should note the importance of the variety of building materials, techniques, and vernacular architectural styles representative of persons from all socio-economic status.
• The Guide should clearly state that it applies to both 'green fields' and 'brown field' or redeveloped sites
• A <.pdf> version of the Guide should be included on the Council web site as a free down-load
• The Guide should be a segment of all staff inductions, and assist Council staff to understand the historical archaeology of the Goulburn Mulwaree region

NOTE 3: Mapping of AMP sites and indicative places

• Identification on the map and schedule
  A. Where an archaeological site is indicative but exact knowledge remains unknown, and/or the land parcel is pending a more comprehensive site, assessment, the entire lot and DP to be included on the AMP map and AMP schedule (this being the normal practice for any heritage place)
  B. Where it is known where archaeological evidence is relative to a parcel of land, then a circle be plotted on the map for that portion of the lot thus affected, inclusive of a buffer radius as determined by the local heritage advisor (which is increasingly the method used for non-specific identification of Aboriginal sites), and an extract map be included in the AMP schedule and attached to the 'place' and/or AMP inventory sheet

NOTE 4 Cultural landscape assessment and guides

• The following are some known other documents that may assist
  - Wingecarribee Council ‘Cultural Landscape Study and Assessments’
  - Shellharbour City Council ‘EWAR Landscape Assessment Guide’
• Key Cultural Landscapes should be included in cultural tourism programmes and brochures

NOTE 5 Conservation Management Plans (CMP) and Conservation Management Strategies (CMS)
• A CMP should be undertaken for places having State and National significance
• Where funds are initially limited and for more modest places, a CMS should be undertaken
• Both a CMP and a CMS should specifically include sections on assessment of views and vistas, and the relationship of the ‘place’ to the AMP
• CMPs and CMSs should be
  - endorsed by the Council for a period of 5 years,
  - included in the property information fields and
  - a trigger for heritage referral if an application is made for the land
• CMPs and CMSs could identify what works and activities on the land may be considered for ‘exemptions’ for further approvals from a consent authority.

NOTE 6 Conservation Area Boundaries
• The current Conservation Areas have been identified because of other layers of significance, such as built heritage and visual aesthetics. The AMP would create an additional layer of significance, which may or may not include the existing building stock or other values, such as aesthetics
• The Goulburn Conservation Area should include
  - The Police Headquarters and convict stockade c1828-1840, including ‘Riversdale’, the goal and former cemetery, and much of the flood plain
  - Old Goulburn layout
  - the 1860s southern extension
• Conservation Area boundaries may need further refinement subsequent to further study and inputs, such as
  - the View and Vista Survey,
  - as sites become excluded for archaeological potential via individual Archaeological Impact Statements, such sites be differentiated on the AMP map overlay, and thereby become a trigger for Council staff to affirm that an Archaeological Impact Statement is NOT required because one already existing for that parcel of land. In this way, over time, the an entire conservation area will be investigated and provided greater certainty to both residents and in regard to archaeology or its absence
• Extensions to the conservation areas might also be recorded as a ‘group item’ having more than one land parcel. This approach may be more suitable for villages of Marulan and Bungonia (and with regard to the latter where some places have been incorrectly located and or notated)
APPENDIX 2. A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION IS RECEIVED BY COUNCIL – WHAT NEXT?
## APPENDIX 2. A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION IS RECEIVED BY COUNCIL – WHAT NEXT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A Development Application is received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does the property include Standing Buildings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go to Row 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go to Row 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the property include Ruins or an archaeological site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Go to Row 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Go to Row 14, Columns 2 or 3, as required</td>
<td>Go to Row 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is the property identified as a Category of Archaeological Site in the Archaeological Management Plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Go to – ‘Locating a Site and establishing its Archaeological Site Category’ in the AMP (Volume 2, Chapter 14.4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Go to Row 7, Columns 3 or 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does the property also possess Ruins? Go to Row 8, Columns 1 or 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB. Some archaeological sites are not identified in the AMP. If the date of any buildings, works, relics or other items is outside the Themes set as priorities in the AMP, or if the items post-date 1860, it is possible they have been omitted from the AMP, even though they are defined as ‘relics’ under the Heritage Act or recognised as heritage items. If in doubt, see advice from Council or the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No Go to Row 9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Go to Row 14, Columns 2 or 3, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the AMP identify the property as an archaeological site? Go to Row 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Go to Row 21 in this column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB. Some archaeological sites are not identified in the AMP. If the date of any buildings, works, relics or other items is outside the Themes set as priorities in the AMP, or if the items post-date 1860, it is possible they have been omitted from the AMP, even though they are defined as ‘relics’ under the Heritage Act or recognised as heritage items. If in doubt, see advice from Council or the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning. Go to Row 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go to Row 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Go to Row 14, Columns 2 or 3, as required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12  | Is the building of heritage significance?  
Is it a listing on the LEP 2009?  
Is the building  
Vernacular  
Georgian  
Victorian  
Federation  
California Bungalow  
Or other style, dating up to WW II  
(cut-off date to be determined jointly by  
Goulburn Mulwaree Council and the Heritage  
Branch, NSW Department of Planning)  
Go to Row 13 if Yes.  
Go to Row 14, Columns 2 or 3, if answer to  
questions in Column 1, Row 7 or 9 was ‘Yes’.  
Go to Row 21 in Column 4, if ‘No’ is the  
answer to both of the above. | | | |
| 13  | Yes      | | | |
| 14  | 1. Prepare Conservation Management  
Plan for items of state significance.  
2. Prepare Conservation Policy document  
for items of local significance.  
4. If the building or property includes  
ruins or archaeological sites, also  
follow procedures for each  
Archaeological Site Category in Row  
14, Columns 2 and 3 to right. | Archaeological Site Category 1  
or 2a.  
Go to – ‘Locating a Site and  
establishing its Archaeological  
Site Category’ in the AMP  
(Volume 2, Chapter 14.4). | | Archaeological Site  
Category 2b  
Go to – ‘Locating a Site  
and establishing its  
Archaeological Site  
Category’ in the AMP  
(Volume 2, Chapter 14.4). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Is the property listed on the State Heritage Register?</td>
<td>Go to Row 16, in Column 1</td>
<td>Go to Row 16, in Column 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the property is listed on the State Heritage Register, obtain Section 60 approval under the Heritage Act. Care should be taken to ensure that the correct approvals are obtained: 1. Standard Section 60 approval for Standing Buildings. 2. Section 60 approval for archaeological investigation. 3. Where standing buildings also require archaeological investigation, both types of Section 60 approval should be obtained. Seek advice from the archaeologist at the Heritage Branch, NSW department of Planning.</td>
<td>If the property is not listed on the State Heritage Register, obtain Section 140 (excavation permit) approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The impact on the State Heritage Registered item may be minor and eligible for permit exemption. Follow procedures for Permit Exemptions.</td>
<td>The impact on the item (not on the State Heritage Register) may be minor and eligible for excavation permit exception. Follow procedures for Permit Exceptions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>After Section 60 approval or permit exception is obtained, proceed with archaeological investigation, if required. See also Users’ Guide to AMP for timetable of archaeology in the process of design for DA approval. Care should be taken to obtain the written approval from Council and the Heritage Branch, if archaeological investigation is being undertaken prior to DA approval.</td>
<td>After Section 140 excavation permit or permit exception is obtained, proceed with archaeological investigation, if required. See also Users’ Guide to AMP for timetable of archaeology in the process of design for DA approval. Care should be taken to obtain the written approval from Council and the Heritage Branch, if archaeological investigation is being undertaken prior to DA approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Obtain DA approval</td>
<td>Obtain DA approval</td>
<td>Obtain DA approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Proceed with DA in accordance with:</td>
<td>Proceed with DA in accordance with:</td>
<td>Proceed with development in accordance with DA conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. DA conditions.</td>
<td>1. DA conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Section 60 excavation permit or permit exemption conditions.</td>
<td>2. Section 140 excavation permit or permit exemption conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well Done!