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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background
The Wharf Property Development Pty Ltd proposes to develop a residential retail and commercial development complex, known as 'The Boardwalk', within the former Civic Railway Workshop area at Newcastle. This area, which is owned by the Honeysuckle Development Corporation, contains a group of heritage items included on the State Heritage Register. The proposed development is on the site adjacent to the north and west of the former Per Way Store fronting Workshop Way. No buildings remain on the subject site. Godden Mackay Logan has been engaged by Wharf Property Developments Pty Limited and Crone Associates to assess the heritage impact of this proposal and to prepare an Archaeological Assessment.

This Archaeological Assessment has been prepared, in accordance with the requirements of the Newcastle Archaeological Zoning Plan and the Archaeological Assessment Guidelines for the NSW Heritage Office, to accompany a Development Application (DA) for submission to Council.

1.2 Site Location
The development site of 'The Boardwalk' is located between the foreshore and Civic Railway Station, within the block currently bounded by Wharf Road, Merewether Street, Workshop Way and Honeysuckle Drive in the Newcastle Central Business District. The location is shown in Figure 1.1.

1.3 Methodology
This Archaeological Assessment has been prepared in accordance with the methodology outlined in the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning's Archaeological Assessment Guidelines. The criteria and principles set out in these guidelines form the basis for the assessment of archaeological potential and significance contained within this report.

The report has been formulated with the following objectives in mind:

- to assess the potential for historical archaeological remains to be present within the boundaries of the study area that currently remain undetected;
- to provide an evaluation of the significance of the potential historical archaeological resource associated with development;
- to identify those areas of the subject site that may be archaeologically sensitive within the context of the proposed redevelopment; and
- to formulate and recommend a program of appropriate action where archaeological issues may constitute a constraint within the context of the site works currently proposed.

The site has not been assessed for the presence of Aboriginal archaeological deposits.
1.4 Statutory Context

1.4.1 NSW Heritage Act 1977

The New South Wales Heritage Act 1977 affords automatic statutory protection to 'relics' that form archaeological deposits or part thereof. The Act defines a 'relic' as:

any deposit, object or material evidence relating to the settlement of the area that comprises NSW, not being an Aboriginal settlement, and which is 50 or more years old.

The Act requires anyone proposing to disturb land to obtain a permit issued by the Heritage Office of NSW if it is suspected that 'relics' may be disturbed.

1.4.2 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974

The current study deals specifically with European archaeological heritage. However, there should be prudence in recognising the legal requirements and automatic statutory protection provided to Aboriginal 'relics' under the terms of the National Parks and Wildlife Act of 1974 (as amended) as:

it is an offence to knowingly damage, deface or destroy Aboriginal sites or relics without the prior consent of the Director General of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

The Act defines a 'relic' as:

any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft for sale) relating to indigenous and non-European habitation of the area that comprises New South Wales, being habitation both prior to and concurrent with the occupation of that area by persons of European extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains.

As a consequence, whilst this project does not specifically deal with Aboriginal archaeology, relevant statutory and procedural requirements are identified in the event that site works expose Aboriginal cultural material.

1.4.3 Newcastle City Council

The Newcastle City West Development Control Plan (DCP) 40 requires the completion of an Archaeological Assessment of any site that has been identified in the Newcastle Archaeological Management Plan (AMP).

The AMP identifies the Honeysuckle Point (1840) as an Archaeological Precinct within the City. Individual inventory sheets identify the Honeysuckle Point settlement (1032), Railway Workshop (1033), and Railway Turntable (1034) as individual items with archaeological potential. These inventory sheets are included as Appendix B.
The AMP recommends that archaeological monitoring is undertaken in respect of the settlement (1032) and Conservation Management Plans be prepared in respect of the workshop (1033) and the turntable (1034).

1.5 Constraints
This report assesses the historical archaeological potential of the study area. The potential for Aboriginal cultural material to be present also exists.

The historical research for this project was limited to research in the Mitchell Library, State Archives and the Newcastle City Library (Local Studies Collection).

Physical evidence analysis was confined to visual inspection and review of available geotechnical data.

A physical evaluation of the nature and extent of the potential subsurface archaeological features was constrained by existing surfaces, ground cover and structures.

1.6 Author Identification
This report has been prepared by Matthew Kelly, Archaeologist; Shaun Mackey, Archaeologist; and Mark Dunn, Historian. Specialist advice and review has been provided by Richard Mackay, Managing Director.
Figure 1.1 Location Plan and Site Context.
2.0 Historical Development

2.1 Earliest European Use

Prior to 1840, the study site, on the outskirts of the main settlement at Newcastle, was mostly unsettled and undeveloped. Prior to c1830, the Honeysuckle Point site was used for a number of convict industries. Up until the 1840s, Newcastle had been dominated by its convict population, which had limited the number of free settlers who wished to settle there. In 1819, Governor Macquarie began planning for the removal of the penal settlement from Newcastle, due to its proximity to Sydney and the effect it was having on free settlement in the area. Direct transportation to Newcastle was halted from 1823 (Port Macquarie took over as the Government's preferred place of banishment), however in 1836, 426 of the population of 704 people in Newcastle were still convicts. The Government was still the principal employer, with most of the convicts working in the coal mines or on the building of the breakwater.

With the scaling down of the Government presence through the 1820s, the town of Newcastle went into decline. It was the arrival of the Australian Agricultural (AA) Company in 1828 that once again stimulated the town's development. The AA Company had selected 2000 acres of land adjacent to the settlement at Newcastle, on which they mined for coal — trucking it to the waterfront via an inclined plane railway, the first of its kind in Australia.¹ In its first full year of production the mine produced 7,000 tons of coal, with production growing steadily thereafter. However, with most of the workforce being convicts, supply could not meet the demand and the AA Company was forced to bring out a party of thirty-seven British miners to supplement the workforce. The arrival of these miners and the development of an industrial village by James Mitchell and Alexander Scott at Stockton, on the northern side of the harbour, stimulated a growth in the number of houses and a subsequent rise in the number of free settlers.

2.2 The Bishops Settlement 1840–1854

In 1840, some of the residents of Newcastle and the surrounding districts organised for the establishment of a Grammar School for their sons, much like The Kings School at Parramatta. Forty-seven subscribers purchased 130 shares at £50 each, with a deposit of £5. With this money they then approached the Bishop of Australia, Dr Broughton, for assistance. As a representative of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, he secured a further £500, which was used to purchase a thirty-eight acre site at Honeysuckle Point for the school. The total cost at auction was £803.15.0.²

The deed of trust for the site was made out to prominent Novocastrian Dr James Mitchell and two trustees, Alexander Scott and William Croasdell. However, no more shares were taken up for the school due to Australia’s economic depression, which culminated in the collapse of the Bank of NSW and left the Hunter River settlers with no money to speculate with. Faced with this, the site remained undeveloped through the 1840s, until the arrival of the first Bishop of Newcastle in 1848. The
Bishop of Sydney had informed the new Bishop that a large piece of Church land lay unused on the outskirts of town, and so it was surveyed and subdivided into forty-two allotments.

By January 1851, up to forty of the allotments had been rented with twenty-one year leases. Some of the tenants erected houses, others shipbuilding yards and other industries. A number of wharves were also established along the point. Mr Simon Kemp was appointed as the Bishop’s agent to collect rents, and the area became known as the Bishop’s Settlement. In April 1851, the Sydney Herald announced that suburban allotments would soon be laid out in the Church land at Honeysuckle. A plan of the area dated 1857 shows at least thirty-three buildings present on the site by this time, some with defined yard areas and waterfront access (see Figure 2.2).

Throughout the 1840s, as the free population grew and new mines were opened, industrial development increased in Newcastle. One of the pioneering industries was the meat cannery operated by Henry, Richard and William Dangar at Honeysuckle Point. The Dangar family had been associated with the Newcastle area since Henry Dangar had surveyed the town in 1823 as Government surveyor, as well several settlements further up the Hunter Valley. Dangar was also in boiling-down works and the export of tallow, hides and bone. The tallow business was only profitable if cattle could be purchased for £2 or less, and so with their cattle fetching £2.12.6 in the late 1840s, the Dangar’s decided to open the canning business. The Newcastle Meat Preserving Company opened on 17 July 1848. It was the second canning company in Australia and the first in Newcastle. The first commercial canning company had opened in Sydney in 1846, but was overwhelmed by heavy taxes, cost of tins and the competition from the Dangars.

The first plant, manufactured in England, was installed in a large wooden building on the harbour foreshore. The site was purchased by the Dangar brothers from AW Scott and AP Onslow for £90. By 1853 the main building housed the preserving room, a filling room, a cutting-up room, a tinmen’s shop, three store rooms and an office. Adjacent to this were the boilers for preserving meat and rendering tallow, while the slaughter house, stables, stockyards and workman’s cottages occupied the remainder of the site. At its height, the works processed 700 cattle and 400 sheep per annum, to produce an annual average output of eighty tons of preserved meat and twenty-four tons of tallow.

From the beginning of the venture, the brothers were looking to London as their main market, in particular the ships of the Admiralty. In 1851 they displayed their product at the Great Exhibition in London where they won two gold medals and soon after secured contracts with the British Admiralty. In 1851, 43,265 either four or six pound tins were filled. The export of meat from the Dangar’s factory represented the beginnings of a new market for Australian manufactured goods on the world market.

Despite their apparent success, the Dangars sought to sell their business in 1853, but could find no buyers. This may have been due to the imminent arrival of the Railway and their interest in the Honeysuckle Point area; but whatever the reason, the works closed their doors two years later in 1855.
2.3 The Honeysuckle Workshops

In 1853, the Hunter River Railway Company was created by an Act of Parliament to build a rail line between Newcastle and Maitland, and then further into the Hunter Valley. The Act gave them the power to resume land for their purpose, and they chose Honeysuckle Point for the site of the terminus. The tenants on the Church Estate were given notice of eviction on 5 July 1854, with the vacation date set at 22 July.

The following year (1855), the Hunter River Railway Company ran into financial difficulties and the whole of the Company’s works, assets and liabilities were taken over by the Government. The Sydney Railway Company had been taken over at the same time, making the NSW railway the largest Government-owned railway in the British Empire.

The first annual report for the Railway Commissioner, released in February 1856, reported that a line had been constructed between the Honeysuckle terminus and Hexham. The contractor, Mr William Wright, was then further commissioned to extend the line to East Maitland, with the total cost being estimated at £76,240 or £10,000 per mile. A turntable measuring 36ft was installed at each end to allow for the trains to be turned.

The Governor, Sir William Dension, officially opened the line in March 1857, while 1500 people took advantage of free rides on the new trains. The line was extended east to Watt Street (the current terminus) the following year (see Figure 2.2).

The opening of the railway in Newcastle can be seen as the most significant day in Newcastle’s nineteenth century history. Prior to the coming of the railway, Newcastle had struggled against Maitland as the main town and service centre for the Hunter Valley. However, with the opening of the railway line and the subsequent growth in port facilities, Newcastle’s role as the Hunter Region’s capital was set.

When the line opened, the terminus area at Honeysuckle Point was already well developed as the site for the railway workshops. Adequate workshop facilities were considered vital to the economic running and development of the railways, and, although most of the first rolling stock was imported, the Honeysuckle workshops were soon producing equipment such as horse-boxes and brake vans.

As the Great Northern Railway (GNR) grew, the need for better workshop facilities also increased. Workshops were needed to cope with new rolling stock and to keep the present stock in working order. In 1866 the GNR had fifty-two miles of permanent way opened, with seventeen locomotives, fifty-five passenger vehicles and one hundred and thirty-one goods vehicles. By 1871, this had increased to one hundred and nine miles of permanent way, nineteen locomotives, seventy-five passenger vehicles and two hundred and ninety-two goods vehicles.

With the rapid increase in infrastructure, the Per Way Branch (then known as the Existing Lines branch) established their own separate workshops at Honeysuckle Point from 1870. These shops
were the first purely Per Way workshops to be operating in NSW. The workshops served for both maintenance and storage, particularly for new rails and wrought iron bridge components that had been imported from England for track extensions.

A more substantial Per Way Store building was soon needed, and plans were drawn for it in 1881. The store was erected within the same year, with a stores office added to its western end. The store was the first major structure of high quality built on the site by the Existing Lines Branch for its own use, and remains on the study site. The Per Way Store joined the Loco Engine Shed, Carriage Repairing Shed, Carriage Painting Shop, Machine Shop and Blacksmith's building, which had all been built through the 1870s.

The completed Per Way Store building was soon joined by more buildings as the Existing Lines Branch sought to establish themselves as a separate operation from the loco shops. In 1883 a large Per Way machine or fitting shop was built to the west of the Store, and included a five hundredweight steam hammer, twenty-five horse power horizontal engine, fan blast, Cornish boiler and 100ft of three inch line to operate eleven machine tools as part of its equipment stock. In 1895 a tall assembling shop or bridge shop was built, probably on the site of an earlier temporary structure. A blacksmith's shop was added in 1895 as well, with another built in 1904. Another machine shop was added in 1905, a carpenter's shop in 1920 and a large foundry in 1926.10

The Per Way Workshop site included fourteen buildings involved in production by the 1930s, with State-wide markets for their products. The Per Way Workshops, with the exception of the Store, were all built on a different angle to the remaining Honeysuckle shops, following the alignment of the original 1855 spur line to the Merewether Street jetty. The Per Way department was also responsible for the design, layout and construction, as well as the prioritisation, of any new buildings on the site.

Between the 1880s and 1920s the Per Way department was involved in the fabrication or assembly of such things as water tanks, points, switches, sheds, signals, crossing gates, cranes and bridge components. They also contributed to large-scale Government engineering and construction projects including coal loaders at Bullock Island, the Sydney City Rail Loop, the Sydney Harbour Bridge, the State Coal Mine at Lithgow and the major Railway Workshops buildings at Chullora. Ironically, it was the upgrading and opening of the Chullora works in the late 1920s, coupled with the economic downturn at the same time, that signalled the start of the scaling back of operations at Honeysuckle.11

During the same period, the waterfront directly to the north of the site was being assessed for development into strip wharves to handle the increasing shipping trade in the port. In 1875 the waterfront at Honeysuckle Point was still vacant, but also swampy and low lying. However, its proximity to the city centre and to the railyards made it ideal for the development of general cargo wharf facilities. In 1908 the Public Works Department gave the authorisation to proceed with the development of timber cargo wharves at Honeysuckle Point. As part of the construction process, a retaining wall was built along the foreshore to present a straight-line wharf front to the harbour.
Approximately nine acres of fill, mainly dredged from the harbour shipping channels, was then set behind, forming a stable base on which to build the cargo wharves. The new wharf capabilities allowed for further expansion of the Port facilities, which by 1900 made Newcastle the fifth busiest port in the world with a record 5043 vessels arriving in 1906.

In 1957, the Government proposed the closing of the Foundry at Honeysuckle Point and the removal of operations to the Chullora workshops in Sydney. At the time the Foundry was mainly producing cast-iron brake blocks, which were set to be replaced by ‘Ferodo’ brake blocks made from asbestos, a process that Honeysuckle was not set up to handle. Despite local opposition, the closure went ahead in May 1958. The Foundry building was stripped out and converted to a goods shed in 1962.

With the shut down of the Foundry, pressure mounted for the removal of the remaining operations to workshops at Cardiff, and for the railway’s land to be released for redevelopment. In the mid 1970s, some of the operations were removed to Cardiff, and in 1978/79 the railways demolished most of the Per Way Workshop buildings, leaving only the Store building and the later carpenters and plumbers shops.

In c1983, the staging was removed from the west end of the Store and a concrete ground-level slab was poured. The western end of the building was converted to a garage for the survey section, whilst the former office was used as a lunch room and change room. The eastern end of the Store was still used by the Electrical Branch into the 1990s. The carpenters, plumbers and painters also still occupied the site, although their work had been reduced to local maintenance.

2.4 Honeysuckle Development Corporation

With the closure of the railway yards in the early 1990s, the site was handed over to the newly formed Honeysuckle Development Corporation, who were charged with the task of planning the redevelopment of the surplus Government railway and port facilities along four kilometres of Newcastle’s waterfront. The first phase of the project included some demolition, clearance and decontamination of the former rail yards to make way for new developments and private investment.
Figure 2.1 Newcastle Survey c1839 showing the main settlement to the east of Honeysuckle Point. Honeysuckle Point is shown as the spur of land in the bottom centre. The land was a partly tidal flat, with an ill-defined swampy northern boundary. It is bounded to the south by the Maitland Road and the east by the AAC's 2000 acre grant (Newcastle Local Studies Library LHM A 333.38/98).
Figure 2.2 Hunter River Railway, Plan of Extension into Newcastle, 1857. This plan illustrating the extension of the railway from Honeysuckle Point to Watt Street shows at least thirty structures at Honeysuckle Point at this time. These would have included the earliest railway workshops, as well as remnant buildings from the Bishops Settlement and possibly the Dangar’s canning factory (AONSW Map 6236).
Figure 2.3 Ornate bridge at Honeysuckle Station in 1892. Note the harbour waters up against the northern side of the station platform.
Figure 2.4 Newcastle Harbour Improvements Plan showing reclaimed land proposed to be transferred to the Railway Commissioners at Honeysuckle, Newcastle, February 1916. The plan shows the areas reclaimed for Lee Wharf as well as the Per Way Store and associated buildings, obviously due to their different alignment to the main yard (Honeysuckle point Heritage Study).
Figure 2.5 C1910 photograph showing the retaining wall in place for the construction of Lee Wharf. Note the sandy ground to the left of the image. This represents the northern edge of the original Honeysuckle area (GPO 1 – 20660).
Figure 2.6 Department of Railways New South Wales – Mortuary. The Per Way store is shown with its office attached to the western end and the associated Per Way workshops to the west. Note to the north of the site the Lee Wharf and reclaimed harbour land (Honeysuckle Heritage Study).
Figure 2.7 Looking east toward Lee Wharf with reclamation for the wharf extension, c1920s. The large wool store on the right sits on the study site and is an example of the scale of the Per Way Workshop buildings (GPO 1 – 19911).
2.5 Endnotes

3 ibid p 116.
6 Turner 1980, op cit p 35.
10 ibid p 20
11 ibid p 26.
12 ibid p 100.
14 *Honesuckle Point Heritage Study* p 29.
3.0 Physical Assessment

3.1 Physical Evidence

Soil Map

The area of The Boardwalk is listed as a variant residual landscape, Hamilton type, in the Soil Landscape Map series of NSW.¹

The Hamilton Landscape is described as Quaternary age sands based upon stiff estuarine clay. The sand can be between 1–3m in depth. It is represented in suburban Newcastle to the south and west of the Hunter River. This area has recently been incised by human activity such as the dredging and reclamation for the construction of wharves in the late nineteenth century and seawall construction in the mid-twentieth century (see Figures 3.5-3.8).

Geotechnical Evidence

The geotechnical report for the site suggests that this soil landscape continues to exist, sealed beneath up to 0.5m of fill gravel and brick.

Bore logs of work undertaken by Douglas Partners illustrate the nature of the subsurface deposits in the study site.

These bore logs indicate that, in parts of the site, the sand profile exists to a depth of up to 5m. Some sections also contain bands of shell deposit.

Previous Excavations

Excavation of the site of the Frederick Ash Building, undertaken by Godden Mackay in 1997, to the south of the current study site, indicated that portions of the natural sandy profile of the Hamilton formation still survive in this area of Newcastle.

While the construction of structures on this site had partially disturbed the natural soil profile, this disturbance was localised and much of the pre-European deposits survived on the site.

The excavation also uncovered three Aboriginal stone flakes illustrating the potential for survival of Aboriginal cultural material in the current study site.

3.2 Additional Historic Evidence

Early Maps

Early maps of the Hunter River indicate the area which is now the Boardwalk Development site as a northwesterly projection into the channel of the Hunter River. Much of the land along this southern
boundary of the river is indicated as sandy and swampy with an indistinct boundary between dry land and estuarine sands (see Figure 3.9).

**Description**

The Honeysuckle area was to the west of the early township and consequently does not appear frequently in early accounts of life at Newcastle.

A mid-century (1859) account of the landscape to the west of Brown Street, still at that stage considered the edge of the town, indicates that:

> along the road to Maillard (Hunter Street west) to the Cottage Bridge were a couple of boiling down establishments and a number of grazing paddocks with here and there a cottage and a humpy.

This sketchy description suggests that at Honeysuckle the period between the 'Bishop's Settlement' and the complete establishment of the workshops was one of non intensive occupation and land use.

What is worthy of note is the reference to continued operations in this area of Newcastle of meat/livestock processing sites, even if not on the current study site.

**3.3 Site Description**

The site was visited once during the course of the study. No excavation of deposits, removal of house fabric or removal of turf was undertaken during the course of the study.

The subject site is located between the foreshore and Civic Railway Station, within the block currently bounded by Wharf Road, Merewether Street, Workshop Way and Honeysuckle Drive, within the Newcastle Central Business District Conservation Area.

The subject site is currently vacant, the land located within the boundaries of the Civic Railway Workshops Group identified on the State Heritage Register and on the Newcastle Local Environment Plan 1987 (amended 25 February 2000).

A number of heritage buildings comprise the Civic Railway Workshops Group and are located in the immediate vicinity of the subject site. These include: the Lee Wharf Building A to the north (Figure 3.4); the Per Way Store in the southeastern corner of the site (Figures 3.1-3.3); the Blacksmith's and Wheel Shops, and the Locomotive Boilershop to the south, both fronting Workshop Way.
Figure 3.1
The Per Way Store adjacent to the Boardwalk site, looking east.

Figure 3.2
Wider view looking east. Per Way Store is to the right of photo.
Figure 3.3
Looking south-east to the Per Way Store, across the former roadway, along the harbour frontage.

Figure 3.4
Looking west to the Lee Wharf Building A. The Hunter River/Harbour is to the right of photo.
Figure 3.5
'Lee Wharf Extension, low level section under construction', GPO 1, nd, 20660. This image is looking west.

Figure 3.6
'Barque 'Chittacong', Newcastle', GPO 1, nd, 47732.
Figure 3.7
'Lee Wharf looking from Inflammable Liquid Wharf, looking east', nd, GPO 1, 20657.

Figure 3.8
'Lee Wharf Extension', nd GPO 1, 19911.
3.4 Endnotes

1 Matthei, LE, 1995, *Soil Landscapes of the Newcastle 1:100,000 Sheet, Department of Land and Water Conservation.*
4.0 Archaeological Sensitivity

4.1 Preamble
Information outlined in the preceding sections, the data relating to occupation sequences and discussion of past site disturbance and surviving physical evidence were considered in the assessment of potential survival of archaeological deposits on the site.

4.2 The Potential Archaeological Resource
The potential archaeological resource at the Boardwalk development site consists of remains of the three major phases of occupation of the site:

1. Pre-European occupation.
2. Early European occupation, including the ‘Bishop’s Settlement’ (see Figures 4.1 and 4.2).
3. The Railways.

The nature of each phase’s occupation of the area was substantially different and will consequently have resulted in a wide range of potential resource types.

1. While the site has not been assessed for potential Aboriginal remains it must be recognised that potential does exist for survival in situ of Aboriginal cultural material.

   Given this recognition, the range of potential sites range from single stone artefacts, to fireplace/campsites to shell middens. Coastal dune formations are also commonly used as burial sites.

2. Early European occupation, not historically attested, may include ephemeral structures and fencelines, lime kilns etc.

   The structures associated with the Bishops’ Settlement included the substantial remains of the Dangar’s Meat Work but the nature of the remainder of the occupation is unknown at this stage other than the general set out of structures indicated in Figure 4.1.

3. The Railway period represents the largest European impact on the site. The area of the Boardwalk development is, however, within the area of the trackway and is only likely to contain remnants of track/sleepers etc.
Figure 4.1 Overlay of the 1857 map of the area which shows the structures existing on Honeysuckle Church Estate over the current street plan. Note the structures within the development zone. Refer to Figure 4.2 for the relationship between the proposed excavation and these historic structures.
Figure 4.2 Closeup view of overlay of the 1857 map of the area over the plan of the development site (cf with Figure 4.1)
5.0 Significance Assessment

5.1 Basis of Assessment

5.1.1 General Principles

Assessment of heritage significance endeavours to establish why a place is important. Significance is embodied in the fabric of a place (including its setting and relationship to other items), the records associated with the place and the response the place evokes in the community or in individuals to whom it is important.

The term heritage significance is, in most respects, synonymous with 'cultural significance' which is the term used in the (Australia ICOMOS) Burra Charter to mean:

aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations.

An assessment of cultural significance can be undertaken in a number of ways. Kerr's The Conservation Plan,\(^1\) for example, considers the concept of cultural significance according to three qualities that are generally followed in most heritage assessments. These are:

the ability of a place to demonstrate a process, custom or style, associational (historical) links for which there may or may not be surviving evidence, and formal or aesthetic qualities.

5.1.2 Specific Guidelines

The NSW Heritage Manual, published by the NSW Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, sets out a detailed process for conducting assessments of heritage significance. The Manual provides a set of specific criteria for assessing the significance of an item, including guidelines for inclusion and exclusion. The following assessment has been prepared in accordance with these guidelines.

A new set of assessment criteria has also been prepared and gazetted as a result of recent amendments to the NSW Heritage Act. The seven criteria upon which the following significance assessment is based are outlined below:

- Criterion (a) an item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW's cultural or natural history;
- Criterion (b) an item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW's cultural or natural history;
- Criterion (c) an item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW;
- Criterion (d) an item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
• Criterion (e) an item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW's cultural or natural history;

• Criterion (f) an item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW's cultural or natural history; and

• Criterion (g) an item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW's cultural or natural places or cultural or natural environments.

The criterion should also be applied in relation to the local area (Newcastle) to determine whether the item is of Local significance.

5.1.3 Assessing the Site

The following assessment presents an assessment of heritage significance of the potential archaeology for the development site.

5.2 Significance of the Site

5.2.1 Criterion A

An item is important in the course, or pattern, of Newcastle's cultural or natural history.

The Boardwalk Development site is part of Newcastle's cultural history as a component of the site of the city's early industrial development and as the first railway terminus and rail works yard. Dangar's Cannery Factory was one of a number of early Newcastle industries that challenged the dominance of the coal industry and helped develop a market for Australian manufactured goods. The railway and workshops were developed only one year after the opening of the first railway line in NSW. The establishment of the railway at Honeysuckle Point confirmed Newcastle's status as the prime settlement in the Hunter Valley. The proximity of the railway to the harbour in turn encouraged the development of Newcastle's port facilities which, by 1900, were the fifth largest in the world.

5.2.2 Criterion B

An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Newcastle's cultural or natural history.

The Boardwalk Development site is associated with a number of prominent Newcastle pioneers, including the first Bishop of Newcastle who initiated the first subdivision, known as the Bishop's Settlement, the entrepreneurs Alexander Scott and Dr James Mitchell, who encouraged the development of the site, and the Dangar family, who were major figures in the colonial development of the Newcastle and the Hunter regions.
5.2.3 Criterion C

An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in Newcastle.

At this time, when the physical evidence on site is largely obscured, it is impossible to determine with any certainty whether and, if so how, the features of this site might meet this criterion. While it is expected that the remains of built structures, artefacts scatters and other material evidence, may have some distinctive visual qualities as ruins, they are unlikely to display aesthetic attributes or technical achievement.

5.2.4 Criterion D

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

The study site does not meet this criterion.

5.2.5 Criterion E

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

The site has potential to contribute to research regarding material evidence of the development of the early industrial sector of Newcastle during the nineteenth century.

The site may contain evidence of the early- to mid-nineteenth-century industrial/residential occupation and activities associated primarily with food processing or shipping industries. These include structural remains, outbuildings, services and some occupation deposits from the nineteenth century.

There is also potential that the site may contain deposits at depth relating to pre-European environment and topography, Aboriginal occupation and early environmental modifications of the land by the first European occupants of the area.

5.2.6 Criterion F

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

The proposed development site is relatively rare insofar as it is part of a finite set of archaeologically intact sites within the Newcastle Central Business District. The nature of subsequent intensive development across the central zone of the City has removed and/or destroyed much of the remaining resource.
5.2.7 Criterion G

An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of Newcastle’s cultural or natural places or cultural or natural environments.

The study site does not meet this criterion.

5.3 Statement of Significance

The proposed development site is a place of considerable archaeological research potential. The site is part of an early settlement along the southern frontage of the Hunter River. The area is known to have been occupied by Europeans from the early nineteenth century and, potentially, by the pre-European occupants of the area. It is associated with the emerging merchant industrialists of the Newcastle area until its resumption for development associated with Newcastle’s urban infrastructure. It therefore represents a significant aspect of the development of Newcastle as an urban and regional centre. The site is expected to contain physical evidence such as archaeological deposits, features, wells and cesspits, which can provide evidence of material culture that contributes information about early Newcastle that is unavailable from other sources.

5.4 Endnotes

6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Archaeological Conclusions

With regard to the assessments of significance made in Section 4.0 and the assessment of archaeological sensitivity of the site in Section 5.0, the following conclusions, in relation to the site's archaeological resources, have been reached:

- The Boardwalk Development has the potential to disturb or remove some European archaeological resources within the site.
- The area of the site that will potentially impact upon the archaeological resource is identified in Figure 4.2. The assessment of sensitivity has been formed on the basis of the likely survival of deposits and features.
- The assessments of archaeological sensitivity and significance have highlighted areas that potentially survive in the Boardwalk Development site and warrant further research and/or archaeological intervention.
- While this assessment has not considered the potential for survival of Aboriginal cultural material in detail it would be prudent to assume that there is potential for survival on this site given the result of previous excavations in the area.

6.2 Archaeological Recommendations

It is recommended that the following process is accepted as the basis for conservation and management of the historical archaeological resources at the Boardwalk Development site:

1. Early liaison should be established with the NSW Heritage Office and Newcastle City Council in relation to excavation and required archaeological works.
2. Advice should be sought from both the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Local Aboriginal Land Council in relation to potential Aboriginal cultural material.
3. The Research Design should be submitted accompanying an Excavation Permit Application under the NSW Heritage Act.
4. Contractors and subcontractors should be provided with training relating to their obligations for protecting 'relics' under the NSW Heritage and National Parks and Wildlife Acts.
5. Suitable contract clauses should be included in all subcontractor contracts to highlight obligations and requirements under both of these Acts.
6. On the basis of the prepared research design archaeological investigation should take the form of a staged on-site archaeological investigation and monitoring program which
coincides with construction works. Provision should be made for recording of features that are revealed and, if substantial intact deposits or elements are discovered, these provisions should enable other work to be deferred to allow archaeological excavation.

7. The work involved in the archaeological program should be allowed for in the overall development timetable, to ensure that the construction process is not unduly impeded.

8. Early negotiations should commence with relevant authorities regarding the long-term curation and storage of any material recovered during excavation.

9. Consideration should be given to public relations opportunities associated with the archaeological work. Media interest in archaeological projects such as this can be substantial. Provision can be made for interpretative signage, media releases and information leaflets to coincide with the archaeology/construction.
7.0 Research Design

7.1 Preamble

The Archaeological Assessment for the site concludes that the archaeological potential of the site and the assessed significance of the potential resource warrants archaeological investigation.

The archaeological investigation should be based upon a strategy which optimises the information recovered form the site.

The aim of the archaeological strategy is to recover information in areas to be disturbed by the proposed construction works. Areas in which no development impact is to take place are not proposed for archaeological investigation at this stage.

This section provides the research framework and the means by which the archaeological significance of the site may be realised.

7.2 General Research Questions

A number of general archaeological questions form the most basic level of any archaeological investigation. These are:

- What physical evidence of former activities survives on the site?
- What is the extent of the surviving archaeological evidence?
- What is the nature of extant archaeological features?
- What is the date of the identified elements?
- What can the material culture contribute to our knowledge about this site or other sites?

The monitoring of the site is designed to answer these basic questions about the nature and extent of the existing archaeological resource.

While these questions provide a basic archaeological context for further site investigations, more specific questions must be asked to address the research potential of the study area.

7.3 Site Specific

The proposed archaeological investigation is directed at recovering information available through no other technique. The assessment of the site has identified a number of areas in which archaeological techniques are likely to be the most reliable form of investigation.

The questions that are asked of the site are as follows.
7.3.1 What is the nature of the pre-contact environment?

Should they be present, ecological data, including soil samples and pollen records, will be recovered/document for future analysis. The focus here would be recovering material for palynological analysis, an examination of the study area's unmodified topography, and the nature of the site's soils, where such information is available. The data may afford an opportunity to examine the effect of settlement on the local environment, and changes made to the original topography - especially upon the original shoreline of the Hunter estuary- to accommodate increased development.

7.3.2 Is there physical evidence for Aboriginal occupancy within the study site?

The Aboriginal occupants of the area may have used areas of the study site. Evidence for land management and other cultural activities will be observed and recorded, if present.

(If such evidence is encountered the relevant procedures arising from the NPWS Act will be followed).

7.3.3 Is there physical evidence of Aboriginal-European contact?

Evidence of contact may survive in the form of European artefacts modified to suit Aboriginal use.

(If such evidence is encountered the relevant procedures arising from the NPWS Act will be followed).

7.3.4 What is the evidence for early European impact on the study area?

The study area is located within a region of Newcastle to undergo extensive European modification. Evidence in the form of changes in vegetation, erosion and pollution would be sought.

7.3.5 What is the physical evidence for the facilities of the Newcastle Meatworks or other activities on the site?

Currently the historical evidence suggests that a number of activities were formerly carried out on the Honeysuckle site. The nature of use of particular structures and spaces is, however, not defined.

Archaeological excavation of the areas of the Boardwalk site to be disturbed by development will enable greater understanding of the nature and extent of activities carried out in this area.

7.3.6 How does the physical evidence reflect attitudes to the use of this area as a residential or industrial zone?

It is already known that this area was put to use as an industrial area in the early part of the nineteenth century. Did this use preclude the establishment of residences adjacent to the industrial establishments.
7.4 Archaeological Questions
As with all archaeological investigations, this project provides an opportunity to gather information about site formation and disturbance processes. It is expected that analysis of the taphonomy (site formation processes) and stratigraphic analysis will present some challenges. The report on this aspect of the project may be a useful reference document for those undertaking subsequent excavations in these parts of Newcastle.

7.5 Archaeological Site Methodology
The Archaeological Assessment identified areas of the site that are archaeologically sensitive and are likely to be impacted upon by the development.

That impact consists of the excavation of a basement car park and the excavation for footings and service lines for the proposed development.

The following methodology establishes the means by which the archaeological significance of the site will be realised on site and during any post excavation work.

7.5.1 Test Trenching
It is proposed to excavate an area of the site for testing purposes. Based on the results of that test trench a number of further archaeological processes may be undertaken. They include, potential open area excavation, further test trenching, archaeological monitoring or no further action.

The excavation of a 5 metre by 5 metre trench will be undertaken initially by machine to remove recent fills and overburden.

The entire area of the test trench will then be excavated by hand to expose deposits and features associated with pre-Railway occupation of the site.

The test trench is sited to expose the site of a structure indicated on the 1857 plan overlaid across the current site plan, indicated in blue in Fig 7.1. The site of this former structure intersects with the eastern part of the car park and the southern portion of building C.

The specific nature (use, construction materials) of this 19th Century structure is unknown at this time and the excavation, should it expose in-situ material, will provide information which can be used to determine future archaeological requirements on the site.

Should the structure be substantially intact then it is proposed to extend the test trench to undertake open area excavation of the remainder of the structure and investigate the site of the additional structure to the east, indicated by the green arrow in figure 7.1.

Given the historical information currently available it appears that these are the only substantial structures likely to suffer impact from the excavation for the development.
However should further substantial or significant remains be exposed during the initial work further open area excavation may be required.

7.5.2 Monitoring

On the basis of currently available information and owing to the nature, significance and extent of potential in situ deposits within the remaining affected area of the site, a complementary archaeological monitoring program will be used to identify features present and make ongoing decisions about which require further archaeological input.

The monitoring program requires that an archaeologist:

• be available to provide advice, on call, on the significance of any feature or material exposed during the course of the development work;

• record any significant features or deposits associated with the work;

• undertake more detailed site excavation should the development work or exposed archaeological features warrant it:

7.5.3 Recording

The recording of archaeological features on the site will be undertaken using standard archaeological recording techniques. A standard pro-forma will be used to identify each archaeological context.

Measured drawings, pro-forma context sheets, black and white archival photographs and colour slides will all form part of the archaeological archive for the site. In addition specialist analyses of soil samples or other deposits may be undertaken as part of the recording and analysis phase where sampling is appropriate. Generally, the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (DUAP) guidelines for the completion of Archival Recording will be followed during the recording phase.

7.6 Post Excavation

Should it become necessary, the post-excavation period will include cleaning, cataloguing, labelling and boxing of artefacts recovered during the excavation phase.

An analysis will be made of these artefacts in relation to the questions outlined in the research design, or any subsequent questions developed during the course of the work.

Artefacts and samples will ultimately be lodged with an appropriate repository.
7.7 Reporting

A report will be prepared as a result of this project. It will include a final report outlining the work undertaken, results achieved and responses to the research design and specialist reports as required.

The final report will consist of:

- a summary of the results of the investigation, an account of the archaeological results, including interpretation of observed features, measured drawings, and photographs;

- the results of any analysis which may have been undertaken on soil samples, or other deposits and a report on any artefacts retained from the investigation; and

- conclusions relating to the nature and extent of surviving archaeological remains.

The final archive of archaeological material will consist of site records, context sheets, artefact sheets, photographs, slides, drawings and artefacts (inventoried, boxed, labelled and catalogued).
Figure 7.1 Areas of impact and excavation area. (Not to scale)
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9.0 Appendices

Appendix A
Inventory Listings from the Archaeological Management Plan of Newcastle.
**Newcastle Archaeological Management Plan**

**ITEM DETAILS:**

**NAME:**
Honeysuckle Point Settlement

**OTHER NAMES:**

**STREET NO. TO:**

**STREET NAME:**
Lee Wharf Road

**SUBURB:**
Newcastle Central

**REAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:**

**CROSS STREET (NE):**
Merewether Street

**CROSS STREET (SE):**
Worth Place

**FAR BOUNDARY:**
Hunter Street

**STAGE OF PLAN:**
Stage 2

**PREPARED BY:**
C&MJD

---

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE**

**DESCRIPTION:**
Map 1851-B drawn when Honeysuckle Point was resumed for railway use, shows a pointed piece of land with a scattering of about 70 houses and sheds, including several boatsheds, and a lime kiln. Turner says these were all temporary structures. Subsequently, the site was cleared, and redeveloped as a major railway workshops with extensive buildings and network of tracks. Still later, the point was dredged away and the shoreline drastically re-aligned, to form Wharf Road and Lee Wharves.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE:**
Very unlikely for any remnants of the pre-railway buildings to survive. However, if footings etc., are found which do not fit the known railway buildings, they could be from the pre-railway settlement, and could show the nature of its buildings.

**SIGNIFICANCE:**
Archaeological

**HISTORY OF OCCUPATION**

**HISTORY:**
Map 1816-A shows "Commandant's Farm" at Honeysuckle Point. By 1840 the land had been acquired by Mitchell on behalf of the Church of England, for a school (not built). The land was then subdivided as "Church Estate", for homes and light industry. Many homes, boatsheds, etc., were built c1840-1850, but then demolished after the land was resumed in 1853 for the Hunter River Railway Company. The government took over the railway in 1855, and used this site as Honeysuckle Point Workshops & Depot.

**DATE FROM:**
1840

**TO:**
1856

**HISTORIC THEMES:**
Govt.Town, 1823-1853

**MAP REFS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0000-Z</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1816-A</td>
<td>Commandant's Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-B</td>
<td>Shows pre-railway point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-A</td>
<td>1906 Map still shows H. Point owned by Mitchell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEXT REFS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doring-1</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doring-2</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHARACTER OF OCCUPATION:**
Residential

Industrial

---

**MANAGEMENT:**

**INVESTIGATIONS REFERENCES:**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Schedule for Listing

**PRESENT CONDITION:**
Pre-railway settlement demolished. Most of the site redeveloped and built over as railway workshops, since closed and partly demolished. Part of the site was dredged away or redeveloped to form Lee Wharves and Wharf Road.

**COMMENTS:**
Monitor excavations. Investigate footings that do not match known railway works.

**FINAL DRAFT REPORT:**
Suters, Lavelle, Doring, Turner - 3867

Final Draft Report - February 1997
Newcastle Archaeological Management Plan

Honeysuckle Point Railway Workshop

ITEM DETAILS:
NAME: Honeysuckle Point Railway Workshop
OTHER NAMES: 
STREET NO. TO: 
STREET NAME: Lee Wharf Road
SUBURB: Newcastle Central
REAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:
STAGE OF PLAN: Stage 2
PREPARED BY: C&MJD

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE
DESCRIPTION:
A very large complex of heavy engineering workshop buildings, stores, offices, etc., interconnected with an array of railway tracks. The buildings ranged from small timber one-room offices, to large brick buildings with overhead cranes.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE:
Extensive in-ground footings of demolished brick buildings. Underground pipes for air, water, gas. Some machines removed and stored. Traverser pit, and c1856 turntable pit (item 1034), known to exist. Very old double-head rails recently found.

SIGNIFICANCE:
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:

HISTORY OF OCCUPATION
HISTORY:
Honeysuckle Point was resumed in 1854 for the private Hunter River Railway Company, but was taken over by the NSW Government in 1855, when the company failed. It was developed as the central workshop for the government's Great Northern Railway. Honeysuckle became the second-largest railway workshops in NSW (after Eveleigh), maintaining rolling stock, and making perway components (from dog spikes to whole iron bridges). From 1920s, work gradually declined, and the workshops closed c1990.

MAP REFS:
0000-Z
1902-B
1904-A
1958-A
COMMENTS:
Honeysuckle Point in original shape, not dredged
Honeysuckle Workshops (in original shoreline).
TEXT REFS:
Doring-1
Doring-2
COMMENTS:
Quotes many other references
Quotes many other references

DATE FROM: 1855
DATE TO: 1990
HISTORIC THEMES:
Railways
Manufacturing/Engineering
Tramways
Govt. & Administration

CHARACTER OF OCCUPATION:
Railways
Industrial
Government

MANAGEMENT:
INVESTIGATIONS REFERENCES:
Doring-1; Check Conservation plan by PWD?

PRESENT CONDITION:
The Railways have closed the workshops and vacated the site. Most buildings and rails have been removed, but a few of the historic brick buildings have been refurbished for new uses, as part of the Honeysuckle Redevelopment Project.

COMMENT:
Refer to Conservation Plan for standing buildings. Monitor excavations within the yard.

Sutera, Lavelle, Doring, Turner - 3867
Final Draft Report - February 1997
**Newcastle Archaeological Management Plan**

**ITEM DETAILS:**

**NAME:**
Honeysuckle Point Railway Turntable

**OTHER NAMES:**

**STREET NO. TO:**
Great Northern Ra

**SUBURB:**
Newcastle Central

**STREET NOTE:**
Railway land (not on road)

Includes adjacent railway land.

**CROSS STREET (NE):**
Auckland Street

**CROSS STREET (SE):**
Worth Place

**FAR BOUNDARY:**
Railway Yards

**REAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:**

**STAGE OF PLAN:**
Stage 2

**PREPARED BY:**
C&JJD

**CONSIDERED ITEMS:**

**ITEM REF. NO.:**
1034

---

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE:**

**DESCRIPTION:**
The turntable comprised an iron beam (like a bridge span), pivoted to turn 360 degrees within a circular brick-lined pit, about 10 metres diameter. Rails on top of the rotating beam could be lined up with other sets of rails radiating into the yard. A loco would run onto the turntable from one set of yard rails, then the turntable swung manually to direct the loco into another set of yard rails, or turned 180 degrees to send the loco back onto the first set of rails, but facing the opposite way.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE:**
Brick-lined circular pit still survives, in good condition. It was partly excavated recently by P.Fenwick, then reburied. Since then, some old 19th C. double-head rails have also been found, elsewhere in the Honeysuckle railway yards.

**SIGNIFICANCE:**
Archaeological

**HISTORY OF OCCUPATION:**

**HISTORY:**
Two 36 ft diameter turntables were ordered from England in 1853/55. One was installed at Honeysuckle in 1857, mainly to allow steam locomotives arriving at Honeysuckle terminus to turn around and face the right way for the journey out again. The turntable became inadequate as locomotives became larger. By c1905, the turntable pit had been filled in, and a shed built over the top. The pit still exists, and is now possibly the oldest surviving railway relic in NSW.

**DATE FROM TO:**
1857 c 1905 c

**HISTORIC THEMES:**
Railways

**MAP REFS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP REF</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1874-A</td>
<td>Sh.37 &amp; 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-A</td>
<td>Doring-1 Item No.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-B</td>
<td>Doring-2 Item No.F-74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-C</td>
<td>Fenwick Unpublished excavation report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-C</td>
<td>Old railway turntable still shown SRAA-14 List of plant ordered from England, 1859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**MANAGEMENT:**

**INVESTIGATIONS REFERENCES:**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Schedule for Listing

**PRESENT CONDITION:**
Iron turntable beam removed long ago. Circular masonry pit filled and buried c1905. It is still on railway land, but under threat from proposed rearrangement of the Honeysuckle/Civic railway station, or redevelopment of the now-disused railway land.

**COMMENTS:**
Possibly the oldest surviving railway relic in NSW. Conserve and eventually expose pit. Monitor yard for rails and conserve old rails.