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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The study area comprises the Teralba Cemetery, within Precinct 10, Site 7777, Teralba. The area of Precinct 10 was identified in the Hunter Regional Environmental Plan 1989 as a potential residential area within the settlement strategy for the lower Hunter Area. The cemetery is within the Local Government Area of the Lake Macquarie Council. The general location of the study area is shown in Figure 1.

The Teralba Cemetery (also known as the ‘Old Teralba Cemetery’), occupies a formerly isolated site within an area of Precinct 10 which is shortly to be developed by Landcom as a new release subdivision. The area was not intensively settled until the arrival of the railway during the 1880s, with the cemetery itself probably established by 1890, as the earliest extant inscription dates from 1892. The cemetery contains at least thirty identifiable graves, most of which are marked by surrounds of brick or stone without formal headstones. About 12 headstones (some in fragments only) remain on the site.

Following the issue of a brief for an “Archaeology - Cemetery Study”, this report was commissioned by Landcom in December, 1993.

1.2 AIMS OF THE STUDY

A copy of the study brief is included in the Appendices to the report. As described in the Brief, the main objectives of the study are:

a) Provide a detailed plan of management for the early 20th century cemetery;

b) Provide a detailed report;

c) Have the report accepted by Council and the Department of Planning.

The study also requires the research and approval of Aboriginal names to be used for parks and streets in the new subdivision. This component forms Appendix I of the report.

1.3 AUTHORSHIP

This report represents the combined effort of a multi-disciplinary study team. The study was co-ordinated by Siobhán Lavelle, Historical Archaeologist, who is responsible for this overall report, its assessments and recommendations.

The main historical research was undertaken by Dr John Turner, Hunter History Consultants, who prepared the historical outline comprising Section 2.1 of this report. Siobhan Lavelle also completed some supplementary historical research, concentrating on the records of the Lands Department and Land Titles Office.

Expert advice on the cemetery vegetation was provided by the National Trust's Bush Management Officer, Ms Louise Brodie, and Senior Conservation Officer, Mr Graham Quint. Landscape advice was also obtained from Mr Geoffrey Britton, Landscape Architect, who was also consulted during the selection of an appropriate curtilage for the cemetery site.

1.4 METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE

This study and report generally follow the methodology and structure outlined in J S Kerr, The Conservation Plan, the National Trust of Australia (NSW), third edition 1990. The report is also consistent with the principles of the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter) and its Guidelines. The Burra Charter and its Guidelines are reproduced in the Appendices to the report. Additional documents
considered in the preparation of the report include The Department of Planning / Heritage Council Cemeteries - Guidelines for their care and conservation, 1992, and the National Trust of Australia (NSW) Cemeteries Policy Paper, 1985. These documents outline criteria for assessing the significance of cemeteries and address other matters to be considered in examining cemetery conservation issues.

In accordance with the sequence of actions outlined by J S Kerr, this report includes documentary research, and physical analysis of the site (incorporating recording of the extant fabric of the cemetery by means of inventory sheets and detailed site plans) prior to the determination of significance and formulation of conservation policy.

The study boundaries included the present cemetery area and its immediate environs, as it is believed the site may have extended further in earlier periods than is now evident from the extant physical fabric. In order to understand the significance of the site it is also necessary to consider its local and regional context.

1.5 DEFINITIONS


• CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE means aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations.

• PLACE means site, area, building or other work ...together with associated contents and surroundings.

• FABRIC means all the physical material of the place.

• CONSERVATION means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain cultural significance. It includes maintenance and may according to circumstance include preservation, restoration, reconstruction, and adaptation and will commonly be a combination of more than one of these.

• MAINTENANCE means the continuous protective care of the fabric, contents and setting of a place, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves restoration or reconstruction and should be treated accordingly.

• PRESERVATION means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

• RESTORATION means returning the EXISTING fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.

• RECONSTRUCTION means returning a place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state and is distinguished by the introduction of materials (new or old) into the fabric.

• ADAPTATION means modifying a place to suit proposed compatible uses.

• COMPATIBLE USE means a use which involves no change to the culturally significant fabric, changes which are substantially reversible, or changes which require a minimal impact.

1.6 RESEARCH / CONSULTATION

Completion of the study has involved examination of a wide variety of archival and historic sources, available both in the local area and in Sydney. Archives or records repositories consulted during the study include:
Archives Office of NSW (State Archives - Sydney and Kingswood Repositories)
Lake Macquarie City Library and Newcastle City Library (Local Studies collections)
Lands Department (CALM - Sydney and East Maitland)
Land Titles Office (Sydney)
State Rail Authority Archives (Sydney)

The conduct of the study has also included consultation (by correspondence and discussion) with a number of individuals and organisations. The views of organisations including the Lake Macquarie Council, the Lake Macquarie and District Historical Society, the National Trust, and the Heritage Branch of the Department of Planning have been taken into consideration in preparing this report.

1.7 LIMITATIONS

As with many consultancy studies, the timing and budgetary allocation has imposed limits on the amount of detailed research and analysis able to be undertaken. In particular, research into individual biographies and detailed family histories has not been completed. It is possible that additional information, not available to this study, may come to light. Nevertheless, the level of research undertaken is considered sufficient to enable a proper understanding of the site and its history, allowing an informed assessment of its cultural significance.
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1 A short presentation on the cemetery, study and proposed recommendations was made to the National Trust's Cemeteries Committee (Sydney) on 14/2/94. A similar discussion was held with the Archaeologist, Heritage Branch, Department of Planning on 21/2/94.
2.0 DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

2.1 HISTORICAL OUTLINE - TERALBA'S PIONEER CEMETERY

The town of Teralba was a product of the construction of the Newcastle-Sydney railway, commenced 1880, completed 1889, but built in stages. The contract for the construction of the Gosford to Waratah section was let to the Amos Bros. in 1883 and work began soon afterwards.

The route of the railway between the headwaters of Fennell’s Bay and Awaba Bay crossed a large hill, known as “Big Hill” or “Billygoat Hill” and the contractors opened up gravel quarries on its north side to provide fill and ballast for the line. By 1884 a large construction camp had been set up on or near the Big Hill, probably close to an adjacent creek which came to be known as Fresh Water Creek - this camp was sometimes called “Freshwater Creek” and sometimes “The Gravel Pits”. The camp is shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3.

“The Big Hill” and its adjacent Fresh Water Creek formed part of the 914 acre “Awaba Park” estate of Margaret Quigley, the daughter of the wealthy Dr James Mitchell of Sydney whose extensive landholdings were divided between his children when he died in 1869. The Quigley family lived in Awaba House, near Marmong Point, and Margaret and her husband, William, are buried near the site of the house (refer to Figure 4).

It was a policy of Dr Mitchell and his heirs to retain the freeholds of their estates, choosing to develop them by leaseholds as they did at Stockton, Merewether and at Awaba Park. Thus, when a town threatened to develop out of “The Gravel Pits” camp, those who sought land for commercial or residential purposes were merely offered leases.

Large railway construction camps often developed into permanent towns, especially if employment opportunities existed in the area. This was the case at “The Gravel Pits” because of local timber, gravel and coal reserves. In 1886 the Great Northern Coal Company began to develop a mine which was later known as the Northern Colliery, the Pacific Co-operative Colliery, the Pacific Colliery and finally the Macquarie Colliery. Another coal mine, the Garlee (?) opened in the district in 1890 (known as Northern Extended after 1902), confirming the potential for a permanent town. Saw mills were also established and there was a continuing demand for gravel.

Recognising the more stable prospects of the Gravel Pits area, the Education Department moved the Cockle Creek Camp school to the former location early in 1886. On a one acre site leased from the Quigley Estate, the school had ninety pupils by the end of 1886 and by the end of 1889 there were 190. First known as the Gravel Pits, then called Glen Mitchell after the Quigley’s first subdivision, the school did not take the name Teralba until 1891. This was in conformance with the name adopted for the railway station which had opened in 1887 as Teralba Station.

In 1886 the Quigley Estate had opened the first residential subdivision offering only leases of 50 years duration to householders. However, the estate did agree to sell four lots on the corner of William and Mitchell Streets, Teralba in 1892 (see Figure 5). This site was close to the Railway Station and the Post Office, both on the eastern side of the railway line where the centre of the town was developing.

2.1.1 Site of the Gravel Pits Railway Camp

Although no contemporary map of the Gravel Pits Railway Camp has been found, it appears to have been at the base of Billygoat Hill on the northern side and close to Fresh Water Creek (refer to Figure 4), probably between the present Boundary Street and Pitt Street. The first school site was on Billy Goat Hill. Such a location was not too far from the site of the cemetery being investigated but the early development of the town of Teralba on the eastern side of the railway and the location of the Teralba Railway Station increased the distance between the town and the cemetery which was certainly in use by 1892 (extant monument) and was probably in use from 1884.
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2.1.2 The Increasing Isolation of the Cemetery

As shown above, the town had moved away from its cemetery and this development was accentuated by the re-routing of the railway in 1903 (see Figures 6 and 7). Known as the Fassifern - Teralba Deviation, it took the line in a loop to the east around the base of Billy Goat Hill. The new route was quite close to the cemetery site but there was no station in its vicinity until Booragal opened in 1926 (see Figures 6 and 7).

By 1908 the Teralba Progress Association was discussing the need for a cemetery and early in March 1909 its secretary wrote to M. Chariton, M.L.A., "with a view of a site being obtained for a cemetery." In the meantime (see below) some Teralba residents were being buried at Sandgate Cemetery, a reflection, perhaps, of the unsatisfactory state of the cemetery on Billy Goat Hill.

2.2 STATUS OF THE CEMETERY SITE

The Teralba Cemetery site is within Lot 3 DP 628454, and forms part of Portion 33 Parish of Teralba and County of Northumberland. The Teralba Cemetery being studied does not appear on any of the official (published) editions of the Parish Map for Teralba. The fifth edition of the Parish Map, dated 1892, and the eleventh edition, dated 1947, are reproduced as Figure 6 and Figure 7.

In an attempt to clarify the status of the cemetery site a land title search was completed for Portion 33. The original Portion plan is reproduced as Figure 8. As noted on this plan and already discussed in Section 2.1 above, following a Crown Grant dated 12th March 1842 Portion 33, an area of 914 acres, was the property of Dr James Mitchell and subsequently passed to his daughter Margaret Scott Quigley and her husband William Bell Quigley. The property then passed to their children, Daniel Quigley, James Mitchell Aspinal Quigley, William Frederick Bannister Quigley, and Augusta Sophia Quigley. All of the transactions involving the property on which the cemetery is located are summarised in the schedule to Primary Application PA 23964 dated 19th December 1921. A copy of this application and its accompanying plan is included in the Appendices to the report.

The Primary Application also indicates that from the 1890s the Perpetual Trustee Company controlled the estate, initially as Trustees but eventually becoming owners. The land title documents also indicate that the Teralba Cemetery was never officially resumed, notified, or otherwise gazetted. In fact, the cemetery is never mentioned on any of the title documents and is not shown on any of the plans included with the Primary Application or any other Certificates of Title for the portion.

The absence of the cemetery from these documents means that it was never an official or formally established burial site. This gives it no separate legal status, it is merely an interesting historical and physical presence within a large freehold land portion eventually obtained by the current owners of the Department of Housing / Landcom. Thus there was also no authority (for example a Cemetery Trust) officially charged with record keeping or with the care, control or management of the Teralba Cemetery.

During completion of the research on the status of the site, however, one interesting historic reference to the existence of the cemetery on Portion 33 was located. This was a copy of the sixth edition of the Teralba Parish Map dated 1902, held in the East Maitland Lands Office. This copy of the map, which is included as Figure 9, bears a hand-written annotation showing the cemetery site. The notation on the reverse of the map reads:

"Portion 33, LB 051431. Sur. Beatty rep. re Cemetery Site. Land already resumed, if more desired advised to communicate with Perpetual Trustee Coy (owners) Misc.05.17617.597""

This notation proved to be the only "official" reference located for the Teralba Cemetery. Dated 1905, it suggests that representations concerning the existence of cemetery had

---

1 Newcastle Morning Herald, 11 March, 1909
been made to the Lands Department and a surveyors report had been prepared. It also indicates that official resumption was being referred to and that the site owners had been advised. Unfortunately, the papers referred to do not survive. From the other land title information, however, it is clear that the intended resumption never actually took place. As outlined in Section 2.1.2 above, this may have been because the later railway deviation had effectively cut the cemetery off from the township.

A search through the volumes of Births, Deaths and Marriage notices in the Hunter Valley newspapers for the period 1901-1905 was also undertaken by Dr John Turner, noting all death notices from Teralba. Although some residents may not have bothered with notices in the Newcastle Morning Herald, there were eleven burials in Teralba Cemetery. All but one refer to "Teralba Cemetery", the other refers to the "R.C. Cemetery, Teralba". There were also three burials from Teralba to Sandgate - one Congregational, one Presbyterian and one of unspecified denomination. Copies of these notices are included in Appendix X. It has also been possible to extrapolate from these records that several of the burials in the Teralba Cemetery are from families of Protestant denominations, including Wesleyan / Methodist, Congregational and Church of England. This strongly suggests that the cemetery was in effect, operating as a general cemetery for the township, probably being run and maintained by the townsfolk, possibly with some supervision / organisation by the local undertaker. This was not an uncommon practice in earlier townships (prior to the gazettal of formal burial sites, which often lagged decades behind the first use of cemetery sites) but is certainly unusual for a period as late as the 1880s/1890s.

It is perhaps also interesting to note that the Teralba Parish Map also shows a separate "General Cemetery at Teralba" some 20 acres in size located on Portion 12 (refer to Figures 6 and 7). This General Cemetery was resumed on 13th March 1891 and dedicated on 5th June 1894. The cemetery was never used and the site was eventually revoked in 1975. Further south, in the Parish of Awaba, another General Cemetery was notified on 17th July 1931. This site has also not been used. Once again, it might be inferred that the non-use of the official General Cemetery occurred because the Teralba Cemetery was successfully fulfilling this role, and before the railway deviation was a more conveniently located site. It might also be inferred that the later General Cemetery notification might reflect the obsolescence and inconvenience of the Teralba Cemetery after the moving of the railway. The non-use of this later General Cemetery probably relates to factors such as the increasingly common use of motorised funerals from the 1930s onwards, which allowed conveyance of the dead to burial places beyond the confines of the immediate area.

As the Teralba Cemetery was not formally established, it should be noted that it has not been officially closed either. Although the extant monuments suggest a date range of c1880s to c1920s/30s several local informants have advised of a much later burial which took place in the either the late 1960s or early 1970s. This was the burial of a Mr Chris Thornton, whose wife and family had been previously buried in the cemetery. According to one informant, Chris Thornton prepared his own grave a year before his death, excavating a grave which was then backfilled with sand to enable very easy subsequent excavation. No extant headstone or other marker records this later burial.

Unfortunately it was also not possible to confirm this burial in the documentary records. Given existing legal requirements at this time, Council should have been notified, even if the burial was technically occuring on private land. No records for the Teralba Cemetery were located during a visit to Lake Macquarie Council. In the absence of an exact date, it was also not practicable to search the local press for a death or funeral notice.

---

1 No relevant records could be located in either the Lands Department or State Archives. Nearly all Lands Office cemetery records have been lost or destroyed except for cemetery tracings and the records of major public cemeteries still administered by Trustees responsible to the Minister for Lands. In an effort to locate the owners version of any correspondence telephone calls and a written request for access to archives was also made to the Perpetual Trustee Company. The Company forwarded a list of all documents held relative to the Quigley Estate, however, none appeared to relate to the cemetery.

2 These are held in the Newcastle Library. Five volumes, containing a total of 4,000 entries were reviewed to extract this information.

3 Government Gazette, 28th February 1975.
FIGURE 6 Map of Parish of Teralba, 5th Edition 1892
Note separate 20 acre general cemetery site, and original line of Railway across Billygoat Hill. The Teralba Cemetery is not shown.
FIGURE 7  Map of Parish of Teralba, 11th Edition 1947
Note separate 20 acre general cemetery site, line of Railway deviation
and Booragul Railway Station (opened 1926).
3.0 DESCRIPTION

3.1 SITE and SETTING

The Teralba Cemetery is situated on a gently sloping, southeast facing, ridge which falls gradually to a lower area enclosed by a loop of the Main Northern Railway Line. The slope within the cemetery area itself is also relatively gradual, with a fall of about 0.1 metre in 10 metres from northwest to southeast across the site.

Access to the cemetery is presently via an unformed track leading southwest from the pedestrian footbridge adjacent to the Boolagul Railway Station. Another track which leads off James Street, Teralba, through the bushland at the rear of the local Mining Museum, joins the access track near the footbridge. Via the access track the cemetery is situated approximately 225 metres southwest from the Railway Station footbridge, and thence 45 metres southeast of the edge of the track. The location of the cemetery in relation to these features and the contour of the site and surrounding areas is shown in Figure 10.

The cemetery is surrounded by native open woodland vegetation including Eucalypt and Angophora species trees and an understorey of native shrubs and grasses. This vegetation provides an attractive and unspoilt bush setting and screens the cemetery from the surrounding areas. The cemetery does not feature any views or other visual links with adjacent areas.

3.2 DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Figure 11 presents the current site plan of the Teralba Cemetery. Plates 1 to 4 are general photographs of the site.

The cemetery area lacks any clearly defined physical boundaries. The area containing obvious cemetery monuments is roughly rectangular in shape, extending for about 50 metres from west to east and 25 metres from south to north. Despite these roughly regular dimensions, the exact extent and shape of the cemetery is not clear. A number of possible graves, marked only by surrounds of local stone, also occur beyond the main cemetery area and several depressions which may be unmarked graves occur between the cemetery and the access track to the Railway Station.

Given the absence of any historic documentation (ie old plans or earlier photographs) and the lack of any surviving physical markers it has not been possible to determine whether the cemetery had clearly defined historic boundaries. Although the cemetery could have originally been fenced no evidence of prior fencing was noted. Even if older timber fencing (eg post and rail) may not have withstood the local fire regime, post-holes might nevertheless be expected to survive on the site if it had been fenced.

There is also no direct evidence of any previous features in the cemetery linked to a formal entry, for example pathways, although a rough pedestrian track meanders across the site between the groups of monuments. The monuments themselves form two main clusters within the cemetery about 14 metres apart (from west to east). Depressions in the ground, however, suggest that this separation is somewhat illusory as the area between the extant monuments appears to contain a number of unmarked graves. In plan the layout of the grave rows and monuments does appear to be divided along a possible east-west axis which might reflect an initial attempt at a semi-formal layout (Figure 12).

The orientation of individual grave rows in the Teralba Cemetery is somewhat random, and unusual. In the Christian tradition graves are usually oriented to face east. This is a long standing funerary tradition generally ascribed to solar models and later adopted by members of the Christian faith who rationalised its adoption on theological grounds.

---

1 Justifications included: that the risen Christ ascended in the east and would appear from the east at the day of Judgement; that the east is the region of good and light, God is the true light of the world, Christians are the children of light; that the cross of Calvary faced west so those who saw it faced east.
As larger public cemeteries became increasingly organised during the nineteenth century, graves were frequently arranged in east-west facing double rows (a more efficient use of space than single east facing rows).

The grave rows in the Teralba Cemetery, however, have variable orientation. The overall orientation of the site itself is northeast / southwest, which relates to the topography of the ridgeline. Most of the more formal and marked graves generally have an easterly aspect, but vary in their orientation between 50 degrees (northeast) and 90 degrees (due east). In addition, at least four of the monuments in the cemetery face at 240 degrees (southwest). Some of the less formal graves in the Teralba Cemetery, which are marked only by surrounds of local stone, also have more variable orientations (refer to Figure 11).

The largest plot, at the eastern end of the site is surrounded by a simple stone terrace on the downslope side apparently constructed in response to the slope of the area, in order to help retain soil and support the grave plot.

From the surviving fabric it appears that, even if not entirely well-ordered or organised, there was a progressive filling of the cemetery area. Four or five major grave rows are now evident within the cemetery, which probably relate to family groupings rather than any denominational separation. The oldest monuments also appear to be those at the top of the hill (western end of site) with those at the bottom being slightly later in date.

3.3 LANDSCAPE, VEGETATION and PLANTINGS

A specialist vegetation survey and report, including a list of existing plant species is included as Appendix 8.

The present landscape of the Teralba Cemetery is dominated by the presence of a glade of mature native trees around the utilised cemetery area, with individual trees scattered across the site. Several native shrubs, grasses and creepers are also evident within the cemetery. This range of species provides a textured landscape and contributes to the visual quality of the cemetery area. The grass cover probably also protects the ground surface, helping to prevent excessive soil erosion and consequent de-stabilisation of monuments. A few self-sown seedling trees have invaded grave plots and may cause the disruption (breaking) of monuments or grave surrounds if not checked.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth century deliberate planting was often utilised to emphasise the layout of cemeteries and was also featured on individual grave plots. In Victorian and Edwardian times many plants used in cemeteries had well recognised symbolic associations and smaller scale shrubs or other plants such as groundcovers, creepers and bulbs were intentionally planted on individual grave plots in remembrance of those interred. Only two introduced plant species were noted during fieldwork, although other species might occur depending on the season. Two deliberate plantings of Carolina Jasmine occur within the Jury/Barret grave plot and bulbs (either Hippeastrum or Amaryllis) were noted on the grave adjacent to the Thornton plot (refer to Figure 12). The survival of these traditional grave plantings in the cemetery provides an important indication of the values and associations of previous periods.

3.4 MONUMENTS and GRAVE FURNITURE

All major extant monuments, grave furniture and other elements in the Teralba Cemetery have been recorded on the inventory sheets which are presented in Appendix A. The inventory sheets describe each major cemetery element, outline suggested conservation works and allocate priorities. A "high" priority has been given to items whose survival is threatened by their current condition and whose significance will be clearly enhanced or partially recovered by the completion of appropriate conservation-(repair) work. The detail site plan presented in Figure 12 shows the allocation of the inventory item numbers in the Teralba Cemetery.
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The cemetery contains a total of twelve formally marked grave plots in four (possibly five) major rows. These twelve plots feature headstones and/or formally constructed surrounds of either sandstone kerbing, rendered brick, or cement. The cemetery also contains eight simpler, single course, brick surrounds and at least five graves marked by surrounds of local stone pieces. One plot is marked by a surviving surround of in-situ salt-glazed edging tiles. A pile of similar material (presumably removed from graves) indicates the former presence of at least four different types of edging tiles marking plots in the cemetery. One of the types of edging tile is stamped with the maker’s name “J. Bowtell”. Joseph Bowtell commenced brickmaking in the 1860s and operated the Steam Brick and Tile Works in Morgan Street, Merewether from the 1870s to 1914.  

All except one of the extant monuments in the cemetery are in very poor condition (see section 4.2 below). Recognisable monuments in the cemetery include one sandstone headstone, four marble headstones, two sandstone desks, two cement desks, and one “homemade” cement rendered brick headstone. All of the desk monuments are missing their identifying marble tablets or plaques. A large number of fragments from such tablets are scattered around the grave plots at the eastern end of the cemetery. The fragments indicate the presence of at least three “open book” style tablets and two other rectangular tablets or plaques. Other fragments in the vicinity may derive from additional marble headstones. The extremely weathered condition of some of these fragments (many of the broken edges are now rounded) indicates that the damage is fairly old. This material is also so fragmentary that specific identification is not possible either for the individuals commemorated or to determine the correct location of the fragments (i.e. which fragments belong with which of the desk monuments). Additional unprovenanced monument fragments are also situated at the western end of the cemetery. These include one piece bearing the date 192, and a smashed rectangular marble tablet to James Johnson dated 1892 (see inventory sheet number 5).

Monumental masonry tends to reflect the current developments in architectural style and cultural attitudes to death and its commemoration, as well as being a record of taste, fashion, religious beliefs and other values. The materials chosen for monuments and associated elements such as surrounds may also reflect the local economic circumstances and other factors such as the availability of materials and skilled labour.

Although the site history has indicated that the cemetery was probably established during the 1880s, the earliest date recorded on an extant monument is 1892. The legible dates on extant monuments and fragments suggest that the site was in use for a relatively brief period, between 1892 and the 1920s. The vernacular surrounds of rock pieces and the simpler brick surrounds also suggest that use of the cemetery probably continued into the Depression years of the 1930s. It is also possible that 1880s graves might have been marked with crosses or other timber elements which have not survived.

The surviving monuments erected in the cemetery follow the typical designs of their era. Monuments and surrounds are of fairly simple form and restrained style, suggesting fairly modest economic circumstances and expenditure. As noted above, the majority of headstones are of marble. Some of these bear examples of traditional funerary symbolism in carved motifs including stylised florals, or illy or convolvulus. This material reflects the local adoption of a fashion which had seen marble become the dominant material used in Sydney’s city cemeteries from the 1880s. Marble provided new opportunities for delicate and decorative carving of symbolic motifs and elaborate lead-inlaid lettering styles, and its colour (white) helped to negate some of the more sombre associations of death and mourning in the Victorian period.

The sandstone headstone, dated 1906, is a relatively late date for this material, and the style of the monument itself is also rather old-fashioned (see inventory sheet number 2).

The desk monuments and tablets (legible dates 1911 and 1913) are also of typical design and materials for the early twentieth century. The “open book” style tablet was a fairly common shape, the motif being symbolic of the Bible, Book of Knowledge, or Book of Life.

---

1 W Gemmell, And So We Graft from Six to Sic: The Brickmakers of NSW, 1986, p. 76.
whilst the "clasped hands" motif was also fairly common and symbolised either parting, reunion, or hands joined across the gap of death.

Three stonemasons are recorded on the monuments in the cemetery. These are Browne, Newcastle, G P Lock, Newcastle, and F Russell, Jesmond. This suggests that Newcastle was the closest centre providing access to monumental masons and funerary trade skills.

The inscriptions and verses on the monuments also provide an important record of the attitudes and values of members of the Teralba community, although the fragmentary nature of many monuments has meant that some of this information has been lost from the cemetery. Where possible inventory sheets have recorded all extant inscribed information. Other information including previous transcripts and other records which have been reviewed during the current study have also been collated into a list of all (currently) known burials in the cemetery which is presented in the Appendices to the report.

In addition to the inscribed monuments, the Teralba Cemetery also contains a variety of other grave furniture. These include two substantial rendered brick surrounds, both of which apparently also featured iron grave fences; three sandstone kerb enclosures (also with iron grave fences) and a range of cement kerb enclosures. The edging tiles and simpler types of surrounds which occur on site were described above. Some other remnants of other types of grave infill were also noted, including scattered pieces of sea-shells, apparently deriving from former grave topping.
4.0 ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

4.1 ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

As indicated in Section 2.0 of this report, the Teralba Cemetery is linked to the origins of the township and local community as a by product of the construction of the Main Northern Railway. As also discussed, the creation of the town cemetery on a large freehold land portion, and its continued use despite the gazettal of other separate formal burial sites is an historical anomaly, particularly for such a late period, making its physical presence and survival highly significant to the heritage of Lake Macquarie.

4.2 ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL CONDITION

As already indicated in the descriptions given in Section 3.0, the majority of the fabric in the Teralba Cemetery is in very poor condition. The constant attrition of site elements through vandalism has substantially diminished the integrity of the site. The condition of all major cemetery elements and suggested conservation works and priorities are noted on the individual inventory sheets in Appendix A.

Owing to the particularly severe and systematic vandalism which has occurred over the past three decades, many of the monuments in the cemetery are extensively damaged and ideally require the completion of major repair works if they are not to substantially deteriorate further. Once monuments have lost their structural integrity, through collapse or breakage of components, deterioration increases and usually the longer a damaged monument remains in disrepair the more difficult repair becomes. Continuation of the current situation, with fragile monument fabric exposed to increased weathering and the threat of removal and/or damage, is likely to lead to further decay and oblivion.

All except one of the headstones in the cemetery have been forcibly removed from their plinths and thrown on the ground, causing the stones to break into pieces and also destabilising and/or cracking the plinths. All marble headstones in the cemetery have proved particularly vulnerable to this treatment, and most of these headstones have been broken into a large number of major pieces and other fragments.

In other cases only one or two (identifiable) pieces of a headstone survive. In addition, much of the extent physical fabric and monument fragments which have survived on the site are in a particularly confused state. Some elements and joining pieces of fabric have been scattered up to 10 metres away from their correct positions and have also been incorrectly placed on the wrong grave plots. Other material, including fragments and iron grave railing is situated some 35 metres north of the cemetery area, apparently carried away by vandals and hence discarded.

Through detailed survey and recording of the extant fabric it has been possible to ascertain the correct locations and/or provenance of some of the displaced cemetery elements, although many remain uncertain. This is noted on the individual inventory sheets in Appendix A.

The repair of most of the damaged monuments in the cemetery is technically feasible but will require the services of a skilled stonemason or other professional experienced in the conservation of aged and fragile fabric and the use of specialised materials. Additional repair guidelines are presented in Section 10 of this report.

The reinstatement of the Rodgers headstone for example, is likely to be relatively simple. Many of the broken monument pieces should also be able to be rejoined using bronze or other non-ferrous dowels and appropriate adhesives such as polyester or epoxy resins to secure the join (a dotted application should be used to prevent the creation of a moisture barrier across the join). In some cases it is likely that the rejoined fragments will not have sufficient structural strength and additional supporting structures may be necessary. This will also be the case for very fragmentary items. Appropriate structures may include armatures (frames) or backing sheets at the rear of headstones onto which pieces may be affixed.
Any such structures should be placed on the actual grave plots in order that monuments remain in their correct (original) locations.

Repair is not likely to prove successful in the long term unless additional security and protection can be provided for the cemetery to reduce the incidence of vandalism. Appropriate measures (including fencing) are considered further in Section 8 of this report. The present recording (mapping and inventory) provides documentation of the current position of all major monuments, fragments and grave furniture surviving in the cemetery.

4.2.1 ADDENDUM

In view of the delay between the draft and final reports for this study the Teralba Cemetery was reinspected in October 1994. At this time the site was found to have suffered increased damage, apparently from a single vandalism event sometime between January 1994 (when the inventory accompanying this report was completed) and October 1994.

The resources of the project were not sufficient to enable the re-inventory of items which had been further damaged in the intervening time. The major damage noted was:

- Item 4, William J Hart - desk with damaged “open book”. Desk has been forcibly pushed off the plinth. Desk will now need to be re-fixed prior to other repairs.

- Item 11, William Rogers - marble headstone, broken but formerly in a single piece. Headstone is now broken into two pieces. Will need an extra join (adhesive and dowels).

- Item 14, Large kerbed plot containing two desk monuments. The larger of the concrete desks has now been displaced and will require re-bedding.
5.0 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

5.1 THE CONCEPT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

The concept of cultural significance attempts to define the aspects of a place or item which make it of value to the community. The term, "cultural significance" is essentially interchangeable with the term "environmental heritage", as defined by the NSW Heritage Act, 1977; it "means those buildings, works, relics or places of historic, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic significance".\(^1\) Of these listed adjectives, "cultural" significance has become the generic term, with the other adjectives attempting to provide more comprehensive detail.

The methodology and guidelines used to assess cultural significance have been standardised by conservation practitioners in recent years and there is now a considerable quantity of material on this subject published and disseminated by a number of heritage authorities and groups.\(^2\)

5.2 CRITERIA FOR CEMETERIES

In 1985, the National Trust published a policy paper on cemetery conservation. This document included an aspect of significance considered by the National Trust when assessing cemeteries for inclusion in the Trust's Register of heritage items. Criteria defined by the National Trust comprise:

- Historic Significance,
- Social Significance,
- Artistic Significance,
- Religious Significance,
- Genealogical Significance,
- Creative/Technological Accomplishment,
- Setting,
- Landscape Design,
- Botanical,
- Representativeness.\(^3\)

The criteria appropriate for considering the categories of cultural significance as defined in the NSW Heritage Act in relation to cemeteries have also been considered in detail in a recent publication by the Department of Planning / Heritage Council of NSW, *Cemeteries: Guidelines for Care and Conservation* (1992). The major categories outlined in the Guidelines document (Section 2: The Significance of Cemeteries) are summarised below:

5.2.1 Historic Significance

Cemeteries provide a direct historical record of their local communities and in the case of some of the older cemeteries, an historic record of importance to the whole of Australia. The monuments within cemeteries document the nation's growth and provide valuable insights into its history. Cemeteries record significant events or periods in the history of a region or district and, unlike most other histories, cemeteries record the lives of all, whether rich or poor, famous or infamous. Headstones and memorials may also document facts about an individual or a family, particularly when they were important locally or famous nationally.

The genealogical value of cemeteries is an important component of their historic significance, as nearly all monuments include some biographical or genealogical information. In the historical context of New South Wales, headstones which pre-date the introduction of civil registration in 1856, through which all births, deaths and marriages were

---

2. Reference information includes:
   - Australia ICOMOS, *Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance*, 1984;
   - Department of Planning, *Heritage Assessment Guidelines*, 1990;
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Cooranbong (1871 and 1862). Apart from two of the private burial sites, all of the sites mentioned are still in use.

As discussed in Sections 2 and 4 of this report, the Teralba Cemetery is an anomaly which does not conform with the pattern of establishment and use of late nineteenth century formal general cemeteries.

5.4 STATEMENTS OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE TERALBA CEMETERY

The Teralba Cemetery is an important component of the heritage of Lake Macquarie as it provides a direct physical and historical record of the occupation of the area and the genesis of the township of Teralba during the late nineteenth century. In this respect the Teralba Cemetery is an important historic and genealogical resource, recording many individuals and families in the area.

The Teralba Cemetery has an attractive setting amidst remnant natural vegetation. The remnant native vegetation surviving within and around the cemetery, also provides a "bush" setting evocative of the pioneer period of settlement in the area. The Teralba Cemetery also contains some surviving examples of traditional grave plantings.

The cemetery presents a simple nineteenth century design and layout and its development in the early twentieth century, and contains typical examples of late nineteenth and early twentieth century monumental masonry, providing a record of the designs and skills of the era. The inscriptions and motifs recorded on the monuments are also representative examples of funerary traditions and symbolism in this period.

The cemetery has considerable social significance not only to descendants of the families buried in the cemetery, but also to the wider local community. The Teralba Cemetery is an item of considerable social significance to the local community as it conveys a sense of historic continuity and hence a contribution to the identity of the present community. The cemetery has been a focus of community concern for a number of years.

The Teralba Cemetery has a high degree of interpretative significance as a result of its ability to evoke the living conditions, circumstances, values and beliefs of earlier periods. It also provides a tangible physical demonstration of the demographic history and origins of the township of Teralba.
6.0 EXISTING LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK and BACKGROUND CONTEXT

Cemeteries in New South Wales may be owned and managed by a number of different organisations, including State or Local Government, church authorities, private agencies and individuals. An overview of relevant legislation is presented below.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries many areas of land in rural and urban centres were dedicated as reserves for cemetery purposes, with appointed Trustees. It has been noted in Section 2 of this report that although official cemetery sites were intended to be established elsewhere in the Teralba area, they were not used by the community.

Following the decline of many cemetery Trusts owing to a lack of resources for active management, the responsibility for these local public cemeteries was largely transferred to Local Councils by the Local Government (Control of Cemeteries) Amendment Act, 1966. This legislation was based on the assumption that cemetery management is a matter of community concern. Local Government Authorities are therefore responsible for the care, control and maintenance of the dedicated general cemeteries in their area.

Many private or family burial grounds and isolated graves are located on unconsecrated, freehold land in New South Wales. These cemeteries were not transferred to local government control in 1966, although some provision was made for private cemeteries to be brought within the transfer provisions following agreement between the Local Council and the cemetery authority. In most cases there is no authority charged with the care, maintenance or record keeping of these sites. The research undertaken for this study indicates that the Teralba Cemetery falls in this category (i.e. an informally established site on freehold land).

In NSW, land use planning is controlled by the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979. (EPA Act). This Act and the standard provisions developed by the Department of Planning for implementation in planning instruments confirm the relationship between planning and heritage conservation. The standard provisions aim to ensure that places identified in heritage studies (or other documents, such as this report) are protected and that development is compatible with the importance, character and appearance of significant buildings or places. The planning system established by the Act includes regional environmental plans (REPs), local environmental plans (LEPs) and provisions relating to development control.

Land is usually zoned under an LEP or other planning instrument. Unlike public general cemeteries which are generally zoned ‘special uses (cemetery)’, cemeteries established on freehold land will usually have the zoning of the surrounding land. Developments permissible within each zone usually require Council consent. This development control role is supplemented by the environmental matters which must be considered by the consent authority under Section 90 of the EPA Act. These matters apply to land proposed for development and to the relationship of that development to adjacent land.

When items are listed in the heritage schedule to a Local Environmental Plan (L.E.P.) or a Regional Environmental Plan (R.E.P.), usually following identification in an Heritage Study, they are offered protection by the heritage provisions contained within the plan which will require a Council’s consent for certain actions or activities. Depending upon the Plan, this may range from requiring concurrence of the Director of Planning or the Heritage Council for proposed works, to requiring the Council to take into consideration the effect of the proposed works upon the heritage significance of the place.

The Heritage Act, 1977, (amended 1987) was enacted to ensure that the environmental heritage of New South Wales would be adequately identified and conserved. The provisions of the Heritage Act with particular reference to the management and conservation of cemeteries in New South Wales are those which relate to “relics” and the provisions for the making of conservation instruments or orders.
The term "relic" is defined in the Heritage Act, 1977, as amended in 1987, as:

"any deposit, object or material evidence -
(a) which relates to the settlement of the area that comprises New South Wales, not being Aboriginal settlement; and
(b) which is 50 or more years old." (Section 4(1)).

This definition will include any feature or physical object from any New South Wales cemetery which is 50 or more years old. Such objects may include headstones and grave surrounds, moveable objects and landscape features as well as the buried remains.

Section 139 of the Heritage Act, 1977, states that:

"A person shall not disturb or excavate any land for the purpose of discovering, exposing, or moving a relic, not being a relic subject to a conservation instrument, except in accordance with an excavation permit."

The relics provisions of the Heritage Act therefore provide some incidental control over cemetery maintenance and development.

The Australian Heritage Commission is a federal statutory authority established under the Australian Heritage Commission Act, 1975, as the Commonwealth Government’s policy advisory and administrative body responsible for the National Estate. The Act prevents any Commonwealth Department or instrumentality, or any organisation using Commonwealth funds, from taking any action which might adversely affect a place in the Register except where there is no “feasible and prudent” alternative.

The National Trust of Australia (New South Wales) is a non-government community organisation concerned with promoting the conservation of all lands, sites, buildings and items of heritage significance. As the result of an ongoing survey and assessment process, the Trust maintains a Register of landscapes, townscape, buildings, industrial sites, cemeteries and other items, which the Trust considers to have heritage significance and are therefore worthy of conservation. Items listed in the Register are said to be "Classified". The listing of a place in the National Trust Register has no legal force, but is widely recognised as an authoritative advisory and educational statement regarding the heritage statement of a place.

The National Trust has a specialist Cemeteries Committee, comprised of experts in fields related to cemetery conservation, which is available for consultation on cemetery projects. The Trust also employs a part-time Cemeteries Advisor.

The Conversion of Cemeteries Act was passed by the New South Wales government in 1974. The Act allows Local Councils to make application to the Minister for Natural Resources to close and convert cemeteries into "rest" or "pioneer memorial parks". The result in most cases where the Act has been applied has been to destroy the integrity and nature of the cemetery and significantly compromise the existing heritage values of these sites. The "conversion" of cemeteries does not accord with established conservation principles such as those elaborated in the Burra Charter of Australia ICOMOS, nor with the provisions of the more recent New South Wales Heritage Act, 1977. The National Trust does not support cemetery conversion and has called for the Act to be repealed.

A number of other Acts including Crown Lands, 1989, and Public Health, 1991, also have provisions which affect operational cemeteries, but are not considered relevant, given the circumstances of the Teralba Cemetery. Provisions of the Local Government Act which may be relevant to the future of the Teralba Cemetery are outlined in Sections 8 and 9 of this report.
7.0 CONSTRAINTS AND REQUIREMENTS

7.1 CONSTRAINTS ARISING FROM THE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Section 5 has assessed the cultural significance of the Teralba Cemetery. Following from the significance assessment there are various actions which should (or alternatively should not) occur if the significance of the site is to be retained and/or enhanced. Constraints on activities are given below, with reference to the statement of cultural significance.

- The Teralba Cemetery should be retained and conserved in accordance with established conservation principles.
- Existing elements of the cemetery landscape, including plantings, should be conserved and maintained.
- The setting of the cemetery should be maintained.
- All extant cemetery monuments and other cemetery fabric should be retained and conserved.
- Monument layout and orientation should not be further altered and future work should seek to reinstate the earlier layout where this can be determined.
- All surviving grave surrounds, including brick and ironwork enclosures, should be retained and conserved.
- All other surviving cemetery fabric, including remnants of edging tile grave surrounds, should be retained and conserved.

7.2 CONSTRAINTS ARISING FROM THE BURRA CHARTER OF AUSTRALIA ICOMOS

References in parentheses refer to the relevant articles of the Burra Charter. Reference should be made to the copy of the Burra Charter in Appendix C of this report.

- The cultural significance of the cemetery should be maintained. Provision should be made for its security, maintenance and future. (Article 2)
- All conservation work should be based on respect for the extant fabric and should involve minimal intervention to existing fabric. (Article 3)
- An appropriate visual setting for the cemetery should be maintained. No new construction or other development which detracts from the heritage value or context of the cemetery should occur. Environmental intrusions which will adversely affect the appreciation or enjoyment of the place should be excluded. (Article 6)
- All fabric within the cemetery should remain in its historical location. Relocation of fabric should not occur unless moving it is the sole means of ensuring its survival. Any fabric removed under these circumstances should be returned to its correct location if changed circumstances make this feasible (Article 9 and Article 10)
- All features of the existing cemetery should be taken into consideration. Fabric from all periods should be recognised as contributing to the significance of the cemetery. (Article 16)
- Where appropriate, reconstruction should be limited to the reproduction of fabric the form of which is known from physical and/or documentary evidence. (Article 19)
- Any major work on a cemetery should be preceded by a detailed study or plan. Existing fabric should be recorded prior to disturbance. (Article 23)
Disturbance of fabric should only occur to provide evidence needed to make decisions on the conservation of the cemetery. (Article 24)

The process of decision making and individuals responsible should be identified. (Article 26)

Appropriate professional direction and supervision should be maintained at all stages of the work. (Article 27)

Records should be kept of new evidence and subsequent decisions. (Articles 25 and 27)

Copies of all reports and records should be placed in a permanent archive and made publicly accessible. (Article 28).

7.3 CONSTRAINTS ARISING FROM PHYSICAL CONDITION

The current physical condition of the Teralba Cemetery imposes a range of constraints on conservation options, although the proposed development may also be considered to provide an important opportunity. Key points are summarised below.

- The cemetery has been disused and neglected for many years.
- The location and setting of the cemetery is relatively isolated, and has provided a secluded haven for vandals in the past. These circumstances will change with the development of a surrounding new housing estate.
- The Teralba Cemetery is badly affected by vandalism and has suffered considerable mechanical damage and breakage. Nearly all monumental masonry has been damaged and displaced from plinths or bases.
- Many monument fragments have been displaced from the original grave, and are disassembled and scattered. Numerous fragments and broken pieces are also missing.
- Many of the surrounds, including those of brick, tile and stone, have also been damaged and/or disassembled.
- A majority of the cemetery fabric requires repair or other conservation treatment.

The site plans also present additional information concerning the current layout and condition of the site. Specific information, including an assessment of the condition of individual monuments is presented on the inventory sheets in Appendix A.

7.4 CONSTRAINTS ARISING FROM STATUTORY CONTROLS

An overview of the statutory context is provided in Section 6 of this report.

- The Teralba Cemetery is not listed on the Register of the National Estate.
- The Teralba Cemetery is not subject to a conservation order pursuant to the NSW Heritage Act. The cemetery contains monuments and other features classed as “relics” under the Heritage Act.
- The Teralba Cemetery is not identified in the heritage schedule to the Hunter Regional Environmental Plan.\(^1\)
- The Teralba Cemetery is not currently identified in a heritage schedule to a Local environmental planning instrument. The Lake Macquarie Council recently commissioned

\(^1\) Heritage Items Identified in the Hunter REP 1989 (Schedules 3 & 4) are discussed in Section 2 of the Lake Macquarie Heritage Study.
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the preparation of a Heritage Study. The Teralba Cemetery was identified in the Heritage Study (Item TA-13). It is likely that following on the Heritage Study a comprehensive LEP which includes heritage provisions will be prepared.

- Lake Macquarie Council has also previously declared an interest in ensuring the preservation of the Teralba Cemetery.

7.5 OTHER CONSTRAINTS

- The Teralba Cemetery is not classified by the National Trust of Australia (NSW). A survey of all burial grounds in the Hunter Region was completed by the National Trust’s Cemeteries Committee in 1983. At this time the Teralba Cemetery was indexed by the Committee.

---

1 Suters Architects Snell, *City of Lake Macquarie Heritage Study*, final report prepared for Lake Macquarie Council and Department of Planning, 1993
2 Letter from Town Clerk to State Manager, Department of Housing, dated 20th October, 1987.
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8.0 CONSERVATION POLICY

8.1 DISCUSSION - CONSERVATION OPTIONS

The Teralba Cemetery has been disused for many years. The surviving physical evidence indicates that the site was in use for a relatively short period, probably for less than 40 years from the 1880s to the 1920s. Although a much later burial has been reported by local informants as occurring during the 1960s, this was not able to be confirmed by documentary evidence. The establishment and continued use of the site, although a necessity for the developing permanent community, was also somewhat of an anomaly especially given that other areas were set aside for formal cemeteries and yet remained unused. An extensive search of available records also indicates that the Teralba Cemetery is almost “invisible” in the historical record, making its survival as a physical record of the origins of the community even more remarkable and important.

The heritage value of the cemetery is embodied in its history, the fabric of the monuments and surrounds, its setting, and the responses that these evoke in individuals. In relation to cemeteries it is usually the fabric which most evidences significance. In the case of the Teralba Cemetery, however, the current poor condition of the site and the damage to its fabric means that the ability of the cemetery to demonstrate its own history and significance is diminished.

Given the current circumstances there would appear to be two main options for the Teralba Cemetery. These are:

1) A minimum policy of preservation, whereby the cemetery is retained in its existing state but no repairs or other works are undertaken. Whilst this may be appropriate for some individual items within the cemetery (see below) the adoption of this approach should be regarded as a lost opportunity for enhancing and disseminating the heritage value of the site. It would also not conform with overall conservation principles which aim to ensure that places with heritage value are treated in accordance with their identified significance. This option is primarily mentioned here as a benchmark by which the benefits of the alternative strategies may be compared and assessed.

2) The second, and preferred, option is for the development of a policy and strategy for appropriate conservation works, involving a variety of actions, including some repairs, restoration and stabilisation. On the basis of its assessed significance the Teralba Cemetery warrants conservation and repair in accordance with established conservation principles such as those elaborated in the Burra Charter of Australia ICOMOS.

Whilst the Burra Charter states that the aim of conservation is to retain or recover the cultural significance of a place, it does not advocate broad scale, or expensive reconstruction. In considering repair of the Teralba Cemetery it is necessary to be aware of the limitations imposed by the physical condition of the extant fabric and the amount of new fabric required. The question should be asked what needs to be replaced and how much new fabric will need to be introduced to complete the repair. In general the Burra Charter recommends that all work should involve the least possible intervention in the existing fabric and that new work should not constitute the majority of fabric in a restored monument. For this reason in the case of the most severely damaged and extremely fragmentary monuments in the Teralba Cemetery the substantial repair which would be required is not considered appropriate unless further evidence is forthcoming. In other cases, where the design and information value of the monument will be recoverable following repair, more substantial restoration and reconstruction is considered justifiable.

The site location and context is also a major issue. Systematic and recurrent vandalism would appear to be the cause of the current condition of the site, and the isolation of the site is likely to have been a contributing factor. The proposed development of a new subdivision in Precinct 10, however, means that these circumstances will change rapidly. Although the final layout of the subdivision has not been determined in terms of its street pattern and open space network, the cemetery will be retained and it is also likely that some of the surrounding allotments will overlook the area, ideally providing some increased surveillance of the site.
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In the short term any works at the cemetery should look first to its protection and security, and then to repair. In the short term the operational requirements of Landcom in developing the new subdivision also need to be recognised.

In the longer term it is necessary to look towards future management and maintenance (after the completion of repair works) and also consider the possibilities for future site visitation and interpretation.

Given these points and the constraints outlined in Section 7 above, the following conservation policies are proposed for the Teralba Cemetery.

### 8.2 GENERAL CONSERVATION POLICY

The Teralba Cemetery is an item of environmental heritage for the City of Lake Macquarie with aesthetic, historic, social and interpretative value for current and future generations.

The cemetery should be conserved in accordance with the Burra Charter of Australia ICOMOS and other appropriate guidelines including those published by the National Trust and the Heritage Council of NSW.

The Teralba Cemetery should be afforded statutory protection and formal recognition through identification as an heritage item in an appropriate schedule of a gazetted local environmental planning instrument.

The Teralba Cemetery should be conserved and managed as an historic site. (In the long term Lake Macquarie Council is considered the most appropriate management agency).

The Teralba Cemetery should be protected from vandalism and other physical threats.

### 8.3 FABRIC (MONUMENTS AND SURROUNDS)

Monuments should be retained in-situ and conserved.

Grave furniture (such as surrounds) should be retained and conserved.

Displaced monuments, plinths, surrounds/railings and other fragments should be collected and replaced at the original grave location where this is known. All other displaced fabric should be retained on-site, even if the original provenance (exact location) is unknown.

Repair of damaged monuments should be undertaken as recommended in Section 10 and Appendix A of this report. The intention at all times should be to retain the maximum amount of original fabric.

Repair work should be undertaken by a monumental mason or other conservation practitioner skilled in the repair of aged and fragile monument fabric.

All repair work should be undertaken in accordance with the guidelines of this report, the Heritage Council’s Cemeteries Guidelines and the specialist Appendices (B and C) of the National Trust Cemeteries Policy Paper. (A copy is included in Appendix F of this report).

The iron fences around several grave plots should be repaired and treated for rust, thence replaced on the appropriate plot and repainted (preferably a traditional dark colour). Also refer to Appendix F of this report.

Reconstruction of significant cemetery elements may occur if their form is known, and original fabric has deteriorated to a point beyond repair. In this context, new fabric (for example a new desk for an original tablet or a supporting structure for a headstone) may be introduced into the cemetery.
All new work or fabric should be compatible with the existing character of the site, and should only be introduced to enhance or recover significant attributes.

8.4 SETTING AND LANDSCAPE

A specific vegetation report and separate guidelines form Appendix B of the report.

The setting of the cemetery should be maintained, and an appropriate curtilage, (i.e. visual buffer formed by vegetation), should continue to be present around the place.

The existing surrounding glade of native trees and understorey vegetation should be maintained.

Existing elements of the landscape in the cemetery should be conserved and maintained. No new major landscape elements (such as paths) should be introduced.

No new plantings should be introduced unless these are species already present in the cemetery or are known (from further research) to have been planted in the cemetery.

Plants which may threaten the stability of cemetery monuments if not checked, or which are invasive exotic species (e.g. blackberry) should be removed.

Ground cover should continue to be provided by existing low-key, minimum maintenance, native grasses and creepers.

Fencing may need to be introduced to provide increased security for the site. This may be especially necessary following the completion of repair works. Any fencing considered should be of a simple design and fireproof materials (for example steel pickets and wire mesh).

In the short term, the existing access should continue to be used. Planning for the new subdivision should provide for future access to the cemetery.

8.5 FUTURE ACTIVITIES / USE

In the long term the Teralba Cemetery should be managed primarily as an historic site and open space/passive recreation resource for members of the existing and new Teralba communities.

Passive recreation uses should be limited to those appropriate for the inherent nature of the site as a cemetery. Whilst use of the site as an educational and research resource would be acceptable, other uses such as horse-riding (currently occurring) or cycling would be inappropriate.

In general the introduction of new elements into the cemetery or its curtilage is not recommended. If new elements (for example seating) are desirable for passive recreation purposes, the precise need, location and design would require careful future consideration in order that such elements did not diminish or obscure the cultural significance of the place.

8.6 INTERPRETATION

Community support for the conservation of the Teralba Cemetery should be encouraged through limited circulation of information on the history and heritage value of the cemetery to interested parties (e.g. local historical society).

Continuing research and publication about the cemetery should be encouraged, particularly as additional information might be found which would further assist the development of conservation policy and interpretation.
In the longer term it is desirable that provision be made for public visitation of the site and that the history and heritage value of the cemetery be interpreted on site.

An informative and sympathetically designed sign or other marker may be introduced to the site.

Consideration may be given to the future introduction of commemorative plaques which reproduce previously known memorial inscriptions or document individuals for whom no extant grave marker now survives. (A list of currently known burials in the cemetery is included in Appendix D).

8.7 MANAGEMENT

Upon completion of the new development and the necessary cemetery conservation works (‘partial restoration’) the Teralba Cemetery should be transferred from Landcom to Lake Macquarie Council for future management as a public reserve.

In order to facilitate the future conservation works and the eventual transfer of site ownership, consideration should be given to forming a small working party comprising representatives of Landcom, Council and any other interested parties.

In the longer term it is recommended that a small management committee with delegated authority from Council be responsible for management of the cemetery.

Management is also considered in Section 9 of this report.

8.8 RESOURCES / FUNDING

The responsibility for funding ongoing cemetery maintenance works usually rests with the site owner or responsible authority and the descendants of those interred and commemorated on-site.

In cases of severe vandalism in cemeteries identified as having heritage value, funding for urgent conservation and repair works may be available through the annual Heritage Assistance Program administered by the Heritage Branch of the NSW Department of Planning. Applications close in March, with funding of successful applications made for the following financial year. Funding from this program is usually granted on a dollar for dollar basis; is more likely to be directed to cemeteries with well-established heritage significance (e.g. those Classified by the National Trust or included in other registers); and is more often granted for works supported by a Conservation Plan (such as this report).

In the present circumstances it is recommended that funding for the suggested conservation works in the Teralba Cemetery should be made available by Landcom as part of the development costs for Precinct 10.

8.9 IMPLEMENTATION

This report and policy should be considered by the client and, if accepted, should be adopted as a basis for the future care, conservation and management of the Teralba Cemetery.

It was previously recommended that consideration should also be given by the client to the circulation of copies of the draft report to Lake Macquarie Council in order that comments, endorsement and support for the actions proposed could be sought. Other relevant parties suggested for circulation of the draft report were the Heritage Branch of the Department of Planning and the National Trust.

Following adoption of the report a specific individual should be nominated with responsibility for implementation of this plan, including establishment of the proposed working party with Lake Macquarie Council.
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8.10 REVIEW

The Conservation and Management plan provided in this report should be updated as circumstances change, and should be reviewed and, if necessary replaced, in five years.

8.11 CONSEQUENCES OF CONSERVATION POLICY

Implementation of this plan / report will ensure retention of the significant attributes of the Teralba Cemetery. It will involve some change in the current state of the cemetery, including reinstatement and reconstruction of displaced monuments.

Implementation of the Conservation Policy will enhance the significance of the Teralba Cemetery.

Implementation of the Conservation Policy will require the further allocation of resources (both human and financial) from the site owner, Landcom.

Implementation of the Conservation Policy will require interest and commitment from Lake Macquarie Council if long term future management is to be achieved.

Failure to implement the Conservation Policy will result in the further degradation of the Teralba Cemetery and would be an abrogation of responsible heritage management.
9.0 IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION POLICY

9.1 GENERAL

This section outlines in more detail how the Conservation Policy is to be implemented. It describes the recommended conservation actions or works required to the monuments, other maintenance tasks and procedures to be adopted for the grounds, the priority status for the proposed works and the sequence and timing of events. In addition, the technical expertise required, a recommended management structure and the financial resources required to carry out the works are also described.

9.2 CURRENT OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY

It has been noted that the Teralba Cemetery lies within land (Precinct 10, Teralba) which is now owned by Landcom. The main activity proposed for this land is the development of a new housing subdivision. Whilst conservation generally lies outside Landcom’s brief, the desire to conform with necessary requirements and principles is clearly reflected in the commissioning of this report. All policies and actions recommended for the cemetery must recognise that in the first instance, Landcom has responsibility for the site, and any actions must have the commission’s concurrence.

In order to provide a basis for the undertaking of conservation work, interpretation, and most importantly future management and maintenance, it is recommended that Landcom (or its project managers) instigate the establishment of a small working party for the cemetery. This group need not meet frequently. It should include representation from Landcom, Lake Macquarie Council (possibly more than one Section) and the local community (eg Historical Society). Specialist input should be sought from time to time, e.g. comment from the National Trust Cemeteries Committee on “as needs” basis.

The working party would be responsible for:

Implementation and review of this Plan;

Decisions concerning conservation, maintenance and repair work;

Preparation of funding applications;

Fostering of limited and appropriate community interest via appropriate events and publications (eg tours, sign, brochure);

Instigation of further research;

In addition, it is strongly recommended that a single person be nominated as responsible for co-ordinating the implementation of this Plan.

9.3 FUTURE OWNERSHIP, USE AND MANAGEMENT

During preparation of the report discussions were held with Ms Cathy Blunt of Lake Macquarie Council concerning the future of the Teralba Cemetery ¹.

It was generally agreed in these discussions that the best long term option for the cemetery would seem to be that it is partially restored by Landcom during the development of the surrounding subdivision, and is then transferred to Council control for management as a local reserve. The new Local Government Act 1993 requires Council to classify the land in its ownership. The most appropriate future classification for the Teralba Cemetery would appear to be “community land”. The Act also requires all such community land to be the subject of plans of management in which sites are further classified

¹ Correspondence received from Council, is included as Appendix J of this report.
according to open space categories. It is considered that the current study report provides information able to be adopted or adapted into a future Council Plan of Management once ownership and control is transferred.

On a day to day basis it would also appear possible for management of the Teralba Cemetery to be achieved by delegation to a local committee under Section 355 of the new Local Government Act 1.

This study also suggests that an overall curtilage of between 30-50 metres on each side of the cemetery will be desirable to maintain its existing "bush" setting. This currently proposed curtilage would result in about a 1 hectare site. The vegetation survey (refer to Appendix B of this report) has confirmed that once the damaged monuments are stabilised and repaired that very little other active management would be necessary. Although periodic 'control burns' may be necessary around the cemetery to maintain the existing vegetation these are likely to be at about 7 - 10 year intervals. Some initial weed control would also be required. For day to day purposes over zealous maintenance (mowing, etc) is actually likely to detract from the current setting and atmosphere of the site and may alter the current vegetation regime.

It should, however, be recognised that an overgrown "bush cemetery" may require some appropriate on-site interpretation and future community education or explanation. It would also seem desirable that, if possible, the cemetery be linked to other open space within the new subdivision and that in the longer term it also be considered/interpreted as part of an overall network of heritage items in the Lake Macquarie Council area.

Lake Macquarie Council is currently responsible for the management and maintenance of eight operational general cemeteries, viz.: Belmont Cemetery, Catherine Hill Bay Cemetery, Morisset Cemetery, North Coorongbund Cemetry, Toronto Cemetery, West Wallsend Cemetery, Whitebridge Cemetery and Wyee Cemetery. A draft Plan of Management for these cemeteries was prepared by Lake Macquarie Council in 1993. The plan indicates that Council's Administration Support Group Supervisor and the Community Facilities Clerk are responsible for the day to day operation of the cemeteries. Maintenance of Councils cemeteries is carried out by Council's Parks Engineering Section when requested by the Community Facilities Staff. The Cemeteries budget is part of the Engineers Department budget but with Community Facilities in control of expending the allocated funds. As all of these sites are currently in use they require a high level of regular maintenance including mowing, turfing, topdressing and the allocation of funding for capital works and improvements such as signage, roads, provision of parking, provision of niche walls, etc. As operational cemeteries, however, they also generate income from the sale of burial rights which can be used to offset maintenance costs. In 1993, the estimated cemetery income was $50,000 with an expenditure of $55,040. In round figures this equates to an annual expenditure of approximately $7,000 per cemetery (not including capital works or improvements) to achieve a fairly intensive level of maintenance.

It has already been recommended (Section 8.5) that the Teralba Cemetery should be retained and conserved as an historic site, and should be managed as a place of passive recreation and education. The site should not be used for future burials, although the interment of ashes (cremated remains) in existing family plots might be permitted. The site has long term importance as an historic place and heritage resource for the Teralba community.

In the short term, it must be recognised that the circumstances of the cemetery, and the practicalities of its location necessarily will restrict the immediate opportunities for public access and promotion. By the same token actions taken by the current owners in the short term must not prejudice long term options for the preservation and presentation of the cemetery.

---

1 Council's written opinion on this was requested, refer to letter included in Appendix J of this report.
9.4 FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS

9.4.1 Costs

The following costs have been identified as associated with the conservation of the Teralba Cemetery:

Approximately $6,000 for repair of approximately ten individual monuments or other cemetery elements. These costs are indicative only, and derive from the inventory sheets in Appendix A. A more precise costing would require an inspection by an experienced stonemason, and preparation of a detailed quote / specification for repair works.

Approximately $5,000 for erection of steel post and wire mesh around the cemetery curtilage.

Approximately $2,000 for design, production and installation of an informative sign.

It is recommended that the future regular maintenance of the Teralba Cemetery should be fairly minimal, although some collection of rubbish and sporadic additional work (e.g. weed removal, "control burns") may be expected. Allow for $2,000 per year.

9.4.2 Funding Sources

It has been recommended in section 8.8 that funding for the immediate essential conservation and repair work to cemetery monuments should be made available by Landcom.

Other funding sources may also be investigated (e.g. Heritage Assistance Program).

The sponsorship of individual monument repair by descendants or other groups (historical societies or community organisations) might also be encouraged by limited dissemination of information about the significance of the site and repair proposals. Fees could also be charged for use of existing plots for the interment of ashes (this is not likely to generate any significant revenue).

If Lake Macquarie Council is prepared to take future responsibility for the care and management of the Teralba Cemetery, Council must be committed to the appropriate and continuing annual maintenance of the site.

9.5 CONSERVATION ACTIONS REQUIRED

9.5.1 Establishment of a Cemetery Conservation Area

It is recommended that a conservation area be established which incorporates the Teralba Cemetery and an appropriate surrounding curtilage (refer to Section 8.4 and Appendix B of this report). A proposed curtilage/conservation area is shown in Figure 13. This area should be excluded from the new development proposal and should be governed by the conservation policy stated in this plan. This area should be eventually transferred to Council ownership.

9.5.2 Layout and Landscape

There should be minimal change to the existing cemetery landscape and setting. Native grasses and other vegetation should be maintained as the dominant ground cover. The tree canopy and surrounding glade should be retained. No major new structural elements such as paths should be introduced within the cemetery.

9.5.3 Plantings

In general new plantings should not be introduced (refer to section 8.4), although low maintenance native groundcovers (e.g. Hardenbergia) may be planted in existing and reinstated grave surrounds.
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9.5.4 Monuments

Repair of monuments should be undertaken in accordance with the specific repair guidelines included in Section 10 of this report, and other appropriate procedures such as those elaborated in Appendix F of this report (drawn from National Trust documents).

Repair of monuments should only be undertaken where sufficient resources and expertise are available to ensure the works are carried out to an acceptable conservation standard. For example, repair of broken monuments, including re-dowelling of disassembled sections and repair of damaged plinths should be completed by a qualified monumental mason or other conservation practitioner experienced in the repair of aged and fragile monument fabric. (Repair of broken monuments using inappropriate materials and techniques may exacerbate physical problems and result in increased deterioration).

A detailed repair quotation (including a works specification) should be obtained.1

Fragments of broken monuments for which repair is not considered justifiable, should be catalogued and buried within grave plots.

Wherever possible damaged monuments should be erected on original grave plots. Options include use of frames or new backing for very fragmentary material.2

9.5.5 Surrounds

Repair of surrounds should also be undertaken and should be regarded in the same way as monument repair. Wherever possible, missing surrounds should be reinstated. The quotation for repair should include works to the grave surrounds.

9.6 NEW WORK

The introduction of new fabric into the Teralba Cemetery should be minimised. Any necessary new material (e.g., required for repair) should be compatible and should not intrude into the visual quality of the cemetery.

A new element that should be introduced is an interpretative sign providing information on the history and heritage significance of the cemetery.

A new fence should be installed around the proposed cemetery conservation area. Currently there is no evidence available to suggest the location or style of any prior fencing. A modern steel picket and wire mesh fence (with appropriate pedestrian access points) is recommended. If evidence becomes available concerning the location of any former fencing it would be appropriate to re-align the fence to known earlier boundaries.

9.7 MAINTENANCE

9.7.1 General

The following sections of this report describe general principles and procedures for future maintenance of the Teralba Cemetery. Reference should also be made to Appendix B and to other published cemetery policy documents, including those of the Heritage Council and the National Trust.

9.7.2 Mowing

The Teralba Cemetery should not be mown.

---

1 The Heritage Branch and the National Trust maintain lists of conservation practitioners. The Repair Guidelines provided in Section 10 should form part of any invitation to tender for repair works.

2 A possible material for a backing sheet is compressed wet area fibro which has been profiled to match the form of the original monument. Pieces may then be pinned or glued to the backing sheet.
Powerline trimmers ('whipper snippers') should not be used in the cemetery, as these cause indiscriminate damage to plant material and to the edges of monuments.

If required, periodic hand-trimming of edges around monuments, and areas within plots may occur.

9.7.3 Trees

All major trees in and around the cemetery should be retained. Trees should be periodically inspected to ensure health and stability. Dead or dying branches in danger of falling and damaging monuments should be removed.

Self-sown trees or woody weeds which are a problem should be cut-off at ground level, and stumps should be poisoned by hand application of an appropriate herbicide (e.g. Roundup®).

9.7.4 Weeds

Initial and systematic (regular) control of weed species present on the site should be undertaken. Manual removal of minor weeds is appropriate. Undesirable grasses or other species should be subject to a controlled poisoning program.

9.7.5 Grave Plots

All elements of graves (monuments, surrounds, fences) should be retained.

Deliberate or desirable plantings within grave plots should be retained. In the Teralba Cemetery these include bulb species, the Carolina Jasmine and the Hardenbergia species.

The planting of appropriate species (e.g. existing native creepers) in grave plots may be undertaken.

Additional, sympathetically designed, grave markers may be added to existing plots (refer to Section 8.6).

9.7.6 Paths

The introduction of new, formal pathways is not recommended. The existing informal track through the cemetery should be monitored for signs of increased erosion or deterioration.

9.7.7 Rubbish

The introduction of rubbish receptacles at the Teralba Cemetery is not recommended. Regular maintenance should include provision for periodic collection and removal of rubbish.

9.8 VANDALISM / SECURITY

Regrettably the Teralba Cemetery has been subject to long neglect and sporadic attacks of severe vandalism. The following measures are suggested as ways of mitigating future vandalism following the conservation of the cemetery:

Design of the new subdivision should include provision for some allotments to overlook the cemetery conservation area, providing a measure of future surveillance.

Erection of the new fence will also clearly define the cemetery boundaries (see below).

The proposed interpretative sign may include a request not to damage the site and might also suggest that it is regularly patrolled.
If it becomes the site owner, Council should gazette new by-laws which make it an offence to enter the cemetery between sunset and sunrise. The cemetery should also be included in Council ranger patrols.

The proposed future management committee should establish effective liaison with the local community and local police, and should monitor any occurrences of vandalism so that problem areas and times can be identified, and appropriate measures may be implemented to apprehend those responsible.

9.9 INTERPRETATION AND PUBLIC APPRECIATION

The Teralba Cemetery has the potential to be an important item of environmental heritage for the local community. While it would be impractical for extensive interpretation to be undertaken at present, proposals for the short and long term are made below.

9.9.1 Short Term

Erect interpretative sign on-site, drawing attention to the cemetery’s history and significant elements. This may be of anodised aluminium type, or bronze plaque, or may be a sympathetically designed painted sign.

The proposed management committee could encourage and promote a limited number of events e.g. tour or inspection by locals following conservation works.

9.9.2 Long Term

In the longer term, with the development of the surrounding subdivision, additional public access should be available to the cemetery. Increased security may also be required.

Copies of relevant material from this report (or other documents, such as the Council Heritage Study) may be incorporated into a small brochure or resource kit which could be distributed to local schools, with a request that the site be included in their local history studies curriculum. This action should be undertaken by the proposed management committee.

Involvement of volunteers from the surrounding community (including historical societies and community service organisations) in the ongoing care of the Teralba Cemetery should be encouraged.

9.10 STATUTORY PROTECTION

The Teralba Cemetery should be afforded permanent statutory protection and formal recognition through inclusion in the heritage schedule of a Local Environmental Plan (LEP).

9.11 SUMMARY OF ESSENTIAL AND ONGOING ACTIONS

The following table (over page) summarises the activities recommended by this plan and notes the sequence and nature of proposed actions. Where possible, indicative cost estimates have been provided.
### 9.11.1 Immediate Actions

The following actions should be carried out within three to twelve months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review &amp; Adopt Conservation Plan</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate report to Lake Macquarie Council, Heritage Branch, National Trust</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Cemetery working party &amp; seek Council support</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include Teralba Cemetery in heritage schedule of LEP</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider application for HAP funding</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue and collect monument fragments &amp; place on grave plots</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain detailed quotation for repair works</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.11.2 Short Term Actions

The following actions should be carried out within one to three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erection of new fence</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$5,000 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair cemetery in accordance with recommendations (refer to Appendix A)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$6,000 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erect informative sign</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$2,000 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange cemetery visits</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.11.3 Long Term Actions

The following actions should be carried out within three to five years, or as soon as circumstances and resources permit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer ownership of cemetery to Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish management structure (either the committee recommended in this report or other)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Council Plan of Management (adopt and/or adapt this report and seek other appropriate advice as per Appendix B)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence appropriate maintenance regime</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$2,000 p.a. (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of education kit and/or brochure</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Plan of Management after 5 years</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.11.4 Continuing Actions

The following activities should be carried out on an ongoing basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular (minimal) maintenance, including &quot;burn-offs&quot;</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$2,000 p.a. (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with Local Community and others as necessary</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor condition of site</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Plan of Management at 5 year intervals</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.12 RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

A single person should be nominated as being responsible for the implementation of this plan.
10.0 SPECIFIC REPAIR GUIDELINES

10.1 PRINCIPLES

Conservation works carried out with respect to a place of cultural significance, should
endeavour to retain identified significant attributes and to enhance or recover them. The
vandal damage that has occurred at the Teralba Cemetery has affected the significance
of the place by reducing its:

- integrity
- aesthetic qualities
- historic and genealogical information

and by obscuring its:

- ability to demonstrate

The effect is an adverse and negative impact for the cemetery visitor, and therefore a
perceived reduction in the value of the place. It may reasonably be expected that
sympathetic repair of the damaged monuments will recover some of the significant
aspects of the site that were lost as a result of vandalism.

In carrying out physical work on the damaged monuments within the cemetery, the
following principles should be applied:

- wherever possible original fabric should be retained and preserved, thereby
  maintaining the integrity of the original monument;
- displaced fabric should be reinstated to its original location, where this is
  known, thereby restoring both original fabric and form;
- careful regard should be paid to the landscape and setting of the site, and
  the physical and visual relationships of individual elements within the cemetery;
- the information content of monuments should be retained;
- reconstruction, using new fabric, should be limited to works which are
  essential, in order to allow preservation and restoration of existing fabric.

Wherever practicable, existing damaged fabric should be retained and incorporated in
repair work. The temptation to replace fabric with "new" works should be resisted, as it is
inevitable that an old cemetery will show evidence of some wear and tear. The original
fabric has greater integrity than any replacement fabric, and could always be replaced at
a later date - the reverse process being impossible once the original material has been
discarded.

In Burra Charter terms preservation, restoration, and in some cases, reconstruction of the
cemetery fabric is appropriate at this site. The following activities therefore should not
occur:

- hypothetical reconstruction of missing elements
- movement or relocation of any monument (other than return to its original
  location if this is known and relocation is a practical option)
- discarding of original monument fabric

In the short term, pending the completion of a repair program, portable monument
fragments should be labelled, catalogued and either buried on-site or removed to safe
storage.

---

1 These Guidelines have been adapted from the following report:
Slobhán Lavelle / Godden Mackay Pty Ltd, The Old Man’s Valley Cemetery; Conservation Plan,
prepared for the Higgins Family Association, June 1992. The Guidelines in that report were originally
prepared by Mr Richard Mackay with considerable input from Dr George Gibbons.

Slobhán Lavelle, Historical Archaeologist
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The nature of the damage at the Teralba Cemetery is such that repair work should only be attempted by a qualified stonemason or other practitioner skilled in the repair of damaged monuments.

Contractors should be asked to provide a list of completed projects, and should also provide examples of patching and repair techniques as necessary before the completion of on-site works.

10.2 FALLEN MONUMENTS

No monuments in the cemetery are currently tilted or leaning. Leaning monuments are not a problem unless the stone is liable to fall under its own weight, or unless they attract the attention of vandals. All except one headstone are fallen. One of the fallen monuments in the cemetery (Rodgers Headstone) displays a relatively simple break, other breakages are more complex.

The soil within the cemetery appears relatively stable, apart from some localised depressions (unmarked graves) and minor erosion.

10.3 DISASSEMBLED MONUMENTS

No monuments in the cemetery are merely disassembled. All fallen monuments have suffered breakage. The desk monuments have become displaced, and require re-bedding. In view of the vandalism problem at the site it is considered desirable that monuments are dowelled to provide additional strength. Non-ferrous dowels (e.g. bronze) should be used, set in lead, mason’s putty (traditional mixture: rock-lime, whiting and linseed oil) or other appropriate inert compound.

10.4 BROKEN MONUMENTS

Monuments which are subject to simple breaks only, may be treated in the same way as 10.3 above. It is important that the plinth and stone be re-set level, and that appropriate dowelling and fixing material is used.

The damage done to several headstones is excessive, resulting in multiple breaks and fragmentation. Much of the fabric of a number of monuments is actually missing. The nature of this damage will require specialist treatment by a monumental mason skilled and experienced in repair of damaged monuments.

Ultimately the options available for physical treatment of the monuments at Teralba Cemetery is dependent upon the amount of fabric recovered (refer to Section 7.1). Consideration should be given in repair to the use of lightweight armatures or frames, or the use of a sheet of compressed wet area fibre as a backing or support. It cannot be emphasised too strongly that such work should only be carried out by a practitioner experienced in repair of old cemetery monuments.

Cleaning of stones is not considered a priority unless it is required to facilitate the repair and re-erection of broken monuments. Cleaning should not attempt to restore the stone to "new" condition, and should not remove the natural surface hardening of the stone. Cleaning should only seek to remove surface soiling and agents of deterioration. Where required, for example to enable accurate patching of broken stones, cleaning should generally be done with water and a bristle brush.

In many cases some fragments will be missing, and repaired headstones would consequently have gaps between rejoined pieces. In such cases patching with reconstituted stone may be undertaken. For example, for sandstone headstones, patching may be undertaken with epoxy resin and sand. This should generally be in the ratio of 10 parts sand to 1 part epoxy resin by weight. Other appropriate composite stones for filling voids may also be prepared using mortars comprising lime, cement, and the original crushed stone or stone dust. Any composite stone patching compound must be
formulated for compatibility (ie strength, water permeability) with the given stone type. Mortar ratios should generally be in the vicinity of 12: 3: 1 (sand: lime: cement).

Patching should aim to match the colour and texture of the existing stone, and should be completed flush with the surface of the stone (the break line may need to be trimmed before the adhesive is completely set). Where reconstituted stone patches cross areas of incised lettering this may be reinstated where the prior wording is accurately known and its replacement will facilitate the reading of the original inscription. Lettering should not be reinstated where wording is conjectural.

Where damage has occurred to the tenon and/or mortice of a monument, repair (by consolidation) and re-use of the existing fabric is preferable. As a last resort consideration may be given to cutting back / re-morticing (involving some loss of original fabric) or to the use of a facsimile or replacement plinth preferably in an appropriate stone.

10.5 SPALLING

The site inspections completed during this study did not reveal any serious indications of spalling or frettng of monuments. Should cases of spalling or fretting be noted in the future its is likely that drainage around the base of the monument is a problem. The site is currently quite dry, but periodic inspections / monitoring should occur (for example after heavy rain).

10.6 INSCRIPTIONS

The Teralba Cemetery headstones have been recorded in the work undertaken for this study, and may be readily documented by transcriptions and photographs. The re-inscription of monuments, in order to conserve and present their genealogical and historic information, is not generally necessary. As a general rule inscriptions should not be re-cut, as inscription weathering is part of the natural history of the stone. However, from another point of view it may be argued that re-inscription is a traditional cemetery maintenance procedure. In cases where the family of the deceased wishes the monument to be re-inscribed and repair of the inscription can be easily achieved, re-inscription may be considered. Alternatively, and in preference to re-cutting stone, if it is desired to retain information content, a small bronze plaque which reproduces the original inscription may be erected in an unobtrusive place at the rear or base of the stone, or on plinth or kerbing/surround.

10.7 IRON SURROUNDS

All existing surrounds should be retained and conserved (refer to notes in Appendix F). Broken surrounds may be repaired using pin or spiliot. Where re-setting into kerbing or surrounds is required this should be undertaken by a qualified stonemason using lead, mason’s putty, or other waterproof compound. It is extremely important that the iron does not come into contact with moisture and thence other components (eg masonry) or long term cracking will result. Rusting surfaces on iron surrounds are not generally a problem, unless corrosion is particularly severe. For most surrounds, a periodic application of fish oil would suffice. If resources are available, a rust inhibitor or cold galvanising paint may be applied following removal of all loose and flaking rust.

10.8 INDIVIDUAL MONUMENT IDENTIFICATION

Appendix A contains 18 inventory sheets with photograph, description and assessment of main cemetery items. The sheets also suggest repair works and provide a cost estimate for the works suggested.

1 The National Trust Cemeteries Policy includes instructions for the use of replacement concrete plinths, refer to Appendix F of this report.

Sliebahn Lavelle, Historical Archaeologist
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CITY OF LAKE MACQUARIE HERITAGE STUDY

NAME/IDENTITY
OLD TERALBA CEMETERY, BILLYGOAT HILL, TERALBA

ITEM NO. TA - 13

KNOWN HERITAGE LISTINGS:

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS
Scrubby bushland with a few formally fenced graves clearly visible, and with numerous other inconspicuous adult or child graves marked just by a rectangle of loose stones or bricks, or shown just by hollows. The more formal graves have had cast-iron or wrought-iron railings, or a perimeter of glazed border-tiles. (Some tiles were made by J. BOWTELL.)

Curiously, the Wallsend 1:25,000 Map and Awaba Parish Map show a cemetery on the east side of the railway, south of the Booragul loop (Map ref. 689 497). It is shown as 4 acres, notified 17th July 1931. No trace of this cemetery could be found on the ground. Another "Teralba Cemetery", near Rhondan Colliery, is shown on the Teralba Parish Map as being dedicated on 5th June 1894 (TA-22). This one was not found either.

INTERPRETATION:
None at present. The headstones are mostly destroyed and many graves are unmarked. Recommend signs giving the period the cemetery was in use, and the names, date of birth & death, etc., of the people buried here.

CONSERVATION ACTIVITY:
Abandoned, and becoming overgrown with natural bush and grasses. The cemetery had survived long neglect, but was recently vandalised, and all headstones but one have been smashed. Local community care is needed.

PRESENT USE:
Disused, but the graves still exist.

HISTORICAL NOTES:
Oldest graves seen are James Johnson died 1892 age 31 years, & his son David died 1892 age 8 months. Others include: William Rogers, died 1903; Robert Jury, 1908; Henry Barrett, 1915; James Cherry killed at Pacific Colliery 1908; Christopher & Sarah Thornton, both died 1906. According to verbal advice, the last buried was Christopher Thornton (son of above?) c1960.

REFERENCES:
Verbal advice from Mr & Mrs Weatherstone of Teralba.

Jepson, P. "TERALBA", 1967, Lake Macquarie & District Historical Soc. p.9

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

HISTORIC
Rare ( ) Associative ( ) Representative ( )

AESTHETIC
Rare ( ) Associative ( ) Representative ( )

SOCIAL
Rare ( ) Associative ( ) Representative ( )

SCIENTIFIC
Rare ( ) Associative ( ) Representative ( )

OTHER
Rare ( ) Associative ( ) Representative ( )

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:
This small and seemingly long-lost cemetery contains some interesting graves. It appears to be the only actually existing cemetery associated with and representing the early history of Teralba. It has been neglected for a very long time and is now sadly damaged, however it has potential for proper restoration, and it should be researched and mapped and the surviving headstones should be transcribed.

RECOMMENDATION:
Graves & headstones in the cemetery would be classed as relics in terms of the NSW Heritage Act. Work as noted above should be carried out under supervision of an archaeologist. Also ensure that National Trust Guidelines for the care & conservation of cemeteries (or similar Dept. of Planning guidelines) are followed in future planning & care of the cemetery

Regional Significance - moderate
Local Significance - high

ITEM No. TA - 13
CEMETERY INDEX CARD

LOCALITY
BOORAGUL

POSTCODE 2284

NAME OF SITE (INCLUDING PREVIOUS NAMES)
BOORAGUL CEMETERY, called 'Old Teralba Cemetery' in 'Teralba', by P Japson 1967 (Publ. by the Lake Macquarie & District Historical Society.)

PRECISE ADDRESS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY
LAKE MACQUARIE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

PARISH
TERALBA

COUNTY
NORTHUMBERLAND

AUTHORITY RESPONSIBLE FOR SITE
(CROWN LAND)
Lake Macquarie Municipal Council

LOCAL INTEREST GROUP
Newcastle Branch of Trust or Lake Macquarie and District Historical Society.

DATE SITE ESTABLISHED
About 1890

NO. OF MONUMENTS
10

APPROX. AREA
½ acre

% OF SITE AREA USED
ISOLATED SITE SURROUNDED BY BUSH

% OF MONUMENTS TRANSCRIBED
6% of these have transcriptions

DATE OF FIRST BURIAL
1894

SITE IN USE
YES

NO

CONVERTED
YES

NO

NOTES

POINTS OF INTEREST: (E.G. SIZE, MONUMENTS, HISTORY, LANDSCAPE, NOTABLE PEOPLE BURIED, MATERIAL OF MONUMENTS/HEADSTONES, DETERIORATION OF HEADSTONES, TOPOGRAPHY)

The burial ground is in the bush, with access by a track which was at one time used for the transference of goods from Booragul railway station to Toronto, but now leads to a fine break and a pulled down bridge over the railway, and is seldom used.

Although there are 50 or more graves, many are marked only by an outline of stones or bricks. A high percentage are the graves of infants or children if size counts. Some fragments of headstones are lying around, some partly decipherable.

This area was not settled till the advent of the railway in the '80s, and so these graves, although late, throw an interesting light on the early people of this area. E.g. Christopher Thornta-1906 and Sarah Jane Thornta 1915; people of this name live in the area. James Johnson, native of Mooreham, Yorkshire; 1894 & David, his son (8 months). William Rod...1903 & Mula Maree, his infant daughter, 1903. James Cherry, accidentally killed in the Pacific Colliery, 1908 aged 31 years; family still in neighbourhood. Many of the headstones have been removed.

THREATS TO SITE

PERSISTANT VANDALISM AND NEGLECT

CONDITION OF SITE
NEGLLECTED

SURVEY DATE 20.2.1983

CARD TYPED 22.3.83

SURVEY TEAM B.E. BEIBOER

*= CEMETERIES, CHURCH GRAVEYARDS, OR ISOLATED GRAVES
N/A = NOT APPLICABLE
Site 7777 Booragul Development Application

Discipline: Archaeology - Cemetery

1. Base Document

All work is to be based on Landcom's Standard Conditions of Engagement of Subconsultants.

2. Introduction

The Hunter Regional Environmental Plan 1989 identified the study area shown on Annexure A as a potential residential area within the settlement strategy for the lower Hunter Area.

The area is described as Precinct 10, Site 7777 Booragul and covers an area of some 50 hectares with an identified potential of up to 460 residential lots.

The study area includes one land holder, the Crown. Landcom now wish to proceed with development of this Land.

The purpose of this brief is to request submissions, for the preparation of an archaeological investigation (cemetery preservation) for Precinct 10 for the circa 1900 cemetery. The successful applicant will have recognised qualifications and experience, in archaeology with particular reference to European Cemetery of the early twentieth century and have necessary certificates.

3. Study Area

The study area is shown on Exhibit A. The work will cover sufficient area within the Booragul district to ensure that the work is completed to the appropriate standard.

4. Objectives

a) Provide a detailed plan of management of the early 20th century cemetery

b) Provide a detailed report

c) Have the report accepted by Council and the Department of Planning.

5. Tasks of the Consultant

The tasks that will be required to be completed for each of the various components of the study are:

☐ determine the european heritage significance of the grave site.

☐ provide recommendations as to preservation and conservation of the graveyard site.

☐ report on the cultural significance of any other items

☐ provide recommendations as to the preservation, conservation or other treatment of any items

7:9528.16
all work to be carried out in accordance with any requirements of the Heritage Branch of Department of Planning.

prepare a plan of management for the cemetery at 1:200 including landscaping proposals if relevant.

prepare a formal Study Report for the purposes of exhibition to form part of the planning document prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as amended.

provide a list of aboriginal names agreed with the Local Land Council for naming:

- Parks (separate list - 20 names)
- Streets (separate list - 50 names)

The following information is available:

- Archaeological investigation of part of Housing Commission Site No 7777 at Boorangul NSW, prepared by Helen Brayshaw October 1983.

- Mrs Barbara Belbor, librarian, local historical society supplied details of graves to the National trust in 1983.

- any other work required on this commission to complete the requirements of the Department of Planning.

6. Submissions

Consultant submissions to carry out the archaeological work, as detailed in this brief, should include the following:

a) A work program

b) Outline methodology of addressing each task and any other relevant work

c) Provide a total fee for the project and breakdown for each component of the work required (See Section 10 for further details)

d) Provide detailed curriculum vitae for all members and sub-consultants, illustrating qualifications and relevant experience, and nominate tasks for all personnel who will be working on the project

e) List all individuals, groups/organisations/public authorities that should be consulted.

f) A statement that the report and plan proposed will reach the objective of the commission.

The successful Consultant will be required to submit four (4) copies of the draft Study to Landcom. It is anticipated that two (2) weeks will be required for detailed review. Twenty (20) copies of the final Study are to be submitted within two (2) weeks of the return of the approved draft report upon the written advice of Landcom that the report is acceptable.
SUMMARY

* Native vegetation on the site of the cemetery should be retained, as such bushland will become scarce with increasing urban development.

* Urban bushland has recreational, aesthetic, educational, scientific and historic value for the community

* On this site a minimum area of 1 Hectare should be retained

* The area retained should extend to the ridgetop to protect the bushland from the impacts of urban stormwater run-off. Urban run-off should not be directed into the area.

* Weed control should be carried out while weed presence is minimal.

* Future management should include weed control and prescribed burning (hazard reduction / ecological) strategies in a formal management plan.
OLD TERALBA CEMETERY, BILLYGOAT HILL, TERALBA

NAME/IDENTITY: OLD TERALBA CEMETERY, BILLYGOAT HILL, TERALBA
PREVIOUS/OTHER NAMES OR USES:

Long disused.

ADDRESS: Billygoat Hill, Teralba NSW 2284
(about 0.3 km S-W of Booragul Station)

PARISH: TERALBA  COUNTY: Northumberland

CATEGORY: area
SUBCATEGORY: cemetery

HISTORICAL PERIOD - BUILT: 1876 - 1900

One of many recently smashed headstones in the former Teralba Cemetery, on Billygoat Hill south-west of Booragul Station.

This stone is a memorial to Robert Jury, died 1908, and to Henry Barrett, died 1915.

The long-abandoned cemetery is reverting to bushland.

(Doring Neg.480.16)
### Feature Name or Identification
ROCK-EDGED GRAVE (a)

### Feature Number
1

### Priority
Low

### Cost Estimate
n/a

---

**Significance**
SOCIAL, HISTORIC.

The presence of several simple rock-edged graves is a feature of the Teralba Cemetery. The use of local materials and the simple vernacular design demonstrates ingenuity and self-sufficiency using items readily available, also suggesting fairly modest economic means.

**Description**

Small grave at western end of site, approximately 1 metre x 0.5 metre. The grave is outlined with a border of natural sandstone rock pieces. The small size suggests the grave of an infant or small child.

Several similar items are situated throughout the Teralba Cemetery (about five, but possibly others - refer to site plan). Nearly all are small, suggesting that the enclosures mark the burials of children.

The presence of these enclosures suggests that the poorer members of the Teralba community were not able to afford formal headstones.

The date of these graves is not certain - they may mark the earliest burials (1880s) or, probably more likely, may mark later burials during the 1930s Depression era.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The graves of this type noted are basically intact and in fair condition.</td>
<td>No immediate threats evident. Gradual overgrowth, weathering &amp; decay, possible displacement or removal of components.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**  
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

All these simpler types of grave enclosures should be retained on-site. If necessary, these graves should be periodically hand-cleared to prevent excessive overgrowth.

**Comments**

**PHOTOGRAPH**

![Photograph of a grave site]

**Recorder**  
S. Lavelle

**Survey Date**  
01/1994
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THORNTON HEADSTONE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**  
SOCIAL, HISTORIC, REPRESENTATIVE

**Description**

Semicircular topped (rounded) sandstone headstone with simple incised border around top edge, and relief carved stylised florals. Headstone oriented to face 240 degrees.

Minor damage (chip) to top edge. The headstone is within a double plot enclosed by a low cement kerb which appears to be of later date than the headstone. Headstone has also previously been painted white.

**Inscription:**

In Loving Memory

of

CHRISTOPHER THORNTON  
BELOVED HUSBAND OF  
SARAH THORNTON  
WHO DIED 26TH NOV 1906  
AGED 60 YEARS

(Ah how ?) patient in his suffering  
When no hand could give him ease  
God the helper of the helpless  
Saw his grief and sent him peace

Also  
OUR DEAR MOTHER  
SARAH JANE THORNTON  
WHO DIED 13TH MARCH 1915  
AGED 65 YEARS  
Love's last token

No mason's name was evident.
**TERALBA CEMETERY STUDY 1994**

**CEMETERY FEATURE RECORDING SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headstone is in fair condition. Surroun also in fair condition.</td>
<td>No immediate threats evident. Currently poor and neglected condition of entire cemetery threatens the survival of individual elements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

No specific action recommended for this headstone at present. Adopt policy of preservation. Monitor condition of headstone.

**PHOTOGRAPH**

**Recorder**  S. Lavelle

**Survey Date**  01/1994

Form by S.Lavelle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEADSTONE (RENDERED BRICK)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**

SOCIAL, HISTORIC.
RARITY, TECHNICAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

Apparently a "homemade" monument.

**Description**

Small arched headstone and plinth constructed of cement rendered brick.
No inscription evident.
Headstone broken away from plinth, plinth also displaced.

The grave plot is partly defined by a border of bricks with a cement grave topping.
At the time of inspection bulbs were emerging from this grave (either Hippeastrum or Amaryllis species).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor condition, headstone and plinth no longer intact and also displaced.</td>
<td>Further decay, weathering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Action for Conservation or Management

(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Reset plinth, and rejoin headstone to plinth (re-rendering may be required).

Comments

PHOTOGRAPH

![Image of a headstone and plinth in the grass]

Recorder  S. Lavelle

Survey Date 01/1994

Form by S.Lavelle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HART MONUMENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**  
SOCIAL, HISTORIC, REPRESENTATIVE

**Description**

Sandstone desk monument on sandstone plinth (81 x 60 cm). Marble 'open book' style tablet affixed to face of desk. Left half of book still affixed, right half broken away, with three fragments lying on grave plot. Double grave plot enclosed by low cement kerb. Monument oriented to face 60 degrees. Mason: Browne, Newcastle

Inscription, (left side of book only):

IN MEMORY OF
WILLIAM R.
BELOVED HUSBAND OF SARAH J. HART
DIED 4TH APRIL 1911
AGED 30 YEARS
SADLY MISSED

Inscribed on bookmark: LOVE'S LAST TOKEN
CONDITION / INTEGRITY
Not intact. Poor condition.

THREATS
Loss of monument pieces.

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR CONSERVATION OR MANAGEMENT
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)
Rejoin fragments and refix to desk. (Adhesives and dowels probably required). Check stability of desk - reset if necessary.

COMMENTS

PHOTOGRAPH

RECORDER S. Lavelle

SURVEY DATE 01/1994

Form by S.Lavelle
Feature Name or Identification: JOHNSON MONUMENT

Feature Number: 5

Priority: High

Cost Estimate: $300

Significance: HISTORIC, SOCIAL.

Description:
Small square marble tablet or plaque (36 x 35 cm). Plaque is broken into 12 extant fragments and is now incomplete. Plaque is not in-situ, and has been placed within the Hart plot.
Correct location/provenance is not known but is likely to be at top (west) end of site, possibly associated with the edging tiles or the large plot [see Inventory items #6 and #7].

Inscription:
Sacred
TO THE MEMORY OF
JAMES JOHNSON
A NATIVE OF MOO(RSHA)M YORKSHIRE WHO D(EPAR)TED
THIS LIFE OCTr 3 ....
AGED 31 Y(EARS)
(D)AVID THE SON
(AB)OVE NAMED
JANY 19th (18)92
AGED 8 MONTHS
TERALBA CEMETERY STUDY 1994
CEMETERY FEATURE RECORDING SHEET

Condition / Integrity
Poor condition, damaged and not in-situ.
Correct location unknown.

Threats
Further decay and loss of more fragments.

Recommended Action for Conservation or Management
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)
Rejoin fragments and pin to new supporting structure e.g. small inclined sandstone or similar.

Comments
Although correct location is not known at present, it is suggested that if repaired, the monument might be placed within the plot for Item 08, in order to achieve some future protection. In accordance with the Burra Charter, this may also mean that some additional information be added to prevent future confusion as a result of this action. Alternatively re-set monument base elsewhere on site.

PHOTOGRAPH

Recorder S. Lavelle
Survey Date 01/1994

Form by S. Lavelle
Feature Name or Identification
BRICK GRAVE SURROUND (A)

Feature Number
6

Priority
Medium

Cost Estimate
$500

Significance
SOCIAL, HISTORIC, REPRESENTATIVE

Description
Large square grave plot, dimensions 3.25 x 3.25 metres. Enclosed by fairly substantial surround constructed of brickwork with rendered coping. Brickwork is Colonial Bond, i.e. three courses of stretchers with a header course above. The plot is becoming overgrown.
Parts of brickwork have been damaged, with individual bricks removed and scattered around the vicinity. The surround also appears to have formerly featured an iron railing. One rail lies within the plot, and additional matching railings are now situated at the lower (eastern) end of the cemetery.

At the time of inspection several small fragments from a marble tablet or similar were observed within the plot (but not necessarily provenanced to this location). One fragment bears the date 192...
**TERALBA CEMETERY STUDY 1994**
**CEMETERY FEATURE RECORDING SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor.</td>
<td>Further damage /deterioration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Reconstruct surround by repair of brickwork with material collected from vicinity and additional match if necessary. Use of a lime mortar for reconstruction (re-render) is suggested. Also collect iron fence and reinstate on plot. Treat for rust (clean back & cold galvanise) then repaint. Additional (new) panels replicated if necessary.

**Comments**

**PHOTOGRAPH**

![Photograph of a stone structure with vegetation surrounding it.](image)

**Recorder**  S. Lavelle  
**Survey Date**  01/1994

Form by S.Lavelle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAVE EDGING TILES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance: RARITY, SOCIAL, HISTORIC.

Description:

A pile of discarded salt-glazed ceramic edging tiles is situated at the western end of the site. The pile provides evidence of the use of three or four different types of edging tiles formerly marking grave plots in the cemetery. One of the types of edging tile is stamped with the maker’s name “J Bowtell”. Joseph Bowtell commenced brickmaking in the 1860s and operated the Steam Brick and Tile Works in Morgan Street, Merewether from the 1870s to 1914 (see main report for reference).

One grave plot in the cemetery still retains in-situ edging tiles (refer to inventory sheet #13).

The presence of the tiles suggests that there were several graves in the vicinity of this location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor, not intact, not in-situ.</td>
<td>Already realised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**

(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Retain tiles on-site.

**Comments**

Although in poor condition this material provides important evidence of additional and grave marking practices. Do not remove in an effort to "tidy-up" the cemetery.

**PHOTOGRAPH**

![Photo of a cemetery scene with tiles and grave markers]

**Recorder** S. Lavelle

**Survey Date** 01/1994
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY HEADSTONE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance: HISTORIC, SOCIAL, REPRESENTATIVE.

Description:
Semicircular topped marble headstone with chamfered edge. Originally oriented to face 90 degrees (East). The upper portion of the headstone lies face up within a double grave plot (2.45 x 2.45 m) enclosed by sandstone kerbing. The plot also features an iron grave fence, however, although the panels appear to match, only one fence panel is actually in-situ. Three and a half panels, although placed onto the kerbing some time ago (due to growth of creepers on ironwork) do not belong to this plot, but must derive from another location (probably fairly close). The correct location for this fencing could not be determined, but may relate to the pile of edging tiles, item #7. An additional (matching) fence panel for the Cherry plot is now located further down the hill.

The marble headstone has been forcibly removed from the plinth/kerb. The upper portion (within the plot) bears the lead-inlaid inscription:

In Loving Memory

of

JAMES CHERRY
ACCIDENTALLY KILLED IN PACIFIC COLLIERY
18TH DEC 1908 AGED 31 YEARS

Seven additional fragments of this headstone, which join to form an almost complete base, are situated about 8 metres to the northeast of the plot (downhill). These fragments bear the mason's name: F Russell, Jesmond.
Condition / Integrity
Poor. Broken and not in-situ.

Threats
Further scattering and loss of monum fragments.
Weathering / deterioration of extant fabric.

Recommended Action for Conservation or Management
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Rejoin all headstone pieces (glue and dowel) and reset on grave plot. Also consider repair (including rust treatment and/or repainting) thence reinstatement of appropriate fencing. Ideally, some of existing fence should be reset elsewhere, although correct position is not known. It may prove more practicable to retain fencing on this grave plot, in which case the native creeper (Hardenbergia sp) growing on the fence shoul...

Comments

PHOTOGRAPH

Recorder S. Lavelle

Survey Date 01/1994

Form by S. Lavelle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JURY/BARRETT HEADSTONE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**
TECHNICAL ACCOMPLISHMENT, HISTORIC, SOCIAL.

**Description**
Arched gothic style marble headstone with stylized relief florals on top edge, and relief gothic tracery (cinquefoil) on face. Originally oriented to face 90 degrees (East). The upper portion of the headstone is broken across the centre, and lies face up within a double grave plot (2.45 x 2.45 m) enclosed by sandstone kerbing. The kerb previously featured an iron grave fence, also apparently of elaborate gothic style, but only two small fragments now remain. The kerbing is also cracked and becoming displaced due to forcible removal of ironwork and rusting of the iron cramps within the kerb.

The base course and plinth for the headstone are also within the plot but require re-setting.
The lead-inlaid inscription reads:

**In Loving Memory**

of

ROBERT JAMES JURY
DIED 8TH DECEMBER 1908 (?)
AGED 54 YEARS

THY WILL BE DONE
ALSO MY DEAR FATHER

HENRY BARRETT
DIED 8TH OCT 1915
AGED 80 YEARS
"PEACE PERFECT PEACE"

The Jury/Barrett plot also features two remnant traditional grave plantings of the shrub/creeper Carolina jasmine. These should be retained and periodically pruned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not intact, poor condition.</td>
<td>Further damage and decay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Action for Conservation or Management
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Rejoin headstone pieces (glue and dowel) and re-erect on plot, by resetting base.
Also re-bed sandstone kerbing, note that it may be necessary to replace iron cramps.
Retain grave plantings, prune occasionally. Retain leaf litter within the plot and periodically hand-weed grave plot.

Comments

PHOTOGRAPH

Recorder  S. Lavelle
Survey Date 01/1994
Form by S.Lavelle
**TERALBA CEMETERY STUDY 1994**
**CEMETERY FEATURE RECORDING SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICK GRAVE SURROUND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**
SOCIAL, HISTORIC, REPRESENTATIVE.

**Description**

A rectangular grave plot, dimensions 3.85 x 2.45 metres. Enclosed by fairly substantial round constructed of cement rendered brickwork with rendered coping. Brickwork is monial Bond, i.e. three courses of stretchers with a header course above. Riser is cracked and parts of the brickwork and surround itself are displaced. Surround also appears to have formerly featured an iron railing, although no matchings were noted. A self-sown seedling tree is at the northern end of the plot, and there are several small self-sown blackberries within the plot.

The plot also contains a sandstone plinth (not in-situ) and four fragments from a semicircular bed marble headstone. The surviving inscription on these fragments is not sufficient to provide exact identification.

Inscription (formerly lead-inlaid) reads:

Me...
LIAM...
D...
ED 24...
BE LET ME WAIT WITH...
T TILL THE TIDE IS...
T TILL I SEE THE MORN...
AK ON THE GOLDEN SHOR...

Headstone is signed by the mason G P Lock, Newcastle.

By S. Lavelle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor.</td>
<td>Further damage / deterioration, and loss of headstone fragments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Reconstruct surround by repair of brickwork with material collected from vicinity and additional matching bricks if necessary. Rebed plinth, rejoin headstone pieces (glue and dowel) and reset in plot (stone probably faced eastwards). Cut off seeding tree, poison stump and remove. Also poison and remove blackberries which have invaded this plot (use "Round up" or similar herbicide applied with brush).

**Comments**

**PHOTOGRAPH**

![Photograph](image)

**Recorder** S. Lavelle

**Survey Date** 01/1994

Form by S.Lavelle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RODGERS HEADSTONE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**

HISTORIC, SOCIAL, AESTHETIC.

**Description**

Sandstone plinth, partly displaced and broken by forcible removal of headstone. Snapped off tenon for 3 inch width marble headstone evident in plinth. The correct headstone for this plinth has been placed inside the adjacent plot (item 12).

It is an arched marble headstone with incised border and stylised florals on edge. Central lozenge medallion on face with relief carved florals, either convolvulous or lily. The plinth for this headstone indicates that it faced at 240 degrees. The inscription has been damaged by being partly chipped-away (apparently fairly old vandalism).

The inscription reads:

*In Loving Memory Of*

WILLIAM TH(OM)AS RODGERS  
DIED DECEMBER 12TH 1903  
AGED 34 YEARS  
AND  
(MUL)A MAREA  
HIS INFANT DAUGHTER  
DIED FEBRUARY 14TH 1903  
AGED 1 YEAR 3 MONTHS  

Mason: G P Lock, Newcastle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not intact, poor condition.</td>
<td>Further displacement, fall &amp; breakage of headstone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**

(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Headstone should be reset in correct location (glue and dowel onto plinth). Plinth may require consolidation first, or new replacement plinth may be necessary. If base/monument lack sufficient strength, a separate supporting structure e.g. frame or solid backing, may be required. Releading of inscription would require a skilled professional, and would increase the cost of the repair.

**Comments**

-Photograph-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE SANDSTONE KERBED PLOT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**  SOCIAL

**Description**

Single grave plot enclosed by sandstone kerbing with low iron railing. Plot lacks any identifying grave marker. The Rodgers headstone (Item 11) is currently within this plot, but belongs adjacent.
### Teralba Cemetery Study 1994

#### Cemetery Feature Recording Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature No:</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition / Integrity</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair condition. Essentially intact, ironwork rusted but relatively stable.</td>
<td>No immediate threats evident.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommended Action for Conservation or Management

(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Consider appropriate treatment of ironwork. As corrosion is not severe a routine application of fish oil or other preservative treatment would probably suffice. Alternatively, ironwork may be cleaned back (scouring pad or brush), cold galvanised and repainted. Refer to Appendices of report. Note that no attempt should be made to remove existing rust unless the ironwork will be subsequently treated.

#### Comments

#### PHOTOGRAPH

![Photograph of a cemetery feature]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE GRAVE WITH EDGING TILES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**  
RARITY, SOCIAL, HISTORIC.

**Description**

Grave plot featuring in-situ, salt glazed, ceramic edging tiles. The plot is either a single adult grave, or could be two small infants or childrens graves. The plot is partly silted up and obscured by leaf-litter, this may have protected the edging tiles.

Iron grave fence panels displaced from other plots lie in the vicinity of this plot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intact, but poor condition.</td>
<td>Vandalism and removal from site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Retain tiles on-site. Consider careful hand-clearing of plot.

**Comments**

**PHOTOGRAPH**

**Recorder** S. Lavelle

**Survey Date** 01/1994
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LARGE KERBED PLOT, CONTAINING TWO DESK MONUMENTS AND OTHER FRAGMENTS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance: SOCIAL, HISTORIC.

Description:

Very large (family) grave plot, 2.3 x 4.9 metres, enclosed with cement/concrete kerbing with terrace formed using natural rock pieces on lower side. The plot is divided internally with smaller cement kerbs, into three small plots at the northeast end and two large plots at the southwest end. Two concrete desk monuments at situated at the northeast end of the plot, these are oriented to face 240 degrees.

The larger desk monument (76 x 58 cm) formerly featured a marble surmount with a "clasped hands" motif. This surmount now lies face up on the plot. The desk also featured an attached plaque or tablet (64 x 34 cm), probably of "open book" type. A number of fragments from such tablets lie within the grave plot and are described on inventory sheet #15. The large desk has also been partly damaged - the left top corner has been broken away and the desk has been partly displaced/loosened from its base.

The smaller desk monument measures approximately 50 x 37 cm. The upper portion of the monument has been broken away. The plaque/tablet for this monument has also been forcibly removed, but may be one of those represented by the pieces within the plot (see #15).

The desks and kerbing also show evidence of having previously been painted white.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor condition.</td>
<td>Already realised, risk of further damage and decay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Refix desk and base. Conserve/stabilise both desks (will require introduction of new fabric/cement mix to fill damaged areas/voids).

**Comments**

**PHOTOGRAPH**

![Photograph of the feature](image-url)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONUMENT FRAGMENTS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**

HISTORIC, SOCIAL.

Degree of significance severely compromised by poor condition of material, which is incomplete and therefore unable to demonstrate its significance.

**Description**

A large number of fragments from marble monuments are situated within the large family plot, item #14. The form of the fragments, including consideration of lettering styles, thickness and other identifiers, suggests that there are pieces from at least 5 and possibly 7 separate monuments. It appears that at least some fragments must derive from the nearby desk monuments (see items #14, #17, #18). No monuments are intact enough to enable individual identification and the correct provenance of the fragments is not known.

Fragments appear to represent 3 "open book" style tablets and 2 rectangular plaques; also possible additional headstone fragments.

Books are:

i) In ....ory ...
ii) ....
iii) ....LLA....(William ?)

W.............

AGED ....

(MAR?) 5TH 1913

ALSO AN.....

.....NTHS  (AG)ED 3 MONTHS

DAUGHTER ..... "Two Buds In Heaven"

"Love's Last Token"

Rectangular plaque: In .....Memory Of ....

AT R(EST)

Other fragments: (AG)ED 6 MON(THS)

The extremely weathered appearance of many fragments (ie straight-edged breaks have become rounded) suggests that much of this material has been disassembled for a considerable time.
TERALBA CEMETERY STUDY 1994
CEMETERY FEATURE RECORDING SHEET

Feature No: 15

Condition / Integrity
Extremely poor condition.
Integrity lost.
Provenance or correct locations are not known.

Threats
Further damage and removal off-site.

Recommended Action for Conservation or Management
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

The extremely fragmented nature of this material means that a large amount of new fabric would be necessary if it were to be repaired. This is not considered justifiable unless future research or investigation reveals more fabric and allows the correct identification of material. Material is very vulnerable to theft/removal therefore consider burial within the grave plot at depth of 50cm surrounded by geotextile and clean sand.

Comments
Burial of fragments is suggested, in order that material is able to be kept on-site, allowing for reinstatement in the future if circumstances change.

PHOTOGRAPH

Recorder S. Lavelle

Survey Date 01/1994

Form by S. Lavelle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRICK EDGED GRAVES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance: HISTORIC, SOCIAL.

Description:

A group of six brick-edged grave plots occurs towards the eastern end of the site. (One further example also occurs at the western end between items #7 and #8, refer to site plans).

Plots are defined by a single course of unbonded bricks laid flat and on edge. Plot sizes suggest that at least two graves may be children. Some bricks removed from these plots lie in piles immediately adjacent.
### Condition / Integrity
Fair condition, mostly intact.

### Threats
Removal from site.

### Recommended Action for Conservation or Management
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)
Retain these edgings on site. Rebed displaced bricks, reinstate removed material and supplement with new bricks if necessary.

### Comments

### PHOTOGRAPH

[Image of the feature]
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**Recorder**  S. Lavelle  
**Survey Date**  01/1994
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANDSTONE DESK MONUMENT (Single Plot)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>HISTORIC, SOCIAL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sandstone desk monument, 70 x 57 cm. Oriented to face 70° degrees. Upper portion of desk damaged, with piece missing. Former tablet or plaque on face now removed and not evident, so monument lacks identification. Grave plot is partly outlined by brick edging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition / Integrity</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor condition, not intact.</td>
<td>Further weathering/deterioration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Repair desk monument; use of reconstituted or synthetic stone to fill upper area may be required.

**Comments**

**PHOTOGRAPH**

![Image of the monument]
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**Survey Date**  01/1994
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name or Identification</th>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANDSTONE DESK (Double Plot)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance: HISTORIC, SOCIAL.

Description:
Sandstone desk monument, situated on double grave plot which is enclosed by low cement kerbing. The desk is oriented to face 50 degrees. The former tablet or plaque on the face of the desk is now missing, so the monument lacks identification. The kerbing is also displaced in the southeast corner (due to rusting of internal iron support) and is also cracked at the foot of the grave.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition / Integrity</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor.</td>
<td>Further deterioration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action for Conservation or Management**
(Also refer to Repair Guidelines section of the main report)

Stabilise / repair desk and kerb.

**Comments**

**PHOTOGRAPH**

![Photograph of a cemetery feature]
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BIG HILL

A Tribute to the Pioneers Interred in Teralba & District Cemeteries
N.S.W.
TERALBA

In a bush setting at Teralba, on top of what was known as ‘Big Hill’ then ‘Goat Hill’ lies a silent cemetery where some of the early pioneers of that township have been laid to rest, as well, many young children belonging to those early families have been interred there. This cemetery is in ruin, the few remaining headstones lie broken and neglected. Some of the graves are marked with an outline of rock and stones. I was told from a resident of Teralba that a fire came through the area of the cemetery many years ago and burnt a lot of wooden crosses that marked a number of the graves, their messages lost forever. The cemetery is not easily accessible and the area has been used as a dumping ground for what would seem decades. Some people still living in the area have loved ones interred here, others still recall the cemetery when it was well kept. The cemetery is not easily reached, a walk up from the Booragul train station, or a walk up from the Mining Museum is the only way to reach it. Only four wheel drive vehicles are able to negotiate the bush tracks these days. Mrs. Doris Sager who herself passed on recently, recalled Mr. Christopher Thornton, riding his horse to the cemetery daily to tend the graves. Although it cannot be verified I am led to believe Mr. Thornton was also the grave digger for the cemetery. No known grave diggers records have survived. There is a story that Christopher Thornton dug his own grave a few years prior to his death and filled it with sand so it would be easy to dig when he passed on. He was the last interment in the cemetery, he passed away on 10 January, 1970 at the age of 84 years and special permission had to be sought for his burial. This permission was only granted because the plot had been set aside for this burial. This cemetery was never dedicated as a cemetery, therefore the Lake Macquarie Council has no interest in the site as a cemetery, they hold no records of interments. When funerals were held at this cemetery, the cortege would cross the northern railway line at a point a little south of Teralba station. 1 Unfortunately the long abandoned cemetery is reverting to bushland. From talking with many residents of the town, I am led to believe there were four cemeteries in the Teralba area. There is one clearly marked in Gregory’s Road map, just off the old main road, one situated on Goat Hill, one near the Quigley homestead that had several burials in it and one at Rhondha which was officially dedicated on June 5, 1894, (and known as the Teralba Cemetery), of which I found only one burial listed, that of a small child. This site has now reverted to bushland and is very hard to locate. This has made the task of locating where people were actually laid to rest a very daunting job. The other problem that arises is what is now known as Teralba is only a small portion of the area that was known as Teralba in the infancy of the area. There could be many loan graves in the area, lost for ever. As the Aboriginal people roamed this area many years prior to white settlement, there are possibly many sacred burial sites scattered around the area belonging to these people. Where ever people reside, cemeteries or grave sites are required.

As the township of Teralba developed, so did the little cemetery on top of ‘Goat Hill.’ According to an article that appeared in the Newcastle Morning Herald of 14 December, 1972, the cemetery occupies about half an acre of land. Due to the overgrown state of the cemetery and the absence of defined graves, it would be impossible to judge from the appearance of the site the actual amount of land the cemetery occupies. The few headstones that have survived tell the stories of those few people, but there are many more stories to be told of the people interred at Teralba. It is these people that are the story of Teralba and hopefully this work will be a lasting monument to them.

It is thought that Aboriginal settlement at Lake Macquarie may have begun more than 30,000 years ago. The lake area would have resembled the ‘Garden of Eden’ to these people who became known as the Awakabal Tribe. Food sources such as kangaroos, ducks, swans, pigeons, quails, fish and oysters were in abundance and the climate ideal. 2 Being a nomadic people, the Awakabal Tribe would most certainly have drifted into the area of what is known today as “Teralba”. No one is sure where the word Teralba originated from, but due to the presence of the aboriginal people in the area, it is almost a certainty that the word Teralba was derived from an aboriginal word, meaning edible bush. 3

1 Newcastle Morning Herald & Miners’ Advocate, December 14, 1972
2 Coulton; Reids Mistake - 200 Years on the Story of Lake Macquarie, July 1800 - July 2000, City of Lake Macquarie celebrating 200 years. p. 5
3 Teralba School Centenary 1884 - 1984 p. 6
The Institute Sunday school services were held in the Teralba church yesterday. The afternoon session was in charge of Mr. W. J. Swain, the Southern New South Wales district president of Sunday Schools.

At the night services Elders Stewart and Swain of Sydney, addressed those present on the subjects: Need of Christianity, and What Think Ye of Jesus? A solo was sung by Eud Pascoe and a quartette by Messrs. E. David, D. Roberts, R. Emrie and A. Hepworth.

From the above articles we gain a picture of a town that was struggling for existence, that relied heavily on the coal mines of the district for employment, but also a town full of community spirit. Several churches met the needs of people in the town, the Methodist, Lay Methodist, Presbyterian, Church of England, Catholic and the Reorganised Latter Day Saints. Police Sergeant Hickey along with four police constables, Thomas Fallon, Constable Danks, John Dunshen and Constable Wright served the community. The first hotels in Teralba were Hodges Great Northern Hotel, Lake Macquarie Hotel and the Teralba Hotel. Several lodges catered for the men of the town, Manchester Unity of Oddfellows - Loyal Teralba Lodge No. 616, Grand United Order of Oddfellows - Pride of Lake Lodge No. 334, Grand United Order of Oddfellows - Pride of Lake Lodge No. 2304 and Grand United Order of Free Gardeners - Foreget-me-not Lodge No. 18. The women of the town were also very active, serving on various church committees as well as the many fund raising committees that were established in the town to meet the needs of the times. Several doctors served the community, although some were not actually living in the town, Dr. Alfred Edward Perkins, Dr. Andrew Nash (WallSEND) Dr. A.H. Zarzurwyn and Dr. Ody. These medical practitioners were shared by various communities in the surrounding area. There were no chemists in the town, scrips were sent from WallSEND or Newcastle as required.

Name Changes
The area that is known as Teralba today has had many different names. Some of these names are recorded in obituaries in following pages. We find such names as Big Hill, Goat Hill, Billy Goat Hill, Nanny Goat Hill, The Gravel Pits, Monkey Town, The Quarry, Glen Mitchell and Teralba. An article appearing in the Newcastle Morning Herald in 1971 indicates some changes that have taken place more recently. “Evidently names of localities change with the times, as indicated in a discussion at a meeting of Teralba Advisory Committee. Dealing with the need for bus shelters, a member said it would benefit residents at Angora Heights (formerly known as Billy Goat Hill). The chairman (Mr. C. Evans) said the area got its name from the large herds of white goats that once grazed there, to be rounded up at night and driven to properties. The committee was also told residents of and near Victoria Street (called Monkey Town by early settlers) would also benefit. It was recalled that this spot, comprising a large gully, was once a small rainforest, noted for its tall trees. The name sprang from the thousands of hanging vines that dropped on the vegetation below.”

The Big Hill Cemetery (Billy Goat Hill Cemetery)
In June 2000, Ian Lyons, Nancy Edge and Margaret Parsons from the Newcastle Family History Society Inc. visited the site of the Teralba Cemetery on Goat Hill. This cemetery is almost forgotten except by those few residents of the town who have loved ones interred here. The cemetery contains over 200 burials covering all age groups; yet we found very little visual evidence due to the vandalism and ravages of time that has taken place over many decades. Many young children are interred here, no headstones or crosses mark their graves, if they once did, they have perished over the years. There are 132 children under the age of three years, 7 children 3-5 years group and 5 children in the 5-10 years group, making a total of 144 children.

The setting is tranquil and has almost returned to natural bushland, but marred by the remains of broken beer bottles and debris. A few lone headstones remain standing, others lie broken amongst the bush and scrub. From all appearances, it would appear that the area has been used for unsavoury activities in recent years. The sacredness of the cemetery has been ignored and graves desecrated over time.

If is difficult to say who the first burial was in the Teralba Cemetery - possibly that of Annie Lister aged 31 who died on August 18, 1879, or Tommy Young who died on May 29, 1879 aged 3 weeks. Newcastle Morning Herald & Miners’ Advocate, Thursday, July 16, 1971 Page 34
aged 31 who died on August 18, 1879, or Tommy Young who died on May 29, 1879 aged 3 weeks. An article appearing in the NHM in 1916 (see below) refers to that of a child being the first burial.

The first registered burial in the Teralba area - as it was defined in the infancy of the area - was that of Charles Anderson Warner, who would have, most certainly been buried on the Warner’s property.

Those burials attributed to Teralba prior to this date were scattered around various properties in close proximity to the Goat Hill Cemetery. Those graves have long been erased from the landscape, but they have been included in this work as a monument to their memories.

The only reference to the first burial in the Goat Hill cemetery I was able to locate was made in a newspaper article in the Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners’ Advocate of February 19, 1916 -

“For instance, there is a burial place, which was started about 20 years ago since by a child being buried there and since then a good many have been buried in this place”. 24

Whether this land, on which the Teralba Cemetery is situated, was just used for the first burial because of necessity and convenience, the others just following as a matter of course, or whether the land was given by the trustees of the Quigley estate for the specific purpose of a burial ground will never be known. No records exist to indicate the latter. The cemetery was never dedicated, therefore never officially designated as such. Yet, there is no question of its existence.

The last four burials in the Teralba Cemetery were William Mark Thornton, aged 63 years who died 27 May, 1940, Ivy Eileen Wood, who died 14 December, 1946, Catherine Ann Thornton, who died 24 September 1963 and Christopher Thornton, aged 84 years who died 10 January, 1970, and was privately interred following a Seventh Day Adventist service at the graveside, at which Pastor Lachlan officiated on Monday 12 January, 1970 at 11.30am. Unfortunately, there is no indication where these graves may be located. It was stated that special permission had to be obtained for this burial - Lake Macquarie Council has no record of this request. One Teralba resident, Mrs. Bernice Wood recalls the day of Mr. Thornton’s funeral. She witnessed the coffin being carried over the railway bridge from Booragul Station.

A period of 90 years has spanned between the first and last burials in the cemetery. It would be more correct to say, the cemetery served the citizens of Teralba for a period of 60 years.

The cemetery was operating as a General Cemetery for the settlement of Teralba between the years of c.1879/1880 and 1946. Most funeral notices included in this work refer to Teralba Cemetery, or General Cemetery Teralba, although some refer to Church of England Cemetery Teralba, and Roman Catholic Cemetery Teralba. One funeral notice mentions the burial place as Quigley Paddock, Teralba, another as being interred in the Estate. Various funeral directors were mentioned, the majority in the latter years of the cemeteries operation was Evans of Wallsend. With permission, these records were perused, and were most helpful. Unfortunately these records are incomplete due to a fire in Evan’s premises many years ago. Other funeral directors mentioned were Thomas C. Butler, W. Craft, Froome & Co., Archibald Hay, J. Meighan, A. Murray & Co., Walter Neve, T. Sherlock, T. Sherlock & Wood Coffin Ltd. Only one of these remain in business today.

Mrs. Doris Sager related the funeral of her infant children, Beryl Joyce and Doris Clare who died in 1927 and 1931 respectfully. Their coffins were placed in the front seat of the funeral car, her husband Harry sat in the back with a couple of their relatives (Doris was unable to attend as she was still in bed following her confinements). The tiny coffins were carried up the hill to the cemetery which was well kept in those days. Both children had brief graveside services. Doris informed me they did not have the money in those days to erected a stone over the graves. Another story Doris related to, was of one family who could not afford a coffin for their child, so they made one themselves and conducted their own burial. This fact was also confirmed by Mrs. B. Wood. On inquiring from Doris if the cemetery was divided into the various dominations, she informed me that it wasn’t, but everyone had their own special place.

---

24 Newcastle Morning Herald & Miners’ Advocate, Saturday, February 19, 1916 p.3 cs. 3/4
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Mr. Christopher Thornton maintained this cemetery for most of his working life. It was also stated by some of the current residents of Teralba that he was also the gravedigger at the cemetery. No records have been found to verify this fact, but it may well be true. It is of interest to note there are many members of the Thornton family interred in the Teralba cemetery, eleven of them bear the Thornton name.

In 1916 there was a push to do something about a permanent cemetery for Teralba. There was money put aside by the Teralba Progress Associations for improvements to the town. It was suggested the money be used to improve the area and clear the timber from the Goat Hill Cemetery. Some of the town Progress Associations had also contacted the Government and the Medical Officer for the Hunter District with the view of having a permanent cemetery for Teralba. The site chosen for a new cemetery for the town was unsuitable because an overhead bridge would need to be constructed for an access route. However, the land for that cemetery - The Teralba Cemetery situated at Rhondda has been resumed on 13 March, 1891, and dedicated as the site for the cemetery on 5 June, 1894. (see plan of Cemetery) Due to the many objections to this cemetery, and its non use over many years, this cemetery was eventually revoked in 1975. (Government Gazette 28 February 1975) One small child, John Poulden aged 11 days, who died on 1 November, 1901, the son of John Edward Poulden and Mary Catherine nee O’Conner has been registered as being interred in Rhondda Cemetery. As a result the existing cemetery on Goat Hill continued to be used long after this time.

Teralba Cemetery
Photography courtesy of Margaret Parsons

---

25 *Newcastle Morning Herald & Miners' Advocate*, Saturday, February 19, 1916 p.3 cs.3/4
26 N.S.W. Births, Deaths and Marriages Records
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>Given Name/s</th>
<th>D.O.D.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Parent / Father</th>
<th>Parent / Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>09.03.1902</td>
<td>C. 40 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEY</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>05.02.1908</td>
<td>3 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLEY Walter V.</td>
<td>JUDD Esther F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHMAN</td>
<td>Unnamed Male</td>
<td>14.01.1898</td>
<td>4hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASHMAN John</td>
<td>HEPPLE Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHMAN</td>
<td>Unnamed Female</td>
<td>25.01.1897</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASHMAN John</td>
<td>HEPPLE Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANKS</td>
<td>Unnamed Female</td>
<td>25.06.1930</td>
<td>20 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>BANKS Harry</td>
<td>WIGGIN Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNETT</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>09.07.1907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BARNETT David Jr.</td>
<td>BARNETT John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNETT</td>
<td>Edith May (Mary)</td>
<td>19.12.1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BARNETT Hilton G.</td>
<td>DICK Mary D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNETT</td>
<td>Hilton</td>
<td>09.11.1917</td>
<td>12 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>BARNETT Hilton G.</td>
<td>DICK Mary D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNETT</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>14.11.1921</td>
<td>75 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>BARNETT Henry</td>
<td>RODGER Fanny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEACHER</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>08.10.1915</td>
<td>80 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEACHER James J.</td>
<td>EVANS Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEACHER</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>05.11.1907</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEACHER James J.</td>
<td>EVANS Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEDLINGTON</td>
<td>Winifred Jane</td>
<td>10.04.1890</td>
<td>14 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEDLINGTON William</td>
<td>EVANS Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>13.11.1892</td>
<td>40 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>EVANS Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKWELL</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>02.05.1887</td>
<td>6 1/2 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>BLACKWELL William</td>
<td>EVANS Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAKE</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>07.11.1895</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>Younger of twins</td>
<td>BLAKE Alfred</td>
<td>EVANS Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAKE</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>07.11.1895</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>Elder of twins</td>
<td>BLAKE Alfred</td>
<td>EVANS Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWE</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>13.07.1895</td>
<td>62 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYD</td>
<td>John Ernest</td>
<td>06.03.1881</td>
<td>7 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOYD Thomas</td>
<td>FREEMAN Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADLEY</td>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>07.11.1908</td>
<td>37 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRADLEY Harry</td>
<td>FREEMAN Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROADBENT</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>10.05.1925</td>
<td>41 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>THORNTON Anna Augusta</td>
<td>FREEMAN Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROAD</td>
<td>Clarence Bertram</td>
<td>29.10.1902</td>
<td>11 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BROAD Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIN</td>
<td>Unnamed Male</td>
<td>07.06.1908</td>
<td>1 dy</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAIN Robert J.</td>
<td>HAMILTON Marian M. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMERON</td>
<td>James Norman</td>
<td>26.11.1900</td>
<td>9 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAMERON Allan</td>
<td>FIDDAMAN Frances Matilda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLES</td>
<td>Valery Albert</td>
<td>08.06.1910</td>
<td>15 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>CASTLES George N.</td>
<td>CHARLTON Mabel F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLTON</td>
<td>Albert James</td>
<td>20.12.1917</td>
<td>2 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLTON Mabel F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>04.07.1940</td>
<td>86 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERRY Duncan</td>
<td>JOHNSTONE Christina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>18.12.1908</td>
<td>31 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHERRY Duncan</td>
<td>JOHNSTONE Christina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD</td>
<td>Hannah Priscilla</td>
<td>15.01.1880</td>
<td>10 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMITH Amelia</td>
<td>WONDERS Isabella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAYDON</td>
<td>Blanch</td>
<td>08.03.1893</td>
<td>15 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAYDON Henry</td>
<td>HEWSINING Sophia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>Given Name/s</td>
<td>D.O.B.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Parent / Father</td>
<td>Parent / Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAYDON</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>20.05.1891</td>
<td>55 yrs</td>
<td>CLAYDON Samuel John</td>
<td>GARRATT Benjamin</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLINS</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>27.05.1902</td>
<td>33 yrs</td>
<td>RICHARDSON Margaret</td>
<td>COLLINS John</td>
<td>CLEARY Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNELLY</td>
<td>Eva May</td>
<td>15.09.1895</td>
<td>17 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONNELLY Thomas</td>
<td>CARROLL Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNELLY</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>13.09.1895</td>
<td>16 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONNELLY Thomas</td>
<td>CARROLL Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>04.06.1909</td>
<td>20 yrs</td>
<td>WALDROON William J.</td>
<td>COOPER Joseph</td>
<td>Isabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>31.07.1919</td>
<td>68 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>John Richardson</td>
<td>10.03.1922</td>
<td>5 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>COOPER Benjamin</td>
<td>Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>Joseph Richardson</td>
<td>02.11.1915</td>
<td>70 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLARKE Mary A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNALLY</td>
<td>Edna</td>
<td>24.10.1911</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORNALLY Walter C.</td>
<td>FULLER Rachel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREIGHTON</td>
<td>Gertrude Maud</td>
<td>01.08.1904</td>
<td>24 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUCK Edward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALE</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>03.04.1892</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>DALE Frank</td>
<td>DEW Mary Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS</td>
<td>William Charles</td>
<td>02.07.1903</td>
<td>4 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>DENNIS William</td>
<td>MORGAN Elizabeth Claudia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>08.09.1891</td>
<td>2 yrs 8 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>DICK William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXON</td>
<td>Louisa M.</td>
<td>12.08.1904</td>
<td>6 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIXON William R.</td>
<td>ABSOLAM Elizabeth M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXON</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>05.10.1918</td>
<td>84 yrs</td>
<td>FERRY Jane Ann</td>
<td>DIXON Thomas</td>
<td>MOSES Annie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXON</td>
<td>William R.</td>
<td>23.08.1904</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIXON William R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOBELL</td>
<td>Charles Victor</td>
<td>31.01.1938</td>
<td>46 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOBELL John</td>
<td>ABSOLAM Elizabeth M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODDS</td>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>03.12.1889</td>
<td>6 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>DODDS John</td>
<td>MCGUIRE Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUTTREE (HICKS)</td>
<td>Fanny</td>
<td>05.02.1902</td>
<td>38 yrs</td>
<td>HICKS Charles Henry</td>
<td>HAIR John</td>
<td>NETHEVILLE Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUGGAN</td>
<td>Michael Edgar</td>
<td>10.09.1898</td>
<td>11 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>DUGGAN Patrick Bernard</td>
<td>OPHIR Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUXBURY</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>23.11.1894</td>
<td>34 1/2 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>DUXBURY Matthew</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYER</td>
<td>Brian Edward</td>
<td>08.12.1933</td>
<td>3 1/2 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>McMACHON Thomas</td>
<td>BOWEN Vera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYER</td>
<td>Nellie Price</td>
<td>15.11.1923</td>
<td>9 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>DYER Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FENNELL</td>
<td>Arthur Clarence</td>
<td>11.06.1893</td>
<td>11 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>FENNELL William</td>
<td>CHAPMAN Harriet Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZPATRICK</td>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>04.06.1929</td>
<td>71 yrs</td>
<td>FITZPATRICK William John</td>
<td>BARTON William</td>
<td>TUCKER (late TAYLOR) Annie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZPATRICK</td>
<td>Annie Eileen</td>
<td>05.10.1920</td>
<td>1 yr 9 mths</td>
<td>FITZPATRICK William John</td>
<td>BARTON William</td>
<td>TUCKER (late TAYLOR) Annie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZPATRICK</td>
<td>Martin Thomas</td>
<td>09.11.1920</td>
<td>28 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>FITZPATRICK Martin Thomas</td>
<td>SUSAN Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZPATRICK</td>
<td>William John</td>
<td>23.10.1925</td>
<td>63 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>FITZWILLIAMS John</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZWILLIAMS</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>05.02.1892</td>
<td>62 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>Given Name/s</td>
<td>D.O.B.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Parent / Father</td>
<td>Parent / Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLANAGAN</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>21.01.1915</td>
<td>76 yrs</td>
<td>SPALDING Elizabeth</td>
<td>FLANAGAN Bartholomew</td>
<td>WATSON Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>Ada Mary Lyons</td>
<td>24.02.1893</td>
<td>17 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>FORD Thomas Lyons</td>
<td>JOHNS Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>Ambrose Charles</td>
<td>09.07.1899</td>
<td>17 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>FORD Thomas Lyons</td>
<td>JOHN Janc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>William Lyons (John 7)</td>
<td>23.05.1898</td>
<td>75 yrs</td>
<td>HENDON Ellen</td>
<td>FORD Henry Ebenezer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORREST</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>02.06.1902</td>
<td>68 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULLICK</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>12.04.1893</td>
<td>11 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>FULLICK James</td>
<td>SMITH Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULTON</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>22.09.1917</td>
<td>4 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td>FULTON William</td>
<td>BARNES Adelaide P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFITHS</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>05.09.1909</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>GRIFFITHS Thomas</td>
<td>CATTON Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFITHS</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>31.12.1925</td>
<td>74 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFITHS</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>07.07.1906</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>GRIFFITHS Thomas</td>
<td>CATTON Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFITHS</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>15.11.1908</td>
<td>28 yrs</td>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE Louisa</td>
<td>GRIFFITHS David</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUILFOYLE</td>
<td>Margaret Mary</td>
<td>04.10.1902</td>
<td>8 mths</td>
<td>GUILFOYLE Patrick Gregory</td>
<td>GUILFOYLE Elizabeth Catherine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL</td>
<td>Frances Annie</td>
<td>24.09.1907</td>
<td>23 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>HALL Adam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>09.09.1890</td>
<td>29 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUNN George</td>
<td>THOMPSON Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>17.10.1902</td>
<td>18 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>HART James</td>
<td>DIXON Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>26.04.1926</td>
<td>48 yrs</td>
<td>THORNTON Jane Esther</td>
<td>HART James</td>
<td>DIXON Mary Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>16.07.1938</td>
<td>86 yrs</td>
<td>DIXON Mary</td>
<td>HART James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>Jane Esther</td>
<td>31.12.1928</td>
<td>48 years</td>
<td>HART James</td>
<td>HART James</td>
<td>THORNTON Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>William Robert</td>
<td>04.04.1911</td>
<td>30 yrs</td>
<td>THORNTON Sarah J.</td>
<td>HART James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEANEY</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>05.02.1906</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE James</td>
<td>HEANEY John</td>
<td>GRIFFITHS Mary Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>15.06.1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>18.10.1899</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE Richard</td>
<td>GRIFFITHS Alice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE</td>
<td>Thomas Patrick Blacket</td>
<td>24.06.1897</td>
<td>2 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE Thomas Henry</td>
<td>RICHARDSON Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE</td>
<td>Valda</td>
<td>03.10.1939</td>
<td>S.B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HEPPLEWHITE David</td>
<td>BROMAGE Nellie May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HICKS (DOULTREE)</td>
<td>Fanny</td>
<td>05.02.1902</td>
<td>38 yrs</td>
<td>DOULTREE William</td>
<td>HAIR John</td>
<td>NETHEVILL Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HITCHCOCK</td>
<td>Unnamed Female</td>
<td>16.08.1910</td>
<td>3 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>HITCHCOCK Thomas</td>
<td>SHAKESPEARE Annie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODGES (HODGE)</td>
<td>Lydia Pearl</td>
<td>24.06.1888</td>
<td>4 yrs 10 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>HODGES John</td>
<td>O'DONNELL Mary Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODGES</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>11.07.1896</td>
<td>6 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HODGES Florence Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>Given Name/s</td>
<td>D.O.D.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Parent / Father</td>
<td>Parent / Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLBERT</td>
<td>Nonce Charles</td>
<td>17.11.1892</td>
<td>4 yrs 10 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOLBERT Edward</td>
<td>NEWITT Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORNE</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>01.11.1920</td>
<td>3 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOWELL Elsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWELL</td>
<td>Percy</td>
<td>15.01.1900</td>
<td>5 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASHMAN Annie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGHES</td>
<td>Emma Alice</td>
<td>13.09.1898</td>
<td>13 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>HUGHES Thomas</td>
<td>EASTON Isabella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGHES</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>10.08.1918</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>HUGHES Thomas</td>
<td>LEWIS Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGHES</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>20.01.1928</td>
<td>58 yrs</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>HUGHES John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>13.09.1890</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>HYDE Thomas</td>
<td>ROGERS Martha Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>25.08.1884</td>
<td>7 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>HYDE Robert</td>
<td>SIDEBOTTOM Emma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>11.03.1910</td>
<td>4 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>JACKSON Christopher</td>
<td>MILLIGAN Mabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>29.05.1893</td>
<td>3 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES Henry</td>
<td>COLLINS Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>06.10.1891</td>
<td>45 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEPSON</td>
<td>Dora</td>
<td>20.01.1899</td>
<td>28 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>JEPSON William</td>
<td>HAWKINS Rosanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>Bridget A.</td>
<td>11.08.1907</td>
<td>67 yrs</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>HOGAN Patrick</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>19.01.1892</td>
<td>8 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHNSON James</td>
<td>DODSON Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>15.07.1895</td>
<td>7 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHNSON James</td>
<td>DOBSON Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>05.10.1894</td>
<td>31 years</td>
<td>DOBSON</td>
<td>JOHNSON James</td>
<td>BENNISON Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>05.03.1890</td>
<td>64 yrs 5 mths</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>JOHNSON James</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSTON</td>
<td>Elizabeth Anne</td>
<td>12.08.1910</td>
<td>1 1/2 yrs</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>JOHNSTON James E.</td>
<td>BROAD Matilda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES</td>
<td>Thelma</td>
<td>18.06.1921</td>
<td>1 dy</td>
<td></td>
<td>JONES William James</td>
<td>REES Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>15.01.1892</td>
<td>12 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>JONES William</td>
<td>REES Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURY</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>26.07.1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JURY William</td>
<td>JURY William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURY</td>
<td>Robert James</td>
<td>28.12.1908</td>
<td>54 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEDWELL</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>11.12.1906</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>KEDWELL George</td>
<td>REID Florence Adeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEEN</td>
<td>Alma Enoch</td>
<td>22.07.1906</td>
<td>2 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>KEEN William</td>
<td>RODGERS Nellie Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEEN</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>05.02.1916</td>
<td>6 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>KEEN Edward</td>
<td>RODGERS Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEEN</td>
<td>Lily May</td>
<td>05.05.1909</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>KEEN William</td>
<td>RODGERS Nellie F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEMBREY</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>26.11.1891</td>
<td>19 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>KEMBREY Alice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGWELL</td>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>01.02.1906</td>
<td>43 years</td>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>KINGWELL John</td>
<td>SNOW Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKBY/KIRBY</td>
<td>Rae Norman</td>
<td>24.11.1912</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>KIRKBY Christopher G.</td>
<td>STEELE Edith V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>Given Name/s</td>
<td>D.O.D.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Parent / Father</td>
<td>Parent / Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUGHTON</td>
<td>Frederick William</td>
<td>20.11.1912</td>
<td>14 hrs</td>
<td>SUNDERLAND Margaret</td>
<td>LAUGHTON Frederick W.</td>
<td>WOOLLEY Edith C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>29.03.1890</td>
<td>63 yrs 7 mths</td>
<td>LISTER Matthew</td>
<td>LEE Henry</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTER</td>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>18.08.1879</td>
<td>31 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>LISTER Matthew</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDONALD</td>
<td>Mabel Ellen</td>
<td>23.03.1903</td>
<td>8 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>MacDONALD Charles</td>
<td>HENRY Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACEY</td>
<td>Elsie Clara</td>
<td>15.01.1898</td>
<td>13 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>MACEY James William</td>
<td>SMITH Emily Louisa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACEY</td>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>26.06.1891</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td></td>
<td>MACEY James William</td>
<td>SMITH Emily Louisa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGISON</td>
<td>Gwendolene Theresan</td>
<td>15.09.1904</td>
<td>19 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>MARGISON Alice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKS</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>14.05.1883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASON</td>
<td>George Duncan</td>
<td>11.03.1906</td>
<td>5 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>MASON Percy</td>
<td>CHERRY Mary Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASON</td>
<td>Stennie</td>
<td>02.02.1903</td>
<td>2 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>MASON William</td>
<td>SPROLES Silvina Elizabeth Vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEWS</td>
<td>Mary Jane</td>
<td>12.12.1893</td>
<td>35 yrs</td>
<td>MATTHEWS Andrew</td>
<td>GRIFFIN John</td>
<td>HINKS Eliza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McALLAN or McCALL</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>04.03.1916</td>
<td>65 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McALPINE</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>07.05.1895</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>McALPINE Thomas</td>
<td>LESSELS Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAVINEY</td>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>22.12.1902</td>
<td>5 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloCH</td>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>18.08.1924</td>
<td>1 mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMAHON</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>04.06.1874</td>
<td>41 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>See David Bell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILBURN</td>
<td>PHILIP</td>
<td>13.11.1892</td>
<td>40 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER</td>
<td>John Roy Meader</td>
<td>27.06.1904</td>
<td>6 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>MILLER Frank Edward</td>
<td>MEADER Alfreida Rosina May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER</td>
<td>Martha Catherine</td>
<td>29.12.1889</td>
<td>5 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>MILLER Henry</td>
<td>COOKER Phobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELSON</td>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>02.06.1929</td>
<td>1 mth</td>
<td></td>
<td>NELSON Harry</td>
<td>SAGER Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESBITT</td>
<td>Edward John Thomas</td>
<td>15.06.1890</td>
<td>13 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>NESBITT Harry Frank</td>
<td>MOY Katherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWALLS</td>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>13.12.1891</td>
<td>9 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEWALLS John</td>
<td>NEWALLS Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSTEAD</td>
<td>Elsie Sarah</td>
<td>04.01.1903</td>
<td>4 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEWSTEAD Phillip</td>
<td>PARKER Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSTEAD</td>
<td>Mervyn Henry</td>
<td>14.02.1916</td>
<td>4 1/2 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEWSTEAD Phillip</td>
<td>PARKER Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORRIS</td>
<td>William David</td>
<td>14.04.1902</td>
<td>30 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>NORRIS William</td>
<td>DODDS Ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPHER</td>
<td>Henry James</td>
<td>24.01.1904</td>
<td>13 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>OPHER Henry Edward</td>
<td>COOK Harriet Jessie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPHER</td>
<td>Matilda Catherine</td>
<td>23.11.1901</td>
<td>6 1/2 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>OPHER Henry</td>
<td>COOK Harriet Jessie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPHIR</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>13.09.1919</td>
<td>82 yrs</td>
<td>OPHIR Johann</td>
<td>OPHIR John</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPHIR</td>
<td>John (Johann)</td>
<td>26.12.1913</td>
<td>73 yrs</td>
<td>HILZAPFEL Catherine</td>
<td>OPHIR John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>Given Name/s</td>
<td>D.O.D.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Parent / Father</td>
<td>Parent / Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTRAM</td>
<td>Enoch Rodgers</td>
<td>15.06.1896</td>
<td>8 1/2 mths</td>
<td>PARKES</td>
<td>Arthur Henry</td>
<td>OUTRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKES</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>25.07.1938</td>
<td>3/4 hr</td>
<td>PARKES</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>IRWIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKES</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>28.07.1909</td>
<td>2 dys</td>
<td>PARKES</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>PALMER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKES</td>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>22.12.1902</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>PARKES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRY</td>
<td>Albert William Oscar</td>
<td>05.12.1894</td>
<td>3 mths</td>
<td>PARRY</td>
<td>Albert Edward</td>
<td>SHERWOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARYMAN</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>05.02.1915</td>
<td>34 yrs</td>
<td>PARYMAN</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARCE</td>
<td>Ivy Ann</td>
<td>08.02.1895</td>
<td>9 mths</td>
<td>PEARCE</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARCE</td>
<td>Olive Blanche</td>
<td>09.07.1895</td>
<td>5 wks</td>
<td>PEARCE</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>02.08.1907</td>
<td>3 dys</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POULDEN</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>01.11.1901</td>
<td>11 dys</td>
<td>POULDEN</td>
<td>John Edward</td>
<td>O’CONNOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRATTEN</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>16.02.1902</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>PRATTEN</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>REID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCELL</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>04.09.1902</td>
<td>43 yrs</td>
<td>PURCELL</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>MAHONEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCELL</td>
<td>Linda Winifred</td>
<td>30.06.1897</td>
<td>4 yrs</td>
<td>STEWART</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>STEWART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCELL</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>09.05.1905</td>
<td>57 yrs</td>
<td>PURCELL</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>CONDRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIGLEY</td>
<td>Margaret Scott</td>
<td>04.11.1886</td>
<td>37 yrs</td>
<td>QUIGLEY</td>
<td>William Bell</td>
<td>BELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIGLEY</td>
<td>William Bell</td>
<td>18.03.1879</td>
<td>37 yrs</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
<td>Margaret Scott</td>
<td>SHUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAINGER</td>
<td>Christian Bell</td>
<td>02.03.1906</td>
<td>3 dys</td>
<td>RAINGER</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REES</td>
<td>John Henry</td>
<td>24.01.1923</td>
<td>11 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDS</td>
<td>John Michael</td>
<td>24.03.1906</td>
<td>35/40 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDSON</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>29.02.1916</td>
<td>19 yrs</td>
<td>THORN</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>RICHARDSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDSON</td>
<td>Samuel Smith</td>
<td>09.07.1901</td>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARDSON</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>RICHARDSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>Edward French</td>
<td>24.03.1901</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>Alma Enoch</td>
<td>OUTRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>29.01.1915</td>
<td>7 wks</td>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>Alma Enoch</td>
<td>OUTRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>02.12.1915</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>Alma Enoch</td>
<td>OUTRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>17.12.1891</td>
<td>6 mths</td>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>MARGESON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>Nula Maria</td>
<td>12.02.1903</td>
<td>20 mths</td>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>William Thomas</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODGERS</td>
<td>William Thomas</td>
<td>11.12.1903</td>
<td>34 years</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>Angelina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOTSEY</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>24.10.1905</td>
<td>43 yrs</td>
<td>ROOTSEY</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>HAWKINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWLEY</td>
<td>Harriet Ann</td>
<td>04.10.1922</td>
<td>74 years</td>
<td>ROWLEY</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Given Name/s</td>
<td>Parent / Father</td>
<td>Parent / Mother</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>D.O.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THORNTON</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td>Elizabeth A.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>84y</td>
<td>x 10.01.1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROADBENT</td>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ann</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td>36y</td>
<td>x 05.02.1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZPATRICK</td>
<td>Catherine Ann</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Margaret A.</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td>9mths</td>
<td>x 13.03.1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Ann</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td>6mths</td>
<td>x 26.06.1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOLEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Ann</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td>6mths</td>
<td>x 26.06.1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZPATRICK</td>
<td>Catherine A.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ann</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td>6mths</td>
<td>x 26.06.1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Ann</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td>13 hrs</td>
<td>x 26.06.1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Ann</td>
<td>Jolley</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>x 26.06.1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>BRIDGE</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>x 22.07.1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>LAYBUTT</td>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>x 17.01.1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>21 1/2 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>21 1/2 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>SEARLE</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>BM.</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
<td>x 10.02.1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>Given Name/s</td>
<td>D.O.D.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Parent / Father</td>
<td>Parent / Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMSON</td>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>24.10.1880</td>
<td>19 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>WILMOT</td>
<td>Mary Ann (mother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMOT</td>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>08.12.1893</td>
<td>14 dys</td>
<td></td>
<td>WILMOT</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>Christina Neihven</td>
<td>21.11.1894</td>
<td>7 wks</td>
<td>RUSSELL Ada</td>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>27.07.1927</td>
<td>70 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>Mary Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>Tobitha</td>
<td>13.10.1898</td>
<td>3 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>Mary Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>12.11.1902</td>
<td>3 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>Ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>Ivy Eileen</td>
<td>14.12.1944</td>
<td>5 yrs 7 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>Lucy May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODS</td>
<td>Theodore Joseph</td>
<td>22.07.1905</td>
<td>16 mths</td>
<td></td>
<td>WOODS</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG</td>
<td>Tommy</td>
<td>29.05.1879</td>
<td>3 wks</td>
<td></td>
<td>YOUNG</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
he saw the body afterwards. There was nothing to lead him to conclude that it died any but a natural death. He had a child die under similar circumstances. He had known Mr. & Mrs. Fennell for over four years, and had found them very respectable.

This concluded the evidence, and a verdict was returned to the effect that death was due to natural causes.

Fitzpatrick Grave - Photograph Courtesy Mrs. Elsie Baker

FITZPATRICK ANNIE

d. 4 June, 1929

Headstone Inscription
Also, Annie
Beloved Wife of
William John FITZPATRICK
Died 4th June 1929
Aged 71 years
At Rest

Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners' Advocate, Wednesday June 5, 1929 p.8 c.7
FUNERALS
FITZPATRICK - Relatives and friends of ANNIE FITZPATRICK (relict of the late Mr. WILLIAM JOHN FITZPATRICK) are invited to attend her funeral: To move from her late residence “Gartlee”, Teralba: This Afternoon at 3 o'clock for Teralba Cemetery.

R.M. Evans & Sons Motor Funeral Directors.
Phone 51 Wallsend.

FITZPATRICK - Relatives and friends of Mr. and Mrs. B. FITZPATRICK, Mr. and Mrs. C. THORNTON, Mr. and Mrs. I. TREAY, and Mr. and Mrs. R. STEWART, Jun., and FAMILIES are invited to attend the funeral of their dearly beloved mother, mother-in-law, and grandmother, ANNIE FITZPATRICK, To move from her late residence “Gartlee”, Teralba: This afternoon at 3 o'clock for Teralba Cemetery.

R.M. Evans & Sons, Motor Funeral Directors.
Phone 51 Wallsend

FITZPATRICK ANNIE EILEEN

d. 5 October, 1920

Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners' Advocate, Wednesday, October 6, 1920 p.6 c.9
FUNDALS
FITZPATRICK - Friends and relatives of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Fitzpatrick are invited to attend the Funeral of their dearly beloved daughter, ANNIE EILEEN FITZPATRICK: To move from their residence THIS AFTERNOON, at 4 o'clock for Teralba Cemetery.

R.M. Evans & Co. Undertakers

FITZPATRICK - Friends and relatives of Mr. and Mrs. W.J. FITZPATRICK and Mrs. SIDEBOTTOM are invited to attend the Funeral of their dearly beloved granddaughter, ANNIE E. FITZPATRICK: To move from the parents' residence, THIS AFTERNOON, at 4 o'clock for Teralba cemetery.

R.M. Evans & Co. Undertakers
City of
Lake Macquarie
Administrative Centre
Spears Point
NSW 2284
PO Box 21
Boolaroo 2284
Newcastle Document
Exchange DX 7869
Telephone (049) 210 333
Facsimile (049) 58 7257

15 March 1994

Ms Siobhan Lavelle
Historical Archaeologist
P O Box 42
WOODFORD NSW 2778

Dear Ms Lavelle

RE: LANDCON STUDY - OLD TERALBA CEMETARY

Thank you for your letter in regard to the cemetery. I apologise for the delay in responding.

In regard to your suggestion that the cemetery be transferred to Council as a local reserve the following comment is provided.

1. Should the land be declared public reserve as part of a subdivision, a Section 355 Committee could be formed. The group could be linked to the historical society, precinct committee or progress association. As public reserve, Council would have a duty of care, control and management which would be dependent upon local expectations for conservation coupled with funding availability.

2. A special reservation could be possible with care, control and management the responsibility of a trust body set up by the Department of Conservation and Land Management.

Conservation of the cemetery is a worthwhile and important heritage project. It is our opinion that the success of such a project will depend upon community involvement at an early stage.

Yours faithfully

R J GRAY
GENERAL MANAGER
Per.