

Pre-Construction Minor Works Approval Form

Minor Works are defined as any low impact activities that are undertaken prior to the commencement of 'construction' as defined in the project's applicable planning approval. However if Minor Works affect or potentially affect heritage items, threatened species, populations or endangered ecological communities, these works are defined as 'construction' unless otherwise determined by the applicable planning authority.

Minor Works approvals do not remove any obligation to comply with the project's applicable planning approval conditions (including requirements prior to 'any works' commencing) or obtain any other applicable permits, licenses or approvals as necessary.

This application and all supporting information must be submitted to TfNSW/the Environmental Representative as one (1) PDF file at least 10 business days prior to the commencement of the proposed Minor Works.

Part 1: Application

| | |
|---|--|
| Contractor: | John Holland & Laing O'Rourke joint venture (JHLOR) |
| Project: | Sydenham Station and Junction |
| Application Title: (e.g. Smith St trenching works) | Site Investigation and Utility Works within Sydenham Station and Sydenham Pit Heritage Curtilage |
| Application Number: | SSJ-PCMW-004 |
| Application Date: | 15/03/2018 (23/5/2018) |
| Planning Approval: | Sydney Metro City and Southwest Infrastructure Approval CSSI 7400 Sydney Metro City and Southwest – Chatswood to Sydenham - Environmental Impact Statement Sydney Metro City and Southwest - Environmental Impact Statement – Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South Modification Report (MOD 4) Sydney Metro City and Southwest - Environmental Impact Statement – Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South Modification Submissions Report |
| Minor Works Categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlight as applicable. If Items 4, 8 or 11 are applicable, this form must be endorsed by an Environmental Representative. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Survey, survey facilitation and investigations works (including road and building dilapidation survey works, drilling and excavation). 2. Treatment of contaminated sites. 3. Establishment of ancillary facilities (excluding demolition), including construction of ancillary facility access roads and providing facility utilities. 4. Operation of ancillary facilities that have minimal impact on the environment and community. 5. Minor clearing and relocation of vegetation (including native). 6. Installation of mitigation measures, including erosion and sediment controls, temporary exclusion fencing for sensitive areas and acoustic treatments. 7. Property acquisition adjustment works, including installation of property fencing and utility relocation and adjustments to properties. 8. Utility relocation and connections. 9. Maintenance of existing buildings and structures. 10. Archaeological testing under the Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW, 2010) or archaeological monitoring undertaken in association with other Minor Works to ensure there is no impact on heritage items. 11. Any other activities that have minimal environmental impact, including construction of minor access roads, temporary relocation of pedestrian and cycle paths and the provision of property access. |
| Planning Authority Determination: Will the proposed works affect or have the potential to affect heritage items, threatened species, populations or endangered | <p><i>If 'Yes', this completed form must be endorsed by an Environmental Representative, approved by TfNSW and submitted to the applicable planning authority to determine that the works are not defined as 'construction'.</i></p> <p>Yes. The site investigation and utility works will be carried out within the heritage curtilage of Sydenham Station and the Sydenham Pit. Works will have low impacts on the non-aboriginal heritage items. Works may have the potential to impact aboriginal heritage, however no items were identified in any of the planning approval</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| ecological communities? | <p>documentation.</p> <p>As per the terms in the project approval, where heritage items, or threatened species, populations or ecological communities (within the meaning of the EP&A Act) are affected or potentially affected by any low impact work, that work is construction, unless otherwise determined by the Secretary in consultation with OEH.</p> <p>Comment was sought from OEH. OEH noted that the proposed mitigation measures for the works are considered adequate. Based on the limited nature of the works and the lack of heritage impact, the proposed investigation works at Sydenham Station are considered acceptable. (See Attachment 6). Approval from the DP&E will also be sought.</p> |
|-------------------------|--|

Part 2: Details

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Describe the proposed Minor Works:</p> <p>Including work methodologies, site location(s) and site description(s) (e.g. landscape type, waterways, etc.).</p> | <p><u>Site Description Overview</u></p> <p>This overview is based on information from the EIS, Modification Report and Modification Submissions Report.</p> <p>The site is a rail site with track, rail and ballast extending from Bedwins Road Bridge at the city end and branching out past Sydenham Station towards Tempe Station on the T4 line, Marrickville Station on the T3 line and the XPT Maintenance Facility.</p> <p>There are a number of buildings and structures on the site included within the State Heritage listed Sydenham Station and the Sydenham Pit and Pump Station Curtilage. Vegetation on the site includes grasses, shrubs, weeds and planted street trees.</p> <p>The site includes the Sydenham Pit, which receives water from the local Marrickville catchment. A concrete channel, known as the "Eastern Channel", runs through the site from north to south and discharges stormwater from the wider catchment and the Sydenham Pit to the Cooks River. There is a number of drainage pits located throughout the site, including a number of pits located within the track.</p> <p>The area is surrounded by a mixture of industrial/commercial properties and residential properties. There are no major arterial roads in the vicinity of the project.</p> <p><u>Description of Works</u></p> <p>Site investigation works are a critical aspect of the design development phase and are required early on to inform the design. Without this information, detailed design cannot effectively proceed.</p> <p>Rail related utility works are required to be completed early on to facilitate the future rail shutdowns planned by Sydney Trains and Sydney Metro, in particular the segregation of the Bankstown Line.</p> <p>The works would include the following:</p> <p>Sydenham Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pothole investigation of utilities and existing services including Non-destructive digging and hand digging to locate services • Geotechnical Borehole drilling of approximately 100mm diameter borehole drilled to approximately 20m depth taking samples of the soil strata and performing standard penetration tests (SPT) at various depths as determined by the Geotechnical Engineer. • Geotechnical test pits for CBR testing involving an excavator digging a pit approximately 2m deep to allow testing and sampling of the track formation at various depths as required by the Geotechnical Engineer • Installation of Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST), GST route to run underneath the coping on platform 6 and will be fixed to the existing platform retaining wall underneath the platform. These items are drilled and fixed into existing brackets fixed to the platform wall. • Cable trench transition from Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST) to buried concrete encased cable route in front of existing corridor access gate on city side of platform 6. • Installation of Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST) route to run on the down side of the Illawarra lines. The GST to be mounted on new posts. • Construction of pit and pipe buried cable route through platform 5 as part of the Combined Services Route. This involves saw cutting the asphalt platform surface, undertaking non-destructive digging, surveying of services and reinstating with cold asphalt mix to match the existing. • Permanent installation of location cases. Cases are 1m wide and 2m high. <p>Sydenham Pit</p> <p>Site Investigation Works including the following:</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geotechnical boreholes will be required in the Sydenham pit. 9 bore holes between 12m to 20m deep. This is to allow the Geotechnical Engineer to take samples of the soil strata and perform SPT tests at various depths <p>See Appendix 1 for a site plan detailing the location of these works.</p> <p><u>Heritage Impacts</u></p> <p>The SSI 15_7400 modification 4 and submissions report assessed the impacts to Sydenham Station and the Sydenham Pit.</p> <p>A Heritage Impact Assessment was prepared by Heritage Specialists Purcell and Extent and is provided in Appendix 2. This specifically assesses the proposed works in this application. The assessment rated all of the proposed activities as having neutral, minor or negligible impact.</p> <p>An addendum Historical Archaeological Research Design (ARD) for the Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South (the project as modified) was completed by Artefact (January, 2018). The report concluded that an Unexpected Finds Procedure would be sufficient for managing works within the project area. See Appendix 4</p> <p><u>Proposed Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The following mitigation measures will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sydney Metro Unexpected Finds Procedure V1.4 (Appendix 4) Photographic archival recording to be completed prior to the works Sydenham pit would be drained and cleaned by Sydney Water prior to investigation works Aboriginal archaeologist to monitor two boreholes located outside the pit perimeter. This work would entail monitoring for the appearance of cultural material and the collection of samples above residual clay levels for further analysis. <p>Comment was sought from OEH as required by the project approval for low impact works. OEH noted that the proposed mitigation measures for the works are considered adequate, and based on the limited nature of the works and the lack of heritage impact, the proposed investigation works at Sydenham Station are considered acceptable.</p> <p><u>Working Hours</u></p> <p>The majority of works within Sydenham Station would be undertaken during rail possessions under an Out of Hours Work Approval. This would be managed in accordance with the City & Southwest Chatswood to Sydenham Out of Hours Work Protocol. Where possible, works would be undertaken during standard working hours.</p> <p>Works within the Sydenham Pit would be undertaken during standard working hours.</p> <p><u>Applicable Conditions of approval</u></p> <p>See HIA in Appendix 2.</p> |
| Planned Commencement Date: | <p>Sydenham Station</p> <p>WE48 Possession – 26/5/18 to 27/5/18 to WE53 Possession 30/6/18 to 1/7/2018. Works may need to be completed in later possessions if there are any unforeseen delays during works.</p> <p>Sydenham Pit</p> <p>From 26/5/18 to 30/8/18.</p> |
| <p>Local Sensitivities:</p> <p>Describe the presence (if any) of local sensitive environmental areas and community receptors</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a number of residential properties located along Bridge St and Railway Rd. These properties may be sensitive to excessive noise. The properties nearest the rail corridor have been previously treated with double glazing to reduce rail noise. The works are not expected to be noisy. NDD works would be carried out during the day where possible. Heritage – there are a number of heritage structures within the project footprint including SHR curtilage of Sydenham Station (SHR 01254) and the Sydenham Pit and Pump Station (SHR 01644) |
| Part 3: Environmental Risk Assessment and Management | |
| <p>Prepare an Environmental Risk Assessment (in accordance with the <i>Sydney Metro Risk Management Standard</i>) and an Environmental Control Map for the proposed Minor Works and attach as Appendix 3.</p> <p>If an Environmental Risk Assessment and/or an Environmental Control Map for the proposed Minor Works is/are already</p> | |

contained in existing documentation, attach the relevant section(s) as Appendix 3.

Documentation:

List any existing documents (including those referenced above) that the proposed Minor Works will be undertaken in accordance with and attach as Appendix 2 (e.g. plans, procedures, procedures, etc.).

An Environmental Risk Assessment and an ECM for the Works is included within Appendix 3 and Appendix 5.
Unexpected finds procedures for contamination and items or deposits with heritage significance, and the ARD are included in Appendix 4.

Part 4: Workforce Notification**How will the environmental and community risks and associated mitigation measures of the proposed Minor Works be communicated to the contractor's workforce?**

A site induction covering heritage requirements will be delivered to all personnel working on the project site by the Heritage Specialist or delegate.
Works will be undertaken in accordance with a SWMS. SWMS will be reviewed by the JHLOR Environment Manager.

Part 5: Community Consultation**What community consultation has been undertaken already?**

The community been has been previously notified of the works through the monthly notification that was issued.

What community consultation is planned to be undertaken?

New notifications will be distributed in accordance with the contract and Community Communication Strategy requirements and prior to any Out of Hours Works. A notification was issued on the 18/5/18 for possession works.

If drafted already, attach applicable Community Notification as Appendix 6.

Part 6: Contact Details

Nominate contractor's project manager, environmental and communications contact(s).


| | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---|---------------|--------------|
| Name: | Neil Ivison | Position: | Project Director | Phone: | 0458 288 625 |
| | Cameron Newling | | Environmental Manager | | 0419 727 445 |
| | Sanjin Muhic | | Stakeholder and Community Relations Manager | | 0447 186 803 |

Part 7: Signature

This signature acknowledges that the proposed Minor Works will be undertaken in accordance with this application, have minimal environmental impact and are not defined as 'construction' in accordance with the applicable planning approval.

Name:

Cameron Newling

Signature:

Date:

23/5/18

Determination Page

(TfNSW/Environmental Representative Use Only)

12. Endorsement/Approval

These signatures represent formal endorsement/approval for the proposed Minor Works to commence in accordance with this application and the applicable planning approval requirements (subject to any determination from the applicable planning authority as may be required by the planning approval conditions).


| | TfNSW Principal Manager, Communication & Engagement – Endorsement (required for all applications) | TfNSW Principal Manager, Sustainability, Environment & Planning – Approval (required for all applications) | Environmental Representative – Endorsement (required as necessary in accordance with the applicable planning approval, optional for all other circumstances) |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| Signature: | | | |
| Name: | | | |
| Date: | | | |
| Comments: | | | <i>Supporting letter attached as Appendix 4 if necessary.</i> |
| Conditions: | | | <i>Supporting letter attached as Appendix 4 if necessary.</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Approved (by TfNSW) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Endorsed (by Environmental Representative) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Rejected | | |


Appendix 1: Site Plan


SYDENHAM STATION





KEY


 Borehole


 Test Pit

 Pothole

 CSR Trench

 GST

 Signalling Location Case

 Project Boundary

SYDENHAM PIT



KEY



Borehole

Project Boundary

Appendix 2: Heritage Impact Assessment

SYDENHAM STATION AND JUNCTION
MINOR WORKS 004
HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT
4 MAY 2018



Purcell

Brickfields Studios, 5 Queen Street, Sydney, NSW 2008, Australia
lucy.burke-smith@purcellau.com
+61 (0)415 423 497
www.purcellap.com

All rights in this work are reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form or by any means (including without limitation by photocopying or placing on a website) without the prior permission in writing of Purcell except in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright (Moral Rights) Act 2000. Applications for permission to reproduce any part of this work should be addressed to Purcell at info@purcellau.com.

Undertaking any unauthorised act in relation to this work may result in a civil claim for damages and/or criminal prosecution. Any materials used in this work which are subject to third party copyright have been reproduced under licence from the copyright owner except in the case of works of unknown authorship as defined by the Copyright (Moral Rights) Act 2000. Any person wishing to assert rights in relation to works which have been reproduced as works of unknown authorship should contact Purcell at info@purcellau.com.

Purcell asserts its moral rights to be identified as the author of this work under the Copyright (Moral Rights) Act 2000.

Purcell® is the trading name of Purcell Miller Tritton LLP.

© Purcell 2018

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION | 01 |
| BACKGROUND, CONTEXT AND LIMITATIONS | 01 |
| UNDERSTANDING THE SITE | 02 |
| STUDY AREA | 02 |
| LEGISLATION AND HERITAGE LISTINGS | 03 |
| SIGNIFICANCE | 05 |
| DESCRIPTION AND HISTORIC OVERVIEW | 09 |
| PROPOSED WORKS – OVERVIEW | 11 |
| HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT | 12 |
| METHODOLOGY AND CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT | 12 |
| ASSESSMENT | 13 |
| SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUDING REMARKS | 17 |
| APPENDIX I - DRAWINGS | 18 |

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND, CONTEXT & LIMITATIONS

BACKGROUND

This Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been prepared with reference to a programme of Pre-Construction Minor Works, investigation, testing and enabling, associated with the Sydenham Station and Junction (SSJ) Metro project.

The Sydney Metro City & Southwest project was declared by Ministerial Order on 10 December 2015 to be State significant infrastructure and critical State significant infrastructure. Planning approval was granted by the Minister for Planning under Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act on 9 January 2017. A modification was sought under section 115ZI of the EP&A Act to include works forming part of the Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South package. The Modification (SSI 7400 MOD 4) was approved by the Executive Director Priority Projects assessments, as a delegate of the Minister for Planning, 13 December 2017.

The scope of this HIA is limited to the programme of investigative, testing and enabling works for both the Sydenham Station and Sydenham Pit and Pumping Station, referred to as Minor Works 004. Under the planning approval minor works are such activities as site investigation and other low impact works that can be endorsed by the Environmental Representative prior to the approval of the Construction Environment Management Plan and sub plans. Where heritage items, (within the meaning of the EP&A Act) are affected or potentially affected by any low impact work, that work is construction, unless otherwise determined by the Secretary in consultation with OEH.¹

This report has been prepared by Purcell, together with Extent Heritage. It has been informed by a desk-based study and physical inspection.

LIMITATIONS

The assessment of the overall SSJ Metro Project is outlined within documentation forming part of the EIS supporting the Sydney Metro City and Southwest – Chatswood to Sydenham (application SSI 7400) and associated Modification Reports (MOD 4). Further analysis of the overall impact and tracking of the project is beyond the scope of this Assessment.

Research of primary historical information is beyond the scope of this assessment.

¹ C. Newling 04 April 2018.

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

STUDY AREA

THE SITES

Sydenham Station and Sydenham Pit and Pumping Station sit adjacent one another and form part of the Sydney Station and Junction Precinct. The below plan indicates their location on the Sydenham to Bankstown Rail line. With various street references and property identifiers the sites are located as follows:

- Sydenham Station - Lat: -33.9144805223 Long: 151.1665472130
- Sydenham Pit and Pumping Station - Lat: -33.9118419749 Long: 151.1686631960




Figure 1 – Identification of heritage items within the vicinity of the Sydenham Station Precinct. (Source: Sydney Metro)

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

LEGISLATION AND HERITAGE LISTINGS

The following summary of applicable legislation is extracted from the CHMP, prepared by Purcell and Extent Heritage.

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT ACT 1979

The EPA Act establishes a system of environmental planning and assessment of development proposals for the State. The project has been assessed under Part 5.1 of this Act and is subject to the Minister's Conditions of Approval. Compliance and responsiveness to the approval conditions and obligations are assessed through this HIA and its tracking register.

HERITAGE ACT 1977 (NSW)

This Act provides for the preservation and conservation of heritage items such as buildings, work or, relics, places of historic, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic significance.

It is an offence under this Act to wilfully and knowingly damage or destroy heritage items. It is an offence to demolish damage, move or develop around any place, building, work, relic, moveable object, precinct, or land that is the subject of an interim heritage order or listing on the State Heritage Register or heritage listing in a Local Environmental Plan without an approval from the Heritage Council (NSW) or local council, as appropriate. Under Section 146 of the Act, the Heritage Council must be notified if a relic is uncovered during the execution of works. The projects CHMP outlines the archaeological potential for the site, together with the unanticipated finds procedure to be implemented in the event that a relic is uncovered.

Heritage Items that are identified on the site are addressed as part of the Condition of Approval (CoA). An approval under Part 4, or an excavation permit under section 60 or 139, of the Heritage Act 1977 is not required for works approved under Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT 1974

Blanket protection for all Aboriginal objects. The Act includes processes and mechanisms for development where Aboriginal objects are present. Discovery of material on site suspected as being of Aboriginal origin must be reported and protected pending assessment and direction by the Client's Representative.

ABORIGINAL LAND RIGHTS ACT 1983

This Act establishes Local Aboriginal Land Councils (LALCs), and allows for the transfer of ownership of vacant Crown Land (lands that are not lawfully needed for an essential public purpose) to a LALC. The Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983, registers Aboriginal land claims and maintains the Register of Aboriginal Owners. This is often used in NSW to identify relevant stakeholders for consultation.

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER HERITAGE PROTECTION ACT 1984 (Cwth)

This Act provides for the preservation and protection from injury or desecration to areas and objects of particular significance to Aboriginals. Areas and objects can be protected by Ministerial Declaration and it is then an offence to contravene such a declaration.

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

LEGISLATION AND HERITAGE LISTINGS

HERITAGE LISTINGS

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Listing</i> | <i>Location</i> |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Sydenham Railway Station Group</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Heritage Register SHR #01254 • s.170 Heritage and Conservation Register – Railcorp • Inner West Council (Schedule 5 Marrickville LEP 2001) | Gleeson Ave, Burrows Ave and Railway Parade, Sydney, NSW. |
| <i>Gleeson Avenue Overbridge</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the curtilage of State Heritage Register SHR #01254 | Gleeson Ave |
| <i>Sydenham (Illawarra Line) Underbridge</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railcorp s170 register (item 4805746) | Southwest of the Sydenham Railway Station Group |
| <i>Sydenham Pit and Drainage Pumping Station I</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Heritage Register SHR #01644 • s.170 Heritage and Conservation Register – Sydney Water • Inner West Council (Schedule 5 Marrickville LEP 2001) | Garden Street, Marrickville, NSW. |
| Brick retaining walls | Inner West Council (Schedule 5 Marrickville LEP 2001) | <i>Marrickville Road and Railway Parade</i> |

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

SIGNIFICANCE

SYDENHAM RAILWAY STATION

State Heritage Register

The Sydenham Railway Station group is included on the State Heritage Register (SHR) (Item 01254). The Statement of Significance provided in the SHI Database is:

Sydenham Railway Station - inclusive of all platform buildings and awnings, parcels office, waiting shed, brick faced platforms, steel footbridge structure and stairs, Gleeson Avenue overbridge and brick perimeter walls - is of State heritage significance. Sydenham Railway Station is of historical significance as a major junction station developed from 1884 to the present, with two 1884 platform buildings, 1914 steel footbridge and stairs, 1925 platform building and waiting shed, 1962 parcels office, and 1920s Gleeson Avenue overbridge demonstrating its development over time, including the adaptation of the 1884 wayside platform buildings for island platform use.

Of aesthetic and historical significance, the platform building awnings demonstrate the range of awnings used on railway buildings from the small original awning of two bays on the Platform 2/3 building (the original minor platform) to the addition of cantilevered awnings in 1925. All platform buildings are of aesthetic significance as good representative examples of their types and periods. The 1914 footbridge structure and stairs are of aesthetic and historical associational significance as a representative haunched beam structure and stair manufactured by Dorman Long & Co. engineers. The surviving interior and exterior detailing of the 1884 platform buildings and awnings is considered rare on the Illawarra line, with other examples at St. Peters, Tempe and Rockdale.

State Agency Heritage and Conservation Register

The Sydenham Railway Station group is included on the RailCorp Heritage and Conservation Register. The Statement of Significance provided in the SHI Database is the same as that in the SHR, with the following addition:

The brick retaining wall along the freight line fronting Marrickville Rd is aesthetically significant as a streetscape element (excluded from State Heritage Register listing).

Local Environmental Plan

Schedule 5 (Heritage Items) of the Marrickville Local Environmental Plan 2011 includes the Sydenham Railway Station Group, including interiors. The Statement of Significance provided in the SHI Database for Sydenham Railway Station Group, including interiors is:

Sydenham is an important junction station on the Illawarra and Bankstown Lines. The buildings to platforms 3 & 4 are attractive examples of 1880's station buildings.

| Station Element | Heritage Significance Ranking | Tolerance for Change |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Platform 1 – Waiting shed (1925) | Moderate | Moderately changeable |
| Platform 1 – Parcels office (1962) | High | Some tolerance |
| Platform building, Platform 2/3 (Type 4) (1884) | Exceptional | Low tolerance |
| Platform building, Platform 4/5 (Type 3) (1884) | Exceptional | Low tolerance |
| Platform building, Platform 6 (Type 11) (1925) | High | Some tolerance |
| Platforms: 1 and 6 (1925), Platforms 2/3 and 4/5 (1884) | High | Some tolerance |
| Brick Perimeter walls (1925) | High | Some tolerance |
| Gleeson Avenue overbridge (c1920) | High | Some tolerance |
| Sydenham Pit and Pumping Station | | |
| Oleander planting | High | Assume Some tolerance |
| Original ballast ramp | High | Assume Some tolerance |
| Concrete floor and concrete ramp lining | Low | Assume reasonably changeable |
| Pumping Station | Exceptional | Low tolerance |
| Pumping Station – supporting structure | High | Assume Some tolerance |

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

SIGNIFICANCE

SYDENHAM PIT AND PUMPING STATION

State Heritage Register

The Sydenham Pit & Drainage Pumping Station 1 is included on the State Heritage Register (SHR) (Item 01644). The Statement of Significance provided in the SHI Database is:

The Sydenham Pit and Pumping Station is of historic, aesthetic and technical significance. Historically, it is the first such infrastructure built in the SWC system and is an intact and major component of the Marrickville low level stormwater drainage infrastructure that was built in response to increasing urban expansion since the 1870s in an area prone to flooding. Its large scale and labour intensive construction method of excavating the pit reflects the abundance of labour during the Great Depression and the type of public works undertaken to provide relief work for the unemployed. Aesthetically, the use of pitched dry packed ashlar sandstone walls to line the sides of the pit provides a pleasantly textured and coloured finish to the pit. It is a major landmark and dramatic component of the industrial landscape of Sydenham particularly as viewed from the railway. The pumping station is a very good example of a utilitarian building displaying Inter-War Mediterranean style architectural details. Technically, the pumping plant contains good working examples of 1930s pumps, particularly three Metropolitan Vickers pumps, and its original electrical mains equipment has been preserved insitu during upgrading in c1992.

State Agency Heritage and Conservation Register

The Sydenham Pit & Drainage Pumping Station 1 is included on the Sydney Water Heritage and Conservation Register. The Statement of Significance provided in the SHI Database is the same as that in the SHR.

Local Environmental Plan

Schedule 5 (Heritage Items) of the Marrickville Local Environmental Plan 2011 includes the Flood Storage Reserve & Brick Drain (Sydenham Pit & Drainage Pumping Station 1). The Statement of Significance provided in the SHI Database for Flood Storage Reserve & Brick Drain (Sydenham Pit & Drainage Pumping Station 1) is:

The drainage of the low-lying parts of Marrickville was an important part of the industrialisation of this area. This overflow pit was an extension of this scheme. It was one of a number of relief schemes in the 1930's which incorporated the use of local stone.

SYDENHAM (ILLAWARRA LINE) UNDERBRIDGE

State Agency Heritage and Conservation Register

The Sydenham (Illawarra Line) Underbridge is included on the RailCorp Heritage and Conservation Register. The Statement of Significance provided in the SHI Database is:

The Illawarra Line Flyover is of local significance as the largest item of original infrastructure on the Botany Line. The bridge is a good representative example of a riveted steel Pratt truss rail bridge.

BRICK RETAINING WALLS

Local Environmental Plan

Schedule 5 (Heritage Items) of the Marrickville Local Environmental Plan 2011 includes the Brick Retaining Walls. The Statement of Significance provided in the SHI Database for the Brick Retaining Walls is:

These walls are a type commonly erected along this railway line, but in this case the size, location and line of the two walls combine to form an important streetscape element.

The site, subject of this application, includes several items of State heritage significance. Furthermore, the scope of works has a direct impact on individual elements and structures within the listed curtilages which have been assessed as being of Exceptional or High significance. The following table, extracted from the SSJ Heritage Design Guidelines², summarises these elements and their relative significance. It is supplemented with additions to account for the Sydenham Pit and Pumping Station.

² NWRLSRT-PBA-SRT-AT-REP-000038 Rev B– Heritage Design Guidelines, Transport for NSW, 5 April 2017

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE SIGNIFICANCE

ABORIGINAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

The potential for the survival of Aboriginal cultural material in deposits within the proposed work zones has been assessed through an examination of past environments and topography. This has been re-evaluated following field inspections and the examination of borelog data that has indicated truncation of many areas of the site, including the rail corridor, to the level of residual clay or bedrock (i.e. pre-human). The potential has been mapped as high, medium and low. Although some area of work will be undertaken in areas with a moderate ranking the nature of the impacts, such as potholing within existing service trenches, will not have an impact on deposits with the potential to contain Aboriginal cultural material.




Figure 2 - Aboriginal Archaeological Potential

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

SIGNIFICANCE

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

The historical archaeological potential within the proposed work zones has been assessed as low. The subject site was subject to low level development during the early to mid-nineteenth century with few activities likely to leave physical remains with any research potential or significance.




Figure 3 - Historical Archaeological Potential

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

DESCRIPTION AND HISTORIC OVERVIEW

DESCRIPTION OF SYDENHAM STATION

The following description of the Station is extracted from Appendix E: Non-Aboriginal Heritage Technical Information of the Modification Report:

Sydenham Station was constructed between 1884 and 1962 by C. & E. Miller and William Robinson (Figure 132, Figure 133). It was originally built on a duplicated line from Illawarra Junction to Hurstville. The station opened as Marrickville Station but it was given its present name in 1895 with the opening of the Belmore branch line. In 1907 the platforms were extended. In 1907 the line from Edgeware Road to Sydenham was quadruplicated to serve the Belmore to Bankstown extension when it opened in 1909. This resulted in confining both buildings on island platforms so that passengers had to reach the platforms by an extended footbridge.

A new timber overhead booking office on a steel support frame was built between Platforms 3 and 4 and steel footbridges were eventually extended to all platforms around 1914. The overhead footbridge at Sydenham is a haunched beam design which consists of tapered cantilevers resting on platform trestles and supporting shallow beams over the railway tracks where headroom over rolling stock can be critical.

To provide for the proposed Eastern Suburbs Railway, two additional tracks were constructed so that in 1925 the standard brick building on Platform 6 was built (Figure 134, Figure 135). In 1926 the lines were electrified at Sydenham. Soon after, in 1927 the refreshment room was opened for factory workers in the area. As the additional tracks were never utilised for the Eastern Suburbs Railway they have been mainly used for the Bankstown Line trains. In 1962 a brick parcels office building was constructed on Platform 1 but closed in the late 1980s.

The weatherboard ticket office on the overhead footbridge burnt down in the mid-1980s. In the late 1980s a new brick overhead booking office and a new metal-clad shop were built on the existing c. 1914 footbridge structure, and new canopies built over the stairs and connected to platform buildings. A TAP upgrade of the station was completed in 2013 with the removal of the 1980s overhead booking office and footbridge and the construction of a new concourse, four lift shafts, access stairs, new canopy structure and a new station building at overbridge level (Figure 139).¹¹⁰ The original station master's residence was demolished in 2014.

It is not clear what date the northern platform, waiting sheds and northern boundary wall were constructed. What is known is that these elements were not present in 1943 (Figure 13). As platform 1 would have been required to be constructed prior to the 1962 Parcels Office, it would have been built between 1943 and 1962. The brick boundary wall located along the northern side of the station appears to be constructed of an identical brick and bonding to the parcels office and may also be dated 1962. The waiting sheds on platform 1, partly made of the brick boundary wall and new brick work, appear to post-date these structures. The south-western portion of the brick boundary wall is likely to have been built circa 1920-25 at time of construction of the overbridge and Platform 6, its curved form also associating with Inter-War architecture.

Today the station consists of the 1884 platforms and platform buildings, the 1920s Gleeson Avenue overbridge, the 1925 platform and platform building, the 1962 parcels office (closed in the 1980s), waiting sheds, brick boundary walls and a new concourse and stairs.³

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The following historical overview is extracted from the Artefact Heritage Report *Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South – Second Addendum to the Sydney Metro City & Southwest – Chatswood to Sydenham Historical Archaeological Assessment and Research Design*, January 2018:

Sydenham Station, originally named 'Marrickville Station', was constructed on the first section of the Illawarra Railway line in 1884.⁴ The station and associated buildings, including the station masters residence, were designed by the NSW Railways Department. The contract for the construction of the station was awarded to William Robinson in 1883.⁵

³ Modification Report Appendix E: Non-Aboriginal Heritage Technical Information, p.1

⁴ State Heritage Inventory 'Sydenham Railway Station Group', NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage, Parramatta NSW. Accessed 19 June 2016.

⁵ Australian Town and Country Journal, 15 September 1883. Accessed via TROVE, 29 June 2016.

UNDERSTANDING THE SITE

DESCRIPTION AND HISTORIC OVERVIEW

In 1895, following the construction of the present-day Marrickville Station on Illawarra Road, the station was renamed 'Sydenham'. The station originally comprised of two platforms with impressive and detailed platform buildings (Figure 2). The station was originally intended to serve the Marrickville township, but it was distant and surrounded by industrial and rural estates.⁶ Consequently, whilst a number of small businesses were established in the area surrounding the station to serve local residents, Sydenham remained relatively underdeveloped in comparison to neighbouring Marrickville.

In 1909 the railway line was extended to Bankstown, and the line from Edgeware Road to Sydenham was quadruplicated. This required the extension of the platforms at Sydenham Station. The railway cutting was widened and the original platforms were transformed into island platforms, requiring the construction of an extended footbridge to allow access. The lines were electrified in 1926.




Figure 2 – 1881 Plan of Marrickville (Sydenham) Station showing original platform configuration (Source: State Records, NSW, 17420_a014_a014000815)




Figure 2 – 1948 Plan of Sydenham Station showing current platform configuration and earlier plan configuration of Platform 2/3 building (Source: State Records, NSW, EDMS CV0104081)

⁶ State Heritage Inventory 'Sydenham Railway Station Group', NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage, Parramatta NSW. Accessed 19 June 2016.

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PROPOSED WORKS - OVERVIEW

SCOPE

The scope of work comprising the Minor Work 004 package has been defined by the Contractor, John Holland Laing O'Rourke as follows:

Sydenham Station

- *Pothole investigation of utilities and existing services including Non-destructive digging and hand digging to locate services*
- *Geotechnical Borehole drilling, approx. 100mm dia borehole drilled to approx. 20m depth taking samples of the soil strata and performing SPT tests at various depths as determined by the Geotechnical Engineer.*
- *Geotechnical test pits for CBR testing involving an excavator digging a pit approx. 2m deep to allow testing and sampling of the track formation at various depths as required by the Geotechnical Engineer*
- *Installation of Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST), GST route to run underneath the coping on platform 6 and will be fixed to the existing platform retaining wall underneath the platform. These items are drilled and fixed into existing brackets fixed to the platform wall.*
- *Cable trench transition from Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST) to buried concrete encased cable route in front of existing corridor access gate on city side of platform 6.*
- *Installation of Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST), GST route to run on the DN side of the Illawarra lines, GST to be mounted on new posts.*
- *Construction of pit and pipe buried cable route through platform 5 as part of the Combined Services Route. This involves saw cutting the platform surface, undertaking non-destructive digging, surveying of services and make good with cold asphalt mix to match existing.*
- *Permeant installation of location cases. Cases are 1m wide and 2m high.*

Sydenham Pit

- *Geotechnical boreholes will be required in the Sydenham pit. 9 bore holes between 12m to 20m deep. This is to allow the Geotechnical Engineer to take samples of the soil strata and perform SPT tests at various depths.⁷*

⁷ Cite reference C. Newling 04 April 2018 and subsequent correspondence

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

METHODOLOGY AND CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT

METHODOLOGY

The impacts of the proposal to the significance and values of the subject items is comprehensively outlined in the project's Environmental Impact Statement the Modification Report and its Appendix E. These reports form the baseline assessment. The purpose of this HIA is to assess the impacts of the proposed investigation and testing works. This assessment been carried out in accordance with the Conditions of Approval, and Guideline documentation below.

GUIDANCE DOCUMENTATION

Consistent with the project assessments to date the following guidance documents have been referenced as is applicable to the scope of works and their potential impacts:

- *NSW Heritage Manual 1996* (Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, 1996)
- *Assessing Heritage Significance* (Heritage Office, 2001)
- *Statements of Heritage Impact* (Heritage Office, 2002)
- *Heritage Platforms Conservation Management Strategy, Sydney Trains* (2015)
- *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (Australian ICOMOS, 2013) 'The Burra Charter'
- *NSW Railway Conservation Guide: Railway Station Platforms, Office of Rail Heritage* (2013)

TERMINOLOGY AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The Modification Report employs the following definitions with regard to impacts, with the magnitude of potential impacts employing the relevant terminology.

- **Direct impacts**, resulting in the demolition or alteration of fabric of heritage significance
- **Indirect impacts**, resulting in changes to the setting or curtilage of heritage items or places, historic streetscapes or views
- **Potential direct impact**, resulting in impacts from vibration and demolition of adjoining structures.

| Magnitude | Definition |
|------------|--|
| Major | Actions that would have a long term and substantial impact on the significance of a heritage item. Actions that would remove key historic building elements, key historic landscape features, or significant archaeological materials, thereby resulting in a change of historic character, or altering of a historical resource. These actions cannot be fully mitigated. |
| Moderate | Actions involving the modification of a heritage item, including altering the setting of a heritage item or landscape, partially removing archaeological remains, or the alteration of significant elements of fabric from historic structures. The impacts arising from such actions may be able to be partially mitigated. |
| Minor | Actions that would result in the slight alteration of heritage buildings, archaeological remains, or the setting of an historical item. The impacts arising from such actions can usually be mitigated. |
| Negligible | Actions that would result in very minor changes to heritage items. |
| Neutral | Actions that would have no heritage impact. |

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT OF SCOPE

| Scope item | Assessment Aboriginal Archaeology | Assessment Historical Archaeology | Assessment Built Heritage |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Pothole investigation of utilities and existing services including Non-destructive digging and hand digging to locate services | neutral | neutral | neutral |
| Geotechnical Borehole drilling, approx. 100mm dia borehole drilled to approx. 20m depth taking samples of the soil strata and performing SPT tests at various depths as determined by the Geotechnical Engineer. | neutral | neutral | neutral |
| Geotechnical test pits for CBR testing involving an excavator digging a pit approx. 2m deep to allow testing and sampling of the track formation at various depths as required by the Geotechnical Engineer | neutral | neutral | neutral |
| Installation of Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST), GST route to run underneath the coping on platform 6 and will be fixed to the existing platform retaining wall underneath the platform. Fixing to be drilled and fixed into existing brackets fixed to the platform wall. | neutral | neutral | neutral |
| Cable trench transition from Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST) to buried concrete encased cable route in front of existing corridor access gate on city side of platform 6. | neutral | neutral | neutral |
| Installation of Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST), GST route to run on the DN side of the Illawarra lines, GST to be mounted on posts. | neutral | neutral | negligible |
| Construction of pit and pipe buried cable route through platform 5 as part of the Combined Services Route. This involves saw cutting the platform surface, undertaking non-destructive digging, surveying of services and make good with cold asphalt mix to match existing. | neutral | neutral | neutral |
| Installation of location cases 1m wide and 2m high. | neutral | neutral | negligible |
| Geotechnical boreholes will be required in the Sydenham pit. 9 bore holes between 12m to 20m deep. This is to allow the Geotechnical Engineer to take samples of the soil strata and perform SPT tests at various depths | minor | minor | negligible |

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT AGAINST CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

| Condition | Summary | Assessment |
|-----------|---|---|
| E10 | The Proponent must not destroy, modify or otherwise physically affect any Heritage item not identified in documents referred to in Condition A1 | The scope of works is limited to the immediate curtilage of listed sites forming part of the MOD 4 approval. There will be no direct impact to items beyond the curtilage. |
| E13 | Heritage archival recording | Archival recording is required under the Heritage SWTCs to be completed prior to the commencement of work. |
| E14 | In addition to the archival recording as required by Condition E13, the Proponent must, prior to demolition, undertake external photography of all buildings and structures to be demolished, in consultation with and to the standards of the relevant Council. The recordings must be made available to the relevant Council. | Archival recording is required under the Heritage SWTCs to be completed prior to the commencement of work. |
| E15 | The Proponent must salvage items of heritage value from heritage listed buildings and structures to be demolished before demolition, and assess options for its sympathetic reuse (including integrated heritage displays) on the project or other options for repository, reuse and display. Suitable repository locations must be established in consultation with Relevant Council(s). Any State listed items or elements suitable for salvage must be determined in consultation with the Heritage Division of the OEH. | The works will not impact on any known listed items or elements which require salvage. |
| E16 | Salvage Report | While the salvage report is currently being prepared the works will not impact on any known listed items or elements which require salvage. |
| E17 | Implementation of the AARD | |
| E19 | Unexpected Heritage Finds Procedure must be prepared | UHFP in place |
| E20 | Uncovering of potential relics of State Significance | UHFP in place |
| E23 | The Proponent must take all reasonable steps so as not to harm, modify or otherwise impact any Aboriginal object associated with the CSSI except as authorised by this approval. | Adherence to CHMP |
| E24 | Before excavation, the Proponent must implement the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment prepared for the CSSI and included in the PIR. Excavation and/or salvage must be undertaken by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the Registered Aboriginal Parties for the CSSI. | Not required in this instance |
| E25 | Uncovering of Aboriginal objects | Adherence to CHMP |
| E26 | This approval does not allow the Proponent to harm, modify, or otherwise impact human remains uncovered during the construction and operation of the CSSI, except in accordance with the Exhumation Management Plan (Condition E27). | Adherence to CHMP |
| E27 | An Exhumation Management Plan must be prepared to guide the relocation of recovered human remains. | Adherence to CHMP |
| E31 | The Proponent must seek the advice of a heritage specialist on methods and locations for installing | The identification of protection measures for heritage items is a Stage 3 deliverable, however the |

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT

| | | |
|-------|---|---|
| | equipment used for vibration, movement and noise monitoring of heritage-listed structures. | works are considered to generate only minimal vibration impacts. These will be monitored in accordance with the CEMP. |
| NAH1 | Archival Recoding | See E.13 & E.14 |
| NAH2 | The archaeological research design would be implemented. Significant archaeological findings would be considered for inclusion in heritage interpretation (as per NAH8) for the project and be developed in consultation with the relevant local council | Adherence to CHMP |
| NAH11 | Except for heritage significant elements affected by the project, direct impact on other heritage significant elements forming part of the following items would be avoided | See E10 |
| NA20 | The design and detailed construction planning of works directly impacting the Sydenham Pit and Drainage Pumping Station would consider the requirements of the Sydenham Pit & Drainage Pumping Station I Conservation Management Plan (Sydney Water, 2004). | Adherence to CHMP |
| AH2 | The cultural heritage assessment report would be implemented. | Adherence to CHMP |
| AH3 | Archaeological test excavation (and salvage when required) would be carried out where intact natural soil profiles with the potential to contain significant archaeological deposits are encountered. | Adherence to CHMP with specific mitigation requirements set out in the Mitigation table of this report |

ASSESSMENT AGAINST NSW HERITAGE BRANCH GUIDELINES⁸

| New Services | Assessment |
|--|--|
| How has the impact of the new services on the heritage significance of the item been minimised? | The potential impact of services has been mitigated through consolidated routes and discrete placement. The works seek to establish existing services through investigation so as to mitigate and consolidate the design and specification of any additional services required through the delivery of the project. |
| Are any of the existing services of heritage significance and are they affected by the new work? | The works will not impact on any know services of significance. There is no proposal to remove services as part of this scope. |
| Are any known or potential archaeological deposits affected by the proposed new services? | None |
| Minor Additions | Assessment |
| How is the impact of the addition on the significance of the item been minimised? | Visible features are small in scale and are typical/ubiquitous within rail corridors throughout the system |
| Will the additions visually dominate the heritage item? | The works will not visually dominate the Sydenham Station Precinct. It is unlikely to impact significant views and vistas to or from the site and presents little risk to internal views given the relative height of the location cases to the platforms, and their siting away from platforms. The works will not result in a visual impact to the Pit and Pumping Station. |
| Is the addition sited on any known, or potentially significance archaeological deposits? If so have alternative positions been considered? | None |

⁸ Statements of Heritage Impact (Heritage Office, 2002)

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT

MITIGATION

| Scope item | Mitigation |
|--|---|
| Pothole investigation of utilities and existing services including Non-destructive digging and hand digging to locate services | UHFP |
| Geotechnical Borehole drilling, approx. 100mm dia borehole drilled to approx. 20m depth taking samples of the soil strata and performing SPT tests at various depths as determined by the Geotechnical Engineer. | UHFP |
| Geotechnical test pits for CBR testing involving an excavator digging a pit approx. 2m deep to allow testing and sampling of the track formation at various depths as required by the Geotechnical Engineer | UHFP |
| Installation of Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST), GST route to run underneath the coping on platform 6 and will be fixed to the existing platform retaining wall underneath the platform | none |
| Cable trench transition from Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST) to buried concrete encased cable route in front of existing corridor access gate on city side of platform 6. | UHFP |
| Installation of Galvanised Steel Troughing (GST), GST route to run on the DN side of the Illawarra lines, GST to be mounted on posts. | UHFP |
| Construction of pit and pipe buried cable route through platform 5 as part of the Combined Services Route | UHFP |
| Installation of location cases | UHFP |
| Geotechnical boreholes will be required in the Sydenham pit. 9 bore holes between 12m to 20m deep. This is to allow the Geotechnical Engineer to take samples of the soil strata and perform SPT tests at various depths | Aboriginal archaeologist to monitor two boreholes located outside the pit perimeter. This work would entail monitoring for the appearance of cultural material and the collection of samples above residual clay levels for further analysis. |

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

SUMMARY

The proposed works present a minor direct impact to Platforms 5 and 6 of Sydenham Station and a negligible indirect impact to its setting and internal views. The proposed works are consistent with the operational and servicing requirements of the Station, its ongoing use and its forthcoming transition to a rail and metro station.

The works seek to establish current servicing and reticulation and enable switching and signalling upgrades to facilitate the commencement of the approved works. They seek to consolidate reticulation to existing routes where possible. The works do not involve the demolition of any items of significance. Interventions to fabric are largely limited to fixings to existing brackets (Platform 6 GSTs) and the removal and a like for like make-good of the trafficable surface to Platform 5 which is replacement fabric.

The surface mounted GST's to Platform 6, identified as being of High significance, will be fixed in a discrete location on the brick closed face platform and to existing brackets mitigating both visual and physical impacts. The installation of new GSTs and location cases beyond the platforms will present an indirect minor impact to the setting and context of the Station. It is unlikely to impact significant views and vistas to or from the site and presents little risk to internal views.

Work to Platform 5 will involve the removal of non-original fabric and makegood reconstruction in a like for like manner with cold asphalt. It will have a minor direct impact to the Platform surface.

The investigative works to the Sydenham Pit present no impact to fabric or high or exceptional significance and are limited to the pit floor and adjacent sites beyond the curtilage. Furthermore, they present no impact to the setting and presentation of the Pit or view to the Pumping Station.

In regard to Aboriginal archaeology there are only two areas that may impact on potential Aboriginal archaeological deposits. These consist of two bore-holes located outside the perimeter of the pit.

There are no impacts on potential historical archaeological deposits, relics or features.

CONCLUSION

The works forming part of the Minor Works 004 package are consistent with the intent of the works forming part of approval SSI 7400 MOD 4, approved 13 December 2017. They facilitate early work phases to ensure an efficiency of the projects roll out and continuity of services with mitigation of disruption.


The execution of the works will be implemented in accordance with the Construction Environment Management Plan and sub plans, specifically the Construction Heritage Management Plan (CHMP). Elements of the CHMP, such as the Unanticipated Finds Procedure, and its recommendation of a heritage site induction will support the mitigation of potential direct and indirect impacts to buildings, elements and archaeological potential of the Sydenham Station, Pit and Pumping Station.

Management of the site's archaeology falls within the scope of the Unexpected Heritage Finds Protocols. An exception to this, requiring the presence of an archaeologist on-site during works, is the monitoring of two boreholes located outside the pity perimeter.

Holistically the works present a minor impact to Sydenham Station and Sydenham Pit Pumping Station. They should be supported as part of the delivery of the wider SSJ Metro project.


APPENDIX
DRAWINGS

SYDENHAM STATION



APPENDIX
DRAWINGS

SYDENHAM PIT



KEY

⊕ Borehole

Appendix 3: Risk Assessment

This Risk Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of *Sydney Metro Risk Management Standard*.

Note; **C** = Consequence & **L** = Likelihood as per *Sydney Metro Risk Management Standard – Appendix A Sydney Metro Risk Matrix*

Heritage Risk Assessment

| Aspect | Potential Environmental Impact | Initial Risk Rating | | | Control Measures | Residual Risk Rating | | |
|--|---|---------------------|-----------|------------|--|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| | | C X | L = | Risk | | C X | L = | Risk |
| Working around Heritage Structures | Damage to existing heritage structures Vibration Impacts | C4 | L4 | Med | Induction to include heritage management requirements Spotters and swing restrictors to be used on plant Physical barriers to be used where required Intrusive works only to be completed as per this approval Vibration impacts are expected to be minimal As per HIA | C3 | L6 | Low |
| Items of heritage significance uncovered during borehole works | Damage to heritage items or archaeological deposits | C3 | L5 | Med | Induction to include heritage management requirements. Intrusive works only to be completed as per this approval Implement unexpected finds procedure Aboriginal archaeologist to monitor two boreholes located outside the pit perimeter. This work would entail monitoring for the appearance of cultural material and the collection of samples above residual clay levels for further analysis. | C3 | L6 | Low |

| Aspect | Potential Environmental Impact | Initial Risk Rating | | | Control Measures | Residual Risk Rating | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------|----|------|---|----------------------|----|------|
| | | C | X | Risk | | C | X | Risk |
| Visual impact to heritage items | Potential visual impact to heritage items prior to CEMP approval and commencement of construction | C5 | L5 | Low | The HIA note that the works will not visually dominate the Sydenham Station Precinct. It is unlikely to impact significant views and vistas to or from the site and presents little risk to internal views given the relative height of the location cases to the platforms, and their siting away from platforms. The works will not result in a visual impact to the Pit and Pumping Station. Potholing and excavation works would be reinstated with asphalt Temporary fencing and shade cloth or hoarding will be used As per HIA | C5 | L6 | Low |

General Risk Assessment

| Aspect | Potential Environmental Impact | Initial Risk Rating | | | Control Measures | Residual Risk Rating | | |
|---|--|---------------------|----|------|--|----------------------|----|------|
| | | C | X | Risk | | C | X | Risk |
| Contamination uncovered during service searching works and excavation works | Mixing of contaminated materials with non-contaminated materials | C4 | L4 | Med | Induction to include contamination management requirements. Implement unexpected finds procedure | C4 | L5 | Low |
| Runoff from service searching process | Service searching water entering local stormwater and impacting on water quality | C5 | L5 | Low | Set up erosion and sediment controls as appropriate (i.e. sandbags) if service searching water is likely to generate runoff. | C5 | L6 | Low |

| Aspect | Potential Environmental Impact | Initial Risk Rating | | | Control Measures | Residual Risk Rating | | |
|---|---|---------------------|-----------|------------|---|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Service Searching Waste | Incorrect handling or disposal of service searching waste leading to environmental degradation | C4 | L4 | Med | Service searching waste is deemed to be liquid waste. The waste must be lawfully transported and disposed of to a licenced facility. Exposed Potential Acid Sulphate Soil within the excavations will be kept wet during the works. The excavations will be backfilled immediately to prevent any Potential Acid Sulphate Soils from oxidising. | C4 | L5 | Low |
| Noise from vacuum truck | Noise from vacuum truck impacting on sensitive receivers Noise impacts outside standard construction hours | C5 | L4 | Low | Works to occur in during standard construction hours where possible Vacuum truck to be positioned so that the noisier part of the truck points away from sensitive receivers, where possible Follow the appropriate approvals process and submit Out of Hours Work applications for Acoustic Advisor endorsement and Environmental Representative approval. Mitigation measures to be implemented in accordance with the Construction Noise Strategy. | C5 | L6 | Low |
| Contamination uncovered during borehole works | Mixing of contaminated materials with non-contaminated materials | C4 | L4 | Med | Induction to include contamination management requirements. Implement unexpected finds procedure | C4 | L5 | Low |
| Noise from plant | Noise from plant impacting on sensitive receivers Noise impacts outside standard construction hours | C5 | L4 | Low | Works to occur in during standard construction hours where possible Plant to be positioned so that the noisier part of the rig points away from sensitive receivers, where possible Follow the appropriate approvals process and submit Out of Hours Work applications for Acoustic Advisor endorsement and Environmental Representative approval. Mitigation measures to be implemented in accordance with the Construction Noise Strategy. | C5 | L6 | Low |

| Aspect | Potential Environmental Impact | Initial Risk Rating | | | Control Measures | Residual Risk Rating | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-----------|------------|--|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Works in Sydenham Pit | Flooding Siltation of water | C4 | L4 | Med | Sydney water to empty and clean the pit prior to works Works to be completed during dry conditions with no rain on the immediate forecast Controls to be installed to prevent water ingress during works (sandbags, diversion bunds etc) | C4 | L5 | Low |
| Air Quality | Dust activity in close proximity to residential and commercial premises, complaints received Emissions resulting in air pollution. | C4 | L4 | Low | Excavation works will be minimal and small plant will be used NDD will be used for excavation around services Dust suppression equipment will be used (eg water sprays) Works will be conducted within the station and Sydenham pit away from sensitive receivers Temporary fencing and shade cloth or hoarding will be used | C4 | L5 | Low |

Appendix 4 – Sydney Metro Unexpected Finds Procedure and ARD

Sydney Metro Unexpected Heritage Finds Procedure

Supporting Document – Applicable to:

Status:

Division:

Version: 1.4

Date of issue: 19/04/2018

Effective date:

Review date: 22/03/2019

Document owner:

Security classification:

Document History

| Version | Date of approval | Doc. Control no. | Notes |
|---------|------------------|------------------|--|
| 1.1 | | | Incorporates ER comments 21/06/17 |
| 1.2 | | | Amends p13 step 8 reference to s146 added |
| 1.3 | | | Incorporates Planning Mods 1-4 including amended CoA E20 |
| 1.4 | | | Incorporates ER comments 21/03/18 |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 1. | Purpose | 3 |
| 2. | Scope..... | 4 |
| 3. | Definitions | 6 |
| 4. | Accountabilities | 7 |
| 5. | Types of unexpected heritage items and corresponding statutory protections | 7 |
| 5.1. | Aboriginal objects..... | 7 |
| 5.2. | Historic heritage items..... | 8 |
| 5.2.1. | Archaeological relics | 8 |
| 5.2.2. | Other historic items | 9 |
| 5.3. | Human skeletal remains..... | 9 |
| 6. | Legislative Requirements | 10 |
| 7. | Unexpected heritage finds protocol | 12 |
| 7.1. | What is an unexpected heritage find? | 12 |
| 7.2. | Managing unexpected heritage finds..... | 13 |
| 8. | Responsibilities | 22 |
| 9. | Seeking advice..... | 23 |
| 10. | Related documents and references..... | 23 |
| 11. | List of appendices | 23 |

1. Purpose

This procedure is applicable only to the Sydney Metro Critical State Significant Infrastructure Planning Approval (CSSI 15_7400) including the following planning approval modifications:

Modification 1- Victoria Cross Substation and Artarmon Substation which involves relocation of the Victoria Cross northern services building from 194-196A Miller Street to 50 McLaren Street together with inclusion of a new station entrance at this location referred to as Victoria Cross North. 52 McLaren Street would also be used to support construction of these works. The modification also involves the relocation of the substation at Artarmon from Butchers Lane to 98 – 104 Reserve Road. This modification application was approved on 18 October 2017;

- Modification 2- Central Walk which involves additional works at Central Railway Station including construction of a new eastern concourse, a new eastern entry, and upgrades to suburban platforms. This modification application was approved on 21 December 2017;

- Modification 3- Martin Place Metro Station which involves changes to the Sydney Metro Martin Place Station to align with the Unsolicited Proposal by Macquarie Group Limited (Macquarie) for the development of the station precinct. The proposed modification involves a larger reconfigured station layout, provision of a new unpaid concourse link and retention of the existing MLC pedestrian link and works to connect into the Sydney Metro Martin Place Station. It is noted that if the Macquarie proposal does not proceed, the modification (if approved) would be surrendered. This modification application was approved on 22 March 2018; and

- Modification 4- Sydenham Station and Metro Train Facility which incorporated Sydenham Station and precinct works, the Sydney Metro Trains Facility South, works to Sydney Water's Sydenham Pit and Drainage Pumping Station and ancillary infrastructure and track and signalling works into the approved project. This modification application was approved on 13 December 2017

This procedure has been developed in response to Condition of Approval (CoA) E19, that requires Sydney Metro City & Southwest Program to provide a method for managing unexpected heritage items (both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) that are discovered during construction.

An 'unexpected heritage find' can be defined as any unanticipated archaeological discovery, that has not been previously assessed or is not covered by an existing approval under the *Heritage Act 1977* (Heritage Act) or *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* (NPW Act).

In NSW, there are strict laws to protect and manage heritage objects and relics. As a result, appropriate heritage management measures need to be implemented to minimise impacts on heritage values; ensure compliance with relevant heritage notification and other obligations; and to minimise the risk of penalties to individuals, TfNSW and its contractors. This procedure includes TfNSW's heritage notification obligations under the Heritage Act, NPW

Act and the Coroner's Act 2009 and the specific requirements of the conditions of approval(CoA) issued by NSW Department of Planning and Environment for CSSI 15-7400.

Note that a Contractor may create their own Unexpected Finds Procedure or modify this document, however its use will be subject to compliance with the following:-

- CSSI CoA E17 requires consultation with the Heritage Council of NSW (or its delegate)
- CSSI CoA E19
- Prior approval from the nominated Excavation Director, as required under CSSI CoA E18
- Prior approval from the Environmental Representative, CSSI CoA A24

- Prior approval from Sydney Metro.

It should be noted that this procedure must be read in conjunction with the relevant CCSI conditionals of approval, the contract documents and other plans and procedures developed by the contractor during the delivery of the works.

Legislation that does not apply

The following authorisations are not required for Sydney Metro approved Critical State significant infrastructure (and accordingly the provisions of any Act that prohibit an activity without such an authority do not apply):

- Division 8 of Part 6 of the *Heritage Act 1977* does not apply to prevent or interfere with the carrying out of approved State significant infrastructure.
- An approval under Part 4, or an excavation permit under section 139, of the *Heritage Act 1977*,
- An Aboriginal heritage impact permit under section 90 of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*,

This document provides relevant background information in Section 3, followed by the technical procedure in Sections 6 and 7. Associated guidance referred to in the procedure can be found in Appendices A-H.

2. Scope

Despite appropriate and adequate investigation, unexpected heritage items may still be discovered during maintenance and construction works on a Sydney Metro site. When this happens, this procedure must be followed. This procedure provides direction on when to stop work, where to seek technical advice and how to notify the regulator, if required.

This procedure applies to construction activities for the Sydney Metro Program as approved under Section 115ZB of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 for Critical State Significant Infrastructure, Application No. SSI 15-7400.

This procedure **applies to**:

- the discovery of any unexpected heritage item, relic or object, where the find is not anticipated in the Archaeological Assessment Design Report (AARD) or Archaeological Method Statements (AMS) that are prepared prior to commencement of excavation.

This procedure must be followed by all Sydney Metro staff, contractors, subcontractors or any person undertaking works for Sydney Metro. It includes references to some of the relevant legislative and regulatory requirements, but is not intended to replace them with the exception S139 of the NSW Heritage Act 1977

This procedure **does not apply to**:

- The discovery and disturbance of heritage items as a result of investigations being undertaken in accordance with the Office of Environment and Heritage's (OEH) *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigations of Aboriginal Objects in NSW 2010*¹; an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) issued under the NPW Act; or an approval issued under the Heritage Act.
- the discovery and disturbance of heritage items as a result of construction related activities, where the disturbance is permissible in accordance with an AHIP; or an approval issued under the Heritage Act; All new Construction Environment Management Plans (CEMPs) must make reference to and/or include this procedure (included as a heritage sub-plan, refer to CSSI CoA C6(g)).

Note that this procedure does not supersede the requirements of CSSI CoA CSSI CoA E10 and E26:

- E10 The Proponent must not destroy, modify or otherwise physically affect any Heritage item not identified in documents referred to in CoA A 1.
- E26 This approval does not allow the Proponent to harm, modify, or otherwise impact human remains uncovered during the construction and operation of the CSSI, except in accordance with the Exhumation Management Plan (CoA E27).

¹ An act carried out in accordance with the *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in NSW* as published by the Department in the Gazette on 24 September 2010 is excluded from the definition of **harm** an object or place in section 5 (1) of the NPW Act.

3. Definitions

All terminology in this procedure is taken to mean the generally accepted or dictionary definition with the exception of the following terms which have a specifically defined meaning:

| Term | Meaning |
|--|--|
| AHIP | Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit |
| Aboriginal object | An Aboriginal object is any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area, being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non-Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains. An Aboriginal object may include a shell midden, stone tools, bones, rock art, Aboriginal-built fences and stockyards, scarred trees and the remains of fringe camps. |
| CEMP | Construction Environmental Management Plan |
| CoA | Conditions of Approval |
| CSSI | Critical State Significant Infrastructure |
| EP&A Act | NSW <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> |
| Heritage Act | NSW <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> |
| NPW Act | NSW <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i> |
| OEH | Office of Environment and Heritage |
| Relic (non-Aboriginal heritage) | <p>A relic means any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) relates to the settlement of the area that comprises NSW, not being Aboriginal settlement, and b) is of State significance. <p>A relic may include items such as bottles, utensils, remnants of clothing, crockery, personal effects, tools, machinery and domestic or industrial refuse.</p> <p>Note that Modification 2 amends the previous definition of a relic, being the same as described in the NSW <i>Heritage Act 1977</i>, by deleting all reference to local heritage significance. For the purpose managing relics under the CSSI 15_7400 Planning Approval CoA E20 applies to relics of State significance only.</p> |
| TfNSW | Transport for New South Wales |

| Term | Meaning |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Work (non-Aboriginal heritage) | Archaeological features such as historic utilities or buried infrastructure that provide evidence of prior occupations such as former rail or tram tracks, timber sleepers, kerbing, historic road pavement, fences, culverts, historic pavement, buried retaining walls, cisterns, conduits, sheds or building foundations, but are subject to specific assessment by the Excavation Director |

4. Accountabilities

5. Types of unexpected heritage items and corresponding statutory protections

The roles of project, field and environmental personnel (including construction contractors) are critical to the early identification and protection of unexpected heritage items. **Appendix A** illustrates the wide range of heritage discoveries found on transport infrastructure projects and provides a useful photographic guide. Subsequent to confirmation of a heritage discovery it must then be identified and assessed by Excavation Director as required under CSSI CoA E20. An 'unexpected heritage item' means any unanticipated discovery of an actual or potential heritage item, for which Sydney Metro (refer to CSSI CoA E10 and E26) does not have approval to disturb² and/or have an existing management process in place.

These discoveries are categorised as either:

- (a) Aboriginal objects
- (b) historic (non-Aboriginal) heritage items
- (c) human skeletal remains.

The relevant legislation that applies to each of these categories is described below and is also addressed in the Sydney Metro Exhumation Management Plan (refer to CSSI CoA E26 and E27).

5.1. Aboriginal objects

The NPW Act protects Aboriginal objects which are defined as:

“any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises New South Wales,

² Disturbance is considered to be any physical interference with the item that results in it being destroyed, defaced, damaged, harmed, impacted or altered in any way (this includes archaeological investigation activities).

being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains³.

Examples of Aboriginal objects include stone tool artefacts, shell middens, axe grinding grooves, pigment or engraved rock art, burials and scarred trees.

IMPORTANT!**All Aboriginal objects, regardless of significance, are protected under law.**

If any impact is expected to an Aboriginal object, an AHIP is usually required from OEH⁴. Also, when a person becomes aware of an Aboriginal object they must notify the Director-General of OEH about its location⁵. Assistance on how to do this is provided in Section 7 (Step 5).

CSSI CoA E23, E24 and E25 for management of Aboriginal Heritage Applies to the Sydney Metro Chatswood to Sydenham Project

5.2. Historic heritage items

Historic (non-Aboriginal) heritage items may include:

- archaeological 'relics'
- other historic items (i.e. works, structures, buildings or movable objects).

5.2.1. Archaeological relics

The Heritage Act protects *relics* which are defined as:

"any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that relates to the settlement of the area that comprises NSW, not being Aboriginal settlement; and is of State or local heritage significance"⁶.

Changes to CoA E20 included within Planning Modification 1 (Oct 2017) deleted reference *local heritage significance*, so that E20 applies to relics of State significance only.

Relics are archaeological items of local or state significance which may relate to past domestic, industrial or agricultural activities in NSW, and can include bottles, remnants of clothing, pottery, building materials and general refuse.

³ Section 5(1) NPW Act.

⁴ Refer to CSSI CoA E23 & E25.

⁵ This is required under section 89(A) of the NPW Act and applies to all TfNSW projects.

⁶ Section 4(1) Heritage Act.

Construction in the vicinity of a relic, of State significance, must not recommence until the requirements of the ARMP have been implemented, in consultation with the Excavation Director. The Sydney Metro must notify the Secretary of the Department of Environment & Planning in writing of the outcome of consultation with the Heritage Council of NSW, refer to CSSI CoA E20.

IMPORTANT!

All relics are subject to statutory controls and protections.

If a relic is likely to be disturbed, a heritage approval is usually required from the NSW Heritage Council⁷. Also, when a person discovers a relic they must notify the NSW Heritage Council of its location⁸. Advice on how to do this for works under CSSI 15_7400 is provided in Section 7 (Step 5).

5.2.2. Other historic items

Some historic heritage items are not considered to be 'relics'; but are instead referred to as works, buildings, structures or movable objects. Examples of these items that may be encountered include culverts, historic pavements, retaining walls, tramlines, rail tracks, timber sleepers, cisterns, fences, sheds, buildings and conduits. Although an approval under the Heritage Act may not be required to disturb these items, their discovery must be managed in accordance with this procedure.

As a general rule, an archaeological relic requires discovery or examination through the act of excavation. An archaeological excavation permit under section 140 of the Heritage Act is required to do this. In contrast, 'other historic items' either exist above the ground surface (e.g. a shed), or they are designed to operate and exist beneath the ground surface (e.g. a culvert).

Despite this difference, it should be remembered that relics can often be associated with 'other heritage items', such as archaeological deposits within cisterns and underfloor deposits beneath buildings.

5.3. Human skeletal remains

Refer to Sydney Metro Project Exhumation Management Plan

⁷ Refer to CSSI CoA E20,

⁸ This is required under section 146 of the Heritage Act and applies to all TfNSW projects however also refer to foot note 8.

Human skeletal remains can be identified as either an Aboriginal object or non-Aboriginal relic depending on ancestry of the individual (Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal) and burial context (archaeological or non-archaeological). Remains are considered to be archaeological when the time elapsed since death is suspected of being 100 years or more. Depending on ancestry and context, different legislation applies.

As a simple example, a pre-European settlement archaeological Aboriginal burial would be protected under the NPW Act, while a historic (non-Aboriginal) archaeological burial within a cemetery would be protected under the Heritage Act. For a non-Aboriginal archaeological burial, the relevant heritage approval and notification requirement described in Section 3.1 would apply. In addition to the NPW Act, finding Aboriginal human remains also triggers notification requirements to the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment under section 20(1) of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984 (Commonwealth).

IMPORTANT!

All human skeletal remains are subject to statutory controls and protections.

All bones must be treated as potential human skeletal remains and work around them must stop while they are protected and investigated urgently.

However, where it is suspected that less than 100 years has elapsed since death, the human skeletal remains come under the jurisdiction of the State Coroner and the *Coroners Act 2009* (NSW). Such a case would be considered a 'reportable death' and under legal notification obligations set out in section 35(2); a person must report the death to a police officer, a coroner or an assistant coroner as soon as possible. This applies to all human remains less than 100 years old⁹ regardless of ancestry (i.e. both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal remains). Public health controls may also apply.

Guidance on what to do when suspected human remains are found is provided in **Appendix E**.

6. Legislative Requirements

Table 1 identifies some of the relevant legislation/regulations for the protection of heritage and the management of unexpected heritage finds in NSW. It should be noted that significant penalties exist for breaches of the listed legislation as a result of actions that relate to unauthorised impacts on heritage items. Further, it is noted that heritage that has been

⁹ Under section 19 of the *Coroners Act 2009*, the coroner has no jurisdiction to conduct an inquest into reportable death unless it appears to the coroner that (or that there is reasonable cause to suspect that) the death or suspected death occurred within the last 100 years.

assessed and is being managed in accordance with relevant statutory approvals(s) is exempt from these offences.

To avoid breaches of legislation, it is important that Sydney Metro and its contractors are aware of their statutory obligations under relevant legislation and that appropriate control measures are in place to ensure that unexpected heritage items are appropriately managed during construction. Contractors/Alliances will need to ensure that they undertake their own due diligence to identify any other legislative requirements that may apply for a given project.

CSSI CoA E10 applies to unexpected finds, so that all relevant legislation will apply to heritage items not identified in documents referred to CoA A1.

Table 1 Legislation and guidelines for management of unexpected heritage finds

| Relevant Requirement | Objectives and offences |
|---|--|
| <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act)</i> | Section 115ZB Giving of approval by Minister to carry out a project. |
| <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act)</i> | Requires heritage to be considered within the environmental impact assessment of projects. This guideline is based on the premise that an appropriate level of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment and investigations and mitigation have already been undertaken under the relevant legislation, including the EP&A Act, during the assessment and determination process. It also assumes that appropriate mitigation measures have been included in the conditions of any approval. |
| <i>Heritage Act 1977 (Heritage Act)</i> | The Heritage Act provides for the care, protection and management of heritage items in NSW. Under section 139, it is an offence to disturb or excavate any land knowing or having reasonable cause to suspect that the disturbance or excavation will or is likely to result in a relic being discovered, exposed, moved, damaged or destroyed, unless the disturbance or excavation is carried out in accordance with an excavation permit issued by the Heritage Division of the OEH. Under the Act, a relic is defined as: <i>'any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that: (a) relates to the settlement of the area that comprises New South Wales, not being Aboriginal settlement, and (b) is of State or local heritage significance.'</i> A person must notify the Heritage Division of OEH, if a person is aware or believes that they have discovered or located a relic (section 146). Penalties for offences under the Heritage Act can include six months imprisonment and/or a fine of up to \$1.1million. |

| Relevant Requirement | Objectives and offences |
|---|--|
| National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NPW Act) | <p>The NPW Act provides the basis for the care, protection and management of Aboriginal objects and places in NSW.</p> <p>An Aboriginal object is defined as: <i>'any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises New South Wales, being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non-Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains'</i>.</p> <p>An 'Aboriginal place' is an area declared by the Minister administering the Act to be of special significance with respect to Aboriginal culture. An Aboriginal place does not have to contain physical evidence of occupation (such as Aboriginal objects).</p> <p>Under section 87 of the Act, it is an offence to harm or desecrate an Aboriginal object or place. There are strict liability offences. An offence cannot be upheld where the harm or desecration was authorised by an AHIP and the permit's conditions were not contravened. Defences and exemptions to the offence of harming an Aboriginal object or Aboriginal place are provided in section 87, 87A and 87B of the Act.</p> <p>A person must notify OEH if a person is aware of the location of an Aboriginal object.</p> <p>Penalties for some of the offences can include two years imprisonment and/or up to \$550,000 (for individuals), and a maximum penalty of \$1.1 million (for corporations).</p> |

7. Unexpected heritage finds protocol

7.1. What is an unexpected heritage find?

An 'unexpected heritage find' can be defined as any unanticipated archaeological discovery that has not been identified during a previous assessment or is not covered by an existing permit under the Heritage Act. The find may have potential cultural heritage value, which may require some type of statutory cultural heritage permit or notification if any interference of the heritage item is proposed or anticipated.

The range of potential archaeological discoveries can include but are not limited to:

- remains of rail infrastructure including buildings, footings, stations, signal boxes, rail lines, bridges and culverts
- remains of other infrastructure including sandstone or brick buildings, wells, cisterns, drainage services, conduits, old kerbing and pavement, former road surfaces, timber and stone culverts, bridge footings and retaining walls

- artefact scatters including clustering of broken and complete bottles, glass, ceramics, animal bones and clay pipes
- Archaeological human skeletal remains.

7.2. Managing unexpected heritage finds

In the event that an unexpected heritage find (the find) is encountered on a Sydney Metro site, the flowchart in Figure 1 must be followed. There are eight steps in the procedure. These steps are summarised in Figure 1 and explained in detail in Table 2

Figure 1 Overview of steps to be undertaken on the discovery of an unexpected heritage item

IMPORTANT!

Sydney Metro may have approval to impact on certain heritage items during construction. If you think that you may have discovered a heritage item and you are unsure whether an approval is in place or not, **STOP** works and follow this procedure.

Table 2 Specific tasks to be implemented following the discovery of an unexpected heritage item

| Step | Task | Responsibility | Guidance and tools |
|----------|---|--|--|
| 1 | Stop work, protect item and inform the Excavation Director | | |
| 1.1 | Stop all work in the immediate area of the item and notify the Project Manager | Contractor/ Supervisor | Appendix A (Identifying Unexpected Heritage items) |
| 1.2 | Establish a 'no-go zone' around the item. Use high visibility fencing, where practical. No work is to be undertaken within this zone until further investigations are completed and, if required, appropriate approvals are obtained. Inform all site personnel about the no-go zone. | Project Manager/ Contractor/ Supervisor | |
| 1.3 | Inspect, document and photograph the item. | Excavation Director | Appendix B (Unexpected Heritage Item Recording Form) Appendix C (Photographing Unexpected Heritage items) |
| 1.4 | Is the item likely to be bone? If yes , follow the steps in Appendix D – 'Uncovering bones'. Where it is obvious that the bones are human remains, you must notify the local police by telephone immediately. They may take command of all or part of the site. If no , proceed to next step. | Excavation Director | Appendix D (Uncovering Bones) |

| Step | Task | Responsibility | Guidance and tools |
|----------|---|--|--------------------|
| 1.5 | Inform the Excavation Director of the item and provide as much information as possible, including photos and completed form (Appendix B). Where the project has an Environmental Representative (ER), the ER should be involved in the tasks/process as appropriate. | Contractors Project Manager | |
| 1.6 | Can the works avoid further disturbance to the item? Project Manager to confirm with TfNSW Environment and Planning Manager. Complete the remaining tasks in Step 1. | Contractors Project Manager | |
| 1.7 | Excavation Director to advise the Project Manager whether TfNSW has approval to impact on the 'item'. Does Metro have an approval or permit to impact on the item? If yes , work may recommence in accordance with that approval or permit. There is no further requirement to follow this procedure. If no , continue to next step. | Contractors Project Manager | |
| 1.8 | Has the 'find' been damaged or harmed? If yes , record the incident in the Incident Management System Implement any additional reporting requirements related to the planning approval and CEMP, where relevant. Contact Sydney Metro Manager, Environment Safety, Environment and Business Systems | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 2 | Contact and engage an archaeologist and/or an Aboriginal heritage consultant | | |

| Step | Task | Responsibility | Guidance and tools |
|----------|---|--|--|
| 2.1 | <p>If an archaeologist and/or Aboriginal heritage consultant has been previously appointed for the project, contact them to discuss the location and extent of the item and arrange a site inspection, if required. The project CEMP may contain contact details of the archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant.</p> <p>Where there is no project archaeologist engaged for the works engage a suitably qualified consultant to assess the find:</p> <p>if the find is a non-Aboriginal deposit, engage a suitably qualified and experienced archaeological consultant</p> <p>if the find is likely to be an Aboriginal object, engage an Aboriginal heritage consultant to assess the find.</p> | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 2.2 | If requested, provide photographs of the item taken during Step 1.3 to the archaeologist or Aboriginal heritage consultant. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | Appendix C (Photographing Unexpected Heritage items) |
| 3 | Preliminary assessment and recording of the find | | |
| 3.1 | In a minority of cases, the archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant may determine from the photographs that no site inspection is required because no heritage constraint exists for the project (<i>e.g. the item is not a 'relic', a 'heritage item' or an 'Aboriginal object'</i>). Any such advice should be provided in writing (<i>e.g. via email or letter with the consultant's name and company details clearly identifiable</i>) to the TfNSW Project Manager. | Archaeologist/ Aboriginal heritage consultant/ Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | Proceed to Step 8 |

| Step | Task | Responsibility | Guidance and tools |
|------|--|--|---|
| 3.2 | Arrange site access for the archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant to inspect the item as soon as practicable. In the majority of cases a site inspection is required to conduct a preliminary assessment. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 3.3 | Subject to the archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant's assessment, work may recommence at a set distance from the item. This is to protect any other archaeological material that may exist in the vicinity, which may have not yet been uncovered. Existing protective fencing established in Step 1.2 may need to be adjusted to reflect the extent of the newly assessed protective area. No works are to take place within this area once established. | Archaeologist/ Aboriginal heritage consultant Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 3.4 | <p>The archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant may provide advice after the site inspection and preliminary assessment that no heritage constraint exists for the project (e.g. the item is not a '<i>relic</i>' or a '<i>heritage item</i>' or an '<i>aboriginal item</i>'. Any such advice should be provided in writing (e.g. via email or letter with the consultant's name and company details clearly identifiable) to the Metro Project Manager.</p> <p>Note that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a relic is evidence of past human activity which has local or State heritage significance. It may include items such as bottles, utensils, remnants of clothing, crockery, personal effects, tools, machinery and domestic or industrial refuse an Aboriginal object may include a shell midden, stone tools, bones, rock art or a scarred tree a "work", building or standing structure may include tram or train tracks, kerbing, historic road pavement, fences, sheds or building foundations. | Archaeologist/ Aboriginal heritage consultant/ Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | Proceed to Step 8 Refer to Appendix A (Identifying heritage items) |

| Step | Task | Responsibility | Guidance and tools |
|----------|---|--|--------------------|
| 3.5 | Where required, seek additional specialist technical advice (such as a forensic or physical anthropologist to identify skeletal remains). The archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant can provide contacts for such specialist consultants. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 3.6 | Where the item has been identified as a 'relic' or 'heritage item' or an 'Aboriginal object' the archaeologist should formally record the item. | Archaeologist/ Aboriginal heritage consultant | |
| 3.7 | OEH (Heritage Division for non-Aboriginal relics and Planning and Aboriginal Heritage Section for Aboriginal objects) can be notified informally by telephone at this stage by the Sydney Metro Principal Manager Sustainability Environment and Planning (Program). Any verbal conversations with regulators must be noted on the project file for future reference. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 4 | Section 4 not used | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Step | Task | Responsibility | Guidance and tools |
|----------|--|--|---|
| 5 | Notify the regulator, if required. | | |
| 5.1 | Based on the findings of the archaeological or heritage management plan and corresponding legislative requirements, is the find required to be notified to OEH and the Secretary? If no , proceed directly to Step 6 If yes , proceed to next step. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 5.2 | If notification is required, complete the template notification letter, including the archaeological/heritage management plan and other relevant supporting information and forward to the Sydney Metro Principal Manager Sustainability Environment and Planning (Program) for signature. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | Appendix F (Template Notification Letter) |
| 5.3 | Forward the signed notification letter to OEH and the Secretary. Informal notification (via a phone call or email) to OEH prior to sending the letter is appropriate. The archaeological or heritage management plan and the completed site recording form (Appendix B) must be submitted with the notification letter (for both Aboriginal objects and non-Aboriginal relics). For Part 5.1 projects, the Department of Planning and Environment must also be notified. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 5.4 | A copy of the final signed notification letter, archaeological or heritage management plan and the site recording form is to be kept on file and a copy sent to the Sydney Metro Project Manager. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 6 | Implement archaeological or heritage management plan | | |

| Step | Task | Responsibility | Guidance and tools |
|------|---|--|--------------------|
| 6.1 | Modify the archaeological or heritage management plan to take into account any additional advice resulting from notification and discussions with OEH. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 6.2 | Implement the archaeological or heritage management plan. Where impact is expected, this may include a formal assessment of significance and heritage impact assessment, preparation of excavation or recording methodologies, consultation with Registered Aboriginal Parties, obtaining heritage approvals etc., if required. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 6.3 | Where heritage approval is required contact the Environment and Planning Manager for further advice and support material. Please note there are time constraints associated with heritage approval preparation and processing. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 6.4 | Assess whether heritage impact is consistent with the project approval or if project approval modification is required from the Department of Planning and Environment. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 6.5 | Where statutory approvals (or project approval modification) are required, impact upon relics and/or Aboriginal objects must not occur until heritage approvals are issued by the appropriate regulator. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 6.6 | Where statutory approval is not required but where recording is recommended by the archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant, sufficient time must be allowed for this to occur. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |

| Step | Task | Responsibility | Guidance and tools |
|----------|---|--|--------------------|
| 6.7 | Ensure short term and permanent storage locations are identified for archaeological material or other heritage material removed from site, where required. Interested third parties (e.g. museums, local Aboriginal land councils, or local councils) should be consulted on this issue. Contact the archaeologist or Aboriginal heritage consultant for advice on this matter, if required. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 7 | Section 7 Not Used | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 8 | Resume work | | |
| 8.1 | Seek written clearance to resume project work from the Environment and Planning Manager and the Archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant. Clearance would only be given once all archaeological excavation and/or heritage recommendations and approvals (where required) are complete. Resumption of project work must be in accordance with the all relevant project/heritage approvals/determinations. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 8.2 | If required, ensure archaeological excavation/heritage reporting and other heritage approval conditions are completed in the required timeframes. This includes artefact retention repositories, conservation and/or disposal strategies. | Contractors Project Manager, Excavation Director | |
| 8.3 | Deleted | | |
| 8.4 | If additional unexpected items are discovered this procedure must begin again from Step 1. | All | |

8. Responsibilities

Roles and Responsibilities

| Role | Responsibility or role under this guideline |
|---|--|
| Contractor / Supervisor | Stop work immediately when an unexpected heritage find is encountered. Cordon off area until Environmental Manager advises that work can recommence. |
| Contractor or Environment Manager | <p>Manage the process of identifying, protecting and mitigating impacts on the 'find'.</p> <p>Liaise with Sydney Metro Project Manager and Environment and Planning Manager and assist the archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant with mitigation and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Complete Incident Report and review CEMP for any changes required. Propose amendments to the CEMP if any changes are required.</p> |
| Contractor's or Project Heritage Advisor or Consultant | Provide expert advice to the Sydney Metro Environment and Planning Manager on 'find' identification, significance, mitigation, legislative procedures and regulatory requirements. |
| Environmental Representative | <p>Independent environmental advisor engaged by Sydney Metro</p> <p>Review and provides advice on heritage management plan and changes to the CEMP. Ensures compliance with relevant approvals (new and existing).</p> |
| Heritage Division of OEH | <p>Regulate the care, protection and management of relics (non-Aboriginal heritage).</p> <p>Delegated authority for Heritage Council</p> <p>Issue excavation permits.</p> |
| Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) | Aboriginal people who have registered with Sydney Metro to be consulted about a proposed project or activity in accordance with the OEH <i>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010</i> . |
| Sydney Metro Environment and Planning Manager | Notify the TfNSW Principal Manager, Environmental Management of 'find' and manage Incident Reporting once completed by Environmental Manager. |
| Contractors Project Manager | Ensures all aspects of this procedure are implemented. Advise Contractor / Supervisor to recommence work when all applicable requirements have been satisfied. |

9. Seeking advice

Advice on this procedure should be sought from the Sydney Metro Environment and Planning Manager in the first instance. Contractors and alliance partners should ensure their own project environment managers are aware of and understand this procedure.

Technical archaeological or heritage advice regarding an unexpected heritage item should be sought from a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant.

10. Related documents and references

Related Documents

Environmental Incident Classification and Reporting – 9TP-PR-105

Guide to Environmental Control Map – 3TP-SD-015

NSW Heritage Office (1998), *Skeletal remains: guidelines for the management of human skeletal remains*.

Roads and Maritime Services (2015), *Standard Management Procedure Unexpected Heritage Items*.

Department of Environment and Conservation NSW (2006), *Manual for the identification of Aboriginal remains*.

11. List of appendices

The following appendices are included to support this procedure:

- Appendix A: Examples of finds encountered during construction works
- Appendix B: Unexpected Heritage Item Recording Form
- Appendix C: Photographing Unexpected Heritage Items
- Appendix D: Uncovering Bones
- Appendix E: Archaeological Advice Checklist
- Appendix F: Template Notification Letter

Appendix A - Examples of finds encountered during construction works



Photo 1 - Aboriginal artefacts found at the Wickham Transport Interchange, 2015



Photo 2 – Aboriginal artefacts (shell material) found at the Wickham Transport Interchange, 2015



Photo 3 1840s seawall and 1880s retaining wall uncovered at Balmain East, 2016



Photo 4 Sandstone pavers uncovered at Balmain East, 2016



Photo 5 - Platform structure at Hamilton Railway Station classified as a 'work' by the project archaeologist - Wickham Transport Interchange project, 2015

Photo 6 - Platform structure at Hamilton Railway Station classified as a 'work' by the project archaeologist - Wickham Transport Interchange project, 2015



Photo 7 - Sandstone flagging and cesspit - Wynyard Walk project, 2014



Photo 8 - Chinese Ming Dynasty pottery and English porcelain/pottery dating back to early 19th century -Wynyard Walk project, 2014



Photo 9 - Pottery made by convict potter Thomas Ball during the early settlement - Wynyard Walk project, 2014

The following images, obtained from the Roads and Maritime Services' *Standard Management Procedure for Unexpected Heritage items 2015*, can be used to assist in the preliminary identification of potential unexpected items during construction and maintenance works.



Photo 10 - Top left hand picture continuing clockwise: Stock camp remnants (Hume Highway Bypass at Tarcutta); Linear archaeological feature with post holes (Hume Highway Duplication), Animal bones (Hume Highway Bypass at

Woomargama); Cut wooden stake; Glass jars, bottles, spoon and fork recovered from refuse pit associated with a Newcastle Hotel (Pacific Highway, Adamstown Heights, Newcastle area) (RMS, 2015).



**Photo 11 - Top left hand picture continuing clockwise: Stock camp remnants (Hume Highway Bypass at Tarcutta);
Linear archaeological feature with post holes (Hume Highway Duplication), Animal bones (Hume Highway Bypass at**

Woomargama); Cut wooden stake; Glass jars, bottles, spoon and fork recovered from refuse pit associated with a Newcastle Hotel (Pacific Highway, Adamstown Heights, Newcastle area) (RMS, 2015).

Appendix B- Unexpected heritage item recording form

Example of unexpected heritage item recording form

This form is to be completed Excavation Director on the discovery of an archaeological heritage item during construction or maintenance works

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| Date: | | Recorded by: (include name and position) | |
| Project name: | | | |
| Description of works being undertaken: | | | |
| Description of exact location of item | | | |
| Description of item found (What type of item is it likely to be? Tick the relevant boxes). | | | |
| A. A relic | <input type="checkbox"/> | A 'relic' is evidence of a past human activity relating to the settlement of NSW with local or state heritage significance. A relic might include bottle, utensils, plates, cups, household items, tools, implements, and similar items | |
| B. A 'work', building or structure' | <input type="checkbox"/> | A 'work' can generally be defined as a form infrastructure such as track or rail tracks, timber sleepers, a culvert, road base, a bridge pier, kerbing, and similar items | |
| C. An Aboriginal object | <input type="checkbox"/> | An 'Aboriginal object' may include stone tools, stone flakes, shell middens, rock art, scarred trees and human bones | |
| D. Bone | <input type="checkbox"/> | Bones can either be human or animal remains. Remember that you must contact the local police immediately by | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | telephone if you are certain that the bone(s) are human remains. | |
| E. Other | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Provide a short description of the item <i>(eg metal rail tracks running parallel to the rail corridor. Good condition. Tracks set in concrete, approximately 10 cm below the current ground surface).</i> | | | |
| Sketch <i>(provide a sketch of the item's general location in relation to other road features so its approximate location can be mapped without having to re-excavate it. In addition, please include details of the location and direction of any photographs of the item taken)</i> | | | |
| Action taken (Tick either A or B) | | | |
| A. Unexpected item would not be further impacts on by the works | <input type="checkbox"/> | Describe how works would avoid impact on the item. <i>(eg the rail tracks would be left in situ and recovered with paving).</i> | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| B. Unexpected item would be further impacted by the works | <input type="checkbox"/> | Describe how works would impact on the item. <i>(eg milling is required to be continued to a depth of 200 mm depth to ensure the pavement requirements are met. Rail tracks would need to be removed.)</i> | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Excavation Director | | Signature | |
| | | Signature | |

Important

It is a statutory offence to disturb Aboriginal objects and historic relics (including human remains) without an approval. All works affecting objects and relics must cease until an approval is sought.

Approvals may also be required to impact on certain works.

Appendix C- Photographing unexpected heritage items

Photographs of unexpected items in their current context (*in situ*) may assist archaeologists/Aboriginal heritage consultants to better identify the heritage values of the item. Emailing good quality photographs to specialists can allow for better quality and faster heritage advice. The key elements that must be captured in photographs of the item include its position, the item itself and any distinguishing features. All photographs must have a scale (ruler, scale bar, mobile phone, coin etc) and a note describing the direction of the photograph.

Context and detailed photographs

It is important to take a general photograph (Figure 1) to convey the location and setting of the item. This will add value to the subsequent detailed photographs also required (Figure 2).

Removal of the item from its context (e.g. excavating from the ground) for photographic purposes is not permitted.




Figure 1: Telford road uncovered on the Great Western Highway (Leura) in 2008 (RMS, 2015).

Photographing distinguishing features

Where unexpected items have a distinguishing feature, close up detailed photographs must be taken of these features, where practicable. In the case of a building or bridge, this may include diagnostic details architectural or technical features. See Figures 3 and 4 for examples.



Figure 3: Ceramic bottle artefact with stamp.



Figure 4: Detail of the stamp allows 'Tooth & Co Limited' to be made out. This is helpful to a specialist in gauging the artefact's origin, manufacturing date and likely significance.

Photographing bones

The majority of bones found on site will be those of recently deceased animals, often requiring no further assessment (unless they are in archaeological context). However, if bones are human, the police must be contacted immediately (see Appendix F for detailed guidance). Taking quality photographs of the bones can often resolve this issue quickly. The project archaeologist can confirm if bones are human or non-human if provided with appropriate photographs.

Ensure that photographs of bones are not concealed by foliage (Figure 5) as this makes it difficult to identify. Minor hand removal of foliage can be undertaken as long as disturbance of the bone does not occur. Excavation of the ground to remove bone(s) should not occur, nor should they be pulled out of the ground if partially exposed.

Where sediment (adhering to a bone found on the ground surface) conceals portions of a bone (Figure 6) ensure the photograph is taken of the bone (if any) that is not concealed by sediment.



Figure 5: Bone concealed by foliage.



Figure 6: Bone covered in sediment

Ensure that all close up photographs include the whole bone and then specific details of the bone (especially the ends of long bones, the *epiphysis*, which is critical for species identification). Figures 7 and 8 are examples of good photographs of bones that can easily be identified from the photograph alone. They show sufficient detail of the complete bone and the epiphysis.



Figure 7: Photograph showing complete bone.



Figure 8: Close up of a long bone's epiphysis.

Appendix D - Uncovering bones

This appendix provides advice regarding:

- what to do on first discovering bones
- the range of human skeletal notification pathways
- additional considerations and requirements when managing the discovery of human remains.

1. First uncovering bones

Refer to the Sydney Metro Exhumation Management Plan

Stop all work in the vicinity of the find. All bones uncovered during project works should be **treated with care and urgency** as they have the potential to be human remains. The bones must be identified as either human or non-human as soon as possible by a qualified forensic or physical anthropologist..

On the very rare occasion where it is immediately obvious from the remains that they are human, the Project Manager (or a delegate) should **inform the police by telephone** prior to seeking specialist advice. It will be obvious that it is human skeletal remains where there is no doubt, as demonstrated by the example in Figure 1¹⁰. Often skeletal elements in isolation (such as a skull) can also clearly be identified as human. Note it may also be obvious that human remains have been uncovered when soft tissue and/or clothing are present.

¹⁰ After Department of Environment and Conservation NSW (2006), *Manual for the identification of Aboriginal Remains*: 17




Figure 1: Schematic of a complete skeleton that is 'obviously' human¹².



Figure 2: Disarticulated bones that require assessment to determine species.

This preliminary phone call is to let the police know that a specialist skeletal assessment to determine the approximate date of death which will inform legal jurisdiction. The police may wish to take control of the site at this stage. If not, a forensic or physical anthropologist must be requested to make an on-site assessment of the skeletal remains.

Where it is not immediately obvious that the bones are human (in the majority of cases, illustrated by Figure 2), specialist assessment is required to establish the species of the bones. Photographs of the bones can assist this assessment if they are clear and taken in accordance with guidance provided in Appendix C. Good photographs often result in the bones being identified by a specialist without requiring a site visit; noting they are nearly always non-human. In these cases, non-human skeletal remains must be treated like any other unexpected archaeological find.

If the bones are identified as human (either by photographs or an on-site inspection) a technical specialist must determine the likely ancestry (Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal) and burial context (archaeological or forensic). This assessment is required to identify the legal regulator of the human remains so **urgent notification** (as below) can occur.

Preliminary telephone or verbal notification by the archaeologist to the Sydney Metro Principal Manager Sustainability Environment and Planning (Program) appropriate. This

must be followed up later by a formal letter notification to the relevant regulator (as per Appendix G) when a management plan has been developed and agreed to by the relevant parties.

2. Range of human skeletal notification pathways

The following is a summary of the different notification pathways required for human skeletal remains depending on the preliminary skeletal assessment of ancestry and burial context.

A. Human bones are from a recently deceased person (*less than 100 years old*).

Action

A police officer must be notified immediately as per the obligations to report a death or suspected death under s35 of the *Coroners Act 2009* (NSW). It should be assumed the police will then take command of the site until otherwise directed.

B. Human bones are archaeological in nature (*more than 100 years old*) and are likely to be Aboriginal remains.

Action

The OEH (Planning and Aboriginal Heritage Section) must be notified immediately. The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor must contact and inform the relevant Aboriginal community stakeholders who may request to be present on site.

C. Human bones are archaeological in nature (*more than 100 years old*) and likely to be non-Aboriginal remains.

Action

The OEH (Heritage Division) must be notified immediately

Figure 3 summarises the notification pathways on finding bones.




Figure 3 Overview of steps to be undertaken on the discovery of bones

After the appropriate verbal notifications (as described in 2B and 2C above), the Project Manager must proceed through the *Unexpected Heritage Items Exhumation Management Plan* (Step 4). It is noted that no *Exhumation Management Plan* is required for forensic cases (2A), as all future management is a police matter. Non-human skeletal remains must be treated like any other unexpected archaeological find and so must proceed to record the find as per Step 3.6.

3. Additional considerations and requirements

Uncovering archaeological human remains must be managed intensively and needs to consider a number of additional specific issues. These issues might include facilitating culturally appropriate processes when dealing with Aboriginal remains (such as repatriation and cultural ceremonies). Project Managers may need to consider overnight site security of any exposed remains and may need to manage the onsite attendance of a number of different external stakeholders during assessment and/or investigation of remains.

Project Managers may also be advised to liaise with local church/religious groups and the media to manage community issues arising from the find. Additional investigations may be required to identify living descendants, particularly if the remains are to be removed and relocated.

If exhumation of the remains (from a formal burial or a vault) is required, Project Managers should also be aware of additional approval requirements under the *Public Health Act 1991* (NSW). Specifically, TfNSW is required to apply to the Director General of NSW Department of Health for approval to exhume human remains as per Clause 26 of the *Public Health (Disposal of Bodies) Regulation 2002* (NSW)¹¹.

Further, the exhumation of such remains needs to consider health risks such as infectious disease control, exhumation procedures and reburial approval and registration. Further guidance on this matter can be found at the NSW Department of Health website.

In addition, due to the potential significant statutory and common law controls and prohibitions associated with interfering with a public cemetery, project teams are advised, when works uncover human remains adjacent to cemeteries, to confirm the cemetery's exact boundaries.

¹¹ This requirement is in addition to heritage approvals under the *Heritage Act 1977*.

Appendix E - Archaeological/heritage advice checklist

The archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant must advise the Sydney Metro Principal Manager Sustainability Environment and Planning (Program) of an appropriate archaeological or heritage management plan as soon as possible after an inspection of the site has been completed (see Step 4). An archaeological or heritage management plan can include a range of activities and processes, which differ depending on the find and its significance.

In discussions with the archaeologist/Aboriginal heritage consultant the following checklist can be used as a prompt to ensure all relevant heritage issues are considered when developing this plan. This will allow the project team to receive clear and full advice to move forward quickly. Archaeological and/or heritage advice on how to proceed can be received in a letter or email outlining all relevant archaeological and/or heritage issues.

| | Required | Outcome/notes |
|--|----------|---------------|
| Assessment and investigation | | |
| • Assessment of significance | Yes/No | |
| • Assessment of heritage impact | Yes/No | |
| • Archaeological excavation | Yes/No | |
| • Archival photographic recording | Yes/No | |
| Heritage approvals and notifications | | |
| • AHIP, section 140, section 139 exceptions etc. | Yes/No | |
| • Regulator relics/objects notification | Yes/No | |
| • Notification to Sydney Trains for s170 heritage conservation register | Yes/No | |
| • Compliance with CEMP or other project heritage approvals | Yes/No | |
| Stakeholder consultation | | |
| • Aboriginal stakeholder consultation | Yes/No | |
| Artefact/heritage item management | | |
| • Retention or conservation strategy (e.g. items may be subject to long conservation and interpretation) | Yes/No | |
| • Disposal strategy | Yes/No | |
| • Short term and permanent storage locations (interested third parties should be consulted on this issue). | Yes/No | |
| • Control Agreement for Aboriginal objects | Yes/No | |

Appendix F- Template notification letter

[Insert on TfNSW letterhead]

[Select and type date]

[Select and type reference number]

XXX

Manager, Conservation
Heritage Division, Office of Environment and Heritage
Locked Bag 5020
Parramatta NSW 2124

[Select and type salutation and name],

Re: Unexpected heritage item discovered during Transport for NSW –Sydney Metro activities.

I write to inform you of an unexpected [select: relic, heritage item or Aboriginal object] found during TfNSW Infrastructure and Services construction works at [insert location] on [insert date] in accordance with the notification requirement under select: section 146 of the *Heritage Act 1977* (NSW). [Where the regulator has been informally notified at an earlier date by telephone, this should be referred to here].

NB: On finding Aboriginal human skeletal remains this letter must also be sent to the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment in accordance with notification requirements under section 20(1) of the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984* (Commonwealth).

[Provide a brief overview of the project background and project area. Provide a summary of the description and location of the item, including a map and image where possible. Also include how the project was assessed under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (NSW) (e.g. Part 5). Also include any project approval number, if available].

Sydney Metro [or contractor] has sought professional archaeological advice regarding the item. A preliminary assessment indicates [provide a summary description and likely significance of the item]. Please find additional information on the site recording form attached.

Based on the preliminary findings, Sydney Metro [or contractor] is proposing [provide a summary of the proposed archaeological/heritage approach (e.g. develop archaeological research design (where relevant), seek heritage approvals, undertake archaeological investigation or conservation/interpretation strategy). Also include preliminary justification of such heritage impact with regard to project design constraints and delivery program].

The proposed approach will be further developed in consultation with a nominated Office of Environment and Heritage staff member.

Should you have any feedback on the proposed approach, or if you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact [Environment and Planning Project Manager] on (02) XXXX XXXX.

Yours sincerely

[Sender name]


Sydney Metro Principal Manager Sustainability Environment and Planning (Program) [Attach the archaeological/heritage management plan and site recording form].

SYDENHAM STATION AND SYDNEY METRO TRAINS FACILITY SOUTH

Addendum to the Sydney Metro City &
Southwest – Chatswood to Sydenham
Historical Archaeological Assessment and
Research Design

Report to Jacobs/Arcadis/RPS

January 2018



Artefact Heritage
ABN 73 144 973 526
Level 4, Building B
35 Saunders Street
Pyrmont NSW 2009
Australia

+61 2 9518 8411
office@artefact.net.au

CONTENTS

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 | Project Background | 1 |
| 1.2 | Previous heritage assessments | 2 |
| 1.3 | Study area | 2 |
| 1.4 | Statutory context..... | 2 |
| 1.5 | Report Authorship..... | 3 |
| 2.0 | Historical context..... | 5 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 5 |
| 2.1.1 | Early land grants..... | 5 |
| 2.1.2 | Subdivision and early industry..... | 7 |
| 2.1.3 | Industrial consolidation | 11 |
| 3.0 | Archaeological Assessment | 18 |
| 3.1 | Previous studies | 18 |
| 3.2 | Land use summary | 19 |
| 3.3 | Potential archaeological remains..... | 19 |
| 3.3.1 | Phase 1 (1788 – 1840s) | 19 |
| 3.3.2 | Phase 2 (1840s – 1880s) | 19 |
| 3.3.3 | Phase 3 (1880s – 1909) | 19 |
| 3.3.4 | Phase 4 (1909 – present) | 20 |
| 3.4 | Summary of archaeological potential | 20 |
| 3.5 | Archaeological significance | 21 |
| 4.0 | Archaeological Management | 23 |
| 4.1 | Summary of Archaeological Impacts and Management..... | 23 |
| 4.2 | Research Design | 23 |
| 4.2.1 | Historic themes | 23 |
| 4.2.2 | Research questions | 24 |
| 4.3 | Archaeological Management | 25 |
| 4.3.1 | Unexpected Finds Procedure | 25 |
| 4.3.2 | Heritage induction..... | 25 |
| 4.3.3 | Further archaeological investigation..... | 25 |
| 4.3.4 | Excavation director | 26 |
| 5.0 | References | 27 |

FIGURES

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1-1: Study area of the project as modified | 4 |
| Figure 1-2: Key features of the Marrickville Dive Site and Southern Support Facility | 5 |
| Figure 1-3: Key features of the Sydenham station and precinct works..... | 6 |
| Figure 1-4: Construction sites..... | 7 |
| Figure 2-1: Undated plan of the Parish of Petersham, showing Thomas Moore's grant of 470 acres. The study area was located within this grant and also crossed into the small holdings of John Fincham and James Wain..... | 6 |
| Figure 2-2: Detail of John Allan's plan showing the subdivision of the Petersham Estate, c. 1850. King's Garden is labelled. Source: NLA MAP F 178. | 6 |
| Figure 2-3: Detail from J. Allans plan of Sydenham Farms. Swam Road and Unwin's Bridge Road. The approximate location of Sydenham Station is arrowed. Plan no. 1 / J. Dating between 1840 and 1850. SLNSW M2 811.1826/1840/1..... | 7 |
| Figure 2-4: Detail from the c.1917 Municipality Maps Series. SLNSW..... | 8 |
| Figure 2-5: The houses associated with the 1906 Smidmore estate are located between Edinburgh and Murray Streets. NSW Lands and Property Information, SIX Maps. | 9 |
| Figure 2-6: Fraser Park, Sydenham, c. 1947. Source: Marrickville Library & History Services..... | 9 |
| Figure 2-7: The Smidmore subdivision, south of Edinburgh Road, is within the study area. NLA image 230293982..... | 10 |
| Figure 2-8: The main workshop at the Edinburgh Road Marrickville Sydney Steel Company factory, 1911. Source. Stuart 2012 <i>Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979</i> | 11 |
| Figure 2-9: Photograph of the stockyard at the rear of the Sydney Steel Company workshop, taken from the roof of the workshop looking south towards Sydenham Station, c1913. Source. Stuart 2012 <i>Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979</i> | 12 |
| Figure 2-10: Photograph of the stockyard at the rear of the Sydney Steel Company workshop, showing steam operated crane, c1913. Source. Stuart 2012 <i>Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979</i> | 12 |
| Figure 2-11: View of the Sydney Steel Company, Marrickville in 1919. A 44-tonne girder is seen being transported on a custom-made horse drawn limber to a rail siding near Sydenham Station. Source. Stuart 2012 <i>Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979</i> | 13 |
| Figure 2-12: Employees at work outside Sydney Steel Company, Marrickville in 1922. The train line can be seen in the background. Source. Stuart 2012 <i>Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979</i> | 13 |
| Figure 2-13: Photograph of the Sydney Steel Company in Marrickville in 1948. Source. Stuart 2012 <i>Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979</i> | 14 |
| Figure 2-14: Photograph of the Sydney Steel Company in Marrickville in 1962, showing crane and buildings on land adjacent to railway line. Source. Stuart 2012 <i>Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979</i> | 15 |
| Figure 2-15: 1881 Plan of Marrickville (Sydenham) Station, showing the platform configuration prior to the construction of the Bankstown line. Source: State Records NSW, images 17420_a014_a014_a014000815. | 16 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 2-16: Subdivision plan from 1882 indicating the location of the proposed Illawarra Railway corridor. Source: Marrickville Library & History Services. | 17 |
|--|----|

TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1-1: Key features of the modification | 1 |
| Table 1-2: Listed items in the modification area | 3 |
| Table 3-1: Summary of potential archaeological resources and significance | 20 |
| Table 3-2: Assessment of archaeological significance for Sydney Metro Trains Facility South Precinct..... | 21 |
| Table 4-1: Archaeological impacts and management strategies in the study area..... | 23 |
| Table 4-2: Historic themes for study area | 24 |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This addendum report constitutes an Archaeological Research Design (ARD) for the Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South (the project as modified), a modification to Sydney Metro City & Southwest Chatswood to Sydenham project (the project as approved). This report has been prepared as an addendum to the ARD for the project as approved (Artefact 2016b).

1.1 Project Background

Planning approval for the project as approved was granted by the Minister for Planning under Part 5.1 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* (EP&A Act) on 9 January 2017. The modification area (study area) is located at the southern end of the Chatswood to Sydenham section of the approved project and includes:

- The southern services facility (for traction power supply and an operational water treatment plant) adjacent to the southern dive structure
- Sydenham Station and precinct works
- Track and rail system facilities
- Adjustments to the Sydenham Pit and Drainage Pumping Station
- Ancillary infrastructure and works.

Table 1-1: Key features of the modification

| Component | Description of activities |
|--|---|
| Sydenham Station and precinct works | Demolition and reconstruction of platforms 1 and 2 for metro rail operations and a new aerial concourse connecting to new station entries at Railway Parade and Burrows Avenue. Upgrades to transport interchange facilities and provision for active transport would be delivered as part of the station works |
| Sydney Metro Trains Facility South | Construction and operation of train stabling and maintenance facilities for the overall metro network. The scope includes earthworks, retaining walls, track and rail systems, construction of new buildings, enabling works to support future rail corridor development above the facility, plus operation of trains and maintenance activities within the stabling yard |
| Track and rail system facilities | Reconfiguration of existing track and rail systems to segregate the T3 Bankstown Line and the Goods Line, installation of metro tracks and rail systems including crossover and turnback facilities |
| Adjustments to the Sydenham Pit and Drainage Pumping Station | Including a new aqueduct over the pit, new pumping station and new maintenance access ramp |
| Ancillary infrastructure and works | Including fencing, maintenance access, utilities works, drainage, noise barriers, road and transport network works, bridge works, and temporary facilities to support construction |

1.2 Previous heritage assessments

This ARD is informed by previous heritage assessments prepared for the Metro project, which have assessed the archaeological potential and significance within the portions of the project as modified. These assessments are:

- Arcadis, 2017, *Chatswood to Sydenham: Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South Modification Report*
- Artefact Heritage 2017, *Sydney Metro City & Southwest Sydenham to Bankstown Technical Paper 3 Non-Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment*
- Artefact Heritage, 2016a, *Sydney Metro City & Southwest – Chatswood to Sydenham Technical Paper 4 Non-Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment*
- Artefact Heritage 2016b, *Sydney Metro City & Southwest Chatswood to Sydenham – Historical Archaeological Assessment and Research Design*

Works within the eastern portion of the study area of the project as modified are included in the project as approved. The Southern Dive Site and adjacent works site were assessed in the project as approved Non-Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment (NAHIA) (Artefact 2016a). The NAHIA found that there was unlikely to be impacts to significant archaeology as a result of the project and management under an Unexpected Finds Procedure was recommended as appropriate mitigation.

Any potential archaeological resources within the study area would be impacted by substantial excavation works associated with the dive structure and tunnel portal. Although any impacts to potential archaeological resources within the study area would be substantial, the archaeological assessment did not identify any significant archaeological resources within the study area. (Artefact 2016a:247)

The ARD for the project as approved included a management map for the Southern Dive Site and adjacent works site which showed the entire area as covered under the Unexpected Finds Procedure (Artefact 2016b: Figure 13-11).

1.3 Study area

The study area of the project as modified is illustrated in Figure 1-1 to Figure 1-4. This addendum ARD provides management measures for potential archaeological resources within the study area, as shown in Figure 1-2. The study area is located in the Inner West Local Government Area.

1.4 Statutory context

There are no statutory listed heritage items with identified archaeological values located within the study area. The following listed items are located within the study area and are significant for their built heritage values (Table 2). Built heritage is assessed in the modification report (Arcadis 2017).

Table 1-2: Listed items in the modification area

| Listing | Suburb | Number | Significance |
|---|--------------|--|--------------|
| Sydenham pit and drainage pumping station 1 | Sydenham | State SHR (01644) | State |
| | | Sydney Water S. 170 Heritage and Conservation Register (4571743) | |
| | | Marrickville LEP 2011 (181) | |
| Sydenham Railway Station Group | Sydenham | SHR (No. 01254) | State |
| | | RailCorp S.170 Heritage and Conservation Register (4801154) | |
| | | Marrickville LEP 2011 (1286) | |
| Sydenham (Illawarra Line) underbridge | Sydenham | RailCorp S.170 Heritage and Conservation Register (4805746) | Local |
| Marrickville (Meek's Road) Railway Substation | Marrickville | RailCorp S.170 Heritage and Conservation Register (4801123) | Local |

All four listed items within the study area are identified in their listing information or relevant Conservation Management Plans (CMPs) as having no, or low, non-Aboriginal archaeological potential.

1.5 Report Authorship

This report was prepared by Jenny Winnett (Senior Heritage Consultant) and Dr Sandra Wallace (Director).

Figure 1-1: Study area of the project as modified




Figure 1-2: Key features of the Marrickville Dive Site and Southern Support Facility



Figure 1-3: Key features of the Sydenham station and precinct works





Figure 1-4: Construction sites



2.0 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

2.1 Introduction

Land in the Marrickville area was first granted to European settlers in the 1790s. Initially used for low intensity timber getting and agricultural activities, subdivision and establishment of various manufacturing industries, such as brickmaking, began in the 1830s. By the 1860s Marrickville had grown as a suburb with both residential and industrial development areas. Marginal swampy land, such as the study area, was slow to develop. During the early to mid-1900s the study area developed primarily as a location for industry and manufacturing, rather than residential subdivision (with some exceptions). The topography and development history influenced the subdivision pattern and land use throughout the twentieth century. The study area today remains predominately industrial in character surrounded by both residential and other industrial pockets.

2.1.1 Early land grants

Land grants were first issued in 1793 for farms and crop growing in the Marrickville area. By 1810 all the land in Marrickville was granted to settlers. In 1799, Thomas Moore received a grant of 470 acres adjoining the swamp and in 1803, a further grant of 700 acres. Moore also purchased adjoining land and by 1807 held 1,920 acres, making him one of the largest landowners in the area (Figure 8). His holdings incorporated much of present day Marrickville, Petersham, and Dulwich Hill. Douglas Farm, as Moore's holdings were named, was utilised for the growing of maize and wheat and for its valuable stands of timber. Moore was appointed Master Boat Builder in the dockyard at Port Jackson, and it is likely that some of the timber from the property went to his shipbuilding yard.

Moore sold his land holdings to Dr Robert Wardell on the 21st of July, 1830. At this time, the estate extended from Parramatta Road to Cooks River. Wardell was a flamboyant figure, hosting lavish parties at his home, Sara Dell (originally located on Parramatta Road in the vicinity of the Fort Street High School), and stocking his property with imported English deer for hunting. In September 1834, Wardell stumbled across the camp of three escaped convicts whilst riding along the Cooks River and was murdered. Wardell's estate was divided amongst his sisters, Anne Fisher, Margaret Fraser, and Jane Isabella Priddle. Wardell's death opened the way for the first era of subdivision in the area, and parts of his land began to be sold off soon after his death, creating small farms for orchards and dairy cattle, and new industries such as brickmaking. Most of the remaining land was scrub earning the name of 'Wardell's Bush'.

The western half of present-day Sydenham, including the area now occupied by Sydenham Station, was part of the Gumbramorra Swamp. During the 1830s and 1840s, the outer lying suburbs of Newtown, St Peters, Tempe, and Petersham became desirable locations for the construction of rural retreats, due to increasing land prices in the city.

By the 1840s, a track known as Swamp Road was established, now Sydenham Road. Unwin's Bridge Road was constructed by convict labour in 1836 for Frederick Wright Unwin, a prominent landowner south of the study area. During this phase, the area was occupied primarily by brickmakers, farms and stockmen utilised the swamp to water livestock.

The area to the north of the railway line was originally part of the extensive Petersham Estate, also referred to as the Sydenham Farms. This was subdivided, primarily into large agricultural lots, from the mid-19th century. A portion of the study area (including, and east, of Sydenham Railway Station) was included in Section No.1 of the subdivision c. 1850. The subdivision plan from the time indicates that much of the study area was low-lying at this time, and is shown as being marsh-land (Figure 2-2). The area today known as Fraser Park formed part of the area labelled as 'King's Garden' (Figure 2-2;

Figure 2-6). The areas was obviously suited to this use, as 'Meek's Garden' was also located to the north of the study area.

Figure 2-1: Undated plan of the Parish of Petersham, showing Thomas Moore's grant of 470 acres. The study area was located within this grant and also crossed into the small holdings of John Fincham and James Wain.




Figure 2-2: Detail of John Allan's plan showing the subdivision of the Petersham Estate, c. 1850. King's Garden is labelled. Source: NLA MAP F 178.





Figure 2-3: Detail from J. Allans plan of Sydenham Farms. Swamp Road and Unwin's Bridge Road. The approximate location of Sydenham Station is arrowed. Plan no. 1 / J. Dating between 1840 and 1850. SLNSW M2 811.1826/1840/1.



2.1.2 Subdivision and early industry

In the 1880s there was a Sydney wide population boom, resulting in mass residential and commercial development for the area. Steam trams were introduced and in 1881 a line ran from Newtown Bridge to Marrickville. This was designed to stimulate residential development within the area. The Tramvale subdivision in the western portion of Sydenham was offered for sale soon after, targeting working class families and offering close proximity to factories and employment opportunities. The estate was affected by regular flooding and poor drainage, and lacked basic sewerage facilities. Mosquitos were rampant in summer and its inhabitants suffered badly from a range of diseases. In May 1889, after several days of heavy rain, the Cooks River flooded and the areas surrounding Gumbramorra Swamp were soon inundated with water, including the Tramvale estate. Residents were rescued as their homes were severely flooded. The Tramvale estate was consequently abandoned, although the area continued to be used, primarily for industrial and agricultural purposes.

The Gumbramorra Swamp, and other low-lying areas within the district, were systematically drained from the late 1890s. This work was part of a broader scheme for waste water management for Sydney, creating useable land in out-lying districts for residential and industrial purposes. The Sewage Pumping Station 271 (described below) located in the south-west of the study area, and within the former swamp, was designed and built by the Public Works Department in 1889 as part of this broader program. This scheme included the construction of a number of brick and concrete drains, as well as a series of low level sewage pumping stations constructed to transport waste against gravity by means of a series of rising mains. During the early 20th century an open stormwater channel, and later a below-ground stormwater drain ('under construction' in 1917), passed though the Sydenham Triangle (Figure 2-4). In the 1930s the Sydenham Pit (described below) was constructed to deal with overflow from the system, discharging it into the Cooks River.

Figure 2-4: Detail from the c.1917 Municipality Maps Series. SLNSW.



The draining of the Swamp allowed for industrial businesses to utilise the land that was deemed unsuitable for residential development.¹ Industries included potteries, metal work, quarries, and food manufacturing. Brickmaking was still prominent in the area, with many of the former market farms converting their land to brick pits.² The proliferation of the brick business also witnessed the demolition of grand homes, and subdivision of the estates for cheap worker's accommodation was made.

Residential lots from the Smidmore subdivision, in the north-east of the study area, were auctioned in 1906 (Figure 2-7). It is likely that the majority of occupants were employed at the nearby factories and warehouses. The residences associated with the Smidmore subdivision are still present in 1943, prior to demolition in the late 20th century to make way for the present-day warehouses (Figure 2-5).

With the exception of the Smidmore Estate, the study area remained largely industrial in character throughout the early 20th century. By 1910 Marrickville and Sydenham were dominated by iron and woollen works, with residential development continuing in the remaining suitable open areas of land subdivision, mostly for the working class. Dairies were prominent along Edinburgh Road in 1911. Woollen mills, such as Vicars Woollen Mills which was founded in 1893, were located along Victoria Road.³ James Steel Engineering was established in 1915 on Victoria Road. Malco Industries (formerly Malleable Castings Ltd), started in 1915 on Rich Street. The industry was so important to the people of Marrickville that they held annual exhibitions in the town hall.⁴

¹ Fox 1986, 29; Whitaker 2006, 6.

² Meader 2008

³ Cashman & Meader 1990, 168.

⁴ Meader 2008


Figure 2-5: The houses associated with the 1906 Smidmore estate are located between Edinburgh and Murray Streets. NSW Lands and Property Information, SIX Maps.



Figure 2-6: Fraser Park, Sydenham, c. 1947. Source: Marrickville Library & History Services.



Figure 2-7: The Smidmore subdivision, south of Edinburgh Road, is within the study area. NLA image 230293982.



2.1.3 Industrial consolidation

The 1929 Wall Street crash led to many of the industries within Australia, including Marrickville, being affected, with many workers left jobless.⁵ Prior to World War Two the industrial area was consolidated in the low lying areas, but new growth began after the founding of new raw materials for iron and steel works.⁶ Immigration increased after World War Two with the factories and warehouses providing jobs for unskilled workers with little English and cheaper accommodation.⁷

With increased road transport, industries were not relying as heavily on rail transport, resulting in many of the industries in the Marrickville area moving out cheaper sites. In the 1943s aerial, the study area was a mix of residential and light industry (Figure 2-5). By 1970s many of the larger industries within Marrickville had moved out of the Marrickville area, although smaller industries still continue to the present day.

2.1.3.1 Sydney Steel Company

In 1910, the Sydney Steel Company was established on a 22-acre site to the north of the rail line (within the Sydney Metro Trains Facility South Precinct boundary). This was a vast area of vacant land on the fringe of the city, adjacent to the main rail line and located between Sydenham and St Peters stations. Founded by Scottish migrant Alexander Stuart, the former Premier of NSW and Mayor of the former St Peters Council, the large factory was established on Edinburgh Road in Marrickville and supplied steel fabrication and distribution services to Sydney's expanding construction industry in the decades that followed (Figure 2-8).⁸

Figure 2-8: The main workshop at the Edinburgh Road Marrickville Sydney Steel Company factory, 1911. Source. Stuart 2012 *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*.



With merchandising of steel having been an important part of the company's business for several decades, the stockyard was originally laid out at the rear of the main Edinburgh Road workshop in 1913 (Figure 2-9 and Figure 2-10). A steam operated crane was installed in this location to move the stock.

⁵ Whitaker 2006, 13.

⁶ Fox 1986, 30.

⁷ Whitaker 2006, 13.

⁸ Stuart, W. 2012. *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*

Figure 2-9: Photograph of the stockyard at the rear of the Sydney Steel Company workshop, taken from the roof of the workshop looking south towards Sydenham Station, c1913. Source. Stuart 2012 *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*.



Figure 2-10: Photograph of the stockyard at the rear of the Sydney Steel Company workshop, showing steam operated crane, c1913. Source. Stuart 2012 *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*.



Figure 2-11: View of the Sydney Steel Company, Marrickville in 1919. A 44-tonne girder is seen being transported on a custom-made horse drawn limber to a rail siding near Sydenham Station. Source. Stuart 2012 *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*.



Figure 2-12: Employees at work outside Sydney Steel Company, Marrickville in 1922. The train line can be seen in the background. Source. Stuart 2012 *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*.



The post-World War II building boom resulted in significant expansion of the fabrication area at Edinburg Road during the 1950s. The stockyard was relocated adjacent to the rail line, where a giant crane was assembled, and additional buildings were constructed on the vacant land. By 1960, half of the 22-acre site had been developed as covered fabrication area. Sydney Steel Company had, by this time, become one of the largest employers in the suburb of Marrickville.

The factory was responsible for producing steel used in the construction of landmark city structures including the Farmers (now Myer) and David Jones department stores, the AWA Building in York Street, the AMP Building at Circular Quay and the Wentworth Hotel in Phillip Street, Sydney Harbour Bridge, and iconic structures like the MA Noble Stand at the Sydney Cricket Ground and the 250 tonne Hammerhead Crane at Garden Island.⁹

Between 1973 and 1975, Sydney Steel Company relocated to the site of a smaller fabricator and reinforcing supplier located at Revesby. Following closure of the Sydney Steel Company at Marrickville, the site was redeveloped. In 1975, the rear of the site (approximately eight acres) was sold, and the remaining portion of the site was subsequently sold in 1976.

Figure 2-13: Photograph of the Sydney Steel Company in Marrickville in 1948. Source. Stuart 2012 *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*.



⁹ Stuart 2012

Figure 2-14: Photograph of the Sydney Steel Company in Marrickville in 1962, showing crane and buildings on land adjacent to railway line. Source. Stuart 2012 *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*.



2.1.3.2 Sydenham Pit and Drainage Pumping Station

The Sydenham Storage Pit and Pumping Station was designed and built by the New South Wales Public Works Department between 1935 and 1941. The Sydenham Pit and Drainage Pumping Station 1 was constructed during the Great Depression immediately west of the steelworks and east of Garden Street. It remains at the site today and consists of a brick lined drainage pit designed to collect the overflow from stormwater drains in the area. The Eastern Canal is associated with the pit and extends into the study area.

2.1.3.3 Sewage Pumping Station 271

The Sewage Pumping Station 271 was designed and built by the Public Works Department in 1889 as part of a larger program of waste water management within Sydney. The complex consists of a combined boiler house and engine room, a large chimney stack and a residence. The pumping station/boiler house is designed in classic Federation Romanesque style. The residence is an unadorned two storey brick building designed in Federation Queen Anne style and the stack is a local landmark. The station and residence building are in good condition and the fabric is substantially intact. A series of low level sewage pumping stations were constructed to transport waste against gravity by means of a series of rising mains. The low-level portions of Marrickville, Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and St Peters are still serviced by a low level sewer which discharges into the wells of Marrickville Pumping Station. The sewage is then pumped to the high level of the Eastern Branch of the Southern and Western Suburbs Ocean Outfall Scheme (SWOOS). Marrickville SPS also receives stormwater discharge from the Central stormwater channel during certain high tides in the Cooks River.

2.1.3.4 Meeks Road substation

Marrickville Railway Substation was designed and built by NSW Government Railways in 1926. It is located facing south on to the Illawarra Line within the Sydenham Triangle. The site is accessed via

an overbridge via Way St to the south. The site includes the substation building, the switch house, transformers and surrounding electrical equipment.

2.1.3.5 Sydenham Railway Station


Sydenham Station, originally named 'Marrickville Station', was constructed on the first section of the Illawarra Railway line in 1884 (Figure 2-16).¹⁰ The station and associated buildings, including the station masters residence, were designed by the NSW Railways Department. The contract for the construction of the station was awarded to William Robinson in 1883.¹¹

In 1895, following the construction of the present-day Marrickville Station on Illawarra Road, the station was renamed 'Sydenham'. The station originally comprised of two platforms with impressive and detailed platform buildings (Figure 2-15). The station was originally intended to serve the Marrickville township, but it was distant and surrounded by industrial and rural estates.¹²

Consequently, whilst a number of small businesses were established in the area surrounding the station to serve local residents, Sydenham remained relatively underdeveloped in comparison to neighbouring Marrickville.

In 1909 the railway line was extended to Bankstown, and the line from Edgeware Road to Sydenham was quadruplicated. This required the extension of the platforms at Sydenham Station. The railway cutting was widened and the original platforms were transformed into island platforms, requiring the construction of an extended footbridge to allow access. The footbridge was constructed by Dorman Long & Co Ltd., the same company that would engineer the Sydney Harbour Bridge.¹³ The lines were electrified in 1926.

Figure 2-15: 1881 Plan of Marrickville (Sydenham) Station, showing the platform configuration prior to the construction of the Bankstown line. Source: State Records NSW, images 17420_a014_a014_a014000815.



¹⁰ State Heritage Inventory 'Sydenham Railway Station Group', NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage, Parramatta NSW. Accessed 19 June 2016.

¹¹ Australian Town and Country Journal, 15 September 1883. Accessed via TROVE, 29 June 2016.

¹²

State Heritage Inventory 'Sydenham Railway Station Group', NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage, Parramatta NSW. Accessed 19 June 2016.

¹³ *Ibid.*

Figure 2-16: Subdivision plan from 1882 indicating the location of the proposed Illawarra Railway corridor. Source: Marrickville Library & History Services.



3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

3.1 Previous studies

David Scobie Architects Pty Ltd 2012. Sydenham Railway Station. Heritage Impact Statement. Prepared for Arenco (NSW) Pty Ltd.

A TAP upgrade of the station was conducted in 2012 with the removal of the 1980s overhead booking office and footbridge and provision of a new concourse, new lifts and stairs; new canopy structure; and new station building at overbridge level.

Sydney Water 2004. Sydenham Pit & Drainage Pumping Station 1. Draft Conservation Management Plan. Prepared for Sydney Water.

The CMP was commissioned by Sydney Water to provide a conservation and management framework for Sydenham Pit and DPS No.1. The report provides a contextual history of Sydney Water and the legislative background to the management of heritage assets, as well as an assessment of significance and conservation policies specific to the site. The CMP was consulted to understand the elements that constitute the significance of the site and how these would be affected by the project. The project was assessed against the relevant conservation policies of the CMP. The CMP is a draft report which was not endorsed by the Heritage Council.

The CMP did not identify archaeological potential for the item.

Historical evidence suggests that the site was probably once used for crop growing or livestock grazing purposes. The land was resumed from Sydney Steel Co. to make way for the construction of the pit. As the land was excavated, to make way for Sydenham Pit, it is unlikely that the area would contain potential historical archaeology. There is a potential that the site contains evidence of the construction activities for the pit; i.e. tools, materials, but if this existed it would be most likely contained beneath the Pit base and walls. (Page 77)

Sydney Water 2005. Sewage Pumping Station SP0271. Conservation Management Plan. Prepared for Sydney Water.

The CMP was commissioned by Sydney Water to provide a conservation and management framework for the Sewage Pumping Station SP0271. The CMP outlines the history of the site and identifies the item as having historical and aesthetic significance as a landmark item with important architectural values. No archaeological values are identified. The CMP was endorsed by the Heritage Council in 2005 with an expiry of 2010.

The CMP did not identify archaeological potential for the item.

There is no evidence to suggest the likelihood of any physical remains of any other activity than these typical uses of the item and the site. There is thus only a limited potential for the survival of historical archaeological remains ('relics', under the NSW Heritage Act 1977). Any surviving remains are likely to be fragmentary and disturbed by later uses and services in this area of the site. Their potential to provide additional information regarding the history of the site is likely to be limited. (Page 82)

3.2 Land use summary

The historical development of the study area can be divided into the following phases of activity:

- Phase 1 (1799 – 1840s) early land grants: Gumbramorra Swamp, large residential estates, farms and rural retreats.
- Phase 2 (1840s – 1880) scattered residential and industrial settlement: Swamp Road (now Sydenham Road) established, farms, brickmakers and stockmen utilise swamp.
- Phase 3 (1880 – 1909) arrival of the tramway, railway, residential subdivisions and scattered industrial settlement: Establishment of the Smidmore Estate, Gumbramorra Swamp systematically drained, railway arrives in 1895.
- Phase 4 (1909 – present) rail line extension, Sydenham Pit and Pumping Station and associated drainage channels, Meeks Road substation, Sewage Pumping Station SP0271 and Sydney Steel Company established, line from Edgeware Road to Sydenham quadruplicated, railway cutting widened.

Construction of the railway station and rail line in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century would have included a considerable amount of ground disturbance and excavation. Rail corridor upgrades throughout the twentieth century and the construction of the Sydenham Pit and Pumping Station and surrounding warehouses would have resulted in high levels of subsurface impacts throughout the area.

3.3 Potential archaeological remains

3.3.1 Phase 1 (1788 – 1840s)

There is no evidence of structures located within the study area during this phase. Archaeological remains associated with early agricultural land use near marginal swamp land may include tree boles, field drains, fence line postholes, imported garden soils and isolated refuse deposits/rubbish pits. The likelihood of remains from this period surviving is low.

3.3.2 Phase 2 (1840s – 1880s)

There is no documentary evidence of specific industrial activities taking place within the study area during this phase. Structures associated with King's Garden, in the south-west of the study area, were located further south, on Unwin's Bridge Road. Archaeological remains associated with grazing and land drainage, such as fence line postholes, drainage channels, land fill, and isolated artefacts from this phase, if present, are likely to have been disturbed by later construction works. The likelihood of remains from this period surviving is low.

3.3.3 Phase 3 (1880s – 1909)

There is low to moderate potential for archaeological remains associated with the early phase of railway infrastructure such as ceramic and wooden service pipes, brick drainage pits, electrical conduits and pits, stanchion bases, sleepers and rail track to be located within the rail corridor on the south eastern side of the study area.

The study area has low-moderate potential to contain archaeological remains associated with the draining of the swampland commencing in the late 19th century. Evidence of this drainage scheme may include subsurface brick, concrete and terracotta drains and former land-drains (likely concrete or similar). As these drains continued to be used into the 20th century (and may possibly still be in use), they are unlikely to contain intact soil deposits with research potential. There is low potential that artefactual remains associated with the construction of the drainage system remain within the drain cuts and backfilled soils.

3.3.4 Phase 4 (1909 – present)

Archaeological remains associated with rail line upgrades such as utilities and drainage may be present but as the rail line has undergone maintenance and upgrades, any remains are likely to be fragmentary and no longer in situ.

The location of the Sydney Steel Company and yards have been subject to development of warehouses and infrastructure since its decommissioning. Manufacturing would have largely occurred in the factory itself which was constructed on a slab. It is therefore unlikely evidence of the manufacturing process or workers would remain. Archaeological remains in the yard section of the factory are likely to have been impacted by previous development, and would largely have consisted of incidental remains such as offcuts which may not have survived. There is a low potential that remains of crane footings, the steam crane tracks in the rear yard, or footings of other structures may remain beneath the existing warehouse slabs. The steam crane track was elevated on fill therefore it is probable it was removed during levelling in preparation for the construction of existing warehouses.. Any remains are more likely to be in the northern section of the Sydney Steel Company site as the southern section vacant until around 1950 and was not the focus of the operation.

There is moderate evidence that remains associated with the former Smidmore Estate may remain in the north-eastern portion of the study area, below the present-day warehouses. Remains are likely to be typical of those associated with early to mid-20th century residential development, including brick and concrete footings and remnant floor treatments. Artefacts and occupation deposits are rarely found in structures of this date. There is some potential for rubbish pits and other domestic refuse deposits (yard scatters, outhouses) to be located in the rear yards of the properties. This potential, however, is low, due to the introduction of municipal rubbish collection and sewage services in the 1880s.

3.4 Summary of archaeological potential

Previous assessments have provided historic context and a description of archaeological potential in the study area. A summary of the archaeological potential and significance of those remains is provided in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1: Summary of potential archaeological resources and significance

| Phase | Likely archaeological remains | Potential |
|------------------|--|-----------|
| 1 (1788 – 1840s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">No documentary evidence of specific activities or development with the siteArchaeological remains associated with low intensity land use associated with early agricultural use may include tree boles, field drains, fence line postholes, imported garden soils and isolated artefact scatters. | Nil-low |

| Phase | Likely archaeological remains | Potential |
|--------------------|---|--------------|
| 2 (1840s – 1880s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No documentary evidence of specific industrial activities within the site Archaeological remains associated with low intensity land use associated with early agricultural use may include tree boles, field drains, fence line postholes, imported garden soils and isolated artefact scatters. | Nil-low |
| 3 (1880s – 1909) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological remains associated with the early phase of railway infrastructure and the development of Sydenham Station, such as ceramic and wooden service pipes, brick drainage pits, electrical conduits and pits, stanchion bases, sleepers and rail track Archaeological remains associated with the late 1890s drainage program including drainage associated with the SWOSS and Marrickville Sewerage Pumping Station may include subsurface brick, concrete and terracotta drains and former land-drains. Low potential for artefactual remains. | Low-moderate |
| 4 (1909 – present) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological remains associated with rail line upgrades such as utilities and drainage and structural remains associated with former warehouses Low potential for remains associated with the Sydney Steel Company, such as building and/or crane footings, steam crane and line, offcuts, refuse from manufacturing processes. These would most likely be present on the northern section of the former Sydney Steel Company site. Remains associated with the Smidmore Estate residential subdivision may include footings. Low potential for artefactual remains. These remains are unlikely to reach the threshold of local significance. | Low-Moderate |

3.5 Archaeological significance

The previous reporting provided the following assessment of significance for the archaeology of the study area:

Table 3-2: Assessment of archaeological significance for Sydney Metro Trains Facility South Precinct

| Criteria | Discussion |
|---|--|
| Research potential | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is highly unlikely that archaeological remains associated with Phase 1 and Phase 2 would be present within the site and they are unlikely to have research potential Potential archaeological remains associated with the Sydney Steel Company site may give insight into early 20th century industrial development, manufacturing techniques and structural layouts. <p>Archaeological remains associated with Phase 4 may have local significance under this criterion.</p> |
| Association with individuals, events or groups of historical importance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of the rail network facilitated economic development and suburban growth in Sydney in the latter half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Illawarra line was constructed in 1881 and was extended to accommodate the Bankstown line between (1895-1939). The potential Phase 3 archaeological remains are associated with the historical development of the Illawarra and Bankstown rail lines The potential archaeological Phase 4 remains associated with the Sydney Steel Company site are associated with Alexander Stuart, who was a Scottish-born merchant and politician who became Premier of New South Wales in 1883. The factory produced steel for the Sydney Harbour Bridge, numerous landmark buildings in Sydney and iconic structures including the Garden Island |

| Criteria | Discussion |
|--|---|
| | <p>Hammerhead Crane. It was also one of the first major factories constructed after the Gumbramorra Swamp was drained.</p> <p>Archaeological remains associated with Phases 3 and 4 may have local significance under this criterion.</p> |
| Aesthetic or technical significance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential archaeological remains from Phase 1 and 2 are not likely to have aesthetic value • The remains of Phase 3 former rail infrastructure may demonstrate changes in technology and rail engineering over time. However, they are not expected to demonstrate technical significance • Evidence of the Phase 3 swamp drainage, and associated works, would have technical significance • Any remains of Phase 4 steel works structures and rail infrastructure may demonstrate changes in technology and rail engineering over time. <p>Archaeological remains associated with Phases 3 and 4 may have local significance under this criterion.</p> |
| Ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential archaeological remains are not considered to have the ability to illustrate the historical development of the surrounding area. |

4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT

4.1 Summary of Archaeological Impacts and Management

A summary of impacts and the recommended archaeological management strategies are shown in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1: Archaeological impacts and management strategies in the study area

| Potential archaeological resource | Significance | Archaeological potential | Proposed impact | Archaeological Management |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Phase 1 (1788 – 1840s) | Unlikely to reach threshold of local significance | Nil-Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enabling works Site preparation Support operations Facilities construction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unexpected Finds Procedure |
| Phase 2 (1840s – 1880s) | Unlikely to reach threshold of local significance | Nil-Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enabling works Site preparation Support operations Facilities construction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unexpected Finds Procedure |
| Phase 3 (1880s – 1909) | Local (Development of the railway and swamp drainage) | Low- Moderate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enabling works Site preparation Support operations Facilities construction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unexpected Finds Procedure |
| Phase 4 (1909 – present) | Local (Sydney Steel Company) | Low – moderate for rail line and Smidmore Estate, low for Sydney Steel Company | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enabling works Site preparation Support operations Facilities construction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unexpected Finds Procedure |

4.2 Research Design

4.2.1 Historic themes

Historical themes are a way of describing important processes or activities which have significantly contributed to Australian history. Historical themes are described at a national and state level. The Heritage Council of NSW has prepared a list of state historic themes relevant to the demographic, economic and cultural development of the state (Heritage Council 2006). The use of these themes provides historical context in order to allow archaeological items to be understood in a wider historical context.

Table 4-2: Historic themes for study area

| Australian theme | NSW theme | Explanatory Notes | Comments |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| 3. Developing local, regional and national economies | Agriculture | Activities relating to the cultivation and rearing of plant and animal species, usually for commercial purposes, can include aquaculture | The acquisition and use of the land by Thomas Moore and later Dr Robert Wardell was notable in the early history of Sydney for its size. |
| 3. Developing local, regional and national economies | Industry | Activities associated with the manufacture, production and distribution of goods | The Sydney Steel company was associated with Alexander Stuart, the former Premier of NSW and Mayor of the former St Peters Council. The company was responsible for producing steel used in the construction of the Sydney Dental Hospital, the Sydney Morning Herald building, Qantas building, Sydney harbour Bridge, and Sydney Cricket Ground. |
| 3. Developing local, regional and national economies | Transport | Activities associated with the moving of people and goods from one place to another, and systems for the provision of such movements | The corridor which the study area partially encroaches into has been a rail corridor since 1881 and undergone periodic improvements. |
| 4. Building settlements, towns and cities | Utilities | Activities associated with the provision of services, especially on a communal basis | The study area contains Sydenham Pit, which is an item of State significance with high technical values. |
| 9. Marking the phases of life | Persons | Activities of, and associations with, identifiable individuals, families and communal groups | The study area sits partly on land owned and exploited by Thomas Moore, Dr Robert Wardell, and Alexander Stuart. |

4.2.2 Research questions

Archaeological resources within the study area have the potential to answer a number of research questions. Additional research questions may be added if the archaeological resource allows for further, or more in-depth, investigation. The following research questions have been provided to guide the archaeological investigative program.

- Is there remaining evidence of land use practices associated with early 18th century farming on the edges of marginal swamps and if so, how is this expressed in the archaeological record?
- Are any expressions of early rural use similar to, or noticeably different from other similar sites near Sydney?
- Were the smaller rural holdings on the edges of Moore's land occupied by their owners, such as John Fincham or James Waine?
- Are the industrial process of the Sydney Steel Company interpretable within the archaeological record?

- Can the spatial layout of the Sydney Steel Company's operations be discerned within the archaeological record?
- Are successive phases of railway development present within the archaeological record?
- If successive phases of railway development are present in the archaeological record, are they able to provide insight into changing rail technology or utilisation of utilities associated with rail corridors in Sydney?

4.3 Archaeological Management

The study area would be managed under the Metro Unexpected Finds Procedure.

There is a nil-low potential for remains associated with Phases 1 and 2 (low intensity land use and development) to be impacted. If remains exist their location is not predictable, therefore the unexpected finds procedure is appropriate and in adherence to the archaeological management framework outlined in the project ARD (Artefact 2016b).

There is a low-moderate potential for remains associated with the infill of the Gumbramorra Swamp and construction of the early rail line to be impacted by the project. As the location of any intact deposits from Phase 3 is difficult to predict, and remains are likely to be dispersed the unexpected finds procedure is appropriate and in adherence to the archaeological management framework outlined in the project ARD (Artefact 2016b).

There is a low-moderate potential that Phase 4 remains associated with the development of the rail line and Smidmore Estate would be located within the modification area. It is unlikely these remains would reach the threshold of local significance. There is a low potential that locally significant remains of the Sydney Steel Company would be present. The archaeological management framework outlined in the project ARD states that areas with low potential for locally significant archaeology would be managed under the unexpected finds procedure.

4.3.1 Unexpected Finds Procedure

Unexpected archaeological finds would be managed under the Sydney Metro Unexpected Heritage Finds Procedure.

4.3.2 Heritage induction

Archaeological heritage would be included in the general project induction for all personnel. At a minimum, this would include an overview of the projects obligations and archaeological management requirements, the role of the archaeological team and the unexpected finds procedure.

4.3.3 Further archaeological investigation

If significant archaeological remains are identified as an unexpected find, an Archaeological Work Method Statement (AMS) would be prepared and recommendations would be made on appropriate archaeological management.

The project ARD (Artefact 2016b) outlines the appropriate methodology for archaeological investigation and reporting. This methodology would be followed under the modification.

4.3.4 Excavation director

Archaeological investigations would be managed by a suitably qualified Excavation Director with experience in the historical archaeology of Sydney and identification. The Excavation Director should meet the NSW Heritage Division criteria for locally significant archaeological sites.

5.0 REFERENCES

Arcadis, 2017, Chatswood to Sydenham: Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South Modification Report

Artefact Heritage 2017, Sydney Metro City & Southwest Sydenham to Bankstown Technical Paper 3 Non-Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment

Artefact Heritage, 2016a, Sydney Metro City & Southwest – Chatswood to Sydenham Technical Paper 4 Non-Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment

Artefact Heritage 2016b, Sydney Metro City & Southwest Chatswood to Sydenham – Historical Archaeological Assessment and Research Design

Bickford, A and Sullivan, S 1984. 'Assessing the research potential of historic sites', in Sullivan, S & Bowdler, S (eds) *Site surveys and significance assessment in Australian archaeology*, Department of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra.

Cashman, Richard and C. Meader 1990 *Marrickville, rural outpost to inner city*. Hale & Iremonger.

David Scobie Architects Pty Ltd 2012. *Sydenham Railway Station. Heritage Impact Statement*. Prepared for Arenco (NSW) Pty Ltd.

ICOMOS 2011. *Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties*.

McKillop, B. 2016 The Railways of Sydney: Shaping the City and its Commerce. Accessed via the dictionaryofsydney.org, 26 June 2016

Meader, C. 2008 "Sydenham" Dictionary of Sydney.

Muir, L. 2013. "From a fine stream to an industrial watercourse" Dictionary of Sydney. Accessed online at: http://dictionaryofsydney.org/entry/from_a_fine_stream_to_an_industrial_watercourse 27/02/2017.

NSW Heritage Office 2002. *Assessing Heritage Significance*. Update to the *NSW Heritage Manual*.

NSW Heritage Office 2009. *Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and 'Relics'*.

NSW State Heritage Inventory, NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage, Parramatta, NSW. "Sydenham Railway Station Group"

Stuart, W. 2012. *Sydney Steel: An Illustrated History of the Sydney Steel Company 1910-1979*

Sydney Water 2004. *Sydenham Pit & Drainage Pumping Station 1. Draft Conservation Management Plan*. Prepared for Sydney Water.

Sydney Water 2005. *Sewage Pumping Station SP0271. Conservation Management Plan*. Prepared for Sydney Water.



artefact

Artefact Heritage

ABN 73 144 973 526

Level 4, Building B

35 Saunders Street

Pymont NSW 2009

Australia

+61 2 9518 8411

office@artefact.net.au

www.artefact.net.au

Appendix 5 – Environmental Control Map



Legend

Project Boundary

Drainage

Heritage Item/Place

Sensitive Receiver

Key Environmental Risks & Controls

No works are permitted outside the red project boundary or within protected areas

Report all incidents and any complaints

Notify Environment Manager any unusual finds (odours, discoloured soil, asbestos, remains, and suspected artefacts)

SOIL AND WATER:

Hazardous substances must be stored correctly to prevent spills

ERSED controls to be installed as per this SEP and the Erosion and Sedimentation control plans (ESCP) and report damaged controls

No mud/ sediment to be tracked outside the site area

FLORA AND FAUNA

No vegetation to be impacted

WASTE:

Place rubbish in appropriate bins, do not litter

Waste must only be disposed off site at licenced waste facilities, meaning they must hold an Environment Protection Licence to receive waste

IMPORTING MATERIALS:

Obtain reports/ certificate for all imported material prior to delivery to site. The paperwork must be checked by the Environment Team to ensure it meets EPA requirements

AIR QUALITY:

Dust suppression measures must be used to prevent impacting nearby residents and all loads must be covered

NOISE AND VIBRATION:

Standard construction hours are 7am to 6pm M-F; 8am—1pm Sat – all Out of Hours Works are subject to approval in accordance with the Conditions of Approval and EPL

No works Sundays or Public Holidays

No idling or parking outside residential properties

High noise impact works only permitted 8am to 5pm M-F; 8am to 1pm

Sat and in continuous blocks not exceeding 3 hours each with a minimum respite of 1 hour between each block

TRAFFIC:

Parking only within designated areas and use only approved haul routes

No queuing in residential streets before or after hours

HERITAGE:

Approved works only in Heritage Areas

| Key Contacts | | |
|-----------------|---|--------------|
| Cameron Newling | Environmental Manager | 0419 727 445 |
| Ian Butler | Utilities Manager | 0409 412 394 |
| Paul Field | Construction Manager | 02 9867 4211 |
| Sanjin Muhic | Stakeholder and Community Relations Manager | 0447 186 803 |

SSJ-ECM-Pre-Construction Minor Works Centre Portion Rev04.docx

Appendix 6 – Community Notification

NOTIFICATION – SYDENHAM METRO UPGRADE | WEEKEND WORK 26 – 28 MAY 2018

Sydney Metro is Australia's biggest public transport project.

Services start in 2019 in the city's North West with a train every four minutes in the peak. Metro rail will be extended into the CBD and beyond to Bankstown in 2024. Sydney Metro includes new CBD railway stations underground at Martin Place, Pitt Street and Barangaroo and new metro platforms under Central.

In 2024, Sydney Metro will have 31 stations on a new 66km rail system – the biggest urban rail project in Australian history. Sydney Metro will have ultimate capacity for a train every two minutes in each direction under the CBD.

John Holland Pty Ltd and Laing O'Rourke Australia Construction Pty Ltd has been awarded the contract for major railway work at Sydenham as part of Sydney Metro, including the upgrade of Sydenham Station.

Out of hours work

Early work to upgrade Sydenham Station to metro standards is underway. Work to locate and inspect existing and install new underground services around Sydenham Station has started. Work will continue during a scheduled weekend rail shutdown from **2am Saturday 26 May to 2am Monday 28 May 2018** when trains are not running.

Equipment used during this work will include vacuum suction trucks, elevated work platforms, small excavators, drilling equipment, road sweepers, construction and traffic vehicles, watercarts, various power and hand tools. In preparation for this work, equipment will be delivered to work sites adjacent to and into the rail corridor on **Friday 25 May** between **6pm and 10pm** and removed **Monday 28 May 2018** between **7am and 6pm** via the rail access gates shown on the map over the page.

Work will involve:

- geotechnical testing of ground conditions
- excavation and installation of new service routes and signalling infrastructure within the rail corridor
- visual inspections and surveying of existing service pits and to confirm location of existing service routes
- pre-construction condition surveys at Sydenham Station, structures within the rail corridor.


What to expect:

- traffic control and signage will be in place for the safety of workers and the community
- some noise will be generated from these activities
- access to buildings and driveways will be maintained at all times
- there will be an increase in light vehicle movements around the local area
- six parking spaces will be periodically removed during the weekend along Burrows Avenue junction with Railway Road
- you will notice workers, plant and equipment inside the rail corridor, along Bolton Street, Railway Road intersection with Burrows Avenue, Lower Railway Parade and along the rails access gates as shown on the map over the page.

Thank you for your cooperation while we complete this essential work.

If you have any questions please contact Andie Pitsiari on **1800 171 386** (24 hour community information line) or SydenhamMetro@transport.nsw.gov.au.

Sydenham Station - work location



Appendix 7 – OEH Correspondence

Newling, Cameron (SSJ)

From: Sarah Jane Brazil <SarahJane.Brazil@environment.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 23 May 2018 3:45 PM
To: Newling, Cameron (SSJ)
Cc: Turner, Ron; Tim Smith; Siobhan Lavelle; Alexander Timms
Subject: Sydney Metro City and Southwest - Sydenham Station and Junction Works - Heritage Division comments

Dear Cameron

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to comment on the Early Works at Sydenham Station and Junction before finalisation of the Construction Heritage Management Plan (CHMP). This consultation is carried out in accordance with the Conditions of Approval for the approved Metro Project, City & Southwest Chatswood to Sydenham SSI 7400.

A review of the *Sydenham Station and Junction Minor Works 004, Heritage Impact Assessment* (Purcell and Extent Heritage, 4 May 2018) has been carried out and the following comments are made.

Review of the proposed works indicates that there is low archaeological potential in this area and no significant heritage fabric would be affected. The proposed mitigation measures for the works include:

- Sydney Metro Unexpected Finds Procedure V1.4
- Photographic archival recording to be completed prior to the works
- Sydenham pit would be drained and cleaned by Sydney Water prior to investigation work

The proposed mitigation measures for these works are considered adequate. Based on the limited nature of the works and the lack of heritage impact, the proposed investigation works at Sydenham Station are considered acceptable.

For future correspondence, please ensure it is submitted to heritagemailbox@environment.nsw.gov.au Also, It would be appreciated if you could clearly outline the required response timeframes in your submission.

Regards



Office of
Environment
& Heritage

Sarah Jane Brazil
Senior Team Leader
Major Projects

Level 6, 10 Valentine Ave, Parramatta
PO Box A290, Sydney South 2000
T 02 9585 6510

From: "Newling, Cameron (SSJ)" <Cameron.Newling@jhlorjv.com.au>
To: "Tim Smith" <Tim.Smith@environment.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Sydney Metro City and Southwest - Sydenham Station and Junction Works

Hi Tim

Further to my previous correspondence regarding the Construction Heritage Management Plan, JHLOR are proposing to undertake low impact works within the heritage curtilage of Sydenham Station and the Sydenham Pit prior to the approval of the Construction Environmental Management Plan and associated Sub Plans. The works would involve the following:

Sydenham Station

- Pothole investigation of utilities and existing services in platforms 3,4,5,6
- Geotechnical borehole drilling within station precinct
- Installation of GST route to run underneath the coping on platform 6
- Construction of pit and pipe buried cable route through platform 5 as part of the Combined Services Route. This involves saw cutting the asphalt platform surface, undertaking non-destructive digging, surveying of services and reinstating with cold asphalt mix to match the existing.
- Installation of 2 signalling location cases either end of the station (not on the platforms)

Sydenham Pit

- Up to 9 boreholes in and around the Sydenham Pit outside of the fabric of the sandstone retaining walls

These works are required in order to inform the design process and to mitigate future program risk associated with the segregation of the Bankstown Line from Sydney Metro.

JHLOR are seeking determination from the DP&E that these works can continue outside the definition of construction subject to consultation with OEH and the application of applicable mitigation measures. A Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared by Purcell and Extent and is contained in Appendix 1 of the attached Minor Works Application that JHLOR have submitted to Sydney Metro for Approval. The HIA rated all of the proposed activities as having either neutral, minor or negligible impact.

Can you please review the attached and provide any comments at your earliest convenience.

Thanks

Cameron Newling

Environment Manager

Sydenham Station and Junction Project (SSJ)

John Holland Laing O'Rourke Joint Venture

Level 6, 52 Phillip Street, Sydney, 2000

mobile: +61 419 727 445

email: cameron.newling@jhlorjv.com.au

This email is intended for the addressee(s) named and may contain confidential and/or privileged information.

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and then delete it immediately.

Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender except where the sender expressly and with authority states them to be the views of the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage.

PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL

Appendix 8 - Environmental Representative Supporting Letter