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<tr>
<th>Term</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHD</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>approx.</td>
<td>Approximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;DHHS</td>
<td>The Berry and District Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal slopes</td>
<td>Slopes which represent the relative lower proportion of the relief within a gully, valley, spur, ridge or range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDLCA</td>
<td>Berry District Landscape Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTUCA</td>
<td>Berry Township Urban Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Circa (from latin meaning <em>around about</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.f.</td>
<td>Compare (an abbreviation for the latin word <em>confer</em> meaning bring together)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Cultural landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co.</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>All the processes of looking after a heritage item or place so as to retain its cultural significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>The highway corridor is the operational phase, RMS owned and controlled land (the road reserve) on which the proposal is situated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural significance</td>
<td>Aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtilage</td>
<td>The area around a building or heritage item, often used in regard to conservation management to mean a minimum area of open space required to maintain landscape and contextual values of the enclosed item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMR</td>
<td>Department of Main Roads [former state government department responsible for main roads]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eds</td>
<td>Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP&amp;A Act</td>
<td>The NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et al.</td>
<td><em>et alii</em> (from latin meaning <em>and others</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>All the physical material of a heritage item or place including components, fixtures, contents, and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible</td>
<td>In the context of impact mitigation, the term feasible means an action or structure which is practically and/or technologically possible without regard to fiscal constraints (Roads and Maritime Service defined meaning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig</td>
<td>Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial</td>
<td>Processes. landforms and deposits associated with rivers, streams and creeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Gerringong to Bomaderry [often used as being a prefix to heritage recording numbers H1 – H89]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway corridor</td>
<td>The area of the highway road reserve. The reserve area of the existing highway, or of the proposed and upgraded highway may be referred to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIP</td>
<td>Heritage Impact Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holocene</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ie</td>
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<td>Igneous</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>Situated in original and undisturbed position (from latin meaning <em>in place</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfluve</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBRC</td>
<td>Jaspers Brush Reunion Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>Kilometre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latite</td>
<td>A volcanic rock formed when magma cools, either on the surface or below the ground. It typically contains low amounts of quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Local Environmental Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltd.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metamorphic</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>No date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOHC</td>
<td>Navin Officer Heritage Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWLA</td>
<td>New South Wales Legislative Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEH</td>
<td>Office of Environment and Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>The geological epoch which lasted from about 2.6 million to around 12,000 years ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal boundary</td>
<td>The edge of all construction and ancillary related works required by the proposal, including the construction footprint, upgraded highway corridor and ancillary areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal corridor</td>
<td>That area that will form the road reserve of the upgraded and operational highway (this category excludes ancillary areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pty.</td>
<td>Propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary</td>
<td>The Quaternary is the most recent of the three periods of the Cenozoic Era in the geologic time scale. It spans from approximately 2.6 million years ago to the present. It includes two epochs, the Pleistocene and the Holocene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>In the context of impact mitigation, the term reasonable means where a structure or the conduct of an action falls within justifiable fiscal and practical constraints, relative to the value of the objective to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP</td>
<td>Regional Environmental Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Roads and Maritime Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA</td>
<td>Roads and Traffic Authority [now the Roads and Maritime Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedimentary</td>
<td>Of or relating to sediment, especially when referring to rock or deposits which have formed from sediment deposited and sorted by water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHS</td>
<td>Shoalhaven Family History Society Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICPH CL</td>
<td>Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spur</td>
<td>A lateral descending projection from a hill, ridge or mountain. A spur is generally of smaller size and of a lesser order than a ridge or range. [also spurline]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>The arrangement of the natural and artificial physical features of an area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuff</td>
<td>A rock formed by the accumulation of volcanic ash [also tuffaceous]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFP</td>
<td>Unexpected Finds Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewshed</td>
<td>An area of land, water or other, which is visible to the human eye from a fixed vantage point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed</td>
<td>A line, or typically the crest of a ridgeline, that separates neighbouring drainage basins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

The proposal

Roads and Maritime Services of NSW (RMS) is undertaking an assessment under Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) for the upgrade of about 11.5 kilometres of the Princes Highway between Schofields Lane (south of Berry) and Cambewarra Road, Bomaderry (the proposal). The proposal would provide a four lane divided highway (two lanes in each direction) with median separation.

The proposal is one of a series of upgrades to sections of the Princes Highway which aims to provide at least a four-lane divided highway between Waterfall and Jervis Bay Road, Falls Creek. This would improve road safety and traffic efficiency, including for freight, on the NSW South Coast.

This technical paper was commissioned by AECOM and informs a review of environmental factors for the proposal which documents the environmental impact assessment required under Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (EP&A Act) 1979.

Methodology

The methodology for this assessment included:

- A documentary and database review including former heritage studies and current statutory and non-statutory registers.
- Compilation of an historical overview.
- Archaeological survey and field inspection of the proposal area.
- Documentation of survey and excavation results.
- Assessment of Significance and Impact according to NSW Heritage Branch guidelines.

Field inspection results

Thirty nine non-Aboriginal (European) field recordings were made within the proposal area, or within 200 metres of the proposal boundary. A description of each recording is contained within the body of the report. The following is a summary of the field recordings.

- Two remnants of the 1858/69 Berry Estate road between Bomaderry and Broughton Creek (Berry).
- One highway bridge.
- Three remnant twentieth century portions of former Princes Highway.
- Two public school buildings and associated residences.
- One former 1880s public (tent) school site with potential to include archaeological deposits.
- The site of the former Meroo Meadow Hall.
- The Meroo Meadow Union Church.
- A former agricultural water reservoir and pipeline easement constructed as part of the Berry Estate swamp reclamation scheme.
- Ten former Berry Estate farms. One recording includes substantially modified Berry estate tenant farm building remains. Five recordings consist of only potential archaeological deposits from the Berry Estate era. Four include standing farm buildings and structures which post-date the Estate and may also include earlier potential archaeological deposits.
- Eleven post Berry Estate farm houses, cottages or building complexes.
The site of two former local Dairy Co. factories.
Three road side tree plantings.
One cultural landscape, the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland.

Five of these heritage items are included on existing statutory heritage listings.

Significance assessment
Of the 39 field recordings:

- Eight have been found to fall below the significance thresholds defined within the assessment criteria. These recordings are not classed as heritage items and are not considered further with regard potential impact and impact mitigation.
- Eight cannot be given definitive assessments until the nature of predicted archaeological deposits are confirmed through test and/or salvage excavation. These items have been given indicative assessments of local context significance, subject to confirmation.
- The remaining 23 items are assessed as having heritage significance within a local context, according to one or more of the specified significance criteria.

All field recordings with assessed cultural heritage significance, known or indicative, have been classed as heritage items. There are thirty one heritage items.

Summary of proposal impact
Of the 31 heritage items, 18 would not be directly impacted, eight would be, or potentially be, partially impacted, and two would be, or potentially be, wholly impacted. The extent of direct impact is not known for three items.

Of those not directly impacted (18), seven would be subject to indirect impacts relating to their landscape and/or visual contexts.

All heritage items subject to direct impact are of an assessed local scale of significance.

The proposal would impact upon the heritage values of the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape by the imposition of a modern structural component onto the landscape. The degree and severity of this imposition would vary. The proposal would not significantly alter the pre-existing impact because the current highway alignment would be maintained with only minor changes to curves. Similarly, the vertical alignment of the highway has in many places been substantially modified from the natural gradient. The major differences would a substantially wider highway corridor, and elevated components at interchanges such as overpasses and on ramps and off ramps.

None of the potential ancillary areas include heritage recordings. In seven instances the potential ancillary areas are situated adjacent to a heritage recording, six of which are heritage items.
Impact mitigation and management

The impact mitigation and management actions proposed for heritage items affected by the proposal fall into seven broad categories:

- Avoid direct impact where item falls either outside of proposal boundary (eleven items), or within boundary (two items).
- Manage indirect impacts (visual and contextual) only (seven items).
- Commemorate and interpret (no archival recording or excavation required) (one item).
- Conduct archival recordings and then as necessary, mitigate, and where feasible and reasonable, minimise impact (including replacing tree plantings, and relocation of an entrance gateway) (five items).
- Conduct archaeological test and/or salvage excavation, as necessary and where necessary prior to impact (four items).
- Avoid direct and indirect impact to heritage items related to the positioning and use of ancillary areas (five items).
- Manage cultural landscape values (one landscape item).

In addition, the instigation of fenced off, no-go areas if feasible and reasonable is proposed in order to identify on-site constraints and as a precaution against accidental or peripheral physical damage to items in close proximity to construction activities.

Recommendations

A suite of management strategies have been recommended with the aim of either avoiding or mitigating the impact of the proposal. The following is a summary of the management strategies.

Avoidance of direct impact

A large number of heritage items are located outside of the proposal area and would not be impacted. Impact to these items should be avoided when the location of sites for ancillary facilities areas are determined.

Establishment of temporary fencing and ‘no go’ areas

If feasible and reasonable temporary fencing should be erected between construction zones and the remaining un-impacted portions, with the aim of defining ‘no go’ areas. Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.

Management of impact to heritage tree plantings

Where, and if feasible and reasonable, impact to the large trees in three tree alignment recordings should be avoided. Trees that can be retained should be fenced off and defined as no-go areas. All plantings subject to impact should, be archivally recorded and their age determined. Where impact is substantial, replacement plantings should be established.

Management of built structures

The entrance gateway to ‘Pomona’ should be relocated to a location on the revised property boundary.
Management of known or potential archaeological deposits

Where feasible and reasonable, potential archaeological deposits should be avoided, and where necessary fenced off as no-go areas.

A program of archaeological test excavation should be conducted within those portions of six sites within the construction footprint of the proposal. Based on the findings of this program, any further necessary management actions should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include salvage excavation and/or providing some form of site interpretation.

Under the NSW Heritage Act 1977 a Section 140 excavation permit will be required to undertake the subsurface archaeological investigations.

Archival recording

An archival recording should be conducted at five sites prior to any clearing, demolition of construction impact.

Management of visual and contextual impacts

Visual and contextual impacts (including viewsheds, noise and artificial light), to and from heritage items should be variously mitigated through urban design and/or the maintenance or establishment of appropriate vegetation and/or creation of other appropriate barriers or curtilages.

Where feasible and reasonable the upgraded highway corridor boundary should be varied so that effective open space or plantings are retained in front of buildings.

Commemoration and interpretation

The location of the former Meroo Meadow public hall (G2B H67), and where warranted, the following sites should be the subject of public interpretation in an appropriate form and method: G2B H68, 75, 80, 81, 88 and 91.

The cultural values of the proposal area should be promoted, interpreted and presented to current and future public audiences using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP).

The Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Landscape

Where feasible and reasonable, the construction and finishing of the proposal corridor should be conducted in such a way to minimise and ameliorate adverse visual impacts, and facilitate the re-establishment of appropriate vegetation.

It is recommended that local cultural heritage themes be considered in the design of artistic elements to be incorporated or commissioned for the proposal, especially at locations in close association to places of heritage significance.

Ancillary areas

In order to avoid direct or indirect impacts to heritage items which adjoin potential ancillary areas it is recommended that the root zones of adjacent trees with heritage significance be defined as no-go areas.

Unexpected Finds Protocol

In the event that unexpected cultural heritage finds are encountered during proposal construction then the RMS Unexpected Finds Procedure should be adopted and followed. The Procedure should be included within a Construction Environmental Management Plan or equivalent document.
Listing on RMS Section 170 register

RMS should consider entering onto the RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register, all heritage items which, following the end of construction, remain wholly, or in part, within the proposal corridor. Any conservation or management requirements of listed items should be determined and adopted.

Statutory requirements regarding the conduct of archival recordings and archaeological excavation

The conduct of archival recordings, of all archaeological excavations, and the lodgement of reports should comply with the standards and guidelines prepared by the NSW Heritage Council and the Heritage Branch of the Office of Environment and Heritage.

Incorporation within construction and heritage management plans

The recommended management strategies and actions outlined in this report should be incorporated into any relevant construction related management plans such as a Construction Management Plan or Cultural Heritage Management Plan.

Induction of site workers

An outline of the cultural heritage management strategies outlined in this report should be included as part of compulsory induction courses for site workers during construction.
1 Introduction

1.1 Background

This technical paper was commissioned by AECOM and presents an assessment of the potential environmental impacts on non-Aboriginal cultural heritage (historic heritage). It supplements a review of environmental factors for the proposal which documents the environmental assessment as required under Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (EP&A Act) 1979.

The description of the proposal presented in this report represents the proposal concept design. This design may be amended as additional engineering detail is collected in response to any submissions received following the exhibition of the review of environmental factors for the proposal or to minimise environmental impacts. The final design may therefore vary from the concept design presented in this report.

1.2 Proposal description

RMS proposes to upgrade about 11.5 kilometres of the Princes Highway between Schofields Lane (south of Berry) and Cambewarra Road, Bomaderry. The proposal would provide a four-lane divided highway (two lanes in each direction) with median separation.

The proposal is one of a series of upgrades to sections of the Princes Highway which aims to provide at least a four-lane divided highway between Waterfall and Jervis Bay Road, Falls Creek. This would improve road safety and traffic efficiency, including for freight, on the NSW South Coast.

Key features of the proposal are shown in Figure 1-1. These would include:

- Upgrade of the existing highway, including widening from two lanes to a four-lane divided highway (two lanes in each direction) with median separation (wire rope barriers generally, or concrete barriers where space is constrained, such as at bridge locations).
- Provision for widening of the highway (if required in the future) to six lanes within the road corridor between Schofields Lane and around Pestells Lane.
- Tie-in to the Berry bypass to the north of the proposal.
- Grade-separated facilities1 at:
  - Jaspers Brush Road and Strongs Road.
  - Morschels Lane and Devitts Lane.
- A grade-separated half-interchange at:
  - Pestells Lane and Meroo Road.
- Protected right turn bays at:
  - Mullers Lane (northbound).
  - Croziers Road (southbound).
  - Between Strongs Road and Turners Lane at about chainage 23200 (northbound).
  - Between Strongs Road and Turners Lane at about chainage 24050, adjacent to Silos Winery (southbound).
  - Lamonds Lane (northbound).
  - Boxsells Lane (southbound).
  - South of Abernethys Lane at about chainage 28590 (northbound).

---

1 Unlike a standard grade separated interchange which has full length on-ramps and off-ramps, a grade separated facility has deceleration lanes to a connecting road that links to an overpass or underpass. Grade separated facilities have been used along the Pacific Highway and are informally referred to as Type S interchanges.
• U-turn facilities at:
  - Mullers Lane (to travel southbound).\(^2\)
  - Croziers Road (to travel northbound).
  - Between Strongs Road and Turners Lane at about chainage 23200 (to travel southbound).
  - Between Strongs Road and Turners Lane at about chainage 24050, adjacent to Silos Winery (to travel northbound).
  - Lamonds Lane (to travel southbound).
  - South of Abernethys Lane at about chainage 28590 (to travel southbound).

• A large cutting at Strong Road, Jaspers Brush of around 300 metres long and up to a maximum of ten metres deep in addition to various smaller cuttings along the proposal.

• Eight bridges over waterways:\(^3\):
  - Creek crossing No. 1 – Unnamed drainage line at chainage 19350, a three span concrete structure around 44 metres long and three metres high.
  - Creek crossing No. 2 – Unnamed drainage line at chainage 19800, a single span concrete structure around 33 metres long and four metres high.
  - Creek crossing No. 3 – Flying Fox Creek, a single span concrete structure around 18 metres long and seven metres high.
  - Creek crossing No. 4 – Jaspers Brush Creek, a three span concrete structure around 44 metres long and six metres high.
  - Creek crossing No. 5 – Wileys Creek, a five span concrete structure around 76 metres long and five metres high.
  - Creek crossing No. 6 – Tandingulla Creek, a three span concrete structure around 44 metres long and three metres high.
  - Creek crossing No. 7 – Tullian Creek, a three span concrete structure around 44 metres long and five metres high.
  - Creek crossing No. 8 – Abernethys Creek, a three span concrete structure around 76 metres long and two metres high.

• Major drainage and flood mitigation structures:
  - Flood mitigation bridge – located just south of O’Keeffes Lane at chainage 21200, a three span concrete structure around 45 metres long and 3.5 metres high.
  - Pestells Lane culverts – eight cell box culvert, with each cell around 2.5 metres wide, 1.5 metres high and 130 metres long.
  - Overflow channel – 300 metre long channel located upstream of the alignment to allow flood waters to follow the existing drainage path (between chainage 22320 and 22650).

• A northbound heavy vehicle inspection bay at Jaspers Brush, staffed as needed and locked when not in use.

• Modifications to the connections between local roads and the highway, including Strong Road, Jaspers Brush Road, Morschels Lane, Devitts Lane, Pestells Lane, Meroo Road and Abernethys Lane.

• Physical modifications to about 16 existing property accesses.

\(^2\) The u-turn facility within the proposal area at Mullers Lane (southbound) will be constructed under separate approval as part of the Foxground and Berry bypass project, however the right turn bay would be constructed as part of the Berry to Bomaderry upgrade.

\(^3\) Existing waterway crossings at Flying Fox, Jaspers Brush and Abernethys creeks are all currently spanned by bridges. These three bridges would be replaced as part of the proposal. The remainder of the existing waterway crossings are culverts. New bridges would be constructed at these locations.
- Relocation and formalisation of existing southbound bus stops at Mullers Lane, Jaspers Brush Road, Morschels Lane and Lamonds Lane and existing northbound bus stops at Boxsells Lane, Croziers Road and Strongs Road. Bus stops would be relocated to sites where there is provision for safe vehicular access, set down and pick up.
- Removal of the current southbound bus stop adjacent to Croziers Road.
- Ancillary operational facilities, including permanent detention basins and stormwater treatment facilities.
- Tie-in with the existing highway at the Cambewarra Road / Moss Vale Road roundabout.

1.3 Construction ancillary facilities

Temporary construction ancillary facilities (such as compound sites, stockpiles and sediment basins) would be required for the proposal.

Potential locations for construction ancillary facilities have been identified, in consultation with RMS and relevant specialists, through a preliminary environmental constraints analysis of land within a 200 metre buffer of the proposal corridor. This analysis included review of the results of the non-Aboriginal heritage documentary research and archaeological field survey. The potential locations identified by the preliminary analysis are shown in Figure 1-1. Some of these sites are currently owned by RMS. Others are not owned by RMS and would need to be leased or acquired.

The use of each potential construction ancillary facility has not yet been determined. The range of potential activities that could be undertaken at each of the potential construction ancillary facility sites is described in the following sections.

1.3.1 Site compounds

There would be three types of construction compounds as part of the proposal:

- Administration compounds – act as the centre for works coordination and communication. Staff and visitor parking would be provided.
- Construction compounds – vary in size, and provide a supporting role to administration compounds. Machinery and materials would be stored here.
- Bridge compounds – similar to construction compounds but would have specific function to support bridge construction works.

Site compound establishment activities may include:

- Erection of site fencing.
- Establishment of erosion and sediment control measures at site perimeter downstream.
- Clearing and levelling of the site (to achieve flat or at least 0.5 per cent to facilitate drainage).
- Construction of hard stand areas, consisting of compacted road base (or similar). This would include dedicated hard stand areas for plant and equipment, areas for plant inspection and maintenance, and a wash down area.
- Construction of offices and storage sheds. Dwelling houses would be used (if appropriate and suitable) to supplement office space but would not negate the need for temporary buildings. The office buildings and storage sheds would comprise of prefabricated or purpose built temporary buildings.
- Construction of crib sheds for construction workers separate to the site offices – Including briefing rooms, lunch rooms, rest areas inside and outside, amenities etc.
- Temporary utilities connections would be established, if not pre-existing.
• Car parking for staff and visitors for Administration compounds, and parking for staff at other compounds.
• Establishment of waste collection areas i.e. skip zones and wheelie bins etc.
• Establishment of bunded storage areas for small quantities of fuels, chemicals etc. (It has been assumed that plant would be refuelled out on the job by a mobile fuel vehicle and large quantities of fuel would not be stored on site).
• Sewerage storage and pump out facility if no sewerage connection can be made.

1.3.2 Construction stockpile sites (including inter-project stockpiles)
This type of site temporarily stores materials for construction, or materials generated from within the construction site.

Materials may include constituents of road base, stripped topsoil (for reuse in landscape work), crushed rock and excess spoil that is won from cuttings but is not suitable for use in the project.
Site establishment activities may include:
• Erection of site fencing.
• Establishment of erosion and sediment control measures at site perimeter downstream.

1.3.3 Haulage roads
For the purposes of this assessment, haulage roads have been assumed to be contained within the construction footprint of the highway. Haulage roads outside the construction footprint have not been identified at this time. If haulage roads are required outside the construction footprint these would need to be assessed once they have been identified.
MUST READ INFO
SAME FILE AS "BBU DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL" + "BBU OVERVIEW OF PROPOSAL ZONING" (Difference: In "overview" file lane markings are switched off and layer "midian" switched on. In the "zoning" file the cuts and fills, waterways, railway and roads are also switched off. In the detailed file all lane markings are switched on but "midian" switched off)
NOTE: ANCILLARY SITES LAYER ADDED TO FIGURE 1-1 ONLY!

Figure 1-1 Proposal layout
1.4 Previous related heritage assessments

AECOM was engaged by RMS in December 2006 to carry out an Options and Route Selection Study, Concept Development and Environmental Assessment for the upgrade of the Princes Highway between Gerringong and Bomaderry on the south coast of New South Wales. Following the Route Selection Study, the upgrade program was divided into three separate proposals, of which the current proposal comprises the western section of the original program.

The following non-Aboriginal cultural heritage assessments and studies were conducted as part of the Gerringong to Bomaderry assessment prior to the assessment outlined in this report:

- A preliminary Non-Aboriginal heritage assessment, conducted at the route options assessment stage. This study involved:
  - Literature and heritage database reviews.
  - Mapping of known sites.
  - Provision of a predictive model for Non-Aboriginal heritage sites (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2007b).
  - An oral history recording program (AECOM Australia 2009).

- A field survey and inspection of the proposal. The survey comprised:
  - Archaeological survey of surface features and structures.
  - Archaeological survey of the limited extent of ground surface exposures (most of which have occurred within the existing road reserve).
  - A predictive assessment of subsurface archaeological potential (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2011).

The concept design, upon which the current assessment is based, was developed and refined with consistent reference to known and potential cultural heritage constraints.

1.5 Report outline

This report:

- Describes the environmental setting of the study area.
- Provides a background of local and regional archaeology and history for the study area.
- Describes previously recorded or registered heritage items within or near the proposal.
- Describes the results of the field survey.
- Provides heritage significance assessments and statements of significance for all heritage items.
- Identifies the potential and anticipated impact of the proposal on heritage items.
- Provides impact mitigation and management recommendations for all potentially affected heritage items.
2 Study methodology

2.1 Documentary and database review

A range of archaeological and historical data relevant to the proposal was reviewed. This literature and data review was used to determine if known historical sites were located within the area under investigation, to facilitate site prediction on the basis of known regional and local site patterns, and to place the proposal within an archaeological and heritage management context. The review of documentary sources included heritage registers and schedules, local histories and archaeological reports.

Sources of historical information included regional and local histories, heritage studies and theses; parish maps; newspaper articles, local museum displays and websites, oral history reports, and where available, other historical maps, such as Crown survey and Deposited Plans.

Searches were undertaken of the following statutory and non-statutory heritage registers and schedules (updated March 2013):

2.1.1 Statutory lists

- World Heritage List.
- The National Heritage List (Australian Heritage Council).
- The Commonwealth Heritage List (Australian Heritage Council).
- The State Heritage Register (NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage).
- Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register compiled by the Roads and Maritime Services.
- Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register compiled by Rail Corp.
- Existing and draft Heritage Schedule(s) from the Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan.

2.1.2 Non-statutory lists

- Australian Heritage Database (Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities).
- The State Heritage Inventory (NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage).
- The Register of the National Estate (Australian Heritage Council).
- Register of the National Trust of Australia (NSW).
- Australian Institute of Architects, Heritage Buildings List.
- Royal Australian Institute of Architects Twentieth Century Register of Significant Buildings.
- Engineers Australia (Engineering Heritage Recognition Program).

2.2 Acknowledgements

Navin Officer Heritage Consultants (NOHC) greatly appreciates the assistance in local historical research provided by local members of the community and by members of the Berry and District Historical Society Inc. (BDHS) and the Shoalhaven Historical Society Inc. In particular, thanks go to: Mrs Nancy Bevan (BDHS), Mr Ray and Ms V.S. Ison, Mrs Glenda and Mr Ted North, Mr Patrick Muller and Mrs Rita Pheeney.
2.3 Consultation with statutory authorities

Information regarding heritage items held by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage has been accessed from the State Heritage Inventory, State Heritage Register and Minutes of the State Heritage Register Committee.

Commensurate with the local level of significance of all the heritage items subject to potential impact from the proposal, the majority of consultation with government authorities has occurred with heritage staff of the Shoalhaven City Council. This has included the provision of heritage schedule and heritage inventory information, discussions regarding the status of unlisted items, and the provision of information updates on fieldwork and findings.

A draft of this report was provided to the Shoalhaven City Council in July 2013 as part of consultation undertaken in accordance with Clause 14 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure). A number of comments were provided by Council in response to the draft and these are presented and addressed in Appendix F.

2.4 Archaeological survey

An archaeological field survey and inspection was conducted over a period of three months (February to April) in 2009 in multiple survey events according to property access availability and local weather conditions. This program was conducted as part of a wider survey extending between Bomaderry and Gerringong. Isolated and supplementary inspections, specific to the proposal, have also occurred in 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013.

The survey involved inspection both on foot and via vehicle, depending on property access and ground visibility constraints. The intensity of the survey varied according to an appreciation of ground surface visibility, archaeological potential, historical research, and the interpretation of historical mapping and aerial photography.

The field assessment involved the inspection of standing structures, surface and above ground archaeological remains, and an assessment of the potential for subsurface archaeological material.

The area subject to archaeological survey and cultural heritage assessment consisted of the proposal corridor (defined as the proposed road reserve for the proposal), together with an area contained within a radius of 200 metres from boundaries of that corridor. The 200 metre extension from the corridor boundaries was to allow for the potential siting of ancillary facilities or actions during construction.

General location mapping of all recordings is presented in Appendix A.

2.5 Test excavation

Archaeological test excavations were not conducted for this assessment because none of the sites with predicted archaeological potential within the proposal boundary were considered to have a potential level of significance which would necessitate in situ conservation or avoidance of impact. Given the consequential absence of a scenario where the management of an archaeological deposit could require changes to the proposal design, any exploratory excavation phase for determining the presence and/or extent of remains can most effectively be conducted when and if the proposal proceeds.
2.6 Recording codes and heritage item definition

All items recorded in the field (field recordings) have been given a recording code with the prefix G2B H (standing for Gerringong to Bomaderry – Historical), and a consecutive number based on all recordings made across the three Princes Highway upgrade proposals between Gerringong and Bomaderry. As a consequence, the numbering sequence in any of the separate proposals may be discontinuous. This system originates from the route selection stage of the series of upgrades to the Princes Highway between Gerringong and Bomaderry.

For this assessment, a distinction has been made between field recordings and heritage items. A field recording refers to any recorded item or site, regardless of its assessed heritage significance. A heritage item refers to an item or site which is assessed to have heritage significance which satisfies or exceeds the threshold for significance within a local context (as defined in the NSW Heritage Act 1977, refer Section 6.1). Field recordings which were not found to be heritage items have not been considered further in impact identification and mitigation analysis.

The terms site and recording when used in isolation, may refer to both field recordings and heritage items.

2.7 Personnel

The archaeological survey was conducted by archaeologists Kelvin Officer, Kerry Navin and Deirdre Lewis-Cook. Background and historical research was conducted by Lindsay Smith, Kelvin Officer and Caroline Plim.

The report was written by Kelvin Officer and edited by Kelvin Officer, Adrian Cressy and Nicola Hayes.

2.8 Recording parameters

Historical archaeology refers to the 'post-contact' period (at and following the start of the written record) and includes: domestic, commercial and industrial sites as well as most maritime sites. It is the study of the past using physical evidence in conjunction with historical sources. The primary types of places or items that may form part of the historical archaeology context include:

- Below ground evidence, including building foundations, occupation deposits, features and artefacts.
- Above ground evidence, including buildings, works, industrial structures and relics that are intact or ruined.
- Areas of land that display evidence of human activity or occupation.
- Shipwrecks, deposits and structures associated with maritime activities.

Within these broad parameters, an historical archaeological site may include:

- Topographical features and evidence of past environments (ie resident in pollens and diatoms).
- Evidence of site formation, evolution, redundancy and abandonment (ie features and materials associated with land reclamation, sequences of structural development, demolition/deconstruction, and renewal).
- Evidence of function and activities according to historical theme(s) represented (eg an industrial site may contain diagnostic evidence of process, products and by-products).
- Evidence associated with domestic occupation including household items and consumables, ornaments, personal effects and toys.
- Evidence of diet including animal and fish bones, and plant residues.
• Evidence of pastimes and occupations including tools of trade and the often fragmentary signatures of these activities and processes.

• Methods of waste disposal and sanitation, including the waste itself which may contain discarded elements from all classes of artifact as well as indicators of diet and pathology.

• Any surviving physical evidence of the interplay between site environment and people.

The information found in historical archaeological sites is often part of a bigger picture which offers opportunities to compare and contrast results between sites. The most common comparisons are made at the local level, however, due to advances in research and the increasing sophistication and standardisation of methods of data collection, the capacity for wider reference (nationally and occasionally, internationally) exists and places added emphasis on identification and conservation of historical archaeological resources.
3 Environmental context

3.1 Broad scale context

The proposal consists of an 11.5 kilometre traverse across the valley floors and fringing spurs and slopes of the Southern Illawarra Coastal plain.

The coastal plain consists of the rolling hills, littoral zone and valley floor topography situated downslope and downstream of the basal ranges and spurs of the Cambewarra Range (a southern extension of the Illawarra Escarpment). The boundary between the foothills and the coastal plain is not distinct and an approximate cut-off would be the 100 metre to 140 metre contour (Australian Height Datum (AHD)).

The basal slopes bordering the coastal plain have formed from the Berry Formation (siltstone, shale and sandstones), the Broughton Tuff (tuff and tuffaceous sandstone), and the Bombo Latite. The former two are metamorphic sedimentary formations, the latter a series of igneous lava flows. The Bombo Latite has formed the watershed ridges and higher ground that subdivide the various catchments and valley floors in the Kiama and Gerringong region. The basal slopes and watershed ridges across the proposal area have formed from the Berry formation.

The valley floor of the coastal plain presents a low relief topography of quaternary fluvial sedimentary deposits which typically includes a suite of depositional landforms such as colluvial fans, flood plain, terrace sequences, current and former streambeds (including palaeochannels), wetland basins and old delta deposits. Quaternary fluvial deposits are encountered on the floors of the Abernethys, Tandingulla, Jaspers and Flying Fox creek valleys.

The majority of the fluvial valley deposits were laid down some 20,000 to 30,000 years ago and the high terrace levels probably date to around 29,000 years ago (Walker 1962). There has been a marked increase in water runoff and the rate of sediment discharged from major Illawarra streamlines in the last 100 years (Wollongong City Council 1976). The increase in sedimentation is attributable to the great disruption of vegetative cover, and the consequent erosion caused by European clearing and agriculture. A consequence has been the deposition of sediment layers across the surface of the plain’s basins and fans, causing pre-historic land surfaces to be buried and obscured. Another impact is increased rates of erosion and bank failure.

The town of Berry is situated at a point where the fluvial deposits of the Broughton Mill Creek valley (including Bundewallah Creek) interface with the former estuary embayment of the lower Shoalhaven. Upon entering the estuary, these streams would have dumped their sediments, and formed a small delta which extended progressively from north south into the embayment, prior to its infilling by about 4000 years ago (Weame 1984:Fig. 6.1, Woodroffe et al. 2000).

The sedimentary facies of the coastal margin are dominated by marine and aeolian sediments deposited as a result of prograding coastlines after high sea levels. These consist of estuarine deposits, as well as former sand barriers, dune and beach ridges. Around 8000 years ago, the sea was more than 10 metres below the present level, and reached its present level between 6000 to 6500 years ago. This is known as the post glacial marine transgression (Roy 1994, Thom and Roy 1985, Woodroffe et al. 2000).

Following stabilisation of the former, and the current sea level, sand barriers formed across drowned valley embayments, creating a series of estuarine environments along the eastern seaboard, which subsequently and variously filled with sediment (Roy 1994). The plains of the lower Shoalhaven River are a large scale example of this process. They demonstrate an evolution from a brackish water estuarine environment to freshwater alluvial plains. When the sea reached its present level, most of the plains were flooded to form a large coastal embayment. Remnant beach and shoreline features are still evident along the former edge of this palaeo embayment (Figure 3-1). Following the incipient formation of a sand barrier (of which Comerong Island is an evolved remnant), a coastal lagoon and estuary, similar in extent to Lake Illawarra must have been formed. This lagoon received fluvial input from Broughton Creek to the north and the Shoalhaven River to the west. The gradual infilling of the estuary then proceeded, with a pattern characterised by sedimentation around the periphery and...
gradual infill in the centre of the flood basin. Most of the plains adjacent to Broughton Creek were infilled between 5000 and 4000 years ago. Infill of the estuary basin was largely complete by 3000 years ago (Woodroffe et al. 2000).

During the last 2000 to 3000 years, the Shoalhaven River appears to have been channelised within levee deposits for most of its course across the plain. Isolated flood basins have persisted to the north and south (Woodroffe et al. 2000).

Figure 3-1: Example of a remnant beach ridge and palaeo-shoreline marking the edge of a former marine embayment and estuary in the area of the Broughton Creek lowlands. Looking north from Swamp Road, Jaspers Brush.

3.2 Small scale context

The proposal traverses a series of ridge and spurline slopes, interspersed by creeklines, valley floor flats and fringing toe slopes. All of the creeks drain in an approximately southeast alignment onto the former swamp basins and flats of the Broughton Creek floodplain. These were progressively drained in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and the natural network of meandering flood and estuarine channels have now been replaced by formalised man-made channels. The largest creeks and associated catchments crossed by the proposal area are Jaspers and Abernethys Creeks. Lesser streamlines include Flying Fox, Wileys, Tandingulla and Tullian Creeks.

Between the northern (Berry) end of the proposal area and Lamonds Lane, the proposal area can be characterised as a traverse across a series of relatively narrow valleys, separated by low relief spurlines or interfluves. Typically the crest of the spurs reaches an elevation ranging between 10 and 20 metres AHD. The highest and widest spurline of the traverse is at Jaspers Brush, which is crossed at an elevation just above 30 metres (Figure 3-2).

Just south of the east-south bend in the highway at Meroo Meadow, the proposal area traverses the basal margins of a former natural wetland which prior to European clearing supported a 'meadow' or natural grassland clearing in the surrounding forest (Figure 3-3). This area was previously known as 'Little Meadow'.
South of Lamonds Lane the proposal area traverses the low relief basal slopes and valley floor of Tullian and Abernethys Creeks. A steep slope on the southern side of Abernethys Creek marks the return of the Berry Formation sandstone which forms an elevated surface with overall low relief on which the town of Bomaderry has been constructed.

Figure 3-2: Looking south from Andersons Lane across an unnamed tributary and towards the Flying Fox valley and spurline in distance

Figure 3-3: Looking west towards the former Little Meadow swamp basin at Meroo Meadow
4 Historical context

4.1 Historical overview

4.1.1 Municipalities

The study area lies within the current administrative boundaries of the Shoalhaven City Council.

Local Government in the Shoalhaven began on 26th October 1868 with the incorporation of two new Municipal Councils, Broughton’s Creek and Bomaderry, north of the Shoalhaven River, and Numbaa on the south side. This achievement by local petitioners for the privilege of establishing their local Councils followed the abortive attempt of James Graham to set up the Municipal Council of Shoalhaven. This Council was proclaimed on 22nd September 1859, but Alexander Berry objected to his lands being included in the Municipality and applied to the Supreme Court for an injunction. Mayor James Graham appealed to the Privy Council, which delivered its findings, in favour of Berry in 1865. The Council became defunct.

In 1891 the Broughton Creek and Bomaderry Municipality changed its name to the Berry Municipality. In 1906 following the sale of the Berry Estate lands, the Estate lands east of Broughton Creek were included in the municipality.

Over the next few years the demand for Local Government by residents of the widely scattered settlements saw other Municipal areas declared. Following the Second World War, the Labour State Government sought to create more efficient councils through amalgamation. As part of this process, the Minister for Works and Local Government, J.J. Cahill, persuaded the councils of Berry, Broughton Vale, Nowra, South Shoalhaven, Cambewarra, Clyde and Ulladulla to merge and form the Shire of Shoalhaven (Robson et al. 2008:22). The Shoalhaven Shire came into being in 1948. The Shire was proclaimed the City of Shoalhaven on 1st August 1979 (Robyn Florance n.d.).

4.1.2 Early exploration

In April 1770, Captain James Cook was the first European to sight the eastern shores of the region while sailing north towards Botany Bay. Cook named Pigeon House Mountain, Cape St George and noted the entrance of what seemed to be a bay (Jervis Bay), the inner north head of which he named Longnose Point, before passing Kiama’s shore and on to further exploration.

Nothing more of the area was recorded until after the settlement of Sydney in 1788. On 27 July 1791, Captain Weatherhead of the Matilda discovered Jervis Bay, which he named Matilda Bay after his ship, but the name was not retained. Following his visit to the bay on 18 August 1791, Naval Lieutenant Bowen provided the name ‘Port Jervis’ in honour of Sir John Jervis. Whaling ships immediately began calling there for shelter and water.

The district was first crossed overland by Europeans when Clarke and the remaining surviving sailors of the shipwreck of the Sydney Cove in Bass Strait, passed through it in April of that year. Clarke’s party was forced to trek overland when their longboat was wrecked at Point Hicks (Bayley 1975).

In December 1797, George Bass, during his voyage of coastal exploration in a whaleboat with a crew of six seamen, landed in a sheltered bay, later named Kiama Harbour, and followed around the bight of Seven Mile Beach to discover the mouth of a river, which he named Shoals Haven. He spent three days examining the river, noting the fertile banks that he thought would not be subject to flooding (Bayley 1975:15-16, 1976:15).

Knowledge of the area was advanced when on 10 March 1805, Lieutenant Kent of HMS Buffalo returned to Sydney after examining the district overland 18 miles north from Jervis Bay with James Meehan, the assistant Surveyor-General. Information from that expedition confirmed that the area was originally covered with rainforest, brush cedar, soft and hardwoods and a variety of bushes, palms, vines and ferns.
Independent cedar getters were in the Shoalhaven from at least 1811. After grounding on the shoals, the Speedwell managed to bring the first recorded cargo of cedar from the Shoalhaven River to Sydney in December 1812. The timber industry then grew in scale, exploiting the patches of cedar on the rivers and creeks, but the main concentration was in the Long Brush, which stretched from Kiama to Jamberoo (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:11).

A cedar party comprising George Wood, Jones and Dawson was lost in early 1815 and a search located one body, said to be that of Wood, all having been killed by Aboriginal people. Following that episode, Governor Macquarie forbade the cedar cutters from visiting the district.

Exploration from landward began in February 1818 when Dr Charles Throsby and James Meehan set out from Sydney to find an overland route to Jervis Bay. The party reached Kangaroo Valley, crossed the Shoalhaven and reached Jervis Bay but found the route to be impractical. To find a better route in 1819, two surveyors, John Oxley and James Meehan, explored Jervis Bay, Currambene Creek and the site of Nowra. From there Meehan went due north; however, that inland section did not offer a feasible route for wheeled vehicles.

The need for a better route from the Southern Highlands was met, to an extent, in 1821 by a new route pioneered by Hamilton Hume and Charles Throsby through Tallaganda Shire, which Hume reported could be made along a line of where he marked the trees. However, the route was not developed until the 1840s when The Wool Road from Braidwood via Nerriga, Sassafras and Wandandian was created.

No sooner had Hume returned from that expedition when, in January 1822, he left Sydney in the Snapper with Lieutenant Johnston and Alexander Berry to explore the coastal rivers, sailing up the Clyde and trudging inland to the Pigeon House. Although it was a government sponsored voyage it appears that Berry’s purpose was to seek out land on which he could make a settlement after an adventurous life of roving in his early days (Bayley 1975:20).

### 4.1.3 The Berry Estate

After a brief stay in Sydney in 1808 during his early career as an international merchant, Alexander Berry returned to London in 1812 by way of Cadiz. In Cadiz Berry met Edward Wollstonecraft, who subsequently became Berry's London agent, and later his partner when they decided to start a business in Sydney. Berry returned to Sydney in July 1819, and Wollstonecraft arrived in September. While Wollstonecraft supervised their George Street business, Berry visited England in March 1820, carrying Governor Macquarie’s dispatches, one of which described him as 'an eminent merchant of this place'. In 1827, Berry married Wollstonecraft's sister Elizabeth.

Like other merchants Berry and Wollstonecraft often had to accept stock in payment of debts, and Berry sought a grant of land on which to accommodate the stock. Macquarie refused, as Berry was about to leave for England, but promised him a grant when he took up permanent residence. While he was away Wollstonecraft obtained a grant and located part of it on the North Shore where he built a cottage, 'Crow's Nest'.

On Berry's return he sought a site for the grants made to him and Wollstonecraft, travelling widely even in unsettled districts because 'Everybody was flocking to the Hunter River, Bathurst, and other places and all were elbowing one another. But we neither wished to elbow any one nor to be elbowed'. Berry first visited the Shoalhaven in January 1822, taking the cutter Snapper into Crook Haven (formerly Shoals Haven) from which he proceeded overland to examine the country on either side of the river. The rich alluvial soils and natural grassy 'meadows' led him to choose the Shoalhaven as the site for an estate and he returned in June 1822 to occupy it.

In February 1822, Berry and Wollstonecraft had jointly applied for a grant of 10,000 acres under the regulation introduced by the Governor that those accepting grants should maintain, free of expense to the crown, one convict for each 100 acres of the grant. This grant was approved by Governor Brisbane, though the deed was not issued until 1830. It was located on the southern side of the river between the Shoalhaven and Crookhaven Rivers, but Berry established his headquarters at the foot of Mount Coolangatta on the northern side of the river.
The grant to ‘Messrs Berry and Wollstonecraft’, named “Coolloomagatta”, was between Broughton Creek and the government reserve along the beach to Black Head and Crooked River, to which was added a 2,000 acre grant on the south side at Numbaa.

In July 1822, Berry decided that his station would be built at the south eastern foot of Mount Coolangatta. He called it “Cullengatty Farm”. A store and huts were erected on the lower slope of Mount Coolangatta and the flat at Numba was prepared for cultivation, becoming the first farm on the Shoalhaven. His residence was begun in 1823 and completed in 1824, by which time he had 120 acres under wheat, 40 under maize, three acres under barley and three as a garden with an orchard planted at Numba, where 250 acres were already cleared. He had 600 cattle, 14 horses and 235 pigs on his estate. A barn was completed in 1830 at Upper Numba or Jindiandy where it may still be seen.

In January of 1826, James Smith, the overseer of a timber establishment recently established at Broughton Creek (the original nucleus for the town of Berry) reported the presence of 628,049 feet of red cedar on hand. A subsequent reconnaissance by D.S.Souter, a general overseer at Coolangatta, located many cedar trees located at “Muroo” and Broughton Creek (Bayley 1975:34, Antill 1982:14).

The development of the estate to 1827 is shown on a pencil map, probably drawn by Berry himself. It shows the country north of and including the Shoalhaven River to the head of Broughton Creek. It marks Pig Island, Broughton Creek, and ‘Bombadara’ Creek and shows the western side of Broughton Creek as a ‘Large Swamp’. It shows ‘Muroo Hut’, ‘New Stock Yard’ west of and beside the swamp, ‘Bangley Creek’ with ‘Bangley’ as its source, ‘Good Dog’ and a high peak ‘Broughton’s Rump’. Figure 4-1 shows a map of Berry’s holdings in 1837.

Berry secured additional grants of two lots each of 4000 acres north of the first grant and one lot of 4000 acres west of Broughton Creek. West of the latter, John Berry (one of Alexander’s younger brothers) later secured 3225 acres at Bunberra north of Pig Island and several grants surrounding it. On his death in 1848, John Berry’s grants passed to Alexander.

Other grants in the area were:

- 1920 acres at Toolia (Toolijooa) called “Richardson’s Farm” promised to J. G. Richardson 23 March 1830 (granted to A. Berry 11 February 1837).
- 1000 acres called “Hyndeston” near Gerringong promised to Thomas Hyndes 24 July 1824 (granted to A. Berry 18 Oct 1839).
- 4000 acres called “Broughton Head Farm” promised to Aspinall and Brown 27 May 1829 (granted to A. Berry 29 May 1838).
- 1280 acres called “Cumbewarra Farm”, promised to Charles Staples 27 January 1830 (granted to A. Berry 20 May 1837):
- 1280 acres called “Meroo Farm” promised to Richard Mutton 22 June 1829 (granted to A. Berry 28 November 1837).

By 1840, all had passed to Alexander Berry in whose name the grants were issued. In 1842, Berry also secured 2560 acres called “Burke’s Farm” promised to John Burke (granted to A, Berry 15 February 1842) along Seven Mile Beach (Bayley 1975:24-26, Organ and Doyle 1994).

By the early 1840s, purchases of land from the crown and private individuals increased the size of the estate to about 32,000 acres, and to more than 40,000 acres by 1863. Figure 4-2 shows a map of Berry’s holdings around 1844.

The total holdings of the Berry Estate, from grants and purchases, north and south of the Shoalhaven River, amounted to 57,000 acres. This included 14,480 acres from nine grants to others which were “bought out”, by Mr Berry. Some or all of these may have already been occupied by their original grantees (Organ and Doyle 1994).
Figure 4-1: Extract from Robert Dixon’s 1837 map of the Colony of NSW showing early land grants and the approximate location of the proposal – solid blue line (State Library of NSW)
Unlike other Sydney merchants who took up land but seem to have kept their mercantile and pastoral activities separate, Berry and Wollstonecraft set out to integrate the two, and during its early years the Shoalhaven estate was the source of much produce sold in the George Street store. When the Blanch returned to Sydney after establishing the settlement at Coolangatta she carried a cargo of hay and cedar from the Shoalhaven.

The partners' effort to enlarge their estate at every opportunity was probably to secure the cedar growing in the district, for by the 1820s the supply of cedar from the Illawarra and the Hunter River valley was nearing exhaustion. Maize, tobacco, wheat, barley and potatoes were planted and marketed in Sydney; pigs were also reared and cattle were brought to Shoalhaven from the Illawarra over a road made for the purpose. Besides buying a ship to provide transport between Sydney and Shoalhaven, the partners built a sloop and began to drain the extensive swamps included in their grants. Barron Field feared that 'these grants will hardly ever repay Messrs. Berry and Wollstonecraft for their outlay upon them', but they did, and handsomely, if only because of the profit on the cedar cut on them. Despite the absence of financial stress, problems remained for the partners.
The estate was a cause for considerable criticism of Berry and he was publicly accused of negligence in his care of convict servants and of ill-treating them; it was said that a government tax on cedar cut on crown land was engineered to give Berry and Wollstonecraft a virtual monopoly, and that a tax on imported tobacco was introduced for their benefit. By 1846, Berry wrote that he had lost interest in the estate and 'would gladly part with it upon any terms'; this feeling grew as labour became scarcer after the abolition of transportation and the discovery of gold. In the 1850s, Berry began to let farms on clearing leases, and with this occupation by tenant farmers the real development of the Shoalhaven district commenced.

After his wife's death in 1845, Alexander Berry (Figure 4-3) became a recluse in his Crow's Nest House. After his brother David took charge of the Shoalhaven estate in 1836 he appears to have rarely visited it. He died at 'Crow's Nest' on 17 September 1873.

Berry had no children and his property passed to his brother David (Perry 1965:92-95).

Figure 4-3: Alexander Berry (1781–1873) (Source: State Library of NSW)

David Berry, with his brothers John and William and his sisters Janet and Agnes, put into effect a long-held idea to join their eldest brother Alexander in NSW. They arrived at Sydney in July 1836 went at once to Coolangatta, the Shoalhaven property which, at Wollstonecraft's death in 1832, had passed entirely to Alexander.

Until John Berry died in 1848 he and David jointly managed the property. The greater part of the land was undeveloped and most of the work force was convict. The number of their assigned servants appears to have increased from an original 100 to some 300 in the 1840s. The main source of income was the breeding of cattle and horses, which were scientifically improved by imported blood. After John's death David began leasing some of the land. By 1850, he had 36 tenants, who paid 20 shillings an acre for cleared ground and were allowed five years without rent in order to clear timbered land. When convict labour ceased, David Berry decided to trial Chinese labourers and German families hired in Hamburg. The Chinese did well as dairymen and house servants but in general Berry considered their usefulness was limited. Leasing was continued and by 1863 he had almost 300 tenants, who occupied some 8650 acres (3500 hectares) or about a sixth of Coolangatta and paid an aggregate rent of about £6000.
When David Berry inherited the estate from Alexander, it was valued at £400,000 and consisted of 60,000 acres at Shoalhaven and 500 acres at North Sydney. William Berry died in October 1875, also leaving a will in David's favour. He continued to lease the Shoalhaven land on terms considered more than lenient. Berry also introduced the practice of share farming with land, implements and materials provided by the estate and labour by the farmer, the profits to be shared on an agreed basis.

In 1882 the Broughton Creek portion of the estate was described as having 120 tenants and 6000 acres under lease, almost all devoted to grazing. The greater part was laid out in Italian rye-grass, winter feed being provided in the shape of oats, barley and sorghum. Maize was cultivated on the rich alluvial flats, with yields of 60 to 80 bushels to the acre. The cattle bred for market were principally ‘shorthorns’ (Australian Town and Country Journal 11 Nov 1882).

After 1883, the management of the Shoalhaven estate passed increasingly to Berry's cousin, (Sir) John Hay (Figure 4-5). When David Berry died unmarried at Coolangatta in 1889, he left an estate valued at £1,250,000. Hay was the principal beneficiary of his will (Stephen 1969:149-151). Hay was knighted in 1908 and died without issue at his residence at Crows Nest, Sydney in 1909. He was buried at the Coolangatta homestead (Northern Star 5 Mar 1909:2). Most of his estate of almost £140,000 was left to his widow, brothers and sisters (Kalgoorlie Western Argus 17 Aug 1909).
The enormous bequests by David Berry to the University of St. Andrews (Scotland) and to the
Endowment of a hospital at Berry, amounting to a quarter of a million pounds, made it necessary for
the Trustees, John Hay and others, to sell the Estate. They immediately set about a comprehensive
plan of improvements before selling. Among these the reclamation of the swamp areas took a
prominent place.

Figure 4-5  Dr John Hay (1840 – 1909) (from Anon 1895:4)

The entire area of the estate at that time amounted to around 100 square miles. Of that area 40
square miles consisted of alluvial flat land. Although drainage works on the Coolangatta Estate date
from 1829 a majority of the lowlands in the Broughton Creek catchment remained unavailable for
agriculture and pasture into the late nineteenth century (Bayley 1975). In its natural state that land
consisted of a series of freshwater marshes with surfaces in their lowest, some three or four feet
below the flood level of the district in which they lay. Therefore, as part of any drainage scheme, these
lowlands had to be protected from the influx of possible tidal floods by a system of drains and flood
gates. Another leading feature of the marsh-reclamation scheme was protection from floods which
otherwise would rise above the natural banks of the Shoalhaven River and Broughton Creek and flow
freely into the reclaimed basins. Consequently, at all places where the river banks, either from erosion
or other causes, had fallen below their normal crest-level, levees (or embankments) were employed to
restore them.

John Hay’s plans for swamp reclamation were put into effect in 1891 with the expenditure of 20,000
pounds. John Wright, a civil engineer who had worked on the South Coast rail line, was engaged. The
scheme involved the construction of drains, levees, flood gates and pump station. The following year
large engineering works were carried out two miles upstream of the Broughton Creek mouth,
reclaiming 7000 acres, with a steam driven centrifugal pump to move the water. The pump had a
capability of shifting at least 100 tons of water per minute to a height of seven feet (Bayley 1975:158;
Sydney Morning Herald 17 Oct 1892). The pumping station was situated at the mouth of Snake Island
Creek on the east side of Broughton Creek (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:187, recording B147),
(Figure 4-6). The network of drains amounted to a net length of about 145 miles (Figure 4-6). The
bottom width of which ranged from two to 20 feet. In many places embankments were constructed to
a height of up to 18 inches to prevent the backwash of tidal water (Sydney Morning Herald 7 Sep
1895:6).
It was estimated that the drainage works would double the stock carrying capacity of the Estate lands (Sydney Morning Herald 17 Oct 1892). By 1905, an estimated 15,000 acres of swampland had been drained, for a total expenditure of 135,000 pounds (Shoalhaven and Hawkesbury Diary 1908). Some 25 sluice gates guarded the reclaimed lands from tidal waters, with waterways ranging from 4 to 150 square feet (Antill 1982:354; The Nowra Colonist 12 Dec 1894). The chief outlets were to the Shoalhaven River and Broughton Creek. In 1901 the Brundee Swamp Drainage Trust attended to drainage on the south side of the river (Bayley 1975:158).

Following the drainage of the lowland meadows, there remained the problem of resupplying them with fresh water for the support of dairy herds. To this end, the multiple catchments of the surrounding slopes, and notably the “sugarloaf flanks and spurs” of the Coolangatta Hill, were harnessed through the construction of dams to form reservoirs. These formed the head of a gravity fed reticulation system which employed leading mains, branches and small pipes to fill drinking troughs situated in “practically every paddock” within the “sphere of influence” of the Hill (Antill 1982:354).

One such reservoir appears to remain, just north and upslope of the Princes Highway, between Jaspers Brush and Meroo Meadow (G2B H81) (Figure 4-7). An associated easement, which crossed the highway, provided for the piped reticulation of water to the drained estuarine flats in the area of the current Meroo Meadow airfield. Following, or as part of, the sale of the Estate lands, it would appear that the reservoirs and their pipelines, as shared infrastructure, were legally separated from the adjacent lands using defined easements and allotments, and vested with the local Council. A review of the fourth edition (1916) Coolangatta parish map reveals six similar pipeline easements with former or remaining reservoirs situated at their head, on creeklines draining the fringing slopes of the Coolangatta Mountain. One of these probably supplied the Berry Estate pumping station which was constructed in 1892 to drain the adjacent swamplands (Figure 4-8). Only two reservoir dams remain (situated in lots 64a and 26a of the original Coolangatta subdivision).
Drainage of the lowlands continued to be an issue after the sale of the Berry Estate and works have continued to the present day. There are now over 230 kilometres of drains on a 40 square kilometre flood plain, with 16 flood gates on 20 main drains into Broughton Creek. There were further works in 1901 and more extensive drain formation in 1949. From 1965-72 larger capacity and deeper drains were established with the upgrading and establishment of fixed floodgates (Pease 1994).

On 29 March 1892 the first sale of the Berry (Shoalhaven) Estates began and continued for three days. The entity was divided into three for the purpose of the sale; first, the Gerringong farms of which there were four and totalled 175 acres; next came the sale of the whole township of Bomaderry followed on 30 March by the Numbaa estates, which consisted of between 5000 and 6000 acres, apportioned into some 108 farms from 20 to 200 acres. The Numbaa estates were included in the Municipality of Numbaa, which had been incorporated in 1868.
The sale terms were all standardised at 25 per cent deposit, 15 per cent within two years and the balance over five years with an interest rate of five per cent per annum. In all cases preference was given to tenant farmers to secure the land they had formerly farmed many of the present family holdings date their freehold from that date. The disposal by sale of the estates in Shoalhaven and North Sydney began in 1892 and was not completed until 24 years later in 1916 (Antill 1982:19, Bayley 1975:160; Sealy 2000: 120-121).

The Cambewarra farms, situated to the west of the South Coast Road (the Princes Highway), and the Meroo farms, situated between Bomaderry and Jaspers Brush, were all auctioned on the 15th March 1893. This was reportedly the second of the Berry Estate land sales. The Northern Star reported that there was an ‘immense attendance and spirited bidding’. In most cases the old tenants purchased their holdings. Upwards of 3000 acres were sold, realising £41,000. Dairy farms sold for up to £34 per acre (Northern Star 22 Mar 1893:3).

The third (60 farms) and fourth sales were conducted on 25 May and 14 June 1893, each involving the Jaspers Brush and Meroo subdivisions. In the fourth sale, about 760 acres of land was sold for £19,300, the average price per acre being £27 11s 6d. All lots went to local buyers (Sydney Morning Herald 26 Apr 1893:10, Northern Star 24 Jun 1893:3).

The Cambewarra farms sales poster indicates the presence of the ‘Main South Coast Road’ along its current alignment, despite the much later development of this road reserve for the Bomaderry bypass in 1929. No farmhouses or structures are shown along the road alignment (Figure 4-9). A factory site is shown on the Cambewarra Road (now Moss Vale Road), 500 metres east of the highway intersection. This is probably the Cambewarra and Meroo Dairy Co. premises (1889 – 1906).

The 1893 Meroo Farms sales poster shows the presence of seven houses or structures adjacent to the highway (Figure 4-10 and Figure 4-11). Each of these locations is associated with a heritage recording in the proposal area, although most of the buildings are no longer standing or have been replaced. An exception is the Meroo Meadow Union Church (G2B H3) which was constructed in 1890. The school building shown in the Meroo Meadow school reserve (G2B H4) was replaced in 1898 by a brick building. The original building was then demolished.

In addition to the public auctions, a proportion of the Estate was offered for private sale, at less stringent terms than the auction sales. An undated sales poster for Subdivision no. 1, being former tenant farms in the Jaspers Brush and Bolong areas, entitled “the Coolangatta and Berry Estates”, advises the following terms: 10 per cent deposit and 10% annually for nine years, with any unpaid balance bearing interest at five per cent annum payable quarterly (Figure 4-12, NSW Dept. of Land and Property Management Information, reference BC5788). The private sales appear to have been a further provision by the Estate trustees to facilitate the purchase of lands by the incumbent and resident tenant farmers.

The Coolangatta and Berry Estate sales poster shows three building groups at this time along the South Coast Road (Princes Highway): A farm complex at the current Silos winery/restaurant (G2B H82), a ‘house’ situated approximately one kilometre west of the current Strongs Road intersection (G2B H80), and the Jaspers Brush Public School and residence (G2B H44), just east of the Jaspers Brush Creek crossing (Figure 4-13).
Figure 4-9: Sales poster for the auction of the Cambewarra Farms on the Berry Estate in 1893. The south eastern boundary of this area forms part of the proposal area (Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith., John Ewing licenced surveyor, NLA Map folder 33, LFSP 439 http://nla.gov.au/nla.map-lfsp439)
Figure 4-10: Sales poster for the auction of the Meroo Farms on the Berry Estate in 1893. The proposal area follows the ‘South Coast Road’ indicated on this poster. (Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith., John Ewing licenced surveyor, Libraries Australia ID 41570599, NLA map-itsp322-v). Refer Figure 4-11 for enlarged details.
Figure 4-11  Extracts from the 1893 Meroo Farms Sale poster (refer Figure 4-10), showing buildings present at the time of the subdivision: ‘Maylands’ farm complex (G2B H85), The Meroo Meadow Union Church (G2B H3), a building complex on Lot 49 (G2B H73), The Meroo Meadow Public School (G2B H4), Berry Estate buildings on Lot 59 (G2B H90), ‘Country fair’ farm complex (G2B H83), and the Anderson farm complex on Lot 196 (now Silos Winery and restaurant) (G2B H82). (Note that the modern property names used in these recordings may not relate to the buildings shown for this age period).
Figure 4-12: Sale poster (undated) for the private sale of Subdivision No. 1, Berry Estate farm lots in the area of Jaspers Brush, on the Coolangatta and Berry Estates (Berry Estate Office, Norton Smith & Co Solicitors, Dobbie & Kenny Surveyors, William Brooks & Co Ltd Lithographers, collection of the NSW Dept. of Land and Property Management Information, http://www.baseline.nsw.gov.au/files/catalogue3.pdf reference BC5788). The date of this poster must fall between 1892 (the commencement of Berry Estate sales) and 1908 the date of the registered subdivision plan (DP6131). Refer Figure 4-15 for enlarged details.
Figure 4-13  Extract from the undated (between 1892 and 1908) Subdivision No. 1, Coolangatta and Berry Estates Farms Sale poster (refer Figure 4-12), showing buildings and other heritage features present at the time of the subdivision: farm complex on Lot 196 (now Silos Winery and restaurant) (G2B H82), ‘House’ on Lot 206 (G2B H80), a Berry Estate water reservoir (G2B H81), and the Jaspers Brush Public School (G2B H44).

Figure 4-14 presents an extract from a map of the County of Camden, NSW, 1895, showing land tenure and the growth of settlement centres, including Berry, Bomaderry and Gerringong, at that time.

Figure 4-14:  Extract from map of County of Camden, NSW, 1895, showing land tenure and the approximate location of the proposal – solid blue line (NLA)
4.1.4 The development of settlements and townships

Berry established a location for a township at “Bumaderry” in December of 1859 (Cousins 1948:268; Bayley 1975:69). This appeared to be an exercise in forward planning based on the area’s strategic position relative to the northwestern portion of the Berry Estate lands and the presence of higher ground on the north shore of the Shoalhaven River. Growth however was slow relative to the downstream estate settlements and the northern settlement of Broughton Creek (Berry).

Rather than follow formal or planned structures, the evolution of settlements appears to have been more organic, and focused initially around prominent spurs with maritime access (Jaspers Brush), and natural clearings (Meroo Meadow). The 1858/69 Berry Estate road between Broughton Creek (Berry) and Bomaderry established a formal transport corridor which was paralleled in 1893 by the South Coast rail line. Community services, buildings and industry tended to be scattered along each of these corridors.

The development of Jaspers Brush and Meroo (also known as Little Meadow, and later known as Meroo Meadow), reflected the need of the adjacent freehold and tenant farmers to form a focus for local community life and services such as religious observance, education, the postal service, and subsequently dairy infrastructure. Prior to the construction of the Berry estate road of 1858/69, the main vehicle access to the Jaspers Brush area was via the Broughton Creek estuary and a wharf situated at the end of O’Keefes Lane (formerly Wharf Road) (JBRC 1997:2).

A few miles north of Berry’s Bomaderry town site was a “cattle station” taken up by John Ingold and Henry Claydon in 1860. John is said to have named the place Jaspers Brush, after his father Jasper Ingold, and the local dense forest vegetation known at the time as ‘Brush’. However earlier references to Jasper Brush occur in the Kiama Examiner of 8 May 1858 (Bayley 1975:69).

An alternative explanation for the origin of the name is that it derives from an ex-convict cedar cutter, Jasper Morley who was employed by Alexander Berry as an overseer to supervise felling of red cedar in the area. That the Jasper name had become related to a locality and not just a forest is demonstrated in 1876 by the post office directory which lists residents at Jasper’s Brush and Jasper’s Mount, and in 1884/85 by references in the electoral roll to Jasper’s Brush, Jasper’s Mount, Jasper’s Creek or Jaspers Mountain (JBRC 1997:1).

In May 1866 the Government commenced a ferry service across the Shoalhaven River from Nowra to Bomaderry. A similar service had commenced at Numbaa in 1858 (Bayley 1975:69).

In 1867 public schools were established at Meroo, and at Bomaderry Ferry (Havergal 1996:167). The Meroo school started in an existing building, situated on Pestells Lane, which continued to be used as a church. Following the disrepair of the building through the 1870s and a need for greater space, the school was moved in 1882 into a tent on a temporary site at Little Meadow, next to Wileys Creek (G2B H91). The tent school was illustrated in the same year in the Australian Town and Country Journal (Figure 4-15). A permanent location was the subject of considerable local debate until the current location, on the Main South Coast Road at Meroo, was resumed from the Berry Estate lands in 1884 (G2B H4) (Berry Museum display 2009, Bunberra Parish map 3rd Ed 1916, NSWDoE 1967). After first agreeing, David Berry later objected to the site stating that its location at ‘Meroo Station’ (G2B H90), would place it next to his cattle yards and necessitate construction of new station buildings elsewhere (NSWDoE 1967). After twenty months as a ‘tent school’ the school moved back to Meroo, into a new wooden schoolhouse in 1884.

At Bomaderry the Birriley Street Public School was established in 1893. The Presbyterian Church began a Sabbath School at Bomaderry in 1895/96 but other major denominations did not start there until the 1950s (Bayley 1975).
In 1880, one year before the completion of the Shoalhaven bridge, Bomaderry boasted one store and a small school.

In September of 1884 the Jaspers Brush public school was opened in a temporary structure. A new permanent brick building was completed by A. Johnston for £417 in October 1897 (Sydney Morning Herald 15 May 1897:11). Two years earlier, the school's teacher, Mr Edwin Larcombe had died of exposure and shock following his efforts to save the school property during a bush fire (Sydney Morning Herald 24 Aug 1895:5). On the 26 August 1920 the schoolmaster's residence at Jaspers Brush was destroyed by fire. One story relates that the fire was intentionally lit by people who thought that the school master was harbouring a nun who had fled from a Bowral Convent, suspicions which were later to be proved to be baseless (JBRC 1997:3). Mr Baldwin, the teacher was badly burned about the face and hands, and his family lost everything except the clothes they were wearing (Northern Star 6 Sept 1920:2).

The Jaspers Dairy Co. factory was established in 1888 at the corner of Jaspers Brush Road and the main South Road (G2B H68), a similar factory at Meroo was established in 1899 (G2B H75). About fifty local dairy farms supplied the Jaspers Brush factory with milk which was transported to Sydney (JBRC 1997:2).

The Jaspers Brush post office was established following the opening of the Jaspers Brush butter factory in 1889 and was originally located near the rail line (Australian Town and Country Journal 6 Jul 1889:14, Sydney Morning Herald 15 Jun 1889:8). It was later moved to a residence on the south side of the highway between Strongs Road and Railway Lane (G2B H76) (Figure 4-16).
In 1890 a Union Church, which provided a shared place of protestant worship for Presbyterian, Methodist, Anglican and Salvation army church members, was constructed at Meroo Meadow on land, and with funds donated by, the Berry Estate (G2B H3). It was identical in design to another church built at the same time at Greenwell Point. The churches were handed over to trustees appointed in 1890, however it was not until June 1913 that the Meroo Meadow deed of trust was executed (Antill 1982:24).

In 1905 it was reported that the Meroo community had decided to plant a number of ornamental trees on the church property. The trees were being obtained from the State Nursery, through the Berry Council (Northern Star 29 Jul 1895:6). It is probable that the six large mature camphor laurel trees still present around the church building date from this period. Some of the pine trees around the property boundary may also have been planted at this time.

In January 1899, a new brick school house, designed by William Edmund Kemp and completed in 1898, was opened at Meroo (Bayley 1975:131) (Figure 4-17). Prior to this time, an 1892 Berry Estate sales poster shows a single building, which was the 1884 timber schoolhouse. A brick school residence was also completed in 1899. The two new brick buildings were situated to the north and south of the original building which was then removed. The Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory notes that the existing brick residence was also designed by Kemp (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory B160). A shelter shed was subsequently built between the two brick buildings (Figure 4-17).
A school of Arts Hall was established at Jaspers Brush, prior to 1898 and served as a focus for community and social activities up to its demolition in 1949 following damage from strong winds (JBRC 1997) (**Figure 4-18**). Timbers from the hall were used in the construction of outbuildings at ‘Northcote’ (G2B H76). The site of the Hall was removed during excavation works for highway improvements in 1975. The public school served as an alternative venue from that date.

![Figure 4-18: The Jaspers Brush School of Arts Hall (from JBRC 1997:17). This location was impacted by highway upgrade earthworks in the 1970s.](image)

The formal survey for the township of Bomaderry was instigated by the trustees of the Berry Estate in 1891. The first sale of town lots was held on March 30 1892, perhaps in anticipation of the completion of the South Coast rail line which would terminate at the town in the following year (Bayley 1975:116). The original town area was bounded by Cambewarra Road, the South Coast Road, and Meroo Street (Antill 1982:19) (**Figure 4-19**).

Bomaderry was officially named in 1893 with the re-opening of the Post Office (previously known as Bundbaderra – Aboriginal for fighting ground, and previously spelt Bomadary) (Clark n.d.).

The first settler of the township of Bomaderry was most likely Herman Meyers, Station Master, when the railway was extended from Bombo in 1893. However, the first substantial private residence is thought to have been that of Anne Hall, widow of Thomas Hall of the Berry Estate, whose block of land was the second to be transferred after the township was opened up in 1892. Her Bolong Road home, ‘Flawcraig’, was constructed in about 1895.

The main electricity line went through Meroo in 1924, and connection was available for local residence in 1936. The first silo was built in Meroo for Mr Jake Muller, and subsequently at Abernethys property in 1925 (Morshel 1992).

At Meroo, a new weatherboard public hall was erected and opened in 1933. Bayley states that gates and a fence were subsequently erected in 1954 in commemoration of Privates M.T. Morschel and J. Warby who lost their lives in the Second World War (Bayley 1975:187). The hall was demolished in 1974 prior to the widening of the adjacent highway in 1975, the commemorative gates are now located at the entrance to the Meroo Meadow Union Church.

Horlicks opened a factory in 1937, to be followed in 1939 by the Dairy Co-operative Factory (now Australian Co-operative Foods). The John Bull Rubber Factory was established in 1951, and 1956 saw the opening of the paper mill by Wiggins Teape (now APPM). While production of paper and the processing of dairy products are now the major industries, there is also steel fabrication and other light industries in the area (Clark 1993: 6).
In 1938 Bomaderry water and electricity were officially turned on by H J Bate, MLA. Water was secured from a dam on Bomaderry Creek whilst electricity, extended to Berry and later to Bomaderry in 1927 and was distributed to the rural areas of Bolong, Back Forest, Coolangatta, Jerry Bailey, Meroo, Jasper’s Brush and Broughton Village, ten years later (Bayley 1975).

The Jaspers Brush school was closed in May 1969. The Meroo Meadow public school was closed in December 1971.
4.1.5 The dairy industry

Alexander Berry, being the first in the area to create the concept of a farming village community, also became the first to set up a dairy on the south coast. Within two years of his arrival, he recorded that, “a shipment of farm produce to Sydney … included in this shipment 78 pounds of butter and 20 cheeses”. So, by the end of 1824 his first dairying trade with Sydney Town had begun (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998).

Within another 10 years or so the dairying herd at ‘Coolangatta’ had increased in quantity and quality. While the first dairy structures were hurriedly installed and crudely made from packed mud, as the brickfield production improved, later buildings were more substantial. A large dairy was developed on his grants south of the river at Jindiandy, close to Upper Numbaa and strategically placed three miles from the river bank so as to reduce the risk from flooding.

After his arrival in 1836, John Berry, who managed the Shoalhaven Estate, changed its emphasis from agriculture to stock breeding and the production of beef. He was said to have lived on horseback and was eventually thrown from his horse on April 15, 1848, dying from injuries four days later. With John Berry’s death and in 1849 the introduction of tenant farmers, the early days of the Shoalhaven being a breeding ground for young stock drew to a close.

Twenty acre plots were leased rent free on the condition that they were cleared and fenced by the end of two to five years. By 1850, the leasing of the Estate started and the tenant farmers began to establish dairying as the chief industry of the Shoalhaven district. By the 1870s most of the cedar had been cut out and the clearing leases had given way to farms – originally for wheat production. Eventually wheat growing was replaced by dairying (Bayley 1975:34-37, Sealy 2000:107).

Bayley contends that Kiama was the birthplace of dairying in Australia; it was the centre that first tried to export butter to England and it pioneered the system of factory production (Bayley 1976: 89). A Butter Export Co-operative Co. was formed in 1870 and efforts were made to export butter to London and India, with an initial measure of success.

Commercial dairying was dependent on a means of separating cream from large volumes of milk and this technology reached Australia in the form of the cream separator by 1881. In 1883 separators were introduced by the Fresh Food and Ice Co and placed in a factory in Mittagong. In the following year they were introduced to the Illawarra with the erection of the Pioneer Factory (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:32, The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 17 Nov 1898:2). The Kiama Pioneer Co-operative Dairy Factory was officially opened on 18 June 1884 and was the first of its kind in Australia. It was situated near Spring Creek on the Jamberoo Road. A monument commemorating the Butter Factory now stands at that location.

Further south, other dairy factories were established between 1884 and 1899. From the late 1880s there was a general movement for the establishment of local butter factories or creameries. These included:

- Kangaroo Dairy Co. (1888).
- Barrengarry Butter Factory (1888 to 1925).
- Berry Dairy Co. (1889 -1903).
- Cambewarra and Meroo Dairy Co. (1889 - 1906).
- Foxground Dairy Co. (1889 – 1914).
- Kangaroo River Dairy Co. (1890) (Bayley 1975).
- Broughton Vale Dairy Co. (1892 – 1897).
- Back Forest Creamery (1895 – 1901).
• Berry Central Creamery (1895 - continues today as Berry Rural Cooperative Society Ltd).
• Bolong Dairy Co. (1896 – 1902).
• Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. (1899 – 1906).
• Woodhill Co-op Refrigerated Butter Co. (1901 – 1914).
• Jaspers Brush Dairy Company (1902 – 1938).

(Sources: Bayley 1975, Berry Museum display 2009)

In the mid-1890s, the home separator came onto the market and gradually became very popular amongst dairy farmers. These allowed the separation of milk on their own premises, with the consequence that only cream needed to be carted to the factory (Caffery n.d.:47). In 1895 it was reported that there were 14 butter factories and creameries on and adjoining the Berry Estate, the furthest being 12 miles from Berry. All supplied the Central butter factory in Berry (Sydney Morning Herald 7 Sep 1895:6).

With the exponential growth in the industry and its technological development, there was a real risk of contamination on increasingly large scales. In January 1887, the Dairy Supervision Act was passed which aimed at ensuring the cleanliness of all dairy products. It was subsequently a requirement for bails, dairies and yards to have floors capable of being cleaned. From this date, flagstone and concrete floors become a feature of bails. Also required was the daily cleaning of dairies and bails, and weekly cleaning of yards. Whitewash was to be used with cool rooms and storage rooms constructed of brick. Amendments in 1893 and 1894 stipulated that tank water, rather than creek water, had to be used in dairies, and that pigs could not be yarded less than fifty yards from the dairy. (Pigs were frequently fed on the skimmed milk, or whey, produced by dairies and butter factories, to create a secondary income (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd and Edwin Higginbotham and Associates 1997:14).

When it was opened in September 1895, the Berry Central Creamery was described as the 'largest and most complete butter factory in the colony'. At that time it was noted that 1075 tons of butter were produced annually in the Berry district from 12,800 cattle, the product of which could be treated by the Berry Central Creamery. The registered trade mark was a bunch of Lillipilli berries (Figure 4-20). In 1911, a group of dairymen purchased the Creamery from the Berry Estate and formed a co-operative, which subsequently became the Berry Rural Co-operative Society Ltd. The milk market continued to grow and in 1958 butter manufacture ceased. A peak annual milk intake was reached in 1976-77 but a downward trend developed in the 1980s. From 1991, milk was collected from farms in the Cooperative’s tankers and delivered direct to the Australian Co-operative Foods Limited Factory at Bomaderry (Lidbetter 1993:14-15).

(Figure 4-20 The trade mark of the Berry Central Creamery in 1895 (Anon 1895).
The Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. was built by G. and M. Muller, on the creek beside the Nowra-Berry Road, on land owned by D. Fletcher (Bayley 1975). At its commencement on the 8 May 1899 it was reportedly the fourth separating station within a two mile radius supplying the Berry Central Factory with cream. It included a cream cooler and pasteuriser (Bayley 1975:154, Sydney Morning Herald 9 May 1899). The following year the company reported that 167,222 gallons of milk were separated, producing 66,877 pounds of commercial butter. Suppliers were paid for 59,814 pounds of butter fat with an average price of 10.38d per pound, equal to 3.71d per gallon for milk (Australian Town and Country Journal 20 Jan 1900:19).

In 1890 the importance of the local butter factory in the social life of a settlement was noted in a description of Jaspers Brush:

"Here there is a large butter factory. The farmers for miles round bring their milk, and this and other factories are becoming centres where the men who before "separators" were introduced, were really separated one from another, and only saw a newspaper once a week, meet and talk. Now the separators bring them together…

The wives and daughters of the dairy farmer have only as a memory the “white slavery” of which they were the subject; and the dairy and the churn and the labour they had to undergo every day, Sunday included...(Australian Town and Country Journal 29 Mar 1890).

In July 1898 Jaspers Brush Dairy was reportedly the first factory to commence a new system of payment to milk suppliers based on the commercial butter contained in milk, instead of the “butter fat” (Clarence and Richmond Examiner 13 August 1898:4). This was a suggestion of a recent dairymans conference ad it was hoped that its adoption would provide a uniform basis for payment across the south coast (Northern Star 24 Aug 1898:2).

To improve butter production the government introduced rules for dairy supervision in 1899. These provided for the use of tank water instead of from creeks, that pigs should not be within 50 yards of factories, that tin vessels be replaced with zinc, and that dairy bails and yards should be paved and regularly swept (Bayley 1975:156). Pasteurisation was a contested development for the industry at the end of the nineteenth century, with some local businesses quickly adopting the process, while others delayed and debated its merits. The Jasper Dairy Co. adopted pasteurisation in 1899 (Northern Star 1 Mar 1899), but the Berry Central Creamery postponed installation until 1913 (Bayley 1975:157, 200).

The Jaspers Dairy Co. claimed to be an innovator under the management of its engineer, Mr C.W.Wood, who moved from the butter producing district of Koroit in Victoria. In 1892 a series of newspaper articles described innovations by Mr Wood in controlling milk temperature during the separation process. A steam powered winch was also stated to be a local first. Mr Wood was described as taking steps to protect his innovations ‘by letters patent’ (The Capricornian 29 Oct 1892:4). Between 1897 and 1899, the factory was one of the first places to erect a facile or improved steam turbine Habcock machine for treating milk. By this time, the factory was separating cream and sending it to the Berry Central factory, as were most of the local Dairy companies (Sydney Morning Herald 10 Feb 1899). Mr Wood became the manager and engineer of the Illawarra Central Dairy Co. creamery at Albion Park in July 1899 (Northern Star 18 Jul 1899:8).

To date, no photos or illustrations of the Meroo Meadow or jaspers Brush factories have been identified. Figure 4-21 shows examples of local factories of roughly contemporary age and capacity, and Figure 4-22 illustrates a suggested factory design from 1893.
Figure 4-21: Examples of local butter factories: (top) Berry Butter Factory (1889 – 1901) this view dated 1891 (from ‘Shoalhaven Estate’ p.19, Wollongong City Library no. P03/P03737, courtesy Berry and District Historical Society); (bottom) Woodhill Butter Factory (1901 – 1913) this view c.1908 (Wollongong City Library P03/P03297, also Mabbutt n.d.:41)
The illustration represents a factory worked on what is known as the "gravitation" system. In the design of this building our aim has been to arrange the plant in such a manner as to reduce the labour in working same to a minimum, besides keeping in view the greatest cleanliness in working. Special attention has also been paid to the lighting of the factory.

The working of the plant may be briefly described as follows: The milk is raised by means of the hoist M from the vehicle below, and emptied into the milk-weighing tank A. Upon a valve on the discharge pipe of tank B being opened, the milk will flow into the milk-receiving tank B. The latter tank is provided with an outlet pipe having branches with valves leading to the separators C, and so arranged that the milk from tank B may be allowed to flow to each of the separators at one time, or to any given separator only.

Our illustration shows the plant arranged so that the cream separated from the milk may be run into cream tanks placed in a cool storage chamber during hot weather; and if not required to cool, it may be run into the churns G on the ground floor. The churns, after being charged, are set in motion, and after the butter is made it is removed to the butter-worker, to have the moisture worked out and the butter salted.

The cream separators and skim milk tank L are arranged to allow the skim milk to readily gravitate from separators to skim-milk tank.

Our working drawings show two cool storage chambers, one for cooling the cream in warm weather, and the other for storage of the butter. The refrigerators for keeping these chambers cool are also arranged to supply plenty of cold water for churning the butter. Probably the cool rooms and refrigerators may be done away with, as your climate is so much milder than ours.

Where practicable, the factory could be erected at the foot of a hill, and thus do away with the hoisting of the milk.*

Figure 4-22 A suggested design for a butter factory from 1893 (Dept of Agriculture, Tasmania, Bulletin No.2, "Modern Dairying", Hobart 1893 pp.53-54, In Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1997, vol 1, p.14)

The sub-division of the Berry estate over the 40 years following the death of David Berry created many small dairy farms on both sides of the Shoalhaven. Examples of the style of dairyman's weatherboard house, bail and other outbuildings survive from the period around 1900, such as Knapp's property at 680 Bolong Road, Bomaderry, conveniently close to a dairy factory and the railhead (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:23).
By the turn of the century emphasis in the dairy industry was turning towards the raw milk trade with the Sydney market. Cattle that produced quantity milk rapidly displaced breeds that produced milk in lesser quantities. The demand for big black and white Friesians (Holsteins) soon changed the character of local herds which were formerly dominated by the Guernsey and Jersey breeds. Another consequence of the diversion of milk to the Sydney market was the demise of many small local butter factories. Examples include the Boolong Dairy Co (to 1900), the Meroo Dairy Co (to 1906) and the Jasper Dairy Co. (to 1902) (Antill 1982:26). The Berry Central Butter factory considered purchasing the Jaspers Brush Co. in 1901, provided milk supply could be guaranteed for two years (Sydney Morning Herald 6 Nov 1901, Kiama Reporter 16 Nov 1901:2).

The widespread adoption of the private cream separator was also cited as a reason for the demise of local creameries. In 1904, The Northern Star announced that their Kiama reporter states that “the private separator has knocked the Meroo Meadow Dairy Company out”. Another report described rumours that the factory would close shortly owing to the continued secession of suppliers (Northern Star 24 Aug 1904:5). The following year the Meroo Meadow Dairy Co was wound up with a final dividend settlement of 1s 9d per share (Northern Star 12 Jul 1905:3).

During the last decade of the nineteenth century, when Alexander Hay was the Manager of the late David Berry’s ‘Coolangatta Estate’, a more scientific approach was adopted towards dairying in the Shoalhaven. Following an investigative trip to Europe by Alexander, the Trustees of the Estate erected the abovementioned Butter Factory at Berry and established a select herd of imported pure bred dairy cattle purchased on their native pastures, and placed it on a stud farm at Coolangatta.

At that time, two public institutions of importance to the dairy farmers of the district were established at Berry. At the urging of Alexander Hay, a Bill was passed through the NSW Parliament to vary the will of David Berry to the extent that a Stud Farm and an Experimental Farm should share in the endowment bequeathed by him for a Cottage Hospital established at Berry. That was agreed upon and a transfer of Port Jackson foreshores belonging to the Estate and judged to be of equal in value to the endowment was satisfactorily arranged. The Crown then assumed the Trusteeship of all three institutions (the Hospital, Stud Farm and Experimental Farm) and established them at Berry (Antill 1982:355).

The Berry Experiment Farm opened near the river beside the road to Coolangatta in October 1899, being the first of its kind on the coast. It continued under the Department of Agriculture until in April 1934 it was taken over by the Child Welfare Department. It was remodelled with the provision of a dining room, dormitories and other facilities with cottages to house 40 boys to take farm training. In 1939, additional buildings were added, together with more modern farming facilities. In the 1970s the Child Welfare Training Farm closed and re-opened as a holiday home for the underprivileged and was later transferred to the Department of Sport and Recreation (Bayley 1975:206).

The first milking machines in the Meroo district were installed in 1917 by John Muller at his ‘Pomona’ dairy farm. They were reportedly in use for 47 years. The first tractors were introduced to the district in the 1930s and 1940s (Morschel 1992).

In 1924 the Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. acquired the Jaspers Brush branch of the Shoalhaven Milk and Ice Co. Ltd. In 1927 the company installed a new fuel oil engine and compressor. It operated at a cost of 7d per hour, and reportedly enabled the factory to greatly increase its output (Sydney Morning Herald 28 Aug 1924:11, 15 Jan 1927:13). However, later that year the company was fined ten pounds for unsanitary factory conditions, the repair of which had been delayed by contractor delays (Northern Star 23 July 1927:5).

In 1930 a profitable year was reported by the Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. however shareholders expressed alarm at the decision of milk companies to pay only 10½d per gallon for milk, meaning that dairy farmers would soon only be receiving a price for milk equivalent to that for butter (Sydney Morning Herald 3 Dec 1930:11). In 1935 a profit of £46/3/6 was reported with a total of 506,250 gallons of milk being treated and despatched to Sydney (Sydney Morning Herald 2 Dec 1935:9). Three years later the company went into voluntary liquidation (Sydney Morning Herald 12 July 1938:17).
Concrete silos

Tall concrete silos, now redundant and mostly abandoned, remain a persistent regional landscape feature. The silos are a product of the dairy industry and were developed to store silage for the supplemental feeding of the dairy herds.

Silage as a means of increasing feed stocks was gradually introduced during the 1880s and 1890s (Dowling 1893:103-105).

Fodder conservation in the Shoalhaven district began in the early 1920s and was recognised by farmers as important for successful dairying and the prevention of bush and grass fires. The first silo to be erected in the district was on Pritchard’s farm on Jindyandy Lane, Numbaa. The silo was imported from overseas and erected in 1911.

Amongst the district’s earliest silos was that of Vaughan Bros., which was erected on Vaughans Farm at the end of Hanigans Lane, Bomaderry, and of J W Henry of Bolong. The first silo in Meroo was built for Mr Jake Muller. Construction dates at other properties include Binks at Cambewarra in 1918, Abernethys in 1925, and Urquharts in 1931.

The local concrete silos with rusked rib iron roofs were built by either Alf Tetley, who lived at Bolong, or ‘Podgy’ Elliott, son of the local builder, Seward Elliott, of Nowra. (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390229).

Thomas Binks’ ensilage experiments succeeded at Cambewarra and in 1923 he gave open days to outline the system and give a lead to the district. The establishment of a superphosphate industry at Port Kembla in 1921 also assisted pasture and crop growth by its distribution and use.

The first fodder conservation competition was conducted in the district in 1931, being won by Alfred Mottram of Numba with H O Cox winning in Kangaroo Valley in the following years (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390229).

4.1.6 The development of the main road between Kiama and Bomaderry

Although not supported by direct European historical observations, it is highly probable that the local Aboriginal people used and maintained trails across the southern Illawarra coastal plain. These are likely to have taken advantage of natural corridors, such as creeks and rivers, ridge and spurline crests, and the elevated ground between swamp basins. Other factors which may have influenced Aboriginal cross-country routes, were the incidence of thick ‘brush’ or lowland rainforest, and the location of saddles and passes providing passage across the Cambewarra Range (NOHC 2007, 2009a).

The purposes and destinations which would have governed an Aboriginal network of trails would not have corresponded with the differing economic and communication interests of the early European inhabitants. However, it is probable that where Aboriginal trails coincided with European interests, trails would have been used and quickly formalised into bridle trails and later into paths and tracks. There is some limited evidence for this process across the Illawarra Ranges where natural passes and interconnecting routes became important for inland communication, and the movement of stock and early diary produce (Officer 1991a, Griffith 1978).

The first European established roads were most probably sawyers’ tracks, which allowed the hauling of felled red cedar logs from the hinterland forests to points of maritime access such as coastal ports and navigable streams. This activity would have commenced with the first cedar harvesting in 1812. Trails are likely to have followed terrain and gradients of least resistance, such as ridge and spur crests, as well as the level ground of the valley floors and associated meadows. Some examples of the informal trails which developed prior to the construction of formal roads are shown on the 1866 County map for Camden (Figures 4-23 and 4-24).

The regular maritime transport of logs to Sydney provided as a secondary function, a means of transport and communication for European settlement, and the sea corridor dominated regional transport well into the late nineteenth century.
An alternative to inland trails was provided by a rough coastal track which developed informally to link the coastal settlements from Bulli, south to Kiama. The ‘track’ consisted of a series of headland traverses that allowed access onto the intervening beaches. Creek, river and estuary mouths were a hazard that could be crossed depending on local conditions and the depth of sand barriers.

European settlement followed the initial incursions of the cedar getters, and as this occupation extended beyond maritime access points, centres of habitation became linked by informal trails which developed into tracks with continued use. Following the steady alienation of crown lands via government grants and sales, the use of such early tracks became an increasing source of dispute, across the Illawarra, as the rights of private landholders began to be asserted. Amongst the complaints were those of Alexander Berry who stated that his property was being trespassed upon for want of a proper road (J.M.E. 1951:76). Increasing pressure from landholders to survey and establish public roads resulted in an expedition by Surveyor-General Mitchell which, by 1834, had formalised a road route between Appin and the northern Illawarra via Broughtons Pass and Mount Keira. In addition to a northerly extension to Bulli, the road was extended southwards ‘as far as Saddleback Mountain to connect some miles inland with a line marked from Kiama to Bong Bong by Surveyor Hoddle in 1830’ (J.M.E. 1951:77).

Mitchell begged ‘to observe that the continuance of a great road further south than the Nurrima Range [Saddleback Mountain] should be considered with reference to the passage of the Shoalhaven River and the best direction for a thoroughfare through the Coast Country of St Vincent’. Mitchell was ‘of the opinion that the valley of Broughton’s Creek would be the best direction for it to cross…’ (in JME 1951:77).

In 1841 a petition by Gerringong residents to Governor Gibbs stated:

‘That your Petitioners grievously labouring under the many disadvantages arising from the want of a practicable Road on the south side of Kiama do humbly pray your Excellency That you may be pleased to allow a continuation of the Jamberoo Parish Road to be surveyed through Kiama as far as Gerringong...’ (in JME 1951:78).

A meeting at Kiama, in 1841, to discuss extending the road from Saddleback Mountain to the Shoalhaven, failed to result in any official action (JME 1951:81). Fifteen years later, in 1856, Surveyor Shone was required to mark a line from Gerringong to Broughton Valley and to report on the expediency of extending the line to Bomaderry. Following further official inaction, Alexander Berry took the initiative, and privately constructed a road across his estate lands from Gerringong to Broughton Creek (Berry) in 1856 and later to Bomaderry by 1858 (JME 1951:81; Cousins 1948:105).

It is this private road that is shown on an 1866 map of the County of Camden (Figure 4-23 and Figure 4-24). The alignment of this road established a transport corridor which has been retained to the present day, with many sections of the Princes Highway retaining the original alignment. The Berry Estate road was distinctive in its use of long straight sections, which often traversed steep spurs and ridges without apparent regard for the consequentially steep gradients. The straight and sometimes steep nature of the road may be explained by:

- The need to minimise length and consequential costs.
- Pressure to establish a road link in a minimal time period.
- The absence of cadastral or land ownership limitations that would otherwise have required deviations and bends.
- The predominant early use of bullock teams to convey produce, and thus a greater tolerance of moderate gradients.

James Wilson is reported to have surveyed and pegged the first “track” from Broughton Creek to the present Foxground area and on to Gerringong (SFHS 2003:vol 2 p.113).
On 9 August 1858, the Illawarra Mercury reported that a road was to be proclaimed from Gerringong to the head of Broughton Creek. It was to be maintained at the expense of the parishes which it traversed. Bayley (1975) notes that the road from Gerringong to Broughton Creek was gazetted by the government in 1858 and Berry sent men to open the road from Gerringong to Bumaderry Creek (Bayley 1975:51).

In August the following year the Illawarra Mercury reported that:

‘Mr David Berry is also busy in the march of progress. He is opening the new road from Bumaderry [Bomaderry] to Broughton’s Creek, and from the number of men employed quarrying stone, and brick making at Bumaderry, Mr Berry appears at last to have an eye to the future advancement of the district.’ (8th August 1859).

In September 1859 a Municipal Council of Shoalhaven was proclaimed and meetings of elected councillors commenced. Alexander Berry however objected to the inclusion of his estate lands within the boundary of the municipality, and following both a Supreme Court injunction and an appeal to the Privy Council, the area was declared illegal in 1865 and the Council become defunct.

On 8 December 1859, the Illawarra Mercury, reported on the unanimous passing by Council of ‘a resolution of Mr Bice, ‘as to the necessity for the immediate survey of the road from Bomaderry to Kiama,’ which is very important to the district…”.

In the early 1860s the government provided 140 pounds to be spent on the road between Kiama and Broughton Creek, roughly ten pounds per mile (Cousins 1948:232). Crown survey plans for the road indicate that the alignment had been surveyed and confirmed by 1862, and show how the new road comprised of long straight traverses would replace a network of informal and curvilinear tracks which followed contours and the basal valley slopes (Figure 4-25, also refer Figure 4-28).

Antill (1982) states that the road from Broughton Creek to Bomaderry was completed and opened for use in July 1869, despite many potholes left by the removal of tree stumps. Bridges over the creeks on the new road between Bomaderry and Gerringong were completed in October (Antill 1982:82).
Figure 4-23: Extract from an 1866 map of the County of Camden, showing the location of roads between Klama, Gerringong, Broughton Creek (Berry) and Bomaderry, highlighted in blue. Note the alignment of the Berry Estate Road between Gerringong and Bomaderry which comprises many straight sections with minimal bends and deviations (County of Camden, New South Wales, 1866 compiled by Messrs Braddock & Baly, & engraved by John L. Ross. National Library of Australia 1866. MAP RM 1798. Part 2; http://nla.gov.au/nla.map-rm1798-s1-sd-cd)

These references to the completion of the Broughton Creek to Bomaderry road by 1869 appear to contradict references in Cousins (1948:105) and J.M.E. (1951:81) for the completion of this road by 1858. This disparity may be a contrast between earlier and privately initiated works by David Berry, and later government funded formal survey and follow-up construction. It remains an issue to be definitively resolved.
Figure 4-24: Enlarged detail from extract of 1866 map of the County of Camden, showing the location of tracks (black dotted lines) and roads (continuous black lines) in the vicinity of the proposal. Note the location of the original Berry Estate road relative to the proposed Berry to Bomaderry upgrade (red overlay – approximate location) (County of Camden, New South Wales, 1866 compiled by Messrs Braddock & Baly, & engraved by John L. Ross. National Library of Australia 1866. MAP RM 1798. Part 2; http://nla.gov.au/nla.map-rm1798-s1-sd-cd)
Figure 4-25  1862 survey of proposed and subsequent alterations to road between ‘Bomedary’ and Broughton Village (Crown survey plan R193a – 1603), this portion showing the section between the Shoalhaven River and ‘Meroo Station’. Note the curvilinear nature of the previously existing trackways.
Prior to the Berry Estate road via Broughton Creek, terrestrial travel southwards by vehicle had been via Seven Mile beach, with a crossing of the Crooked River near modern Gerroa. Further travel was via the north bank of the Shoalhaven, past Berry’s Coolangatta homestead, to a ferry crossing at Numbaa. Following the completion of the Berry Estate road, a government ferry commenced operation at the Bomaderry crossing in May of 1866 (Shoalhaven Heads website).

Despite the fact that the road between Broughton Creek (Berry) and Bomaderry, was clearly funded, at least partly, by the Government, the road shares many of the characteristics of his privately funded road between Gerringong and Broughton Creek - long straight traverses, with little or no concession to gradients (Figure 4-25). This may be explained by the earlier private initiation of the road by Berry, and/or the possibility that the same work crew, managed by the Estate, was employed. Both possibilities are supported by local news reports of Berry sending men to open the road from Gerringong to Bumaderry Creek (refer above).

Following the cessation of the Shoalhaven Council, two alternative Municipalities of Numba, (south of Shoalhaven) and of Broughton Creek and Bomaderry (north of the river) were proclaimed in 1868. Many of the roads and bridges constructed by the Berry Estate served as the region’s main transport corridors, and consequently came under the jurisdiction of the new Councils. These roads were proclaimed, prior to the Councils commencing systematic clearing and stumping, together with the construction of small bridges and culverts. Much of this work had to be done on the Gerringong road and contracts were let in different sections, some at 15 shillings, some at 17 shillings and some at 19 shillings 6 pence, a chain. Bridges across some of the creeks were also constructed, one for 23 pounds 7 shillings 6 pence, and another for 16 pounds (Shoalhaven News in Cousins 1948:266; JME 1951:81).

In 1872, a correspondent to The Sydney Mail described the road in the following way:

‘The road from Jerringong to Broughton Creek is a very hilly one, and, in parts, rough and unformed, though much has been done towards the making and completion of it; and the bridges and culverts are as excellent as they are numerous. Almost the whole of it runs through Mr Berry’s estate, over ridge and valley, among pasture farms and comfortable homes, and by tall dead trees rising against the sky, white and ghastly, but relieved by the waving plumes of the cabbage trees that are largely intermixed with them...’

‘...and a good deal of “corn” is grown in places; but from the crossing at Upper Broughton Creek until a view is gained at the big rich valley of Broughton Creek proper, few homesteads are visible. The ‘bush’ is still in a comparatively wild state, though there are “clearings” on either side that cannot be perceived from the road.’

‘...From Broughton Creek to the Shoalhaven at Bomaderry ferry, the road is still less formed than that leading to the Creek; but it has the advantage of being comparatively level, and is in course of improvement. It is lined almost throughout with splendid trees, straight as a ship’s mast, and far taller; the size and closeness of these make the task of clearing the land a very heavy one; but even here there are “clearings” and some of the most luxuriant corn in the district.’ (The Sydney Mail May 4 1872:p558).
In the period between Berry’s original construction of the estate road from Gerringong to Bomaderry in the late 1850s, and the 1890s, the further development of the road by the local Councils resulted in a longer and more angular alignment, involving switch-backs and deviations around spurs, mostly on slopes to the east of Berry. This is evident in a comparison of the 1866 and 1895 County Maps (Figure 4-23 and Figure 4-29). The elaboration and revision of Berry’s originally straight alignments appears to have been a consequence of establishing more gradual grades, suitable for horse drawn vehicles, and complying with various farm boundaries and related cadastre. By this time, most of the latter were now freehold title following the break up and sale of the Berry Estate.

Most of the current highway within the proposal area follows the original alignment of the 1858/69 Berry Estate road, most probably because the gradients being traversed did not require deviations. There are two exceptions. The first is the southern-most portion of the highway between the Meroo and Cambewarra Road intersections. The original estate road followed, what is now known as Meroo Road, southwards to a ferry on the Shoalhaven River, on the downstream side of the Bomaderry Creek mouth (Figure 4-24). The construction of a road bridge across the river in 1881, approximately 1km upstream of the ferry, necessitated a new highway alignment connecting to the Cambewarra and Berry roads. Although the new highway alignment acts as a bypass to Bomaderry, it had been surveyed by at least 1886, five years before the town survey. A survey of this date for the ‘Kiama to Nowra’ rail line already describes Meroo Road as the ‘Old Main South Coast Road’ and shows the new alignment to the west (NSWLA 1890, v.6:239). The 1892 Bomaderry subdivision sales poster confirms this change by identifying the new alignment as the ‘South Coast Road’ (Figure 4-19).

The second exception was the climb and descent over the Strongs Road spurline at Jaspers Brush. A more gradual climb to the east of the original line was constructed in the latter 1890s (refer Figure 4-27 and 4-28). The current highway alignment still approximates this deviation.

The Shoalhaven River bridge, designed by American engineer C. Shaler Smith, and built by the Edge Moor Iron Co. (Delaware) was constructed using American pin-jointed Whipple steel trusses. The bridge works, including a new approach bridge over Bomaderry Creek, cost £42,000 (Sydney Morning Herald 3 Aug 1881:7). The bridge was intended for a double track railway, or shared road and rail, but was completed in 1881 twelve years before the railway reached Bomaderry. The rail line was never continued further south. The bridge’s timber decking was maintained until 1981 when it was replaced with concrete (RMS Section 170 register).
Following the death of David Berry in 1889, the estate passed to his cousin John Hay. Hay developed a formal street grid for the town of Broughton Creek in the 1880s, on the western side of Broughton Mill Creek. This was surveyed in 1879 and well established by 1890 (Cousins 1948:262; RMS Section 170 register, Broughton Creek bridge citation). The new grid was orientated slightly differently to the existing emergent streetscape, and this resulted in many buildings being misaligned, necessitating their movement or realignment to the new pavements (Lidbetter 1993:19). Another consequence was that the existing road to Bomaderry which lead away from the town in a straight south westerly trajectory would be truncated by the new grid, and a new approach road had to be developed at the northwestern corner of the grid. The current highway alignment follows this late nineteenth century revision.

In 1890, the road from Jaspers Brush to Meroo was described as ‘bad in places, very bad in others, and exceptionally bad in some spots, diabolically bad here, there and everywhere, and is positively dangerous to man or beast which has to travel thereon. (Australian Town and Country Journal 29 Mar 1890)

Hay established a street grid for the Bomaderry township in the following year 1891.

The approximate route of the current Princes Highway was declared the ‘Main South Coast Road’ through the Local Government Extension act of 1906. However, in 1920, during a visit to Australia of the Prince of Wales, the National Roads Association secured approval from the Prince to name the coastal road after him. An opening ceremony was held at Bulli on 19 October 1920. The road was formally proclaimed the Prince’s Highway (State Highway No.1) in 1928 under the Main Roads Act.
Figure 4-27: Extracts from 1958 aerial photograph (left), 1893 Jaspers Brush Farms sales poster (middle) and an 1866 County of Camden map (right), showing the original 1858/69 alignment of the Berry Estate private road across the Strongs Road spurline at Jaspers Brush (right), the subsequent highway deviation, established by the 1890s (middle), and road remnants still evident in 1958 (left). (SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK12 699-5057, 23/7/1958; The jaspers Brush Farms, Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, Libraries Australia 44485223; County of Camden map 1966, ANL)
Figure 4-28  Extract from Crown survey plan R193d – 1603, showing 1895 survey of a deviation of the Main South Coast Road at Jaspers Brush. The original privately constructed Berry Estate Road is shown in blue (officially closed in 1933), the new alignment is shown in red (officially resumed and gazetted in 1898). Note later straightening in 1933 of the 1898 alignment at the eastern end. Also note near eastern end, the location of former ‘Store’ (left side of new alignment), and the Jaspers Brush Butter Factory (right side), and Jaspers Brush public school (far right).
From the passing of the *Local Government Act* in 1906, road maintenance and improvements were the responsibility of local Councils. This meant that highway works were uncoordinated and tended to be local in nature, and driven by local needs. Many of the municipalities along the road depended heavily on the volunteer support of local landholders in the upkeep of the road. The construction of bridges was the responsibility of the Department of Public Works. Following the Main Roads Act in 1924, the formation of the Main Roads Board in 1925 marked the beginning of an integrated approach to highway maintenance and reconstruction.
At its formation, the Board found that the highway through the Shoalhaven area consisted of gravel, broken stone or plain earth surfaces (Bayley 1975:178). The Board immediately embarked on a Statewide programme of improving roads to a standard to suit high speed automobile traffic. The Board first arranged with a number of Councils for the urgent reconstruction or construction of portions of the Highway, and later assumed full responsibility for the whole length of the Highway to the Victoria border (expecting a short section through Wollongong), a length of around 342 miles.

The approximate route of the current Princes Highway was declared the 'Main South Coast R’ad' through the Local Government Extension Act of 1906. 'n opening' and naming of the Princes Highway took place at Bulli in 1920 (DMR 1976, pp. 64 and map opposite). Under the Main Roads Act, the Princes Highway was proclaimed a State Highway in August 1928 and was subsequently targeted for improvement by surfacing, realignment, line marking and bridge construction and improvement. (DMR 1976, pp. 138-56)

Outside of new and reconstructed portions, a program of gradual improvement was pursued, funded by annual maintenance and improvement budgets. This program included works such as widening of existing formations and pavements, improvements to crests and curves, elimination of V-gutters by the construction of culverts, erection of safety fencing, guide posts, and the strengthening of pavements. By December 1932 the highway between Sydney and the Shoalhaven had been improved and most sections surfaced with a bituminous macadam (Figure 4-30). By 1951, the Highway had a continuous bituminous surface from Sydney to Moruya (JME 1951:84; OzRoads website; RMS Section 170 Broughton Creek bridge register).

Unemployment relief work was undertaken along the highway during the 1930s. The lookout at Mount Pleasant was constructed in 1935. In 1935-6 a new concrete bridge was constructed over Broughton Creek, on a short deviation, 650 metres downstream of the original timber structure. The cadastral street grid of Broughton Village was largely bypassed by the new alignment.

Figure 4-30: 1937 photo of the Princes Highway between Nowra and Berry, possibly looking north, approximately one kilometre north of the Moss Vale Road – Cambewarra Road intersection (‘Mount View’ in left middle distance) (State Library of New South Wales d1_26424r).

1936 also saw the completion of a 1.7 kilometre deviation through steep country to the south of the creek. This section included what is now known as ‘The Big Dipper’, and cut off a tight bend known at the time as ‘Binks’ Corner (OzRoads website; Parish map of Broughton 6th edition 1916-1938). Between 1936 and 1938, a 2.3 kilometre deviation between Omega and the Gerringong Railway Stations was constructed. This was known as the Omega deviation (or the Gerringong Bypass) and removed two railway crossings along the former route of Fern and Belinda Streets within Gerringong.
The late 1920s to 1930 also saw the upgrading of the old 1880s Bomaderry deviation, commencing just south of Tullian Creek and bypassing Bomaderry to the west. The present reinforced concrete highway bridge over Abernethys Creek (G2B H2) was constructed as part of these works in 1929 (RMS Section 170 Register). The deviation followed road reserves which had been gazetted since before the Berry town subdivision.

Sometime in the first half of the twentieth century, tree plantings were established by local Councils at various places along the highway, and notably within or adjacent to settlements. These often consisted of avenues with plantings on both sides of the road. Some of these survive and have been actively maintained with progressive replacement of any losses. Examples occur at Meroo Meadow (G2B H78), where the western side of an original avenue of pines remains, and between Meroo Meadow and Wileys Creek (G2B H5), where north and south-side plantings remain and include pines, silky oak, bunya pine, camphor laurel and Eucalyptus. These tree varieties reflect both the taste of the early twentieth century and probably also the range available from the Government Nursery at Goulburn, which was a likely source for the Councils (Varman 2001:8). A local newspaper report suggests that some of the pines close to the Meroo Meadow Union Church were planted in 1905 (Northern Star 29 Jul 1905:6).

The reconstruction of the highway was halted in 1941 due to the onset of war in the Pacific, with funds and manpower being transferred to major defence routes. One of these was the Mount Ousley Road which provided an alternative descent of the Illawarra Escarpment (OzRoads website). 1941 also saw the possessive form removed from the Highway name, which became simply the ‘Princes Highway’ (OzRoads website).

In 1948 the intersection of the highway and the Cambewarra Road (now Moss Vale Road) was improved and widened with straightening of the north-south highway alignment (Parish map of Bunberra 4th Ed).

In 1954 the highway was included in the National Route system as part of National Route 1. Signage was erected along the length of the highway during June 1955 (OzRoads website).

In 1955 an inspection of the Broughton Mill Creek Bridge at Berry was made by an appointed administrator of the Shoalhaven Shire, Keith Hawkshaw, who called for a report from the Council engineer on an innovative design of pile for a new bridge. Due to the difficult approach to the bridge, many accidents had occurred. Hawkshaw agreed with Berry residents that actions were required. A new concrete bridge on a new alignment was opened in 1958 (Bayley 1975:213; Robson and Knevitt 2008:48-49).

The 1960s brought the completion of the reconstruction and sealing plan that had been started in 1925. The bitumen finally reached the Victorian Border in 1965.

From the mid-1970s to the early 1980s, the highway was progressively improved by the removal of steeper grades and sharp bends, and modifying intersections, notably in the area of Strongs Road (1979) and Boxsells Lane, and the east-south bend at Meroo Meadow.

In 1980, a new three-lane bridge to carry northbound traffic was constructed immediately upstream and adjacent to the 1881 Shoalhaven River steel truss bridge which continued to carry two lanes of southbound traffic. The new bridge cost 2.9 million dollars.

In 1989 the roundabout at the intersection of the Princes Highway and Moss Vale Road (SR79) was installed.

Dual carriageways were completed through Bomaderry in December 1993.
4.1.7 The South Coast rail line

The South Coast rail line reached North Kiama (now Bombo) from Wollongong in 1887 and was extended to Bomaderry in 1893. The extension was formally opened on 3 June 1893 and cost £359,692/-/- (Clarke 1989). The line immediately dominated the passenger market to Nowra and in 1895 the Illawarra Steam Navigation Co. decided to concentrate on the freight market. Heavy cargo continued to be transported by both rail and sea into the twentieth century but the coastal trade steadily declined and had virtually disappeared by the 1940s (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:24).

Three railway stations were opened in 1893 as part of the extension, at Berry, Jaspers Brush and at Bomaderry (originally named Nowra and later changed to Nowra-Bomaderry). A siding was also constructed at Meroo Meadow, at the eastern end of Lamonds Lane. Following the closure of the Jasper Brush milk depot in 1939, the Jaspers Brush siding was rarely used and it was removed in 1951. The station was closed in 1988 (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:25).

4.2 Cultural heritage studies and inventory of listed heritage items

4.2.1 Statutory and non-statutory registers

The following statutory and non-statutory registers were searched for this assessment (updated March 2013):

**Statutory listings**

- World Heritage List.
- The National Heritage List (Australian Heritage Council).
- The Commonwealth Heritage List (Australian Heritage Council).
- The State Heritage Register (NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage).
- Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register compiled by RMS.
- Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register compiled by Rail Corp.
- Schedule 7 (Heritage Conservation) Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 1985 (with amendments as at 21 Oct 2011).
- Schedule 1 (Items of Environmental heritage) Illawarra Regional Environmental Plan No.1, gazetted 1986 and now deemed a State Environmental Planning Policy, (as at 7 Jan 2011).

**Draft statutory listings**

- Schedule 5 (Environmental Heritage) Draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 2013.

**Non-statutory listings**

- The Australian Heritage Database (Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities).
- The State Heritage Inventory (NSW Heritage Branch, Office of Environment and Heritage).
- Australian National Shipwreck Database (Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities).
- The Register of the National Estate (Australian Heritage Council).
- Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory (includes data sheets on LEP listed items together with non-listed items identified in previous Heritage studies and reports).
- Register of the National Trust of Australia (NSW).
- Australian Institute of Architects, Heritage Buildings List.
The searches found ten heritage items in or within 200 metres of the proposal boundary. Five of these are included on statutory registers and five on non-statutory listings (refer Table 4.1). The five statutory listings are:

- The Princes Highway Abernethys Creek bridge listed on the RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register (identified as G2B H2 in this report).
- Four items included on the Heritage Conservation Schedule (Schedule 7) of the Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (1985, with amendments as at 21 Oct 2011):
  - The Meroo Meadow Union Church (identified as G2B H3 in this report).
  - The former Meroo Meadow public school and schoolmasters residence, now the ‘Hotel Woodbyne’ (identified as G2B H4 in this report).
  - The former Jaspers Brush public school and Schoolmasters residence (identified as G2B H44 in this report).
  - ‘Pomona’ a late nineteenth century dairy farm complex (identified as G2B H46 in this report).

A revision of the Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan is currently in progress by the Shoalhaven City Council. Public exhibition of a 2009 draft ended in October of 2011 and a 2013 revision was on public exhibition until the 10 May 2013. Schedule 5 (Environmental Heritage) of the Draft Shoalhaven LEP 2013 does not include any new proposed listings relevant to the proposal.

The Shoalhaven City Council compiles and maintains the Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory, based on NSW Heritage Branch software and data sheet proformas. The inventory does not constitute a statutory listing and entered items may be based on a variety of received sources although most have been generated by the Shoalhaven Heritage Study (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998). The inventory serves to inform planning and management actions, but does not infer or define statutory constraints on included items. Many inventoried recordings are not included within either the current 1985, or Draft 2013, Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan.

Five recordings are included on non-government registers with no statutory role. Three of these relate to landscape heritage values. The Berry District Landscape Conservation Area is a broad scale, landscape based recording, originally defined by the National Trust of Australia (New South Wales). It is listed on the Trust’s Register, and was also placed on the Register of the National Estate as an Indicative Place.

The Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes were identified by the Shoalhaven Heritage Study (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998).

A recent addition to the Register of the National Trust is the Berry Township Urban Conservation Area. This listing incorporates three levels:

- A broad scale visual boundary which adopts the regional boundary of the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area.
- A subdivision boundary which relates to the closer urban settlement of the nineteenth century Berry town grid.
- A buffer zone which seeks to protect the immediate rural setting of the urban grid (Clark and Duyker 2010).

Of these subcategories, the buffer zone and the broader visual boundary area, occur within the proposal area.
The two remaining non-statutory listings are for ‘Northcote’, an early twentieth century cottage which was the former site of the Jaspers Brush post office, and ‘Exeter’, a Victorian farmhouse and its silo, just north of Bomaderry.

For detailed descriptions of these recordings please refer to heritage listing extracts provided in Appendix B and to the relevant sections in Appendix C.
Table 4-1: Heritage recordings and listed heritage items on statutory and non-statutory heritage schedules and lists, located within or 200 metres either side of the proposal boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Statutory and draft Statutory listings</th>
<th>Non-Statutory listings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>RTA s170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H2</td>
<td>Abernethys Creek Bridge</td>
<td>Abernethys Creek, Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H3</td>
<td>Meroo Union Church</td>
<td>8 Boxsells Lane, Meroo Meadow Lot 4 249776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H4</td>
<td>Former Meroo Meadow Public School and Schoolmasters residence</td>
<td>C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow Lot 1 DP716669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to SICPH CL Berry District Landscape Conservation Area (BDLCA)</td>
<td>Embraces the coastline south of Kiama some 30 kilometres southward to Greenwell Point, the undulating coastal plain and the flood plain on both sides of the lower Shoalhaven River and including the steep, benched slopes rising up to the escarpment of the Illawarra plateau.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Equivalent to SICPH CL Berry Township Urban Conservation Area | Three levels:  
- Visual boundary - equates with BDLCA above.  
- Subdivision boundary - comprises area of closer settlement in town C19th urban grid.  
- Buffer zone – comprising of the immediate rural setting of the town |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | ✓ |   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>RTA s170</th>
<th>Illawarra REP 1986</th>
<th>Shoal. LEP 85</th>
<th>Draft Shoal. LEP 2013</th>
<th>RNE</th>
<th>SHI</th>
<th>NT (NSW)</th>
<th>Sh HI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Equivalent to SICPH CL | Berry – Bolong Pastoral Landscapes | Roughly bounded by:  
- The Shoalhaven River in the south.  
- The coast in the southeast.  
- The City Council boundary in the east.  
- The Cambewarra Range escarpment in the northeast, north and northwest (as far as Browns Mountain).  
- The northern and eastern margin of Tapitallee, Bangalee and Bomaderry. | | | | | | | | | ✓ |
| G2B H44 | ‘Hotel Woodbyne’  
Former Jaspers Brush Public School complex and gardens | 4 O'Keefes Lane  
Jaspers Brush  
Lot 1 DP872572 | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| G2B H46 | ‘Pomona’  
Late nineteenth century Dairy farm complex | C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow  
Lot 2 DP 620160 | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| G2B H76 | ‘Northcote’ Early twentieth century farm  
cottage and outbuildings | 25 Jaspers Brush Road  
Lot 5 DP740764 | | | | | | | | | ✓ |
| G2B H77 | ‘Exeter’  
Victorian farmhouse and silo | C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow  
Lot 4 DP249085 | | | | | | | | | ✓ |

**Key**

HR = Heritage Register, NSW Heritage Branch.  
SHI = State Heritage Inventory, NSW Heritage Branch.  
RTA s170 = Roads and Traffic Authority Section 170 Heritage & Conservation Register.  
Illawarra REP 1986 = Illawarra Regional Environmental Plan (first gazetted 1986).  
Shoal. LEP 85 = Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 1985 – Schedule 7.  
Sh HI = Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory.  
RNE = Register of the National Estate (R = Registered, IP = Indicative Place).  
NT = Register of the National Trust of Australia (NSW).
4.2.2 Cultural heritage studies

The proposal is situated within the assessment areas of one previous Heritage Study, the Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1995-1998 (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998).

A detailed review of this heritage study was prepared during the selection of the preferred route for the proposal (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2007b). The reader is referred to the study for detailed information on the subject.

Seven items identified by the Shoalhaven Heritage Study occur in or within 200 metres of the proposal boundary (refer Table 4-2). Four of these are included within the Local Environmental Plan heritage schedule. The three remaining items consist of a pastoral landscape, and the ‘Exeter’ farm house and silo. All of these items are considered further as heritage items within this proposal assessment, the Berry-Bolong pastoral landscapes are considered as part of the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape.

Table 4.2: Heritage recordings in or within 200 metres the proposal boundary, identified in the Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1995-1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal ID</th>
<th>Heritage study ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Level of identified significance</th>
<th>Shoalhaven LEP 1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent to SICPH CL</td>
<td>B094</td>
<td>Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes</td>
<td>Roughly bounded by:  • The Shoalhaven River in the south.  • The coast in the southeast.  • The City Council boundary in the east.  • The Cambewarra Range escarpment in the northeast, north and northwest (as far as Browns Mountain).  • The northern and eastern margin of Tapitallee, Bangalee and Bomaderry</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H44</td>
<td>B150</td>
<td>Woodbyne (Former Jaspers Brush School House &amp; School Master’s Residence)</td>
<td>4 O’Keefes Lane, Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H4</td>
<td>B160</td>
<td>Residence (former Meroo Meadow School &amp; School Master’s Residence)</td>
<td>C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H3</td>
<td>B161</td>
<td>Meroo Union Church</td>
<td>8 Boxsells Lane, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H46</td>
<td>B162</td>
<td>Pomona Farm &amp; Outbuildings</td>
<td>C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H77</td>
<td>B165</td>
<td>‘Exeter’ Victorian Farm House</td>
<td>C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H77</td>
<td>B167</td>
<td>‘Exeter’ Silo</td>
<td>C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provisional = Further research required to ratify level of significance.
4.2.3 Predictive historical archaeology statement

Unrecorded historic sites and features of heritage significance that potentially may occur within or near the proposal are likely to comply with the following predictive statements:

- Structures of historical interest and heritage significance may be standing, ruined, buried, abandoned or still in use.
- Buildings and structures would be focused in towns, settlements, and along the early centres and corridors of occupation, agriculture, industry, travel and transport.
- Standing commercial and public buildings are most likely to survive within the towns and urban landscapes.
- Nineteenth century structures, such as farm dwellings, outbuildings, selector’s or tenant farmer cottages may survive as standing buildings, ruins or archaeological deposits and are most likely to survive on less developed rural properties, and in or near established farm building complexes.
- Former timber mills and associated infrastructure such as timber pole structures, remains of machinery, tracks and tramways may survive on the outskirts of the towns or adjacent to former or existing forested areas.
- Traces of agricultural and industrial processing or extractive sites such as mills, dairies, factories, and quarries may be found throughout agricultural lands on the valley floor and adjacent low ranges.
- Sites associated with early roads would be closely associated with early private estate and cadastral (public) road reserves, watershed ridgelines, and related to early river and creek crossing points.
- Archaeological sites such as the occupation remains of former dwellings including homesteads, houses and huts, would be distributed in close association with land settlement patterns and correlated with favourable agricultural lands, trading nodes and transport corridors.
- Transport and access routes such as bridle paths, stock routes, rail line and highway alignments of varying forms and ages, may survive as abandoned remnants adjacent to modern transport routes, or as alignments now followed by more modern or upgraded road and track infrastructure.
- Old fence lines (such as dry stone wall and post and rail fencing) may occur along road reserve boundaries and enclosed farmlands. Other indications of field systems, such as drainage channels and ridge and furrow ploughlands, may survive in low lying agricultural ground, especially in areas that are now used for grazing, rather than cropping.
- Archaeological sites, earthworks and features related to the nineteenth and early twentieth century drainage of former freshwater and estuarine swamp basins are likely to occur throughout the alluvial flats of the proposal area and may include, ditches, drains, pipelines, levee banks, flood barriers, and pump station. Traces of infrastructure for the storage and supply of freshwater to the drained lowlands may also remain, including reservoir dams on adjacent slopes.
5 Field inspection results

This chapter provides a summary of Non-Aboriginal field recordings situated within the proposal area, or within 200m of the proposal boundary. All previously listed items within the proposal area are included.

The general locations of the recorded items are shown in Figure 5-1. Larger scale location mapping is provided in Appendix A. An inventory and summary description of recordings and items is provided in Table 5.1. Detailed site descriptions, including site specific background information, are presented in Appendix C.

A description of cultural landscape values and relevant recordings is presented as a separate section (Section 5.3).

Please note that the numbering of the recordings is generated from an on-going inventory of archaeological survey results for the whole of the Princes Highway upgrade between Mount Pleasant (Gerringong) and Bomaderry (refer Section 2.4). As a consequence, the numbering sequence is discontinuous.

5.1 Summary of field recordings

Thirty-nine non-Aboriginal (European) field recordings were made within the proposal area, or within 200 metres of the proposal boundary (G2B H1 – H9, 44, 46, 66 - 92 and SICPH CL).

Eight of these recordings were not found to have heritage significance against the assessment criteria (refer Chapter 6). These recordings are included in Table 5-1 and comprise three highway remnants which were bypassed between the 1970s and 1980s (G2B H6-8), and five farm houses or cottages (G2B H69, 70, 72, 79 and 84).

The remaining 31 recordings were found to have heritage significance and are classed as heritage items. These consist of:

- Two remnants of the 1858/69 Berry Estate road between Bomaderry and Broughton Creek (Berry) (G2B H7 and 9).
- One highway bridge (G2B H2).
- Two public school buildings and associated residences (G2B H4 and 44).
- One former 1880s public (tent) school site with potential to include archaeological deposits (G2B H91).
- The site of the former Meroo Meadow Hall (G2B H67).
- The Meroo Meadow Union Church (G2B H3).
- A former agricultural water reservoir and pipeline easement constructed as part of the Berry Estate swamp reclamation scheme (G2B H81).
- Ten former Berry Estate farms or unidentified buildings, five of which consist of only potential archaeological deposits from the Berry Estate era (G2B H73, 80, 88, 90 and 92). Five include standing farm buildings and structures which post-date the Estate and may include earlier potential archaeological deposits (G2B H76, 82, 83, 85 and 89). One substantially modified Berry estate tenant farm building remains (G2B H83).
- Six post Berry Estate farm houses, cottages or building complexes (G2B H1, 46, 66, 71, 77 and 89).
- The site of two former local Dairy Co. factories (G2B H68 and 75).
- Three road side tree plantings (G2B H5, 78 and 86).
- One cultural landscape, the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland (SICPH CL).
Five of these heritage items are included on existing statutory heritage listings (G2B H2, 3, 4, 44 and 46, refer Table 4.1).
### 5.2 Summary table of field recording descriptions

**Table 5.1: Summary of non-Aboriginal field recordings within proposal area or within 200 metres of the proposal boundary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name/location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Statutory listing</th>
<th>MGA references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G2B H1 'Mount View', Abernethys Lane Meroo Meadow Lot 2 DP882059</td>
<td>Early twentieth century farmhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>280209.6142841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H2 Abernethys Creek Bridge Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>1929 Reinforced concrete highway bridge</td>
<td>RMS Section 170</td>
<td>280456.6143411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H3 Meroo Union Church 8 Boxsells Lane Meroo Meadow Lot 4 DP 249776</td>
<td>1890 Church and grounds including perimeter tree plantings</td>
<td>SLEP</td>
<td>281236.6144874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H4 Former Meroo Meadow public schoolhouse and schoolmasters residence C385 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 1 DP 716569</td>
<td>1898 - 1899 Schoolhouse and residence, including associated potential archaeological deposits</td>
<td>SLEP</td>
<td>281462.6145250 281438.6145209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H5 Avenue of planted roadside trees Princes Highway (and Turners Lane) Meroo Meadow between Wileys Creek and 500 metres west of Devitts/Morshels Lane</td>
<td>Avenue of planted trees (of mixed ages), probably dating from the first decades of the twentieth century, situated along the northern and southern side of highway, trees include Pinus, silky oak, bunya pine, camphor laurel and Eucalyptus</td>
<td></td>
<td>282285.6145435 283511.6145391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name/location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Statutory listing</td>
<td>MGA references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway Strongs Road</td>
<td>Highway remnant was bypassed in the mid-1970s, remnant is situated to the west of the modern Strongs Road intersection with the highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaspers Brush Lot 27 DP250664</td>
<td>usal runnant was bypassed in the mid-1970s, remnant is situated to the west of the modern Strongs Road intersection with the highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road</td>
<td>The Bomaderry to Berry section of the road was completed in 1858/69. This remnant may have been bypassed as early as 1869. The public road re-alignment was certainly in place by the 1890s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Strongs Road Lot 2 DP1121436</td>
<td>usal runnant was bypassed in the mid-1970s, remnant is situated to the west of the modern Strongs Road intersection with the highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway</td>
<td>Highway remnant was bypassed in the mid-1970s, remnant extends for 400 metres west of Jaspers Brush Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Resistant remnant was bypassed in the mid-1970s, remnant extends for 400 metres west of Jaspers Brush Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road</td>
<td>The Bomaderry to Berry section of the road was completed in 1858/69. This remnant extends 150 metres upslope and to the west of Jaspers Brush Creek. The remnant may have been bypassed as early as 1869. The public road re-alignment was certainly in place by the 1890s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20B Strongs Road Lot 26 DP 250664</td>
<td>usal runnant was bypassed in the mid-1970s, remnant extends for 400 metres west of Jaspers Brush Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>‘Hotel Woodbyne’ 4 O’Keefes Lane</td>
<td>Former Jaspers Brush public schoolhouse and schoolmaster’s residence. Recording includes 1897 Schoolhouse and 1920s residence, and potential archaeological deposits of former school structures from 1884.</td>
<td>SLEP</td>
<td>286256.6146612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H44</td>
<td>Jaspers Brush Lot 1 DP 872572</td>
<td>Former Jaspers Brush public schoolhouse and schoolmaster’s residence. Recording includes 1897 Schoolhouse and 1920s residence, and potential archaeological deposits of former school structures from 1884.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name/location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Statutory listing</td>
<td>MGA references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H46</td>
<td>‘Pomona’ C360 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 2 DP 620160</td>
<td>Late nineteenth century dairy farm complex. Complex includes outbuildings. Homestead was built by George Muller in 1893. Farm remains in ownership of Muller family descendants</td>
<td>SLEP</td>
<td>281433.6144990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H66</td>
<td>‘Westbury’ B210 Princes Highway; Berry Lot 1 DP 249692</td>
<td>Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>286966.6147713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H67</td>
<td>Site of former Meroo Meadow public hall Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 8 DP249776</td>
<td>Former weatherboard public hall building, built in 1933 and demolished in 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>281469.6145147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H68</td>
<td>Site of former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory 25 Jaspers Brush Road Jaspers Brush Lot 5 DP740764</td>
<td>Archaeological deposit and remains of former dairy factory, operated by: Jaspers Dairy Co (1888 – 1902) and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co (1902 – 1938)</td>
<td></td>
<td>286041.6146381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H69</td>
<td>‘Amaroo Park’ 10A Jaspers Brush Road Jaspers Brush Lot 1 DP601531</td>
<td>Substantially modified early twentieth century cottage, former Jaspers Brush post office</td>
<td></td>
<td>285882.6146264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H70</td>
<td>‘Hillview Park’ 480C Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 42 DP250662</td>
<td>Substantially modified early twentieth century farmhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>286720.6147118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H71</td>
<td>‘Fairview’ C480 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 3 DP739850</td>
<td>Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>282356.6145374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name/location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Statutory listing</td>
<td>MGA references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>[unnamed] Cottage C441B Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 102 DP777264</td>
<td>Substantially modified late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian cottage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>281951.6145600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate building complex 26A Boxsells Lane Lot 4 DP589387</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit Former Lot 49 of the Meroo Farms subdivision. Present in 1893, not evident in 1931 Approximate location</td>
<td></td>
<td>281299.6145084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>‘Abernethy’s Bend’ Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway</td>
<td>Highway remnant was bypassed in the late 1970s or early 1980s, remnant is situated just northeast of the former Meroo Meadow public school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H74</td>
<td>Meroo Meadow Lots 11 and 12 DP596623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>281908.6145465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>281550.6145321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory Site may be present</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit Factory was active between 1899 and 1906 Exact location not yet known</td>
<td></td>
<td>281042.6143872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H75</td>
<td>within the following: 43 Fletchers Lane 1003 &amp; 1028 Meroo Road Meroo Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4 DP1127817 Lot 6 DP 740322 Lot 1 DP249085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>‘Northcote’ 25 Jaspers Brush Road Lot 5 DP740764</td>
<td>Early twentieth century farmhouse and outbuildings and potential archaeological deposits of earlier structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>286139.6146315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name/location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Statutory listing</td>
<td>MGA references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid/focal point</td>
<td>End point 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>‘Exeter’</td>
<td>Federation/Edwardian style farmhouse with Arts and Crafts features. Recording includes silo ruin northwest of farmhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>280842.6144094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H77</td>
<td>C265 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 249085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Avenue of planted roadside trees</td>
<td>A remnant alignment of planted <em>Pinus</em> trees (of mixed ages), on the western side of the highway at Meroo Meadow. Road widening in 1975 removed remnant trees on the eastern side. The avenue probably dates from the first decades of the twentieth century.</td>
<td></td>
<td>281234.6144716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H78</td>
<td>Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between Tandingulla Creek and just south of Boxsells Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>‘Glenmoor’</td>
<td>Substantially altered 1916 farmhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>285309.6146077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H79</td>
<td>B455 Princes Highway Jaspers Brush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 31 DP877098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant ‘house’</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit. Former Lot 206 of the Coolangatta and Berry Estates subdivision. Present in 1890s, not evident in 1931. There are no surface traces of this former structure and later ploughing and track construction is likely to have degraded any archaeological resource. Approximate location</td>
<td></td>
<td>284649.6145801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H80</td>
<td>B353 Princes Highway Jaspers Brush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 32 DP877098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name/location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Statutory listing</td>
<td>MGA references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H81</td>
<td>Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement B510 Princess Highway Jaspers Brush Lot 4 DP1002214</td>
<td>Former Berry Estate agricultural reservoir and associated gravity feed pipeline, part of 1890s swampland reclamation scheme, providing freshwater for lowland pastures. The easement was extinguished in 1960 and the dam wall was subsequently trenched and ceased to function. The wall was rebuilt using a modern design in the 1997 and a new additional dam was constructed immediately downstream. It is not known if remnants of the pipeline survive subsurface.</td>
<td></td>
<td>dam: 284514.6146009 pipeline easement crosses highway at: 284695.6145850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H82</td>
<td>‘Silos Estate’ B640 and B640A Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lots 3 and 4 DP776151</td>
<td>Oldest standing structures date from early to mid-twentieth century dairy farm development. Heritage items include flagstone flooring in substantially modified dairy (now cellar and shop), and potential archaeological deposits just south of current houses where original Berry Estate tenant farm buildings were located (former Lot 196)</td>
<td></td>
<td>flagstone floor: 283869.6145716 former farm buildings: 283834.6145608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H83</td>
<td>‘County Fair’ B680 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 3 DP840940</td>
<td>Early twentieth century dairy farm complex. Farmhouse incorporates a substantially modified original Berry estate tenant farm building which was moved from elsewhere (former Lot 72) and subsequently extended. Several outbuildings, including dairy, silo and feedlots and butchery are heritage items. Archaeological remains may survive at former building sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>283481.6145521 283319.6145707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name/location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Statutory listing</td>
<td>MGA references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H84</td>
<td>[unnamed] house C395 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 3 DP250946</td>
<td>1920s Bungalow style farmhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H85</td>
<td>‘Maylands’ 1003 Meroo Road Meroo Meadow Lot 6 DP740322</td>
<td>Early twentieth century dairy farm complex. Buildings are rundown and substantially modified. Smithy outbuilding has heritage values. Recording includes potential archaeological remains of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>281119.6143881 Smithy: 281149.6143872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H86</td>
<td>Road-side planted trees Meroo Road and Fletchers Lane Meroo Meadow between Princes Highway and Fletchers Lane</td>
<td>Row of planted Pinus, silky oak and bunya pine trees (of mixed ages), probably dating from the first half of the twentieth century. Plantings on eastern side of road only.</td>
<td></td>
<td>281035.6143744 281298.6143432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H87</td>
<td>[unnamed] farmhouse and dairy C190 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 27 DP131007</td>
<td>1920s Bungalow style farmhouse, built by Jack Abernethy with minimal changes since construction. Dairy disused since the early 1970s is constructed predominantly in concrete</td>
<td>280704.6143489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H88</td>
<td>Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ 26A Boxsells Lane Meroo Meadow Lot 4 DP589387</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit. Site of a former ‘hut’ within a small fenced enclosure, being part of the former ‘Meroo Station’ (across former lots 49 and 60) indicated on 1883 and 1893 mapping. Approximate location</td>
<td>281421.6145171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name/location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Statutory listing</td>
<td>MGA references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>‘Jaspers Grove’ 20A Strongs Road Jaspers Brush Lot 103 DP794485</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposits and remains. Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm (on former Lot 46). Existing farm buildings at this site date from the early and mid-twentieth century. Approximate location of potential archaeological deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>285749.6146512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ homestead, on original lot 59 C395 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 3 DP250946</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit. An 1884 plan shows a house, garden, separate kitchen and a stable at this location. An 1893 sales poster shows two east-west aligned buildings. Approximate location of potential archaeological deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>281478.6145291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Site of former ‘Little Meadow’ Public (tent) School (1882 1884) 15 Turners Lane Meroo Meadow Lot 1 DP1088466</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>283515.6145345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings (Pestells Lane) C265 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow Lot 4 DP249085</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>280480.6144207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICPH</td>
<td>Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>refer Figure 5-6 for boundary of cultural landscape recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5-1: General location of non-Aboriginal field recordings (excluding SICPH CL, refer to Figure 5.6 for the location of this item)
Base map provided by AECOM
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5.3 Cultural landscape values

5.3.1 Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Landscape (SICPH CL)

The predominantly pastoral landscape character of the coastal plain and basal slopes extending southwards from the Southern Illawarra Range, from Mount Pleasant in the east, to Browns Mountain in the west, and extending southwards to Greenwell Point, has been variously recognised as a landscape with significant heritage and conservation values (Figure 5-2 to Figure 5-6). Previous recognition has been either limited to sub-regions and categories (such as the Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscape), focused on contextual values relative to urban and town centres (such as the Berry Township Urban Conservation Area), or defined primarily in terms of natural and historical landscape characteristics (the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area).

The adoption, in this report, of a cultural landscape classification for this area seeks to recognise cultural heritage values as a consequence of the interplay between cultural practice and the physical environment. This provides for the management of such areas in terms of human processes and economies, as well as physical characteristics.

The area and boundary of the SICPH CL approximates those for the National Trust listing of the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area (Figure 5-6). A detailed analysis and definition of a boundary is beyond the scope of this assessment.

The Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study recognised the western portion of this precinct, north of the Shoalhaven, as the Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscape (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:44) (Figure 5-6). It was noted that the continuity of dairy farming across the region has contributed to the survival of an underlying nineteenth century and early twentieth century pastoral landscape. The development of this landscape has been structured by the evolution of the Berry Estates and surrounding villages and tenant communities, subsequent free selection4 across the surrounding slopes, the development and predominance of the dairying industry, development of the transport corridors, first by water and then by road and rail, and the drainage of the wetland basins across the Shoalhaven flood plain.

---

4 Free selection refers to the process established in the Crown Lands Acts 1861 by the NSW premier John Robertson, for the selection of Crown Land and the purchase of freehold title, often to form small property holdings of between 40 and 320 acre lots. The Acts aimed to break the squatters’ leasehold domination on land tenure up to that time.
Figure 5-3: A collection of views demonstrating some of the cultural and aesthetic cultural landscape values of the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland cultural landscape.
Despite the decline of many smaller villages and communities, changes in population density, the diminishing viability of small farms, and the growth of rural subdivision, the region retains a fundamentally nineteenth century pastoral structure. This is evident as a patchwork of cleared and drained floodplains, cleared estates, vegetated boundaries, forested upper slopes, and a network of townscapes and valley settlements. All of these elements are aesthetically held together by the backdrop of the Illawarra Range, its top escarpment, and prominent ridgelines extending across the plain to the coast. This landscape includes examples of vernacular buildings, farmscapes, churches and public schools, nineteenth century plantings, Victorian residences and a range of buildings, silos, drainage schemes and structures which demonstrate settlement, landuse patterns and the archaeology of the agricultural development of the Southern Illawarra (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:45).
Figure 5-5: A collection of views demonstrating some of the cultural and aesthetic cultural landscape values of the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland cultural landscape.
The vegetation of the region is also a critical component of the cultural landscape. Landscape elements include the continuous pastoral grasslands of the lowlands which extend up slope into a patchwork of smaller former dairy farm clearings, remnant patches of sclerophyll and regenerating rainforest, ribbons of riparian vegetation, and the widespread iconic incidence of often isolated cabbage fan palms, large spreading fig trees, and boundary plantings of Coral trees.

The National Trust (New South Wales) has recognised the cultural, aesthetic and natural values of the landscape values of the Southern Illawarra by defining the **Berry District Landscape Conservation Area (BDLCA)**. This area includes the coastline south of Kiama to Greenwell Point, the lower Shoalhaven River plain, and the slopes leading up to and including the Illawarra escarpment ([Figure 5-6](#)). This area is roughly equivalent to that of the SICPH CL. A description of this identified landscape has been entered onto the Register of the National Estate, as an Indicative Place (Place ID 1625). However no formal nomination or assessment was ever prepared (Refer [Appendix B](#)).

The town of Berry is an integral component of the cultural landscape and its values identified in the SICPH Cultural Landscape recording, and its previously recorded subsets; the Berry Bolong Pastoral Landscape, and the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area. Recognition of this forms a basis for the recent recognition, by the National Trust of Australia (NSW) of the **Berry Township Urban Conservation Area (BTUCA)**. This area was listed on the Trust’s Register in 2011 (refer [Appendix B](#)).

The listing recognises the historic development of the town, and its distinctive urban character set within a rolling agricultural landscape. The BTUCA listing incorporates three levels ([Figure 5-7](#)):

- A broad scale visual boundary which adopts the regional boundary of the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area.
- A subdivision boundary which relates to the closer urban settlement of the nineteenth century Berry town grid.
- A buffer zone which seeks to protect the immediate rural setting of the urban grid (Clark and Duyker 2010).

The northern end of the proposal area extends 400 metres into the southern portion of the BTUCA buffer zone.
Figure 5-6: Previously defined landscape conservation areas which include the proposal: Three levels of the National Trust Berry Township Urban Conservation Area (BTUCA) are defined. (After Figure 13 in Clarke and Duyker 2010; and The boundary of the Berry – Bolong Pastoral Landscapes (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory) (base image: Google Earth Pro 2009).
Figure 5-7: Detail of the Sub-division boundary and fringing Buffer Zone for the National Trust defined Berry Township Urban Conservation Area (After Figure 13 in Clarke and Duyker 2010) (Google Earth Pro 2006).
6 Significance assessment

6.1 Assessment criteria

The NSW Heritage Branch has defined a methodology and set of criteria for the assessment of cultural heritage significance for items and places, where these do not include Aboriginal heritage from the pre-contact period (NSW Heritage Branch and DUAP 1996, NSW Heritage Branch 2000). The assessments provided in this report follow the Heritage Branch methodology.

The following heritage assessment criteria are those set out for listing on the State Heritage Register. In many cases items would be significant under only one or two criteria. The State Heritage Register was established under Part 3A of the *Heritage Act 1977* (as amended in 1999) (*Heritage Act*) for listing of items of environmental heritage that are of State heritage significance. Environmental heritage means those places, buildings, works, relics, moveable objects, and precincts, of State or local heritage significance (Section 4, *Heritage Act*).

An item would be considered to be of State (or local) heritage significance if, in the opinion of the Heritage Council of NSW, it meets one or more of the following criteria:

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

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

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

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

**Criterion (e)** An item has potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area).

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

**Criterion (g)** An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s:

- cultural or natural places; or
- cultural or natural environments.

(or a class of the local area’s:

- cultural or natural places; or
- cultural or natural environments.)

An item is not to be excluded from the register on the ground that items with similar characteristics have already been listed on the register. Only particularly complex items or places would be significant under all criteria.

In using these criteria it is important to assess the values first, then the local or State context in which they may be significant.

Different components of a place may make a different relative contribution to its heritage value. For example, loss of integrity or condition may diminish significance. In some cases it is constructive to note the relative contribution of an item or its components. Table 6.1 provides a guide to ascribing relative value.
Table 6.1: Guide to ascribing relative heritage value to constituent elements of a heritage item or grouping

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

6.2 Summary of individual assessments

This section provides a summary of the significance assessments conducted for the 39 non-Aboriginal (European) field recordings within the proposal area or within 200 metres of the proposal boundary. Eight of these recordings were not found to reach the threshold for heritage significance against the assessment criteria and are not presented in detail. A detailed assessment of each identified heritage item, against the assessment criteria is presented in Appendix D.

Of the 39 field recordings:

- Eight have been found to fall below the significance thresholds defined within the assessment criteria. These are G2B H6, 8, 69, 70, 72, 74, 79 and 84. These recordings will not be considered further with regard to potential impact and impact mitigation.
- Eight cannot be given definitive assessments until the nature of predicted archaeological deposits are confirmed through test and/or salvage excavation. These items have been given indicative assessments of local context significance, subject to confirmation: (G2B H73, 75, 80, 88, 89, 90, 91 and 92).
- The remaining 23 items are assessed as having heritage significance within a local context, according to one or more of the specified significance criteria.

These assessments are outlined in Table 6.2.
Table 6.2: Summary of Non-Aboriginal heritage significance assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Context of significance</th>
<th>Significance criteria</th>
<th>Summary and statement of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G2B H1</td>
<td>‘Mount View’, Abernethys Lane</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This recently renovated farmhouse retains its original design configuration and many original features. Along with its associated remaining outbuilding, it is representative of an early twentieth century farmhouse belonging to a relatively small dairy farm holding. Such buildings, within an open pastoral context are becoming locally rarer due to the urban expansion of Nowra and Bomaderry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H2</td>
<td>Abernethys Creek Bridge</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Construction of this 1929 reinforced concrete bridge by the Department of Main Roads (DMR) was a component of the State Highways improvement program which aimed at bringing the State’s roads up to a standard suited to motor vehicle traffic. The bridge has a low level of historical significance as a minor part of this broader program. It is a good representative example of its design - a cantilevered approach slab and main beam deck system. It has the ability to demonstrate contemporary 1930s standards of bridge design and construction. The whole structure illustrates how sympathetic widening can be achieved, repeating the general design while allowing the process of change to be interpreted readily. Its widening demonstrates changes in demands on road infrastructure over the intervening period and the effects of these changes on 1930s infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H3</td>
<td>Meroo Union Church</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>This church has considerable aesthetic value and is representative of a late nineteenth century Union church constructed in the Victorian Free Gothic Style. It is closely associated with the Berry Estate and David Berry who provided funding and gifted the land. It was designed by W.A. Isley and Sons, a firm which designed many churches on the Estate. The church has potential to provide further information on the Union Church movement and continues to be used for services. It is now one of the few remaining community buildings for the Meroo Meadow settlement and has strong social value and associations with local families and identifies. Its combination of aesthetic, historic and representative values is considered to be rare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H4</td>
<td>Former Meroo Meadow public schoolhouse and schoolmasters residence C385 and C395 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>These late 1890s buildings are representative of turn of the (nineteenth) century, Victorian Georgian school architecture, designed by William Edmund Kemp (Government Architects Office). The schoolhouse has a high degree of intactness and is largely unchanged since its closure in 1971. The school is associated with the life of Herbert William Moffitt (1877-1953), cartoonist, and member of the Workers Compensation Commission Bench. Archaeological deposits may survive on the property and would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the evolution of the school and local education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H5</td>
<td>Avenue of planted road-side trees Princes Highway (and Turners Lane) Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>This tree avenue includes numerous old growth trees with high aesthetic appeal and forms a key element of the local cultural landscape and character. It is representative of plantings dating from the early to mid-twentieth century along the highways of the south coast region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H6</td>
<td>Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway Strongs Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Below threshold</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>This highway remnant falls below the threshold for heritage listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H7</td>
<td>Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road 29 Strong Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>This small section of the nineteenth century Berry Estate road is a rare example of a transport corridor that was locally historically important as a private road and the first main inland route that bypassed Seven Mile Beach. It has a strong association with the Berry Estate and Messrs Alexander and David Berry. The short and eroded nature of this remnant reduces any representative value. However as part of a suite of surviving remnants between Meroo Meadow and Gerringong, it has potential to contribute to an understanding of nineteenth century road construction and use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H8</td>
<td>Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Below threshold</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>This highway remnant falls below the threshold for heritage listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H9</td>
<td>Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>This section of the nineteenth century Berry Estate road is a representative and rare example of a transport corridor that was locally historically important as a private road and the first main inland route that bypassed Seven Mile Beach. It has a strong association with the Berry Estate and Messrs Alexander and David Berry. Despite its eroded and indistinct condition, as part of a suite of surviving remnants between Meroo Meadow and Gerringong, it has potential to contribute to an understanding of nineteenth century road construction and use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H44</td>
<td>‘Hotel Woodbyne’ former Jaspers Brush public schoolhouse and residence</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>This 1897 schoolroom and 1920s residence have been variously altered since the closure of the school in 1969 and are now utilised as part of a boutique hotel. Original tree plantings may now be incorporated into the landscaped grounds. Significant internal changes have occurred but many historical and external characteristics have been maintained. The former school house has high social value as a previous focus for community activities, local history and its association with local identities. Potential archaeological deposits may remain within the grounds and along the adjacent creek bank. If present these would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the evolution of the school and local education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H46</td>
<td>‘Pomona’ C360 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>This dairy farm complex, which includes a farmhouse and a variety of outbuildings, dates from the sale of the Berry Estate in the early 1890s and is strongly associated with the Muller family, who continue to operate the dairy farm to this day. The farmhouse, representative of the late nineteenth century, has aesthetic value and displays federation Queen Anne style influences. It was built by George Muller. The historical and physical record associated with this complex has potential to contribute towards an understanding of the history and development of the local dairy industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H66</td>
<td>'Westbury’ B210 Princes Highway Berry</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>a ✓ b ✓ c ✓ d ✓ e ✓ f ✓ g ✓</td>
<td>This early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and associated outbuildings have a substantial degree of intactness and are locally representative of a relatively large post Berry Estate farm. Some components of the farmhouse have been rebuilt, including the veranda and stumps. The integrity of the outbuildings, including an intact silo, is an increasingly rare characteristic of former dairy farms from this period. This property was owned and operated as a dairy farm by Thomas Newing, who, with his father Thomas Newing senior, constructed a majority of the dry stone walls in the Kiama and surrounding districts. During Thomas’ ownership, the farm served as a brief refuge for Miss Bridget Partridge during the ‘Sister Ligouri’ affair in 1920. This affair attracted political and national press attention and was an important event in the social history of Australia because of its manifestation of religious sectarian divisions across society. The historical and physical record associated with this complex has potential to contribute towards an understanding of the history and development of the local dairy industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H67</td>
<td>Site of former Meroo Meadow public hall Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>a ✓</td>
<td>The Meroo Meadow public hall (1933 – 1974) served as a focus for the civic, social and political life of the Meroo Meadow community and district for forty years. As such, the site of this former facility has a high degree of social value for community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H68</td>
<td>Site of former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory 25 Jaspers Brush Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>a ✓ b ✓ c ✓</td>
<td>A dairy factory commenced operation on this site in 1888 and continued to process local milk and cream for the following fifty years. This is an unusually long history for a non-Centralised dairy enterprise. Its development and evolution was representative of the south coast industry as a whole. The Jaspers Brush factory was important historically for its reputation for technological innovation and rapid adoption of new technologies and methods. This was perhaps largely a consequence of the management of the enterprise by its engineer Mr C.W.Wood. The factory adopted pasteurisation in 1899. The factory was an important focus for economic and social activity within the Jaspers Brush locality. Despite the loss of at least half the site due to past road works, the site retains some potential to include archaeological deposits which could contribute to an understanding of the local dairy industry and its development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H69</td>
<td>‘Amaroo Park’ 10A Jaspers Brush Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Below threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Despite the early nineteenth century origin of this cottage and former function as a post office, this property falls below the threshold for heritage listing. This is due to the substantial renovations and additions to the original building and minimal retention of original features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H70</td>
<td>‘Hillview Park’ 480C Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Below threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>This former farmhouse, currently extended and adapted for use as business offices falls below the threshold for heritage listing. This is due to the substantial renovations, modifications and additions to the original building and minimal retention of original features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H71</td>
<td>‘Fairview’ C480 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>This post Berry Estate early twentieth century farmhouse complex has been substantially renovated and landscaped but retains some original features and character. Heritage values are demonstrated by the remaining outbuildings which date from the first half of the twentieth century and display a considerable degree of intactness and integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H72</td>
<td>[unnamed] Cottage C441B Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Below threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>This renovated cottage falls below the threshold for heritage listing. This is due to the substantial renovations and additions to the original building and minimal retention of original features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H73</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate building complex 26A Boxsells Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have considerable potential to contribute to an understanding of tenant farming and settlement on the Berry Estate lands and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular. Unlike many other former Berry Estate farm sites, this locality does not include a functioning modern farm and has therefore not been disturbed by latter occupation (apart from ploughing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H74</td>
<td>‘Abernethy’s Bend’ Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Below threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>This highway remnant falls below the threshold for heritage listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H75</td>
<td>Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory</td>
<td>Local subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>If archaeological deposits remain within this site, they would have considerable potential to contribute to an understanding of the development and evolution of the local dairy industry and its role in the economic and social life of the Meroo Meadow community. This factory operated for only seven years, between 1899 and 1906, and as a consequence the archaeological record has potential to provide information on the local emergence of the co-operative dairy industry and the evolution from local to centralised factories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H76</td>
<td>‘Northcote’ 25 Jaspers Brush Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>This renovated and extended early twentieth century farmhouse cottage retains some original fabric and features. Heritage values are demonstrated in the remaining outbuildings which include dairy related buildings, yards and covered feeding stalls. These structures display considerable integrity and original features. Timbers from the Jaspers Brush School of Arts were reportedly incorporated into these outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H77</td>
<td>‘Exeter’ C265 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>This recently renovated and extended farmhouse in a Federation/Edwardian style retains its distinctive and original architectural character and design. The building has considerable aesthetic appeal and includes Arts and Crafts traits which are unusual for the local area. A recently constructed new building close to the farmhouse is intrusive and detracts from the landscape context of the building. Only the concrete walls of a silo remain of formerly extensive outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H78</td>
<td>Avenue of planted road-side trees Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>This alignment of pine trees is the remnant of an avenue, originally also present on the opposite side of the highway. The alignment includes many old growth trees with aesthetic appeal and which complement similar plantings in the adjacent grounds of the Meroo Meadow Union church. Although now degraded, the avenue once provided a key component of the local landscape character of the Meroo Meadow settlement. The avenue has social value as a landmark and reminder of the past residents who planted and maintained them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H79</td>
<td>‘Glenmoor’ B455 Princes Highway Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Below threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Despite the 1916 origin of this farmhouse this property falls below the threshold for heritage listing. This is due to the substantial renovations and additions to the original building and the loss of its outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ B353 Princes Highway Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they may have potential to contribute to an understanding of the settlement and development of the Berry Estate and the Meroo Meadow/Jaspers Brush area in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H81</td>
<td>Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement B510 Princess Highway Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>This former reservoir and pipeline easement formed part of the swamp reclamation program conducted across the Berry Estate lowlands in the 1890s. Its function was to provide freshwater to stock pastured on the reclaimed lowlands. It is one of seven former cadastral reservations for such features on the Berry Estate lands. This site is one of three with functioning or remnant dams. This dam is the only such feature known on the west side of Broughton Creek. The dam wall was re-built using a modern design in 1997.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H82</td>
<td>‘Silos Estate’ B640 and B640A Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>The twentieth century history of the ‘Silos Estate’ is closely linked with the Wiley brothers who developed dairying on this and several adjoining properties. This property includes a number of known and potential archaeological features with heritage value. A remnant sandstone flagstone floor continues to be used in a cellar shop established within a substantially modified and extended former dairy building. The sites of several former nineteenth century Berry Estate tenant farm buildings remain in an undeveloped condition at the front of the property. These have potential to contribute to an understanding of the tenant farm settlement and development of the Berry Estate and of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H83</td>
<td>‘County Fair’ B680 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>This farm complex was developed by, and associated with the Wiley brothers, a locally prominent farming family. It consists of a heavily modified nineteenth century farm building, together with a number of remnant outbuildings which have heritage significance. The latter include a butchery, dairy and combined silo and covered feed stall. The latter remains relatively intact, an increasingly rare condition of like structures in the region. The dairy retains an original flagstone floor and includes reused timber slab walls. The outbuildings are representative of a post Berry Estate, early to mid-century dairy farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H84</td>
<td>[unnamed] house C395 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Below threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>This 1920s bungalow farmhouse falls below the threshold for heritage listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H85</td>
<td>‘Maylands’ 1003 Meroo Road Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This farmhouse group of buildings dates from the early to mid-twentieth century and displays varying degrees of modification, extension and dilapidation. Archaeological remains of former nineteenth century tenant farm buildings may be present at the front of the property. A former blacksmith shed, now used for storage, retains a considerable degree of its original fabric and some original features such as its hearth. The former smithy has representative value and may be a locally rare site type in this condition. The potential archaeological resource has potential to contribute towards an understanding of tenant farming and the early development of the Berry Estate and specifically the Bomaderry/Meroo Meadow area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H86</td>
<td>Road-side planted trees Meroo Road and Fletchers Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This alignment of trees includes two large Bunya pines which contribute to the aesthetic values of the local and regional landscape. They complement other old growth Bunya pines which are visible from this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H87</td>
<td>[unnamed] farmhouse and dairy C190 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This 1920s farm complex was built and operated by Jack Abernethy and is thus associated with the locally prominent Abernethy family which developed dairying on the adjacent properties. The farmhouse has a high degree of integrity and is little changed since its construction. It includes many internal decorative, domestic and architectural traits which are representative of the 1920s. The dairy also reflects early twentieth century construction methods with the use of reinforced concrete for all walls and posts. This level of integrity for a dairy of this age is likely to be uncommon or rare in the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H88</td>
<td>Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ 26A Boxsells Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they may have potential to contribute to an understanding of the early settlement and development of the Berry Estate and the Meroo Meadow area in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H89</td>
<td>‘Jaspers Grove’ 20A Strongs Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of tenant farming and settlement on the Berry Estate lands and the development of the Jaspers Brush locality in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H90</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ homestead C395 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the management and development of the Berry Estate lands, and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H91</td>
<td>Site of former ‘Little Meadow’ Public (tent) School, 15 Turners Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the function and material culture of tent schools, and public education between a tightly defined time period of 1882 and 1884. The location, irrespective of physical remains, has historical significance in demonstrating the development of public school sites in the late nineteenth century and the interrelation between the Berry Estate and Government authorities. The identification of former tent school sites, where there also exists the potential for archaeological deposits, is likely to be rare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H92</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings (Pestells Lane) C265 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the management and development of the Berry Estate lands, and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>Context of significance</td>
<td>Significance criteria</td>
<td>Summary and statement of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SICPH CL | Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape       | Local                    | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓       | The SICPH CL is of local significance in terms of its historical associations and importance in the pattern of local history. It is also locally significant in terms of its strong and special association with the local Aboriginal community.  
More notably, it is of local and State significance in terms of its aesthetic qualities, which relate in part to the unique natural character of the junction of the coastal plain with the Illawarra escarpment, and in part from the striking contrast between the culturally modified elements of the landscape and the more natural elements. The clearly identifiable nineteenth century structure of the landscape also contributes to the aesthetic value of the SICPH CL.  
The SICPH CL is a rare landscape type, both in terms of its natural features and also the retention of such clear examples of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century pastoral landscape and associated private towns. It is the only remaining such portion of the broader Illawarra cultural landscape that has not been substantially impacted by urban infill. As such it is also representative of its type and displays considerable research potential in terms of historical themes at local and State levels. |
7 Statutory and policy context

7.1 Overview of key legislation

7.1.1 Commonwealth legislation

The main Commonwealth Act concerned with the protection and management of cultural heritage places is the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). The jurisdiction of this Act relates to heritage places on Commonwealth owned or controlled lands; heritage values which may be impacted by actions by the Commonwealth, heritage values associated with items of national environmental significance; and places with heritage significance consistent with World Heritage, National or Commonwealth Heritage listing.

There are no places within the proposal with cultural heritage values consistent with these jurisdictions.

7.1.2 The Register of the National Estate

The register of the National Estate (RNE) was established under the now repealed *Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975*. The National Estate was defined under this Act as ‘those places, being components of the natural environment of Australia or the cultural environment of Australia, that have aesthetic, historical, scientific or social significance or other special value for future generations as well as for the present community’. The proposal includes one item included on the RNE as an indicative place (the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area).

Following amendments in 2006 to the *Australian Heritage Council Act 2003* (AHC Act), from February 2012 all references to the Register have been removed from the EPBC Act and the AHC Act. The RNE is now maintained on a non-statutory basis as a publicly available archive.

7.1.3 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

The *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act), and its regulations, schedules and associated guidelines require that environmental impacts are considered in land-use planning and decision making. Environmental impacts include cultural heritage.

There are four main areas of protection under the EP&A Act:

- Environmental planning instruments allow particular uses for land and specify constraints. Part 3 governs the preparation of planning instruments. Both Aboriginal and historical (non-Aboriginal) cultural heritage values should be assessed when determining land-use.

- Provision for a fast track approval process of developments declared to be State Significant infrastructure, by order or in a State environmental planning policy.

- Part 4 relates to the development assessment process. Impact to both Aboriginal and historical (non-Aboriginal) cultural heritage values are included.

- State Government agencies which act as the determining authority to decide whether to proceed with proposals must consider a variety of community and cultural factors in their decisions, including Aboriginal and historical (non-Aboriginal) cultural heritage values. Part 5 relates to activities which do not require consent but still require an environmental assessment, such as projects by government authorities.
Under the EP&A Act, various environmental planning instruments can be prepared and approved, such as local environmental plans (LEPs) (Part 3, Division 4) and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) (Part 3 Division 2). These planning instruments may identify places and features of cultural heritage significance and define various statutory requirements regarding the potential development, modification and conservation of these items. In general, places of identified significance, or places requiring further assessment, are listed in various heritage schedules that form part of a local environmental plan. Listed heritage items are then protected from certain defined activities, normally including demolition, renovation, excavation, subdivision, and other forms or damage, unless consent has been gained from an identified consent authority. The consent authority under a local environmental plan is normally the Local Shire or City Council.

Regional environmental plans (REPs) are no longer part of the hierarchy of environmental planning instruments in NSW. All remaining REPs are deemed to be State environmental policies.

7.1.4 NSW Heritage Act 1977

The Heritage Act regulates the identification, assessment and management of non-Aboriginal heritage values within NSW. The Act recognises two levels of heritage significance – State and local significance across a broad range of values.

Some key provisions of the Act are:

- The establishment and functions of the Heritage Council (Part 2).
- Interim heritage orders (Part 3), the State Heritage Register (Part 3A).
- Heritage Agreements (Part 3B).
- Environmental planning instruments (Part 5).
- The protection of archaeological deposits and relics (Part 6).
- The establishment of Heritage and Conservation Registers for State Government owned and managed items (Part 7).

Generally this Act provides protection to items that have been identified, assessed and listed on various registers including the:

- State Heritage Register (consisting of items and places of State heritage significance).
- State government authority Section 170 registers (consisting of significant items and places managed by State authorities).
- Heritage Schedules included within Local and Regional environmental plans, and administered by Local Government.

In addition, Section 139 of the Act specifically provides protection for any item classed as a relic. A relic is defined as:

"...any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that:

(a) relates to the settlement of the area that comprises New South Wales, not being Aboriginal settlement, and

(b) is of State or local heritage significance."

(Heritage Amendment Act 2009, Part 1, Section 4).

Section 146 of the Act requires that the discovery of a previously unknown relic be reported to the Heritage Council within a reasonable time of its discovery.
Current policy and interpretation by the NSW Heritage Branch (Department of Planning and Infrastructure) limits the scope of the ‘relic’ definition to exclude above ground structures and a range of ground features or ‘works’ which may include roads, embankments and other forms of constructed ground relief. This interpretation is based on the definition of ‘environmental heritage’ in Section 4 of the Act which states that environmental heritage means ‘those places, buildings, works, relics, moveable objects and precincts, of State or local significance’. The Heritage Branch interprets each of these categories to be mutually exclusive (correspondence from Reece McDougall, Executive Director, Dept. of Planning, to K. Officer, Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 30/5/07).

In general, the Act disallows interference with a place or item listed on the State Heritage Register, or disturbance to a relic, except according to the provisions of a permit. A number of standard exemptions and general or additional exceptions to the requirement for permits have also been defined (Sections 57 and 139).

Section 170 of the Act requires all state government instrumentalities to establish and maintain a Heritage and Conservation Register that lists items of environmental heritage which are of a class prescribed by the regulations, and owned, occupied or otherwise under the control of that instrumentality. Part 4, Section 22 of the Heritage Regulation 2012 states that the following classes of items of the environmental heritage are prescribed for the purposes of section 170 (4) a of the Act:

- Items that are listed as heritage items under an environmental planning instrument made under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979,
- Items that are subject to an interim heritage order,
- Items that are listed on the State Heritage Register’
- Items identified by the government instrumentality concerned as having State heritage significance.

A consequence of these provisions is that section 170 listing of items of local significance, which are not also listed under an environmental planning instrument under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, remains discretionary.

A government instrumentality must give the Heritage Council not less than 14 days written notice before it either:

- Removes any item from its register.
- Transfers ownership of any item entered in its register.
- Ceases to occupy or demolishes any place, building or work entered in its register.

Each government instrumentality is responsible for ensuring that the items entered on its register are maintained with due diligence in accordance with State Owned Heritage Management Principles approved by the Minister on the advice of the Heritage Council. The Heritage Council can from time to time issue heritage asset management guidelines to government instrumentalities with respect to the conservation of the items entered on registers under Section 170. The guidelines can relate to (but are not limited to) such matters as maintenance, repair, alteration, transfer of ownership and demolition. A government instrumentality must comply with these guidelines.

7.1.5 The National Trust of Australia (NSW)

The National Trust of Australia (NSW) compiles and maintains a register of items and places which the Trust determines to have cultural significance and to be worthy of conservation. Although the Register has no statutory authority, the inclusion of an item or place is likely to lend support to an assessment of heritage value.
7.2 Implications for the proposal

This assessment has identified both above ground structures, potential subsurface archaeological deposits and ground relief features (or earthworks), such as sections of remnant highway. None of the identified items are assessed as having State significance.

Any impact to subsurface archaeological deposits will require an excavation permit (applied for under Section 140 of the Heritage Act 1977) from the Department of Planning and Infrastructure except where the disturbance complies with one or more of the exceptions established under section 139 of that Act. In brief these exceptions are, where disturbance would be unlikely to occur to relics with local or State significance, or where disturbance to relics would be minor, or where a site has little or no research potential. A process of application and notification of an approved exception must be followed in the latter cases prior to the commencement of any disturbance works.

Any proposed investigative or salvage program involving archaeological excavation would require as a pre-requisite an excavation permit.

Impact to above ground heritage structures or relics does not attract a requirement for an excavation permit, nor would impact to ‘works’ such as road carriageways, and ground relief. The planning and approval provisions of local and regional environmental plans are relevant to items listed on LEP and REP heritage schedules, but only where the local Council is a determining authority. This is not the case for the BBU proposal.

Despite the absence of a clearly defined statutory requirement for approval to impact some classes of heritage item, the Heritage Branch of the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) may take an interest to ensure that heritage values, in whatever material form (or statutory class) are to be managed in an effective way. The OEH or Department of Planning may delay Development Approvals until satisfactory strategies are defined or prescribed.

Heritage items or places which may fall into this category include those assessed as having local context significance only, and which are not included on the State Heritage Register, and may or may not be listed on local government LEP or REP heritage schedules.

Five of the heritage recordings within the proposal area or within 200 metres of the proposal boundary are currently included on a statutory list. These are:

- The Princes Highway Abernethys Creek bridge listed on the RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register (identified as G2B H2 in this report).
- Four items included on the Heritage Conservation Schedule (Schedule 7) of the Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (1985, with amendments as at 21 Oct 2011):
  - The Meroo Meadow Union Church (identified as G2B H3 in this report).
  - The former Meroo Meadow public school and schoolmasters residence, now the ‘Hotel Woodbyne’ (identified as G2B H4 in this report).
  - The former Jaspers Brush public school and Schoolmasters residence (identified as G2B H44 in this report).
  - ‘Pomona’ a late nineteenth century dairy farm complex (identified as G2B H46 in this report).

The inclusion of the Abernethys Creek Bridge on the RMS Section 170 register places a number of obligations on RMS with regard to the maintenance and management of the bridge. Written notice (of not less than 14 days), must be provided to the Heritage Council if RMS ceases to occupy or intends to demolish the bridge.

The Shoalhaven City Council Local Environmental Plan listings do not pose a statutory constraint on RMS as the Council is not a determining authority for the proposal. However, RMS should be mindful of listed items and attempt to avoid or minimise impacts wherever feasible and reasonable. This would be a focus of OEH scrutiny of any proposal.
8  Impact assessment

8.1  Potential development impact categories

The classification of impact from a development or activity falls into two broad categories, direct or indirect impact. This classification is made relative to the identified heritage item (which may also include or constitute a place and/or curtilage). Direct impact is where a development would result in physical loss or change to a heritage item, causing a loss of heritage value or significance. Direct impact may occur to a part of an item (partial impact), or affect the whole of the item (whole impact).

Direct impact is most likely to occur within the area of construction impact, either the actual physical location of a construction or excavation – the construction footprint, or within the area of the upgraded highway corridor where ancillary actions may occur, such as vegetation clearance, materials and plant storage, or other processing actions. For this reason, it is assumed in this analysis that any heritage items which fall within the existing or upgraded highway corridor boundaries may potentially be subject to direct impact, unless specifically managed otherwise.

Indirect impact is where a development or activity would change the context and surroundings of an item, causing a loss of heritage value or significance. This may include visual, sonic and olfactic changes, as well as the physical loss or concealment of landscape elements. Indirect impacts may reduce the integrity of an item, by effecting components of its setting which are important for an appreciation of its history, function and meaning.

The potential impacts of the proposal on heritage items consist of the following categories:

a) A whole or complete degree of direct impact to a heritage item resulting in the physical loss of the item. This can be expected to occur in up to 100 per cent of the planned highway corridor, although there may be some limited potential for site remnants to survive in undeveloped areas or in some ancillary areas.

b) Partial or minor direct impact to heritage item(s). The resulting loss or reduction in heritage significance will depend on the nature of the item and the extent and scope of the physical impact. Included in this category are: instances where a proportion of the item will remain, impact to the defined curtilage of an item, and impact to a minor or small proportion of an item, such as the root stock of a heritage tree. This category of impact may also be associated with indirect impacts.

c) Indirect impacts only, such as to the contextual and landscape values associated with an item. Typically this occurs when a development is now adjacent to, or closer to the item. Impacts may include changes in viewsheeds to and from the item, and changes to noise and artificial light levels.

d) Indirect impact to items of movable heritage which could be moved to avoid direct impact and as a consequence lose contextual integrity.

e) No substantive impact. This category involves instances where the development would either: not pose an impact to a heritage item (direct or indirect), or any measurable impact was insignificant and did not reduce the heritage value or significance of the item. An example would be where a development occurs within the view shed from an item, but does not obscure, remove or reduce the role of contextual or landscape components that contribute to the significance of the item. A further example would be where a development, close to an item, does not increase the level of impact that has already occurred from existing elements or actions.

f) The extent of impact relative to the size of the heritage item is not known.
8.2 Summary of impact and items subject to impact

A summary of the proposal impact on the non-Aboriginal heritage items is provided below. Detailed and site specific statements of heritage impact are provided in Appendix E.

Of the 31 heritage items, 18 would not be directly impacted, eight would be, or potentially be, partially impacted, and two would be, or potentially be, wholly impacted. The extent of direct impact is not known for three items. Of those not directly impacted (18), seven would be subject to indirect impacts relating to their landscape and/or visual contexts. The use of categories incorporating potential impact, both with reference to the occurrence of impact and to the extent of impact, is a consequence of recording uncertainty regarding the exact location of a site, or the degree to which archaeological traces may survive.

All heritage items subject to direct impact are of an assessed local scale of significance.

A summary of the impact categories is provided in Table 8.1 The interrelation of the categories used in this analysis and a simplified scheme provided by RMS (refer below), is shown in Table 8.2. An inventory of item specific impact is provided in Table 8.3.

Mapping of recording locations relative to a simplified scheme of impact categories is provided in Appendix A. The simplified scheme is preferred by RMS for a general audience. The interrelation of the categories used in this analysis and the simplified scheme is shown in Table 8.2. The scheme equates direct impact with physical impact, and indirect impact with visual impact. In this regard it should be noted that the term physical impact refers only to the type of impact to the heritage item. Its use in the simplified scheme is distinct from the physical impact of the proposal which may also cause indirect or visual impacts. Although visual impact does not strictly include all indirect impacts, such as non-visual changes to a heritage item’s context (such as noise, hydrology, and access), this inclusivity should be assumed in the simplified scheme. Lastly, the term no impact is applied to mean no substantive impact. That is, the degree of impact does not rise above a threshold relative to the significant values of the heritage item or a pre-existing level of impact. An example of a pre-existing threshold would be an already present road in close proximity to an item. An example of a non-substantive impact could be a distant visual intrusion into a viewscape or vista from a heritage item or a relatively small increase in noise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct impact</th>
<th>Impact category</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Subtotal items</th>
<th>Subtotal items</th>
<th>Total items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>a) Whole direct impact</td>
<td>G2B H2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>a) Potentially whole direct impact</td>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b) Partial direct impact</td>
<td>G2B H5, 7, 46, 67, 68 and 78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, potentially</td>
<td>b) Potentially partial direct impact</td>
<td>G2B H81, SICPH CL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, potentially</td>
<td>f) Extent of impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88 and 91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>c) Indirect impact</td>
<td>G2B H1, 4, 44, 66, 71, 77, 87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>e) No substantive impact</td>
<td>G2B H3, 9, 73, 76, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89, 90 and 92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.2: Interrelation of impact categories used in this analysis and RMS’ simplified classification scheme (refer Appendix A where these categories are employed in proposal mapping). Categories include potential determinations (refer table above and below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simplified impact category</th>
<th>Categories used in analysis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct impact</td>
<td>Impact category</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Total items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Impact –</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>a) Whole direct impact</td>
<td>G2B H2 and 80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Impact –</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b) Partial direct impact</td>
<td>G2B H5, 7, 46, 67, 68, 78, 81 and SICPH CL</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Impact –</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>f) Extent of impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88 and 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extent of impact not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c) Indirect impact</td>
<td>G2B H1, 4, 44, 66, 71, 77 and 87</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e) No substantive impact</td>
<td>G2B H3, 9, 73, 76, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89, 90 and 91</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3: Itemised summary of construction impacts to heritage items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Heritage Item</th>
<th>Direct impact</th>
<th>Impact category</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G2B H1</td>
<td>‘Mount View’, Abernethys Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Upgraded highway corridor boundary would encroach to within about four metres of front veranda, and would remove most of the enclosure front garden, thus imposing a high degree of impact to the context of this house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H2</td>
<td>Abernethys Creek Bridge Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bridge cannot be retained as a functional upgrade component because it would not comply with flood level specifications or the new upgrade elevation. The bridge would be demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H3</td>
<td>Meroo Union Church 8 Boxsells Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Loss of mature pine trees along highway corridor in nearby areas would increase visual and aesthetic value of remaining pine plantings bordering church property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Heritage item</td>
<td>Direct impact</td>
<td>Impact category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H4</td>
<td>Former Meroo Meadow public schoolhouse and schoolmasters residence C385 and C395 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Carriageway would be about seven metres closer and existing vehicle entrance to property would be replaced by new driveway. No direct impact to structures. No change to existing property boundaries. The existing corridor boundary passes approximately one metre from front wall of the schoolhouse, which introduces the possibility of construction activities occurring up to this distance from the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H5</td>
<td>Avenue of planted roadside trees Princes Highway (and Turners Lane) Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>All trees along the northern side of the highway would need to be felled. However the trees on, Turners Lane, and a majority of the trees on the southern side of the highway occur outside of the construction footprint for the proposal. This provides the potential for the retention of these trees within the highway road reserve, subject to safety requirements. Potential ancillary areas 9, 10 and 13 adjoin this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H7</td>
<td>Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road 29 Strongs Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Impact would occur at eastern end of remnant. The remnant is small and this degree of impact would reduce heritage value substantially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H9</td>
<td>Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road 20B Strongs Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Proposal impact elsewhere would mean that this recording would be the only remaining remnant of this road, south and west of Berry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H44</td>
<td>‘Hotel Woodbyne’ 4 O’Keefes Lane Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>No significant change in distance to carriageway, minor change required to property boundary, potential visual impact through loss of bordering vegetation within existing highway corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H46</td>
<td>‘Pomona’ C360 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Existing entrance gateway would be directly impacted. Carriageway would be about 13 metres closer and upgraded highway corridor boundary would encroach to within about 10 metres of farmhouse and approximately two metres within existing front garden enclosure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Heritage item</td>
<td>Direct impact</td>
<td>Impact category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H66</td>
<td>‘Westbury’ B210 Princes Highway Berry</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Carriageway would be about four metres further away, however upgraded highway corridor boundary will include boundary plantings of mature camphor laurel trees. Potential ancillary area one adjoins the southern boundary of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H67</td>
<td>Site of former Meroo Meadow public hall Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Carriageway would be about seven metres closer, however upgraded highway corridor boundary would encroach about 20 metres into site, leaving around a six metre interval of the remaining Lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H68</td>
<td>Site of former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory 25 Jaspers Brush Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Minor direct impact would occur along southern boundary of lot containing site as a result of earthworks adjacent to Jaspers Brush Road. It is not known if any components of this site were/are situated along this boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H71</td>
<td>‘Fairview’ C480 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Carriageway would be slightly further away. No change to property boundaries. Potential visual impact from loss of bordering vegetation in the highway corridor. Potential ancillary area 11 adjoins the eastern boundary of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H73</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate building complex 26A Boxsells Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>No change to property boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H75</td>
<td>Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory May occur within: 43 Fletchers Lane 1003 &amp; 1028 Meroo Road Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>yes potentially</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>The exact location of the factory is not known. The area within which the factory was probably situated includes the eastern side of the existing highway corridor, either side of Meroo Road. Despite minimal extension of the highway platform in this direction, this area would probably be impacted by construction works for the Tullian Creek bridge and nearby interchange works. The presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Heritage item</td>
<td>Direct impact</td>
<td>Impact category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H76</td>
<td>‘Northcote’ 25 Jaspers Brush Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>No change to property boundaries, distance to roads and upgrade works remains similar to present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H77</td>
<td>‘Exeter’ C265 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Upgraded highway corridor boundary would encroach about 35 metres into property adjacent to the farmhouse, however this would be around 100 metres from the farmhouse. Farmhouse is locally elevated and the Meroo Road interchange, overpass and ramps would be visible, around 130 and 200 metres away. Potential ancillary area 15 adjoins the northern boundary of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H78</td>
<td>Avenue of planted roadside trees Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Pine trees adjacent to the Meroo Meadow Union Church property and one tree on the south side of Boxsells Lane would not be impacted. All other trees within this avenue would need to be felled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant ‘house’ B353 Princes Highway Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>a potentially</td>
<td>Construction footprint would extend about 26 metres into area which potentially contains archaeological remains. Upgraded highway corridor boundary extends about 40 metres into same area, representing approximately ¾ of area of potential. Site location is approximate and the presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H81</td>
<td>Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement B510 Princess Highway Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>yes potentially</td>
<td>b potentially</td>
<td>No substantive impact to reservoir dam which would be about 170 metres upslope of the upgraded highway corridor boundary. If a remnant section of the pipeline remains within/under, and/or to either side of the current highway platform, then this would be impacted within the construction footprint which would extend approximately eight and 31 metres to the north and south (respectively) of the existing platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H82</td>
<td>‘Silos Estate’ B640 and B640A Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>No significant change to boundaries or visual impact relative to heritage items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Heritage item</td>
<td>Direct impact</td>
<td>Impact category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H83</td>
<td>‘County Fair’ B680 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>No significant change to property boundaries or visual impact relative to heritage items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H85</td>
<td>‘Maylands’ 1003 Meroo Road Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>No change to property boundaries. Farmhouse is not elevated and is already screened from highway by vegetation. Meroo Road interchange would be about 215 metres away and visible from property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H86*</td>
<td>Road-side planted trees Meroo Road and Fletchers Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>These plantings would remain close to Meroo Road, however the construction of an adjacent round-about would not necessitate tree removal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H87</td>
<td>[unnamed] farmhouse and dairy C190 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>No significant change in distance to carriageway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H88</td>
<td>Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ 26A Boxsells Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>yes potentially</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>No change to property boundaries. Area of recording occurs partially within existing highway corridor and within adjacent property. Potential for direct impact to the portion within the existing corridor. Site location is approximate and the presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H89</td>
<td>‘Jaspers Grove’ 20A Strongs Road Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>No significant change to position of Strongs Road carriageway. Property already substantially screened by vegetation. Site location is approximate and the presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H90</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ homestead, C395 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>No change to property boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Heritage item</td>
<td>Direct impact</td>
<td>Impact category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H91</td>
<td>Site of former ‘Little Meadow’ Public (tent) School, 15 Turners Lane Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Exact location of tent school is not known, however it is likely to have been close and parallel to the (1882) road formation. The proposed upgraded highway corridor boundary extends around 20 metres from the existing highway platform and there is potential for archaeological deposits to be situated within this area. The presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H92</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings, (Pestells Lane) C265 Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Nearest upgrade works would be situated approximately 150 metres to the south east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICPH CL</td>
<td>Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b &amp; c</td>
<td>Impacts would include the visual and structural impact of the carriageway formation, cuttings, and visually obtrusive embankments, overpasses and ramps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: While G2B H86 would not be subject to direct impact, a Statement of Heritage Impact (SOHI) has been prepared for this recording to address the potential for inadvertent impacts occurring during nearby works.*

### 8.3 Impact to cultural landscape values

The following section provides an overview of the development impact to cultural landscape values. A detailed statement of heritage impact is provided in Appendix E under the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland recording (item SICPH CL). Figures 8-1 and 8-2 illustrate the extent to which the proposal is situated within the SICPH CL and previously identified heritage landscape categories.

The Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland has an assessed local level of significance under all criteria: a, b, c, d, e, f and g.

Eighty per cent of the proposal (8.90 kilometres) occurs within the SICPH cultural landscape (ie north of Pestells Lane), and four per cent (0.45 kilometres) occurs within the buffer zone of the Berry Township Urban Conservation area (ie north of Mullers Lane).

#### 8.3.1 The nature and extent of anticipated development impact

The proposal would impose a modern structural component onto the landscape. The degree and severity of this imposition, relative to the existing environment, would vary according to the difference between the forms of the current highway and the proposal. For example, the current horizontal alignment of the highway already includes gradual curves which contrast with the existing, broad-scale, man-made landscape features which are based on grids, right angles, or straight intervals joined by relatively tight curves. The proposal would not significantly alter this pre-existing impact because the current highway alignment would be maintained with only minor changes to curves.
Similarly, the vertical alignment of the highway has in many places been substantially modified from the natural gradient to make climbs and descents more gradual. The major differences would be: the introduction of dual carriageways, resulting in a substantially wider highway corridor; the introduction of elevated components at interchanges such as overpasses and on-ramps and off-ramps; and changes to noise and artificial light levels.

The formal and physical traits of the proposal would contrast with those of the existing landscape in the following ways:

- The vertical alignment of the proposal would be even more gradual and incremental, with more widespread use of ramps, embankments and cuttings to maintain standard rates of climb or descent.
- The inclusion of overpasses and approach ramps would introduce elevated landscape features which may intrude into or obstruct viewsheds to and from heritage items.
- The supply of artificial lighting at select portions of the proposal, such as at interchanges, may interfere with the quality of viewsheds to and from a heritage item.
- Increases in traffic load, and the increased proximity of the proposal on some heritage items is likely to increase noise levels experienced at those items.
- The width of the proposal corridor (including the carriageways, ramps and associated road reserve) would vary from 50 metres to up to 250 metres (at the Meroo Road interchange) with an average of around 70 metres. This is in contrast to the existing highway corridor which can be less than 20 meters where not extended in anticipation of the proposal.
- Unlike the alignment of adjacent roads which, through their curves, and opportunistic alignments, manifest the natural topography they traverse, the proposal alignment would create or accentuate its own topography of cuttings and embankments as required by tolerances in vertical and horizontal alignment to accommodate current design standards. As a consequence, the proposal would accentuate the character of the existing alignment which runs contrary to the natural flow of ridges, valley orientation, and slope contours.

8.3.2 Proposal aspects which respect or enhance cultural landscape values

The proposal would follow the existing highway alignment, which, with some small exceptions, follows the original corridor of the first European road constructed for vehicles between Berry and Bomaderry – the 1858/69 Berry Estate Road. The exceptions are the 1930 Bomaderry bypass (south of Meroo Road) and minor deviations at the Meroo Meadow bend and the traverse across the Jaspers Brush spurline. The maintenance of this alignment provides a degree of historical and functional integrity to the proposal - a modern manifestation of an original mid nineteenth century access and transport corridor.

It is proposed to minimise and ameliorate adverse visual impacts of the proposal, through the establishment of vegetation, and the careful design of the proposal, minimising cuttings, embankments and carriageway elevation where feasible and reasonable, while complying with modern design standards.

The use of vegetation as a strategy to mitigate impact to landscape heritage values provides the opportunity to reinforce and strengthen local characteristics which contribute to local identify and character.
Figure 8-1: Location of proposed proposal relative to the SICPH CL. (After Figure 13 in Clarke and Duyker 2010; and The boundary of the Berry – Bolong Pastoral Landscapes (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory) (base image: Google Earth Pro 2009)
8.4 Potential impact of ancillary areas

The potential of ancillary facilities and associated activities to impact upon non-Aboriginal heritage values that may be present within an area is considerable. Without active measures to avoid or manage impact, any heritage items that were hypothetically present within an ancillary area would be wholly or at least partially impacted.

In most cases, indirect impacts to any adjacent heritage items would be temporary due to the interim nature of the ancillary facilities and associated activities. However, where and if there is a requirement to permanently stockpile excess or unsuitable excavated materials, there may be a permanent impact on landscape, contextual and visual heritage values. The role of ‘no-go’ areas may be an important management tool in maintaining a buffer between facility boundaries and adjacent heritage items.

A description of required construction ancillary facilities is provided in Section 1.3. The potential location of ancillary areas is shown in Figure 1-1.
An analysis of the potential non-Aboriginal heritage impact of each potential ancillary facility area is presented in Table 8.4. Despite the generic use, within the review of environmental factors and Figure 1-1 of this report, of the term site for each of these potential ancillary facilities, for the purposes of this heritage analysis, each potential facility will be referred to as an area, in order to avoid confusion with this report’s generic use of the term site to mean a heritage or archaeological locality.

None of the potential ancillary areas include heritage recordings. In seven instances the potential ancillary areas are situated adjacent to a heritage recording (six of which are heritage items), and there are consequential risks of direct impact to tree root zones (areas 1, 10 and 11), and indirect visual impacts from nearby permanent stockpiling of excavated materials (areas 1, 7, 10, 11 and 15). The latter risk category involves standing heritage structures or/and trees which may be impacted by nearby visually intrusive elements. In one case of an adjacent heritage recording (area 4), the recording is not a heritage item (G2B H69, ‘Amaroo Park’) and would be demolished because it is situated within the construction footprint for the proposal.

There are three other instances where a potential ancillary area is proposed adjacent, or close to, heritage recordings which would be directly impacted by the construction footprint. These are: area 5 (approximately 20 metres from G2B H7), and areas 9 and 13 (each are adjacent to the northern alignment of trees in G2B H5).

There are four instances where the potential ancillary areas are situated close to a heritage recording (all of which are heritage items). Close is defined as within 100 metres, but excluding recordings situated on the opposite side of the highway. These are areas 5, 7, 8 and 17. Areas 5 and 7 have been discussed above, in the remaining areas 8 and 17, the potential ancillary facilities pose no risk of direct or indirect impact as the items are 50 metres or more away and constitute below-ground potential archaeological deposits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area no.</th>
<th>Size (m²)</th>
<th>heritage recordings included within proposed ancillary area</th>
<th>heritage recordings adjacent or close to proposed ancillary area</th>
<th>Potential for impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,657</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H66 adjoins northern boundary of proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>Potential for direct impact to root zone of trees located within G2B H66 boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,4344</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,7364</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,047</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The eastern end of G2B H7 is situated approximately 20 metres south of the south-eastern corner of the proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>None, the eastern end of G2B H7 would be directly impacted by the construction footprint of the proposal independent of any ancillary facilities or actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14,231</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,801</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H81 is situated approximately 50 metres upslope and to the north of the north-eastern corner of the proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area no.</td>
<td>Size (m²)</td>
<td>Heritage recordings included within proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>Heritage recordings adjacent or close to proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>Potential for impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8471</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H80 is situated approximately 50 metres to the east of the eastern boundary of the proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18,526</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H5 adjoins the southern boundary of the proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>None, the portion of G2B H5 situated north of the current highway would be directly impacted by the construction footprint of the proposal independent of any ancillary facilities or actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,666</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H5 adjoins the northern boundary of the proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>Potential for direct impact to root zone of trees located near to northern boundary of proposed ancillary area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>41,972</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H71 adjoins the western boundary of the proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>Potential for direct impact to root zone of trees located within G2B H71 boundary and for indirect visual impact from permanent stockpiling of excavated materials unsuitable for use in construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36,134</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31,139</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H5 adjoins the southern boundary of the proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>None, the portion of G2B H5 situated north of the current highway would be directly impacted by the construction footprint independent of any ancillary facilities or actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15,609</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22,507</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H77 adjoins the south-western boundary of proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>No potential for direct impact because the adjoining portion of G2B H77 consists of potential archaeological deposits and the standing remains of a concrete silo. The heritage item boundary includes a sufficient buffer to protect these features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7482</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2648</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>G2B H92 is situated approximately 100 metres to the north-west of the proposed ancillary area</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Impact management and mitigation

9.1 Summary

The impact mitigation and management actions proposed for heritage items affected by the proposal fall into seven broad strategy groups:

- Avoid direct impact where item falls either outside of proposal boundary (eleven items), or within boundary (two items)
- Manage indirect impacts (visual and contextual) only (seven items)
- Commemorate and interpret (no archival recording or excavation required) (one item)
- Conduct archival recordings and then as necessary, mitigate, and where feasible and reasonable, minimise impact:
  - No additional action (2 items).
  - Replace tree loss with new tree plantings (2 items).
  - Relocate structure (entrance gateway) (one item).
- Conduct archaeological test and/or salvage excavation, as necessary and where necessary prior to impact (four items).
- Avoid direct and indirect impact to heritage items related to the positioning and use of ancillary areas (five items).
- Manage cultural landscape values (one landscape item).

In addition, the instigation of fenced off, no-go areas is proposed in order to identify on-site constraints and as a precaution against accidental or peripheral physical damage to items in close proximity to construction activities. Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the 'no-go' area.

These categories and the heritage items involved are discussed in Section 9.2. A summary of impacts and proposed management measures is provided in Table 9.1. An item specific list of proposed impacts, mitigation measures, and before and after significance assessments is provided in Table 9.2.

9.2 Avoid direct impact

There are thirteen items within this category, eleven are situated outside of the proposal boundary (G2B H3, 9, 73, 76, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89, 90 and 92) and two partially within (G2B H68 and 88).

The potential risk of direct impact to items situated outside of the proposal boundary would be limited to direct impact to the root zone of trees which may extend into the proposal boundary, or accidental physical impact where situated close or adjacent to the boundary. The appropriate management strategies in each category would be to ensure that:

- Ancillary areas and actions remain within their defined boundaries.
- Where feasible and reasonable, any portion of the root zones of trees with heritage significance which extend into the proposal boundary were protected within defined no-go zones (G2B H3 and 86).
9.3 Manage indirect impacts (visual and contextual) only

This category includes seven items, all standing buildings with associated grounds, where impact would be indirect, and would affect visual and contextual values only (G2B H1, 4, 44, 66, 71, 77 and 87). In each case it is recommended that visual and contextual impacts (including viewsheds, noise and artificial light), to and from the sites, should be mitigated through urban design and the establishment of appropriate vegetation and/or other appropriate barriers.

In the case of ‘Mount View’ (G2B H1), the upgraded highway corridor boundary would occur within four metres of the building’s front veranda. This would have a substantive impact on the visual and contextual values of the house (including artificial light and noise). In order to retain as much of an effective curtilage, it is recommended that all feasible and reasonable actions be taken to minimise the loss of open space on the eastern side of the ‘Mount View’ homestead (G2B H1), and to maintain this space as an effective curtilage between the building and the proposal. This may be achievable by modifying the upgraded highway corridor boundary and/or careful management of that section of the corridor adjacent to the G2B H1 building during the operational phase.

In the case of the former Meroo Meadow Public Schoolhouse and residence (G2B H4), the existing highway corridor boundary passes approximately 1 metre from front wall of the schoolhouse. The proposal generally avoids this area (with the exception of the need to reinstate a driveway connection). It is recommended that a no-go area be fenced off in front of the buildings, and that the downslope extent of the no-go area be as large as feasible and reasonable. The area of the present highway corridor (road reserve) immediately adjacent to the former school buildings currently presents as a garden and functions as an open space area, and acts as an open space curtilage in front of the buildings. With regard to the operational life of the proposal, it is recommended that a portion of the highway corridor adjacent to G2B H4, be retained as an open space curtilage in front of the heritage buildings.

In the case of the ‘Westbury’ property (G2B H66), it is recommended that where feasible and reasonable, the mature Camphor Laurel trees on either side of the current driveway be retained, either by ensuring that they remain outside of the upgraded highway corridor, or conserving them within the new corridor, and defining no-go areas around the trees during construction.

Although not technically within this management category, the upgraded highway corridor boundary would marginally truncate the existing enclosed (fenced) front yard and garden of the ‘Pomona’ homestead (G2B H46). In order to preserve this existing spatial element as an aesthetic and effective curtilage in front of this building, it is recommended that the upgraded highway corridor boundary be revised to exclude the existing yard enclosure.

9.4 Commemorate and interpret

One item falls into a category where commemoration and interpretation is the only recommended management strategy. This is the site of the former Meroo Meadow public hall (G2B H67). The site has already been impacted by previous highway widening (which required the demolition of the building), and is unlikely to contain archaeological deposits of any appreciable significance. However the site has considerable social value to the local community and its former presence and role in the community should be commemorated and interpreted. Given that the proposal would further truncate and remove the former site so that less than half of the original building site remains, it would be appropriate for RMS to initiate and establish some form of commemoration and interpretation. It is recommended that this be done in an appropriate form and method. Consideration could be given to the creation of a physical memorial, signage and the use of printed and/or electronic media.

Site interpretation is also a recommended strategy for the management of impact at those sites where archaeological excavation may be conducted. These items are the sites of: the former Jaspers Brush Dairy Company factory (G2B H68), the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Company factory (G2B H75), the former Berry Estate tenant ‘house’ (G2B H80), an agricultural earth dam and pipeline easement (G2B H81), a former Meroo Station hut (G2B H88), and the former ‘Little Meadow’ Public (tent) School (G2B H91). Interpretation would not be required in those cases where the conduct of archaeological excavation did not occur or where no evidence of the item was encountered.
These actions, and the interpretation of the cultural values of the proposal area in general, would be best promoted, interpreted and presented using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP). It is recommended that a HIP should be drafted with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, landowners and local Councils. Options to be considered should include physical memorials; interpretive signage; on-site public access and/or viewing points; printed, internet and/or electronic media; and supporting local museum displays.

9.5 Archival recording and subsequent impact mitigation

Where direct impact to a heritage item is unavoidable, the production of an archival recording provides a means of creating a documentary and photographic record of the item, which can then be used as a reference for the future. The record is a form of information recovery and provides a degree of impact mitigation for the physical loss of the item. In the event that direct impact to an item is avoided, then the conduct of an archival recording of that item would not be required.

There are five items where this strategy is a recommended mitigation strategy (G2B H2, 5, 7, 46 and 78). The Abernethys Creek bridge (G2B H2), could not continue to be used as a component of an upgraded highway because it does not comply with the flood level and carriageway elevation requirements of the proposal. Avoidance of the bridge would necessitate a considerable deviation from the existing highway alignment and would be associated with major property impacts, including greater indirect impact to either G2B H77 or G2B H87. In this instance, and given the local level of the bridge’s significance, the preparation of an archival recording is considered to be the most effective form of impact mitigation.

A small remnant of the mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road (G2B H7) between Berry and Bomaderry would be partially impacted by the proposal, just west of Strong’s Road. This is one of two surviving remnants of this section of the road. More remnants occur of a slightly earlier estate road between Berry and Gerringong, however all but one of these would be directly impacted by the proposed Foxground and Berry Bypass (NOHC 2012). That portion or portions of G2B H7 which are not directly impacted by the proposal, despite their underwhelming appearance and form, are worthy of conservation where feasible and reasonable. The G2B H7 remnant is small, eroded and fragmentary, and is of a lesser quality and size compared to the other remnant G2B H9, situated on the opposite side of the Jaspers Brush ridge. In this context the conduct of an archival recording prior to direct impact is considered to be an appropriate mitigation strategy. The whole of the G2B H7 road remnant should be the subject of the archival record so that the portion subject to impact can be placed in its current context.

The remaining items in this management category consist of the two Meroo Meadow road-side planted tree alignments subject to direct impact (G2B H5 and 78). Due to the limited distance between the tree rows at G2B H5 (west of Wileys Creek), conservation of the entire avenue (ie both tree rows) would not be possible unless the highway were completely realigned either to the north or south. Such a revision would have major consequential impacts, and be equivalent to a bypass, rather than an upgrade of the current highway corridor. The significance of the tree avenue is not of an order which would justify such a revision.

Minimising direct impact to the southern G2B H5 tree row has a higher priority than the northern row. This is due to the presence of Bunya Pines and a larger number of planted trees (as opposed to wild seeded trees). In accordance with this finding, the design of the proposal in the area of this site was shifted marginally to the north with the objective of minimising direct impact to the southern tree row. A consequence is that there is now potential for a majority of the southern side tree plantings to be retained within the upgraded highway corridor, subject to safety requirements. A small number of trees on a side lane (Turners Lane) are also included within this recording and would not be directly impacted. It is recommended that all feasible and reasonable actions be taken to minimise direct impact to the G2B H5 tree row on the southern side of the highway. Where feasible and reasonable, no-go zones defined around trees to be retained should include the full extent of their root zone. An archival recording should be conducted of the whole planted group prior to impact. As part of this record, and in order to ascertain the age of the original planting, it is recommended that dendro-chronological analysis be conducted on samples recovered from the felled trees. This is required to better understand the item and place the planting within an historical context.
The single remaining tree row at (G2B H78), south of Tandingulla Creek, could not be conserved in its entirety due to the vertical and horizontal alignment requirements of an upgraded highway platform. A number of trees, however, including some older and more vigorous trees, could be conserved in the vicinity of the Meroo Union Church, and on Boxsells Lane on the opposite side of the church. Where it is considered feasible and reasonable, these trees should be defined as no-go areas and fenced off for the duration of construction activities.

In order to mitigate the loss of aesthetic and cultural landscape values currently vested in the two tree plantings, it is recommended that where direct impacts are substantial, new plantings should be established (if and where feasible and reasonable) using the same or similar tree varieties in an appropriate and safe configuration. The aim of this strategy is to maintain or restore and support the landscape character and heritage values of the plantings. The type and variety of plantings used in new replacement plantings should (subject to contemporary regulations and horticultural considerations), seek to replicate those felled, and/or be locally prominent and contribute to the existing local landscape character.

In the case of the ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex (G2B H46), impact from the proposal would be mostly indirect (visual and contextual) with the exception of the existing entrance gateway which would need to be demolished. In order to maintain the integrity of this farm complex and its contextual landscape values it is recommended that, if feasible and reasonable, the entrance gateway should be carefully disassembled and reconstructed at a new entrance location, to be determined in consultation with the owner. Prior to any impact, the entrance gateway should be the subject of an archival recording. The reconstructed form of the entrance gateway should be as close to the original as is practical, feasible and reasonable.

9.6 Archaeological test/salvage excavation

There are six items within this category (G2B H75, 68, 80, 81, 88 and 91). In the case of two (G2B H68 and 88), the first management strategy would be to avoid impact if and where feasible and reasonable. In the event that avoidance is not found to be reasonable or feasible, and direct impact is anticipated, then it is recommended that an archaeological program of test excavation be conducted within the area of anticipated impact, with the aim of determining if significant archaeological deposits would be impacted. Based on the findings of the test programs, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or at a later stage, providing some form of site interpretation.

For the remaining four potential archaeological deposits in this category (G2B H75, 80, 81 and 91), the conduct of test and/or salvage archaeological excavation is the direct recommended strategy. Excavation would be required in three of these instances as the construction footprint would impact either a known or likely location of archaeological deposits. These items are: the site of a former Berry Estate tenant ‘house’ (G2B H80), a pipeline easement belonging to a former Berry Estate agricultural water supply (G2B H81), and the site of the Little Meadow Public (tent) school (G2B H91). In each case, initial excavation need only consist of test pits where the objective is to determine if archaeological deposits occur within the construction footprint or proposal corridor, and if a subsequent stage of salvage excavation is warranted. Archaeological excavation is not required at these sites or site portions situated outside of the boundary of the new proposal corridor. Based on the findings of the test programs, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or at a later stage, providing some form of site interpretation.
In the case of the fourth item in this subcategory, the site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Company factory (G2B H75), the identified area within which this site may occur remains large. Research to date has not been able to narrow down the potential area – no photographs have been located and firsthand experience of the factory is now beyond the scope of living memory. Based on an archaeological interpretation of the landscape and evident surface features, it is considered likely that the factory was located just to the northwest of the ‘Maylands’ milking bails (part of G2B H85). This is an area outside of the proposal area, however this identification remains a working hypothesis and is subject to confirmation. Other sources suggest that the factory was on the west side of Meroo Road, or close to Tullian Creek on the east side of the highway. Given the uncertainty in the location of G2B H75, it is recommended that a program of test excavation should be conducted to determine the presence and nature of any archaeological deposits within that portion of the proposal corridor which occurs within the area that may contain the remains of the former Meroo Meadow Diary Co. factory (recording G2B H75). This program may not be required if future historical analysis conducted prior to construction, determines that the factory was located outside of the proposal area.

Under the NSW Heritage Act 1977, a Section 140 excavation permit would be required to undertake any subsurface archaeological investigations.

9.7 Avoid potential impact related to the positioning and use of ancillary areas

There are three potential ancillary areas which adjoin heritage items along boundaries which include trees (of which some or all would not be directly impacted). These are:

- Area 1, bordering G2B H66.
- Area 10, bordering the southern tree alignment in G2B H5.
- Area 11, bordering G2B H71.

In each case, a precautionary strategy should be adopted that requires the identification of ‘no-go’ areas around the likely root zone of any trees to be retained within the boundaries of a heritage item, and which may extend beyond that boundary into or close to an ancillary area.

9.8 Manage cultural landscape values

9.8.1 Proposed strategies for managing impact

The following strategies are proposed to avoid and mitigate proposal related impacts to cultural landscape values (SICPH CL):

- It is proposed to minimise and ameliorate adverse visual impacts where feasible and reasonable through the appropriate design and conduct of construction and finishing of the proposal corridor, embankments and cutting faces, and the re-establishment of vegetation.
- The establishment of appropriate forms of vegetation along the proposal corridor and adjacent areas would be an important strategy in mitigating the broad scale landscape and visual impacts of the proposal corridor. This would be conducted with an awareness of maintaining important vistas from the road corridor, and the use of vegetation boundaries and alignments which conform to the rectangular patchwork of the surrounding landscape and serve to breakup or scatter the dominant curvilinear character of the proposal corridor.
Where existing road-side tree plantings and avenues with heritage value would be impacted by the proposal, it is proposed to:

- Reinstate the alignment or arrangement with new plantings of the same or similar varieties in an appropriate and safe configuration relative to the proposal.
- Use vegetation types and varieties in revegetation programs which, subject to contemporary regulations and horticultural considerations, are locally prominent and contribute to the existing local landscape character.
- Where there is an opportunity to incorporate artistic elements in structures adjacent to the carriageway, (such as bridgework and retaining and noise abatement walls), it is proposed that designs derived from local cultural heritage themes be considered, especially at locations in close association to places of significance.

9.8.2 Residual impacts following mitigation

Following the establishment of mitigation, the residual impacts of the proposal on the SICPH CL and the landscape setting of Berry would consist of:

- Disturbance to, loss of, and truncation of landscape elements due to the physical placement of the proposal. These include ridge and creeklines; cadastral boundaries defined by fence lines, field systems, and road alignments; and patterns of both native and introduced vegetation.
- The addition of a major engineered landscape component in the form of a consistently graded and angled curvilinear road platform associated with extensive bridges, cuttings and embankments.
- Increased visual intrusion of the proposal into views of, and across, the landscape.
- The disturbance to, and truncation of, built environment and landscape elements due to the physical placement of the proposal. These include the front yards and gardens of farmhouses, fence lines and field systems, riparian vegetation, and road alignments. With the exception of curtilages around heritage buildings, these affected features do not have heritage significance as individual items. All however have value as constituent parts of the much larger SICPH CL.
- The visual impact of the proposal looking towards and along the proposal, and southwards from the immediate surrounds of Berry (i.e. the buffer area identified by the National Trust).

All of these residual visual impacts occur in settings already impacted by the existing highway corridor, and thus represent further or incremental impacts of types already present.

The primary means for mitigating the landscape impacts of the proposal would be through the re-establishment of vegetation, the appropriate use of landscaping and barriers, and the use of complimentary visual components and compatible design elements. In some cases, mitigation actions conducted for this proposal could mitigate existing impacts as well as those of the proposal. Examples include revegetation of the road sides, and the re-establishment of plantings which contribute toward landscape heritage character. With the effective use of these strategies, it can be concluded that the residual impacts to the SICPH CL would be acceptable when weighed against the benefits and objectives of the proposal.

9.9 Management of recovered artefacts

Subject to stakeholder agreement, it is proposed to lodge any non-Aboriginal artefactual material recovered during archaeological or construction related excavations with either the Berry Museum (Berry and District Historical Society) or the Nowra Museum (Shoalhaven Historical Society) depending on the location (LGA) and nature of the finds. The material would be appropriately inventoried and accompanied by supporting documentation.
9.10 Summary tables of impacts and proposed management actions

Table 9.1: Summary of measures to mitigate construction impacts (items may occur in more than one category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management measures</th>
<th>Extent of impact*</th>
<th>Heritage items</th>
<th>Total no. of heritage items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid direct impact</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>G2B H9, 73, 76, 82, 83, 85, 89, 90, 92</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid accidental or peripheral impact by implementing 'no go' zones within or adjacent to proposal boundary, as appropriate (Use of temporary fencing)</td>
<td>(Potential) up to full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial or potential partial physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H5, 7, 46, 68, 78</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of physical impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>G2B H1, 4, 44, 66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>G2B H3, 86</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise impact if feasible and reasonable through revision of upgraded highway corridor boundary</td>
<td>Full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>G2B H1, 4, 66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>G2B H1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival recording</td>
<td>Full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H5, 7, 46, 78, 86</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>G2B H46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>G2B H46 (entrance gateway only)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate built structure</td>
<td>Full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H68, 81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of physical impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>G2B H67, 68, 81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological test and/or salvage excavation (either as the primary or secondary recommended strategy)</td>
<td>(Potential) full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Potential) partial physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H68, 81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of physical impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>G2B H67, 68, 81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation strategy</td>
<td>(Potential) full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial or potential partial physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H67, 68, 81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of physical impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>G2B H67, 68, 81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management measures</td>
<td>Extent of impact*</td>
<td>Heritage items</td>
<td>Total no. of heritage items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage visual impacts, or maintain existing vegetation barriers, through vegetation screening and urban design</td>
<td>Full physical impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial physical impact</td>
<td>SICPH CL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>G2B H1, 4, 44, 46, 66, 71, 77, 87</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected Finds Procedure</td>
<td>Full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H2, 80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H5, 7, 67, 68, 81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider amending the RMS Section 170 Heritage Register to include items remaining in proposal corridor post construction</td>
<td>(Potential) full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H5, 7, 67, 78, 86</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid potential impacts related to positioning and use of ancillary areas</td>
<td>Full physical impact</td>
<td>G2B H5, 81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial physical impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of impact not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual impact only</td>
<td>G2B H66, 71, 77</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Heritage item</td>
<td>Current significance Context</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H1</td>
<td>‘Mount View’, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>fg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H2</td>
<td>Abernethys Creek Bridge Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H3</td>
<td>Meroo Union Church Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>bcdefg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H4</td>
<td>Former Meroo Meadow public schoolhouse and schoolmasters residence Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>bdg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H5</td>
<td>Avenue of planted roadside trees Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>cg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Heritage Item</td>
<td>Current significance Context</td>
<td>Criteria*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H7</td>
<td>Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>abef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H9</td>
<td>Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>abefg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H44</td>
<td>‘Hotel Woodbyne’ Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Heritage Item</td>
<td>Current significance</td>
<td>Criteria*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H46</td>
<td>‘Pomona’ Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>bef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H66</td>
<td>‘Westbury’ Berry</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>abefg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H67</td>
<td>Site of former Meroo Meadow public hall Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Heritage Item</td>
<td>Current significance</td>
<td>Criteria*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H68</td>
<td>Site of former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>bceg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H71</td>
<td>‘Fairview’ Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H73</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate building complex Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Heritage Item</td>
<td>Current significance Context</td>
<td>Criteria*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H75</td>
<td>Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H76</td>
<td>'Northcote’ Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H77</td>
<td>'Exeter’ Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>cf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H78</td>
<td>Avenue of planted roadside trees Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Heritage Item</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Criteria*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant ‘house’ Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H81</td>
<td>Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>efg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H82</td>
<td>‘Silos Estate’ Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H83</td>
<td>‘County Fair’ Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>befg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H85</td>
<td>‘Maylands’ Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Heritage Item</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Criteria*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H86</td>
<td>Road-side planted trees Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H87</td>
<td>[unnamed] farmhouse and dairy Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>bfg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H88</td>
<td>Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H89</td>
<td>‘Jaspers Grove’ Jaspers Brush</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H90</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ homestead, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Heritage Item</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H91</td>
<td>Site of former ‘Little Meadow’ Public (tent) School, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local aef</td>
<td>Extent of direct impact not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H92</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Local e</td>
<td>No substantive impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICPH CL</td>
<td>Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>Local abcdefg</td>
<td>Partial direct and indirect impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Criteria are described in Table 6.5.
10 Recommendations

The following recommendations relate specifically to the assessed impacts of the proposal as it is described in this report. In the event of a future change to the anticipated area or nature of proposal impact, it should not be assumed that the absence of a reference to a particular heritage item in these recommendations means that no action remains appropriate in the light of any change.

10.1 Avoidance of direct impact

1). The following heritage items are located outside of the currently mapped proposal boundaries and would not be impacted by proposal. Direct impact to these sites should be avoided: G2B H3, 9, 44, 71 73, 76, 82, 83, 85, 89, 90 and 92.

10.2 Establishment and demarcation of ‘no go’ areas

2). Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between construction zones and the following sites, with the aim of defining ‘no go’ areas and preventing impact to areas or items with heritage value which are either situated close and adjacent to the proposal area, or constitute remnants of partially impacted sites: G2B H1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 44, 46, 66, 68, 75, 78, 80, 86, 88 and 91. Where feasible and reasonable, no-go areas around trees should include the full area of the tree root zone. Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area. In the case of tree alignments or avenues, items G2B H5, 78 and 86, the requirement to demarcate no-go areas does not include any portions of the highway carriageway which may be included within the defined boundary of the item.

3). A no-go area should be defined and fenced off within the existing highway corridor, adjacent to, and on the east side of the former Meroo Meadow Public Schoolhouse and residence (G2B H4). The downslope extent of the no-go area should be as large as feasible and reasonable.

10.3 Management of impact to heritage tree plantings

4). Direct impact to the trees in G2B H86 should be avoided. The trees should be fenced off and defined as a no-go area for the duration of construction works.

5). Direct impact to the following trees, which form part of larger recorded tree groupings, should be avoided and fenced off as no-go areas: the trees on Turners Lane (part of G2B H5), the trees adjacent to the Meroo Union Church (part of G2B H78), and the single pine on the south side of Boxsells Lane (part of G2B H78).

6). All feasible and reasonable actions should be taken to minimise direct impact to the row of planted trees on the southern side of the highway at G2B H5. Where feasible and reasonable, no-go areas should include the full area of the tree root zone.

7). An archival record of the heritage tree plantings G2B H5 and 78 should be conducted prior to any clearing or construction impact.

8). In order to determine the maximum age of each of the planting groups, a dendro-chronological analysis of trunk-section samples from select felled trees in each group should be conducted.

9). In those cases where direct impacts to a recorded tree grouping, row or avenue are substantial, new plantings should be established (if and where feasible and reasonable) using the same or similar tree varieties in an appropriate and safe configuration. The aim of this strategy is to maintain or restore and support the landscape character and heritage values of the plantings.
10. The type and variety of plantings used in new replacement plantings should (subject to contemporary regulations and horticultural considerations), seek to replicate those felled, and/or be locally prominent and contribute to the existing local landscape character.

10.4 Management of directly impacted built structures

Following the conduct of an archival recording, the existing entrance gateway to the ‘Pomona’ property (G2B H46) should, if feasible and reasonable, be disassembled and reconstructed at a new location, to be determined in consultation with the owner. The reconstructed form of the entrance gateway should be as close to the original as is practical, feasible and reasonable.

10.5 Management of known or potential archaeological deposits

If feasible and reasonable, direct impact should be avoided to the area of G2B H88, and to the land to the north of the current Jaspers Brush Road reserve (Part of G2B H68). If direct impact to either or both of these items is anticipated then an archaeological test excavation program should be conducted in the areas of anticipated impact with the aim of determining if significant archaeological deposits would be impacted. Based on the findings of this program, any further necessary management actions should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include salvage excavation and/or providing some form of site interpretation.

A program of archaeological test excavation should be conducted to determine the presence and nature of any archaeological deposits within that portion of the proposal area which occurs within the area that may contain the remains of the former Meroo Meadow Diary Co. factory (recording G2B H75). This program may not be required if future historical analysis conducted prior to construction, determines that the factory was located outside of the proposal area. Based on the findings of this program, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or providing some form of site interpretation.

14). A program of archaeological test excavation should be conducted within those portions of sites G2B H80, 81 and 91 within the construction footprint, to determine the presence and nature of any archaeological deposits, and any required management strategies. Based on the findings of this program, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or, at a later stage, providing some form of site interpretation.

10.6 Archival recording

An archival recording should be conducted of the following items prior to any clearing, demolition or construction impact: G2B H2, 5, 7 and 78. The recordings should be inclusive of any item portions which would be conserved, so that the full context of the item and their current condition are recorded. In the event that direct impact to an item is avoided, then the conduct of an archival recording of that item would not be required.

10.7 Management of visual and contextual impacts

The visual screening function of vegetation within the existing highway corridor adjacent to sites G2B H44 and 71 should be maintained and/or replicated through planting of appropriate vegetation within the new proposal corridor.

If feasible and reasonable, any of the mature Camphor Laurel trees at G2B H66 (‘Westbury’) which may, due to property acquisition, become incorporated into the highway corridor, should be conserved, and no-go areas defined around the trees.
18). The proposed upgraded highway corridor boundary should be revised so that the existing enclosed front garden and yard around the ‘Pomona’ homestead (G2B H46) is excluded from the highway corridor.

19). All feasible and reasonable actions should be taken to minimise the loss of open space on the eastern side of the ‘Mount View’ homestead (G2B H1), and to maintain this space as an effective curtilage between the building and the upgraded highway.

20). If and where feasible and reasonable, the upgraded highway corridor boundary should be revised to allow for:

20a). An effective yard and curtilage at the front of (east of) the ‘Mount View’ homestead (G2B H1).


21). Visual and contextual impacts (including viewsheds, noise and artificial light), to and from the following sites should be mitigated through urban design and the establishment of appropriate vegetation and/or other appropriate barriers: G2B H1, 4, 46, 66, 77, 87.

22). With regard to the operational phase of the proposal, it is recommended that a portion of the highway corridor adjacent to G2B H4 (Former Meroo Meadow Public School and residence) be retained as an open space curtilage in front of the heritage buildings.

10.8 Commemoration and interpretation

23). The location of the former Meroo Meadow public hall (G2B H67) should be commemorated and interpreted in an appropriate form and method.

24). Where warranted by proposal impact, and depending on the results of further research and archaeological investigations, the following sites should be the subject of public interpretation in an appropriate form and method: G2B H75, 80, 81, 88 and 91). Interpretation would not be required in those cases where the proposal did not directly impact the item, where the conduct of archaeological excavation did not occur, or where no evidence of the item was encountered in excavations.

25). The cultural values of the proposal area should be promoted, interpreted and presented to current and future public audiences using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP). The HIP should be drafted with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, landowners and local Councils. Options to be considered should include physical memorials; interpretive signage; on-site public access and/or viewing points; printed, internet and/or electronic media; and supporting local museum displays.

10.9 The Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Landscape (SICPH CL)

26). Where feasible and reasonable, the construction and finishing of the proposal corridor, embankments and cutting faces should be conducted in such a way to minimise and ameliorate adverse visual impacts, and facilitate the re-establishment of vegetation.

27). The establishment of appropriate forms of vegetation along the proposal corridor and adjacent areas should be an important strategy in mitigating the broad scale landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This should be conducted with an awareness of maintaining important vistas from the proposal, and the use of vegetation boundaries and alignments which conform to the rectangular patchwork of the surrounding landscape and serve to breakup or scatter the dominant curvilinear of the proposal corridor.

28). Where there is an opportunity to incorporate artistic elements in structures adjacent to the carriageway, (such as bridgework and retaining and noise abatement walls), it is recommended that designs derived from local cultural heritage themes be considered, especially at locations in close association to places of heritage significance.
10.10 Avoidance of potential impact related to ancillary areas

29). Where potential ancillary areas occur adjacent to heritage items (areas 1, 10 and 11), the likely root zone of any trees, not directly impacted by construction but which are situated within the boundaries of a heritage item, which may extend into an ancillary area, should be demarcated as a ‘no-go’ area. This is relevant to heritage items G2B H5, 66 and 71.

10.11 Unexpected finds procedure

30). In the event that unexpected cultural heritage finds are encountered during proposal construction then the RMS ‘Unexpected Finds Procedure’ should be adopted and followed. This may relate to finds in unexpected areas, or to finds of unexpected significance within known sites. The Procedure should be included within a Construction Environmental Management Plan or equivalent document. Sites for which this strategy is particularly relevant are: G2B H2, 5, 7, 67, 68, 75, 80, 81, 88 and 91.

10.12 RMS Section 170 register

31). RMS are required to give the Heritage Council not less than 14 days written notice prior to the removal of Abernethys Bridge (G2B H2) from the RMS Section 170 Register, and of its intention to demolish the bridge (section 170A of the Heritage Act 1977).

32). RMS should consider entering onto the RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register, all heritage items which, following the end of construction, remain wholly, or in part, within the proposal corridor. Any conservation or management requirements of listed items should be determined and adopted. Items which may be the subject of this recommendation include: G2B H5, 7, 67, 78, 80, 86 and 88.

10.13 Statutory requirements regarding the conduct of archival recordings and archaeological excavation

33). The conduct of archival recordings, of all archaeological excavations, and the lodgement of reports should comply with the standards and guidelines prepared by the NSW Heritage Council and the Heritage Branch of the Office of Environment and Heritage.

34). The conduct of archaeological test and salvage excavations would require the application for, approval and receipt of an excavation permit from the Heritage Branch of the Office of Environment and Heritage. As part of this application process the Heritage Branch is also required to approve of the nominated excavation Director.

10.14 Incorporation within construction and heritage management plans

35). The recommended management strategies and actimorsons outlined in this report, should be incorporated into any relevant construction related management plans such as a Construction Management Plan or Cultural Heritage Management Plan.

10.15 Induction of site workers

36). An outline of the cultural heritage management strategies outlined in this report should be included as part of compulsory induction courses for site workers during construction.
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Appendix A – Mapping and impact classification of Non-Aboriginal cultural heritage recordings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Sites No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Site No Impact - Approximate Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Sites Visual Impact Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Site Visual Impact - Boundary Defined in LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Sites Visual Impact - Approximate Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Sites Partially Impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Site Partially Impacted - Approximate Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Sites Wholly Impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Site Wholly Impacted - Approximate Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-heritage item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| G2B H1 | ‘Mount View’  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H2 | Abernethys Creek Bridge  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H3 | Meroo Union Church  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H4 | Former Meroo Meadow public schoolhouse and schoolmasters residence  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H5 | Avenue of planted roadside trees (west of Wileys Creek)  
Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H6 | Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway  
Jaspers Brush |
| G2B H7 | Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road  
Jaspers Brush |
| G2B H8 | Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway  
Jaspers Brush |
| G2B H9 | Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road  
Jaspers Brush |
| G2B H44 | ‘Hotel Woodbyne’  
former Jaspers Brush public schoolhouse and residence  
Jaspers Brush |
| G2B H46 | ‘Pomona’  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H66 | ‘Westbury’  
Berry |
| G2B H67 | Site of former Meroo Meadow public hall  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H68 | Site of former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory  
Jaspers Brush |
| G2B H69 | ‘Amaroo Park’  
Jaspers Brush |
| G2B H70 | ‘Hillview Park’  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H71 | ‘Fairview’  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H72 | [Unnamed] Cottage  
C441B Princes Highway  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H73 | Site of former Berry Estate building complex  
Meroo Meadow |
| G2B H74 | ‘Abernethy’s Bend’ Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway  
Meroo Meadow |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item ID</th>
<th>Recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G2B H75</td>
<td>Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H76</td>
<td>‘Northcote’ Jaspers Brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H77</td>
<td>‘Exeter’ Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H78</td>
<td>Avenue of planted road-side trees (south of Tandingulla Creek) Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H79</td>
<td>‘Glenmoor’ Jaspers Brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H80</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ Jaspers Brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H81</td>
<td>Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement Jaspers Brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H82</td>
<td>‘Silos Estate’ Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H83</td>
<td>‘County Fair’ Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H84</td>
<td>[Unnamed] house Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H85</td>
<td>‘Maylands’ Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H86</td>
<td>Road-side planted trees Meroo Road and Fletchers Lane, Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H87</td>
<td>[Unnamed] farmhouse and dairy Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H88</td>
<td>Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H89</td>
<td>‘Jaspers Grove’ Jaspers Brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H90</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ homestead Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H91</td>
<td>Site of former ‘Little Meadow’ Public (tent) School, Turners Lane, Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2B H92</td>
<td>Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings Pestells Lane, Meroo Medow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACT CATEGORIES AND AFFECTED HERITAGE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simplified impact category</th>
<th>Map key</th>
<th>Categories used in analysis</th>
<th>Direct impact</th>
<th>Impact category</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Impact – Wholly impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>a) Whole direct impact</td>
<td>G2B H2, 80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Impact – Partially impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>b) Partial direct impact</td>
<td>G2B H5, 7, 46, 67, 68, 78, 81, SICPH CL</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>f) Extent of impact not known</td>
<td>G2B H75, 88, 91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impact only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>c) Indirect impact</td>
<td>G2B H1, 4, 44, 66, 71, 77, 87</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>e) No significant impact</td>
<td>G2B H3, 9, 73, 76, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89, 90, 92</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note that potential impact categories are included in the above table as if confirmed)
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B.1 State Heritage Inventory

NSW State Heritage Inventory, Office of Environment and Heritage

Accessed 8 April 2013
Abernethys Creek Bridge

**Item details**

**Name of item:** Abernethys Creek Bridge

**Other name/s:** Abernathys Creek Bridge, RTA Bridge No. 711

**Type of item:** Built

**Group/Collection:** Transport - Land

**Category:** Road Bridge

**Location:** Lat: 34° 49' 42" S Long: 150° 35' 56" E

**Primary address:** Princes Highway, Bomaderry, NSW 2541

**Parish:** Bunberra

**County:** Camden

**Local govt. area:** Shoalhaven

**All addresses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Suburb/town</th>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Princes Highway</td>
<td>Bomaderry</td>
<td>Shoalhaven</td>
<td>Bunberra</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Primary Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Owner/s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Owner Category</th>
<th>Date Ownership Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Traffic Authority, NSW</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of significance:**

This bridge is a component of the Princes Highway infrastructure developed from the late 1920s and 1930s by the Department of Main Roads (DMR) as part of the State Highways improvement programme aimed at bringing the State's roads up to a standard suited to motor vehicle traffic, a programme which as a whole was a significant activity in the State's cultural history. The bridge has a low level of historical significance as a minor part of this broader programme and as a component of the historically significant route of the Princes Highway. It is a good representative example of its design - a cantilevered approach slab and main beam deck system. It has the ability to demonstrate contemporary 1930s standards of bridge design and construction. The whole structure demonstrates how sympathetic widening can be achieved, repeating the general design while allowing the process of change to be interpreted readily. Its widening demonstrates changes in demands on road infrastructure over the intervening period and the effects of these changes on 1930s infrastructure. This bridge has been assessed as being of Local significance.

**Date significance updated:** 14 May 10

*Note: There are incomplete details for a number of items listed in NSW. The Heritage Branch intends to develop or upgrade statements of significance and other information for these items as resources become available.*
### Description

| Designer/Maker: | DMR |
| Builder/Maker: | Unknown |
| Construction years: | 1929-1929 |

#### Physical description:
The bridge is in gently rolling country reasonably close in to the range behind this coastal area. The original bridge is a three span structure, with spans of 2.28 m, 10.66 m and 2.28 m. The main span consists of three reinforced concrete beams, haunched onto the pier headstocks. The approach spans are cantilever slabs with enclosing wingwalls. The piers consist of four octagonal columns each with a headstock. The bridge has been widened using similar design concepts, but with square columns. The bridge, which still carries two traffic lanes, has wide shoulders with guardrail supported by a steel post system with a higher top rail. The spill-through road approaches are concrete faced, extending inwards beyond the piers.

#### Physical condition and/or Archaeological potential:

| Original condition assessment: | 'The bridge appears in good condition. The road surface evidences slight settlement at the slab ends, but the bitumen surface is intact. Demonstrates a balanced cantilever type design.' (Last updated: 23/10/2003.) |
| 2007-08 condition update: | 'Good.' (Last updated: 17/4/09.) |

#### Modifications and dates:

| Widened in 1974 on downstream side using similar design to original. |

| Current use: | Road bridge |
| Former use: | Road bridge |

### History

| Historical notes: | A road route linking the settlements on the south coast of New South Wales between Wollongong and Eden was well established by the mid nineteenth century, appearing on an 1858 Post Office Department map of postal roads. (DMR, 1976, p. 37) The approximate route of the current Princes Highway was declared the 'Main South Coast Road' through the Local Government Extension Act of 1906. An 'opening' and naming of the Princes Highway took place at Bulli in 1920. (DMR 1976, pp. 64 and map opposite) Under the Main Roads Act, the Princes Highway was proclaimed a State Highway in August 1928 and was subsequently targeted for improvement by surfacing, realignment, linemarking and bridge construction and improvement. (DMR 1976, pp. 138-56) By 1932 the Princes Highway between Sydney and the Shoalhaven River at Nowra had been improved and most sections surfaced in bituminous macadam. (DMR 1976, p. 160-1) It was in this context that the bridge over Abernethys Creek was constructed. This bridge was one of more than 1,000 bridges built by the DMR between 1925 and 1940, a period in which their engineers were adapting existing standards of bridge design to meet the requirements of improved motor vehicle performance - they were generally wider than previously with an improved load capacity. The principal types of bridges constructed in this period were: concrete slab; reinforced concrete beam; steel truss on concrete piers; and timber beam bridges. (DMR, 1976, pp.169, 170.) Concrete was favoured in many instances because it was perceived to be a low maintenance material. In this case a main central beam type span is flanked by two enclosed cantilevered slab spans. The bridge over Abernethys Creek was constructed in 1929 and widened in 1974. A summary of inspections covering the period 1974-1988 indicate only minor work. At the date of the last entry, February 1988, maintenance of the bridge was the responsibility of the Department. One matter of concern in 1973 was excessive bridge vibration during repairs to the abutment and girders. This was explained as being due to the cantilever abutment type of construction which induced positive moments as well as negative bending moments as heavy vehicles crossed the bridge. The vibrations were checked a second time prior to the joining of the old and new. These were more noticeable under traffic than a conventional gider bridge but were not considered excessive for a cantilever type structure. (RTA File 1/404.1302) The name Abernethys, or Abernahys Creek, is possibly associated with William Abernethy who had a Jersey cattle stud at nearby Meroo in 1925, or William and Christopher Abernethy who appear on local electoral rolls as farmers there earlier in the century. (Shoalhaven Historical Society, local electoral rolls) |

---

Princes Highway upgrade – Berry to Bomaderry upgrade  
Roads and Maritime Services  
Technical paper: Non-Aboriginal (historic) heritage
Assessment of significance

SHR Criteria a) [Historical significance] The bridge was constructed as part of the improvement and reconstruction programme undertaken on the Princes Highway by the Department of Main Roads after its opening in 1920 and proclamation as a State highway in 1927. It reflects contemporary standards of bridge design and construction and the new traffic demands of its era.

SHR Criteria b) [Associative significance] It is a bridge which is possibly named after a local family.

SHR Criteria c) [Aesthetic significance] The haunched profile of the girders gives the structure limited aesthetic appeal.

SHR Criteria e) [Research potential] Demonstrates cantilever approach slab and main beam deck system.

SHR Criteria f) [Rarity] The basic design concept and physical principles are similar to those used in the Limestone Creek Bridge at Tuena. (RTA Bridge No. 6400) However the appearance of the two bridges is quite divergent. As only a handful of beam bridges are included in this study its rarity value cannot be assessed at this stage.

SHR Criteria g) [Representativeness] Good example of a single main span and cantilevered abutment beam bridge of the 1930s.

Integrity/Intactness: Moderate. Widening sympathetic.

Assessment criteria: Items are assessed against the State Heritage Register (SHR) Criteria to determine the level of significance. Refer to the Listings below for the level of statutory protection.

Listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Listing</th>
<th>Listing Title</th>
<th>Listing Number</th>
<th>Gazette Date</th>
<th>Gazette Number</th>
<th>Gazette Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Act - s.170 NSW State agency heritage register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Inspected by</th>
<th>Guidelines used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1948 RTA Controlled Concrete Slab and Concrete Arch Bridges in NSW</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burns and Roe Worley and Heritage Assessment And History (HAAH)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### References, internet links & images

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Internet Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan</td>
<td>RTA General File 1/404.1302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Department of Main Roads (DMR)</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>The Roadmakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan</td>
<td>Shoalhaven Historical Society</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Correspondence re Abernethys Creek Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Data source

The information for this entry comes from the following source:

**Name:** State Government

**Database number:** 4309517

---

Image 1

Image 2
B.2 RMS s.170 Heritage and Conservation Register
Abernethys Creek Bridge

Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Item</th>
<th>Abernethys Creek Bridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>4309517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Item</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Sub-Type</td>
<td>Pre-1948 Concrete Slab and Arch Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadloc Address</td>
<td>**** Princes Highway Bomaderry 2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Area</td>
<td>Shoalhaven City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Roads and Maritime Services (replacing Roads and Traffic Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Road bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Use</td>
<td>Road bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of significance

This bridge is a component of the Princes Highway infrastructure developed from the late 1920s and 1930s by the Department of Main Roads (DMR) as part of the State Highways improvement programme aimed at bringing the State's roads up to a standard suited to motor vehicle traffic, a programme which as a whole was a significant activity in the State's cultural history. The bridge has a low level of historical significance as a minor part of this broader programme and as a component of the historically significant route of the Princes Highway. It is a good representative example of its design - a cantilevered approach slab and main beam deck system. It has the ability to demonstrate contemporary 1930s standards of bridge design and construction. The whole structure demonstrates how sympathetic widening can be achieved, repeating the general design while allowing the process of change to be interpreted readily. Its widening demonstrates changes in demands on road infrastructure over the intervening period and the effects of these changes on 1930s infrastructure.

This bridge has been assessed as being of Local significance.

Date

03 November 2003

Significance Updated
### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>DMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction years</td>
<td>1929 - 1929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Physical description

The bridge is in gently rolling country reasonably close in to the range behind this coastal area. The original bridge is a three span structure, with spans of 2.28 m, 10.66 m and 2.28 m. The main span consists of three reinforced concrete beams, haunched onto the pier headstocks. The approach spans are cantilever slabs with enclosing wingwalls. The piers consist of four octagonal columns each with a headstock. The bridge has been widened using similar design concepts, but with square columns. The bridge, which still carries two traffic lanes, has wide shoulders with guardrail supported by a steel post system with a higher top rail. The spill-through road approaches are concrete faced, extending inwards beyond the piers.

#### Physical Condition and/or Archaeological Potential

Original condition assessment: 'The bridge appears in good condition. The road surface evidences slight settlement at the slab ends, but the bitumen surface is intact. Demonstrates a balanced cantilever type design.' (Last updated: 23/10/2003.)

2007-08 condition update: 'Good.' (Last updated: 17/4/09.)

#### Modifications and dates

Widened in 1974 on downstream side using similar design to original.

#### Date condition updated

17 April 2009
**History**

**Historical notes**
A road route linking the settlements on the south coast of New South Wales between Wollongong and Eden was well established by the mid nineteenth century, appearing on an 1858 Post Office Department map of postal roads. (DMR, 1976, p. 37) The approximate route of the current Princes Highway was declared the 'Main South Coast Road' through the Local Government Extension Act of 1906. An 'opening' and naming of the Princes Highway took place at Bulli in 1920. (DMR 1976, pp. 64 and map opposite) Under the Main Roads Act, the Princes Highway was proclaimed a State Highway in August 1928 and was subsequently targeted for improvement by surfacing, realignment, linemarking and bridge construction and improvement. (DMR 1976, pp. 138-56) By 1932 the Princes Highway between Sydney and the Shoalhaven River at Nowra had been improved and most sections surfaced in bituminous macadam. (DMR 1976, p. 160-1) It was in this context that the bridge over Abernethys Creek was constructed. This bridge was one of more than 1,000 bridges built by the DMR between 1925 and 1940, a period in which their engineers were adapting existing standards of bridge design to meet the requirements of improved motor vehicle performance - they were generally wider than previously with an improved load capacity. The principal types of bridges constructed in this period were: concrete slab; reinforced concrete beam; steel truss on concrete piers; and timber beam bridges. (DMR, 1976, pp.169, 170.) Concrete was favoured in many instances because it was perceived to be a low maintenance material. In this case a main central beam type span is flanked by two enclosed cantilevered slab spans. The bridge over Abernethys Creek was constructed in 1929 and widened in 1974. A summary of inspections covering the period 1974-1988 indicate only minor work. At the date of the last entry, February 1988, maintenance of the bridge was the responsibility of the Department. One matter of concern in 1973 was excessive bridge vibration during repairs to the abutment and girders. This was explained as being due to the cantilever abutment type of construction which induced positive moments as well as negative bending moments as heavy vehicles crossed the bridge. The vibrations were checked a second time prior to the joining of the old and new. These were more noticeable under traffic than a conventional girder bridge but were not considered excessive for a cantilever type structure. (Roads and Maritime Services (replacing Roads and Traffic Authority) File 1/404.1302) The name Abernethys, or Abernathys Creek, is possibly associated with William Abernethy who had a Jersey cattle stud at nearby Meroo in 1925, or William and Christopher Abernethy who appear on local electoral rolls as farmers there earlier in the century. (Shoalhaven Historical Society, local electoral rolls)

---

**Listings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Listing</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Gazette Number</th>
<th>Gazette Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Act - s.170 NSW State agency heritage register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Significance

Historical Significance
The bridge was constructed as part of the improvement and reconstruction programme undertaken on the Princes Highway by the Department of Main Roads after its opening in 1920 and proclamation as a State highway in 1927. It reflects contemporary standards of bridge design and construction and the new traffic demands of its era.

Historical Association
It is a bridge which is possibly named after a local family.

Aesthetic/Technical Significance
The haunched profile of the girders gives the structure limited aesthetic appeal.

Social Significance
****

Research Significance
Demonstrates cantilever approach slab and main beam deck system.

Rarity
The basic design concept and physical principles are similar to those used in the Limestone Creek Bridge at Tuena. (Roads and Maritime Services (replacing Roads and Traffic Authority) Bridge No. 6400) However the appearance of the two bridges is quite divergent. As only a handful of beam bridges are included in this study its rarity value cannot be assessed at this stage.

Representativeness
Good example of a single main span and cantilevered abutment beam bridge of the 1930s.

Integrity/Intactness
Moderate. Widening sympathetic.

Assessed Significance
Local

References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Roads and Maritime Services (replacing Roads and Traffic Authority) General File</td>
<td>1/404.1302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Shoalhaven Historical Society</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Correspondence re Abernethys Creek Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Department of Main Roads (DMR)</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>The Roadmakers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Inspected by</th>
<th>Guidelines used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1948 Roads and Maritime Services (replacing Roads and Traffic Authority) Controlled Concrete Slab and Concrete Arch Bridges in NSW</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Burns and Roe, Worley and Heritage Assessment And History (HAAH)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Custom fields**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roads and Maritime Services (replacing Roads and Traffic Authority)</th>
<th>Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Number</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARMS File Number</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Number</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Management Plan</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Images**

- Western face
- Oblique view of northern pier and abutment
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Please note that despite datasheet references to the State Heritage Register and a SHI number, the inclusion of an item on the Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory does not necessarily mean that it is also included on the State Heritage Inventory or State Heritage Register.

Inventory copies kindly supplied courtesy of the Shoalhaven City Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoalhaven Heritage study No.</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>BBU REF assessment code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B094</td>
<td>Berry-Belong Pastoral Landscapes</td>
<td>incl. within SIHCP CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B181R</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>G2B H76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B150</td>
<td>Former Jaspers Brush Public School</td>
<td>G2B H44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B165P</td>
<td>‘Exeter’</td>
<td>G2B H77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B167P</td>
<td>Inter war concrete silo</td>
<td>G2B H77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B162</td>
<td>‘Pomona’</td>
<td>G2B H46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B160</td>
<td>Former Meroo Meadow Public School</td>
<td>G2B H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B161</td>
<td>Meroo Union Church</td>
<td>G2B H3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes (incl. within SICPH CL)

**Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory**

State Heritage Register

**Item Name:** Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes

**Location:** Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

**Address:** Multiple

**Suburb/Nearest Town:** Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolangatta, 2540 & 2535

**Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven

**State:** NSW

**Other/Former Names:**

**Area/Group/Complex:** Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes

**Aboriginal Area:**

**Cultrage/Boundary:** See image 2 in this data sheet

**Item Type:** Landscape

**Group:** Farming and Grazing

**Category:** Pastoralism

**Owner:** Multiple Owners

**Admin Codes:** B094

**Current Use:** Dairy Farming and Lifestyle Farming

**Former Uses:** Dairy Farming

**Assessed Significance:** State

**Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:** The pastoral landscapes of Berry and Bolong are articulated by nineteenth and early twentieth century homesteads, dairy buildings and landscape plantings which illustrate European settlement of the area and the growth of the dairying industry. Buildings include examples of convict built structures, single storey Victorian residences, Federation style homesteads and vernacular forms which illustrate the archaeology of the dairying industry. Individual items are of State, Regional and Local significance. Important as a pastoral landscape which remains productive, has historic, social and aesthetic values and is contiguous with the Crookhaven River and Kangaroo Valley Pastoral Landscapes. State significance (NSW).

**Historical Notes**

The Coolangatta Estate of Alexander Berry was established in 1822 with a grant of 4050 hectares in the Shoalhaven District. In 1873, David Berry inherited the estate from his brother Alexander. Ten years later in 1883 David Berry appointed his cousin, John Hay, as manager.

Between 1823 and 1905 over 145 miles of drains were cut to enable the reclamation of 8,103 hectares of swamp land. Alexander and David Berry founded the township of Broughton Creek (Berry) with villages established on both sides of the Shoalhaven River. These included Merco Meadow adjacent to the route of the Prince Highway established in 1858 by A Berry.

The death of David Berry in 1889 left the executors with the need to raise 250,000 pounds.
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
State Heritage Register

Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

As a consequence of this further drainage improvements were made to enable the sale of land.

The route of the railway to Bomaderry in 1893 followed the 1850 road. Commercial dairying began with the arrival of the cream separator in the 1880s with butter factories well established by the 1890s. Subdivision of the Berry Estate following the death of David Berry benefited from the arrival of the railway, drainage and the new dairying technology. Many small dairy farms were established on the former Berry Estate over the 40 year period following the death of David Berry. Small dairy farms had developed concurrently on land surrounding the Berry Estate. Firstly on the accessible lower slopes, then the valleys and finally the upper slopes of the escarpment when the more marginal land became potentially profitable in the 1880s and 1890s. The dynamics of the milk industry (and the small farms) were affected in turn by the construction of a central milk factory at Berry in 1895, the introduction of the Nowra Co-operative Dairy Co Ltd in 1902 and the introduction of refrigeration c.1910 which made possible delivery of milk to the Sydney market.

The dairy industry, and with it the Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes, developed in the twentieth century into an economic sub-system driven by metropolitan milk vendors. New technology to increase production rates has included winter feed yards, dairies and concrete feed lots.

During recent years many farms have changed to beef and other forms of pastoral activity with some farms increasing in size. Redundant homesteads and dairy buildings have been utilised by commuters wanting a rural lifestyle.

Themes:
- National Theme: Environment - cultural lands
- State Theme: Pastoralism
- Local Theme: (none)

Designer:
Maker / Builder:
Year Started: Physical Description: The Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes occupy the coastal plain north of the Shoalhaven River and eastern tips of the Illawarra and Cambewarra Ranges. Sub-zones include the Cambewarra-Tappaltee area, Bellerangaroo and the catchment areas of Broughton Creek north of Berry. The latter are focussed around communities which developed outside the Berry Estate, Cambewarra, Tappaltee, Bungawatish, Woodhill and Broughton Vale. To the

Date: 04/07/2013
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

west the Bellawongarah community established itself along the ridge between Kangaroo Valley and the coastal plains.

The scale and character are dependent on the subdivision of the Berry Estate which determined the location and form of dairy farms. Internal and external visual boundaries are created by modified and natural vegetation, roads, creeks and property boundaries which reflect the original patterns of subdivision and settlement. This pattern of small farms continues into the surrounding valleys and transitional areas modified by terrain and economics.

In the ranges every accessible pocket of land has been exploited to create a landscape with dramatic rapidly changing visual components and views which contrasts with the horizontality of the coastal plain.

Continued dairying combined with slow change in the dairying industry has contributed to the survival of the underlying landscape patterns which encapsulate evidence of settlement and industry from the 1870s and earlier. The landscapes include examples of early vernacular buildings, farmhouses, early churches and public buildings, nineteenth and twentieth century plantings, Victorian residences and a range of buildings, drainage schemes and structures which document settlement and land use patterns and the archaeology of the dairy industry in Shoalhaven.

Contiguous with the Crookhaven River and Kangaroo Valley Pastoral Landscapes.

Physical Condition:

Modification Dates:

Recommended Management:
Aesthetic values to be managed in accordance with the general principles of the Visual Management Plan prepared by EDAW in March 1994.

Historic parameters to be conserved:
Use - To be maintained as agricultural land.
Boundaries - These are defined by the limit of land clearing expressed in dairy farming and associated agricultural activity.
Land use and settlement patterns - The relationship of the agricultural areas to topography is a function of technology, economics and traditional farming practices. The scale and pattern of land use are dependent on the size of agricultural holdings determined by economics and sub-division of the larger estates in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Implicit in the location of farms, access roads, drainage canals, former rural communities identified by churches and schools and the associated farm structures and tree plantings.

Building Clusters - Comprising farm complexes and the associated farm structures and evidence of former rural communities identified by churches and schools.
Vegetation Patterns - Including remnant native vegetation, whether in pockets or defining the external boundaries, and introduced trees planted as windbreaks, garden elements or landscape elements.
Circulation Routes - The hierarchy of road and other transport and communication routes linking farms and cottages with former and existing rural communities and towns and
**Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory**
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**Item Name:** Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes  
**Location:** Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Regional infrastructure created in response to economic and agricultural processes.

Archaeological sites are to be managed to retain their scientific and interpretive value.

**Management:** Recommended Management  
Prepare or include in a Development Control Plan (DCP)

**Further Comments:** Historical Period: 1801-1825 1826-1850 1851-1875 1876-1900 1901-1925 1926-1950 1951-1975 1976-  
Criteria a)  
Criteria b)  
Criteria c)  
Criteria d)  
Criteria e)  
Criteria f) This item is assessed as aesthetically rare regionally (State)  
Criteria g) This item is assessed as historically representative regionally (State). This item is assessed as scientifically representative locally. This item is assessed as socially representative locally.

**Integrity / Intactness:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perumal Murphy Wu</td>
<td>Illawarra Regional Heritage Study Review, September 1993</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Freeman Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1995-1996</td>
<td>9004</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perumal Murphy Wu</td>
<td>Illawarra Regional Heritage Study/Review</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel(s)</th>
<th>Parcel Code</th>
<th>Lot/Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Plan Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Location validity</th>
<th>Spatial Accuracy</th>
<th>Map Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map Name: 9028-3-N 9028-3-S</td>
<td>AMG Zone: 9028-3-N 9028-3-S</td>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage study</td>
<td>Shoalhaven Heritage Stu</td>
<td>8094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Name:</td>
<td>Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Items:**
- Crockhaven Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2390328
- Milton Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2380596
- Kangaroo Valley Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2390522

**Contributory Components:**
- "Woodside Park" Tenery Road Berry SHI 2390143
- "Sedgford" A195 Princes Hwy SHI 2390155
- "Evisons Dairy Farm" Hockeys Lane Cambewarra SHI 2390159
- "Iolanthe" Jennings Lane Bolong SHI 2390166
- "Buena Vista" Bolong Road Bolong SHI 2390167
- "Glen Al Bas" Bolong Road SHI 2390170
- "Swansea" Bolong Road SHI 2390172
- "Onide" Byrnes Road SHI 2390211
- "Glenview" 219 Storey Road SHI 2390216
- "Glover Hill" Olive's Lane SHI 2390219
- "Hosta" Farm Croziers Road SHI 2390221
- "Tara Dairy" O Keefe's Lane SHI 2390220
- "Pomona" C369 Princes Hwy SHI 2390224
- "Exeter" C265 Princes Hwy SHI 2390227
- "Oakleigh" Woodhill Min Road SHI 2390234
- "Corobadah" Ben Dooley Road Berry Mountain SHI 2390160

**Colonial Contributory Items:**
- Coolangatta Estate Group Bolong Road SHI 2390185
- Pulman Street Heritage Conservation Area - Broughton Creek Town SHI 2390017
- "Manara" Berry Estate Managers House Princes Hwy SHI 2390144
- Berry Stud Farm complex Coolangatta Road SHI 2390146
- David Berry Hospital Complex Tenery Road SHI 2390153
- "Glenvale" Colonial Stab Cottage & Farm Complex Princes Hwy SHI 2390174

**Listing Comments:**
- Date First Entered: 05/05/1999
- Date Updated: 04/10/2012
- Status: Partial
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - View from Cambewarra Mountain looking south east to Jervis Bay
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - View from Cambewarra mountain looking east to Coolangatta mountain
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - Cambewarra Escarpment defines the edge of the landscape.
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - Colangatta Estate Group
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes Pulman street Conservation Area - Broughton Creek Village
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes "Memanga" Berry Estate Managers
Homestead Berry
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - Berry Estate Stud Farm (frw)
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Item Name: Berry-Bolang Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolang Pastoral Landscapes - Dairy Farm Complex (Woodside Park)
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - Dairy Farm Complex (Evans farm)
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - "fionaethe" Dairy farm complex
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This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - "Buena Vista" Dairy farm complex
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes *Ponora* Dairy farm complex Meroo Meadow.
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Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - Victorian Georgian Farmhouse Jaspers Brush Road
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Item Name: Berry-Belong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Belong Pastoral Landscapes - "Glenvale" Dairy Farm Complex
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Image:

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - "Exeter" Federation Farmhouse Princes
Hay Meroo Meadow
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This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
State Heritage Register

Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang


Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
Image Number:
Image Path:
Image File: 2390219b.jpg
Thumb Nail Path:
Thumb Nail File:

State Heritage Register
Full Report with Images
Page 23
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
State Heritage Register

Item Name: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - Colonial Timber Slab Barn
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SHI Number
2390151

Study Number
B064

Item Name: **Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes**

Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolong, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

**Image:**

![Image of Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes](image.jpg)

**Caption:** Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes - Holmes Farm Crockers Road - Feed Stalls and Silos
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Item Name: Berry-Belong Pastoral Landscapes
Location: Multiple, Berry, Bolog, Broughton, Cambewarra, Coolang

Caption: Berry-Belong Pastoral Landscapes 'Cobbadiah' Dairy Farm Complex Ben Dooley Road Berry Mountain.
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**House (G2B H76)**

![Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory](image)

**Address:** 25 Jaspers Brush Road  
**Suburb / Nearest Town:** Jaspers Brush 2535  
**Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven  
**State:** NSW

**DUAP Region:** Illawarra & Macarthur  
**Historic region:** Illawarra

**Owner:** Private - Individual  
**Admin Codes:** B161R  
**Code 2:**  
**Code 3:** Y

**Item Type:** Built  
**Group:** Residential buildings  
**Category:** House

**Contact:**  
**Current Use:**  
**Former Uses:**

**Assessed Significance:** Insufficient information to determine significance - Not assessed  
**Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:**

**Historical Notes or Provenance:** Unknown

**Themes:**
- National Theme:
- State Theme: Accommodation (Housing)
- Local Theme: (none)

**Designer:**

**Maker / Builder:**

**Year Started:**
**Year Completed:**
**Circa:** No

**Physical Description:** Large homestead complex with two hipped roof residences.

**Physical Condition:**

**Modification Dates:** Not seen in detail.

---

This page contains information about the heritage significance of a building in Shoalhaven. The building is a house located at 25 Jaspers Brush Road, Jaspers Brush, NSW. It is classified as a residential building, and its significance is assessed as insufficient information to determine, hence it is not assessed. The building is located in the Illawarra & Macarthur DUAP region and the Illawarra historic region. The building is owned privately and is currently in a residential use. The building is a large homestead complex with two hipped roof residences.
### Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory

**Item Name:** House

**Location:** 25 Jaspers Brush Road, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]

#### Recommended Management:

- Management:

#### Further Comments:

- Criteria a)
- Criteria b)
- Criteria c)
- Criteria d)
- Criteria e)
- Criteria f)
- Criteria g)

#### Integrity / Intactness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Freeman Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1966-1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B161R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel Code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LotNumber</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latitude</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longitude</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry 9028-3-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Map Scale:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMG Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry 9028-3-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easting:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northing:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoalhaven Heritage Stu B161R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a National Trust conservation area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Related Items:

- Berry Boilong Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2390151

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listing Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custom Field Three:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Field Four:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Field Five:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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**Princes Highway upgrade – Berry to Bomaderry upgrade**

**Roads and Maritime Services**

**Technical paper: Non-Aboriginal (historic) heritage**
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Item Name: House
Location: 25 Jaspers Brush Road, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]

Custom Field Six:

Data Entry: Date First Entered: 16/06/1999  Date Updated: 27/04/2012
Status: Basic
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Item Name: House
Location: 25 Jaspers Brush Road, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]
Former Jaspers Brush Public School (G2B H44)

**Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory**

**State Heritage Register**

**Item Name:** Fmr Jaspers Brush School & Schoolgrounds

**Location:** 4 O'Keefes Lane, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]

**Address:** 4 O'Keefes Lane  
**DuAP Region:** Illawarra & Macarthur

**Suburb/Nearest Town:** Jaspers Brush 2535  
**Historic Region:** Illawarra

**Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven  
**Parish:** COOLANGATTA

**State:** NSW  
**County:** CAMDEN

**Other/Former Names:** Woodbyne, Former Jaspers Brush School House & Playground

**Area/Group/Complex:**  
**Group ID:**

**Aboriginal Area:**

**Curtinage/Boundary:** Lot 1 DP 872572

**Item Type:** Built  
**Group:** Education  
**Category:** School - State (Public)

**Owner:** Private - Individual

**Admin Codes:** B150  
**Code 2:** 86519  
**Code 3:** Y

**Current Use:** Tourist facility

**Former Use:** School & Schoolmasters Cottage

**Assessed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:** A representative example of a late Victorian Government school and residence on the former Berry Estate designed by government architect W E Kemp. Local significance (Shoalhaven).

**Historical Notes or Provenance:** In 1876, Jaspers Brush (Berry Estate) tenant farmers erected a school and employed a private teacher. The Government refused to accept this building as a school. Continued petitioning led to the Government’s eventual approval in 1883 to establish a one classroom, one teacher school on a site adjacent to Jaspers Brush Creek. This was followed by a temporary school structure which was opened in September 1884. The present school building was erected in 1897 to the design of W E Kemp. The school closed on 8th May, 1969 and the property was sold to a private owner in 1974. The site is now an art gallery and guest house.

**Themes:**

- National Theme: Education
- State Theme: Education
- Local Theme: (none)

**Designer:** W E Kemp

**Maker/Builder:**

**Year Started:** 1897  
**Year Completed:** 1897  
**Circa:** No

---
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**Date:** 04/07/2013  
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Item Name: Fmr Jaspers Brush School & Schoolgrounds
Location: 4 O'Keefes Lane, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]

Physical Description: Federation period nineteenth century Victorian school building constructed of brick on sandstone footings. Galvanised iron hipped roof continuous over the verandah. Decorative brick chimney. The site consists of 5 acres of which 3 have been converted into a garden. Plantings include a number of mature trees c.100 years old (not confirmed).

Physical Condition:
Modification Dates: The school house building remains unchanged except for the extension of windows to floor level on the north side. A mezzanine level was added to the interior to accommodate a bathroom and bedroom.

Recommended Management:
Management: Recommended Management Prepare or include in a Conservation Policy

Further Comments: Historical Period: 1875-1900
Criteria a)
Criteria b)
Criteria c)
Criteria d)
Criteria e)
Criteria f)
Criteria g) This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally. This item is assessed as socially representative locally.

Integrity / Intactness:

References: Author
Title: Jaspers Brush School, The Jasper's Brush Reunion Committee
Year: 1997

Studies:
Author: Peter Freeman Pty Ltd
Title: Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1995-1998
Number: B150
Year: 1998

Ann Crosland All
Title: Illawarr Region Historic Buildings and Sites
Year: 1981

Parcels: Parcel Code Lot/Number Section Plan Code Plan Number
LOT 1 DP 8752

Latitude:
Location validity:
Spatial Accuracy:
Map Name: Berry 9028-3-N
Map Scale:
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Full Report with Images

Date: 04/07/2013

This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
### Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory

**State Heritage Register**

**Item Name:** Fmr Jaspers Brush School & Schoolgrounds

**Location:** 4 O’Keeffes Lane, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMG Zone:</th>
<th>Berry 902B-3-N</th>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>Northing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listings:</td>
<td>Name: Local Environmental Plan</td>
<td>Number: 13042007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Heritage study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number: B150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Within a National Trust conservation area**

**Related Items:**
- Berry Bolong Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2390151
- Other Schools Designed by William Kemp:
  - Numbug Primary SHI 2390298
  - Bomaderry Primary (Brimley St.) SHI 230801
  - Berry Primary SHI 2390073
  - Greewell Point Primary SHI 2390293
  - Marco Meadow Primary SHI 2390222
  - Terasa Primary SHI 2390848
  - Cambewarra Primary School SHI 2390179
  - Nowra Primary School SHI 2390758

**Listing Comments:** AC All

**Custom Field Three:**

**Custom Field Four:**

**Custom Field Five:**

**Custom Field Six:**

**Data Entry:** Date First Entered: 16/06/1999  Date Updated: 14/06/2012  Status: Partial

---
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Item Name: Fmr Jaspers Brush School & Schoolgrounds
Location: 4 O'Keefes Lane, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]

Image:

Caption: Fmr Jaspers Brush School & Schoolgrounds
Copyright:
Image by:
Image Date:
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Item Name: Fmr Jaspers Brush School & Schoolgrounds
Location: 4 O’Keefes Lane, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name:</th>
<th>Fmr Jaspers Brush School &amp; Schoolgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>4 O'Keefes Lane, Jaspers Brush [Shoalhaven]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caption:** Fmr Jaspers Brush School & Schoolgrounds

**Copyright:**
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**Image Date:**

**Image Number:**

**Image Path:**
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**Item Name:** "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse  
**Location:** C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

**Address:** C265 Princes Highway  
**Suburb / Nearest Town:** Meroo Meadow 2540

**Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven  
**State:** NSW  
**Historic region:** Illawarra  
**Parish:** BUNBERRA

**County:** CAMDEN

**Other/Former Names:** Exeter

**Area/Group/Complex:**  
**Aboriginal Area:**

**Curtilage/Boundary:** Further investigation required re original farm boundaries

**Item Type:** Built  
**Group:** Residential buildings  
**Category:** House

**Owner:** Private - Individual

**Admin Codes:** B165P  
**Code 2:** 48684  
**Code 3:** Y

**Current Use:** Residence

**Former Uses:** Dairy Farm

**Assessed Significance:** Local  
**Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:** Distinctive Federation/Edwardian style homestead with Arts & Crafts features such as shingled gable and gambrel roof, unusual in the area. Building emphasised by elevated position and highly visible from highway. Local Significance (Shoalhaven).

**Historical Notes or Provenance:** This farm known as Lot 42 was purchased from the Berry Estate by William Chisholm on 21 March, 1896. William Chisholm lived in the Berry district all his life and for the 14 years before his death worked at the Berry Experimental Farm. He was a son of Sergeant Chisholm and born in Kiana. William Chisholm died as a result of an accident in 1930 aged 63 years. Mr Arthur John Home of Cambowarra Road Bomaderry, owned the cottage, dairy, pig and cattle etc in the 1950s. In 1968 the property was transferred to Ernest A & Daphne Home. Possibly built by George Muller, builder of the adjacent "Fomonata".

**Themes:**

1. National Theme  
2. State Theme  
3. Local Theme  
4. Economy  
5. Pastoralism  
6. Accommodation (Housing)

**Designer:**

**Maker / Builder:**

**Year Started:**

**Year Completed:**

**Circa:** No

---

This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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Princes Highway upgrade – Berry to Bomaderry upgrade  
Roads and Maritime Services  
Technical paper: Non-Aboriginal (historic) heritage
Item Name: "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Physical Description: A typical dairying homestead complex with barns, sheds and ells; characteristically sited on higher ground. The complex remains in a working environment adjacent to Tullian Creek. Weatherboard and iron roofed homestead with distinctive gambrel roof and shingled gable to north with attic. Verandahs 2 sides. Gable roofed wing to the north features Federation style conservatory windows. Hipped roof wing to the south has unusual projecting bay window. Single concrete silo, with rusted rib structure. Out buildings in poor condition.

Physical Condition:

Modification Dates: Renovated extensively in c. 2008
Recommended Management: Building intact and original condition but lacking in recent maintenance. Paint work in poor condition. Needs a good colour scheme.
Management: Statutory instrument List on a Local Environmental Plan (LEP)
Recommended Management Prepare or Include in a Conservation Policy

Further Comments:

Criteria a)
Criteria b)
Criteria c)
Criteria d)
Criteria e)
Criteria f): This item is assessed as aesthetically rare locally.
Criteria g): This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally.

Integrity / Intactness:

References:
Author: Gladys Horgan (nee Warden) 10 Mulgan Crescent Somsery
Title: Interview with Robyn Florence
Year: 1998

J. J. Robson
Berrys Historical Society

Studies:
Author: Peter Freeman Pty Ltd
Title: Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1956-1958
Number: B165P
Year: 1958

Parcels:
Parcel Code: LOT 4
Lot Number: 4
Section: DP
Plan Code: 241/85
Plan Number: 241/85

Date: 04/07/2013

This report was produced using the Heritage Database. Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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Item Name: "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Latitude: Longitude:
Location validity: Spatial Accuracy:
Map Name: Barry 9028-3-N Map Scale: 1:25,000
AMG Zone: Barry 9028-3-N
Easting: Nothing:
Listings: Name: Title: Number: Date:
Heritage study Shoalhaven Heritage Stk B165P
Within a National Trust conservation area

Related Items: Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2390151
Inter War Concrete Stk SHI 2390229 (located on this property)

Listing Comments:
Custom Field Three:
Custom Field Four:
Custom Field Five:
Custom Field Six:

Data Entry: Date First Entered: 15/05/1999 Date Updated: 07/10/2012 Status: Partial
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Item Name: "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]
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Item Name: "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse c1950
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Item Name: "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]
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Item Name: "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse - view to Coolangatta Mountain c1950
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Item Name: "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse - agricultural view c.1950
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**Item Name:** "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse  
**Location:** C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

![Image of the "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse](image_file)

**Caption:** Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse - agricultural view c1950

**Copyright:**

**Image by:**

**Image Date:**

**Image Number:**

**Image Path:**

**Image File:** 2390227h.jpg

**Thumb Nail Path:**

**Thumb Nail File:**
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Princes Highway upgrade – Berry to Bomaderry upgrade  
Roads and Maritime Services  
Technical paper: Non-Aboriginal (historic) heritage
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
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Item Name: "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse - agricultural view c1950
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### Inter War Concrete Silo

**Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Heritage Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHI Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Name:** Inter War Concrete Silo  
**Location:** C265 Princes Highway, Merewitt [Shoalhaven]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>DUAP Region</th>
<th>Historic region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C265 Princes Highway</td>
<td>Illawarra &amp; Macarthur</td>
<td>Illawarra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb / Nearest Town</th>
<th>Local Govt Area</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merewitt 2540</td>
<td>Shoalhaven</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>BUNBERRA</td>
<td>CAMDEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other/Former Names:</th>
<th>Area/Group/Complex:</th>
<th>Group ID:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aboriginal Area:</th>
<th>Curtilage/Boundary:</th>
<th>Item Type:</th>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>Category:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 249085</td>
<td>Built</td>
<td>Farming and Grazing</td>
<td>Silo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner:</th>
<th>Admin Codes:</th>
<th>Current Use:</th>
<th>Former Use:</th>
<th>Assessed Significance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private - Individual</td>
<td>B167P</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Farm Silage</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Endorsed Significance:**

- **Statement of Significance:** Good representative example of silo building now redundant but contributing significantly to the aesthetics of the pastoral landscape. The silo illustrates the introduction of new technology and the development of a dairy farming in the area. Local significance (Shoalhaven).

- **Historical Notes or Provenance:**
  - Fodder conservation in the Shoalhaven district began in the early 1890s and had been recognised by the farmers as important for successful dairying and for the prevention of bush & grass fires.
  - The first silo to be erected in the district was on Pritchard’s farm on Jindyandy Lane. The silo was imported from overseas and erected in 1911.

  - One of the earliest silos at Milton was made by J Duncan from a converted two-storey brick diary on his farm at Narraweelo in 1921.

  - Thomas Binks’ ensilage experiments succeeded at Cambewarra and in 1923 he gave open days to outline the system and give a lead to the district.

  - The establishment of the superphosphate industry at Port Kembla in 1921 assisted pasture and crop growth by its distribution and use.

  - One of the first was that of Vaughan Bros, which was erected on Vaughans Farm at the end of Hangars Lane, Bomaderry followed by J W Henry of Belong.
Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory
State Heritage Register

Item Name: Inter War Concrete Silo
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

The first fodder conservation competition was conducted in the district in 1931, being won by Alfred Mottram of Numba with H O Cox winning in Kangaroo Valley in the following years. This type of silo was built by either Alf Tefley, who lived at Bolong, or ‘Podgy’ Elliott, son of the local builder, Seward Elliott, of Nowra.

Themes: National Theme: 3. Economy
State Theme: Pastoralism
Local Theme: (none)

Designer: 
Maker / Builder: 
Year Started: 1935
Year Completed: 1935
Circa: Yes


Physical Condition: 
Modification Dates: 
Recommended Management:
Management: Recommended Management
Prepares or includes in a Conservation Policy
Recommended Management
Document and prepare an archival record

Further Comments:
Criteria a)
Criteria b)
Criteria c)
Criteria d)
Criteria e)
Criteria f)
Criteria g) This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally.

Integrity / Intactness:

References:
Author: A William Bayley
Title: Shoalhaven
Year: 

Princes Highway upgrade – Berry to Bomaderry upgrade
Roads and Maritime Services
Technical paper: Non-Aboriginal (historic) heritage
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Item Name: Inter War Concrete Silo
Location: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Studics: Author
Pitar Pleasman Pty Ltd
Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1965-1968

Number: B167P
Year: 1968

Parcels:
Parcel Code | Lot Number | Section | Plan Code | Plan Number
LOT 4 | | | DP | 249265

Latitude: Longitude:

Location validity: Spatial Accuracy:
Map Name: Barry 9028-3-N
Map Scale: 1:25,000
AMG Zone: Barry 9028-3-N

Easting: Northing:

Listings:
Name: Heritage study
Title: Shoalhaven Heritage Site B167P
Within a National Trust conservation area

Related Items:
Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2390151
"Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse SHI 2390227 (located on this property)

Listing Comments:
Custom Field Three:
Custom Field Four:
Custom Field Five:
Custom Field Six:

Data Entry:
Date First Entered: 15/06/1999
Date Updated: 05/10/2012
Status: Partial
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Copyright: Image by:
Image Date:
Image Number: Roll: 30 Negative Number: 20
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**Item Name:** Inter War Concrete Silo

**Location:** C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

**Caption:** Inter War Concrete Silo

**Copyright:**

**Image by:**

**Image Date:**

**Image Number:**

**Image Path:**

**Image File:** 2390229b.jpg

**Thumb Nail Path:**

**Thumb Nail File:** t_2390229.jpg
### Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory

**Item Name:** "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex

**Address:** C360 Princes Highway

**DUAP Region:** Illawarra & Macarthur

**Suburb / Nearest Town:** Meroo Meadow 2540

**Historic Region:** Illawarra

**Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven

**Parish:** BUNBERRA

**State:** NSW

**County:** CAMDEN

**Other/Former Names:** "Pomona"

**Area/Group/Complex:**

**Group ID:**

**Aboriginal Area:**

**Curtailage/Boundary:** Lot 2 DP 620160; Lot 4 DP 739850; Lot 51 DP 3061

**Item Type:** Built

**Group:** Farming and Grazing

**Category:** Farm

**Owner:** Private - Individual

**Admin Codes:**

- B162
- Code 2: 44006
- Code 3: Y

**Current Use:** Working dairy farm

**Former Uses:** Working dairy farm

**Assessed Significance:** Local

**Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:** Pomona is a good example of a late nineteenth century rural farmhouse with Federation Queen Anne style influences constructed after subdivision of the Berry Estates in 1893. The complex is an important component of the pastoral landscape. Associated with the Müller family as designers and builders. Local significance (Shoalhaven).

**Historical Notes or Provenance:** Associated with subdivision of the Berry Estate in 1893 when John Joseph Hubert Müller bought Lots 50 and 51. Built in 1893 by George Müller brother of the owner. Still owned by Müller family descendants.

**Themes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Theme</th>
<th>State Theme</th>
<th>Local Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Settlement Accommodation (Housing)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Settlement Land tenure</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Designer:**

**Maker / Builder:** George Müller

**Year Started:** 1893

**Year Completed:** 1893

**Circa:** No

**Physical Description:** Fine Federation period weatherboard farmhouse and residence with Queen Anne

---

This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
Location: C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Influences. Complex bellcast iron roof. High pitched attic. Standard diagonal plan type with two gabled projecting bays. Verandah on two sides between bays with skillion extension on one side. Excellent timber decoration to verandah. Tall brick chimneys set on a diagonal. Hooded bay below front gabled projection. Decorative timberwork to gables. The site also includes a range of buildings characteristic of dairy farms in the Berry-Botong Pastoral Landscapes.

The architectural expression is reminiscent of the work of Howard Joesten in the 1890s, suggesting that the building was probably built later than 1893. Further research required to establish level of significance.

Physical Condition:

Modification Dates: Side verandah and dormer in roof.

Recommended Management:

Management: Recommended Management
Prevent or Include in a Conservation Policy
Recommended Management
Carry out an Archaeological Assessment

Further Comments: Historical Period: 1875-1900
Criteria a)
Criteria b)
Criteria c)
Criteria d)
Criteria e)
Criteria f) This item is assessed as aesthetically rare locally.
Criteria g) This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally.

Integrity / Intactness: In good condition

References:

Author
Title
Year
Abert Muller
11/12/1955
Berry Historical Society
Cl. Camile Mclnnes (Muller)
Muller family diaries
Perumal Murphy Wu
Illawarra Regional Heritage Study Review (September 1993)

Studies:

Author
Title
Year
Number
Peter Freeman Pty Ltd
Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1956-1958
B162
1958
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**Item Name:** "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex

**Location:** C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

**Perusal Murphy Wu**

**Narrawa Regional Heritage Study/Review**

**1993**

**Parcels:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Code</th>
<th>Lot Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Plan Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIP</td>
<td>630160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Latitude:**

**Longitude:**

**Location validity:**

**Spatial Accuracy:**

**Map Name:** Barry 9028-3-N

**Map Scale:** 1:25,000

**AMG Zone:** Barry 9028-3-N

**Easting:**

**Northing:**

**Listings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Environmental Plan</td>
<td>Shoalhaven heritage Stud</td>
<td>8162</td>
<td>13/04/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage study</td>
<td>Within a National Trust conservation area</td>
<td>Royal Australian Institute of Architects register</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Items:**

- Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2390151
- "Exeter" Federation Weatherboard Farmhouse SHI 2390227

**Listing Comments:**

**Custom Field Three:**

**Custom Field Four:**

**Custom Field Five:**

**Custom Field Six:**

**Data Entry:**

- Date First Entered: 15/06/1999
- Date Updated: 02/03/2012
- Status: Partial
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**Technical paper: Non-Aboriginal (historic) heritage**
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex

Location: C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
Location: C360 Princes Highway, Merroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex - Grant 2011 - before roof restoration
Copyright:
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
Location: C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex - Grant 2011 - after roof restoration and painting
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
Location: C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex - Grant 2011 - before roof restoration and painting
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
Location: C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex - Grant 2011 - after roof restoration and painting
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
Location: C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex - Grant 2012/13 - Bay window to be restored
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
Location: C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex - Grant 2012/13 - bay window before rotting timber replaced
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Item Name: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
Location: C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

Caption: "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex - Grant 2012/13 - Bay window after restoration and painting
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**Item Name:** "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex
**Location:** C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

**Caption:** "Pomona" Dairy Farm Complex - Grant 2012/13 - Bay window after restoration and painting
**Copyright:**
**Image by:** Patrick Muller
**Image Date:**
**Image Number:**
**Image Path:**
**Image File:** 2390224.jpg
**Thumb Nail Path:**
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### Former Meroo Meadow Public School (G2B H4)

**Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory**

**Item Name:** Meroo Meadow Brick School & Residence  
**Location:** C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

**Address:** C385 Princes Highway  
**Suburb/Nearest Town:** Meroo Meadow 2540  
**State:** NSW  
**DUAP Region:** Illawarra & Macarthur  
**Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven  
**Historic Region:** Illawarra  
**Parish:** BUNBERRA  
**County:** CAMDEN

**Other/Former Names:** Former Meroo Meadow School & School Master's Residence

**Area/Group/Complex:**  
**Group ID:**

**Aboriginal Area:**

**Curtilage/Boundary:** Lot 1 DP 718566

**Item Type:** Built  
**Group:** Education  
**Category:** School - State (public)

**Owner:** Private - Individual  
**Admin Codes:** B160  
**Code 2:** 57486  
**Code 3:** Y

**Current Use:** Private residence  
**Former Use:** School and schoolmaster's house

**Assessed Significance:** Local  
**Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:** Federation period school and residence in the Victorian Georgian idiom. Typical of those in many rural localities. Good example of the work of noted school architect, William Edmund Kemp. Both buildings are little altered. Social and historical interest for the area. Local significance (Shoalhaven).

**Historical Notes/Provenance:** Meroo Meadow was originally known as “Little Meadow” and was part of David Berry's Coolangatta Estate. The first school was established for tenant farmers and was opened in 1877. A new building was constructed by the Government in 1899. The building and residence were designed by William Edmund Kemp in the Government Architect's Office. The school closed in 1971.

**Themes:** National Theme  
**State Theme:** Education  
**Local Theme:** (none)

**Designer:** Government Architect W E Kemp

**Maker/Builder:**

**Year Started:** 1899  
**Year Completed:** 1899  
**Circa:** No

---
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**Item Name:** Meroo Meadow Brick School & Residence  
**Location:** C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

**Physical Description:**  
Schoolhouse  

Residence  

**Physical Condition:**

**Modification Dates:**  
Schoolhouse  

Residence  
Partial verandah enclosure and some loss of verandah detail. Needs some repairs and maintenance.

**Recommended Management:**  
Work undertaken by owner, new triple garage added building with attic loft, and dormer window located between heritage school building and residence, both of which are undergoing restoration. The garage is face brick, extruded "sandstocks". The owner has commenced slippping paint from brick walls to either two buildings with varying degrees of success depending on adhesion of old paint surface. Interior of residence has evidence of damp penetration through walls, to the extent that some areas have been lined with hardboard.

**Management:**  
Recommended Management  
Prepare or Include in a Conservation Policy

**Further Comments:**  
Historical Period: 1875-1900

**Criteria a)**  
**Criteria b)**  
**Criteria c)**  
**Criteria d)**  
**Criteria e)**  
**Criteria f)**  
**Criteria g)** This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally. This item is assessed as socially representative locally.

**Integrity / Intactness:**
**Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory**
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**Item Name:** Meroo Meadow Brick School & Residence  
**Location:** C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

### References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A C All</td>
<td>Bawana Region Historic Buildings and Sites</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perumal Murphy Wu</td>
<td>Bawana Regional Heritage Study (September 1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Freeman Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1995-1998</td>
<td>B100</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perumal Murphy Wu</td>
<td>Bawana Regional Heritage Study Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environment and Planning</td>
<td>Background to Bawana Regional Environmental Plan No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Cronan All</td>
<td>Bawana Region Historic Buildings and Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Code</th>
<th>Lot Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Plan Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>716569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Latitude:**  
**Longitude:**  
**Location validity:**  
**Spatial Accuracy:**  
**Map Scale:** 1:25,000

**AMG Zone:** Bawana 9028-3-N  
**Eastings:**  
**Northings:**

**Listings:**  
Local Environmental Plan  
Heritage study Shoalhaven Heritage St B160  
Within a National Trust conservation area

**Related Items:**  
Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscapes SHI 2390151  
Meroo Meadow Union Church SHI 2390223  
Other Schools Designed by William Kemp:  
Jaspers Brush SHI 2390214  
Kangaroo Valley Primary SHI 2390476  
Numbas Primary SHI 2390298  
Bomaderry Primary (Brimilay St) SHI 2390801  
Berry Primary SHI 2390673  
Greenwell Point Primary SHI 2390293  
Taratara Primary SHI 2390648  
Cambewarra Primary School SHI 2390179  
Nowra Primary School SHI 2390758

Other Schoolmasters Residences designed by W E Kemp:  
Cambewarra Primary School SHI 2390180  
Kangaroo Valley Schoolmasters residence SHI 2390475

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name:</th>
<th>Meroo Meadow Brick School &amp; Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fmr Newra Schoolmaster's Brick rendered Residence SH 2390767

Wahra Schoolmaster's Residence (former) SH 2390767

Terara Primary School & attached Residence (adapted by Kemp) SH 2390848

**Listing Comments:** Supplement to REP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Three:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Four:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Five:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom Field Six:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Entry:</th>
<th>Date First Entered: 16/06/1999</th>
<th>Date Updated: 04/05/2012</th>
<th>Status: Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Item Name: Meroo Meadow Brick School & Residence
Location: C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]
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**Item Name:** Meroo Meadow Brick School & Residence

**Location:** C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]

**Image:**
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**Caption:** Meroo Meadow Brick School & Residences
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Item Name: Meroo Meadow Brick School & Residence
Location: C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]
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Meroo Union Church (G2B H3)

| Item Name: Meroo Meadow Free Revival Brick Union Church |
| Location: 8 Boxsells Lane, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven] |

- **Address:** 8 Boxsells Lane
- **Suburb/Nearest Town:** Meroo Meadow 2540
- **Local Govt Area:** Shoalhaven
- **State:** NSW
- **DUAP Region:** Illawarra & Macarthur
- **Historic Region:** Illawarra
- **Parish:** BUNBERRA
- **County:** CAMDEN
- **Other/Former Names:** Meroo Meadow Union Church
- **Area/Group/Complex:** Meroo Meadow Union Church
- **Group ID:**
- **Aboriginal Area:**
- **Curtilage/Boundary:** Lot 4 DP 249776
- **Item Type:** Built
- **Group:** Religion
- **Category:** Church
- **Owner:** Religious Organisation
- **Admin Codes:** B161
  - **Code 2:** 44672
  - **Code 3:** Y
- **Current Use:** Church
- **Former Use:** Church
- **Assessed Significance:** Local
- **Endorsed Significance:**

**Statement of Significance:**
Nestled constructed late nineteenth century church. Handsomely set off by bell tower and spire in the Victorian Free Gothic style. Social and historical interest for the gift of land made by David Berry of the Coolangatta Estate. Local Significance (Shoalhaven).

**Historical Notes or Provenance:**
The Meroo Meadow and Greenwell Point Union Churches were gifts to the people of the Coolangatta Estate from David Berry. The foundation stone for the Meroo Meadow Church was laid by Mrs John Hay, wife of David Berry's cousin and Coolangatta's Manager. David Berry died before the church was completed. Both churches were designed and erected by W A Iley and Sons, who designed many fire churches on the Berry Estate.

**Themes:**
- National Theme
- State Theme
- Local Theme
- 8. Culture
- Religion
- (none)
- 9. Phases of Life
- Persons
- (none)

**Designer:** W A Iley & Sons

**Maker/Builder:** W A Iley & Sons

**Year Started:** 1890

**Year Completed:** 1890

**Circa:** No

---

This report was produced using the Heritage Database Software provided by the Heritage Branch, NSW Department of Planning.
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Item Name: Meroo Meadow Free Revival Brick Union Church
Location: 8 Boxells Lane, Meroo Meadow [Shoalhaven]


Physical Condition:

Modification Dates: Virtually intact. Original roof replaced with corrugated iron.
Recommended Management: Priority external work. Stabilise footings following improvised drainage works.
Management: Recommended Management
Conservation Management Plan (CMP)

Further Comments: Historical Period: 1876-1900
Criteria a) Important for its connection with Berry estate. Excellent surviving example of the Union Church movement.
Criteria b) Excellent example of the work of William Ismay & Sons and of the country gothic style Church.
Criteria d) Continued community esteem from its date of construction in 1890's.
Criteria e) Important for its potential to provide further information on the Union Church movement.
Criteria f) This item is assessed as aesthetically rare locally. This item is assessed as historically rare state.
Criteria g) This item is assessed as aesthetically representative locally. This item is assessed as historically representative locally. This item is assessed as socially representative locally.

Integrity / Intactness:
High degree of integrity & intactness.

References:
Author: A C All
Title: Illawarra Region Historic Buildings and Sites
Year: 1981

Author: Perumal Murphy Wu
Title: Illawarra Regional Heritage Study Review (September 1993)
Year: 1993

Studies:
Author: Peter Freeman Pty Ltd
Title: Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study 1995-1998
Number: B161
Year: 1996

Author: Perumal Murphy Wu
Title: Illawarra Regional Heritage Study Review
Year: 1993

Department of Environment and Planning
Background to Illawarra Regional Environmental Plan No. 1
Year: 1996

Author: Ann Croxton All
Title: Illawarra Region Historic Buildings and Sites
Year: 1981
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Appendix C

Detailed descriptions of heritage items
Appendix C – Detailed description of heritage items

**Heritage Item:** G2B H1

**Name/Description:** 'Mount View'

**Item/Site Type:** Early twentieth century farmhouse

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 280209.6142841

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 2 DP882059

**Street address:** C111 Princes Highway Bomaderry

---

**Context/Setting:** This building is situated close to, and on the west side of the Princes Highway, adjacent to the northern urban edge of Bomaderry. It is located on low gradient north facing slopes which drain to Abernethys Creek, an east-west running creekline 600 metres to the north.

**Description/Fabric:** The farmhouse is a symmetrical weatherboard building, probably dating to the early twentieth century. The building faces east (the highway) and originally comprised of four main rooms arranged around a central (east-west) axis corridor and an attached kitchen block on the southwestern corner (Figure C-1 and Figure C-2). Open verandas originally enclosed all four sides of the building with the exception of the kitchen block (Figure C-3). At some time, the original back (west facing) veranda has been enclosed, and a new veranda extension added. This too has subsequently been enclosed. A laundry (the southwest corner of the original veranda) and a pantry are attached to the southern side of the kitchen. There are two red brick chimneys, one for the kitchen hearth and one for paired fireplaces in the two main rooms on the southern side of the house. The kitchen hearth now includes a 1950s Metters ‘Canberra’ wood stove and oven (Figure C-4).

The roof has a medium pitched hipped roof and is corrugated iron. The original windows are of 2 x 2 sash type. The building is supported by sandstone piles and chimney footings. At the time of survey, two circular rainwater tanks had recently been removed from the southwestern corner of the farmhouse, leaving a grid of sandstone piles which formerly supported a wooden platform.

At the time of survey (April 2012) one skillion roofed timber frame and corrugated iron outbuilding remained, behind the house in relatively poor condition. The building retained a remnant sandstone flagstone floor at its north eastern end, indicating a former dairy function. Some remnant (probably reused) vertical wooden slabs remained along the northwestern exterior walls. A large turpentine tree is a feature of the back yard. Former outbuildings include a dairy and hayshed

A mid twentieth century brick dairy building is situated 60 metres upslope from the farmhouse.

This building complex is absent on the 1893 Sales Poster for this portion of the Berry Estate (refer Figure 4-9), but present and identified as ‘Mount View’ on the 1931 Nowra 1:63360 topographic map.

**Dimensions:** The farmhouse has approximate dimensions of 15 x 13.5 metres, inclusive of verandas.
**Physical Condition:** The main farmhouse remains in excellent condition and has been recently painted and restored. The remaining outbuildings at the time of survey were in a poor condition with the exception of the brick dairy building.

**Integrity:** The front farmhouse exterior retains an original character, with open verandas and bracket decoration. The original internal arrangement of rooms and corridors remains either intact or easily traceable. Many internal original farmhouse features remain including the kitchen hearth, pressed metal ceilings, fireplaces, door and window mouldings and latches, and front door window surrounds (**Figure C-5** and **Figure C-6**). The floorboards have been replaced. The back verandas have been enclosed and one corridor wall may have been removed. Most, if not all of the original wooden frame outbuildings are no longer extant. Further demolition of outbuilding remnants may have occurred subsequent to this survey. A large gravelled hard stand area has been constructed behind and to the south of the farmhouse. A large modern outbuilding has recently been constructed here.

**Associated Features:** This item has value as a contributing component of the cultural landscape (SICHP CL).

**Current Use:** Small farm/landholding and residence

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Based on its architectural style, and early mapping evidence, this farmhouse dates from the first or second decade of the twentieth century (**Figure C-7** and **Figure C-8**). It is representative of an early post Berry Estate farm, which was probably originally setup as a dairy farm and continued as such into the latter decades of the same century.

Until its recent sale in 2011, this property had been in the ownership of the same family for over 50 years. The current owners purchased the property from the granddaughter of the former residents who operated the property as a dairy farm. Her father owned a caryard in Nowra. It is remembered that the farm produced three cans of milk per day. The north eastern front room is remembered as the grandmother’s room and has a specially installed wall air vent. She lived in the farmhouse till she was 92 years of age.

The name W.H. Watts appeared on a dairy building on the property but it is not confirmed if this was the name of the previous dairy farmer owners.
Heritage Item: **G2B H1 ‘Mount View’**

**Figure C-1** General view of the farmhouse, looking north-west

**Figure C-2** General view of the back of the farmhouse and surviving outbuilding (April 2012), looking north-east

**Figure C-3** Detail of veranda brackets, roof line and kitchen chimney, looking north-west
Heritage Item: G2B H1 ‘Mount View’

Figure C-4 Detail of kitchen hearth, note Metters ‘Canberra’ wood stove, looking south-west

Figure C-5 Detail of central corridor and front door, looking east

Figure C-6 Detail of door lock and latch
Heritage Item:  **G2B H1  ‘Mount View’**

**Figure C-7** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing outbuildings at that time (NSW 694-5076 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14, 9/7/58)

**Figure C-8** 2013 Contemporary aerial photograph of ‘Mount View’, note that one brick dairy building at far right remains (Google Earth Pro 2013)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Heritage Item:</strong></th>
<th>G2B H2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name/Description:</strong></td>
<td>Abernethys Creek Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item/Site Type:</strong></td>
<td>1929 reinforced concrete bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GDA Map Reference:</strong></th>
<th>280456.6143411</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadastral Location:</strong></td>
<td>Highway reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address:</strong></td>
<td>Princes Highway, Bomaderry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context/Setting:**
The bridge has been constructed over Abernethys Creek, just north of the current urban extent of Bomaderry and 3.8 kilometres north of the Shoalhaven River (Figure C-9). The bridge spans an artificially cut channel which foreshortens a creek meander. The valley floor at the crossing consists of low gradient alluvial flats, which merge, some 1.5 kilometres with the Broughton Creek flood plain. Locally elevated sandstone based slopes are situated 100 metres to the south of the crossing.

**Description/Fabric:**
The bridge was constructed in 1929 and subsequently widened in 1974 (Figure C-10). The bridge is a three span structure, with spans of 2.28 metres, 10.66 metres and 2.28 metres (Figure C-11). The main span consists of three reinforced concrete beams, haunched onto the pier headstocks (Figure C-12). The approach spans are cantilever slabs with enclosing wingwalls. The piers consist of four octagonal columns each with a headstock. The bridge has been widened using similar design concepts, but with square columns. The bridge, which still carries two traffic lanes, has wide shoulders with guardrail supported by a steel post system with a higher top rail. The spill-through road approaches are concrete faced, extending inwards beyond the piers (RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register, no. 4309517).

**Dimensions:**
approx. 18 metres long x 14 metres wide

**Physical Condition:**
In 2003 the bridge was reported to be in a good condition. The road surface evidenced slight settlement at the slab ends, but the bitumen surface remained intact.

A summary of inspections covering the period 1974-1988 indicate only minor work being carried out (RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register, no. 4309517).

**Integrity:**
The bridge has a considerable degree of integrity. The widening of the structure on the downstream side in 1974, utilised a similar and compatible design to the original construction. The original guardrails remain on both side of the bridge.

**Associated Features:**
None

**Current Use:**
Highway bridge

**Heritage Listings:**
RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register
NSW State Heritage Inventory

**Historical Background/Interpretation**
The bridge is located on the current Princes Highway alignment which appears to have replaced the former 1858 alignment since the construction of the Shoalhaven River bridge in 1881 (Figure C-13 and Figure C-14).
Under the *Main Roads Act*, the Princes Highway was proclaimed a State Highway in August 1928 and was subsequently targeted for improvement by surfacing, realignment, linemarking and bridge construction and improvement. (DMR 1976, pp. 138-56) By 1932 the Princes Highway between Sydney and the Shoalhaven River at Nowra had been improved and most sections surfaced in bituminous macadam. (DMR 1976, p. 160-1) It was in this context that the bridge over Abernethys Creek was constructed. This bridge was one of more than 1000 bridges built by the Department of Main Roads (DMR) between 1925 and 1940, a period in which their engineers were adapting existing standards of bridge design to meet the requirements of improved motor vehicle performance - they were generally wider than previously with an improved load capacity (RMS Section.170 Heritage and Conservation Register, no. 4309517).

The name Abernethys, or Abernathys Creek, is associated with the Abernethy family and may be named after a number of family members who were prominent local dairy farmers. William Abernethy had a Jersey cattle stud at nearby Meroo in 1925. William and Christopher Abernethy appear on local electoral rolls as farmers there earlier in the century. (Shoalhaven Historical Society, local electoral rolls) (RMS Section.170 Heritage and Conservation Register, no. 4309517).

The local community remembers that when the Abernethys Creek bridge was built in the late 1920s, the highway was closed for several years. Traffic was diverted along Meroo Road for that period. Druce and Williams were responsible for building the bridge, and Charlie Turner is one person remembered as working on the bridge (Morschel 1992).
Heritage Item: G2B H2 Abernethys Creek Bridge

Figure C-9 Abernethys Creek bridge, looking north

Figure C-10 Detail of DMR plate with construction and widening dates

Figure C-11 View of upstream side of Abernethys Creek bridge, looking south-east
Heritage Item: **G2B H2 Abernethys Creek bridge**

**Figure C-12 Underside of Abernethys Creek bridge**, showing the three original central span beams from the right.

**Figure C-13 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing Abernethys Creek bridge prior to its widening in 1974 (NSW 694-5074 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14 9/7/58)**

**Figure C-14 Contemporary aerial photograph of Abernethys Bridge (Google Earth Pro 2013)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Heritage Item:</strong></th>
<th>G2B H3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name/Description:</strong></td>
<td>Meroo Union Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item/Site Type:</strong></td>
<td>1890 Church and grounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **GDA Map Reference:** | 281236.6144874 |
| **Cadastral Location:** | Lot 4 249776 |
| **Street Address:** | 8 Boxsells Lane, Meroo Meadow |

**Context/Setting:**
The church is situated on a two acre block on northern side of the intersection of the Princes Highway and Boxsells Lane, Meroo Meadow (Figure C-15). These grounds are situated on a low spurline which forms the watershed between Tullian and Tandingulla Creeks.

**Description/Fabric:**
A Victorian Free Gothic Revival style church, designed by W.A. Isley & Sons and constructed in 1890 using red brick and sandstone (Figure C-16 and Figure C-17). The brickwork is laid in English bond. Sandstone foundations are visible at the base of the walls up to approx. 700 millimetres. Sandstone is used for finials and capping to gables. Windows and entrance doors are set within pointed gothic arch frames. A bell tower with buttresses to sides is situated on the southeastern corner of the building (Figure C-18). It includes a sandstone turret with copper spire (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390223).

The church grounds include mature boundary plantings of Pinus and seven Camphor laurels, six of which are arranged formally around the church (Figure C-19).

A separate, semi enclosed ancillary building was constructed nine metres to the north of the church in around 2005. One of seven original Camphor Laurels arranged around the northern, western and southern side of the church was felled for this construction.

A memorial gate and entrance is situated at the vehicle entrance to the church grounds off Boxsells Lane (Figure C-20). These gates and side fences were originally constructed in 1954 at the Meroo Meadow public hall. When this hall was demolished in 1974 the gates were re-positioned to their current location (Bayley 1975:187). The entrance consists of two hinged wrought iron gates containing a repeated gothic arch motif, and four red brick square columns, two either side of the gates, each pair spanned by a low brick wall and an upper wrought iron panel with repeated circle motifs. A plaque on the outer right hand column provides the following text:

```
THIS FENCE WAS ERECTED BY THE RESIDENTS OF MEROO MEADOW
TO THE MEMORY OF
PTE. M.T.MORSCHEL
AND
PTE. J. WARBY
WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES DURING 2ND WORLD WAR 1939 -1945
LEST – WE – FORGET
JUNE 1954
```
**Dimensions:** Church building approx.: 17 metres x 13 metres

**Physical Condition:** The church appears to be in good condition. In 1999 the Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory noted: ‘priority external work, stabilise footings following improvised drainage works’.

**Integrity:** Virtually intact. The original roof has been replaced with corrugated iron (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390223). One original tree planting has been felled for the placement of the new building.

**Associated Features:** Avenue of Pinus trees along west side of Princes Highway (G2B H78)

This item has considerable value as a contributing component of the cultural landscape (SIHCP CL).

**Current Use:** Union church

**Heritage Listings:** Schedule 7, Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 1985
Schedule 5, Draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 2013

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Union Churches sought to provide a shared place of protestant worship for Presbyterian, Methodist, Anglican and Salvation army church members. The Meroo church was constructed on land, and with funds donated by, the Berry Estate (Figure C-21). It was identical in design to another Union church built at the same time at Greenwell Point, also on donated lands and using Estate funds. Both churches were designed by W.A. [W.T] Isley and Sons, architects and builders of Berry, who designed many of the churches on the Berry Estate (Antill 1982:24, Morschel 1992). The churches were handed over to trustees appointed in 1890, however it was not until June 1913 that the Meroo Meadow deed of trust was executed (Antill 1982:24).

The foundation stone for the Meroo Meadow Church was laid by Mrs John Hay, wife of David Berry’s cousin and Coolangatta’s Manager, in 1889. David Berry died before the church was completed (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390223).

In 1905 it was reported that the Meroo community had decided to plant a number of ornamental trees on the church property. The trees were being obtained from the State Nursery, through the Berry Council (Northern Star 29 Jul 1805:6). It is probable that the six large mature camphor laurel trees still present around the church building date from this period. Some of the pine trees around the property boundary may also have been planted at this time (Figure C-22 and Figure C-23).
Heritage Item: **G2B H3 Meroo Union Church**

**Figure C-15** Meroo Union Church, looking north-west

**Figure C-16** Meroo Union Church, looking north-east

**Figure C-17** Meroo Union Church, looking south-west
Heritage Item: G2B H3 Meroo Union Church

Figure C-18 Detail of bell tower

Figure C-19 Camphor Laurel trees in church grounds

Figure C-20 Memorial gates at church ground vehicle entrance
Heritage Item: **G2B H**  
**Meroo Union Church**

**Figure C-21**  
Extract from the 1893 Meroo Farms Sale poster (refer Figure 4-10), showing recently completed church and grounds.

**Figure C-22**  
Extract from 1958 aerial photograph, showing church and grounds.

**Figure C-23**  
Contemporary aerial photograph of Meroo Union Church and grounds (Google Earth Pro 2013).
**Heritage Item:** G2B H4

**Name/Description:** Former Meroo Meadow public school and residence

**Item/Site Type:** Former public school house and schoolmasters residence, and potential archaeological deposits

**GDA Map**

- Schoolmaster’s residence: 281462.6145250
- Schoolhouse: 281438.6145209

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 1 DP 716569

**Street Address:** C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

**Context/Setting:** This site complex is situated on the west side of the highway, on the crest of a low gradient and minor north-south aligned spurline situated between two tributaries of Tandingulla Creek (Figure C-24).

**Description/Fabric:** Federation period school and residence in the Victorian Georgian idiom (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390222)

**Schoolhouse**

- Gabled iron roof continuing over deep timber veranda to one side. Constructed of brick. Carved timber posts with arched valances. Lattice to one end of veranda roof. Timber louvres to gable apex. Single brick chimney with pot. Two small windows at front below gable. Larger double hung window beside veranda. Victorian Georgian idiom (Figure C-25, Figure C-26, Figure C-27, Figure C-28 and Figure C-29).

**Schoolmaster’s residence**

- Standard symmetrical Georgian form cottage. Constructed of brick with low-pitched hipped iron roof. Two tall brick chimneys, each with two iron pots. Skillion roofed timber veranda to front. Detail similar to schoolhouse. Timber railing balustrade. Double hung windows with multi-paned upper sash (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390222). Old skillion addition to the southern (back) of building. Recent skillion addition to the southern (side) of building. New veranda constructed on northern (side) and western (back) of building (Figure C-30, Figure C-31, Figure C-32, Figure C-33 and Figure C-34).

**Toilet block**

- A former school toilet block, situated just south of the residence, and possibly dating from the 1950s has been incorporated into a modern building now located between the residence and schoolhouse. The block’s original flat roof has been replaced with a pitched roof. The block was originally located at the northern end of a shelter shed which was blow off its footings in a storm (Figure C-35).

**Fencing**

- The southern boundary fence incorporates many relict two rail fence posts and some remaining rails.
Potential archaeological deposits
A former wooden building, the original 1884 school house, was located between the existing schoolhouse and residence, and is indicated on an 1893 sales poster (Figure C-37). This building was extended in 1885 with a timber frame weatherboard structure. The construction of a modern garage complex and driveway in this location has probably removed or substantially disturbed any archaeological traces (Figure C-38). However there remains potential for school and residential dump material to be present as subsurface archaeological deposits on steep slopes and downslope paddock boundaries behind (west of) the buildings. The banks and steep slopes adjacent to the creek in the western portion of the old school reserve are also likely locations.

Former structures to the north and south of the school reserve, as shown on the 1893 sales poster, are likely to relate to the occupation of the adjacent lots and are separately recorded (refer G2B H88 and 90).

Dimensions: Schoolhouse: approx. 16 x 12 metres; Residence: (original building: approximately 10.5 x 15.5 metres), existing extended building: approx. 17 x 18 metres.

Physical Condition: At the time of survey (April 2012) the schoolhouse was being used as a storeroom. The building requires considerable maintenance work including repair to roofing, guttering, facia boards, eaves, and windows, especially on the western side of the building. Despite this, the building appears water tight, secure, and in relatively good condition.

The residence is progressively being renovated with many deteriorated elements have been or are in the process of being replaced, notably the front (original) veranda which was in a deteriorated condition at the time of survey.

Integrity: The schoolhouse remains the same since the school’s closure in 1971. Some developmental changes in the school are evident, including an internal partition wall with sliding doors, and the infilling of the western half of the veranda. The veranda itself may have been original, or an early addition. The building retains many original features and architectural details, many of which relate to its original construction in the late nineteenth century.

The residence has recently been extended along its southern side, with new verandas added to the northern and western sides. Renovations have included some minor changes to internal walls. Earlier changes include partial enclosure of the original front veranda at the southern end and some loss of veranda detail.

A modern three car garage building has been constructed next to the former toilet block and between the two remaining late nineteenth century buildings.

Associated Features: Potential archaeological deposits situated to the north (G2B H90) and south (G2B H88) of the former school reserve. Although these relate to the former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ homestead, these structures were for a time contemporaneous with the original schoolhouse at this location.

This item has considerable value as a contributing component of the cultural landscape (SIHCP CL).

Current Use: private residence

Heritage Listings: Schedule 7, Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 1985
Schedule 5, Draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 2013
Historical Background/Interpretation

A detailed historical summary of the school is outlined in Table C-1.

The Meroo school was established in July 1867 (Havergal 1996:167, Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983:122), and has been situated in three separate locations, the current location being the last and permanent location (NSW Department of Education (DoE) 1967).

Local tradition records the first location was at Wileys Hill, and that the school was either destroyed by fire or by wind (Morshel 1992). This information and the location, is yet to be verified. Based on the documentary record, the first location was a pre-existing structure, used as a church by the Meroo community. Its location was described as being on J. Boxsell’s lease, one and a half miles (2.4 kilometres) from Bomaderry village, towards Broughton Creek (Berry), ‘on the side of the Cambewarra Range’ and ‘off the main road’. The building was ‘100 feet above the high water mark’ and 16 x 20 x 10 feet, built of strong slab with a shingle roof, a hard board floor and clay foundations’.

A possible location is a ‘chapel’ building on Pestells Lane, indicated on a plan in an 1865 Certificate of Title (R197A – 1603), at approximate location: MGA reference 280242.6144713, refer Figures C-40 and C-41. This was a Methodist Church constructed on land gifted by Henry Hodgkinson (portion 45, Parish of Bunberra) and opened in 1866 (Weekly Advocate and Wesleyan Record 4 April 1866).

This original location was non-vested – on freehold leased to the school council. The building continued to be used for religious services on Sundays. As such the location was never considered to be permanent and no permanent reserve was created.

Following increasing dilapidation of this building, and the need for greater space, a new ‘temporary’ one acre site was provided in 1880 by the Berry Estate, at ‘Little Meadow’ at the Turners Lane and Princes Highway intersection (G2B H91). The optimal location for the school was disputed by the Estate, the Department of Public Instruction and the local communities. As such, the Little Meadow remained a temporary site, provided by the Estate under lease. The site was formally surveyed in 1882 for proposed resumption but this was never carried out (Certificate of Title 944 – 1978). Pending a decision on a permanent location, a ‘tent school’ was established on the Little Meadow site and opened in 1882. The tent was erected over a wooden floor, on newly cleared ground, and firmly anchored to the ground. The school had an attendance of fifty and over. The tent school was illustrated in the Australian Town and Country Journal in 1882 (Figure 4-15). The school operated here, under canvas for 20 months, until the school moved to a permanent two acre location in April 1884 at Meroo Station, the current site (refer G2B H91 description).

The third and permanent site was identified in 1883. After the Department accepted Mr Berry’s offer of the site, Berry changed his mind about selling. The Department were forced to resume the land and paid David Berry £260 in compensation (NSW DoE 1967). Berry considered the site too dangerous due to possible flooding and probable straying of cattle from nearby Estate cattle yards. He noted, via his solicitors, that it was ‘in the middle of Meroo Station, close to the overseers house and stable, opposite his cattle yards, compelling him to remove and form a new station, erect new buildings and yards for the paltry compensation of £100’ (Letter to Minister of Public Instruction from Morton Smith Solicitors acting for David Berry 19 January 1885, presumed to be from State Archives school file, presented in NSW DoE 1967).

The permanent school reserve was surveyed in August 1883 (Certificate of Title 1132 – 1978) and gazetted in May 1884 (refer Figure C-295 [part of G2B H90 description]). An initial temporary timber schoolhouse, built in 1883, was extended in 1885. The specifications for the extension were ‘for a timber frame and weatherboard structure, on stone or wooden blocks, 18 x 16 feet with nine foot walls, connected to the main school’, and with a corrugated iron roof. Also defined were a stone fireplace and brick chimney, two double sash 12 x 10 pane windows and framed pine doors (document dated 22/1/1885, “Meroo Public School Proposed Class room:- Specifications of”, presumed from State Archives school file).

In June 1889 a ‘weathershed’ was constructed, early twentieth century photography show this shed positioned between the two future brick buildings that were to be built in 1898/9, aligned north-south (Figure C-36).
An 1892 Berry Estate sales poster shows a single school house building on the school reserve at this time. It is aligned approximately north-south and situated between the two future brick buildings (Figure C-36).

Following progressive deterioration of the timber building, the current surviving brick schoolhouse was constructed in 1898, and opened in 1899, and the current brick residence was built in 1899 (Bayley 1975:131). Both buildings were designed by William Edmund Kemp in the Government Architect’s Office, (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory B160). They cost £315/10/- The old wooden building was removed and new tanks erected. Old fences and gate were replaced by end of the year. A few shade trees were also planted (NSW DoE 1967).

By 1900 75 pupils were enrolled, with an average daily attendance of 48. Attendance may have been boosted due to the families of the staff of the nearby Meroo Meadow Dairy Co.

In 1911 strong winds, a characteristic of the site still experienced today, caused the roof to blow off the weather shed, and the whole structure to move off its piers. The piers remained in a damaged condition for the remaining life of the school and were noted when the current owners bought the property in 1987.

The Meroo Meadow public school was permanently closed in December 1971.

The name of the school has varied across its history (Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983:122). In each case, these changes closely corresponded to either changes in location or to local use of nomenclature. In its first location within the Meroo church building, it was known as ‘Meroo’. When operating as a ‘tent school’ at Little Meadow, it changed its name in 1882 to ‘Little Meadow’. Upon return to Meroo, to its current location, the ‘Meroo’ name was restored in May 1884. In October 1923 the name was finally changed to ‘Meroo Meadow’, reflecting change in local usage.

The current owners, who purchased the property in 1987, recounted that the building had been vacant since 1976.

Flag stones used in recent landscaping originated from Rutledge’s former dairy, Broughton Vale (pers. comm. 2012 Mr and Mrs North).

The South Coast Register of 24 June 1987 reported that Mr Justice Moffitt of New South Wales Supreme Court was reputed to have been a pupil at the school. This is most likely to be a misplaced reference to Herbert (‘Herb’) William Moffitt, who was born in the Shoalhaven district in 1877. Herbert was the second child of Mary Mitchell and Charles Moffitt who settled in the Cambewarra district after they married in 1875. They had a family of eight children. Charles was a grazier and Herbert worked for his father till he was 19. He went on to work as a ‘bush teacher’ at Jiggi on the Upper Richmond River, where his contact with Aborigines and bushman was a source of subject matter for his talent as a cartoonist. He was active as a cartoonist between 1918 and 1924 and regular contributed to the Sydney Bulletin and also to Smiths Weekly. Herbert was subsequently transferred to the city and became English Master at Sydney High School. He gained a law degree, and after nearly twenty years at the Bar he was appointed Acting Judge of the District Court in 1938, and in the following year a member of the Workers Compensation Commission Bench. He was appointed an honorary member of the Royal Art Society of N.S.W. He retired in 1948 and died in 1953 in North Sydney. He was survived by his wife, Sylvia E Muller, and four children. Herbert’s son, Athol Randolf Moffitt went on to become a Supreme Court judge for 22 years. Athol was born in Lismore in 1914 and educated at Artarmon Opportunity School and then North Sydney Boys High School (Sydney Morning Herald 26 Jan 1939, 22 July 1953, 9 Sep 1950; Recorder (S.A.) 22 Sep 1941; www.daao.org.au/bio/Herbert-w-moffitt).
Table C-1 Summary outline of the history of Meroo Meadow Public School

Except where otherwise referenced, this summary is based on a manuscript prepared by the NSW Department of Education (NSW DoE) in 1967 for the centenary of the school (NSW DoE 1967).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Event/Description</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1867 5 April</td>
<td>Date of first letter to the Secretary of the Council of Education requesting establishment of a public school at Meroo, promising 26 children, the subsequent application lists 41 potential pupils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>The location of the first school site was a building used as a church, on J. Boxsell’s lease, one and a half miles (2.4 kilometres) from Bomaderry village, towards Broughton Creek (Berry), ‘on the side of the Cambewarra Range’ and ‘off the main road’. The building was ‘100 feet above the high water mark’ and 16 x 20 x 10 feet, built of a strong slab with a shingle roof, a hard board floor and clay foundations’ (NSW DoE 1967). The building continued to be used for religious services on Sundays. A possible location for the school is a ‘chapel’ building shown on the west side of Pestells Lane, in an 1865 Certificate of Title (R197A – 1603), at approximate location: MGA reference 280242.6144713, refer Figure C-40. Uniting Church records indicate that this was the ‘Good Dog’ or ‘Forest Lodge’ Methodist church, situated on two roods 16 perches ‘being the S.E. corner of Henry Hodgkinson’s land’ (portion 45 Parish of Bunberra). This church was opened for public worship in 1866 and gifted by Hodgkinson to a Council of Trustees on 15 May 1869 (Weekly Advocate &amp; Wesleyan Record 4 April 1866; conveyance registered 7 June 1869. Numbered 28 in Book 114’ Shoalhaven Trustees Property Register referenced in letter from Uniting Church NSW Synod, Church Records &amp; Historical Society, to Mrs G. M. Guppy 21 May 1998, copy held in Berry Museum). The NSW DoE state that the school’s location meant that it was non-vested: the land belonged to the Berry Estate, was leased to Mr Boxsell, who in turn leased to the school council (NSW DoE 1967). This is in contradiction to the Church record which indicates that the land was formerly owned by Hodgkinson, and then vested in Trustees. This means that either the Departmental information is in error regarding the Boxsell lease, or the Forest Lodge Methodist church was not the original school, and there was another building used as a church, situated on Berry Estate lands, close by,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Event/Description</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867 June</td>
<td>Mr Thomas Dunlop, the first teacher at the school, arrived, after just completing his training course. He ordered the stock for the school, costing £10/14/11.</td>
<td>Mr Thomas Dunlop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1868</td>
<td>Mr Thomas resigned, apparently due to poor work and residence conditions. The school closes for nine months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Mr Dunlop returned as a class 3A teacher, after an inspector’s report recommends improvements. Mr Thomas married on 21 October 1869 and Mrs Thomas teaches needlework</td>
<td>Mrs Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 Oct</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Thomas and baby moved to Cambewarra Public School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1875</td>
<td>Miss Jane Anne Bryson was the teacher</td>
<td>Miss Jane Anne Bryson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870s</td>
<td>Attendances dropped to half of the 40 on the roll. In 1870 school made up of 21 children from tenant families and 16 from freehold families. The average attendance is 22 children per day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876 - 1879</td>
<td>Mr David Richardson was the teacher, coming from the Presbyterian School at Campbeltown</td>
<td>Mr David Richardson</td>
<td>Miss Maria Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878 - 1884</td>
<td>Many disputes occur over neighbouring schools and their proposed sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>A new church building was built ‘near the old one’ at Forest Lodge. The new building was weatherboard and cost £54. It was opened on 3 August 1879 (The Weekly Advocate 16 Aug., 1 Nov 1879 p.158 &amp; 245 resp.). The need to build a new church suggests that the condition of the old building, still being used as a school, was deteriorating. Following the erection of the Meroo Union Church in 1889, The 1879 building was re-located to Falls Creek in 1892 (The Methodist 9 Jan 1892 p.15).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Event/Description</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>David Berry sought to have schools at three mile intervals (4.8 kilometres) along the main road, but in compromise made available a one acre site at ‘Little Meadow’ on a 99 year lease. This site was about 1.25 miles (two kilometres) north of the current school buildings and was secured in 1880 (refer recording G2B H91). Due to the increasingly dilapidated nature of the existing Meroo school (church) building, and its small size, building at Little Meadow was imperative. Unlike the district and chief inspectors, the local assistant Inspector did not favour the Little Meadow site, and as a concession it was decided to not erect a permanent building, and instead house the school in a tent as an interim measure. The ‘tent school’ was erected at a cost of £51/14/- and officially known as ‘Meroo Public school, at Little Meadow’. The tent was erected over a wooden floor, on newly cleared ground, and firmly anchored to the ground (contractor was a Mr Wilson). The school was classified as class VI and had an attendance of fifty and over.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Maria Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882 Sept</td>
<td>‘Tent school’ opened (Sep 1882), Mr Brown was the appointed teacher, who resided at Broughton Creek (Berry) as the school site had no residence. Miss Saunders was transferred from Meroo to assist Mr Brown, and paid an annual salary of £114 to teach needlework. During its operation at this location, and from 1882 the school changed its name to ‘Little Meadow Public School’ (Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983:122).</td>
<td>Mr Brown</td>
<td>Miss Maria Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Mr Brown was replaced by Mr Tom Stafford (Jan 1883). The next two teachers were unmarried (which suited the lack of a formal school residence), and required the appointment of a sewing teacher. In support of increasing attendance Mr Stafford was assisted by a pupil teacher, Miss Margaret McBride. Residents of Forest Lodge again petition school conditions and demand temporary buildings at least at Meroo. In April 1883, notice was published in the Government Gazette that the Minister of Public Instruction had resolved to establish a school at Meroo and a contract had been let to erect temporary wooden buildings by July 1883. The chosen site for the new school was the current two acre school site (G2B H4), then on Berry Estate land. After the Department accepted Mr Berry’s offer of the site, Berry changed his mind about selling. He considered the site too dangerous due to possible flooding and probable straying of cattle from nearby cattle yards.</td>
<td>Mr Tom Stafford</td>
<td>Miss Margaret McBride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Event/Description</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>The new schoolhouse was occupied by the 'tent school' and the teacher Mr Crean, in April 1884. The school reserve was gazetted in May 1884. The name of the school was formally returned to the original: 'Meroo Public School' (Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983:122). Mrs Morschel, a local resident, taught sewing. Soon after the return to Meroo, Mr Crean was assisted by a pupil-teacher Mr Cornelius Cleary. During Mr Crean's teachership, the school was also used as an Evening School, comprising men aged between 19 and 31 and lasting for about a term.</td>
<td>Mr Thomas Crean</td>
<td>Mr Cornelius Cleary, Mrs Morschel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>A new classroom was added to the existing temporary building. The specifications were for a timber frame and weatherboard structure, on stone or wooden blocks, 18 x 16 feet with nine foot walls, connected to the main school', and with a corrugated iron roof. Also defined were a stone fireplace and brick chimney, two double sash 12 x 10 pane windows and framed pine doors (document dated 22/1/1885, “Meroo Public School Proposed Class room:- Specifications of”, presumed from State Archives school file).</td>
<td>(Mr Forsyth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Mr Cleary resigned. During an illness in February, Mr Crean was relieved by Mr Forsyth of Kangaroo Valley.</td>
<td>(Mr Forsyth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887 Aug</td>
<td>Mrs Morschel, was temporarily relieved by Miss Jane McCelland, also a local resident.</td>
<td>Miss Jane McCelland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890 Mar</td>
<td>Mr Crean married, but remains in rented premises until July 1891 when he moved to Bombo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884 - 1899</td>
<td>Numerous repairs were made to the wooden buildings, damage was often caused by high winds; 1888, floor boards raised and drawn together to stop drafts; June 1889, weather shed erected; 1894 new fences constructed near creek to prevent cattle entering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Event/Description</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no date provided)</td>
<td>Miss Annie Kennedy took over from Mr Crean. Her service was punctuated by absences due to ill health. She boarded in Meroo while her family were at Bomaderry. She sat for an examination to improve her teaching. She was very popular with parent and pupils. Average attendance was 25 pupils.</td>
<td>Miss Annie Kennedy (relieved variously by: Tom Thurgate, Mrs Howitt and Mabel Monaghan.)</td>
<td>(no recognised assistant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>An 1892 Berry Estate sales poster shows a single school house building on the school reserve at this time. It was aligned approximately north-south and situated between the two future brick buildings that were built in 1898/9 (Figure C-36).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>By the end of 1895 attendance was up to 40, out of an enrolment of 53.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896 Oct</td>
<td>Miss Kennedy exchanged positions with Mr Allan McLean of Cambewarra West. Under McLean, the school reached a high average proficiency and enrolment increased. He sat regularly for his promotion exams.</td>
<td>Mr Allan McLean At least one assistant teacher from 1905, two assistants for about five years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Enrolment up to 63. A report description of the school identified bad ventilation, lack of paint on bare slabs, bad light, and walls 'honey-combed' by white ants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>New brick school house, completed in 1898, and opened in January 1899 (Bayley 1975:131) at a cost of £315/10/-.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899 Jan 9</td>
<td>The new brick school house was officially opened. The old wooden building was removed and new tanks erected. Old fences and gate were replaced by end of the year. A few shade trees were planted. In 1899 a new brick residence was built, the first for the Meroo site. Apart from painting, no renovations were required till 1925. Both the school house and residence were designed by William Edmund Kemp in the Government Architect's Office, (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory B160).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Seventy five pupils were enrolled, with an average daily attendance of 48. Attendance may have been boosted due to the families of the staff of the nearby Meroo Meadow Dairy Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date(s)</td>
<td>Event/Description</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 Sep</td>
<td>Strong winds caused roof to blow off weather shed which also moves off its piers.</td>
<td>Mr Kinlock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no date provided)</td>
<td>Mr Kinlock become the teacher.</td>
<td>Mr Kinlock</td>
<td>Miss Natalie Bullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>The school had improved to grade IV by this time, when Mr Kinlock was granted the assistance of Miss Natalie Bullen. [Classification depended on average attendance and standard of work].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no date provided)</td>
<td>Mr Dobbie was the teacher. He was away several times due to ill health, which variously required a relief teacher to be sent from surrounding schools.</td>
<td>Mr Dobbie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915 - 1916</td>
<td>Mr Dobbie was replaced by Mr Larner, who was the teacher for only 12 months. His wife died whilst at Meroo, rumoured to be brought about by the dismal condition of the school residence.</td>
<td>Mr Larner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>School grade dropped back to class V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repairs were made to the school, residence and grounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWI</td>
<td>During the war, the school was used for recruitment meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916 -</td>
<td>Mr Larner was replaced by Mr Davis, who subsequently served as teacher for 14 years, with one year long service leave in the middle of his term.</td>
<td>Mr Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Repairs were made to the school, residence and grounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 Oct</td>
<td>The name of the school was formally changed to ‘Meroo Meadow Public School’ (Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983:122).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Major renovations to residence were carried out, after complaints by Mrs Davis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Mr Templeton replaced Mr Davis as teacher. During his teachership, the Parents and Citizens Association erect a wire fence and attractive school gates, plant a privet hedge and clean out drains.</td>
<td>Mr Templeton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Repairs to the school house, needed in 1930 but delayed due to lack of funds, were conducted at a cost of £333. The cost was justified by: the fact that there were 51 enrolled children under the age of 13; the likelihood that more young families would move into the district; and the parents’ threat to bring in share workers to increase population rather than see the school close.</td>
<td>Mr Cliff Debenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr Cliff Debenham was teacher between 1937 and 1960 (South Coast Register 24 Jun 1987).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Event/Description</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>The assembly area was gravelled and a new tank installed to catch water from the weather shed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Dec</td>
<td>The school was permanently closed (Havergal 1996:167, Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983:122). Mr Pat Redman was the last teacher when the school was closed (South Coast Register 24 June 1987)</td>
<td>Mr Pat Redman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987 20 June</td>
<td>The school property was purchased by current owners Mrs Glenda and Mr Ted North for $94,000.00. The property had been vacant since 1976 (pers. comm. 2012 Mr and Mrs North).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heritage Item:  **G2B H4  Former Meroo Meadow public school and residence**

**Figure C-24** General view of former Meroo Meadow public schoolhouse and residence, looking north-west (Jan 2007)

**Figure C-25** School house, looking north-west (Jan 2007)

**Figure C-26** School house looking south-west
Heritage Item: G2B H4 Former Meroo Meadow public school and residence

Figure C-27 School house looking southeast

Figure C-28 Interior view of school house ceiling

Figure C-29 Detail of door and wall blackboard in school house
Heritage Item: G2B H4  

Former Meroo Meadow public school and residence

Figure C-30  
Schoolmasters residence, looking west

Figure C-31  
Schoolmasters residence, looking south-west

Figure C-32  
Schoolmasters residence looking north
Heritage Item:  G2B H4  Former Meroo Meadow public school and residence

Figure C-33 Non-renovated interior detail within residence

Figure C-34 Former rear door and side kitchen entrance of residence

Figure C-35 A former toilet shed situated behind the residence
Figure C-36  Views of the Meroo Meadow Public Schoolhouse and residence:  
(top) Schoolhouse, weathershed and residence in 1921/1922;  
(middle) Schoolhouse, class and teachers in 1932;  
(bottom) Residence in 1921/1922 (extract from top photo)  
(photos courtesy Mr and Mrs North, also in Berry Museum collection).
Figure C-37 Extract from 1893 Meroo Farms sales poster, showing single schoolhouse building at that time (Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith., John Ewing licenced surveyor, NLA map-lfsp322-v).

Figure C-38 2013 aerial photograph (right) with an overlay of historical features shown in 1893 sales poster. For top and bottom former building sites refer sites G2B H90 and H88 respectively) (Google Earth Pro 2013)

Figure C-39 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph (above) (NSW 694-5070 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14 9/7/58)
Heritage Item: G2B H4

Figure C-40 Possible location of the first site of the Meroo Public school (blue oval), in a building used as a church on J. Boxsell’s lease, ‘off the main road’ (NSW DoE 1967, Extract from Certificate of Title R197A – 1603)

Figure C-41 Extract from 1894 Deposited Plan 3061
**Heritage Item:** G2B H5  
**Name/Description:** Avenue of planted road-side trees, Princes Highway Meroo Meadow  
**Item/Site Type:** Highway tree avenue  

**GDA Map Reference:** 282285.6145435 - 283511.6145391  
**Cadastral Location:** Highway reserve  
**Street Address:** Princes Highway (and Turners Lane), Meroo Meadow, between Wileys Creek and 500 metres west of Devitts/Morshels Lane  

**Context/Setting:** The tree avenue is situated on either side of the Princes Highway between Wileys Creek in the east and a point 500 metres west of the Devitts and Morshels Lane intersection with the highway (Figure C-42, Figure C-43 and Figure C-44). A small number of trees are also situated on Turners Lane which intersects with the Highway at the astern end of the avenue. The avenue has two sections, each is situated on the slopes and broad crests of low spurlines defined by three creeklines: Wileys Creek in the east, Tandingulla Creek in the west, and an unnamed tributary between them. The highway traverses each creekline approximately one kilometre upstream of their entry onto the Broughton Creek flood plain (the former Bolong swamp basin).

**Description/Fabric:** The tree avenue consists of a single row of mixed age and mixed species trees planted on either side of the highway. The trees are situated both within and outside of the current highway, however most occur within the modern highway reserve which extends beyond the current fencing. Successive widening and drainage works along the highway has reduced the typical distance between the trees and the highway platform to between four and eight metres. The main species present are listed in the table C-2 below.

**Table C-2 Main species of trees present at G2B H5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Location/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Pinus sp</td>
<td>Both sides of highway, predominant on north side together with Camphor Laurels and Eucalyptus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunya Pine</td>
<td>Araucaria bidwillii</td>
<td>Sporadic and south side only, possibly remnants of a more widespread planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silky Oak</td>
<td>Grevillea robusta</td>
<td>Both sides but more common on south side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camphor Laurel</td>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>Both sides but more predominant on north side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Gum and other Eucalyptus</td>
<td>Eucalyptus maculata plus Eucalyptus sp.</td>
<td>Predominant on north side, many at western end of eastern section likely to be naturally sown. The older eastern examples could also conceivably be naturally sown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She Oak</td>
<td>Casuarina sp</td>
<td>Less frequent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuckeroo</td>
<td>Cupaniopsis anacardioides</td>
<td>Less frequent (provisional identification).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The oldest trees consist of Pinus, Camphor Laurel, Bunya Pine, Silky Oak and Eucalyptus (Figure C-45 and Figure C-46). Typical old-growth trunk diameters are Silky Oak: 0.62 metres, Camphor Laurel: 1.07 metres, Silky Oak: 0.72 metres, Bunya Pine: 1.20 - 0.70 metres, Spotted Gum: 1.03 - 0.82 metres, Pinus: 1.35 - 0.78 metres.

The presence of younger plantings as well younger self seeded examples attest to both the past maintenance of the avenue by the relevant authorities, as well a decrease in maintenance activity in the most recent decades. The avenue, as viewed from a 1958 aerial photograph (Figure C-47), reveals more defined and distinct intervals between trees, and less infill vegetation between the older trees. At this time, the western portion of this avenue appears to comprise four bunya pines on the south side of the highway. Of three Bunya Pines at this location, only one is likely to date from the original planting (Figure C-48).

**Dimensions:** The western portion of the avenue has an approximate length of 130 metres, the eastern portion, 700 metres, with an interval of 423 metres in between. The tree rows are approximately 25 metres apart, and separated by the highway.

**Physical Condition:** Apart from a small number of dead trees, most of the trees are alive and appear in good and vigorous health.

**Integrity:** The presence of naturally sown younger trees and shrubs amongst the planted trees has created a bank of vegetation on either side of the highway and consequently reduced the formal and aesthetic quality of the avenue. The Bunya Pines remain visually distinctive and function as local visual landmarks. The limited range of species used in the original (oldest) plantings has been supplemented by later plantings and naturally sown species, creating a more mixed and less distinctive avenue.

**Associated Features:** This avenue may be contemporaneous with a highway Pine tree alignment at the Boxsells and Lamonds Lane intersection at Meroo Meadow (G2B H78). This item has considerable value as a contributing component of the cultural landscape (SIHCP CL).

**Current Use:** Highway roadside planting.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Sometime in the first half of the twentieth century, tree plantings were established by local Councils at various places along the Princes highway, and notably within or adjacent to settlements. These often consisted of avenues with plantings on both sides of the road. Some of these survive and have been actively maintained with progressive replacement of any losses. Local examples include this recording (G2B H5), a remnant alignment adjacent to the Meroo Union Church, where the western side of an original highway avenue of pines remains (G2B H78), and at Broughton Village. Species used include Pines, Silky Oak, Bunya Pine, Camphor Laurel and Eucalyptus. These tree varieties reflect both the taste of the early twentieth century and probably also the range available from the Government Nursery at Goulburn, which was a likely source for the Councils (Varman 2001:8).

A local newspaper report suggests that some of the pines close to the Meroo Meadow Union Church were planted in 1905 (Northern Star 29 Jul 1905:6). Based on tree species and trunk diameters this alignment may be contemporaneous with the current recording (G2B H5) and suggests planting may date from the early twentieth century.
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Figure C-42 General view looking west from Wileys Creek towards eastern end of tree avenue

Figure C-43 Looking west along eastern portion of tree avenue

Figure C-44 Looking east from western end of western portion of avenue
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**Figure C-45 (left)** Bunya Pines at western end of avenue, looking east

**Figure C-46 (right)** Bunya pines on Turners Lane, looking northwest

**Figure C-47** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing tree avenue (NSW 608-5032 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58)

**Figure C-48** 2013 Contemporary aerial photo of avenue (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H6

Name/Description: Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway

Item/Site Type: Latter twentieth century highway remnant

GDA Map Reference: 285515.6146249 - 285415.6146216

Cadastral Location: Lot27 DP 250664

Street Address: Strongs Road, Jaspers Brush

Context/Setting: This remnant of highway is situated on the southwest facing basal slopes of a broad, prominent, but low gradient spurline situated between Jaspers Creek and an unnamed creekline.

Description/Fabric: This is a small section of former highway reserve which has been substantially impacted by subsequent highway and rehabilitation works. Residual remains of the former bitumen surface and road platform are evident.

Dimensions: Approximately 160 x 34 metres.

Physical Condition: The remnant has been substantially impacted by subsequent highway and rehabilitation works. The former bitumen surface has been largely removed and re-grassed. The former road platform has been re-contoured and levelled.

Integrity: This recording has little physical integrity.

Associated Features: Remnant portion of Princes Highway on the opposite side of the highway (G2B H8).

Current use: Agricultural land.

Heritage Listings: No current listings.

Historical Background/Interpretation

This highway remnant follows a former highway alignment dating from the 1890s (resumed and gazetted in 1898, refer to Figure 4-27). This alignment created a more gradual climbing gradient across the Jaspers Brush spurline and amended the straight line traverse of the original Berry Estate private road (Figure 4-27).

This alignment was bypassed in 1975, when the current straightened alignment was constructed (Figures C-49, Figure C-50 and Figure C-51).
Heritage Item: **G2B H6**  
Remnant twentieth century portion of the former Princes Highway

**Figure C-49** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing location of G2B H6 as part of functional road corridor (NSW 699-5059 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk12 23/7/58)

**Figure C-50** Extract from 1975 aerial photograph showing location of G2B H6 at the time of being bypassed (NSW 2528-16 SHI BULLI-VICTORIAN BORDER Run SS14 3/12/75)

**Figure C-51** Contemporary aerial photograph showing location of G2B H6 as a remnant (Google Earth Pro 2013)
**Heritage Item:** G2B H7

**Name/Description:** Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road

**Item/Site Type:** Mid nineteenth century road remnant

**GDA Map Reference:** 285581.6146300 - 285494.6146257

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 2 DP 1121436

**Street Address:** 29 Strongs Road

**Context/Setting:** This road remnant is situated on the southwest facing basal slopes of a broad, prominent, but low gradient spurline situated between Jaspers Creek and an unnamed creekline to the south (Figure C-52). The remnant extends to the west of the current Strongs Road reserve fence, some 65 metres north of its intersection with the highway.

**Description/Fabric:** This remnant consists of a remnant, eroded, dirt road platform, which has been cut into the upslope (northern) side of the hill. The cutting and the general alignment of the road remains evident.

**Dimensions:** approx. 102 x 13 metres.

**Physical Condition:** Other than a general platform alignment and the upslope cutting, this remnant does not retain a great deal of surface detail or features. This remnant has undergone erosion in the past and may have been impacted by partial filling and ploughing.

**Integrity:** This road remnant is residual in its surface character. It does not retain any original surface detail. The subsurface nature of the site is unknown, though has probably been impacted by past erosion (Figure C-53 and Figure C-54).

**Associated Features:** Another remnant of the same road is situated on the northern side of the same spurline (G2B H9).

This item has value as a contributing component of the cultural landscape (SIHCP CL).

**Current Use:** Agricultural land.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Following official inaction, Alexander Berry took the initiative, and privately constructed a road across his estate lands. Firstly between Gerringong and Broughton Creek (Berry) in 1856 and later to Bomaderry by 1858 (JME 1951:81; Cousins 1948:105).

Bayley (1975) notes that following gazettal of the Gerringong to Broughton Creek by the government in 1858 and Berry sent men to open the road from Gerringong to Bumaderry [Bomaderry] Creek (Bayley 1975:51).

In August the following year the *Illawarra Mercury* reported that:

‘Mr David Berry is also busy in the march of progress. He is opening the new road from Bumaderry [Bomaderry] to Broughton’s Creek, and from the number of men employed quarrying stone, and brick making at Bumaderry, Mr Berry appears at last to have an eye to the future advancement of the district.’ 8th August 1859.
On 8 December 1859, the Illawarra Mercury, reported on the unanimous passing by Council of ‘a resolution of Mr Bice, ‘as to the necessity for the immediate survey of the road from Bomaderry to Kiama,’ which is very important to the district...’.

In the early 1860s the government provided 140 pounds to be spent on the road between Kiama and Broughton Creek, roughly ten pounds per mile (Cousins 1948:232). Crown survey plans for the road indicate that the alignment had been surveyed and confirmed by 1862, and show how the new road comprised of long straight traverses would replace a network of informal and curvilinear tracks which followed contours and the basal valley slopes (Figure 4-23, also refer Figure 4-25).

Antill (1982) states that the road from Broughton Creek to Bomaderry was completed and opened for use in July 1869, despite many potholes left by the removal of tree stumps. Bridges over the creeks on the new road between Bomaderry and Gerringong were completed in October (Antill 1982:82).

These references to the completion of the Broughton Creek to Bomaderry road by 1869 appear to contradict references in Cousins (1948:105), and J.M.E. (1951:81) for the completion of this road by 1858. This disparity may simply reflect the earlier and privately initiated works by David Berry, and subsequent government funded formal survey and follow-up construction. It remains an issue which has not been definitively resolved.

Despite the fact that the road between Broughton Creek (Berry) and Bomaderry, was clearly funded, at least partly, by the Government, the road shares many of the characteristics of his privately funded road between Gerringong and Broughton Creek - long straight traverses, with little or no concession to gradients (Figure 4-23). This may be explained by the earlier private initiation of the road by Berry, and/or the possibility that the same work crew, managed by the Estate, was employed. Both possibilities are supported by local news reports of Berry sending men to open the road from Gerringong to Bomaderry Creek (refer above).

This portion of the road (G2B H7) was part of a straight traverse across the Jaspers Brush spurline and would have presented steep gradients to some vehicles. This straight line traverse was subsequently bypassed in the 1890s (resumed and gazetted in 1898, Crown survey plan R193d – 1603). The aim of the revised alignment was probably to create a more gradual climbing gradient across the spurline (Figures 4-23, 4-25 and C-55).
Heritage Item:  G2B H7  Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road

Figure C-52 General view of road remnant, (yellow dotted line shows alignment) looking west across upslope cutting along northern side of remnant

Figure C-53 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing location of G2B H7. The eastern extension of the remnant visible at this time has not survived to the present day (NSW 699-5059 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk12 23/7/58)

Figure C-54 Contemporary aerial view of G2B H7 (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Figure C-55  Extract from Crown survey plan R193d – 1603, showing 1895 survey of highway realignment. Approximate location of G2B H7 shown with yellow outline overlay.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H8

**Name/Description:** Remnant late twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway, Jaspers Brush

**Item/Site Type:** Latter twentieth century highway remnant

**GDA Map Reference:** 285581.6146300 - 285494.6146257

**Cadastral Location:** Road reserve

**Street address:** Jaspers Brush Road

**Context/Setting:** This remnant section of highway traverses the upper slopes and crest of a broad, prominent, but low gradient spurline situated between Jaspers Creek and an unnamed creek to the south.

**Description/Fabric:** The road currently functions as an access road to adjoining properties and consists of a bitumen sealed single carriageway, two lane road with gravel shoulders.

**Dimensions:** The remnant extends for 400 metres south west of Jaspers Brush Road

**Physical Condition:** The road is in a good and maintained condition. The verges are overgrown in places. The eastern and western ends of the original alignment have been impacted by the 1975 upgrade works (Figure C-56).

**Integrity:** Apart from the new connecting road alignment at the eastern end, this road retains the form of a mid 1970s highway carriageway.

**Associated Features:** Remnant portion of Princes Highway on the opposite side of the highway (G2B H6).

**Current Use:** Local road.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This highway remnant follows a former highway alignment dating from the 1890s (resumed and gazetted in 1898). This alignment created a more gradual climbing gradient across the Jaspers Brush spurline and amended the straight line traverse of the original Berry Estate private road (Figure 4-27, C-57). Some subsequent smoothing of corners occurred in 1933 at the far eastern end of the 1890s alignment but this section of has not survived (Crown survey plan R193d – 1603).

This alignment remnant was bypassed in 1975, when the current straightened alignment was constructed (Figures C-57, Figure C-58, Figure C-59 and Figure C-60).
Heritage Item:  G2B H8    Remnant late twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway, Jaspers Brush

Figure C-56 View across the eastern portion of the road, looking south-west

Figure C-57 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing location of G2B H8. (NSW 699-5059 & 5057 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk12 23/7/58)

Figure C-58 Extract from 1975 aerial photograph showing location of G2B H8 at the time of highway upgrade (NSW 2528-16 & 14 SHI BULLI-VICTORIAN BORDER Run SS14 3/12/75)

Figure C-59 Contemporary aerial view of G2B H8 (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H8  Remnant late twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway, Jaspers Brush

Figure C-60 Extract from Crown survey plan R193d – 1603, showing 1895 survey of highway realignment. Approximate location of G2B H8 shown with yellow outline overlay
**Heritage Item:** G2B H9

**Name/Description:** Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road

**Item/Site Type:** Mid nineteenth century road remnant

---

**GDA Map Reference:**

286035.6146528 - 285932.6146473

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 26 DP 250664

**Street Address:** 20B Strong's Road

---

**Context/Setting:** This road remnant is situated on the northeast facing basal slopes of a broad, prominent, but low gradient spurline situated between Jaspers Creek and an unnamed creekline to the south. The remnant extends to the west of the floor of the Jaspers Creek valley, ascending gradual slopes for approximately 150 metres before becoming indistinct in the crest of the spur (Figure C-61).

**Description/Fabric:** This remnant can be traced for most of its length by the slight ground surface relief of two side ditches, approximately 12 metres apart. A small cutting, with low embankments on either side of the road platform is evident at the eastern end of the site where the road crosses the toe slope and merges with the valley floor. The nature and condition of any subsurface traces of the road is not known.

**Dimensions:** approximately 157 x 17 metres.

**Physical Condition:** This site is evidenced by a small cutting at its eastern end, and slight surface relief elsewhere. At its western end the site has been impacted by ploughing, fencing and an overhead powerline easement. At the eastern end the site has been eroded.

**Integrity:** Despite the eroded and vestigial condition of the site, it remains relatively undisturbed, compared to other remnants of the road.

**Associated Features:** Another much smaller remnant of the same road is situated on the southern side of the same spurline (G2B H7).

This item has value as a contributing component of the cultural landscape (SICPH CL).

**Current Use:** Agricultural land.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Following official inaction, Alexander Berry took the initiative, and privately constructed a road across his estate lands. Firstly between Gerringong and Broughton Creek (Berry) in 1856 and later to Bomaderry by 1858 (JME 1951:81; Cousins 1948:105).

Bayley (1975) notes that following gazettal of the Gerringong to Broughton Creek by the government in 1858 and Berry sent men to open the road from Gerringong to Bomaderry [Bomaderry] Creek (Bayley 1975:51).
In August the following year the *Illawarra Mercury* reported that:

‘Mr David Berry is also busy in the march of progress. He is opening the new road from Bomaderry [Bomaderry] to Broughton’s Creek, and from the number of men employed quarrying stone, and brick making at Bomaderry, Mr Berry appears at last to have an eye to the future advancement of the district.’ (8th August 1859).

On 8 December 1859, the *Illawarra Mercury*, reported on the unanimous passing by Council of ‘a resolution of Mr Bice, ‘as to the necessity for the immediate survey of the road from Bomaderry to Kiama,’ which is very important to the district…’.

In the early 1860s the government provided 140 pounds to be spent on the road between Kiama and Broughton Creek, roughly ten pounds per mile (Cousins 1948:232). Crown survey plans for the road indicate that the alignment had been surveyed and confirmed by 1862, and show how the new road comprised of long straight traverses would replace a network of informal and curvilinear tracks which followed contours and the basal valley slopes (Figure 4-23, also refer Figure 4-27).

Antill (1982) states that the road from Broughton Creek to Bomaderry was completed and opened for use in July 1869, despite many potholes left by the removal of tree stumps. Bridges over the creeks on the new road between Bomaderry and Gerringong were completed in October (Antill 1982:82).

These references to the completion of the Broughton Creek to Bomaderry road by 1869 appear to contradict references in Cousins (1948:105) and J.M.E. (1951:81) for the completion of this road by 1858. This disparity may simply reflect the earlier and privately initiated works by David Berry, and subsequent government funded formal survey and follow-up construction. It remains an issue which has not been definitively resolved.

Despite the fact that the road between Broughton Creek (Berry) and Bomaderry, was clearly funded, at least partly, by the Government, the road shares many of the characteristics of his privately funded road between Gerringong and Broughton Creek - long straight traverses, with little or no concession to gradients (Figure 4-23). This may be explained by the earlier private initiation of the road by Berry, and/or the possibility that the same work crew, managed by the Estate, was employed. Both possibilities are supported by local news reports of Berry sending men to open the road from Gerringong to Bomaderry Creek (refer above).

This portion of the road (G2B H9) was part of a straight traverse across the Jaspers Brush spurline and would have presented steep gradients to some vehicles. This straight line traverse was subsequently bypassed in the 1890s (resumed and gazetted in 1898, Crown survey plan R193d – 1603). The aim of the revised alignment was probably to create a more gradual climbing gradient across the spurline (C-62, C-63, C-64 and C-65).
Heritage Item: **G2B H9**  Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road

**Figure C-61** Panorama view of road remnant G2B H9, looking south-west towards small cutting across basal slopes (yellow dotted line shows alignment)

**Figure C-62** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing location of G2B H9. (NSW 699-5059 & 5057 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk12 23/7/58)

**Figure C-63** Extract from 1975 aerial photograph showing location of G2B H9 at the time of highway upgrade  (NSW 2528-16 & 14 SHI BULLI-VICTORIAN BORDER Run SS14 3/12/75)

**Figure C-64** Contemporary aerial view of G2B H9 (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item:  G2B H9  Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road

Figure C-65  Extract from Crown survey plan R193d – 1603, showing 1895 survey of highway realignment. Approximate location of G2B H9 shown with yellow outline overlay
**Heritage Item:** G2B H44

**Name/Description:** ‘Hotel Woodbyne’ former Jaspers Brush public school

**Item/Site Type:** Late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 286256.6146612

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 1 DP 872572

**Street Address:** 4 O’Keeffes Lane Jaspers Brush

---

**Context/Setting:** This former school is situated on a low rise which runs parallel to the northern bank of Jaspers Creek (Figure C-66). The rise is broad and has a level top, suggesting that it is a remnant of an old valley floor terrace.

**Description/Fabric:** This property was not subject to field inspection. The following descriptions come from the Shoalhaven Heritage inventory (no. 2390214) and remote sources.

**Schoolhouse**
Federation period nineteenth century Victorian school building constructed of brick on sandstone footings (Figure C-69, Figure C-70 and Figure C-71). Galvanised iron hipped roof continuous over verandas on the southern and western sides. Decorative brick chimney.

**Residence**
The residence was built in the 1920s in a late Federation style (Figure C-67 and Figure C-68).

**Grounds**
The site consists of five acres of which three have been converted into a garden. Plantings include a number of old-growth mature trees which are original school ground plantings (Figure C-73).

**Potential archaeological deposits**
A comparison of the arrangement of the original 1884 buildings with the post 1890s era, indicates that there may be potential for archaeological traces of the original schoolhouse to remain within the developed open space garden area (Figures C-72, C-73 and C-74).

**Dimensions:**
- Schoolhouse (approx.) 16.5 x 10 metres
- Residence (approx.) originally 13 x 13 metres, with current extensions: 18 x 22 metres

**Physical Condition:** The buildings appear to be in an excellent and well maintained condition

**Integrity:** The adaption and development of the original school buildings for use as a guest house, art gallery, and currently as a boutique hotel, has involved a variety of internal and external changes. These include substantial extensions to the residence, and conversion of the schoolhouse into a dining area with an added mezzanine level, which originally accommodated a bathroom and bedroom (Figure C-70). The northern windows of the schoolhouse have been extended to floor level, and a porch added to the exterior. Many doors are new. The surrounding grounds have been extensively landscaped and gardens established.

Despite these developments and contextual differences, much of the original fabric of the schoolhouse remains and its original configuration can be discerned.
**Historical Background/Interpretation**

In 1876, Berry Estate tenant farmers from Jaspers Brush erected a school and employed a private teacher. The Government however refused to accept this building as a school. Continued petitioning led to the Government's eventual approval in 1883 to establish a one classroom, one teacher school on a site adjacent to Jasper's Brush Creek (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390214).

In September of 1884 the Jaspers Brush public school was opened in a temporary structure. A new permanent brick building, designed by W.E. Kemp, was completed by A. Johnston for £417 in October 1897 (Sydney Morning Herald 15 May 1897:11). Two years earlier, the school’s teacher, Mr Edwin Larcombe had died of exposure and shock following his efforts to save the school property during a bush fire (Sydney Morning Herald 24 Aug 1895:5).

On the 26 August 1920 the schoolmaster’s residence at Jaspers Brush was destroyed by fire. One story relates that the fire was intentionally lit by people who thought that the school master was harbouring a nun who had fled from a Bowral Convent, suspicions which were later proved to be baseless (JBRC 1997:3). Mr Baldwin, the teacher was badly burned about the face and hands, and his family lost everything except the clothes they were wearing (Northern Star 6 Sept 1920:2). (Refer to the ‘Westbury’ (G2B H66) site description for a further discussion on the missing nun story.)

For three months in 1917 (March to May) the school operated in a half time capacity with Broughton Vale, and after that was classed as provisional, before later regaining Public School status (Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983).

The school closed on 8 May 1969 and the property was sold to a private owner in 1974.

The property was then developed by entrepreneur and designer John Pegrum. At the time of his purchase it is stated that the weatherboard former ‘schoolhouse’ building was in a dilapidated state and stood in a bare paddock. Pegrum sold the property to the Jeff and Annette Moore in 1997. The property is currently owned by Rosie Jennings (http://federation-house.wikispaces.com/Woodbyne%2C+Berry).
Heritage Item: **G2B H44  ‘Hotel Woodbyne’ former Jaspers Brush public school**

Figure C-66 View of former Jaspers Brush school grounds, all of the visible structures post-date the school, looking south

Figure C-67 The 1920s school residence, looking south (www.woodbyne.com.au/)

Figure C-68 Internal view within 1920s residence (www.woodbyne.com.au/)
Heritage Item: G2B H44 ‘Hotel Woodyne’ former Jaspers Brush public school

Figure C-69 View of northern end of 1897 schoolhouse, looking south-west (www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/House/NSW/Jaspers-Brush/?adid=2009512059)

Figure C-70 Internal view of the schoolhouse, looking south-west (www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/House/NSW/Jaspers-Brush/?adid=2009512059)

Figure C-71 View of eastern external wall of the schoolhouse (www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/House/NSW/Jaspers-Brush/?adid=2009512059)
Heritage Item: G2B H44 ‘Hotel Woodbyne’ former Jaspers Brush public school

Figure C-72 Extract from 1893 Jaspers Brush Farms Sales Poster showing school configuration with structures dating from 1884 (Hardie & Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith. Sydney, Libraries Australia ID 44485223)

Figure C-73 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing school complex with 1897 and 1920 structures. Yellow overlay shows 1893 configuration taken from C-72 above (NSW 699.5057 SHI DAPTO – ULLADULLA Run Gk12 23/7/58)

Figure C-74 Contemporary 2013 image of school showing substantial development of the property, including new buildings and grounds development. Note realignment of highway away from buildings in the 1970s (Google Earth Pro 2013)
**Heritage Item:** G2B H46

**Name/Description:** 'Pomona'

**Item/Site Type:** Late nineteenth century dairy farm complex

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 281433.6144990

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 2 DP 620160

**Street Address:** C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

---

**Context/Setting:** This farm complex is located on locally elevated ground adjacent to Tandingulla Creek. It is situated on low gradient basal slopes adjacent to the Broughton Creek floodplain located one kilometre to the southeast.

**Description/Fabric:** Federation period weatherboard farmhouse and residence with Queen Anne influences and considerable aesthetic appeal (Figure C-77, Figure C-78 and Figure C-79). Complex bellcast iron roof. High pitched with attic. Standard diagonal plan type with two gabled projecting bays. Veranda on two sides between bays with skillion extension on one side. Excellent timber decoration to veranda. Tall brick chimneys set on a diagonal. Hooded bay below front gabled projection. Decorative timberwork to gables. The property also includes a range of out buildings characteristic of dairy farms in the district, including a wooden vertical slab barn with a raised floor (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390224, Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 2007).

The architectural expression evident in the farmhouse is reminiscent of the work of Howard Joseland in the 1890s. This building was designed by George Muller, who is known to have worked on the construction of Joseland designed homes in the 1890s.

**Dimensions:** (approx.) farmhouse 20 x 17 metres.

(approx.) building complex and grounds: 120 x 130 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The farmhouse is well maintained. The silo retains its roof and elevator shute.

**Integrity:** The farmhouse appears little changed since 1958, as do many of the outbuildings (some now with skillion extensions), and their arrangement (refer Figures C-80, Figure C-81 and Figure C-82). A skillion extension on the southern side of the house may be an infilled former veranda (Figure C-78). The original three lower level bay windows have been replaced with larger double windows. The farm complex has a considerable degree of integrity.

**Associated Features:** This farmhouse was built by George Muller and is thus associated with other local surviving structures known to have been built by the Mullers, such as potentially the ‘Exeter’ farmhouse (Figure C-75).

This item has considerable value as a contributing component of the cultural landscape (SIHCP CL).

**Current Use:** Dairy farm.

**Heritage Listings:** Schedule 7, Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 1985.

Schedule 5, Draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 2013.
Historical Background/Interpretation

The ‘Pomona’ property, being original Lots 50 (55 acres) and 51 (30 acres) of the 1893 Meroo Farms subdivision of the Berry Estate (DP3061), was purchased by John Joseph Hubert Muller for £31 per acre (Northern Star 1st April 1893 p.3). John had arrived in Australia as a three year old with his family from Frauenstein Germany in 1855. He moved to Pomona with his wife Mary Elizabeth (nee Host) and seven children (South Coast Register 14 April 1993 p.3, Reynolds 2011). He named the property after the Roman goddess of fruit and trees (Sunday Telegraph 18 April 1993 p.11).

John’s brother George built the farmhouse either in the year of purchase, or the following year. John quickly established a successful dairy farm (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390224, Reynolds 2011). The property has remained in the Muller family to the present day. Following John’s death on 26 November 1941, at Pomona, aged 90, the property was bought by his son Bert. He in turn sold it to his son Albert, one of eight children, who farmed the land from 1959 until his son, and the present owner, Patrick, bought the property in 1986.

The four generations of Muller ownership are outlined in Figure C-76.

Fourteen years after John’s purchase, the property was featured in an article on the Illawarra district in the Australian Town and Country Journal (refer below). It describes a property, now of 148 largely cleared acres, 57 acres of which had comprised ‘blue and spotted gum forest’, with the balance consisting of ‘dense brush’. The article mentions a few fruit trees, a row of ornamental pines, and ten acres of creek flats under cultivation for green fodder. The milking herd averaged 40 of the over 50 cows of the total herd. Also present were light and draught horses, pigs and poultry.

A NICE PROPERTY.

About four miles from Nowra, and just beyond the pretty little church at Meroo Meadow, lies Pomona, the prettily-situated home-stead of Mr. J. J. H. Muller, who has resided in the Nowra district for many years, and is one of the most successful dairy farmers in it. The property consists of 148 acres, 57 of which were originally a blue and spotted gum forest. The balance was largely covered with a dense brush, and here the soil, as the experienced man may imagine, is both lighter and richer than in those parts where the forest prevailed. When Mr. Muller first took possession of the land, which up to that time formed a portion of the well-known Coolangatta Estate, the job of clearing it presented about as uninviting a problem as any man could set himself to solve; but by untiring energy and constant hard work, the land was cleared by degrees, until now it is virtually all under either grass of crops, and subdivided into numerous well-fenced and convenient-sized paddocks. A few of these there still remain some old stumps, but as time permits, they are gradually being removed, as Mr. Muller is determined that, apart from the small clumps of trees which have been wisely left standing for shelter for the dairy cows, a few fruit trees, and a row of ornamental pines, no sign of a tree will be seen on the farm. Ten acres of the holding, which is well watered by Meroo Creek, are under cultivation, the crops being mostly grown for green fodder for the stock. A small patch of lucerne yields a nice quantity of hay every season, and more of it is to be grown in future. The milking herd averages about 40 head of cows, but there are over 50 cows on the farm, besides the calves, whilst other live stock include draught and light horses, pigs, and a fine lot of poultry. The dairy herd consists largely of Ayrshire blood and a Coolangatta-bred bull, by Tony, by Prince Emerald (Imp.), is now at the head of
John was actively involved in local community activities, including the local church, and agricultural shows such as the Nowra Show Society (Reynolds 2011:19). He assisted with the District exhibit at the Royal Agricultural Society’s annual exhibition in Sydney (South Coast Register 14 April 1993).

The first milking machines in the Meroo were installed by John Muller in 1917, and were reportedly in use for 47 years (Morshel 1992).

Pomona was a focus for social activity at Meroo. Annual Sunday School picnics were always held at the property ‘under the spotted gums’, and ‘was one of the events of the year’. The Meroo tennis court and cricket pitch were also situated on the farm. In 1930 Meroo had their own cricket team and in 1945 a new pitch was formed (Morshel 1992).

George was five when the Muller family arrived in Australia, and when older, accompanied his father, Jacob, who worked as a painter and decorator for the Berry Estate. After Jacob’s death he worked for himself as a builder and constructed many homes in the Shoalhaven district. In 1875 George Muller advertised his services as house painter, decorator, sign writer and paperhanger at Numba (The Shoalhaven News 23 Oct 1875 p.3, research by Robyn Florance presented in Reynolds 2011:16). George married Ernestina Ebert in 1881 and moved to Nowra where they would have a family of six. George built a house in Nowra in 1887, on land deeded to him by his father. In 1890 he added a workshop and opened a business called ‘G. Mullers Steam Joinery and Cabinet Works – Builder and Contractor’. Timber was milled on site. George’s brother Martin, also a builder, joined the business soon after its commencement. He subsequently also began an undertaking business (research by Robyn Florance presented in Reynolds 2011:28).

George worked for Sydney architect Howard Joseland who designed homes on the Berry Estate for John Hay between 1892 and the early 1900s. An example being ‘Lynburn’, Bomaderry, built in 1895 for the Mortons. Another Joseland design is ‘Greenleaves’ Bomaderry, (1895). It has been noted that the design of Pomona appears to be influenced by Joseland’s work in the 1890s (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no.2390224).

George’s wife Ernestina died in 1892 and in the following year he married Annie Lee (nee Johnston) and had a further five children. In 1894, George built Pomona for his brother John. By 1898, Martin had taken over the business following George’s move to Cambewarra in 1898. Martin bought the business in 1901 and included a funeral business. Martin is known to have built some houses together with his brother George (Reynolds 2011:13).
Some of the buildings known, or thought, to have been built by, or worked on by the Mullers are:

- ‘Bundanon’ 1866 (George worked as a painter and decorator).
- Barrengarry School late 1870s (labour and carpenter, and supervised completion of building).
- Imperial Hotel, Nowra, 1886 (contributed carpentry).
- 5 Berry St Nowra 1887 (built by George, site of his joinery and cabinet works).
- ‘Pomona’ Meroo Meadow 1894 (built by George).
- ‘Mananga’ Berry 1894 (possibly designed by Howard Joseland, built by the Mullers (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390144).
- ‘Lynburn’ Bomaderry 1895/6 (erected by George for Sydney architect Howard Joseland, a home for the Mortons).
- ‘Exeter’, Meroo Meadow thought to be built by the Mullers (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390227).
- Meroo Meadow Butter Factory 1899 (built by G & M Muller (Bayley 1975).
- Home in Worrigee St., Nowra 1901 (designed by George, built by George and Martin, for Arthur Woodhill, according to a Swiss design). (research by Robyn Florance presented in Reynolds 2011:15-18).

George died in 1918, aged 68 years, Martin died in 1924 aged 55 years.
Figure C-76  Family tree showing relationship of the (male) Muller family members who have owned and managed the Pomona property (bolded) (based on Reynolds 2010)
Heritage Item: G2B H46 ‘Pomona’

Figure C-77 General view of ‘Pomona’ farmhouse, looking east

Figure C-78 View of ‘Pomona’ c.1910. Note veranda on right side, now the location of a skillion extension (Reynolds 2011:13)

Figure C-79 General view of ‘Pomona’ farmhouse looking north (2007)
Heritage Item: G2B H46 'Pomona'

Figure C-80 General view of ‘Pomona’ outbuildings, looking south-east

Figure C-81 Extract from 1958 aerial photography, showing arrangement of Pomona farm complex (NSW 698-5036 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58)

Figure C-82 (Google Earth Pro 2013)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Heritage Item:</strong></th>
<th>G2B H66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name/Description:</strong></td>
<td>'Westbury'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item/Site Type:</strong></td>
<td>Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GDA Map Reference:</strong></th>
<th>286966.6147713</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadastral Location:</strong></td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 249692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address:</strong></td>
<td>B210 Princes Highway, Berry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Context/Setting:</strong></th>
<th>This group of farm buildings is situated on low gradient, north facing, mid slopes on the Croziers Road spurline situated between Flying Fox Creek in the south and an unnamed creek in the north.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description/Fabric:</strong></td>
<td>Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian weatherboard farmhouse with a hipped (corrugated iron) roof (<a href="#">Figure C-83</a>). Faces north. Formerly separate kitchen block at the southwest corner of building has been subsequently joined to the main house. Verandas, formerly on all four side of farmhouse, have been infilled on eastern and southern sides, and partially on western side (<a href="#">Figure C-84</a>). Outbuildings include milking bails, feeding stalls and silo, now mostly clad with corrugated iron (<a href="#">Figure C-86</a>, <a href="#">Figure C-87</a> and <a href="#">Figure C-88</a>). Bails show signs of whole or partial original weatherboard cladding. Avenue of Camphor Laurels on both side of driveway (<a href="#">Figure C-85</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Dimensions:</strong></th>
<th>Farmhouse: 20 x 15 metres (including kitchen block).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Condition:</strong></td>
<td>Farmhouse in good condition with recent renovation evidenced by wooden stumps replaced by brick blocks and new veranda decking, railing and posts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrity:</strong></td>
<td>House retains original configuration and many original internal features including architraves, dado and two x six pane sash windows. Extensions to original farmhouse in the form of attached buildings on south side, adjacent to kitchen block and infilled verandas. Weatherboards and veranda brackets are original. Former shed on east side of house is no longer present. A new garage and other sheds now present to northwest of farmhouse. Skillion extension to feed stalls shed. Original pumps still located in dairy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Associated Features:</strong></th>
<th>None.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Listings:</strong></td>
<td>No current listings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

The current owner has owned the property for 27 years (as of 2012).

This building group clearly relates to former Lot 60 (DP4468), a 45 acre property farm formed as a consequence of the subdivision and sale of the Berry Estate ([Figure C-89](#)). It is most likely that the farmhouse dates from the initial development of the farm since this subdivision in the turn of the century ([Figure C-90](#) and [Figure C-91](#)).
Deposited Plan 4468, dating from 1904, indicates that Lot 60 was owned by a William James Johnson. This may correspond to a William James Johnson who was born in 1868 at Rose Valley (near Gerringong) (www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~nswgdhs/22617.htm). A ‘Mr W.J. Johnson, Westbury, Berry’ is mentioned as a seller in annual horse sales at Moore Park in August 1911 (Sydney Morning Herald 9/8/1911 p.13). However by 1917, the Johnsons had moved to West Dapto. This is evidenced by a notice of the death of William James Johnson, aged 13, son of William J and Annie Johnson, late of Westbury, at his parents residence West Dapto (Sydney Morning Herald 16/2/1917).

In 1920, the Westbury property became part of a sensationalised national media story which resonated across the sectarian divisions within Australia’s society at the time. On 8 August 1920, a nun, Sister Mary Ligouri, was reported missing from the Mt Erin convent in Wagga. A day or two later a charge of insanity was made, based on information sworn by Bishop Dwyer of Wagga, and a warrant for her arrest was issued at the Central Police Court (Kalgoorlie Miner 16/1/1939).

The ‘missing nun’ was Sister Ligouri, or Miss Bridget Partridge. In statements provided by her afterwards, she explained that her leaving the convent was ‘on account of being dissatisfied with conventual life’. She had attempted to leave on 4 August but returned in the company of three mothers, and was subsequently declared to be ‘run down’ by a Doctor and provided ‘something in a cup’ which had a very dead taste to drink. ‘A sister told me to lie quite still and not to move, and that I would sleep for six months’. After three cupfuls of soapy water, she vomited up the dose and subsequently made her escape, in her nightgown and barefoot (Denholm 1988).

After a fortnight, the police were reported to be searching the city and had circulated a full description to other states and New Zealand (The West Australian 7/8/1920).

Miss Partridge was subsequently arrested and brought before the Lunacy Court at Darlighurst, which quickly announced her to be sane and recommended her release (The Examiner 13/8/1920).

On 30 August, it was announced by Mr H Stocker, grand secretary of the Loyal Orange Institution of New South Wales, that ‘as those who were persecuting Miss Partridge had traced her to a place where she was resting, it had been decided to make her movements public’. It was then recounted that following her release, and a short stay at the Burwood residence of the Grand Master of the Loyal Orange Lodge, Mr R.E. Barton, Miss Partridge had gone to the residence of Mr Newing at Westbury, near Berry. She was accompanied by Mr Barton and his married daughter, and the three of them had remained there since. It was then alleged that the party had been ‘spied upon and annoyed since their arrival at Berry’ Mr Barton reported that ‘for the past three nights the house had been surrounded. That morning, at an early hour, Mr Barton and those with him discovered a party of spies in a gully with[1] 100 yards of the house. They were armed with rifles’. Mr Barton also informed Mr Stocker that ‘it was generally believed in the Berry district that there was a reward of £100 offered for the girl, dead or alive’ (The Examiner 30/8/1920). Mr Stocker went on to claim that he had ‘communication from Wagga this morning stating that the feeling over the treatment of the girl is running so high that unless the persecution of Miss Partridge is discontinued the returned soldiers in the district and their Protestant friends will wreck the Roman Catholic Convent at Wagga’ (Barrier Miner 30/8/1920).

Mr C Lawler, general secretary of the Catholic Federation of New South Wales described the allegations as ‘absolute twaddle’ and explained that since Sister Ligouri had left the court, ‘no Catholic has ever sought to ascertain her where-abouts, nor has made any effort to remove her from her present surroundings’ (Barrier Miner 30/8/1920).

Miss Partridge, having received a guarantee of her expenses by the Loyal Orange Lodge, subsequently took legal action against Bishop Dwyer of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Wagga claiming £5000 damages for wrongful arrest (Denholm 1988). The case caused a high degree of press interest, but she ultimately lost the case in July 1921. In summing-up Justice (Sir) David Ferguson states that ‘it is very unfortunate for the plaintiff that, at the time she left the convent she did not meet somebody [with] a little common horse-sense’ (Denholm 1988).
The costs of the case were calculated to be between three and four thousand pounds (Border Watch 15/7/1921). Miss Partridge continued to reside at the home of Reverend William Touchell at Kogarah. However, three months later on 26 October, in a ‘sensational development’, she was ‘abducted and kidnapped’ by ‘about twenty men’, one of whom was her brother, who picked her up and carried her to a motor car which then sped away in the direction of Sydney (Geraldton Guardian 27/10/1921). The day after the kidnapping, Miss Partridge was ‘found in Macquarie Street’ and able to return to her friends (The Argus 9/11/1921, The Horsham Times 28/10/1921, Kalgoorlie Miner 16/1/1939). It was reported that ‘after a round table conference at Police Headquarters, Sister Ligouri said she would not go back to her brother or to the Roman Catholic church (Geraldton Guardian 29/10/1921). It was widely reported that the Police were to take no action regarding the kidnapping.

The reported kidnapping prompted exchanges in the NSW Legislative Assembly. Mr Hoskins urged the Government to bring to Justice those responsible for her disappearance. Premier Dooley, responding to Sir Thomas Henley said he regarded Wednesday night’s incident as very serious, and was calling for a report. ‘As soon as I get the police report’ he added ‘I shall give the House the information. The case has caused a sensation and consternation throughout the State’ (The Daily News 28/10/1921, The Horsham Times 28/10/1921).

In a protestant rally in 1923 the Reverend Touchell stated that Miss Partridge still lived with himself and his wife in Kogarah and had become a happy member of his church and a kindergarten teacher in the Sunday school (Brisbane Courier 14/8/1923). In 1939 she reportedly was hospitalised suffering from a ‘nervous breakdown’ It was explained that ‘she was suffering from a fear complex that she would be kidnapped if she left her home’ (Kalgoorlie Miner 16/1/1939). Miss Partridge continued to live with the Touchells, moving with the minister to the Cessnock coalfields, Cronulla, Sutherland and Hurstville. The reverend died in 1954. In November of 1962, Miss Partridge and Mrs Touchell were admitted to Rydalmere mental Hospital. Mrs Touchell died the following year, Bridget died in hospital on 4 December 1966 (Denholm 1988, Lee 1997).

The ‘Sister Ligouri’ case, as it was coined, is probably the origin for the oral tradition surrounding the burning of the Jaspers Brush schoolhouse on 26 August 1920. This story relates that the fire was intentionally lit by people who thought that the school master was harbouring a nun who had fled from a Bowral Convent, suspicions which were later proved to be baseless (JBRC 1997:3). Regardless of whether the allegations of armed spies and arson have any basis in fact, it is clear that the short stay at Westbury by Miss Partridge generated a degree of social friction along local sectarian divisions, which were to be played out on a larger scale in the national religious and political arenas.

The Mr Newing of Westbury, near Berry, mentioned by Mr H Stocker, is a reference to Thomas Henry Newing, the son of Thomas Newing (1832-1927) who is well known as the builder of a majority of the stone walls in the Kiama and surrounding regions. Thomas junior was born at Kiama in 1866 and from the age of fifteen learnt the trade of stone walling from his father, assisting him in the construction of walls until the age of nineteen, when he left with the volunteers for the Sudan War in 1885. In that conflict he rose to the rank of Sergeant. On his return, he continued to build walls with his father until the market collapsed with the closure of the banks in 1893. He then joined the Police Force, but was forced to retire after twelve years service due to health problems with his legs. Thomas married Elizabeth Newing at Kiama (date not known). Elizabeth was born in Jamberoo around 1864. She came to live in the Berry district with Thomas around 1910 (Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 17 Jul 1937). After retirement from the Police Force, Thomas took over the Westbury dairy farm in around 1916 and successfully ran the farm till his retirement (around 1932), when ‘he moved into town’. He died in the David Berry Hospital on the 24 April 1941. His wife predeceased him by four years. They had six children (Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 26 April 1941 p.2, Sydney Morning Herald 1 April 1936 p.10). His obituary did not mention his role in the Sister Ligouri affair.

By the 1940s, the ‘Westbury’ property was owned by the Campbells. Clarence Robert Campbell, an officer of the R.A.A.F, died at Westbury in April 1946, and application for probate of the will to be granted to Charles Robert Campbell was published in the Sydney Morning Herald 18 April 1946 (p.10).
Heritage Item:  G2B H66  ‘Westbury’

Figure C-83 General view of front of farmhouse, looking south-west

Figure C-84 View across front veranda, looking west

Figure C-85 Front gates to Westbury, looking west
Heritage Item: G2B H66 ‘Westbury’

Figure C-86 General view of remaining outbuildings, looking south-west from highway

Figure C-87 Dairy, looking north

Figure C-88 Silo and feed stall shed, looking north
Heritage Item: G2B H66 ‘Westbury’

Figure C-89 Extract from 1904 Deposited Plan P4468

Figure C-90 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing Westbury buildings
(NSW 699-5053 SHI DAPTO – ULLADULLA Gk12 23/7/1958)

Figure C-91 2006 aerial view of Westbury (Google Earth Pro 2013)
**Heritage Item:**  
G2B H67

**Name/Description:**  
Site of former Meroo Meadow Public Hall

**Item/Site Type:**  
Potential archaeological deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GDA Map Reference:</strong></th>
<th>281469.6145147</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadastral Location:</strong></td>
<td>Lot 8 DP 249776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address:</strong></td>
<td>Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context/Setting:**  
The Hall was located on a low broad spurline which extends to the east of the highway situated between Tandingulla Creek in the south and an unnamed tributary to the north (Figure C-92). Both drain into a former wetland basin approximately 250 metres downstream.

**Description/Fabric:**  
Apart from a level earth platform and an adjacent low rock edged embankment along the southern boundary fenceline (Figure C-93), there are no surviving surface features of the Hall.

The Hall consisted of a timber structure, aligned east-west, and built on stone foundations. It appears to have had a simple corrugated iron gable roof, with possibly an awning or porch over a main or side entrance along the eastern portion of the southern wall (Figure C-94).

Sub-surface remains of the structure and/or occupation debris may remain on site, although it would appear that the building was purposefully demolished with a view to restoring pasture, and that as a consequence, even the foundation piles have been removed. Deposits from two outside toilets (evident on the 1958 aerial photo (Figure C-95 and Figure C-96) are likely to still be present.

A relatively large pine tree at the northwestern end of the site, on or near the current highway corridor boundary, is likely to be an original planting associated with the former Hall (Figure C-92).

**Dimensions:**  
The dimensions of the Hall were approximately 23 x 11 metres (excluding the awning(?) on the southern side of the building).

**Physical Condition:**  
The building has been demolished and no surface evidence survives of the structure.

**Integrity:**  
Past demolition actions appear to have aimed to rehabilitate to active pasture, and as a consequence, there are unlikely to be any significant structural remains sub-surface. The southern fenceline boundary and a remnant pine tree appear to be the only surviving on-site surface features of the former hall allotment and surrounds.

**Associated Features:**  
A set of memorial wrought iron gates and an associated brick and wrought iron fence was removed from the site at the time of demolition and re-erected at the vehicle entrance to the Meroo Union Church (G2B H3).

**Current Use:**  
Pasture grassland

**Heritage Listings:**  
No current listings.
**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Memories differ regarding the construction of the Meroo Hall. Morschel (1992) recorded local recollections from a 1992 gathering at Pomona, attest that the Hall was built by Bert Green at a cost of £420. Another oral tradition is that it was built by a member of the Blow family, builders at Berry (pers. comm. Rita Pheeney 2/5/2013).

The Hall was opened by Mr John Muller on 27 November 1933. Before the Hall was built, social gatherings were held at George and Lily Lymberys residence in Lamonds Lane (the Collins residence in 1992), at the Muller’s Barn at Pomona, and Mick Lymerys Barn at the foot of Cambewarra Mountain (Huttons farm in 1992), (Morschel 1992).

The Hall was demolished in the 1970s, presumably because the highway widening and re-alignment at this time, meant that safe access and use of the building was no longer possible. It is possible that the building was sold, transported and re-assembled in part of whole at a new location. There are local recollections that the building was re-assembled at, or salvaged materials were used in a building at Shoalhaven Heads (pers. comm. Rita Pheeney 2/5/2013, Patrick Muller 5/2013).

At the time of a 1974 Department of Main Roads plan, the owners as joint tenants of the lot on which the Hall was situated are noted as Albert Norman Muller, Thomas Hitchcock and William Wiley (DMR File Nos 1/404.159-20-23-27-30, Widening Roll 387).
Heritage Item: G2B H67

Figure C-92 General view of former Hall location, (middle distance) looking northeast

Figure C-93 View of the earth platform on which the former Hall was located, looking east

Figure C-94 Detail of low rock edged embankment along southern boundary of Hall allotment, looking east (scale = 2 m)
Heritage Item: **G2B H67**

**Figure C-95** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing former Hall on east side of Highway (left) (NSW 694-5070 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14 9/7/58)

**Figure C-96** Detail of Hall in 1958, from figure above.

**Figure C-97** Plan dated 1977 showing Hall, prior to its demolition necessitated by highway modification (DMR File Nos 1/404.159-20-23-27-30, Widening Roll 387)
**Heritage Item:** G2B H68

**Name/Description:** Site of former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory

**Item/Site Type:** Potential archaeological deposit

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 286041.6146381

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 5 DP 740764

**Street Address:** 25 Jaspers Brush Road, Jaspers Brush

---

**Context/Setting:** The factory was situated at the northeastern corner of the intersection of Jaspers Brush Road and the Highway. The site is situated on the north facing upper slopes of the Jaspers Brush spurline which is a low broad spur projecting in a south easterly direction onto the coastal plain and floodplain of Broughton Creek (Figure C-98).

**Description/Fabric:** The factory was apparently demolished sometime after its closure in 1938. A number of surface features relate to the former factory and its structures:

- A 19 metre ditch aligned northeast-southwest and draining into a natural gully, possibly situated at the back of the former factory complex (Figure C-99).

- The remnant eastern portion of a level earth building platform. This was originally more evident in 1958 when foundation elements in a grid pattern were discernible (Figure C-100).

- A scatter of building and occupation debris in an area of vegetation and erosion gullies, downslope of the former factory site (Figures C-101, C-102 and C-103).

Two buildings, facing the highway, are evidenced in early mapping from 1893 (Figure C-104), however it is not known if other buildings existed, possibly facing the southern side of the property along Jaspers Brush Road.

**Dimensions:** The site, as defined by surface features, includes an area of 90 x 45 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The site has been impacted by the creation of a new access road connecting the 1970s highway re-alignment with the earlier highway remnant and Jaspers Brush Road (Figure C-105 and Figure C-106). This has covered around half of the known extent of former structures, including the original road frontage. Ploughing may have been conducted over the remaining site area. The scatter of material to the downslope side of the site suggests the use of bulldozers during a demolition phase.

**Integrity:** The extent to which subsurface materials may survive or be disturbed is not known. The presence of surface archaeological material on the downslope side of the site, suggests that there may be a substantial density of material surviving subsurface.

**Associated Features:** None.

**Current Use:** Pasture.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.
Historical Background/Interpretation

The Jaspers Brush Butter Factory operated under the management of two successive companies. The first was the Jaspers Dairy Company, from 1888 to 1902, the second was the Jaspers Brush Dairy Company, from 1902 to 1938.

The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser reported on 8 March 1889 that the Jaspers Brush Dairy Company was ‘pushing on with the work of erecting their premises. The plant has been fitted up, and it is proposed to start working the factory within a fortnight’s time’.

In July of the same year the opening of a Post Office was reported (Australian Town and Country Journal 6 July 1889 p.14).

In his obituary, Mr David Thorburn is noted as having been ‘for years’ the chairman of the Jaspers Brush Co-operative Dairy Company. He was also one of the initiators in the establishment of the Coastal Farmers Co-operative Society (Northern Star 23 Jan 1904).

In 1890 the importance of the local butter factory in the social life of a settlement was noted in a description of the Jaspers Brush Butter Factory:

“Here there is a large butter factory. The farmers for miles round bring their milk, and this and other factories are becoming centres where the men who before “separators” were introduced, were really separated one from another, and only saw a newspaper one a week, meet and talk. Now the separators bring them together...

The wives and daughters of the dairy farmer have only as a memory the “white slavery” of which they were the subject; and the dairy and the churn and the labour they had to undergo every day, Sunday included...(Australian Town and Country Journal 29 March 1890).

In July 1898, the Jaspers Brush Dairy Company was reportedly the first factory to commence a new system of payment to milk suppliers based on the commercial butter contained in milk, instead of the “butter fat” (Clarence and Richmond Examiner 13 August 1898:4). This was a suggestion of a recent dairymans conference and it was hoped that its adoption would provide a uniform basis for payment across the South Coast (Northern Star 24 Aug 1898:2).

To improve butter production the government introduced rules for dairy supervision in 1899. These provided for the use of tank water instead of from creeks, that pigs should not be within 50 yards of factories, that tin vessels be replaced with zinc, and that dairy bails and yards should be paved and regularly swept (Bayley 1975:156). Pasteurisation was a contested development for the industry at the end of the nineteenth century, with some local businesses quickly adopting the process, while others delays and debated its merits. The Jasper Dairy Company adopted pasteurisation in 1899 (Northern Star 1 Mar 1899), but the Berry Central Creamery postponed installation until 1913 (Bayley 1975:157, 200).

The Jaspers Dairy Company claimed to be an innovator under the management of its engineer, Mr C. W. Wood, who moved from the butter producing district of Koroit in Victoria. In 1892 a series of newspaper articles described innovations by Mr Wood in controlling milk temperature during the separation process. A steam powered winch was also stated to be a local first. Mr Wood was described as taking steps to protect his innovations ‘by letters patent’ (The Capricornian 29 October 1892:4). Between 1897 and 1899, the factory was one of the first places to erect a facile or improved steam turbine Habcock machine for treating milk. By this time, the factory was separating cream and sending it to the Berry Central factory, as were most of the local Dairy companies (Sydney Morning Herald 10 Feb 1899). Mr Wood became the manager and engineer of the Illawarra Central Dairy Co. creamery at Albion Park in July 1899 (Northern Star 18 July 1899:8).

In November 1901, following negotiations with the Directors, the proprietor of the Berry Central Creamery made an offer to purchase the Jaspers Brush factory and plant provided the suppliers enter into an agreement to supply for two years (Kiama Reporter and Illawarra Journal 16 November 1901, Sydney Morning Herald 6 Nov 1901 p.11). This is an indication of the increasing centralisation of the industry at this time, and is probably related to the change to a new company for the factory in 1902.
The ‘Jasper Dairy Company,’ is listed on the Berry Estate 1903 List of Landholders as occupying nine acres, 0 roods and five perches (Mitchell Library Mss 315/110 Item 3).

In 1924 the Jaspers Brush Dairy Company acquired the Jaspers Brush branch of the Shoalhaven Milk and Ice Co. Ltd with capital of £2500. In 1927 the company installed a new fuel oil engine and compressor. It operated at a cost of 7 pence per hour, and reportedly enabled the factory to greatly increase its output (Sydney Morning Herald 28 Aug 1924:11, 15 Jan 1927:13). However, later that year the company was fined ten pounds for insanitary factory conditions, the repair of which had been delayed by contractor delays (Northern Star 23 July 1927:5).

In 1930 a profitable year was reported by the Jaspers Brush Dairy Company, however shareholders expressed alarm at the decision of milk companies to pay only 10½pence per gallon for milk, meaning that dairy farmers would soon only be receiving a price for milk equivalent to that for butter (Sydney Morning Herald 3 Dec 1930:11). In 1935 a profit of £46/3/6 was reported with a total of 506,250 gallons of milk being treated and despatched to Sydney (Sydney Morning Herald 2 December 1935:9). When the Milk Board demanded improvements in 1937 the Company offered the factory to the Fresh Food and Ice Company but in 1938 the factory was closed, with the company going into voluntary liquidation (Bayley 1975:200, Sydney Morning Herald 12 July 1938:17).

To date, no photos or illustrations of the Meroo Meadow or Jaspers Brush factories have been identified. Examples of local factories of roughly contemporary age and capacity are provided in Figure 4-21, and Figure 4-22 illustrates a suggested factory design from 1893.

The following description of the ‘compact butter factory known as Jaspers Brush’ was published as part of a series entitled ‘South Coast and its Factories’ in the Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser on 18 February 1890 (p.4):
Of relevance to an appreciation of the remaining archaeological traces at this site are the references to:

- The compact nature of the factory.
- The site comprising one acre, with an additional eight taken up with piggeries.
- A well, being the factory’s source of water.
Heritage Item: G2B H68 Site of former Jaspers Dairy Company and Jaspers Brush Dairy Company factory

Figure C-98 General view of former Butter factory site, middle distance, looking northwest

Figure C-99 Detail of ditch running southwest – north-east which may relate to the function and configuration of the former Butter Factory, looking south

Figure C-100 Looking north-east across earth platform of former butter factory building, which has been partially covered by the elevated road platform on the left
Heritage Item: G2B H68 Site of former Jaspers Dairy Company and Jaspers Brush Dairy Company factory

Figure C-101 General view of gully situated downslope of the factory site in which factory related debris and occupation rubbish has been dumped, looking north.

Figure C-102 Detail of cast iron panel, possibly the top of a pot belly stove.

Figure C-103 Detail of occupation debris visible in gully, including bottle glass and ceramic fragments.
Heritage Item: G2B H68 Site of former Jaspers Dairy Company and Jaspers Brush Dairy Company factory

Figure C-104 Sketch of Butter factory layout on an 1893 Berry Estate sales poster for The Jaspers Brush Farms (libraries Australia ID 44485223)

Figure C-105 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing original boundary fence, ditches, and evidence of a building foundation (inset) (NSW 698-5024 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/1958)

Figure C-106 2006 aerial view of former Butter Factory site, with overlay (yellow) of 1958 features evident in Figure above
**Heritage Item:** G2B H69

**Name/Description:** ‘Amaroo Park’ Former Jaspers Brush Post Office

**Item/Site Type:** Substantially modified early twentieth century cottage.

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 285882.6146264

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 1 DP 601531

**Street address:** 10A Jaspers Brush Road., Jaspers Brush

---

**Context/Setting:** The cottage is situated 130 metre west of the intersection of Jaspers Brush Road and the pre 1970s alignment of the Princes Highway. The cottage is situated on the upper south facing slopes of the Jaspers Brush spurline which is a low broad spur projecting in a south easterly direction onto the coastal plain and floodplain of Broughton Creek.

**Description/Fabric:** The interior and exterior of the cottage has been substantially modified to the point that it is difficult to recognise its former building configuration from the 1950s. The following modifications were noted:

- Filling in of the front veranda.
- Addition of a front gable extension to the eastern end of the house.
- Replacement of earlier back skillion extensions with a new extension, including a new roof with a north-south aligned ridge.
- Replacement of (1940s?) ‘Canberra’ wood fired stove with newer kitchen range. This may have involved the replacement of the upper chimney as the lower 800 millimetres is constructed from older sandstock bricks.
- Replacement of original floor piles.
- Removal of a number of internal walls.
- Reuse of some windows and doors in recent renovations.
- Veranda boards replaced.
- Awnings added.
- Verandas added to southern and back portions of eastern and western sides of house.

**Dimensions:**

- Modern house: 19 x 16.5 metres.
- 1950s house: approx. 12 x 14 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The current building is in excellent condition, however there is little visible original fabric (Figure C-107, Figure C-108 and Figure C-109).

**Integrity:** The building has a low level of integrity due to the extent of architectural modification.

**Associated Features:** None.

**Current Use:** Residential house.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.
Historical Background/Interpretation

The Jaspers Brush Post Office was established in July 1889. This was the same year as the opening of the Jasper’s Brush Dairy Company’s Butter Factory (Sydney Morning Herald 15 Jun 1889 p.8, Australian Town and Country Journal 6 July 1889 p.14).

The first post office is remembered to have operated from a house situated at the railway gates on Jaspers Brush Road (Railway Lane), but was later moved to the G2B H69 site, on the south side of the highway, between Strongs Road and Jaspers Brush Road (JBRC 1997).

A 1951 photograph shows the Jaspers Brush Post Office as a small gable roofed cottage with a single side chimney and veranda on the front, western and probably southern sides (Figure C-110). A small ‘lean-to’ is situated attached in front of the western end of the veranda. The room, thus made, is remembered to have been used as the Post Office. During recent renovations, newspapers from the 1940s and 1950s were encountered under the floor lining (pers. comm. Mrs Julie McQuarters, owner April 2012).

The current owners bought the property from the Callaghans in 2002, who had substantially extended the building at the back and re-aligned the roof into a T configuration (Figure C-111 and Figure C-112). The building by that time incorporated a substantial amount of fibro sheeting. The Callaghans are remembered to have had their first child in the house, and that Mr Callaghan was born in Jaspers Brush.
Heritage Item:  G2B H69  ‘Amaroo Park’ former Jaspers Brush Post Office

Figure C-107 View of former Post Office house, looking southeast

Figure C-108 View of the former Post Office house

Figure C-109 View of the former Post Office house
Heritage Item:  G2B H69   ‘Amaroo Park’ Former Jaspers Brush Post Office

Figure C-110 1951

Figure C-111 1991

Figure C-112 Aerial views
**Heritage Item:** G2B H70

**Name/Description:** ‘Hillview Park’

**Item/Site Type:** Substantially modified early twentieth century house

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 286720.6147118

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 42 DP 250662

**Street Address:** 480C Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

---

**Context/Setting:** This building is located adjacent to the highway, on the crest of a relatively narrow, almost east – west aligned, spurline which forms the watershed between Flying Fox Creek and Jaspers Brush Creek. A moderately graded slope and 50 metres separates this building and Flying Fox Creek to the north.

**Description/Fabric:** The building originally consisted of a small early twentieth century, weatherboard cottage, possibly dating around 1910, with a long hipped roof, parallel with the highway and a front projecting gable (Figure C-113). A small front veranda extended to the right of the front gable, and a rear veranda, subsequently filled in, may also have been present (Figure C-114 and Figure C-115). The walls and ceilings are covered with narrow tongue and groove panelling (Figure C-116). Some interior walls have been removed or altered (Figure C-117). Original windows consist of double hung sash windows with one or two panes per sash. The cottage rests on original sandstone block footings (Figure C-119).

A subsequent, separately roofed extension, possibly in the 1930s was added to the rear of the cottage, involving the loss of any original veranda and removal of windows (Figure C-118). This originally had a pyramidal roof, which has now been changed to include a long axis ridge connecting with the original cottage roof. A large modern partially enclosed porch with a concrete floor has been appended to the back of the earlier extension. The complex is currently being used as an office. Many walls in the 1930s extension have been modified as part of this office conversion. None of the original outbuildings or their configuration survive. The building on its southern and western sides is now surrounded by gravelled platforms, parking areas and modern storage sheds.

**Dimensions:** The original cottage had approximate dimensions of 14.5 x 9 metres. The current building is approximately 22 x 15 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The original building is in good to fair condition, requiring maintenance and replacement of some exterior elements including the front veranda decking and floor. The original front yard has been truncated by widening of the highway road reserve. The remaining original garden vegetation is now overgrown.

**Integrity:** The front exterior and rooms of the original cottage retain its original configuration, some window and door framing, and its wall/ceiling panelling. Some windows have been replaced with modern metal framed versions. An original window awning survives on the front gable. The rear portion of the house has been substantially modified to allow for modern office use and the attachment of modern extensions. The original context of the cottage is no longer present.

**Associated Features:** None.

**Current Use:** Office and administration block.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.
**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This cottage relates to the post Berry Estate development of this property, which consisted of Lot 49, of 87 acres, when the Estate was subdivided in the 1890s. The boundaries of this lot are inconsistent with the regular block divisions across much of the Estate (Figure C-120). This suggests that it was already a discrete farm entity when the Estate broke up, and may have been the subject of an early private sale to the occupying tenant farmer. This is supported by the fact that Lot 49 is not mentioned in the reported 1893 auction and sales results for the Estate (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3).

The extension to the original cottage, thought here to date to the 1930s, is remembered to have consisted of a separate home which was transported to its current location and later joined (Figure C-121).

Prior to being used as offices, the building was the home of an uncle of the current owner Mr Gary Rogers.
Heritage Item: G2B H70 ‘Hillview Park’

Figure C-113 View of front of original cottage, looking south-west

Figure C-114 Detail of front door, veranda and front gable with remaining awning

Figure C-115 Detail of veranda and front room windows, looking north
Heritage Item: G2B H70 ‘Hillview Park’

Figure C-116 Interior view of main corridor and front door

Figure C-117 Detail of former exterior back wall of 1930s extension. The windows may have been reused from the rear walls of the older cottage

Figure C-118 General view of southern side of building showing evidence of two sequential extensions from the original cottage
Heritage Item: G2B H70 ‘Hillview Park’

Figure C-119 Detail of under floor sandstone block footings in earliest (front) portion of building

Figure C-120 Extract from deposited plan DP4468 (1904), showing the boundaries of Lot 49 on which Hillview Park was built in the north-east corner

Figure C-121 Comparison of 1958 and 2006 aerial photography of Hillview Park (NSW 699-5055 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk12 23/7/58, Google Earth Pro 2006)
Heritage Item: G2B H71

Name/Description: ‘Fair View’

Item/Site Type: Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings

GDA Map Reference: 282356.6145374

Cadastral Location: Lot 3 DP 739850

Street Address: C480 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

Context/Setting: This group of buildings is situated on the south side of the highway, on the broad crest of a low spurline extending southwards onto the coastal plain and running parallel to Tandingulla Creek.

Description/Fabric: This property consists of an extensively renovated late nineteenth century or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse (Figure C-122 and Figure C-123). Two outbuildings dating from approximately the 1930s survive.

The homestead is of weatherboard over timber frame construction with a corrugated iron ‘U’ shaped ridgeline roof with two south facing hipped ends. The plan formally consisted of a square with a detached rear kitchen block. Verandas were present on the front, rear and eastern side.

The kitchen block has been removed and the eastern roof line extended as part of a recent extension (Figure C-124). An extensive new eastern wing has been added, which links a series of semi separate roofed structures with an overall southeast stepped alignment. Verandas now occur on all sides of the main original homestead block and have been re-decked and posted. At least two sizes of weatherboard are evident, suggesting some re-use and re-arrangement during a renovation phase. A range of window types is also evident, including 2 x 9 pane and 2 x 2 pane double sash windows, and multiple, mixed size panels of Federation style. This suggests the use of imported salvaged elements during, probably the latest, renovation stage.

The location and arrangement of the driveway has changed from an original front entrance to a rear side entrance. This has been accompanied with the development of a substantial ornamental garden and development of a new eastern rear wing. These changes are likely to have coincided with a change in function from a farm to a non-farm residence.

All but two of a large number of outbuildings have been demolished. Sandstone flagstones from a former dairy building have been used in garden landscaping. The two remaining outbuildings consist of:

- A corrugated north-south aligned iron clad, timber frame, low pitched gable roofed shed (Figure C-127).
- Two attached sheds: the eastern one being an east-west aligned timber frame, weatherboard, structure with a low pitched roof and no interior cladding or ceiling; the western one being a small weatherboard and interior (fibre board) lined shed, aligned north-south with a gable roof and a ceiling partly recessed into roof cavity. Slatted rectangular air vents are situated at the top of each gable wall. Original electrical fittings remain, dating to the first half of the twentieth century (Figure C-125 and Figure C-126).
Dimensions: Original homestead (incl. kitchen block) approx.: 20 x 12.5 metres. Outbuildings: single: 12 x 4.5 metres; twin attached: 10 x 4.5 metres. Current extended homestead complex: 38 x 32 metres.

Physical Condition: Main homestead building is in excellent and well maintained condition. The outbuildings are in good to fair condition and require some maintenance and repair.

Integrity: The main homestead has been substantially altered but retains many original elements and details.

The small 1930s interior lined outbuilding appears to be largely original and retains a high degree of integrity.

Associated Features: None.

Current Use: Residence.

Heritage Listings: No current listings.

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This homestead was developed following the post 1890s breakup of the Berry Estate. It is situated on former Lot 57 (35 acres) of the 1894 Meroo Subdivision which at that time formed part of an expanse of uncleared ‘Spotted Gum Forest’ that extended from Meroo Station (where the former Meroo Meadow Public School is located) in the west, to Wileys Creek in the east (DP3061). There are no structures shown on this lot in 1894 (1894 crown survey associated with DP3061).

Lot 57 of the Meroo Farms subdivision was purchased by a J. Hitchcock for £9 per acre (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3). Hitchcock also purchased the adjoining Lot 58 of 44 acres which was predominantly cleared, and opposite the Meroo Station.

A clearing sale by auction of ‘the whole of his extra choice stock and plant’ was held by a T. Hitchcock at his dairy farm at Meroo Meadow on 4 April 1945. The sale included ‘40 choice milking and springing cows’. This may relate to the Hitchcock Lots 57 and 58 land holding. The notice states an ‘absolute sale, as Mr Hitchcock has disposed of his property’ (Sydney Morning Herald 4 April 1945 p.13).

The current owner (since 1994), understands that the original homestead was built in 1894 (Figure C-128 and Figure C-129). The ‘Fair View’ name is thought to be the original property name. At one time a family with eight children resided in the home, all of the children sleeping on the veranda.
Heritage Item: G2B H71

Figure C-122 General view of front of homestead, looking south

Figure C-123 Front door of homestead, looking south-east

Figure C-124 Rear of homestead, note recent extension and removal of former detached kitchen, looking northeast
Figure C-125
Weatherboard outbuilding which retains original materials, finish and details, looking southeast

Figure C-126 Interior view of weatherboard outbuilding, looking south

Figure C-127
Corrugated iron clad outbuilding, looking south-west
Heritage Item:  **G2B H71**

**Figure C-128** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing former arrangement of G2B H71 as a dairy farm GK13 S034 NSW 698-5034 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58

**Figure C-129** Contemporary aerial photograph of G2B H71 (Google Earth Pro 2013)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Heritage Item:</strong></th>
<th>G2B H72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name/Description:</strong></td>
<td>[unnamed] Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item/Site Type:</strong></td>
<td>Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian cottage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **GDA Map Reference:** | 281951.6145600 |
| **Cadastral Location:** | Lot 102 DP 777264 |
| **Street Address:** | C441B Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow |

| **Context/Setting:** | This building is situated on a locally elevated minor spurline on the north side of, and overlooking, the highway, within the Tandingulla Creek catchment. |
| **Description/Fabric:** | This cottage is one of several buildings grouped together in a small radially arranged recently developed sub-division (Figure C-131, Figure C-131 and Figure C-133). This is the only remaining original building and comprises a small Victorian HardiPlank’ clad weatherboard cottage with a hipped (almost pyramidal) roof and verandas on its southern and eastern sides. There is a back projecting wing which incorporates a formerly detached kitchen block and is probably a former extension of an original square plan building. There are two brick chimneys, one being from the kitchen (Figure C-134). A 1958 aerial photograph shows the same configuration except for recent additions of a rear roofed patio and adjacent garage (Figure C-135). A small toilet enclosure is situated under the veranda at the northeastern corner of the cottage. This is a remnant of more extensive veranda infill now removed. The interior floors comprise original wide timber boards. The original sandstone footings are still present. |
| **Dimensions:** | (Excluding back deck): 17 x 12 metres. |
| **Physical Condition:** | The building is well maintained and its condition is very good. |
| **Integrity:** | The building displays a low degree of integrity due to the following changes and additions: |
| | • None of the earlier associated agricultural outbuildings survive (compare Figures C-135 and C-136). Original weatherboards replaced with HardiPlank boards. |
| | • Original windows replaced with modern metal frame versions. |
| | • French doors added to front. |
| | • Veranda ceiling lined, decking and poles replaced, and underfloor space enclosed with brick. |
| | • Roof has been internally reinforced. |
| | • Concrete paths and platform around eastern and southern sides of building. |
| | • A roofed patio has been attached to the back of the former kitchen block. |
| | • Separate garage. |
| **Associated Features:** | None. |
| **Current Use:** | Residence. |
| **Heritage Listings:** | No current listings. |
**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This cottage and farm was developed following the post 1890s breakup of the Berry Estate. The cottage appears to have formed the original farmhouse residence of the property which is situated on original Lot 67 (45 acres) of the 1894 Meroo Subdivision. At that time this formed part of an expanse of uncleared ‘Spotted Gum Forest’ that extended from Meroo Station (where the former Meroo Meadow Public School is located) in the west, to Wileys Creek in the east (DP3061). There are no structures shown on this lot in 1894 (1894 crown survey associated with DP3061).

Lot 67 and one or more adjacent lot were purchased from the Berry Estate in the 1890s by a C. Abernethy (sale records held by the Berry Museum). The Abernethy period of ownership appears to have been long enough to establish in the local vocabulary the name ‘Abernethy’s Bend’ for the adjacent and pronounced south-to-east highway bend.

It is possible that this property corresponds to ‘Bangalow Vale’ a successful Guernsey cattle Stud farm at Meroo Meadow which was run by C. Abernethy, (probably Christopher Abernethy) up until 1946 when it was sold and its stock dispersed. This stud farm was claimed to be one of the oldest Guernsey studs in NSW having been established in 1923. The farm achieved considerable fame and notoriety for its competition and show prizes, sought after stud lineages, and high prices achieved (**Figure C-130**). One hundred and thirty one head of cattle were sold for £5403 at the 1946 auction, averaging £41 per head (Northern Star 22 June 1946 pp.6 and 11).

![Figure C-130](image)

**Figure C-130** Dispersal sale notice for the ‘Bangalow Vale’ Guernsey Stud at Meroo Meadow (Sydney Morning Herald 24 May 1946 p.10).
Heritage Item: G2B H72 [unnamed] Cottage

Figure C-131 General view of front of cottage, looking north-west

Figure C-132 View of cottage looking west

Figure C-133 The western side of the cottage, looking north
Heritage Item: **G2B H72 [unnamed] Cottage**

**Figure C-134** Detail of kitchen block chimney

**Figure C-135** General and detail extracts from 1958 aerial photography showing G2B H72 cottage with former outbuildings (NSW 698-5034 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58)

**Figure C-136** Contemporary aerial photograph of G2B H72, showing current configuration as a residence (Google Earth Pro 2013).
**Heritage Item:** G2B H73

**Name/Description:** Site of former Berry Estate building complex

**Item/Site Type:** Potential archaeological deposit

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 281299.6145084

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 4 DP 589387

**Street Address:** 26A Boxsells Lane

---

**Context/Setting:** This site is located on a locally elevated alluvial terrace on the eastern side of Tandingulla Creek, approximately half way between the former Meroo Meadow Public School and the Meroo Union Church.

**Description/Fabric:** This site is the approximate location of a former group of Berry Estate farm buildings and fenced enclosures, known to be present in 1893 (Figure C-137, Figure C-138 and Figure C-139). This site may have been an Estate tenant farm or may have served a different purpose, such as being a part of Meroo Station a cattle station and mustering area on the estate (see discussion below). The site consists of a potential archaeological deposit situated in pasture grassland. There are no surface features which can be reliably linked to the former Berry Estate buildings formerly sited here. An overgrown hedge occurs in the northwestern portion of the area. The 1958 aerial photograph also shows a group of trees to the southeast of the hedge which may have been related to the former structures, (remnants of shade or garden plants) (Figure C-141 and Figure C-142).

**Dimensions:** This recording is an approximate location. The original buildings may have occupied an area of approximately 60 x 30 metres.

**Physical Condition:** Possible subsurface deposits only. It is likely that the area has been ploughed since the loss of the buildings. The construction of sewerage treatment ponds in the southwestern margin of the area could be expected to have removed any archaeological traces in this area.

**Integrity:** The integrity of any archaeological deposits is not known.

**Associated Features:** Two other nearby potential archaeological deposits (G2B H80 and H90) would be contemporary and may possibly be functionally related.

**Current Use:** Pasture grassland.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Buildings and fenced enclosures are shown in this location on an 1893 Sales Poster for the Meroo Farms subdivision of the Berry Estate (Figure C-140). The buildings are not indicated on a 1931 topographic map (1931 Nowra 1:63,360 topographic map).

The site is situated within Lot 49, but its function must significantly predate the subdivision because the associated enclosed and cleared lands continue across three of the lots. Two possible functions can be proposed. The first is that it represents a tenant farm. An alternative is that it is a group of additional or replacement buildings for Meroo Station, possibly constructed following the declaration of the Meroo Meadow public school reserve in the old station precinct in 1884. Meroo was originally an Estate cattle station which is known to have also served as a mustering area with cattle yards (NSW DoE 1967). The possibility of a second phase of station buildings is indicated in a letter to the Minister of Public Instruction, dated 19 January 1885 from Morton Smith, solicitors acting for David
Berry. Through his solicitors David Berry complained that the school site was too dangerous due to possible flooding and probable straying of cattle from nearby cattle yards. He noted that it was ‘in the middle of Meroo Station, close to the overseers house and stable, opposite his cattle yards, compelling him to remove and form a new station, erect new buildings and yards for the paltry compensation of £100’ (presumed from State Archives school file, presented in NSW DoE 1967).

The buildings may certainly have served as a farm residence for the purchaser (or their subsequent tenant) of Lot 49 (around 23 acres). The purchaser of Lot 49 is recorded as a W. McKerrow, for £15 ten shillings per acre (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3). McKerrow also purchased Lot 60, situated directly north. This lot is referred to in the sales records as ‘Comerfords’. W. McKerrow is likely to be William McKerrow who was elected an alderman of the Berry Municipality in the years 1892 and 1895 (Robson et al. 2008:27). In his obituary, William is noted as being born at Bradford, Yorkshire, England, and having gone to Bega (probably meaning Berry) on the NSW South Coast around 1878 (Northern Star 7 Aug 1936 p.8). He subsequently moved to the Bangalow district in Queensland around 1906. William and his wife had a family of eight children, one of whom, Isaac William McKerrow, was reportedly born in Berry around 1877 (Northern Star 7 September 1950 p.4). William died on the 31 July 1936 aged 83. All of his surviving family at that time variously resided in Queensland.

A ‘W. McKerrow is listed in the Berry Estate 1903 list of landholders as occupying 93, 65 and 77 acres, the latter being at ‘Long Nose’ (Mitchel Library Mss 315/110 Item 3).

William’s ownership of Lot 49 may have ended with his move to Bangalow, around 1906, some thirteen years after its purchase.

A brief note from a local Meroo Meadow oral source by Morschel (1992) states that a ‘Gladys Taylor lived opposite Pomona below [the Meroo Union] church’. This location tallies with the location of the G2B H73 buildings and may be a reference to their last resident prior to their end, by cause or action unknown.

Farm buildings were no longer present at this location in 1931 (Nowra 1:63, 360 topographic map June 1931 Australian Section Imperial General Staff).
Heritage Item: G2B H73 Site of former Berry Estate building complex

Figure C-137 General view of former building location (middle distance beyond pond), looking north

Figure C-138 General view of G2B H73 location (on terrace in middle distance) looking southwest from near Tandingulla Creek

Figure C-139 General view of G2B H73 location (on terrace in middle distance) looking south from Tandingulla Creek
Heritage Item: **G2B H73**  
Site of former Berry Estate building complex

**Figure C-140** Extract from 1893 Meroo Farms sales poster, showing former Berry Estate buildings and enclosures at G2B H73 (Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith., John Ewing licenced surveyor, NLA map-lfsp322-v)

**Figure C-141** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph of G2B H73 area (NSW 698-5034 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58)

**Figure C-142** Contemporary aerial photograph of G2B H73 area (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H73  Site of former Berry Estate building complex

Figure C-143 Extract from 1894 Deposited Plan of the Meroo subdivision of the Berry Estate, showing the enclosed cleared lands associated with G2B H73 (blue circle)
Heritage Item: G2B H74

Name/Description: ‘Abernethy’s Bend’

Item/Site Type: Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDA Map Reference:</th>
<th>281908.6145465 to 281550.6145321</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Location:</td>
<td>Lots 11 and 12 DP 596623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address:</td>
<td>Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context/Setting: This remnant portion of highway is located on the northern side of the current highway and traverses basal slopes around the edge of the valley floor of Tandingulla Creek.

Description/Fabric: This remnant was bypassed in the late 1970s or early 1980s and follows the alignment of the original Berry Estate Road dating from 1858/69. The original bend appeared to have been a sharp corner, which had been smoothed out by 1894 (Figures C-144 and C-145).

This site consists of the former highway road reserve and traces of former boundary fencelines; remnant ground relief which describes the highway earthworks, ditches, cuttings and platform etc; and remnants of the road surface and shoulders. The latter are limited to a 100 metre portion of surviving bitumen surface at the eastern end of the remnant. The blacktop is approximately five metres in width. Elsewhere the former road platform and surface is difficult to discern, presumably due to rehabilitation works including filling, grading and re-contouring, ripping and removal of bitumen, and re-seeding of pasture grasses. Some stock yards have been built at the western end of the bitumen remnant, suggesting that this surface was specifically left to provide vehicle access to the yards (Figure C-146).

With the exception of two remnant two rail fence posts, just west of the stock yards, all fences, where they remain on former reserve boundaries, are modern. The two exceptions are split wooden posts (10 metres apart) situated along the former northern reserve boundary (Figures C-147). These belonged to the southwestern portion of a fenced enclosure in the adjacent property which is evident as a functioning fence in the 1958 aerial photograph (Figure C-148). Typical measurements are:

- Height above ground: 1230 millimetres
- Post width: 190 millimetres
- Post thickness: 100 millimetres
- First through-mortise hole: 130 mm below top, centred within post width, 180 x 95 millimetres rectangle
- Second through-mortise hole: 330 mm below base of first mortise hole, 200 x 100 millimetres rectangle

Dimensions: Remnant is 440 metres along alignment, and original reserve width averaged 22 metres (Figure C-149).

Physical Condition: The condition of the highway traces and reserve is fair to poor. The land involved is well grassed and stable.

Integrity: This remnant has a low degree of integrity due to the rehabilitation work which have been conducted to return the area to productive and stable agricultural land.

Associated Features: The following recordings comprise other remnants of the Princes Highway dating from this period: G2B H6, H8.
**Current Use:** Pasture grassland.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This remnant was bypassed in the late 1970s or early 1980s and follows the alignment of the original Berry Estate Road dating from 1858/69. The original bend appeared to have been a sharp corner, which had been smoothed out by 1894 (Figures C-150, C-151 and C-152). This alignment then remained as a part of the functioning highway until the bypass.

The remaining traces of highway platform and surface relate to the late 1970s rather than the nineteenth century age of the highway alignment.

The prominence and relative acuteness of this highway bend meant that it became a local landmark and was referred to as ‘Abernethy’s Bend’ after the adjacent property owned by Christie Abernethy (pers. comm. Mrs Nancy Bevan, BDHS 30/4/2013). Refer G2B H72 description for further information on this property.
Heritage Item:  G2B H74 ‘Abernethy’s Bend’

Figure C-144 Highway remnant at its eastern end, looking west (yellow dotted line traces alignment of former highway)

Figure C-145 The western portion of the remnant, looking south

Figure C-146 The eastern portion of the remnant, looking east, note remnant two rail fence posts on former northern road reserve boundary
Heritage Item: G2B H74 ‘Abernethy’s Bend’

Figure C-147 Detail view of remnant two rail fence post, looking east, scale numbers are in 10 centimetre intervals.

The two remaining (two rail) fence posts on the northern reserve boundary formed part of this enclosure, which was functional and intact in 1958.

Figure C-148 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing highway following original 1858/69 Berry Estate Road alignment (NSW 698-5034 & 5036 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58)

Figure C-149 Contemporary aerial photograph showing current highway alignment and bypassed remnant (indicated by yellow dashed line) (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H74  ‘Abernethy’s Bend’

Figure C-150 Extract from 1862 crown survey of Berry Estate Road showing original sharp bend in alignment (thick red line) and built features present prior to road construction: former tracks (narrow brown line), Meroo Station (black rectangle) and fenced enclosures (hatched lines) (Certificate of Title R193a-1603).

Figure C-151 Extract from 1894 Deposited Plan of the Meroo subdivision of the Berry Estate, showing the road alignment with a smoothed out bend, as it would remain till the late 1970s.

Figure C-152 Department of Main Roads (DMR) plan dated 1977 showing planned highway realignment and G2B H74 remnant (DMR File Nos 1/404.159-20-23-27-30, Widening Roll 387, courtesy of, and original in collection of, Mr & Mrs North, former Meroo Meadow Public School)
Heritage Item: G2B H75

Name/Description: Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit (approximate location)

GDA Map Reference: 281042.6143872 (refer Appendix A mapping for area extent)

Cadastral Location: May be situated within:
- Lot 4 DP 1127817
- Lot 6 DP 740322
- Lot 1 DP 249085

Street Address: May be situated within:
- 43 Fletchers Lane
- 1003 Meroo Road
- 1028 Meroo Road
all at Meroo Meadow

Context/Setting: The location of this site has been identified with a certain degree of uncertainty. The area within which the site is thought to occur is roughly 280 x 220 metres. This area comprises generally flat or slightly elevated land to the east of the highway and south of Tullian Creek (Figure C-153). It forms part of a broad, low gradient, margin of land which separates the former wetland basins of the Broughton Creek floodplain from the higher gradient foothills and tributary gullies of the Cambewarra Range. It is characterised by meandering creeklines, adjacent floodplains, and minor rises formed from higher terrace remnants and bedrock toe-slopes. The northern margin of the potential site area has been substantially modified by straightening of the formerly meandering course of Tullian Creek, which was conducted by the Department of Main Roads post 1975 as part of flood mitigation works associated with a highway upgrade (compare Figures C-154 and C-155).

Description/Fabric: There are no surface landscape features which can be definitively identified as traces of the former factory. The house and outbuildings of the ‘Maylands’ farm (G2B H85) occurs within the potential site area, however none of these structures appear to be either old enough (ie dating from between 1899 and 1906), or to have characteristics that would suggest a former dairy factory origin (Figure C-158).

The most suggestive feature is an area of apparently levelled, low relief earth platforms situated just southwest of the Maylands milking bails. There are some roughly rectangular edges, suggesting that they once may have been associated with buildings (Figure C-156 and Figure C-157).

Dimensions: The area within which the site is thought to occur is roughly 280 x 220 metres. The area of apparently levelled earth platforms occurs within an area of approximately 30 x 30 metres.

Physical Condition: The area within which the site is thought to occur has been subject to a range of disturbances since the operation of the factory. These include, the upgrading and raising of the current highway platform, construction of the ‘Maylands’ farm, use of an area adjacent to Meroo Road as a materials depot, presumably for road maintenance, straightening of Tullian Creek, and possible ploughing and cultivation. It is not known if these disturbances have impacted any remains of the factory.

Integrity: The integrity of any surviving archaeological deposits is not known.
**Associated Features:** None identified to date

**Current Use:** The area within which the site is thought to occur is currently used for grazing, a residence, storage sheds, and road/highway reserve.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

The Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. operated a factory between 1899 and 1906 (Bayley 1975:154). The factory appears to have commenced as a creamery, but is later described as a butter factory in 1904 (Northern Star 24 Aug 1904 p.5).

**The location of the factory**

There are four sources of information, identified to date, which provide locational information about the factory.

Bayley, presumably quoting a newspaper article, states that ‘the Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. was built… on the creek beside the Nowra-Berry Road, on land owned by D. Fletcher (Bayley 1975:154). David Fletcher is remembered to have bought Lot 35 (51 acres) of the Meroo Farms subdivision from George Purdie who bought it at the Berry Estate auction in 1893 (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3, pers. comm. Mrs Nancy Bevan 2/5/2013, George was Nancy’s grandmother’s uncle). The lane running along the southern boundary of Lot 35 is now named Fletchers Lane. Lot 36, the property to the north of Lot 35, was bought by McGill in the 1893 Berry Estate Auction (pers. comm. Nancy Bevan 2/5/2013). This isolates the Fletcher holding, at the time of the factory, to the eastern side of Meroo Road, at its intersection with the current highway, inclusive of Tullian Creek. Given that Meroo Road formerly functioned as the main road between Bomaderry and Meroo, this information supports the Bayley reference and indicates that the factory was on the east side of the road and in the vicinity of Tullian Creek.

A manuscript of documented oral history from the Meroo Meadow district in 1992 states that ‘the Meroo Dairy Co. was situated near Tullian Creek, near Pheeney’s Farm. The milk was separated - the cream was left at the factory and the milk taken home for the pigs’ (Morschel 1992). Fletcher sold Lot 35 to Woods, who later sold to Pheeney around 1924 (pers. comm. Mrs Rita Pheeney 2/5/2013). Pheeney’s four year old son at the time, Eric, became the husband of Rita who still resides at the ‘Maylands’ family farmhouse former Lot 35. This tradition therefore corroborates Bayley’s information and narrows the potential site to being near Tullian Creek, and near to the Pheeney farm. The latter could be a reference to the whole property, but is more likely to refer to the actual home which is situated within 60 metres of the creek.

Morschel goes on to add that ‘it was common for the local farmers to have derbies with their horses and cart when taking the milk to the factory. Mr Bert Muller was a local milk carrier and when the Meroo Factory closed he transported the milk to the Jaspers Brush Factory’ (Morschel 1992).

Florey Bell, an aunt of Rita Pheeney told her that the factory used to be situated in the three corner block between Meroo Road, the highway and the unformed eastern extension of Pestells Lane (pers. comm. Mrs Rita Pheeney 2/5/2013). This reference places the factory on the west side of Meroo Road, but still near its intersection with the highway, and at least 100 metres south of the creek. It is contrary however to the placement of the factory on land owned by Fletcher which was to the east of Meroo Road.

George Morschel recalls that ‘a couple of girders’ had for a long time been situated on the ground near where Meroo Road joins the highway, and he presumed that these were remnants of the factory (pers. comm. Nancy Bevan 2/5/13). No trace of girders was identified during field inspections for this assessment, and although the origin of the girders is only presumed, this information supports the currently identified area of site potential, and indicates the former presence of potentially industrial remnant architectural elements.
Based on the above information, an area has been defined within which the former factory site is likely to be situated (Figure C-159). This consists of a block of ground which:

- Extends at least 100 metres to the east of the highway.
- Has a northern boundary corresponding with the northern boundary of former Lot 35.
- Includes 300 metres of the former alignment of Tullian Creek downstream and east of the highway.
- Includes the majority of the ‘Maylands’ farm complex and the higher ground it is situated on.
- Includes an area 50 metres to the west, and at least 90 metres east of Meroo Road, and extending southwards for 180 metres from its intersection with the highway.

Based on an appreciation of the likely constraints for the siting of the factory, existing surface features, and the occupational history of the lot, a probable location for the factory is considered to be the open space to the northwest of the ‘Maylands’ milking bails, where an area of apparently levelled earth platforms are evident (Figure C-162).

Likely factory siting constraints:

- Proximity to a dependable and pumpable fresh water source (such as a well or Tullian Creek).
- Proximity to a main road (for ease of deliveries).
- Minimisation of risk from flooding (ie use of locally elevated ground where available).

Surface features or history relevant to factory siting:

- The most locally elevated land is a slight east-west linear rise on which the ‘Maylands’ buildings are situated.
- A potential location immediately adjacent to the highway crossing of Tullian Creek is spatially constrained by the meandering course of the creek and vulnerability to flooding.
- A site on the north bank of Tullian Creek would have necessitated a bridge or access permission across the abutting northern property.
- Given the potential chronological overlap in the presence of the factory buildings with both older on-site Berry Estate buildings (Figure C-160), and the probably later ‘Maylands’ buildings, the factory location could be expected to be exclusive of both the former and later building locations (Figure C-161 and Figure C-163).

Historical outline

In February 1899 it was reported that ‘a movement is now on foot to establish a separating station at Meroo, about five miles on the Nowra side of Jaspers Brush. His locality is much favoured as regards grazing capabilities. Settlement is increasing, and it is therefore anticipated the new station will become an important one’ (Sydney Morning Herald 10 February 1899 p.3).

The Meroo Meadow Dairy Company’s creamery’ was formally opened on 8 May 1899 (Sydney Morning Herald 9 May 1899 p.7).

Just prior to start-up, the provisional directors of the company were reported to be J. McGrath, J. Muller, W. Woods, W. T. McGrath, J. Woods, G. Smith and F. G. Sinclair. A Mr W. Winkens was reported to be the Manager (Sydney Morning Herald 21 March 1899 p.5).

Bayley states that a John Wickens was the first manager and engineer and that the factory was built by G. and M [George and Martin] Muller. It was reportedly the fourth separating station within a two mile radius supplying the Berry Central Factory with cream. It included a cream cooler and pasteuriser (Bayley 1975:154, Sydney Morning Herald 9 May 1899).
Just six months into the life of the factory, ‘much dissatisfaction’ was reported ‘amongst its suppliers owing to the low returns of butter received from Sydney’ and therefore low consequential payment for milk. As a result of ‘canvassing’ prior to a shareholders meeting, Messrs Dauham and Foley survived a vote and ‘it was decided to give them another trial’. Accusations that the factory machinery was inferior were shown to be wrong based on tests of the skim milk produced (The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 2 November 1899 p.2). Shortly afterwards, a Mr Curl was appointed Manager of the Meroo Meadow Dairy Company’s ‘creamery’ in 1900 (Northern Star 13 June 1900 p.1).

In January 1900, the company reported that 167,222 gallons of milk had been separated in the preceding year, producing 66,877 pounds of commercial butter. Suppliers were paid for 59,814 pounds of butter fat with an average price of 10.38 pence per pound, equal to 3.71 pence per gallon for milk (Australian Town and Country Journal 20 January 1900:19).

Another engineer of the factory was Mr Adam Jarman who had formerly been the engineer to the Berry Butter Factory, which operated between 1889 and 1901. In 1901, it was reported that Jarman had been appointed manager of the Meroo Meadow factory, the salary range being from £15 to £20 per month. Twenty five applications had been submitted for the position (The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 21 June 1901 p.2). Jarman’s obituary states that this appointment followed postings at the factories of Foxground, Robertson Park, Braidwood and Bengelala, and that this was a period of centralisation in the industry with commercial advantage going to the larger and centralised factories. Jarman was subsequently appointed to foreman butter maker at the Nowra Butter factory where he remained till retirement in the mid 1920s (Shoalhaven News 22 Jul 1942).

The ‘Meadow Factory’ is listed on the Berry Estate 1903 List of Landholders as occupying 3 acres (Mitchell Library Mss 315/110 Item 3).

In 1904 a rumour was published by the Northern Star that the ‘Meroo Meadow butter factory’ would close shortly, ‘owing to the continued secession of suppliers (24 August 1904 p.5).

The factory closed in 1906 (Bayley 1975:154). It is not known how, or if, the factory was subsequently reused, salvaged or demolished.
Heritage Item: G2B H75  Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory

Figure C-153 General view of the northern margin of recording G2B H75, showing the fenceline boundary and straightened course of Tullian Creek, looking west

Figure C-154 General view of northern margin of recording G2B H75, showing straightened course of Tullian Creek, looking east from the highway

Figure C-155 General view of the northern portion of recording G2B H75, looking west towards the highway and the Exeter farmhouse (G2B H77) beyond
Heritage Item: G2B H75  Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory

Figure C-156 General view (above) of ‘Maylands’ farm buildings, looking east from Meroo Road, showing area of apparent levelled earth platforms (yellow dotted circle) which may be the location of a former factory.

Figure C-157 General view (right) of the southwestern portion of recording G2B H75, between Meroo Road and the highway, looking southwest.

Figure C-158 An example of a factory roughly comparable with Meroo Meadow, the Berry Butter Factory (1889 – 1901), this view dated 1891 (from ‘Shoalhaven Estate’ p.19, Wollongong City Library no. P03/P03737, courtesy Berry and District Historical Society).
Heritage Item:  **G2B H75**  
Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory

**Figure C-159** Extract from 1893 sales poster showing Berry Estate structures present on Lot 35 prior to the factory (15 March 1893 auction of the berry Estate ‘Meroo Farms’ NLA nla.map-lfsp322-v)

**Figure C-160** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing ‘Maylands’ farm (G2B H85), and the area of recording G2B H75 (NSW 694-5072 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk14 9/7/58)

**Figure C-161** Contemporary aerial photograph showing area of recording G2B H75 (orange) and general area of apparent levelled earth platforms which, based on current evidence, is considered to be a possible location of the factory (blue). Note creek straightening in northern portion of area.
Heritage Item: **G2B H75  Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory**

**Figure C-162**
Orthophotomap with combined historical overlays based on previous figures, showing a possible factory location relative to potential factors influencing factory location:

- Yellow curvilinear = former creek alignment
- Yellow rectangular = Pre 1893 Berry Estate structures
- Red = 1958 ‘Maylands’ dairy farm buildings
- Orange = area within which factory may have been situated
- Blue = approximate area of apparently levelled earth platforms and possible factory location

**Figure C-163** Extract from aerial photograph showing ground disturbance related to highway upgrade works in 1975 (NSW 2528-27 Run SS15 SHI BULLI – VICTORIAN BORDER)
Heritage Item: G2B H76
Name/Description: ‘Northcote’
Item/Site Type: Early twentieth century farmhouse and outbuildings and potential archaeological deposits of earlier structures

GDA Map Reference: 286139.6146315
Cadastral Location: Lot 5 DP 740764
Street Address: 25 Jaspers Brush Road

Context/Setting: This site is situated on the north side of Jaspers Brush Road, on north facing upper slopes of a broad elevated spurline which runs northwest – southeast, to the south of Jaspers Creek. This spur provides the geographic focus for the Jaspers Brush settlement.

Description/Fabric: This site consists of the ‘Northcote’ farmhouse, disused dairy and feed stall outbuildings, two rail wooden fences, and associated potential archaeological deposits from earlier structures (Figure C-164).

Farmhouse
The farmhouse was originally a small Victorian timber frame and weatherboard cottage with four rooms and a kitchen block, a central corridor, high pitched hipped corrugated iron roof, and verandas on four sides (Figure C-165). The former kitchen block projects from the back side of the house, creating an ‘L’ roof configuration. The kitchen hearth is the source of the only chimney projecting from the roofline.

A number of 2 x 6 pane double sash windows are thought to be original, or reworked original frames. A number of 2 x 4 pane double sash windows probably date from recent renovations. Several windows in the southwestern portion of the building feature awnings of a Federation style and were salvaged and reused from a separate building in Tomerong. During renovation of the kitchen block, it was noted that the studs appeared to be hand sawn and the walls were constructed using a wattle and daub technique. The weatherboards are thought to be original, as are the French doors on the western side of the house (pers. comm. Bob Pastor, owner 27/4/2012).

The building has been extended with a new wing on the southeastern end of the original building and a further skillion extension (Figure C-166). A new veranda extends to the east of the extension.

Other changes and additions noted are:
- Verandas have been stripped, widened and boarding replaced. Concrete deck under western veranda.
- Footings under at least the eastern veranda have been replaced with new brick piles. Underneath the house the footings consist of round timber piers.
- New separate and detached garage complex at back of house (Figure C-167).
- Laundry and toilet added.
- Some of the veranda brackets have been replaced with copies of older examples.
A wooden post and two rail fenceline (approximately 100 metres long) is present along the Jaspers Brush Road property frontage south of the old dairy. It is in good condition and is likely to be an original fenceline repaired and maintained by salvaging elements from more deteriorated examples from the local area (Figure C-169).

**Outbuildings**

The disused dairy complex includes a timber frame and weatherboard milking bails shed and an attached concrete walled room and partition; a number of concrete slabs, some with drains, indicative of former structures, and a timber frame and weatherboard feed stalls and associated storage room (Figure C-168, Figure C-169, Figure C-170, Figure C-171, Figure C-172 and Figure C-173). All with corrugated iron roofs. The timbers used in the outbuildings include materials salvaged from the former Jaspers Brush dance hall which ‘fell down’ after strong winds in 1949 (pers. comm. Bob Pastor, owner 27/4/2012, JBRC 1997).

Two sheds, now connected by a skillion roof but with contrasting gable roofline orientations, are situated 30 metres to the rear of the house. These are no longer part of the property but probably belonged to the Northcote complex originally (Figure C-174). These buildings were not inspected for this assessment.

**Potential archaeological deposits**

A number of former structures are indicated on this property by an 1886 survey plan of the proposed Kiama to Nowra railway. These features are identified as the ‘House and Garden’ of Thomas Hooligan, the lessee at the time (NSWLA 1890) (Figure C-174). There are two buildings indicated. If the 1886 survey is overlayed and aerial photograph, a ‘best fit’ alignment places one of the buildings immediately adjacent to the western side of the existing house. This may be a correct indication of two phases of building, or the existing house has a pre-1886 origin. The fact that a sales poster for the Berry Estate subdivision c.1892/93 shows no buildings in this location (whilst indicating buildings elsewhere) suggests otherwise (no date ‘Coolangatta and Berry Estates Subdivision No. 1 Dobbie and Kenny Surveyors, William Brooks & Co Ltd Lithograph). The other building was located some 45 metres north of the existing house (Figure C-175 and Figure C-176). There are no obvious surface indications of these former structures at these approximate locations.

**Dimensions:**

The whole building group occurs over a distance of 100 metres. The house has approximate dimensions: 19 x 17 metres. The original house had approximate dimensions: 16 x 12 metres. The dairy outbuildings and platforms occur within an area of 52 x 17 metres.

**Physical Condition:**

The farmhouse is in an excellent and well maintained condition. The outbuildings are in a fair condition and require repair and maintenance.

**Integrity:**

The farmhouse has been substantially renovated and modified, involving the replacement of much of the original materials and extensions to the eastern and back (southern) aspects of the building. The verandas have been widened. The front section of the house retains an original configuration and many of the early characteristics of the house.

The outbuildings have a considerable degree of integrity (probably dating from the middle of the first half of the twentieth century), although most internal dairy fittings and infrastructure are missing.

The potential presence of archaeological deposits related to the earlier Berry Estate structures is subject to confirmation. The integrity of such deposits is not known, however it is likely that disturbance has occurred as a result of subsequent building phases, and the erosion of farm tracks.
**Associated Features:** The use of materials salvaged from the former Jaspers Brush Hall in 1949 means that the outbuildings are associated with the Hall and its history (not described for this assessment as the physical locality of the former Hall was removed in highway excavations and no longer exists).

**Current Use:** Residence.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This property was a tenant farm when part of the Berry Estate. It became Lot 221 of 45 acres when the estate was subdivided in the 1890s.

A long narrow fenced enclosure and two buildings are indicated on this property on an 1886 survey plan of the proposed Kiama to Nowra railway (**Figure C-174**). These features are identified as ‘cattle yards’ and the ‘House and Garden’ of Thomas Hoolihan, the lessee at the time (NSWLA 1890) (**Figure C-174**).

Thomas Hoolihan first appears in the Berry Estate returns for 1875. He is noted as leasing 40 acres, at Jaspers Brush and having rented since 1871. His listing is repeated for the years 1881 to 1885. In 1887 his lease is listed as 54 acres, and this is repeated in 1891 and 1893 (Berry Estate Returns, Mitchell Library Reel CY4412).

If the 1886 survey is overlayed on an aerial photograph, a ‘best fit’ alignment places one of the buildings immediately adjacent to the western side of the existing house (**Figure C-175**). This may be an indication of two phases of building, or alternatively the overlay is slightly skewed and the existing house dates back to this time. The latter possibility is supported by the fact that the 1886 building and garden enclosure approximate the same orientation north-south alignment as the current house and garden - an angle which parallels the eastern boundary of the farm, but which is otherwise difficult to explain based on the modern landscape.

Doubt about a nineteenth century origin for the farmhouse however is raised by the fact that a sales poster for the Berry Estate subdivision c.1892/93 shows no buildings in this location (whilst indicating buildings elsewhere) (no date ‘Coolangatta and Berry Estates Subdivision No. 1 Dobbie and Kenny Surveyors, William Brooks & Co Ltd Lithograph).

Further research would be required to further clarify the age of the farmhouse.

The current husband and wife owners, bought the property in 1984 from the wife’s parents. Many elements of the building, including wall lining and flooring had to be replaced due to borer attack. During renovations, stripping and recladding of the kitchen block interior revealed wattle and daub wall construction and apparently hand sawn timber studs (pers. comm. Bob Pastor 27/4/2012).

The outbuildings were built by Ken Ison, the brother of the father of one of the current owners.

The McIntyres are remembered to have owned the property for a period of time. The Hessenburgers rented the house for a period and had infilled some of the veranda space.
Heritage Item: G2B H76 ‘Northcote’

Figure C-164 General view of Northcote house and disused dairy outbuildings, looking southeast

Figure C-165 Front view of Northcote house, looking southeast

Figure C-166 View of eastern side of house, showing recent back extensions, looking southwest

Figure C-167 View of back of house, showing recent extensions, new garage complex (right) and awnings reused from an unrelated building
Heritage Item: G2B H76 ‘Northcote’

Figure C-168 View of disused dairy, looking northwest

Figure C-169 View of disused dairy and associated post and rail fencing, looking north

Figure C-170 View of disused dairy, looking south
Heritage Item: G2B H76 ‘Northcote’

Figure C-171 View of feed stalls, looking north

Figure C-172 External detail of feed stalls, looking southeast

Figure C-173 Internal detail of feed stalls, looking southeast
Heritage Item: **G2B H76 ‘Northcote’**

**Figure C-174** Extract from 1890 Parliamentary Plan of proposed Kiama to Nowra railway (NSWLA1890), showing leaseholding of Thomas Hooligan (survey conducted in 1886)

**Figure C-175** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing Northcote house and outbuildings (NSW 698-5024 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/1958)

**Figure C-176** Recent aerial photograph of Northcote with ‘best fit’ overlay of Berry Estate tenant farm (houses, garden stock yard and fencelines) as of 1886 (Google Earth Pro 2013)
**Heritage Item:** G2B H77

**Name/Description:** ‘Exeter’

**Item/Site Type:** Federation/Edwardian style farmhouse with Arts and Crafts features, and remnant silo.

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 280842.6144094

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 4 DP 249085

**Street Address:** C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

---

**Context/Setting:** This homestead and former farm complex is located at the southern end of a locally prominent but low elevation, north-south orientated spurline which forms the watershed between Tandingulla Creek in the east, and Tullian Creek to the west and south. The spur has been truncated by Tullian Creek which flows around the western and southern basal slopes of the spur.

**Description/Fabric:** This site originally comprised a locally distinctive and visually prominent homestead together with a complex of outbuildings including a high concrete silo (Figure C-177, C-178 and C-179). None of the outbuildings except for the silo remain evident. The homestead was extensively renovated in 2008 and has been extended with a large western wing addition (Figure C-180, C-181 and C-182). The homestead is constructed in a Federation/Edwardian style with Arts and Crafts features which are unusual to the local area, including shingled hipped gables and gambrel roof.

The homestead is of timber frame and weatherboard construction with a corrugated iron roof. The roof and building has a complex arrangement including the following features (Figures C-180, C-181 and C-182):

- A high, and main, east-west ridge with distinctive shingled hipped gables and two pane attic windows.
- Two hipped side projections at the western end of the original building plan: one to the south with a projecting bay window set under a lowered and protruding extension of the roof line; and one to the north.
- A north extending gable roofed wing with two thirds Federation style conservatory window walls on its three exterior sides.
- Original verandas on the eastern and southern sides of the building, possibly also originally along some or all of the western side prior to extensions.
- Three original chimneys, two internal and one on northern exterior wall.
- A large western projecting extension from the original northwestern corner of the building was constructed in 2008. The extension includes north and west facing verandas and has been completed in a style sympathetic to the original building.
- A separate residential block, in a contrasting modern style, has been constructed immediately adjacent and northeast of the homestead. The blank, featureless rear wall of this structure faces the highway and, although not obscuring the view of the homestead, it presents an incongruous contrast to the original building, and is contextually intrusive.
The concrete silo is described by the as having a rusked roof structure and a construction date of c.1935 (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390227).

The silo is a single concrete silo, with a rusked rib structure (Figure C-184). The out buildings are in poor condition (Figure C-184).

The building is intact and in original condition but is lacking in recent maintenance. The paint work is in poor condition. It needs a good colour scheme

**Dimensions:** The original homestead had approximate dimensions of 16 x 15 metres. The recently extended building has approximate dimensions of 16 x 25 metres. The silo has an approximate diameter of 4.6 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The condition of the homestead is excellent. None of the outbuildings, except for the silo, are standing or have obvious surface traces. The timber and iron roof of the silo is no longer present.

**Integrity:** The homestead retains much of its original configuration and architectural detail (Figure C-185). The 2008 extension is in a sympathetic style and has not resulted in a substantial loss of aesthetic value. The integrity of the homestead context has been substantially impacted by the nearby construction of a modern separate residential building, and by the loss of the agricultural outbuildings. The southern vistas to and from the building retain a working agricultural character (Figure C-186 and Figure C-187).

**Associated Features:** The possibility that 'Exeter' was built by George Muller would mean that it shares an association with other buildings with this origin, including ‘Lynburn’ Bomaderry, ‘Mananga’ Berry, and ‘Pomona’ (G2B H46).

**Current Use:** Residence

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This farmhouse was developed following the subdivision of the Berry estate in the 1890s. At the time of the subdivision survey in 1894, the building was not present and the top of the spurline and eastward slopes to the main road were wooded with spotted gum forest. The west and southern slopes were cleared and fenced, as were the flats of Tullian Creek, all of which appear to have formed part of a tenant farm, referred to as 'Horgans', being a group of buildings situated on the edge of a terrace, 500 metres along, and north of, Pestells Lane (refer recording G2B H92) (1894 DP3061, Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3).

A James Horgan is listed in the Berry Estate Returns for 1875 as leasing 33 acres, and having started the lease in 1871 (Mitchel Library Reel CY4412). There are no other listings in later years however.

In 1893, the ‘Exeter’ property was comprised of Lot 42 (53 acres), and included the ‘Horgans’ farm buildings, 330 metres to the west of the future homestead site. Results of the 15 March 1893 auction state that Lot 42 was purchased by J. Chisholm for £25 per acre (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3). However, the Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory states that Lot 42 was purchased from the Berry Estate by William Chisholm on 21 March, 1896 (no. 2390227). William Chisholm may have commissioned the building of ‘Exeter’. He lived in the Berry district all his life and for the 14 years before his death worked at the Berry Experimental Farm. He was a son of Sergeant Chisholm and born in Kiama. William Chisholm died as a result of an accident in 1930 aged 63 years. He was survived by his wife Sarah, and four children (Sydney Morning Herald 11 March 1930 p.10). Mr Arthur John Herne of Cambewarra Road, Bomaderry, owned the homestead, dairy, silo and bails etc in the 1950s. In 1968 the property was transferred to Ernest A and Daphne Herne (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no.2390227).
‘Exeter’ is thought to have been built by George Muller, builder of the adjacent "Pomona" (G2B H46) (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no.2390227). Mrs Rita Pheeney, long-time owner and resident (since 1944) of ‘Maylands’, situated opposite to ‘Exeter’, reiterates this origin and adds that the building was Muller’s home for a time (pers. comm. Rita Pheeney 2/5/2013). A recent real estate description of ‘Exeter’ stated its construction date to be around 1899 (http://www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/Rural/NSW/Meroo-Meadow/?adid=2009107769).
Heritage Item: G2B H77 ‘Exeter’

Figure C-177 Photo of Exeter taken around 1950, looking south-west (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390227)

Figure C-178 General view of homestead and tree plantings in January 2007, looking west

Figure C-179 Closer view of homestead in January 2007, prior to recent renovations, looking west
Heritage Item: G2B H77 ‘Exeter’

Figure C-180 View of homestead after recent renovations, looking southwest (April 2012) (http://www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/Rural/NSW/Meroo-Meadow/?adid=2009107769)

Figure C-181 View of homestead after recent renovations, looking northwest (April 2012) (www.homehound.com.au/c265+princes+highway+meroo+meadow+nsw+2540/22044303/)

Figure C-182 View of northern aspect of homestead, after renovation, showing new western wing (right of chimney) (http://www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/Rural/NSW/Meroo-Meadow/?adid=2009107769)
Heritage Item: G2B H77 ‘Exeter’

Figure C-183 View of silo which is the sole remainder of a complex of former outbuildings, looking northwest. http://www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/Rural/NSW/Meroo-Meadow/?adid=2009107769

Figure C-184 Photo of Exeter outbuildings, including silo at back, taken around 1950, looking northwest (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory no. 2390227)

Figure C-185 Interior view, after renovation, looking northeast outwards from northern wing. (www.homehound.com.au/c265+princes+highway+meroo+meadow+nsw+2540/22044303/)
Heritage Item: G2B H77 ‘Exeter’

Figure C-186 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing the Exeter property as a functioning dairy farm (NSW 694-5072 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk14 9/7/58)

Figure C-187 Contemporary aerial view of the Exeter property (Google Earth Pro 2013)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Heritage Item:</strong></th>
<th>G2B H78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name/Description:</strong></td>
<td>Avenue of planted road-side trees, Princes Highway Meroo Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item/Site Type:</strong></td>
<td>Highway remnant tree avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **GDA Map Reference:** | 281234.6144716 to 281371.6145069 |
| **Cadastral Location:** | Highway road reserve |
| **Street Address:** | Princes Highway between Tandingulla Creek and just south of Boxsells Lane |

| **Context/Setting:** | This alignment of trees is situated on the western side of the Princes Highway and extend between Tandingulla Creek and just south of Boxsells Lane (Figure C-188). This consists of a traverse along the north facing, low gradient slopes of a broad spurline which forms the watershed between Tandingulla and Tullian Creeks. |
| **Description/Fabric:** | This recording is of a remnant alignment of planted Pinus trees (of mixed ages), on the western side of the highway at Meroo Meadow (Figure C-189). Road widening in 1975 removed remnant trees on the eastern side of the highway (Figure C-190). The alignment contains trees of mixed age, with the larger trees displaying diameters of 1.10, 1.00, 0.78 and 0.68 meters (at 1.4 metres above ground level). The vigour of the trees varies from poor to good. Some examples are dead. The younger examples suggest active management of the stand by the authorities, as well as natural seeding in recent decades. The planted trees are now surrounded, and partly obscured by, a naturally regrown mid-storey of wattles, Eucalyptus and exotics. |
| **Dimensions:** | The remaining trees within the alignment extend across a highway interval of around 400 metres. |
| **Physical Condition:** | Various highway upgrade works in the latter twentieth century have removed all trees on the eastern side of the highway, and from the western side, next to and north of Tandingulla Creek (ie in the vicinity of the Meroo Meadow Public School. Some trees have died, others have an asymmetrical and weathered form. The vigour of the trees varies from poor to good. Some younger planted examples indicate maintenance of the alignment, however a comparison with the clearly defined trees in the 1958 aerial photo (Figure C-191 and Figure C-192) shows that maintenance and the clearing of natural regrowth around the trees has been suspended or inadequate for a considerable period of time. The largest trees, including some of the most vigorous, occur adjacent to the grounds of the Meroo Union Church (G2B H3). |
| **Integrity:** | The integrity of the original tree avenue has been substantially reduced by the loss of the eastern plantings, and many trees from the western alignment, particularly from the Tandingulla Creek end. |
| **Associated Features:** | Another tree avenue, with mixed species but possibly of comparable age, is situated on the highway west of Wileys Creek (G2B H5). |
| **Current Use:** | Highway roadside planting. |
| **Heritage Listings:** | No current listings. |
Historical Background/Interpretation

Sometime in the first half of the twentieth century, tree plantings were established by local Councils at various places along the Princes highway, and notably within or adjacent to settlements. These often consisted of avenues with plantings on both sides of the road. Some of these survive and have been actively maintained with progressive replacement of any losses. Local examples include this recording (G2B H78), a more complete avenue west of Wileys Creek (G2B H5), and at Broughton Village. Species in these other plantings include Pines, Silky Oak, Bunya Pine, Camphor Laurel and Eucalyptus. These varieties reflect both the taste of the early twentieth century and probably also the range available from the Government Nursery at Goulburn, which was a likely source for the Councils (Varman 2001:8).

In 1905 it was reported that the Meroo community had decided to plant a number of ornamental trees on the church property. The trees were being obtained from the State Nursery, through the Berry Council (Northern Star 29 July 1805:6). It is probable that the six large mature Camphor Laurel trees still present around the church building date from this period. Some of the pine trees around the property boundary may also have been planted at this time.

The pine trees on the eastern boundary of the church grounds also form part of the highway tree alignment. These are amongst the largest and most vigorous trees in the alignment and it remains possible that they pre-date, and inspired the subsequent planting of the highway trees. This may also explain the sole use of pine trees, rather than a mix of species as is evident in other highway avenues.

The pines along the highway appear to have been a dominant landscape and aesthetic element of the Meroo Meadow settlement in the first half of the twentieth century, and up to the 1960s. Large pines can be seen bordering the main road behind students in a photo of the Meroo Meadow Public School taken in 1932 (Figure C-190).

Based on tree species and trunk diameters, this alignment may be contemporaneous with G2B H5. It is considered likely that this planting dates from the first decades of the twentieth century.
Heritage Item: G2B H78 Avenue of planted road-side trees, Princes Highway Meroo Meadow

Figure C-188 General view of tree alignment along western side of highway, looking south

Figure C-189 Pines adjacent to the Meroo Union Church grounds, (middle distance) and south of Boxsells Lane intersection (far left distance), looking southwest

Figure C-190 Extract from a 1932 photo of the Meroo Meadow Public School, showing pine trees along the highway, extending up to the school, looking south (photo courtesy Mr and Mrs North, also in Berry Museum collection).
Heritage Item:  G2B H78  Avenue of planted road-side trees, Princes Highway Meroo Meadow

Figure C-191  
Extract from 1958 aerial photograph (left) showing well defined pine trees and intervals on the east and western side of the highway (NSW 698-5036 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK13 21/7/58).

Figure C-192  
Contemporary aerial photograph of tree alignment. Note loss of trees and regrowth between trees (Google Earth Pro 2013).
**Heritage Item:** G2B H79

**Name/Description:** ‘Glenmoor’

**Item/Site Type:** Early twentieth century farmhouse

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 285309.6146077  
**Cadastral Location:** Lot 31 DP 877098  
**Street Address:** B455 Princes Highway, Jaspers Brush

---

**Context/Setting:** This house is located on the southern side of the Princes Highway on a minor spur, on the basal slopes of the Jaspers Brush spurline adjacent to the former wetland basin of the Broughton Creek flood plain.

**Description/Fabric:** This farmhouse was constructed in 1816 and consists of a wooden frame and weatherboard structure with a corrugated iron roof (Figure C-194 and Figure C-195). The roof has a complex structure with a central rectangular hipped section and three short projecting wings, two ending in gables (north and east) and one, formerly hipped to the south, but now modified by renovations. Verandas occur along the northern and eastern sides between the original gabled wings. Additional verandas have been added as part of an eastern hipped roof extension at the southeastern corner of the buildings. A skillion roofed section at the back almost doubles the depth of the building. There is one chimney, centrally placed. A pressed metal ceiling remains in a room at the end of the original eastern gabled wing. Windows consist of two pane double sash windows. Separate awnings are now present over widows on the northern and western side of the building. Floor piers are made of brick.

The building was extensively renovated in 1998. Based on an early pre 1940s photo, the following additions and changes are evident (Figure C-197 and Figure C-198):

- Separate awnings over northern and western windows.
- Original verandas, which had downward curved roofs, have been completely replaced, with straight inclined roofs, new posts, non-replacement of original brackets and a concrete deck.
- Floor piers replaced with brick piers.
- New wing extension to the east with hipped roof and surrounding veranda partly obscures original eastern gable end and transforms original southern hipped wing.
- The skillion roofed section at the back of the building is probably an early extension.
- Internal wall changes including creation of new kitchen and living area.

Only one modified original outbuilding shed survives.

Two large camphor laurel trees remain behind the building.

**Dimensions:** The renovated building has approximate dimensions: 16 x 15 metres. Originally, with the skillion back section, the building’s dimensions were approximately 15 x 13 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The current building is in an excellent and well maintained condition.

**Integrity:** The building has low integrity due to the renovation changes in configuration, design and materials.
**Associated Features:** None

**Current Use:** Residence.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This farmhouse is located on former Berry subdivision Lot 205a (21 acres). This Lot was purchased from the Berry Estate by Isobel Honeyman Morton, wife of Philip Henry Morton, along with Lot 205 (103 acres) in November 1914 (Certificate of Title Vol.2268 Fol.103).

The current owners Mr R and V. Ison state that the house was built for Norman Lylh Hackman in 1916. Hackman, lived in the house, and subsequently leased it (Figure C-193). A photo survives of the building during Hackman’s ownership (Figure C-196). The Ison family moved to the property in 1940 when it was purchased by Arthur Charles Stanley Ison, the father of current owner Ray Ison. At that time the house was ‘a mess’ to which was added a veranda on one side, and new rooms and a kitchen. At the time the house had three electric lights and two power points (pers, comm. Mr and Mrs Ison 21 March 2013).

An extensive renovation was conducted around 1998 which included the construction of new kitchen and an eastern wing.

One of the former outbuildings, the ‘old shed’ burnt down in 1981 (pers, comm. Mr and Mrs Ison 21 March 2013).

Norman Lylh Hackman was a prominent and well respected dairy farmer who was active in local organisations and the representation of the local dairy industry. He was a respected breeder of Australian Illawarra Shorthorn cattle, and was active in developing and publicising pasture improvement methods and local fodder competitions (The Land 17 February 1933 p.7, Northern Star 16 February 1933 p.5, The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 20 May1933 p.4). In the winter of 1932, Hackman participated with the Department of Agriculture in pasture improvement trials conducted on his Jaspers Brush property. In order to test the feasibility of boosting winter fodder on elevated slopes when the lowlands were inundated, 25 acres were subdivided into five equally sized paddocks and variously left untreated or top dressed and seeded. The results were described as ‘outstanding’ with ‘the clovers having responded in a marked degree to the fertiliser’ (Sydney Morning Herald 23 May 1933 p.7).

Hackman was elected an alderman of the Berry Municipality in 1931 (Robson et al. 2008:28). In August 1935 Hackman and his family (including at least two daughters) were farewelled by ‘the citizens of the Brush’ before departing for Berry. The gathering presented Hackman with ‘a beautiful eight day clock as a small token of esteem for the many services which he and his family had rendered during their many years residence in the district’ (Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 3 August 1935 p.4, 6 July 1935 p.4).

In 1937 Hackman left the Berry district and was farewelled with the presentation of a silver coffee service by the Mayor and other community representatives ‘on behalf of his many friends and the citizens of Berry’ (Shoalhaven News 1 Dec 1937, The Shoalhaven News 10 November 1937 p.2).
Hackman variously held a range of representative and organisational positions including:

- Berry delegate to the Grand Council of the Country Milk Suppliers Association (The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 3 October 1931 p.4).
- The Agricultural Society (The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 20 May 1933 p.4).
- The Agricultural and Horticultural Association (Shoalhaven News 10 November 1937 p.2).

Figure C-193  Photograph of Norman L. Hackman, dairy cattle breeder at the Berry Show February 1933 (The Land 17 February 1933 p.7).
Heritage Item: G2B H79 ‘Glenmoor’

Figure C-194 View of eastern side of building showing recent renovation of eastern wing, partly obscuring original gable, looking west

Figure C-195 Detail of front of house, looking southwest

Figure C-196 Early picture of house during period of ownership by Hackman (post 1928 given presence of electricity) (photo courtesy Mr and Mrs Ison).
Heritage Item: G2B H79 ‘Glenmoor’

Figure C-197 Extract of 1958 aerial photograph showing configuration of farmhouse and outbuildings at that time (NSW 699-5059 SHI Dapto-Ulladulla Run Gk12 23/7/58)

Figure C-198 Contemporary aerial photograph of Glenmoor (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H80

Name/Description: Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

GDA Map Reference: 284649.6145801

Cadastral Location: Lot 32 DP 877098

Street Address: B353 Princes Highway, Jaspers Brush

Context/Setting: The site is located on the southern side of the Princes Highway, adjacent to the ‘Dawning’ farmhouse, on a minor northwest – southeast aligned spur, which forms the basal slope margins of the former wetland basin of the Broughton Creek flood plain. This recording is an approximate location and includes the northeast facing slopes of the spurline, from the edge of a minor tributary gully in the north, to the upper slopes of the spur in the south (Figure C-199 to Figure C-202).

Description/Fabric: This recording consists of an approximate area within which archaeological remains of a nineteenth century tenant farmhouse may be present. The area has been defined by overlaying two historical mapping sources, using a ‘best fit’ approach (Figures C-206 to C-211). One source shows a single structure, the other shows three separate buildings.

The area of potential now comprises agricultural pasture land. A driveway entrance crosses the area from north to south (Figure C-203). There are however no definitive surface traces of the former structures or occupation which once occurred here. A small excavated water hole in the bed of the adjacent tributary creek is evident in a 1958 aerial photograph and this may or may not be related to the former house (Figure C-210). It has now infilled.

Three relatively large fig trees were noted in the general area of the site, on the northern side of the tributary, and on the spur crest to the south. All, however, have developed in the last 50 to 60 years from epiphytes establishing on old dead standing tree stumps (Figure C-205). A small linear area of fallen tree debris within the recording area contains regrowth from ornamental garden plants, and it is conceivable that these could be garden remnants from an original residence (Figure C-204). No fragments of glass, metal, ceramic of other occupational debris were noted in the limited ground surface exposures across the area.

Dimensions: The area of potential within which archaeological evidence and the former location of structures may be present has approximate dimensions 100 x 60 metres.

Physical Condition: The presence and nature of any archaeological deposits is not known and subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

Integrity: The integrity of any remaining archaeological traces is not known. An access driveway has been constructed across a portion of the area. The application of repeated ploughing is evident across the area.

Associated Features: An agricultural dam and pipeline easement dating from the Berry estate drainage of the lowland swamps from the 1890s is situated on adjacent slopes on the northern side of the highway (G2B H81).

Current Use: Agricultural pasture.

Heritage Listings: No current listings.
Historical Background/Interpretation

The tenant farm house was located on Berry estate subdivision Lot 206a of 22 acres (Figure C-206 and C-209). This formed part of a group of Lots, totalling 222 acres, purchased from the Berry Estate by Cecil Alfred John Herne in January 1912. The other lots were 206 (83 acres), 207 (57 acres), 207a (23 acres) and 208 (37 acres) (DP 6131, Certificate of Title Vol. 2268 Fol. 103) (Figure C-208). The ‘house’ may therefore have served as the residence for this large property holding after its use by an estate tenant. The tenancy is unlikely to have been by Herne, as this name does not appear in the Berry Estate return books 1862–1893 (Mitchell Library Mss 315/76, Reel CY4412).

Subsequent to Herne, this land formed part a property owned by Davis [or Davies] (pers. comm. Mr Ray Ison 21/3/2013).

Following Davis [or Davies], this land was owned by the Ison family and was recently subdivided from the ‘Glenmoor’ residence and sold as the ‘Dawning’ property in 2012. The current ‘Dawning’ house was transported to its current location.
Heritage Item: **G2B H80** Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’

**Figure C-199** General view of area of potential (on far side of highway, middle distance), looking south

**Figure C-200** General view of area of potential adjacent to highway, looking south-west

**Figure C-201** General view of area of potential adjacent to unnamed tributary, looking south-east

**Figure C-202** General view across area of potential, looking north-east from spurline crest
Heritage Item:  G2B H80  Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’

Figure C-203 View along access driveway which crosses the area of potential, looking north-west

Figure C-204 Remnant ornamental garden plants which may be derived from a former garden in the area, looking south-west

Figure C-205 Examples of fig trees in the area which have developed from epiphytes on old sawn standing tree stumps, looking north-west
Heritage Item: G2B H80 Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’

Figure C-206 Extract from 1908 survey plan of Deposited Plan 6131 showing extent of purchases (outlined in blue) from the Berry Estate by Cecil Alfred John Herne in 1912 (1908, Deposited Plan 6131)
Heritage Item: **G2B H80**  
**Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’**

**Figure C-207** Extract from Berry Estate sales poster showing Lot 206a and the location of the G2B H80 ‘house’ (Coolangatta and Berry Estates Subdivision No.1 Sales Poster, William Brooks & Co. Lith. Sydney [1892])

**Figure C-208** Extract from 1908 survey plan of Deposited Plan 6131 showing Lot 206a and a ‘house’ indicated by three building symbols (1908, Deposited Plan 6131)

**Figure C-209** Close up from extract in Figure C-208 above.
Heritage Item: G2B H80  Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’

Figure C-210 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph of G2B H80 area, with overlays of information from 1892 sales poster (blue), and 1908 Deposited Plan (Yellow), showing approximate area within which archaeological remains of the G2B H80 ‘house’ may be present. Note presence of now infilled water hole in adjacent creekline (NSW 698-5028 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK13 21/7/58)

Figure C-211 Contemporary aerial photograph of G2B H80 area, with overlays of information from 1892 sales poster (blue), and 1908 Deposited Plan (Yellow), showing approximate area within which archaeological remains of the G2B H80 ‘house’ may be present (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H81

Name/Description: Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement

Item/Site Type: Agricultural earth dam and potential archaeological deposit

GDA Map Dam: 284514.6146009
Reference: Pipeline easement crosses highway at approximately: 284695.6145850
Cadastral Location: Lot 4 DP 1002214
Street Address: B510 Princess Highway, Jaspers Brush

Context/Setting: This site includes and extends from a dam, at an elevation of around 12 metres Australian Height Datum (AHD) across a minor northwest – southeast draining tributary gully, and continues as an easement, downstream and along the same drainage line, traversing basal valley slopes, crossing the Princes Highway and the South Coast rail line, and then traversing the former swamp basins and flood plain of Broughton Creek, just north of the east-west runway of the Jaspers Brush landing ground, to finish at a point at the southern end of Swamp Road (approximately: 286432.6144662).

Description/Fabric: This recording consists of an agricultural dam forming a reservoir and an associated downstream pipeline easement (Figure C-214). It is not known if the pipeline is still present within all or some of the easement. The dam consists of an earthen wall constructed across a minor tributary gully. Material for the dam appears to have been excavated from the upstream eastern side of the gully, which has assisted in creating a reservoir area. The dam wall originally had an overflow channel at the western end of the wall (Figure C-212 and Figure C-213). The wall was subsequently compromised to prevent its functioning. The wall was recently rebuilt in the original location, but using a new configuration with an overflow channel at the eastern end of the wall. The original eroded overflow channel was filled and re-contoured.

The pipeline easement immediately downslope of the dam has been removed due to the construction of a new dam, between the original and the highway (Figure C-215, Figure C-219 and Figure C-220). There was no surface indication for the presence and alignment of the easement at the time of field inspection (March 2013).

Dimensions: The current dam wall is approximately 42 metres long and ten metres wide. The reservoir behind occupies an area of with approximate dimensions: 50 x 43 metres.

Physical Condition: The reinstated dam wall and new overflow is in an excellent condition.

Integrity: The integrity of the current dam wall is limited. On the positive side, it has been constructed along the original dam wall alignment, and has recreated the original reservoir impoundment, with a similarly size and shape. The banks and edge of the former reservoir behind the dam wall does not appear to have been changed. On the negative side, the wall does not demonstrate the original design and includes an overflow channel on the opposite side to the original. The original channel has been filled and re-contoured.

Associated Features: The dam and pipeline easement were created by the Berry Estate to store and divert fresh water to the lowland (estuarine) pastures which had recently been drained as part of a swamp drainage program. As such this site is associated with the estate drainage works, pump station, and infrastructure which operated on the lowlands. A small number of similar reservoir and easement sites are present on the spurlines around Coolangatta Mountain.
Current Use: Agricultural dam.

Heritage Listings: No current listings.

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Although drainage works on the Coolangatta Estate date from 1829, a majority of the lowlands in the Broughton Creek catchment remained unavailable for agriculture and pasture into the late nineteenth century (Bayley 1975). In its natural state this land consisted of a series of freshwater marshes with surfaces in their lowest, some three or four feet below the flood level of the district in which they lay.

John Hay’s plans for swamp reclamation were put into effect in 1891 with the expenditure of 20,000 pounds. John Wright, a civil engineer who had worked on the South Coast rail line, was engaged. The scheme involved the construction of drains, levees, flood gates and a pump station. The following year large engineering works were carried out two miles upstream of the Broughton Creek mouth, reclaiming 7000 acres, with a steam driven centrifugal pump to move the water (Bayley 1975:158; Sydney Morning Herald 17 October 1892). The network of drains amounted to a net length of about 145 miles. In many places embankments were constructed to a height of up to 18 inches to prevent the backwash of tidal water (Sydney Morning Herald 7 September 1895:6).

It was estimated that the drainage works would double the stock carrying capacity of the Estate lands (Sydney Morning Herald 17 October 1892). By 1905, an estimated 15,000 acres of swampland had been drained, for a total expenditure of 135,000 pounds (Shoalhaven and Hawkesbury Diary 1908).

Following the drainage of the lowland meadows, there remained the problem of resupplying them with fresh water for the support of dairy herds. To this end, the multiple catchments of the surrounding slopes, and notably the “sugarloaf flanks and spurs” of the Coolangatta Hill, were harnessed through the construction of dams to form reservoirs. These formed the head of a gravity fed reticulation system which employed leading mains, branches and small pipes to fill drinking troughs situated in “practically every paddock” within the “sphere of influence” of the Hill (Antill 1982:354).

The G2B H81 dam is one such reservoir. An associated easement provided for piped reticulation of water to the drained estuarine flats in the area of the current Meroo Meadow airfield. Following, or as part of, the sale of the Estate lands, it would appear that the reservoirs and their pipelines, as shared infrastructure, were legally separated from the adjacent lands using defined easements and allotments, and vested with the local Berry Council.

A review of the fourth edition (1916) Coolangatta parish map reveals six similar pipeline easements with former or remaining reservoirs situated at their head, on creeklines draining the fringing slopes of the Coolangatta Mountain (refer Figure 4-8). Of these, only two reservoir dams remain (situated in lots 64a and 26a of the original Coolangatta subdivision).

The G2B H81 dam is situated on Berry Estate subdivision Lot 198, and the pipeline easement traverses Lots 201, 206a, 205a, 205, 218, 220 and 215.

The earliest reference to the reservoir and easement is their depiction on the Coolangatta and Berry Estates Subdivision No.1 Sales Poster, which must date, to around 1892 (Figure C-216). A more accurate depiction is included on Deposited Plan 6131, prepared by licensed surveyor S.R. Dobbie. The date of survey was June 1908 (Figure C-217 and C-218). These dates place the earliest record of the site in the period of John Hay’s swamp reclamation project from 1891.

Lots 198 and 201 were purchased by Norman Lyih Hackman, Jaspers Brush, farmer, on 5 July 1928. The Certificate of Title excluded a four acre rectangle from the original Lot 198 area, which included the dam and reservoir. This area was transferred to the Council of the Municipality of Berry by Instrument of Transfer no. A 665982. This undated instrument was a grant of easement by Alexander Hay and David William Roxburgh to the Council ‘for water pipelines over the land’ (Certificate of Title Volume 3714 Folio 170. Hay and Roxburgh acted together as trustees of the Hay and Berry estates from the death of Sir John Hay on 26 February 1909, with the implication that the instrument of transfer must post date February 1909.
This Transfer for easement was extinguished on 8 February 1960 with reference to transfer of ownership in 1940 (Tfr No C892773) and Dealing No H133208 not shown on the title.

In 1940 the two lots were purchased from Hackman in the name of Arthur Charles Stanley Ison. In 1972 the land was transferred to Arthur’s widow, Margaret Phoebe Ison (Jaspers Brush), Ailsa Margaret Watson (Nowra) and Alfred Ray Ison (Jaspers Brush, dairy farmer) as point tenants (Certificate of Title Vol. 3714 Fol.170)
Heritage Item: **G2B H81**  
**Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement**

**Figure C-212** View of former overflow area at western end of reinstated dam wall, looking north.

**Figure C-213** View of dam and reinstated dam wall with new overflow at eastern end of wall, looking south-west.

**Figure C-214** General panorama of original reservoir dam (right), and modern downstream dam (middle), looking west (right) to south (left).
Heritage Item: **G2B H81 Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement**

![Aerial oblique view of landscape context of G2B H81 (yellow dotted line), looking south-west](www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/Rural/NSW/Jaspers-Brush/?adid=2009695338)

**Figure C-215** Aerial oblique view of landscape context of G2B H81 (yellow dotted line), looking south-west (www.domain.com.au/Property/For-Sale/Rural/NSW/Jaspers-Brush/?adid=2009695338)
Heritage Item: G2B H81 Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement

Figure C-216 Extract from 1890s Berry Estate subdivision sales poster showing reservoir and pipeline easement in place by this time (Coolangatta and Berry Estates Subdivision No.1 Sales Poster, William Brooks & Co. Lith. Sydney [1892])

Figure C-217 Extract from 1908 Deposited Plan 6131, showing land exclusion and easement for reservoir dam and pipeline (1908, DP6131)

Figure C-218 Detail of land exclusion and pipeline easement from 1908 Deposited Plan 6131
Heritage Item: G2B H81 Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement

Figure C-219 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing overlay of approximate position of pipeline easement in the area of the highway (yellow) (NSW 698-5028 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK13 21/7/58)

Inset: Close up of original dam configuration with overflow and channel at western end of wall

Figure C-220 Contemporary aerial view showing overlay of approximate position of pipeline easement in the area of the highway (yellow) (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H82
Name/Description: ‘Silos Estate’
Item/Site Type: Remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits

GDA Map Reference: 
Former dairy flagstone floor: 283869.6145716,
Former tenant farm buildings: (approximately) 283834.6145608

Cadastral Location: Lots 3 and 4 DP 776151
Street Address: B640 and B640A Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

Context/Setting:  This site is located to the north of the highway, on a low and minor north-south aligned spur situated between Wiley’s Creek in the west and an unnamed creekline in the east. The spur forms part of the basal slope margins of the former wetland basin of the Broughton Creek floodplain.

Description/Fabric:  The ‘Silos Estate’ currently functions as a vineyard, wines cellar and sales centre, restaurant and function centre, and a grouping of separate residences (Figure C-221). Most of the existing buildings of the estate date roughly from the 1930s onward and have been substantially altered or modified to enable new functions or residential capacity (Figure C-222). A cement block situated at the southeastern corner of a modern restaurant roofed portico, is inscribed ‘B. Wiley […] Dec 1939’ and ‘R.W.’ and ‘B.W.’ (Figure C-230). The double silos are thought to date from the 1930s. The oldest remaining structure appears to be the current cellar and reception building which incorporates original features and round pole framing from a former dairy. The most original of these features is the ground level flooring which consists of closely laid rectangular sandstone flagstones (Figure C-223). The regular width and straight edges of these stones suggest quarrying or finishing with a saw.

There is potential for sub-surface archaeological remains of former Berry estate tenant farm buildings to be present across some of the undeveloped spur crest and southwest facing slopes to the south and west of the southernmost residential buildings. Overlays of structures indicated on 1893 and 1908 mapping provide an approximate indication of these locations (Figures C-225 to C-229). A roughly discernible levelled earth platform exists on the crest of the spur in the area of a large fig tree, and may be indicative of one or more former structures (Figure C-224). The fig tree is not an original planting because it has the form of a tree which started as a wild epiphytic seedling on a dead standing sawn tree stump. The stump may have been an original planting.

Dimensions:  The sandstone flagstone floor is approximately 9 x 9 metres in area. The flagstones are 480 millimetres wide and display various lengths, such as 880, 1030 and 1350 millimetres.

The area within which archaeological deposits may occur extends across an approximate area of 70 x 50 metres.

Physical Condition:  The former dairy flagstone flooring is in good condition and actively being used as a floor in a visitor reception and cellar sales area. The area within which archaeological deposits may occur varies substantially in its condition and level of previous impact. Near the crest and away from the existing buildings, impact appears to have been limited to possibly past ploughing. The lower western slopes of the spur have been substantially impacted by the construction of a new access driveway, and the recent establishment of an ornamental garden.

Integrity:  The flagstone floor has limited integrity due to the substantial change in its immediate context.
Associated Features: This site is associated with the ‘County Fair’ G2B H83 site, given the historical and genealogical relationship between these two Wiley family properties.

Current Use: Vineyard, wines cellar and sales centre, restaurant and function centre, and residences.

Heritage Listings: No current listings.

Historical Background/Interpretation

The Berry Estate 1893 Sales Poster for the adjoining Meroo Farms shows this area as ‘occupied by Anderson’ (Figure C-227). It forms Lot 196 of around 81 acres. The Anderson referred to may be William Anderson, who was consistently listed as a tenant in the Berry Estate returns for all years where records have survived - 1873 to 1893. Although the location, when described, is given as ‘Broughton Creek’, it is unclear if this is simply a district name, or means that a location such as Jaspers Brush or Meroo is excluded. The area of the Anderson lease consisted of around 22 acres between 1873 and 1885, then around 19 acres from 1886 to 1889. From 1889 to 1893, a 65 acre area was leased, with another area of around 57 acres added in 1891. These larger and later areas may indicate the current site.

William Anderson ‘of Jaspers Brush’ was an elected Alderman of the Berry Municipal Council in 1900 but resigned in 1904 (Robson et al. 2008:28, The Shoalhaven News and South Coast Districts Advertiser 30 April 1904 p.2).

There are two maps showing Berry estate buildings on the property prior to the property’s subdivision and sale. These date from 1893 and 1908 and are shown in Figures C-225 to C-229. Even though there must be assumed a certain margin for error in the original drafting and symbolisation of the buildings, and the modern overlay process, the location of these buildings from both maps, cluster in an area to the south and west of the existing residences, and appear focused on the spur crest and west facing slopes. Despite this congruence, the arrangement of the buildings is quite different, an unexpected difference over a time period of only 15 years. Only the conduct of archaeological excavation would have the potential to resolve these issues.

Following the subdivision of the Berry Estate, Lot 196, together with Lots 197 and 208a were bought by Frederick Charles Wiley on 21 May 1913 (Certificate of Title Vol.2268 Fol.103). Together these lots formed a block of 158 acres. Twenty years earlier a J. Wiley, (almost certainly James Wiley), had purchased, at auction, five connecting lots immediately to the west, of Frederick’s purchase. These combined to form a holding of 205 acres (Figure C-231). In addition James made purchases of adjoining farms, including property owned by Thorburn (records held by Berry Museum, refer also description of G2B H83).

Frederick was the son of James Wiley and Mary Hanigan, who married in 1870 and had eight children. Frederick was born in 1878 (information from records held by Berry Museum). Frederick was involved in a tragic accident in 1897 when his firearm accidentally discharged and shot his uncle John William Wiley, while shooting quail with two cousins on George Faulks property at Meroo. Following the incident John was carried to James Wiley’s residence (The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 13 and 15 Jul 1897 p.2 and 3 resp.). John William Wiley became the second Town Clerk for the Berry Municipality in 1894.

At the inquest it was stated that John resided with his sons in Berry, but that they were shooting ‘in our paddock and Mr George Faulk’s flat’. This, together with John’s job as Town Clerk, confirms that the Meroo property owner, J. Wiley, referred to in auction records was James Wiley, John’s brother, who as mentioned, owned land close to the incident and assisted in the incident (The Kiama Independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 15 July 1897 p.3).

The purchase of Lot 196 by Frederick Charles Wiley occurred sixteen years after John’s death in 1913. Frederick had married Rebecca Sproule two years earlier in 1911. They had six children: Frederick (jnr), William (jnr), Joy, Robert, Florence and Gladys (information from records held by Berry Museum).
An F.C. Wiley is listed in the Sands Pastoral Directory for 1920 as a resident of Bomaderry. In 1930 the Directory lists F.C. Wiley as a resident of Jaspers Brush and owning 255 acres.

The remnant dairy flagstone floor at the Silos Estate would have represented a significant investment and therefore probably dates from the freehold purchase of the land in 1913. A maximum age for the floor would be the passing of the Dairy Supervision Act 1887 which required bails, dairies and yards to have floors capable of being cleaned. There is a local story that the dairy flagstones were convict hewn, and found left over in an old quarry (pers. comm. Sophie Ray 21/3/2013).

The current owners relate how a well was sited near a spring in a dip at the end of the young Jacaranda trees, west of the current buildings. This would lend support to the early mapping which indicates the former presence of buildings on the west facing slopes towards the valley floor.

During the Second World War, a market garden was established on the eastern side of the spur.

The Wiley properties continued to be farmed by members of the Wiley family until 1980 when the land was subdivided. The last Wileys on the property were Fred and Bill, possibly the sons of Frederick (snr) and Rebecca Wiley. The Banfields bought the Silos property from Wiley in 1980. They developed the original restaurant. The dairy sheds were dilapidated prior to their current modification and re-use (pers. comm. Sophie Ray 21/3/2013).

The current owners bought the property in 2007 (pers. comm. Sophie Ray 21/3/2013).
Heritage Item:  G2B H82  ‘Silos Estate’

Figure C-221  
General view of ‘Silos Estate’, looking north-east. The original Berry Estate farm buildings may have been situated on the green grassed area on the spurline in centre middle distance.

Figure C-222  
General view of former dairy flagstone floor, now used as a wine cellar and visitor reception area, looking north-east.

Figure C-223  
Detail of flagstone floor in cellar and visitor reception area (scale is 1.5 metres long).
Heritage Item:  G2B H82  ‘Silos Estate’

Figure C-224 View looking south-west across spur crest and west facing slopes to the south of the existing residences. Not the foreground level earth platform in the area of the fig tree. This may be the location of former Berry Estate tenant farm structures.

Figure C-225 Extract from 1908 Deposited Plan 6131, showing ‘house’ buildings on Lot 196, presumably of a tenant farm (1908, DP6131).

Figure C-226 Extract from 1858 aerial photograph showing configuration of the farm at this time, and in red overlay, approximate location of buildings indicated on 1908 deposited plan shown above (NSW 698-5030 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK13 21/7/58).
Heritage Item:  G2B H82  ‘Silos Estate’

Figure C-227 Extract from 1893 Berry Estate ‘Meroo Farms’ sales poster (Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith., John Ewing licenced surveyor, NLA map-Ifsp322-v).

Figure C-228 Extract from 1858 aerial photograph showing in overlay, the approximate location of buildings (yellow) indicated on 1893 sales poster shown above (NSW 698-5030 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK13 21/7/58).

Figure C-229  Contemporary aerial view of Silos Estate relative to the approximate locations of formed Berry Estate tenant farm structures as indicated by 1893 (yellow) and 1808 (red) mapping, as presented above.
Heritage Item: G2B H82 ‘Silos Estate’

Figure C-230 Detail view of concrete block with inscriptions by B. and R. Wiley 1939.

Figure C-231 Extract from 3rd Edition map of the Parish of Bunberra (1916), showing location of all purchases by J. Wiley (1893 auction – red outline) and Frederick Charles Wiley (1913 – blue outline) of Berry Estate subdivision Lots (red outline)
Heritage Item:  G2B H83

Name/Description:  ‘County Fair’

Item/Site Type:  Early twentieth century dairy farm complex.

---

GDA Map Reference:  283481.6145521 to 283319.6145707

Cadastral Location:  Lot 3 DP 840940 and Lot 3 DP 251300

Street Address:  B680 and B660 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

---

Context/Setting:  This site is located to the north of the highway, on a low and minor northwest-southeast aligned spur situated between a small side tributary and the main course of Wileys Creek. The spur forms part of the basal slope margins of the former wetland basin of the Broughton Creek flood plain (Figure C-232 and Figure C-240).

Description/Fabric:  This former dairy farm consists of a main homestead and a small number of remaining outbuildings, including a dairy, feed stalls and an attached silo. The homestead incorporates an early residential building which had a conventional central corridor with rooms either side. This initial structure was transported to the current position from an original location adjacent to a large Norfolk Island Pine 925 metres to the northwest. The main homestead has been subsequently extended and many of the original internal walls have been changed.

Amongst the remaining outbuildings are:

- A concrete and iron roofed dairy with a remnant sandstone flagstone floor (Figures C-235 and C-236), and a side wall constructed of re-used vertical wooden slabs (Figure C-237). The stone floor may predate the current dairy structure. The regular width and straight edges of these stones suggest quarrying or finishing with a saw.

- A small weatherboard and corrugated iron clad building, which is currently referred to as the ‘meat room’ with a high pitched gable roof, double two pane sash windows and single front veranda with one remaining veranda end-apron (Figures C-233 and C-234). This building may date from the early twentieth century.

- An open, timber and iron, feed stall shed with attached sheds and concrete silo (Figure C-238 and Figure C-239).

There is potential for sub-surface archaeological remains of former Berry estate tenant farm buildings to be present in an area to the southeast of the homestead (Figure C-241 – C-242). Overlays of structures indicated on 1893 and 1908 mapping provide an approximate indication of these locations (Figure C-243 and Figure C-244).

Dimensions:  The homestead has approximate dimensions: 26 x 13 metres

The small ‘meat room’ building has approximate dimensions: 5 x 4 metres.

The remnant flagstone floor evident within in the dairy has approximate dimensions: 10 x 4 metres
Physical Condition: The homestead is in good condition but requires some maintenance. The ‘meat room’ building is in a fair condition and requires repair and maintenance work. The silo, feed stalls and sheds are in very good condition. Unlike most of the district’s silos, the roof and elevator mechanism appears to be intact. Given that the silo roof is of a gable type rather than circular, it may be a replacement. The flagstone floor remains part of the function floor of the dairy. Some surface erosion and minor slumping is in evidence.

The condition of any potentially occurring archaeological deposits remains undetermined. The potential locations of former structures have been impacted by the creation of tracks, fencelines and the construction of the new building and sheds on Lot 3 DP 251300.

Integrity: The homestead displays little integrity due to the substantial additions and changes made since its re-position to the current location. The silo and feed stalls appear to be in an operational state and therefore have a considerable degree of integrity and may be representative of their type.

Associated Features: This site is associated with the ‘Silos Estate’ G2B H82 site, given the historical and genealogical relationship between these two Wiley family properties.

Current Use: Farm residence and complex.

Heritage Listings: No current listings.

Historical Background/Interpretation

The ‘County Fair’ property occurs in former Berry Estate subdivision Lot 72 of 44 acres. This was one of five lots purchased at the 1893 Berry Estate auction by a J. Wiley (almost certainly James Wiley), the others being 69 of 47 acres, 71 of 34 acres, 74 of 46 acres, and Lot 75 of 34 acres. This formed a block of 205 acres (Figure C-242). In addition James made purchases of adjoining farms, including property owned by Thorburn (records held by Berry Museum). James’ son, Frederick Charles Wiley (born 1878) subsequently bought Lots 196, 197 and 208a in an adjoining holding in 1913, a combined block of 158 acres (Figure C-241).

James Wiley and his relatives are variously listed the Berry Estate returns. In 1862-3 a Charles Wiley, probably James’ father, is listed as having a clearing lease of 60 acres, with rental paid to the value of three bushels of wheat (‘6 and 7 years’) (Mitchell Library Mss 315/78). A Charles Wiley is again listed in 1873 with a 40 acre lease. This is probably still referring to James’ father but it could alternatively relate to his younger brother (Mitchell Library Mss 315/97 Item 6). The last listing for Charles is in 1875, for 20 acres. In that same year, James Wiley appears as a tenant on 40 acres. In 1881 James is listed as leasing 70 acres at Broughton Creek, and is joined by his brother, John Wiley who is listed as leasing five acres, also at Broughton Creek. The following year James’ lease, still 70 acres, is described as being at Jaspers Brush. The 70 and five acre leases of James and John are repeated in listings for 1883 and 1884. In 1885 James is listed as leasing 70 acres, John five acres and his other brother, Thomas Wiley, just one rood, all at Broughton Creek. The following year James is listed as having 105 acres. John with three acres and Thomas with one rood. In 1887 James only is listed, with 49 acres at Meroo, and 54 at Broughton Creek. Roughly the same, 45 and 54 acres are listed under James’ name in 1891, and 50 acres under the name Ann[?] Wiley, probably Charles’ (snr) second wife Ann (nee) Hetherington. There are no Wileys listed in the 1893 returns.

Unfortunately the returns do not give specific addresses for the lessee lands, so it is difficult to determine how long the Wiley leases in the Meroo district were established and where. The earliest reference to a lease at Meroo is 1885. This comes from a ‘Kiama District Land Holders Police Survey’ conducted in that year which identifies James Wiley as having 147 acres at Meroo (information from documents held by Berry Museum).

The 1903 Sands Pastoral Directory lists James Wiley as resident at Meroo and Jaspers Brush, but is not listed again. This may be because he retired from farming, as suggested by a news item in 1905 reporting that James Wiley of Jaspers Brush had bought the Nowra residence of Mr John Maclean ‘Kelvin Grove’ plus six acres of land with river frontage (Northern Star 12 July 1905 p.3).
Subsequent Sands Directory listings are of ‘R. & W. Wiley’ at Meroo Meadow in 1909, and then W, Wiley, resident on 350 acres at Meroo Meadow in 1914, and then W.J.T. Wiley, resident on 350 (or 360) acres from 1919 till the end of the directory series in 1930.

James Wiley married Mary (nee) Hanigan in 1870; The Hanigan family had immigrated to New South Wales on the same ship as the Wiley Family, ‘The Hotspur’ in 1861, although James and his brother Thomas came out a year earlier (information from documents held by Berry Museum, www.mundia.com.au/Person/26569740/12033692436). James and Mary had eight children: Robert (born 1871), William (born 1873), Jane (born 1876), Frederick (born 1878), Elizabeth (born 1882), Isabella (born 1884), Sarah (born 1886) and Millicent (born 1892).

James’ Meroo property appears to have been inherited by his two sons Robert and William, with Frederick purchasing a large property immediately to the east of his father’s property in 1913 (refer site description for G2B H82).

The former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings indicated by the 1893 and 1894 mapping on Lot 72 (Figures C-241 to C-244), may relate to James Wiley’s former tenancy, possibly dating from 1875, and more certainly from 1885 in the Meroo district).

The current owner Mrs Helen Robinson inherited the property from her parents, who bought the property from Pam and Fred Mance in 1975. Pam was the daughter of Keith Wiley. It is recalled that the property operated as a dairy for over 35 years, originally under the Wiley’s, and then the Mances. Many of the outbuildings have been demolished due to dilapidation (pers. comm. Mrs Helen Robinson 17/5/2013).

The early house incorporated into the current homestead was transported to the current location by the Wileys and was originally sited near a large locally prominent Norfolk Island Pine, 925 metres to the northwest (MGA reference: 283228.6146517). This move, was achieved by using locally cut timber logs as rollers, and required the construction of a road between the old and new sites. Prior to the move, milking bails associated with the farm were cut off when Wileys Creek flooded (pers. comm. Mrs Helen Robinson 17/5/2013).

The original house location is on portion 42 (78 acres) in the Parish of Bunberra, which is comprised of both steep and moderately graded, south facing, upper catchment slopes and tributaries of Wileys Creek. This portion was originally purchased and owned by Robert Gardner (Certificate of Title which notes Robert Gardner as the purchaser of this portion at a sale of eight farm portions at Meroo on the 29 May 1855 (I 203.672).

On a deposited plan for adjacent lands, dated 1894, J. Wiley is noted by this time as the ‘owner’ of portion 42 (Figure C-241). One year earlier, in 1893, James purchased better quality agricultural lands from the Berry Estate situated immediately downstream, and to the south. This would offer another reason for moving a residential building off portion 42 onto a more accessible and effective location lower in the valley. By this reasoning, the earliest probable date for the repositioning of the house would be 1893. Another possible date would after 1905, when James retired to Nowra (refer above).

The remnant dairy flagstone floor would have represented a significant investment and therefore probably dates from the freehold purchase of the land in 1893. A maximum age for the floor would be the passing of the Dairy Supervision Act 1887 which required bails, dairies and yards to have floors capable of being cleaned.
Heritage Item: G2B H83 'County Fair'

Figure C-232 General view of 'County Fair' property (middle distance), looking north-west from the highway. Former tenant farm buildings may have been situated on the spur crest at the far right of the picture.

Figure C-233 View of the 'meat room' outbuilding at 'County Fair', looking west.

Figure C-234 The 'meat room' building at 'County Fair', looking south.
Heritage Item: **G2B H83 ‘County Fair’**

**Figure C-235** View of the formerly exterior west side of the milking bails shed (now attached to a larger shed), looking south-east

**Figure C-236** View of sandstone flagging present in ‘County Fair’ dairy, looking north-east

**Figure C-237** Detail of reused vertical slabs on north wall of dairy
Heritage Item: G2B H83 ‘County Fair’

Figure C-238 View of silo and feed stalls at County Fair, looking west

Figure C-239 Detail of feed stalls, looking north-west

Figure C-240 Fig tree adjacent to yards at ‘County fair’, looking north
Heritage Item: G2B H83 ‘County Fair’

Figure C-241 Extract from 1894 Deposited Plan 3061, showing the lots purchased by J. Wiley at Auction in 1893 (red outline). Note at this time, ownership of portion 42 by J. Wiley, (78 acres) above Lot 74. Blue circle indicates location of building and yard (1894 DP3061)
Heritage Item: G2B H83 ‘County Fair’

Figure C-242 Extract from 1893 Meroo Farms sales poster, showing former Berry Estate buildings at G2B H83 (Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith., John Ewing licensed surveyor, NLA map-lfsp322-v)

Figure C-243 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing the ‘County Fair’ dairy farm relative to overlays of the buildings indicated on the 1893 sales poster (yellow), and 1894 Deposited Plan (red) described above (NSW 696-5039 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58)

Figure C-244 Contemporary aerial photograph showing the current arrangement of ‘County Fair’ buildings relative to overlays of the buildings indicated on the 1893 sales poster (yellow), and 1894 Deposited Plan (red) described above (Google Earth Pro 2013)
**Heritage Item:** G2B H84

**Name/Description:** Unnamed 1920s farmhouse

**Item/Site Type:** 1910s-20s Bungalow style farmhouse

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 281480.6145323

**Cadastral Location:** C395 Princes Highway

**Street Address:** C395 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

---

**Context/Setting:** This site is located on the west side of the highway and is situated on the crest of a low gradient and minor north-south aligned spurline situated between two tributaries of Tandingulla Creek (Figure C-245).

**Description/Fabric:** This site consists of a bungalow style weatherboard farmhouse, probably dating from the 1810s - 1920s (Figure C-246 and Figure C-247). There appears to be two extensions to an original building. Either an additional skillion extension has been added to the building’s southwest side or a former veranda has been completely filled in. In addition, a northwest aligned hipped roof wing has been added to the back of the building. Two original gabled projections to the northeast and southeast form the ends of a wide return veranda with wide decorative brackets and half masonry and slab capped pylons with grouped post piers. The building also has wide eaves and exposed roof timbers. The main roof is hipped at the back and has a front facing gable.

There appear not have been many, or substantial, outbuildings, indicating that this building was mainly residential and was not associated with dairying or heavy agricultural activities.

**Dimensions:** The house has approximate dimensions: 15 x 15 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The condition of the house is very good and appears to be well maintained.

**Integrity:** The house has a degree of integrity and displays many characteristics of its age and period style. The extensions however detract from and reduce this value.

**Associated Features:** This building and its modern sheds and garage are located in close proximity to potential archaeological deposits related to the former buildings of the Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ (G2B H90).

**Current Use:** Residence.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This building is situated on Lot 59 of the Meroo Farms subdivision of the Berry Estate in 1893. Lot 59 was purchased by a Mr W. McGrath for the high price of £31 per acre at the 1893 Berry Estate auction. This was one of four lots purchased by McGrath, the others being Lots 64, 65 and 79, providing a large rectangular holding of a further 107 acres, just 200 metres northwest of the old Meroo Station buildings, and comprising an 800 metre upstream section of the Tandingulla Creek valley (Figure C-245) (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3).
The W. McGrath referred to may be William McGrath of Meroo who was an Alderman of the first ill-fated Shoalhaven Municipal Council in 1859. Following Berry’s securing of an injunction against the Council, a Supreme Court finding in 1861 which found the Council to be illegally constituted, and a Privy Council’s decision also against the Council, the mayor and aldermen had to personally pay Berry’s legal fees of £160. The matter was settled with contributions from people of the district (Bayley 1975:89).

William McGrath died on 17 April 1902, aged 74 years, at his residence at Meroo. His wife died in the following year at her son’s residence at West Cambewarra (The Shoalhaven News and South Coast Districts Advertiser 12 April 1902, and 13 June 1903 p.2; Kiama independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 22 April 1902 p.2).

The G2B H84 building appears largely unchanged from its configuration in 1958 (refer 1958 aerial photograph in Figure C-248 and Figure C-249).

The current owner Mrs Ursula Duncan has resided in the house, with her husband since around 1962. She relates that two large plum trees used to be situated half way done the slope in front of the house, and were probably related to the garden of a former building (probably the former Meroo Station overseer’s house) which can be seen in the back of a 1921/22 photograph of the former Meroo Meadow Public School (refer G2B H90 description and Figure C-36). The G2B H84 building can also be seen in this picture, suggesting that the building has an origin in the second decade of the twentieth century, assuming that the age of the school picture is accurately identified.

It is thought that the house was built by Jack Blow, a builder operating out of Berry (pers.comm. Mrs Duncan 27/4/2012).

Given the co-presence of the new G2B H84 house, and much older Meroo Station residence, at this time, it is possible that the new home was built by new owners, following the death of the McGraths, which then allowed for the demolition of the Meroo Station buildings at some later date.
Heritage Item: G2B H84 Unnamed 1920s farmhouse

Figure C-245 General view of farmhouse, looking south-west

Figure C-246 View of farmhouse from driveway, looking west

Figure C-247 View of front aspect of farmhouse facing the highway, looking north-west
Heritage Item:  **G2B H84  Unnamed 1920s farmhouse**

**Figure C-248** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph (above)  
(NSW 694-5070 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14 9/7/58)

**Figure C-249** Contemporary aerial view of farmhouse  
(Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H85

Name/Description: 'Maylands'

Item/Site Type: Early twentieth century dairy farm complex.

GDA Map: 281119.6143881
Reference: Smithy: 281149.6143872

Cadastral Location: Lot 6 DP740322

Street Address: 1003 Meroo Road, Bomaderry

Context/Setting: This site is situated on the east side of the highway and Meroo Road, just south of Tullian Creek. The farmhouse and outbuildings are situated on slightly elevated ground which forms part of a broad, low gradient, rise adjacent to Tullian Creek. This is part of a larger scale margin of slightly elevated land which separates the former wetland basins of the Broughton Creek floodplain from the higher gradient foothills and tributary gullies of the Cambewarra Range. The adjacent portion of Tullian Creek was straightening by the Department of Main Roads post 1975 as part of flood mitigation works associated with a highway upgrade.

Description/Fabric: This farm complex consists of a farmhouse and a variety of outbuildings. The farmhouse probably dates from the 1920s or 1930s and comprises a main weatherboard building with a skillion roofed section at the back, which includes the only (originally external walled) chimney (Figure C-250). This has then been attached, via a narrow connecting roof, to a small cottage with a hipped roof and a single right angled gable extension. The main building has an east-west aligned roof, hipped at the back and ending at the front (west) with a main gable and a lower smaller gable at the southwestern end of the building. A now infilled veranda extended along the western and northern side of the building, between the smaller front gable and a further small gable projection facing north at the northeastern corner of the building. Windows are 2 x 2 pane sash windows, many with metal awnings of 1950s or 1960s age.

The smaller cottage faces north and originally had a front veranda which is now mostly filled in except for an entrance porch (Figure C-251). Sandstone piers are evident below both buildings with supplementation and replacement using round wooden posts and brick. Both buildings are uniformly clad in a metal sheathed weatherboard, which probably replaced or overly a variety of original boards.

Many clustered wooden frame and corrugated iron sheds are situated to the east of the farmhouse. These are now used for storage. In 1958, when still an active dairy farm, this area was clearer, and occupied only by a small and isolated smithy shed. This shed is now attached to larger and later sheds and has a simple gabled roof, with weatherboards on the gables and some upper wall sections (Figures C-253 to C-255). Corrugated iron cladding occurs elsewhere, probably replacing original weatherboard cladding elsewhere. Although entry was not possible due to the volume of stored materials, the owners indicate that the original smithy hearth and configuration (except for the bellows) remain intact. A group of dairy related buildings were situated to the southwest of the homestead, of which the bails (wooden frame, weatherboard and iron construction), concrete silo, and ruined and remnant sheds remain (Figure C-252).

Agricultural sheds and shelters also occur to the northeast of the homestead, in partial ruin or collapse; one includes a wall of re-used vertical timber slabs (Figures C-256 to C-258).
There is potential for sub-surface archaeological traces to remain of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings situated on the west side of the present buildings. The approximate location of these buildings is indicated on an 1893 Berry Estate sales poster (Figure C-259) and has been overlaid onto aerial photography in Figures C-261 and C-262.

**Dimensions:** The approximate dimensions of the current homestead (including attached cottage) are 12 x 21 metres. The original main house was approximately 12 x 13 metres; the small cottage was originally approximately 7 x 6 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The condition of the homestead is fair to good. Some repair and maintenance is required. The condition of the Smithy and the milking bails is fair, with some structural repair as well as maintenance required. The other outbuildings range from good to ruinous. The silo is a ruin. The condition of the potential archaeological deposits is not known.

**Integrity:** Generally the buildings in this group display a low degree of integrity due to condition, subsequent changes and extensions, and the use of materials from a variety of periods and styles. The degree of disturbance to the potential archaeological deposits is not known, although the current driveway is likely to have impacted a proportion of the potential deposit area.

**Associated Features:** This site is situated within the area within which it is likely that the Meroo Meadow Company dairy factory was situated (G2B H75). Based on the current evidence one possible factory location was in the open area to the west of the farmhouse enclosure and northwest of the bails.

**Current Use:** Residence.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

The land on the east side of the South Coast Road, between Pestells Lane and Tullian Creek is shown fenced and under ‘cultivation’ on an 1865 map (1865 Crown Survey plan for Pestells Lane (197A – 1603). No buildings are shown, (though others are shown elsewhere on the map).

By 1893, a sales poster for the 15 March Berry Estate auction of ‘The Meroo farms’ shows a small farm on Lot 35, comprised of three buildings and an enclosed yard (Figure C-259). Strangely, these features are not shown on the Deposited Plan (DP3061, 1 Feb 1894), dated the following year, despite other buildings being shown on neighbouring properties (Figure C-260).

George Purdie purchased Lot 35 (51 acres) at the 1893 auction for £26 10s per acre (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3). Sometime later Purdie sold to David Fletcher, who subsequently sold to a Mr Woods.

Frederick John Pheeney purchased the ‘Mayland’ property from Woods in around the mid 1920s. His son Eric was four years old at the time. Prior to that, the Pheeneys were living at the end of Fletchers Lane on the east side of the railway. The property was inherited by Eric, who married Rita on 6 January 1944. (pers. comm. Rita Pheeney 2/5/2013).

The meandering course of Tullian Creek near the northern boundary of the Pheeney property was straightened by the Department of Main Roads, following the Princes Highway upgrade work in the 1970s. Straightening occurred on both sides of the highway.

Eric Pheeney subdivided the property and sold the greater part to Vaughan, his cousin, the remainder contained the home, which remains the home of his wife Rita. The surrounding land is now owned by John Everson. Eric died in around 1993, aged 73 or 74.
Heritage Item:  G2B H85  ‘Maylands’

Figure C-250 View of the north eastern back end of the main farmhouse, showing the skillion roofed back section, subsequently attached to a small cottage (right), looking south

Figure C-251 View of the attached small cottage at the back of the farmhouse, looking south

Figure C-252 General view of the silo, attached sheds, and disused milking bails (foreground), looking south-east
Heritage Item:  G2B H85  ‘Maylands’

Figure C-253 General view of former Smithy shed, now attached to later and larger sheds looking north-west

Figure C-254 Detail of southern gable and wall of Smithy shed, looking north-east

Figure C-255 Detail of interior northern gable of Smithy shed, looking north-east
Heritage Item: G2B H85 ‘Maylands’

Figure C-256 View of a post 1958 shelter shed in the north-eastern portion of the complex, looking

Figure C-257 General view of agricultural shed at north-eastern end of complex. The western portion of this shed group recently collapsed in high winds, looking west

Figure C-258 Interior detail view of western wall of shed in figure above, showing reused vertical timber slabs, looking south-west
Heritage Item: G2B H85 ‘Maylands’

Figure C-259 Extract from 1893 Berry Estate sales poster for the Meroo Farms, showing buildings and yard present at that time (Sales Poster for 15th March 1893 auction of the berry Estate ‘Meroo Farms’ NLA nla.map-lfsp322-v)

Figure C-260 Extract from 1894 Deposited Plan showing cleared and fenced nature of the ‘Maylands’ location (DP3061, 1 Feb 1894) Note the absence of buildings on Lot 35, despite buildings shown on other properties.
Heritage Item: G2B H85 ‘Maylands’

Figure C-261 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing ‘Maylands’ dairy farm relative to an overlay of features shown on the 1893 sales poster. The Smithy shed is highlighted by a blue circle (NSW 694-5074 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14 9/7/58)

Figure C-262 Contemporary aerial view of the ‘Maylands’ farm complex, relative to an overlay of features shown on the 1893 sales poster. (Google Earth Pros 2013)
**Heritage Item:** G2B H86

**Name/Description:** Row of planted road side trees, Meroo Road and Fletchers Lane, Meroo Meadow

**Item/Site Type:** Road side tree planting

**GDA Map Reference:**
281035.6143744 to 281106.6143494

**Cadastral Location:** Road reserve

**Street Address:** Meroo Road, Meroo Meadow

**Context/Setting:** This row of trees is located on the east side of Meroo Road and north side of Fletchers Lane. These sections of road traverse slightly elevated ground which forms part of a broad, low gradient, rise between Tullian Creek to the north and Abernethys Creek in the south. This is part of a larger scale margin of slightly elevated land which separates the former wetland basins of the Broughton Creek floodplain from the higher gradient foothills and tributary gullies of the Cambewarra Range.

**Description/Fabric:** This alignment of over 20 trees is planted parallel to the east side of Meroo Road and north of Fletchers Lane, with most trees occurring just inside the private property boundary (Figure C-263 and Figure C-264). The species represented are mostly Pinus sp., with Grevillea robusta (Silky Oak) and Araucaria bidwillii (Bunya Pine) also represented (Figure C-265). The trees display a wide range of ages, with the Bunya Pines being the tallest and apparently the oldest. The trunk diameters (at 1.2 metres height above ground) of the two large Bunya Pines are around 0.90 and 0.55 metres. Many of the Silky Oak appear to be the youngest plantings. There are also some naturally seeded examples of both Pinus and Araucaria. An extensive hedge of Kei Apple (Dovyalis caffra) occurs at the northern end of the planted trees.

**Dimensions:** The original planting appears to have been continuous over a distance of 480 metres, 175 metres along Fletchers Lane, and 305 metres along Meroo Road (intersecting at the intersection of Fletchers Lane and Meroo Road. The planting interval appears to have varied between 10 and 20 metres.

**Physical Condition:** A review of 1958 and contemporary aerial photography reveals that many of the former tree plantings are now missing (Figures C-266 and C-267). Some others are present as standing stumps. Many of the *Pinus* plantings have a weathered appearance with many missing canopy branches. The two large Bunya Pines appear to be in good health. The subdivision of the ‘Maylands’ property to the east of Meroo Road has led to the development of some road facing allotments with the associated creation of driveways and ornamental garden beds. Some trees remain within this context, although more were originally present and some may have been purposefully removed. An attempt has been made in the past to maintain the row with the planting of Silky Oak trees.

**Integrity:** The aesthetic quality of the tree alignment as a whole has been reduced by tree loss, (especially at the southern end and along Fletchers Lane), and the irregular shape or small size of many of the trees. The differential growth and form of the two paired Bunya Pines now makes them a visual focus of the alignment. The plantings, as an aesthetic tree alignment, are still evident along Meroo Road.
**Associated Features:** There are two other tree plantings recognised in this assessment G2B H5 and H78. The G2B H86 alignment appears to be later in age than the former examples, but is comprised of the same species.

**Current Use:** Road side planting and property border.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

Sometime in the first half of the twentieth century, tree plantings were established by local councils at various places along the Princes highway, and notably within or adjacent to settlements. These often consisted of avenues with plantings on both sides of the road. Some of these survive and have been actively maintained with progressive replacement of any losses. Local examples include an avenue on either side of the highway at Meroo Meadow, west of Wileys Creek (G2B H5), a remnant alignment adjacent to the Meroo Union Church, where the western side of an original highway avenue of pines remains (G2B H78), and at Broughton Village. Species used include Pines, Silky Oak, Bunya Pine, Camphor Laurel and Eucalyptus. These tree varieties reflect both the taste of the early twentieth century and probably also the range available from the Government Nursery at Goulburn, which was a likely source for the Councils (Varman 2001:8).

The fact that most of the trees in this alignment are within the freehold boundary, suggests that the planting was intended to be a property boundary feature and was conducted for a private land owner. The species composition however is similar to other road side plantings in Meroo Meadow, suggesting that either: the same nursery source was used; or the range was limited by fashion or production; or the road planting was offset with the agreement of the land owner.

Based on a comparison of Bunya Pine trunk diameters, this alignment appears to be a little younger than the two Princes Highway plantings – compare 1.20 – 0.70 metres from G2B H5 , with 0.91 – 0.55 metres from G2B H86.

It is estimated that the oldest trees may date from the 1920s or 1930s.
Heritage Item:  G2B H86  Row of planted road side trees, Meroo Road and Fletcher's Lane, Meroo Meadow

Figure C-263 General view of the southern portion of the tree row along Meroo Road, looking south-east

Figure C-264 General view of the northern portion of the tree row along Meroo Road, looking north, note visual intrusion of subsequent subdivision developments

Figure C-265 Detail of Bunya Pine trunk, located just behind road easement fenceline, note also young seedling
Heritage Item:  G2B H86  Row of planted road side trees, Meroo Road and Fletchers Lane, Meroo Meadow

Figure C-266 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph. Showing an almost complete tree row, and possible new plantings towards the northern (top) end. Note the hedge at far end of the alignment (NSW 694-5074 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14 9/7/58)

Figure C-267 Contemporary aerial view of tree plantings showing the remnant nature of the Fletchers Lane section (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H87

Name/Description: [Unnamed] early twentieth century Bungalow style farmhouse and dairy

Item/Site Type: Farmhouse and dairy

GDA Map Reference: 280704.6143489

Cadastral Location: Lot 27 DP131007

Street address: C190 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

Context/Setting: This group of buildings is located on the north side, and on the flood plain, of Abernethy Creek, between the crossings of the highway and Meroo Road. This is part of a larger scale margin of slightly elevated land which separates the former wetland basins of the Broughton Creek floodplain from the higher gradient foothills and tributary gullies of the Cambewarra Range.

Description/Fabric: This recording consists of a former dairy farm with a farmhouse and remnant outbuildings (Figure C-268). The farmhouse is an early twentieth century, timber frame and weatherboard building which is styled on a Bungalow type square plan structure with a front facing gable end to the main roof ridge (the rear is hipped), and a smaller front gabled projection from which a front veranda with brick piers extends northwards to the edge of the front (Figure C-269). An unusual veranda which is recessed under the main roofline is situated on the northern side of the building (Figure C-270). A smaller similarly recessed portico, now infilled with sliding glass doors is situated at the back of the building, and provides access to a storage room, laundry and back door to the main living areas. Windows consist of two single pane double sash windows, often occurring as pairs. There are two chimneys, both internal. Floor piers are of brick.

The exterior and interior of the house appears little changed from the original state of the building, which is estimated to have been constructed in the 1910s to 1920s. Each room displays a different ceiling and upper wall trim, some showing an Art Deco influence. A serif motif on the top of extended vertical elements of door and window casings is repeated throughout the house. Many of the ceilings have decorative plaster margins around the wall-ceiling boundary. Some light fittings are original (Figures C-271 to C-274). The original laundry configuration has survived, with the copper boiler and twin concrete sinks. The pine floor boards, where exposed are also evidently original.

The dairy and milking bails are of concrete, wood and iron construction (Figures C-275 and C-276). Concrete, round profile columns supporting parts of the structure appear to have been hand-formed on-site. Doors and windows and their framework are missing.

A concrete silo with a ruinous roof and elevator housing is the only surviving element of a larger complex of sheds and yards (compare Figures C-277 and C-278).

Dimensions: The farmhouse has approximate dimensions: 14 x 11 metres

Physical Condition: The farmhouse is in very good to excellent condition. The corrugated iron roof on the dairy appears to be new, however all windows and doors are missing, together with their framework. The dairy is disused and does not including milking equipment. The silo is in a ruinous condition with the roof and elevator housing actively falling apart.
**Integrity:** The farmhouse has a high degree of integrity, due to the absence of extensions of renovations, and the retention of original interior features and materials. The outbuildings have limited or low integrity, due to their dilapidation, and loss of associated yards and sheds.

**Associated Features:** None.

**Current Use:** Residence.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

The current owner Mr Paul Duncan relates that the building was built by/for Jack Abernethy. It remains mostly original except that the original combustion stove has been removed.

Jack stopped dairying in the early 1970s and moved out of the house in the same decade. The farmhouse was subsequently rented. He died in 2010 and the property was sold in 2011.
Heritage Item:  **G2B H87**  [Unnamed] early twentieth century Bungalow style farmhouse and dairy

Figure C-268 General view of farmhouse and outbuildings, looking east  

Figure C-269 View of the front aspect of the farmhouse looking southeast  

Figure C-270 View of side and rear of farmhouse, looking southwest. Note the recessed veranda under the main roof line
Heritage Item: G2B H87 [Unnamed] early twentieth century Bungalow style farmhouse and dairy

Figure C-271 View of main hall, looking towards front door, note original light fitting, decorative ceiling, and repeated use of a serif motif on the top of the vertical elements of door and window casings, looking west.

Inset shows detail of ceiling and upper wall trim

Figure C-272 View of laundry, showing original emplacement for a copper boiler and concrete sinks, looking south

Figure C-273 View of internal doors, picture rails, door casings and skirting boards, looking south-west
Heritage Item: G2B H87 [Unnamed] early twentieth century Bungalow style farmhouse and dairy

Figure C-274 General view of lounge room, decorative ceiling and original doors frames and windows, looking northeast (http://www.raineandhorne.com.au/properties/146405)

Inset detail of ceiling trim

Figure C-275 General view of concrete dairy and silo behind, looking south-east

Figure C-276 Detail of concrete dairy, note hand rounded pillars
Heritage Item: G2B H87 [Unnamed] early twentieth century Bungalow style farmhouse and dairy

Figure C-277 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing the house and outbuildings (NSW 694-5074 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14 9/7/58)

Figure C-278 Contemporary aerial view showing the house apparently unchanged (except for the addition of a garage) since the 1958 photo. Note also loss of some outbuildings, sheds, yards and tanks in dairy complex (Google Earth Pro 2013)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Heritage Item:</strong></th>
<th><strong>G2B H88</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name/Description:</strong></td>
<td>Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item/Site Type:</strong></td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GDA Map Reference:</strong></td>
<td>281421.6145171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadastral Location:</strong></td>
<td>Highway road reserve and Lot 4 DP 589387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address:</strong></td>
<td>26A Boxsells Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context/Setting:</strong></td>
<td>This site is located on the west side of the highway, and situated on the terminal, downslope section of a low, low gradient and minor north-south aligned spurline, situated between two tributaries of Tandingulla Creek (Figure C-279, Figure C-280 and Figure C-281). The area of potential extends partly within the current Princes Highway road reserve, and partly within adjacent freehold land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description/Fabric:</strong></td>
<td>This recording consists of a potential archaeological deposit, which may comprise subsurface archaeological traces of the former hut and any associated occupational debris. The area of potential consists of cleared pasture with some low tree regrowth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions:</strong></td>
<td>The area of predicted archaeological potential occurs within a circle of approximate diameter 20 metres. The original hut may have had dimensions in the order of 8 x 10 metres (based on 1884 Crown Survey plan) (Figure C-282).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Condition:</strong></td>
<td>The area of potential deposit has been partially impacted by fence construction, and may also have been impacted by actions within the highway corridor during highway re-alignment works in the late 1970s, or early 1980s. The conditions of any archaeological deposits that may be present have not been determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrity:</strong></td>
<td>The integrity of any archaeological deposits present is not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated Features:</strong></td>
<td>This site is associated with the former main house and stables of the Meroo Station, situated 100 metres upslope: G2B H90, and may have been contemporaneous with former Berry Estate buildings, probably a tenant farm, 170 metres to the southwest (G2B H73).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong></td>
<td>Highway road reserve and pasture grassland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Listings:</strong></td>
<td>No current listings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This recording consists of the location and any subsurface traces of a hut which formed part of the Meroo Station. The station is shown on a crown survey plan for the Meroo Meadow Public School reserve in 1884 (Figure C-282), and a sales poster in 1893 (Figure C-283). The crown survey plan shows four buildings situated on an elevated spurline adjacent to Tandingulla Creek. The ‘Meroo Station’, as illustrated, is comprised of a ‘house’ with an east facing veranda and fenced off ‘garden’ which borders the Nowra to Broughton Creek road reserve. Behind the house is a separate ‘Kitchen’ building and a little further southwest is a ‘stable’. This group of buildings was located just north of the northern boundary of the former public school reserve. Around 100 metres down the spur, within the same fenced enclosure, a single ‘hut’ is shown, connected to the house by a track running along the crest of the spurline. This structure is the subject of the G2B H88 heritage recording. The hut has a front, east facing veranda, and is situated at the end of the spur, adjacent to both the road and the flats of Tandingulla Creek (Figure C-284 and Figure C-285).
Meroo Station was located on former portion 9 (parish of Bunberra), and was a land grant of 1280 acres initially promised to Richard Mutton in 1829, but subsequently granted to Alexander Berry in 1837. It extended from the northern watershed of Tandingulla Creek, southwards to Abernethys Creek, and occupied the prime basal slopes and flats just west of the swamps of the Broughton Creek flood plain. In the 1836 crown survey the property is named ‘Moroo Farm’ (1836 Certificate of Title Vol.35 Fol.672). On parish maps it is known as ‘Meroo Farm’.

Meroo Station is known to have been a cattle rearing and mustering area in the early development of the Berry Estate. A pencil drawn map, probably by Berry, in 1827, shows ‘Muroo Hut’ and a ‘New Stock Yard’ on the west side of the valley floor swamps (refer Section 4.1.3 historical background). During the establishment, in 1884, of the Meroo Meadow school reserve, situated in between the ‘house’ and the ‘hut’, David Berry objected to the location (after first having agreed). He stated that the site was too dangerous due to possible flooding and probable straying of cattle from nearby Estate cattle yards. He noted, via his solicitors, that it was ‘in the middle of Meroo Station, close to the overseers house and stable, opposite his cattle yards, compelling him to remove and form a new station, erect new buildings and yards for the paltry compensation of £100’ (Letter to Minister of Public Instruction from Morton Smith Solicitors acting for David Berry 19 January 1885, presumed to be from State Archives school file, presented in NSW DoE 1967).

The subdivision and auction of the Berry Estate Meroo farms in 1893, presumably provides a maximum date for the operation of the station. The main ‘house’, identified in Berry’s correspondence as the overseers house, and stables, were incorporated into a small lot of around nine acres (Lot 59). The lower ‘hut’ was incorporated into Lot 60 of around 28 acres, with the lower portion of the associated small fenced enclosure being included in Lot 49 of around 23 acres.

Lots 60 and 49 were purchased by a W. McKerrow, for £15 ten shillings per acre (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3). Lot 60 is identified in the sales records as ‘Comerfords’. The death of a Henry Comerford, native of Galway, Ireland, aged 67, was recorded on 3 November 1897, at his ‘Forest Lodge’ home, Meroo (Sydney Morning Herald 4 November 1915 p.8; The Australian Town and Country Journal 4 December 1897)

The W. McKerrow is likely to be William McKerrow who was elected an alderman of the Berry Municipality in the years 1892 and 1895 (Robson et al. 2008:27). In his obituary, William is noted as being born at Bradford, Yorkshire, England, and having gone to Bega (probably meaning Berry) on the NSW south coast around 1878 (Northern Star 7 August 1936 p.8). He subsequently moved to the Bangalow district in Queensland around 1906. William and his wife had a family of eight children, one of whom, Isaac William McKerrow, was reportedly born in Berry around 1877 (Northern Star 7 September 1950 p.4). William died on the 31 July 1936 aged 83. All of his surviving family at that time variously resided in Queensland.

A ‘W. McKerrow is listed in the Berry Estate 1903 list of landholders as occupying 93, 65 and 77 acres, the latter being at ‘Long Nose’ (Mitchel Library Mss 315/110 Item 3).

William’s ownership of Lots 49 and 60 may have ended with his move to Bangalow, around 1906, some thirteen years after its purchase.
Heritage Item: G2B H88 Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’

Figure C-279 General view of low rise on which the former ‘hut’ was situated (yellow dotted line shows approximate location), looking south

Figure C-280 View across crest of low spur including location of former ‘hut’ (yellow dotted line shows approximate location), looking south-west

Figure C-281 View looking east towards low spur and location of former ‘hut’ (yellow dotted line shows approximate location), looking east
Heritage Item: G2B H88 Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’

Figure C-282 Extract from Crown Survey Plan of Meroo Public School Reserve, August 1883, showing buildings belonging to Meroo Station, prior to establishment of school in 1884. The blue oval indicates the ‘hut’ which is the subject of this recording (Certificate of Title 1132 – 1978).

Figure C-283 Extract from 1893 sales poster for the Berry Estate Meroo Farms, showing single schoolhouse building together with Meroo Station structures. The blue circle indicates the ‘hut’ which is the subject of this recording (Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith., John Ewing licensed surveyor, NLA map-lfsp322-v).
Heritage Item: **G2B H88 Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’**

Figure C-284 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing Meroo Meadow school buildings but none of the original Meroo Station buildings (NSW 694-5070 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run GK14 9/7/58)

Figure C-285 Contemporary aerial photograph with an overlay (yellow) of buildings and fencelines from the 1883 Crown Survey Plan of Meroo Public School Reserve (Google Earth Pro 2013)
**Heritage Item:** G2B H89

**Name/Description:** ‘Jaspers Grove’ - Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm

**Item/Site Type:** Potential archaeological deposit

---

**GDA Map Reference:** 285749.6146512

**Cadastral Location:** Lot 103 DP 794485

**Street Address:** 20A Strongs Road, Jaspers Brush

---

**Context/Setting:** The farm was situated on the northern side of Strongs Road, around 80 metres west of its intersection with the Berry Estate Road, now 190 metres from its non-functional (old) intersection with the Princes Highway. The site is situated on the broad crest of the Jaspers Brush spurline which is a low broad spur projecting in a south easterly direction onto the coastal plain and floodplain of Broughton Creek. Jaspers Creek is situated 360 metres to the northeast.

**Description/Fabric:** This recording consists of a potential archaeological deposit, which may comprise subsurface archaeological traces of former residential and/or agricultural buildings and any associated occupational debris. The area of potential consists of open ground around the existing sheds and outbuildings of the ‘Jaspers Grove’ farm (Figure C-286).

**Dimensions:** The approximate area within which archaeological deposits may occur falls within a circle of diameter 100 metres (Figures C-287, C-288 and C-289).

**Physical Condition:** The approximate area within which archaeological deposits may occur has been impacted by the construction of subsequent outbuildings, sheds and service tracks. The location of the southeastern most building shown on the sales poster has been substantially impacted by the construction of twentieth century (existing) buildings. There is unlikely to be any significant deposit in this area. The condition of any archaeological deposits that may be present elsewhere has not been determined.

**Integrity:** The integrity of any archaeological deposits present is not known.

**Associated Features:** The former buildings which relate to this recording may have been contemporaneous with the function of the Berry Estate Road, of which there are two nearby remnants: G2B H7 and H9.

**Current Use:** Farm yard and outbuilding precinct.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.

---

**Historical Background/Interpretation**

This group of buildings is indicated on an 1893 sales poster for the Jaspers Brush subdivision of the Berry Estate. It is likely, therefore that they functioned as a tenant farm prior to the subdivision. They are situated in Lot 46, which consisted of around 131 acres (1904 DP4468). This lot was passed in, unsold, at the 1893 Berry Estate auctions (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3).

Farm buildings were still present at this location in 1931 (Nowra 1:63, 360 topographic map June 1931 Australian Section Imperial General Staff).

Further research on the sequence of ownership of this property has not been conducted.
Heritage Item: **G2B H89** 'Jaspers Grove' - Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm

**Figure C-286** Extract from 1893 Berry Estate sales poster for Jaspers Brush Farms (libraries Australia ID 44485223)

**Figure C-287** Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing 'Jaspers Grove' farm relative to an overlay (yellow) of former building locations in 1893 (refer Figure C-286 above), (NSW 698-5024 SHI DAPTO-ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/1958)

**Figure C-288** Contemporary aerial view of 'Jaspers Grove' farm relative to an overlay (yellow) of former building locations in 1893 (refer Figure C-287 above),
Heritage Item: G2B H89 ‘Jaspers Grove’ - Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm

Figure C-289 Extract from 1904 survey of Deposited Plan 4468, showing Lot 46 of 131 acres (1904 DP 4468)
Heritage Item: G2B H90

Name/Description: ‘Meroo Station’ Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate cattle station complex

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

GDA Map Reference: 281478.6145291

Cadastral Location: Lot 3 DP 250946

Street Address: C395 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

Context/Setting: This site is located on the west side of the highway, and situated on the crest and east facing slopes of a low gradient and minor north-south aligned spurline, situated between two tributaries of Tandingulla Creek.

Description/Fabric: This recording consists of potential archaeological deposits which may comprise subsurface archaeological traces of the former Berry Estate Meroo Station and any associated occupational debris, including those features known from historical mapping: the overseer’s house, separate kitchen block, and stables. The area of potential comprises cleared pasture grassland, vegetable garden beds, and a minor proportion of modern vehicle tracks and sheds (Figure C-290, Figure C-291 and Figure C-292).

Dimensions: The area within which archaeological deposits may occur is approximately 70 x 50 metres. The original ‘house’ may have had dimensions in the order of 10 x 10 metres, separate ‘kitchen’ block, 7 x 4 metres, and the ‘stables’, 7 x 7.5 metres (based on 1884 Crown Survey plan). A fenced ‘garden’ around the front of the ‘house’ may have had maximum dimensions of 30 x 46 metres (Figure C-293).

Physical Condition: The area of potential has been partially impacted by fence construction and the establishment of a vehicle driveway and sheds at the far north and northwestern margin of the area. Despite this a large area appears to have been used only for grazing and perhaps infrequent agricultural ploughing. A large plum tree, probably a remnant of the garden in front of the overseers house, was present. The condition of any archaeological deposits that may be present have not been determined.

Integrity: The integrity of any archaeological deposits present is not known.

Associated Features: This site is associated with a former ‘hut’ situated 100 metres downslope: G2B H88, and may have been contemporaneous with former Berry Estate buildings, probably a tenant farm, 250 metres to the southwest (G2B H73).

Current Use: Rural residential lot.

Heritage Listings: No current listings.

Historical Background/Interpretation

This recording consists of the location and any subsurface traces of the Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’.

Meroo Station was located on former portion 9 (parish of Bunberra), and was a land grant of 1280 acres initially promised to Richard Mutton in 1829, but subsequently granted to Alexander Berry in 1837. It extended from the northern watershed of Tandingulla Creek, southwards to Abernethys Creek, and occupied the prime basal slopes and flats just west of the swamps of the Broughton Creek flood plain. In the 1836 crown survey the property is named ‘Moroo Farm’ (1836 Certificate of Title Vol.35 Fol.672). On parish maps it is known as ‘Meroo Farm’.
Meroo Station is known to have been a cattle rearing and mustering area in the early development of the Berry Estate. A pencil drawn map, probably by Berry, in 1827, shows ‘Muroo Hut’ and a ‘New Stock Yard’ on the west side of the valley floor swamps (refer Section 4.1.3 historical background). During the establishment, in 1884, of the Meroo Meadow school reserve, situated in between the ‘house’ and the ‘hut’, David Berry objected to the location (after first having agreed). He stated that the site was too dangerous due to possible flooding and probable straying of cattle from nearby Estate cattle yards. He noted, via his solicitors, that it was ‘in the middle of Meroo Station, close to the overseers house and stable, opposite his cattle yards, compelling him to remove and form a new station, erect new buildings and yards for the paltry compensation of £100’ (Letter to Minister of Public Instruction from Morton Smith Solicitors acting for David Berry 19 January 1885, presumed to be from State Archives school file, presented in NSW DoE 1967).

The station is shown as a sketched annotation on an 1862 Certificate of Title for the original Berry Estate Road as two buildings, one forming the boundary of a small rectangular fenced enclosure (Figure C-294). More detail is provided on a crown survey plan for the Meroo Meadow Public School reserve in 1884 (Figure C-295), and a sales poster in 1893 (Figure C-296). The crown survey plan shows four buildings situated on an elevated spurline adjacent to Tandingulla Creek. The ‘Meroo Station’, as illustrated, is comprised of a ‘house’ with an east facing veranda and fenced off ‘garden’ which borders the Nowra to Broughton Creek road reserve. Behind the house is a separate ‘Kitchen’ building and a little further southwest is a ‘stable’. This group of buildings was located just north of the northern boundary of the former public school reserve. Around 100 metres down the spur, within the same fenced enclosure, a single ‘hut’ is shown, connected to the house by a track running along the crest of the spurline. The ‘hut’ is the subject of a separate recording, G2B H88. The hut has a front, east facing veranda, and is situated at the end of the spur, adjacent to both the road and the flats of Tandingulla Creek.

The subdivision and auction of the Berry Estate Meroo farms in 1893, presumably provides a maximum date for the operation of the station. The main ‘house’, identified in Berry’s correspondence as the overseers house, and stables, were incorporated into a small lot of around nine acres (Lot 59). The lower ‘hut’ was incorporated into Lot 60 of around 28 acres, with the lower portion of the associated small fenced enclosure being included in Lot 49 of around 23 acres.

Lot 59 was purchased by a Mr W. McGrath for the high price of £31 per acre at the 1893 Berry Estate auction. This was one of four lots purchased by McGrath, the others being Lots 64, 65 and 79, providing a large rectangular holding of a further 107 acres, just 200 metres northwest of the old Meroo Station buildings, and comprising an 800 metre upstream section of the Tandingulla Creek valley (Figure C-297), (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3).

The W. McGrath referred to may be William McGrath of Meroo who was an Alderman of the first ill-fated Shoalhaven Municipal Council in 1859. Following Berry’s securing of an injunction against the Council, a Supreme Court finding in 1861 which found the Council to be illegally constituted, and a Privy Council’s decision also against the Council, the mayor and aldermen had to personally pay Berry’s legal fees of £160. The matter was settled with contributions from people of the district (Bayley 1975:89). .

William McGrath died on 17 April 1902, aged 74 years, at his residence at Meroo. It was noted at the time that William was the last surviving member of the 1859 municipal council and the first attempt at self government in the Shoalhaven (The Catholic Press 26 April 1902 p.2). William’s wife died in the following year at her son’s residence at West Cambewarra (The Shoalhaven News and South Coast Districts Advertiser 12 April 1902, and 13 June 1903 p.2; Kiama independent and Shoalhaven Advertiser 22 April 1902 p.2).
The current owner, Mrs Ursula Duncan, has resided in the house situated immediately north of the former Meroo Station buildings, with her husband since around 1962. This house (G2B H84) may have been built in the 1910s. She relates that two large plum trees used to be situated half way down the slope in front of the house (Figure C-298 and Figure C-299), and were probably related to the garden of a former building which can be seen in the back of a 1921/22 photograph of the former Meroo Meadow Public School (refer G2B H90 description, and to Figure C-36), (pers.comm. Mrs Duncan 27/4/2012). The house visible in the middle distance of this photograph is almost certainly the former Meroo Station overseer’s house, with the current G2B H84 house in the far background. The likely Meroo Station house is entirely consistent with the 1884 Crown Survey sketch, having a pyramidal roof (and therefore a square plan) and a front, east facing veranda. One chimney on an external back wall is evident, however no separate kitchen block is discernible.

The new house (G2B H84) may have been built by new owners, following the death of the McGraths, which then allowed for the demolition of the Meroo Station buildings at some later date.
Heritage Item: **G2B H90  ‘Meroo Station’ Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate cattle station complex**

**Figure C-290 General view, looking north across area of former kitchen and overseers house, to right and downslope of modern garage**

**Figure C-291 General view looking north-west across location of former overseers house**

**Figure C-292 General view looking south-west across location of former overseers house**
Heritage Item: G2B H90 ‘Meroo Station’ Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate cattle station complex

Figure C-293 1921/1922 photograph of the Meroo Meadow Public School residence (foreground - red), with the former ‘Meroo Station’ overseers house in the middle distance (blue), and the early twentieth century house (G2B H84) in distance (green) (extract from longer panorama photo, courtesy Mr & Mrs North, also in Berry Museum collection).

Figure C-294 Extract from 1862 crown survey of Berry Estate Road showing new road alignment (thick red line) and built features present prior to road construction: former tracks (narrow brown line), Meroo Station (black rectangles) and fences (hatched lines), refer enlargement inset showing two station buildings, one attached to a small fenced enclosure (Certificate of Title R193a-1603).
Heritage Item:  G2B H90  ‘Meroo Station’ Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate cattle station complex

Figure C-295 Extract from Crown Survey Plan of Meroo Public School Reserve, August 1883, showing existing buildings belonging to Meroo Station, prior to establishment of school in 1884 (Certificate of Title 1132 – 1978).

Figure C-296 Extract from 1893 sales poster, showing single schoolhouse building together with Meroo Station structures (Hardie and Gorman Pty Ltd, John Sands Lith., John Ewing licenced surveyor, NLA map-lfsp322-v).
Heritage Item: G2B H90 ‘Meroo Station’ Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate cattle station complex

Figure C-297 Extract from 1894 Deposited Plan of the Meroo Farms subdivision (DP3061), showing the lots purchased at the 1893 auction by W. McGrath.
Heritage Item: G2B H90 ‘Meroo Station’ Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate cattle station complex

Figure C-298 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing overlay (yellow) of house, kitchen, garden, stables indicated in 1883 crown survey (refer Figure C-295 above (Gk13 5036 1958))

Two large plum trees may have been remnant of Overseers Cottage front garden

Figure C-299 Contemporary aerial photograph showing overlay (yellow) of house, kitchen, garden, stables indicated in 1883 crown survey (refer Figure C-295 above (Google Earth Pro 2013))
**Heritage Item:** G2B H91

**Name/Description:** Site of ‘Little Meadow’ Public School – ‘Tent School’ 1882 -1884

**Item/Site Type:** Potential archaeological deposit of former 1880s tent school

---

**Context/Setting:** This recording is situated on the east facing, low gradient, basal slopes of a long low spurline which projects in a northwest-southeast alignment and to form part of the western edge margin of the Broughton Creek flood plain. The slopes are adjacent to Wileys Creek (Figure C-300, Figure C-301 and Figure C-302).

**Description/Fabric:** This recording consists of potential archaeological deposits which may relate to the 20 month occupation of this area by the ‘tent school’ for the Little Meadow Public School. There are no obvious artificially flattened earth platforms evident across the slopes, and it is possible the wooden floor of the tent was ‘floated’ across the sloping ground, or it was situated close to the original road platform, on naturally near-level ground (Figure C-303). Archaeological traces may consist of floor deposits, evidence of floor supports, fence and railing post holes, stake holes, cess pits and rubbish dumps. The latter two may be situated away from the main occupation areas, such as at the edges of the former forest clearing, or disposal areas in the creek bed and/or along the creek bank.

A proposed school reserve area was surveyed but never resumed, and may or may not relate directly to the location of the tent school. Consequently the reserve should be considered to provide a general indication only and the potential area of archaeological deposit is bounded by the current road platforms of the highway and Turners Lane, and west bank of Wileys Creek.

**Dimensions:** The dimensions of the proposed one acre reserve are 400 x 250 feet (122 x 76 metres). The area in which potential archaeological deposits are considered to be possible has dimensions of 130 x 125 metres.

**Physical Condition:** The site area comprises agricultural pasture and a recently established orchard or plantation. The area does not appear to have been seriously disturbed or eroded in the past (Figure C-304).

**Integrity:** Past widening on the southern side of the highway platform to create a left turn lane into Turners Lane has encroached upon the area of potential archaeological deposit occurrence. Changes to the Wileys Creek bank may also have compromised deposits. It is not known if and to what extent the area has been ploughed. The area has also been impacted at isolated points by sign installation and orchard planting.

**Associated Features:** This site is associated with the other past locations of the Meroo Meadow Public school (refer description for G2B H4).

**Current Use:** Agricultural land – grazing pasture and orchard plantings.

**Heritage Listings:** No current listings.
Historical Background/Interpretation

A detailed historical summary of the Meroo Meadow Public School is outlined in Table C-1 (refer G2B H4 description).

The school was established in July 1867 (Havergal 1996:167, Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983:122), and has been situated in three separate locations, the current school location being the last and permanent location (NSW DoE 1967). The first location was a pre-existing structure, used as a church by the Meroo community. Its location was described as on J. Boxsell's lease, one and a half miles (2.4 kilometres) from Bomaderry village, towards Broughton Creek (Berry), 'on the side of the Cambewarra Range' and 'off the main road'. The building was '100 feet above the high water mark' and 16 x 20 x 10 feet, built of strong slab with a shingle roof, a hard board floor and clay foundations'. A possible location is a 'chapel' building recorded on Grahams Road/Pestells Lane, in an 1865 Certificate of Title (R197A – 1603), at approximate location: MGA reference 280242.6144713, refer Figures C-40 and C-41 (in G2B H4 description).

This original location was non-vested - the land belonged to the Berry Estate, and was leased to Mr Boxsell, who intern leased to the school council. The building continued to be used for religious services on Sundays. As such the location was never considered to be permanent and no permanent reserve was created.

Following increasing dilapidation of this building, and the need for greater space, a new ‘temporary’ one acre site was provided in 1880 by the Berry Estate, at ‘Little Meadow’ at the Turners Lane and Princes Highway intersection (G2B H91). This site constitutes item G2B H91. The optimal location for the school was disputed by the Estate, the Department of Public Instruction and the local communities, and as such the Little Meadow remained a temporary site, provided by the Estate under lease. The site was formally surveyed in 1882 for proposed resumption but this was never carried out (Certificate of Title 944 – 1978) (Figure C-305, Figure C-306 and Figure C-307).

Pending a decision on a permanent location, a ‘tent school’ was established on the Little Meadow site and opened in 1882. The tent was erected over a wooden floor, on newly cleared ground, and firmly anchored to the ground. The school had an attendance of fifty and over. The tent school was illustrated in the Australian Town and Country Journal in 1882 (Figure 4-15). The school operated here, under canvas for 20 months, until the school moved to a permanent two acre location in April 1884 at Meroo Station, the current site (refer G2B H91 description).

The third and permanent site was identified in 1883. This is described as recording G2B H4 (refer to this recording description for further historical detail.

The name of the school has varied across its history (Fletcher and Burnswoods 1983:122). In each case, these changes closely corresponded to either changes in location or to local use of nomenclature. In its first location within the Meroo church building, it was known as ‘Meroo’. When operating as a ‘tent school’ at Little Meadow, it changed its name in 1882 to ‘Little Meadow’. Upon return to Meroo, to its current location, the ‘Meroo’ name was restored in May 1884. In October 1923 the name was finally changed to Meroo Meadow, reflecting change in local usage.
Heritage Item: G2B H91 Site of ‘Little Meadow’ Public School – ‘Tent School’ 1882 -1884

Figure C-300 General view of G2B H91, the lower slopes adjacent to, and extending east of the intersection of Turners Lane and the Princes Highway, looking east. The tent school may have been located parallel to the road, where the flattest ground is situated.

Figure C-301 View of G2B H91, looking south-east across slopes towards Wileys Creek.

Figure C-302 View of G2B H91, looking north-east across slopes towards the highway crossing of Wileys Creek.
Heritage Item: G2B H91  Site of ‘Little Meadow’ Public School – ‘Tent School’ 1882 -1884

Figure C-303  Illustration of the ‘Little Meadows Creek Government School’, published on the 11th November 1882 by the Australian Town and Country Journal (p.24). The presence of the post and rail fence, the adjacent clear space to the right, and absence of fences elsewhere, suggests that the fence marks a road boundary. Turners Lane did not exist at this time, leaving the Main South Coast Road as the likely subject. The down slope trend of the fence suggests that the creek is towards the left. Based on this reasoning, this illustration, is looking southwest, and the tent was aligned close to, and parallel to the road.

Figure C-304  General view of G2B H91 area, looking west and south-west from Wileys Creek bridge.
Heritage Item: G2B H91 Site of ‘Little Meadow’ Public School – ‘Tent School’ 1882 -1884

Figure C-305 Extracts from 21 March 1882 Crown survey plan (Certificate of Title 944 – 1978), showing proposed public school reserve for resumption.

*Note that the area of the proposed reserve may not necessarily relate directly to the former position of the tent school.*

Figure C-306 Extract from 1858 aerial photograph showing location of proposed Little Meadow school reserve, overlay taken from 1882 survey (NSW 698-5030 Run Gk13 21/7/1958)

Figure C-307 Contemporary aerial photograph showing approximate location of proposed Little Meadow school reserve, overlay taken from 1882 survey (above) (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: G2B H92

Name/Description: Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate tenant farm buildings

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

GDA Map Reference: (approx.) 280480.6144207

Cadastral Location: Lot 4 DP 249085

Street Address: C265 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

Context/Setting: This site is situated on the north side of Pestells Lane, approximately 500 metres from its intersection with the Princes highway. This area comprises generally flat or slightly elevated valley floor land situated between Tullian and Abernethys Creeks. It forms part of a broad, low gradient, margin of land which separates the former wetland basins of the Broughton Creek floodplain from the higher gradient foothills and tributary gullies of the Cambewarra Range. It is characterised by meandering creeklines, adjacent floodplains, and minor rises formed from higher terrace remnants and bedrock toe-slopes (Figure C-311).

Description/Fabric: This recording consists of potential archaeological deposits which may comprise subsurface archaeological traces of a former Berry Estate tenant farm. The area of potential comprises creek flats and the edge of an alluvial terrace, all supporting cleared pasture grassland.

Dimensions: The area within which archaeological deposits may occur is approximately 140 x 50 metres

Physical Condition: The area of potential has been at least partially impacted by fence construction, and ploughing.

Integrity: The integrity of any archaeological deposits present is not known.

Associated Features: This former farm complex was probably replaced by the construction of the Exeter homestead (G2B H77) in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century.

Current Use: Pasture grassland.

Heritage Listings: No current listings.

Historical Background/Interpretation

The presence of buildings at this site during the time of the Berry Estate is documented by two sources, an 1865 Certificate of Title (Figure C-308), and an 1893 Berry Estate sales poster (Figure C-312). In the former only three buildings, including a ‘hut’, a ‘Barn’ and yards’ (Figure C-309 and Figure C-310). An associated ‘cross cut saw’ fence alignment may have been a consequence of ploughing patterns and a desire to enclose the elevated ground above a terrace embankment (Figure C-313). Twenty eight years on, the sales poster indicates considerable growth in the farming complex, with six buildings, most of which are spread along the edge of the terrace formation, between the creek flats and the higher ground.

Lot 42 (53 acres) consisting of land referred to as ‘Horgan’s’ tenant farm, and was purchased in the 15 March 1893 Berry Estate auction by J. Chisholm for £25 per acre (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3). However, the Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory states that Lot 42 was purchased from the Berry Estate by William Chisholm on 21 March, 1896 (no. 2390227).

A James Horgan is listed in the Berry Estate Returns for 1875 as leasing 33 acres, and having started the lease in 1871 (Mitchel Library Reel CY4412). There are no other listings in later years however.
Members of the Horgan family subsequently purchased Estate Lots 91, 94, and 97 (of 46, 48 and 54 acres) situated on, and north, of Abernethys Creek, and east of Bells Lane (Northern Star 1 April 1893 p.3, Australian Town and Country Journal 25 March 1893 p.41).
Heritage Item: G2B H92 Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate tenant farm buildings

Figure C-308 Extract from 1865 Certificate of Title for Pestells Lane road reserve, showing a ‘Hut’, ‘Barn’ and ‘yards’ (R197A.1603)

Figure C-309 Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing an overlay of the fencelines and structures shown on the 1865 Certificate of Title above (NSW 698-5038 SH DAPTO - ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58)

Figure C-310 Contemporary aerial view of the G2B 92 site, showing an overlay of the fencelines and structures shown on the 1865 Certificate of Title above (Google Earth Pro 2013)
Heritage Item: **G2B H92** Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate tenant farm buildings

**Figure C-311**
General view of G2B H92 area (yellow dotted line) and context, looking north-west

**Figure C-312**
Extract from 15 March 1893 sales poster for the Berry Estate subdivision of the Meroo Farms, showing Lot 42 and a group of farm buildings which constitute the area of G2B H92

**Figure C-313**
Extract from 1958 aerial photograph showing overlay of building positions shown in 1893 sales poster above (NSW 698-5038 SHI DAPTO – ULLADULLA Run Gk13 21/7/58)
Heritage Item: SICPH CL

Name/Description: Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape

Item/Site Type: Cultural Landscape

The predominantly pastoral landscape character of the coastal plain and basal slopes extending southwards from the Southern Illawarra Range, from Mount Pleasant in the east, to Browns Mountain in the west, and extending southwards to Greenwell Point, has been variously recognised as a landscape with significant heritage and conservation values (Figure C-314 to Figure C-318). Previous recognition has been either limited to sub-regions and categories (such as the Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscape), focused on contextual values relative to urban and town centres (such as the Berry Township Urban Conservation Area), or defined primarily in terms of natural and historical landscape characteristics (the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area).

The adoption, in this report, of a cultural landscape classification for this area seeks to recognise cultural heritage values as a consequence of the interplay between cultural practice and the physical environment. This provides for the management of such areas in terms of human processes and economies, as well as physical characteristics.

The area and boundary of the SICPH CL approximates those for the National Trust listing of the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area (Figure C-318). A detailed analysis and definition of a boundary is beyond the scope of this assessment.

The Shoalhaven City Council Heritage Study recognised the western portion of this precinct, north of the Shoalhaven, as the Berry-Bolong Pastoral Landscape (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:44) (Figure C-318). It was noted that the continuity of dairy farming across the region has contributed to the survival of an underlying nineteenth century and early twentieth century pastoral landscape. The development of this landscape has been structured by the evolution of the Berry Estates and surrounding villages and tenant communities, subsequent free selection\(^1\) across the surrounding slopes, the development and predominance of the dairying industry, development of the transport corridors, first by water and then by road and rail, and the drainage of the wetland basins across the Shoalhaven flood plain.

\(^1\) Free selection refers to the process established in the Crown Lands Acts 1861 by the NSW premier John Robertson, for the selection of Crown Land and the purchase of freehold title, often to form small property holdings of between 40 and 320 acre lots. The Acts aimed to break the squatters' leasehold domination on land tenure up to that time.

Figure C-314: Distant view of the Illawarra coastal hinterland, looking south-west from Tulloch Road. Note the coastal plain context framed by the Southern Illawarra Range escarpment and descending spurs from the far right, and the Coolangatta Mountain on the far left.
Figure C-315: A collection of views demonstrating some of the cultural and aesthetic cultural landscape values of the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland cultural landscape
Despite the decline of many smaller villages and communities, changes in population density, the diminishing viability of small farms, and the growth of rural subdivision, the region retains a fundamentally nineteenth century pastoral structure. This is evident as a patchwork of cleared and drained floodplains, cleared estates, vegetated boundaries, forested upper slopes, and a network of townscape and valley settlements. All of these elements are aesthetically held together by the backdrop of the Illawarra Range, its top escarpment, and prominent ridgelines extending across the plain to the coast. This landscape includes examples of vernacular buildings, farmscapes, churches and public schools, nineteenth century plantings, Victorian residences and a range of buildings, silos, drainage schemes and structures which demonstrate settlement, landuse patterns and the archaeology of the agricultural development of the Southern Illawarra (Peter Freeman Pty Ltd 1998:45).
Riparian vegetation along Jaspers Brush Creek

Bunya Pines are a feature of gardens and road sides

Cambewarra Mt from the Abernethys Creek spurline

Small wetland off Flying Fox Creek

The edge of the lowlands

Flying Fox Creek

Figure C-317: A collection of views demonstrating some of the cultural and aesthetic cultural landscape values of the Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland cultural landscape
The vegetation of the region is also a critical component of the cultural landscape. Landscape elements include the continuous pastoral grasslands of the lowlands which extend up slope into a patchwork of smaller former dairy farm clearings, remnant patches of sclerophyll and regenerating rainforest, ribbons of riparian vegetation, and the widespread iconic incidence of often isolated cabbage fan palms, large spreading fig trees, and boundary plantings of Coral trees.

The National Trust (New South Wales) has recognised the cultural, aesthetic and natural values of the landscape values of the Southern Illawarra by defining the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area (BDLCA). This area includes the coastline south of Kiama to Greenwell Point, the lower Shoalhaven River plain, and the slopes leading up to and including the Illawarra escarpment (Figure C-318). This area is roughly equivalent to that of the SICPH CL. A description of this identified landscape has been entered onto the Register of the National Estate, as an Indicative Place (Place ID 1625), however no formal nomination or assessment was ever prepared (Refer Appendix B).

The town of Berry is an integral component of the cultural landscape and its values identified in the SICPH Cultural Landscape recording, and its previously recorded subsets; the Berry Bolong Pastoral Landscape, and the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area. Recognition of this forms a basis for the recent recognition, by the National Trust of Australia (NSW) of the Berry Township Urban Conservation Area (BTUCA). This area was listed on the Trust’s Register in 2011 (refer Appendix B).

The listing recognises the historic development of the town, and its distinctive urban character set within a rolling agricultural landscape. The BTUCA listing incorporates three levels (Figure C-319):

- A broad scale visual boundary which adopts the regional boundary of the Berry District Landscape Conservation Area.
- A subdivision boundary which relates to the closer urban settlement of the nineteenth century Berry town grid.
- A buffer zone which seeks to protect the immediate rural setting of the urban grid (Clark and Duyker 2010).

The northern end of the proposal area extends 400 metres into the southern portion of the BTUCA buffer zone.
Figure C-318: Previously defined landscape conservation areas which include the proposal: Three levels of the National Trust Berry Township Urban Conservation Area (BTUCA) are defined. (After Figure 13 in Clarke and Duyker 2010; and The boundary of the Berry – Bolong Pastoral Landscapes (Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory) (base image: Google Earth Pro 2009).
Figure C-319: Detail of the Sub-division boundary and fringing Buffer Zone for the National Trust defined Berry Township Urban Conservation Area (After Figure 13 in Clarke and Duyker 2010) (Google Earth Pro 2006).
Appendix D

Detailed significance assessment of heritage items
Appendix D – Detailed significance of heritage items

Heritage Item: G2B H1

Name/Description: ‘Mount View’

Item/Site Type: Early twentieth century farmhouse

Analysis against significance criteria

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history
The farmhouse at G2B H1 was not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons
The farmhouse at G2B H1 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement
The farmhouse at G2B H1 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group
There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations for the farmhouse at G2B H1. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history
The farmhouse at G2B H1 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history
Early twentieth century farmhouses within an open pastoral context, like ‘Mount View’, are becoming locally rarer due to the urban expansion of Nowra and Bomaderry.

The farmhouse at G2B H1 is assessed as having local significance against Criterion (f).

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place
The ‘Mount View’ farmhouse at G2B H1, along with its associated remaining outbuilding, is representative of an early twentieth century farmhouse belonging to a relatively small dairy farm holding. The house is in excellent condition and retains original character both externally and internally.

Farmhouse G2B H1 is assessed as having local significance against Criterion (g).

Statement of heritage significance:

The ‘Mount View’ farmhouse (G2B H1) retains its original design configuration and many original features. Along with its associated remaining outbuilding, it is representative of an early twentieth century farmhouse belonging to a relatively small dairy farm holding. Such buildings, within an open pastoral context are becoming locally rarer due to the urban expansion of Nowra and Bomaderry. This site is significant within a local context.

Princes Highway upgrade – Berry to Bomaderry upgrade
Roads and Maritime Services
Technical paper: Non-Aboriginal (historic) heritage
**Heritage Item:** G2B H2

**Name/Description:** Abernethys Creek Bridge

**Item/Site Type:** 1929 reinforced concrete bridge

---

**Analysis against significance criteria**

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

Abernethys Creek Bridge is a component of the Princes Highway infrastructure development from the late 1920s and 1930s by the Department of Main Road's (DMR) as part of the State Highways improvement program which was aimed at bringing the State's roads up to a standard suited to motor vehicle traffic.

As a minor part of this broader program, the G2B H2 bridge is assessed to having a degree of significance within a local context against **Criterion (a).**

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The bridge at G2B H2 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The bridge at G2B H2 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations for the bridge at G2B H2. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The bridge at G2B H2 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The heritage studies of concrete bridges, upon which the RMS section 170 register is partly based (Burns and Roe Worley and Heritage Assessment and History, 2004, 2005 and 2006) have noted that the G2B H2 bridge shares basic design concepts and physical principles with a similarly aged concrete bridge across Limestone Creek at Tuena (Bridge no. 6400). The design of the latter is acknowledged to be 'apparently unusual' although its appearance diverges considerably from the Abernethys Creek bridge (RMS section 170 register item no. 4309560). The heritage studies acknowledge that the existing database is insufficient to provide an accurate assessment of the prevalence of surviving and similarly arranged bridges. Despite this, both bridges were assessed as having an overall significance within a local context only.
**Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place**

Abernethys Creek Bridge at G2B H2 has the ability to demonstrate contemporary 1930s standards of bridge design and construction. It is a good representative example of its design – a cantilevered approach slab and main beam deck system. In addition, the whole structure demonstrates how sympathetic widening can be achieved, repeating the general design while allowing the process of change to be interpreted readily.

The bridge at G2B H2 is assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (g)**.

---

**Statement of heritage significance:**

Abernethys Creek Bridge (G2B H2) has a degree of significance as a minor component of the Princes Highway infrastructure development from the late 1920s and 1930s by the Department of Main Road’s (DMR) as part of the State Highways improvement program. The bridge is a good representative example of its type and design. It demonstrates contemporary 1930s standards of bridge design and construction. The whole structure illustrates how sympathetic widening can be achieved, repeating the general design while allowing the process of change to be interpreted readily. Its widening demonstrates changes in demands on road infrastructure over the intervening period and the effects of these changes on 1930s infrastructure, and also demonstrates subsequent upgrades that have been sympathetic to the original form of the 1929 structure.

This site is significant within a local context.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H3  

**Name/Description:** Meroo Union Church  

**Item/Site Type:** 1890 Church and grounds

### Analysis against significance criteria

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The church and grounds at G2B H3 was not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The Meroo Union Church has a strong association with David Berry who provided funding for the building and gifted the land. In addition, the church was designed by W.A. Isley and Sons, a firm which designed many churches on the Berry Estate.

The church and grounds at G2B H3 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (b).

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The Meroo Union Church demonstrates the Victorian Free Gothic Revival style, showing distinct aesthetic characteristics. The church remains in good condition and virtually intact apart from the replacement of the original roof.

The church at G2B H3 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (c).

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

The Meroo Union Church has a strong association with the Union Church movement and continues to be used for services. It is now one of the few remaining community buildings for the Meroo Meadow settlement and has strong social value and associations with local families and identities.

The church and grounds at G2B H3 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (d).

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The Meroo Union Church has potential to provide further information on the Union Church movement within the local area.

The church and grounds at G2B H3 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The Meroo Union Church is one of the few remaining community buildings for the Meroo Meadow settlement. Its combination of aesthetic, historic and representative values is considered to be rare.

The church at G2B H3 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (f).

**Criterion (g):** important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The Meroo Union Church demonstrates the principal characteristics of a late nineteenth century church. The church remains in good condition and virtually intact, making it a great local example of its type, situated in a context similar to when the building was constructed. The church and grounds at G2B H3 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (g).
Statement of heritage significance:

The Meroo Union Church and grounds has considerable aesthetic value and is representative of a late nineteenth century Union church constructed in the Victorian Free Gothic Style. It is closely associated with the Berry Estate and David Berry who provided funding and gifted the land. It was designed by W.A. Isley and Sons, a firm which designed many churches on the Estate. The church has potential to provide further information on the Union Church movement and continues to be used for services. It is now one of the few remaining community buildings for the Meroo Meadow settlement and has strong social value and associations with local families and identifies. Its combination of aesthetic, historic and representative values is considered to be rare.

This site is significant within a local context.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H4

**Name/Description:** Former Meroo Meadow public school and residence

**Item/Site Type:** Former public school house and schoolmasters residence, and potential archaeological deposits

---

**Analysis against significance criteria**

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The school house and schoolmasters residence at G2B H4 are not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The former Meroo Meadow public school is associated with the life of a former pupil, Herbert William Moffitt (1877-1953), cartoonist, and member of the Workers Compensation Commission Bench.

The Meroo Meadow public school at G2B H4 is assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (b)**.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The school house and schoolmasters residence at G2B H4 are not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

The former Meroo Meadow public school and residence have a strong association with the Meroo Meadow community, both past and present, as it served the educational needs of this small community for over 70 years.

The Meroo Meadow public school and residence at G2B H4 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (d)**.

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The former Meroo Meadow public school and associated grounds have the potential to contribute to an understanding of the evolution of the school and local education, as archaeological deposits may still survive on the property.

The Meroo Meadow public school and grounds at G2B H4 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (e)**.

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The school house and schoolmasters residence at G2B H4 are not rare or uncommon. There are many local examples of late 19th century school houses. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The former Meroo Meadow public school and residence are locally representative in terms of a late nineteenth century school site complex and Victorian Georgian school architecture.

The Meroo Meadow public school and residence at G2B H4 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (g)**.
Statement of heritage significance:

The Meroo Meadow public school and residence (G2B H4) demonstrates the principle characteristics of late nineteenth century Victorian Georgian school architecture. They were designed by William Edmund Kemp (Government Architects Office). The schoolhouse has a high degree of intactness and is largely unchanged since its closure in 1971. The school is associated with the life of a former pupil, Herbert William Moffitt (1877-1953), cartoonist, and member of the Workers Compensation Commission Bench. Archaeological deposits may survive on the property and would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the evolution of the school and local education.

This site is significant within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H5

Name/Description: Avenue of planted road-side trees, Princes Highway Meroo Meadow

Item/Site Type: Highway tree avenue

Analysis against significance criteria

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H5 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H5 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H5 includes numerous old growth trees with high aesthetic appeal and forms a key element of the local cultural landscape and character. The row of trees on the southern side of the highway is considered to have greatest value due to the greater diversity of species (including Bunya Pines), and larger number of planted trees (as opposed to wild seeded examples).

The avenue of trees at G2B H5 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (c).

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations for the avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H5. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H5 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H5 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H5 is representative of plantings dating from the early to mid-twentieth century along the highways of the South Coast region.

The avenue of trees at G2B H5 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (g).
Statement of heritage significance:

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H5 has high aesthetic appeal with many large and mature trees, and forms an important local element of the cultural landscape. The avenue is representative of plantings from the early to mid-twentieth century along the highways of the South Coast region.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H6

Name/Description: Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway

Item/Site Type: Latter twentieth century highway remnant

Analysis against significance criteria

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H6 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H6 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H6 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H6. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H6 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H6 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H6 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

This highway remnant falls below the threshold for heritage listing.
Heritage Item: G2B H7

Name/Description: Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road

Item/Site Type: Mid nineteenth century road remnant

Criterion (a): *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road remnant at G2B H7 was locally historically important as a private road and the first main inland route that bypassed Seven Mile Beach.

The remnant portion of Berry Estate road at G2B H7 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (a).

Criterion (b): *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road remnant at G2B H7 has a strong association with the Berry Estate and Messrs Alexander and David Berry.

The remnant portion of Berry Estate road at G2B H7 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (b).

Criterion (c): *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The mid nineteenth century road remnant at G2B H7 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the mid nineteenth century road remnant at G2B H7. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

The short and eroded nature of this mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road remnant at G2B H7 reduces any representative value, however as part of a suite of surviving remnants between Meroo Meadow and Gerringong, it has potential to contribute to an understanding of nineteenth century road construction and use.

The remnant portion of Berry Estate road at G2B H7 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road remnant at G2B H7 is a rare example of a transport corridor that was locally historically important as a private road and the first main inland route that bypassed Seven Mile Beach.

The remnant portion of Berry Estate road at G2B H7 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (f).

Criterion (g): *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The mid nineteenth century road remnant at G2B H7 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

This small section of the nineteenth century Berry Estate road (G2B H7), is a rare example of a transport corridor that was locally historically important as a private road and the first main inland route that bypassed a coastal route along Seven Mile Beach. It has a strong association with the Berry Estate and Messrs Alexander and David Berry. The short and eroded nature of this remnant reduces any representative value, however as part of a suite of surviving remnants between Meroo Meadow and Gerringong, it has potential to contribute to an understanding of nineteenth century road construction and use.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H8

Name/Description: Remnant late twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway, Jaspers Brush

Item/Site Type: Latter twentieth century highway remnant

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history
The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H8 (Jaspers Brush) is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons
The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H8 (Jaspers Brush) does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement
The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H8 (Jaspers Brush) is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group
There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H8 (Jaspers Brush). This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history
The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H8 (Jaspers Brush) does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history
The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H8 (Jaspers Brush) is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place
The remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H8 (Jaspers Brush) does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:
This highway remnant falls below the threshold for heritage listing.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H9

**Name/Description:** Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road

**Item/Site Type:** Mid nineteenth century road remnant

---

**Criterion (a):** *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road remnant at G2B H9 was locally historically important as a private road and the first main inland route that bypassed Seven Mile Beach.

The remnant portion of Berry Estate road at G2B H9 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (a).

**Criterion (b):** *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road remnant at G2B H9 has a strong association with the Berry Estate and Messrs Alexander and David Berry.

The remnant portion of Berry Estate road at G2B H9 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (b).

**Criterion (c):** *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The mid nineteenth century road remnant at G2B H9 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the mid nineteenth century road remnant at G2B H9. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

The short and eroded nature of this mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road remnant at G2B H9 reduces any representative value, however as part of a suite of surviving remnants between Meroo Meadow and Gerringong, it has potential to contribute to an understanding of nineteenth century road construction and use.

The remnant portion of Berry Estate road at G2B H9 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

**Criterion (f):** *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road remnant at G2B H9 is a rare example of a transport corridor that was locally historically important as a private road and the first main inland route that bypassed Seven Mile Beach.

The remnant portion of Berry Estate road at G2B H9 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (f).

**Criterion (g):** *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The mid nineteenth century road remnant at G2B H9 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

This remnant section of the nineteenth century Berry Estate Road is a representative and rare example of a transport corridor that was locally historically important as a private road and the first main inland route that bypassed a coastal route along Seven Mile Beach. It has a strong association with the Berry Estate and Messrs Alexander and David Berry. Despite its eroded and indistinct condition, as part of a suite of surviving remnants between Meroo Meadow and Gerringong, it has potential to contribute to an understanding of nineteenth century road construction and use.

This site has significance within a local context.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H44

**Name/Description:** ‘Hotel Woodbyne’ former Jaspers Brush public school

**Item/Site Type:** Late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence

**Criterion (a):** *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence at G2B H44 are not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence at G2B H44 do not have strong or special associations with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence at G2B H44 are not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor do these items demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

The former Jaspers Brush public school at G2B H44 has high social value as a previous focus for community activities, local history and its association with local identities.

The late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence at G2B H44 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (d).**

**Criterion (e):** *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

The former Jaspers Brush public school and associated grounds at G2B 44 has the potential to contribute to an understanding of the evolution of the school and local education, as archaeological deposits may still survive on the property.

The Jaspers Brush public school and grounds at G2B H44 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (e).**

**Criterion (f):** *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence at G2B H44 are not rare or uncommon. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence at G2B H44 do not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

This 1897 schoolroom and 1920s residence have been variously altered since the closure of the school in 1969 and are now utilised as part of a boutique hotel. Original tree plantings may now be incorporated into the landscaped grounds. Significant internal changes have occurred but many historical and external characteristics have been maintained. The former school has high social value as a previous focus for community activities, local history and its association with local identities. Potential archaeological deposits may remain within the grounds and along the adjacent creek bank. If present these would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the evolution of the school and local education.

This site is significant within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H46

Name/Description: ‘Pomona’

Item/Site Type: Late nineteenth century dairy farm complex

Criterion (a): *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 which includes a farmhouse and a variety of outbuildings, dates from the sale of the Berry Estate in the early 1890s and is strongly associated with the Muller family, who purchased the new subdivision lot, built the original residence, and continue to operate the dairy farm to this day.

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (b).

Criterion (c): *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 has aesthetic value, in particular the farmhouse which displays federation Queen Anne style influences representative of the late nineteenth century.

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (c).

Criterion (d): *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations for the ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

The historical and physical record associated with the ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 has potential to contribute towards an understanding of the history and development of the local dairy industry.

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a late nineteenth century dairy complex in the region.

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex at G2B H46 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (g).
Statement of heritage significance:

The ‘Pomona’ dairy farm complex (G2B H46), which includes a farmhouse and a variety of outbuildings, dates from the sale of the Berry Estate in the early 1890s and is strongly associated with the Muller family, who purchased the original subdivision lots, built the original residence, and continue to operate the dairy farm to this day. The farmhouse, representative of the late nineteenth century, has aesthetic value and displays federation Queen Anne style influences. It was built by George Muller. The historical and physical record associated with this complex has potential to contribute towards an understanding of the history and development of the local dairy industry.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H66

Name/Description: ‘Westbury’

Item/Site Type: Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse at G2B H66 was owned and operated as a dairy farm by Thomas Newing, who, with his father Thomas Newing senior, constructed a majority of the dry stone walls in the Kiama and surrounding districts. During Thomas’ ownership, the farm served as a brief refuge for Miss Bridget Partridge during the ‘Sister Ligouri’ affair in 1920. This affair attracted political and national press attention and was an important event in the social history of Australia because of its manifestation of religious sectarian divisions across society.

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse at G2B H66 H5 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (a).

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H66 has a strong association with Thomas Newing, who, with his father Thomas Newing senior, constructed a majority of the dry stone walls in the Kiama and surrounding districts. The property is also associated with the life of Miss Bridget Partridge, a principal character in the ‘Sister Ligouri’ affair in 1920.

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H66 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (b).

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H66 are not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor do these items demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H66. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The historical and physical record associated with the G2B H66 complex and its well preserved outbuildings has potential to contribute towards an understanding of the history and development of the local dairy industry.

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H66 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

This early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and associated outbuildings have a substantial degree of intactness and are locally representative of a relatively large post Berry Estate farm. The integrity of the outbuildings, including an intact silo, is an increasingly rare characteristic of former dairy farms from this period.

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H66 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (f).
**Criterion (g):** important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H66 are important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a relatively large, late nineteenth century, post Berry Estate dairy complex.

The ‘Westbury’ Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H66 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (g).**

---

**Statement of heritage significance:**

The ‘Westbury’ early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and associated outbuildings have a substantial degree of intactness and are locally representative of a relatively large post Berry Estate farm. Some components of the farmhouse have been rebuilt, including the veranda and stumps. The integrity of the outbuildings, including an intact silo, is an increasingly rare characteristic of former dairy farms from this period. This property was owned and operated as a dairy farm by Thomas Newing, who, with his father Thomas Newing senior, constructed a majority of the dry stone walls in the Kiama and surrounding districts. During Thomas’ ownership, the farm served as a brief refuge for Miss Bridget Partridge during the ‘Sister Ligouri’ affair in 1920. This affair attracted political and national press attention and was an important event in the social history of Australia because of its manifestation of religious sectarian divisions across society. The historical and physical record associated with this complex has potential to contribute towards an understanding of the history and development of the local dairy industry.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H67

Name/Description: Site of former Meroo Meadow Public Hall

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

---

**Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history**

The site of the former Meroo Meadow Public Hall at G2B H67 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons**

The site of the former Meroo Meadow Public Hall at G2B H67 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement**

The site of the former Meroo Meadow Public Hall at G2B H67 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group**

The Meroo Meadow public hall (1933 – 1974) served as a focus for the civic, social and political life of the Meroo Meadow community and district for forty years. As such, the site of this former facility has a high degree of social value for community members.

The site of the former Meroo Meadow Public Hall at G2B H67 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (d).

**Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history**

The Meroo Meadow Public Hall at G2B H67 seems to have been purposefully demolished with a view of restoring to pasture, and that as a consequence, even the foundation piles have been removed. This site does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources and is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history**

The site of the former Meroo Meadow Public Hall at G2B H67 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place**

The site of the former Meroo Meadow Public Hall at G2B H67 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

---

**Statement of heritage significance:**

The Meroo Meadow public hall, G2B H67, was present at this site between 1933 and 1974. It was demolished when the adjacent highway was upgraded. During its 41 year history it served as a focus for the civic, social and political life of the Meroo Meadow community and district. As such, the site of this former facility has a high degree of social value for community members.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H68

Name/Description: Site of former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The site of the former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory at G2B H68 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The site of the former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory at G2B H68 had a strong association with the works of its engineer Mr C. W. Wood, whose management gave the Jaspers Brush factory a reputation for technological innovation within the industry.

The site of the former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory at G2B H68 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (b).

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The Jaspers Brush factory was important historically for its reputation for technological innovation and rapid adoption of new technologies and methods. This was perhaps largely a consequence of the management of the enterprise by its engineer Mr C.W.Wood. The factory adopted pasteurisation in 1899.

The site of the former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory at G2B H68 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (c).

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the site of the former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory at G2B H68. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

Despite the loss of at least half the site due to past road works, the site retains some potential to include archaeological deposits which could contribute to an understanding of the local dairy industry and its development.

The site of the former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory at G2B H68 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The site of the former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory at G2B H68 is not rare or uncommon. There are many former diary factory locations throughout the wider Shoalhaven district. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

Given that this site was both representative, and important in the development and evolution of the south coast dairy industry as a whole, the subsurface deposits at this site have the potential to be important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place.

The site of the former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory at G2B H68 is assessed to have partial local significance against Criterion (g).
Statement of heritage significance:

The Jaspers Dairy Co. factory commenced operation on this site in 1888 and continued to process local milk and cream for the following fifty years, subsequently operating as the Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. This is an unusually long history for a non-centralised dairy enterprise and as such, the site demonstrates the characteristics of a successful local dairy processing industry. Its development and evolution is also representative of the south coast industry as a whole. The Jaspers Brush factory was important historically for its reputation for technological innovation and rapid adoption of new technologies and methods. This was perhaps largely a consequence of the management of the enterprise by its engineer Mr C.W.Wood. The factory adopted pasteurisation in 1899. The factory was an important focus for economic and social activity within the Jaspers Brush locality. Despite the loss of at least half the site due to past road works, the site retains some potential to include archaeological deposits which could contribute to an understanding of the local dairy industry and its development.

This site is significant within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H69

Name/Description: ‘Amaroo Park’ Former Jaspers Brush Post Office

Item/Site Type: Substantially modified early twentieth century cottage

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

‘Amaroo Park’ former Jaspers Brush Post Office at G2B H69 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

‘Amaroo Park’ former Jaspers Brush Post Office at G2B H69 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

‘Amaroo Park’ former Jaspers Brush Post Office at G2B H69 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with ‘Amaroo Park’ former Jaspers Brush Post Office at G2B H69. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

‘Amaroo Park’ former Jaspers Brush Post Office at G2B H69 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

‘Amaroo Park’ former Jaspers Brush Post Office at G2B H69 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

‘Amaroo Park’ former Jaspers Brush Post Office at G2B H69 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

Despite the early nineteenth century origin of this cottage and former function as a post office, this property falls below the threshold for heritage listing. This is due to the substantial renovations and additions to the original building and minimal retention of original features.
Heritage Item: G2B H70
Name/Description: ‘Hillview Park’
Item/Site Type: Substantially modified early twentieth century house

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

‘Hillview Park’ former farmhouse at G2B H70 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

‘Hillview Park’ former farmhouse at G2B H70 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

‘Hillview Park’ former farmhouse at G2B H70 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with ‘Hillview Park’ former farmhouse at G2B H70. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

‘Hillview Park’ former farmhouse at G2B H70 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

‘Hillview Park’ former farmhouse at G2B H70 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

‘Hillview Park’ former farmhouse at G2B H70 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

This former farmhouse, currently extended and adapted for use as business offices falls below the threshold for heritage listing. This is due to the substantial renovations, modifications and additions to the original building and minimal retention of original features.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H71  
**Name/Description:** 'Fair View'  
**Item/Site Type:** Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings

---

**Criterion (a):** *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The 'Fair View' farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H71 are not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The 'Fair View' farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H71 do not have strong or special associations with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The 'Fair View' farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H71 are not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor do these items demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the 'Fair View' farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H71. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

While there has been substantial landscaping focussed around the farmhouse the intactness and integrity of the outbuildings, which date from first half of the twentieth century, suggest that there is some potential to yield further information about post Berry Estate farming in the region. The 'Fair View' farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H71 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

**Criterion (f):** *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The 'Fair View' farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H71 are not rare or uncommon. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The 'Fair View' farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H71 demonstrate the principal characteristics of a post Berry Estate, early twentieth century farmhouse complex. The farmhouse has been renovated but retains some original character. The remaining outbuildings which date from first half of the twentieth century, display a considerable degree of intactness and integrity.

The 'Fair View' farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H71 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (g).
Statement of heritage significance:

The ‘Fair View’ farmhouse and outbuildings (G2B H71) form a post Berry Estate early twentieth century farmhouse complex which has been substantially renovated and landscaped but retains some original features and character. Heritage values are demonstrated by the remaining outbuildings which date from first half of the twentieth century and display a considerable degree of intactness and integrity.

The site retains some potential within a local context to yield further information about post Berry Estate farming in the region, and to demonstrate the characteristics of a post Berry Estate farmhouse complex.

This site is significant within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H72

Name/Description: [unnamed] Cottage

Item/Site Type: Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian cottage

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The Cottage at G2B H72 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The Cottage at G2B H72 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The Cottage at G2B H72 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the Cottage at G2B H72. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The Cottage at G2B H72 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The Cottage at G2B H72 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The Cottage at G2B H72 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

This renovated cottage falls below the threshold for heritage listing. This is due to the substantial renovations and additions to the original building and minimal retention of original features.
Heritage Item: G2B H73

Name/Description: Site of former Berry Estate building complex

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

Criterion (a): *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The site of the former Berry Estate building complex at G2B H73 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The site of the former Berry Estate building complex at G2B H73 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The site of the former Berry Estate building complex at G2B H73 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the site of the former Berry Estate building complex at G2B H73. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have considerable potential to contribute to an understanding of tenant farming and settlement on the Berry Estate lands and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular. Unlike many other former Berry Estate farm sites, this locality does not include a functioning farm and has therefore not been disturbed by latter occupation (apart from ploughing).

The site of the former Berry Estate building complex at G2B H73 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The site of the former Berry Estate building complex at G2B H73 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The site of the former Berry Estate building complex at G2B H73 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

If sub-surface archaeological traces remain of this former Berry Estate building complex (G2B H73), they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of tenant farming and settlement on the Berry Estate lands, and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular. Unlike many other former Berry Estate farm sites, this locality does not include a modern functioning farm and has therefore not been disturbed by latter occupation (apart from ploughing).
This significance assessment is subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

This site has potential significance within a local context.
**Heritage Item:**

G2B H74

**Name/Description:**

‘Abernethy’s Bend’

**Item/Site Type:**

Remnant twentieth century portion of former Princes Highway

---

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The remnant portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H74 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The remnant portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H74 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The remnant portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H74 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the remnant portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H74. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The remnant portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H74 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The remnant portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H74 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The remnant portion of former Princes Highway at G2B H74 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

---

**Statement of heritage significance:**

This highway remnant falls below the threshold for heritage listing.
Heritage Item: G2B H75
Name/Description: Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory
Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit (approximate location)

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history
The approximate site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory at G2B H75 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons
The approximate site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory at G2B H75 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement
The approximate site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory at G2B H75 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group
There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the approximate site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory at G2B H75. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history
If archaeological deposits remain within this site, they would have considerable potential to contribute to an understanding of the development and evolution of the local dairy industry and its role in the economic and social life of the Meroo Meadow community. This factory operated for only seven years, between 1899 and 1906, and as a consequence the archaeological record has potential to provide information on the local emergence of the co-operative dairy industry and the evolution from local to centralised factories.

The approximate site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory at G2B H75 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history
The approximate site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory at G2B H75 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place
The approximate site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory at G2B H75 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

If archaeological deposits remain within the site of the former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. (G2B H75), they would have considerable potential to contribute to an understanding of the development and evolution of the local dairy industry and its role in the economic and social life of the Meroo Meadow community. This factory operated for only seven years, between 1899 and 1906, and as a consequence the archaeological record has potential to provide information on a specific time period in the local developmental of the co-operative dairy industry and the evolution from local to centralised factories.

This significance assessment is subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

This site has potential significance within a local context.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H76

**Name/Description:** ‘Northcote’

**Item/Site Type:** Early twentieth century farmhouse and outbuildings and potential archaeological deposits of earlier structures

---

**Criterion (a):** *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The ‘Northcote’ farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H76 are not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The ‘Northcote’ farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H76 do not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The ‘Northcote’ farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H76 are not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor do they demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the ‘Northcote’ farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H76. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

The intactness and integrity of the outbuildings, (which date from first half of the twentieth century), and the potential for archaeological deposits of an earlier phase, occupation, indicate some potential to yield information about post Berry Estate farming in the region.

The ‘Northcote’ farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H76 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (e).**

**Criterion (f):** *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The ‘Northcote’ farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H76 are not rare or uncommon. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The ‘Northcote’ farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H76 demonstrate the principal characteristics of a post Berry Estate, early twentieth century farmhouse complex. The farmhouse has been renovated but retains some original character. The remaining outbuildings which date from first half of the twentieth century, display a considerable degree of intactness and integrity.

The ‘Northcote’ farmhouse and outbuildings at G2B H76 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (g).**
**Statement of heritage significance:**

The ‘Northcote’ dairy farm complex (G2B H76), includes a post Berry Estate farmhouse, outbuildings and potential archaeological deposits. The farmhouse consists of a renovated and extended early twentieth century cottage which retains some original fabric and features. The remaining outbuildings which include dairy related buildings, yards and covered feeding stalls, demonstrate greatest heritage value in the complex, as evidenced by a degree of integrity and the retention of original features. Timbers from the Jaspers Brush School of Arts were reportedly incorporated into these outbuildings. There is potential for archaeological traces of an earlier phase of occupation.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H77

Name/Description: ‘Exeter’

Item/Site Type: Federation/Edwardian style farmhouse with Arts and Crafts features, and remnant silo.

**Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history**

The ‘Exeter’ farmhouse and remnant silo at G2B H77 are not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons**

The ‘Exeter’ farmhouse is thought to have been built by George Muller, a local district builder also associated with the construction of ‘Pomona’ (G2B H46). This oral tradition has to date not been corroborated by other sources and must remain conjectural in nature. This site does not have an established strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement**

This recently renovated and extended farmhouse is in a Federation/Edwardian style and retains its distinctive and original architectural character and design. The building has considerable aesthetic appeal and includes Arts and Crafts traits which are unusual for the local area.

The ‘Exeter’ farmhouse and remnant silo at G2B H77 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (c).

**Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group**

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the ‘Exeter’ farmhouse and remnant silo at G2B H77. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history**

The ‘Exeter’ farmhouse and remnant silo at G2B H77 do not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history**

The ‘Exeter’ farmhouse at G2B H77 retains its distinctive and original Federation/Edwardian style, and its Arts and Crafts traits are unusual and rare for the local area.

The ‘Exeter’ farmhouse and remnant silo at G2B H77 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (f).

**Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place**

The ‘Exeter’ farmhouse and remnant silo at G2B H77 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

The ‘Exeter’ farmhouse (G2B H77), has been recently renovated and extended. The farmhouse retains its distinctive Federation/Edwardian style and original architectural character and design. The building has considerable aesthetic appeal and includes Arts and Crafts traits which are unusual for the local area. A recently constructed new building close to the farmhouse is intrusive and detracts from the landscape context of the building. Only the concrete walls of a silo remain of formerly extensive outbuildings.

This site has significance within a local context.
**Heritage Item:**  G2B H78

**Name/Description:** Avenue of planted road-side trees, Princes Highway Meroo Meadow

**Item/Site Type:** Highway remnant tree avenue

---

**Analysis against significance criteria**

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H78 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H78 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

This alignment of pine trees is the remnant of an avenue, originally also present on the opposite side of the highway. The alignment includes many old growth trees with aesthetic appeal and which complement similar plantings in the adjacent grounds of the Meroo Meadow Union church.

The avenue of trees at G2B H78 is assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (c).**

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

Although now degraded, the avenue once provided a key component of the local landscape character of the Meroo Meadow settlement. The avenue has social value as a landmark and reminder of the past residents who planted and maintained them.

The avenue of trees at G2B H78 is assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (d).**

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H78 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H78 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The avenue of planted road side trees at G2B H78 is a remnant feature and does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

This alignment of pine trees (G2B H78), is the remnant of an avenue, originally also present on the opposite side of the highway. The alignment includes many old growth trees with aesthetic appeal and which complement similar plantings in the adjacent grounds of the Meroo Meadow Union church. Although now degraded, the avenue once provided a key component of the local landscape character of the Meroo Meadow settlement. The avenue has social value as a landmark and reminder of the past residents who planted and maintained them.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H79

Name/Description: ‘Glenmoor’

Item/Site Type: Early twentieth century farmhouse

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The ‘Glenmoor’ farmhouse at G2B H79 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The ‘Glenmoor’ farmhouse at G2B H79 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The ‘Glenmoor’ farmhouse at G2B H79 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the ‘Glenmoor’ farmhouse at G2B H79. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The ‘Glenmoor’ farmhouse at G2B H79 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The ‘Glenmoor’ farmhouse at G2B H79 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The ‘Glenmoor’ farmhouse at G2B H79 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

Despite the 1916 origin of this farmhouse this property falls below the threshold for heritage listing. This is due to the substantial renovations and additions to the original building and the loss of its outbuildings.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H80

**Name/Description:** Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’

**Item/Site Type:** Potential archaeological deposit

---

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The site of the former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ at G2B H80 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The site of the former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ at G2B H80 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The site of the former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ at G2B H80 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the site of the former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ at G2B H80. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they may have potential to contribute to an understanding of the settlement and development of the Berry Estate and the Meroo Meadow/Jaspers Brush area in particular.

The site of the former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ at G2B H80 is assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (e).**

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The site of the former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ at G2B H80 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The site of the former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ at G2B H80 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

---

**Statement of heritage significance:**

If archaeological deposits are present at the site of the former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’ (G2B H80) this site has potential to contribute to an understanding of the settlement and development of the Berry Estate and the Meroo Meadow/Jaspers Brush area, .

This significance assessment is subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

The potential significance of this site falls within a local context.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H81

**Name/Description:** Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement

**Item/Site Type:** Agricultural earth dam and potential archaeological deposit

---

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement at G2B H81 are not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement at G2B H81 do not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement at G2B H81 are not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor do these items demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement at G2B H81. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

There remains some archaeological potential for remnant portions or traces of the pipeline to be present within the former pipeline easement between the reservoir and the lowlands. Investigation of such traces could contribute to an understanding of late nineteenth century agricultural infrastructure and the procurement strategies of the Berry Estate prior to its sale.

This item is assessed as having local significance against **Criterion (e).**

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement at G2B H81 is a rare remnant of an integrated swamp reclamation and pasture development program conducted on the Berry Estate lowlands in the late nineteenth century. As part of this program, agricultural reservoirs and pipelines were installed on foothill slopes adjacent to the newly drained lowlands, with the objective of supplying the brackish lands with freshwater. This site is one of seven former cadastral reservations for such features on the Berry Estate lands. The G2B H81 reservoir site is one of only three with functioning or remnant dams.

The agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement at G2B H81 are assessed as having local significance against **Criterion (f).**
Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement at G2B H81 are important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a system for the supply of freshwater to reclaimed swamplands on the Berry Estate in the 1890’s. While the original dam wall has been replaced, the new wall is in the same location and has not changed the dam’s capacity significantly.

The agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement at G2B H81 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (g).

Statement of heritage significance:

This former reservoir and associated pipeline easement (G2B H81), formed part of the swamp reclamation program conducted across the Berry Estate lowlands in the 1890s. Its function was to provide freshwater to stock pastured on the reclaimed lowlands. It is a rare feature, being one of seven former cadastral reservations for such features on the Berry Estate lands and one of only three with functioning or remnant dams. The G2B H81 dam is the only such feature known on the west side of Broughton Creek. The dam wall was re-built using a modern design in 1997. Despite this modification, the reservoir retains its original location, size and banks, and thus remains important in demonstrating a principal characteristic of swamp reclamation on the Berry Estate in the 1890’s.

This site has significance within a local context.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H82

**Name/Description:** 'Silos Estate'

**Item/Site Type:** Remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits

---

**Criterion (a):** *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H82 are not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The ‘Silo’s Estate’ at G2B H82 is closely linked with the Wiley brothers who developed dairying on this and several adjoining properties.

The remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H82 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (b).

**Criterion (c):** *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H82 are not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor do these items demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H82. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

This property includes a number of known and potential archaeological features with heritage value. A remnant sandstone flagstone floor continues to be used in a cellar shop established within a substantially modified and extended former dairy building. The sites of several former nineteenth century Berry Estate tenant farm buildings remain in an undeveloped condition at the front of the property. These have potential to contribute to an understanding of the tenant farm settlement and development of the Berry Estate and of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.

The remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H82 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

**Criterion (f):** *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H82 are not rare or uncommon. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The remnant flagstone floor and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H82 do not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

The twentieth century history of the ‘Silos Estate’ (G2B H82), is closely linked with the Wiley brothers who developed dairying on this and several adjoining properties. This property includes a number of known and potential archaeological features with heritage value. A remnant sandstone flagstone floor continues to be used in a cellar shop established within a substantially modified and extended former dairy building. The sites of several former nineteenth century Berry Estate tenant farm buildings remain in an undeveloped condition at the front of the property. These have potential to contribute to an understanding of the tenant farm settlement and development of the Berry Estate and of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.

This site has significance within a local context.
**Heritage Item:**  G2B H83

**Name/Description:**  ‘County Fair’

**Item/Site Type:**  Early twentieth century dairy farm complex.

---

**Criterion (a):**  *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):**  *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

The ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83 is closely linked with the Wiley brothers who developed dairying on this and several adjoining properties.

The ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83 is assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (b).**

**Criterion (c):**  *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):**  *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):**  *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

There is potential for sub-surface archaeological remains of former Berry estate tenant farm buildings to be present in an area to the southeast of the homestead.

The ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83 is assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (e).**

**Criterion (f):**  *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83 has a number of outbuildings of heritage significance, namely the butchery, dairy, and combined silo and feed stall. The dairy retains an original flagstone floor and includes reused timber slab walls. The silo and feed stall remains relatively intact, and the condition of this building is increasingly rare compared to like structures in the region.

The ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83 is assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (f).**

**Criterion (g):**  *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The outbuildings at the ‘County Fair’ dairy farm complex at G2B H83 are representative of a post Berry Estate, early to mid-century dairy farm.

The outbuildings at G2B H83 are assessed to have local significance against **Criterion (g).**
Statement of heritage significance:

The ‘County Fair’ farm complex (G2B H83), was developed by, and associated with the Wiley brothers, a locally prominent farming family. It consists of a heavily modified nineteenth century farm building, together with a number of remnant outbuildings which have heritage significance. The latter include a butchery, dairy and combined silo and covered feed stall. The latter remains relatively intact, an increasingly rare condition of like structures in the region. The dairy retains an original flagstone floor and includes reused timber slab walls. The outbuildings are representative of a post Berry Estate, early to mid-century dairy farm.

This site has significance within a local context.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H84

**Name/Description:** Unnamed 1920s farmhouse

**Item/Site Type:** 1910s-1920s Bungalow style farmhouse

---

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The unnamed 1920s farmhouse at G2B H84 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The unnamed 1920s farmhouse at G2B H84 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The unnamed 1920s farmhouse at G2B H84 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the unnamed 1920s farmhouse at G2B H84. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The unnamed 1920s farmhouse at G2B H84 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The unnamed 1920s farmhouse at G2B H84 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The unnamed 1920s farmhouse at G2B H84 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

---

**Statement of heritage significance:**

This 1920s bungalow farmhouse falls below the threshold for heritage listing.
Heritage Item: G2B H85

Name/Description: ‘Maylands’

Item/Site Type: Early twentieth century dairy farm complex.

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The ‘Maylands’ dairy farm complex at G2B H85 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The ‘Maylands’ dairy farm complex at G2B H85 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The ‘Maylands’ dairy farm complex at G2B H85 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the ‘Maylands’ dairy farm complex at G2B H85. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

This farmhouse group of buildings dates from the early to mid-twentieth century and displays varying degrees of modification, extension and dilapidation. Archaeological remains of former nineteenth century tenant farm buildings may be present at the front of the property. A former blacksmith shed, now used for storage, retains a considerable degree of its original fabric and some original features such as its hearth.

The former blacksmith shed and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H85 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The ‘Maylands’ dairy farm complex at G2B H85 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The former smithy has representative value and may be a locally rare site type in this condition. The potential archaeological resource has potential to contribute towards an understanding of tenant farming and the early development of the Berry Estate and specifically the Bomaderry area.

The former blacksmith shed and potential archaeological deposits at G2B H85 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (g).
Statement of heritage significance:

The ‘Maylands’ group of buildings dates from the early to mid-twentieth century and displays varying degrees of modification, extension and dilapidation. Archaeological remains of former nineteenth century tenant farm buildings may be present at the front of the property. A former blacksmith shed, now used for storage, retains a considerable degree of its original fabric and some original features such as its hearth. The former smithy has representative value and may be a locally rare site type in this condition. The potential archaeological resource has potential to contribute towards an understanding of tenant farming and the early development of the Berry Estate and specifically the Bomaderry/Meroo Meadow area.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H86

Name/Description: Row of planted road side trees, Meroo Road and Fletchers Lane, Meroo Meadow

Item/Site Type: Road side tree planting

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The road side tree planting at G2B H86 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The road side tree planting at G2B H86 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

This alignment of trees at G2B H86 includes two large Bunya pines which contribute to the aesthetic values of the local and regional landscape. They complement other old growth Bunya pines which are visible from this location.

The Bunya pine trees at G2B H86 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (c).

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the road side tree planting at G2B H86. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The road side tree planting at G2B H86 does not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The road side tree planting at G2B H86 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The road side tree planting at G2B H86 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

This alignment of trees (G2B H86), includes two large Bunya pines which contribute to the aesthetic values of the local and regional landscape. They complement other old growth Bunya pines which are visible from this location.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H87

Name/Description: [Unnamed] early twentieth century Bungalow style farmhouse and dairy

Item/Site Type: Farmhouse and dairy

Criterion (a): *important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history*

The farmhouse and dairy at G2B H87 are not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): *strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons*

This 1920s farm complex was built and operated by Jack Abernethy and is thus associated with the locally prominent Abernethy family which developed dairying on the adjacent properties.

The farmhouse and dairy at G2B H87 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (b).

Criterion (c): *important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement*

The farmhouse and dairy at G2B H87 are not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor do they demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): *strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group*

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the farmhouse and dairy at G2B H87. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): *potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history*

The farmhouse and dairy at G2B H87 do not have the potential to yield information that is not readily available from other sources. These items are assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (f): *possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history*

The farmhouse has a high degree of integrity and is little changed since its construction. It includes many internal decorative, domestic and architectural traits. This level of integrity for a dairy of this age is likely to be uncommon or rare in the local area.

The farmhouse and dairy at G2B H87 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (f).

Criterion (g): *important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place*

The farmhouse includes many internal decorative, domestic and architectural traits which are representative of the 1920s. The dairy also reflects early twentieth century construction methods with the use of reinforced concrete for all walls and posts.

The farmhouse and dairy at G2B H87 are assessed to have local significance against Criterion (g).
Statement of heritage significance:

This 1920s farm complex (G2B H87), was built and operated by Jack Abernethy and is thus associated with the locally prominent Abernethy family which developed dairying on the adjacent properties. The farmhouse has a high degree of integrity and is little changed since its construction. It includes many internal decorative, domestic and architectural traits which are representative of the 1920s. The dairy also reflects early twentieth century construction methods with the use of reinforced concrete for all walls and posts. This level of integrity for a dairy of this age is likely to be uncommon or rare in the local area.

This site has significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H88

Name/Description: Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The site of the former ‘hut’ building on part of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H88 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The site of the former ‘hut’ building on part of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H88 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The site of the former ‘hut’ building on part of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H88 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the site of the former ‘hut’ building on part of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H88. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they may have potential to contribute to an understanding of the settlement and development of the Berry Estate and the Meroo Meadow area in particular.

The potential archaeological deposit at the site of the former ‘hut’ building on part of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H88 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The site of the former ‘hut’ building on part of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H88 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The site of the former ‘hut’ building on part of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H88 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

If archaeological deposits remain at the site of the former ‘hut’ building on a part of the Berry Estate ‘Meroo Station’ (G2B H88), this site has the potential to contribute to an understanding of the early settlement and development of the Berry Estate and the Meroo Meadow area. This significance assessment is subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

This site has potential significance within a local context.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H89

**Name/Description:** ‘Jaspers Grove’ - Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm

**Item/Site Type:** Potential archaeological deposit

---

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The ‘Jaspers Grove’ former tenant farm site at G2B H89 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The ‘Jaspers Grove’ former tenant farm site at G2B H89 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The ‘Jaspers Grove’ former tenant farm site at G2B H89 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the ‘Jaspers Grove’ former tenant farm site at G2B H89. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of tenant farming and settlement on the Berry Estate lands and the development of the Jaspers Creek locality in particular.

The ‘Jaspers Grove’ former tenant farm PAD at G2B H89 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

**Criterion (f):** possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The ‘Jaspers Grove’ former tenant farm site at G2B H89 is not rare or uncommon. Many similar sites of former Berry Estate farms occur in the area of modern and current farm building complexes. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

**Criterion (g):** important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The ‘Jaspers Grove’ former tenant farm PAD at G2B H89 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

---

**Statement of heritage significance:**

If archaeological deposits remain at the ‘Jaspers Grove’ former tenant farm site (G2B H89), they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of tenant farming and settlement on the Berry Estate lands and the development of the Jaspers Creek locality in particular. This significance assessment is subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

This site has potential significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H90

Name/Description: ‘Meroo Station’ Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate cattle station complex

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history
The site of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H90 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons
The site of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H90 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement
The site of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H90 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group
There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the site of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H90. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history
If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the management and development of the Berry Estate lands, and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.

The site of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H90 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history
The site of ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H90 cannot be considered rare or uncommon. This is chiefly because the main potentially remaining portion of this potential archaeological site consists of a former residence, that would be similar or perhaps identical to a Berry estate tenant farm residence. The potentially rare features of such a site, those relating to its function as a back country cattle station, are unlikely to have survived given the surrounding and subsequent development of this site for the public school, adjacent highway, and surrounding agricultural crop lands.

This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place
The cattle station PAD on ‘Meroo Station’ at G2B H90 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

If archaeological deposits remain at the site of the former ‘Meroo Station’ (G2B H90) they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the management and development of the Berry Estate and its cattle husbandry, and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.

This significance assessment is subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

This site has potential significance within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H91

Name/Description: Site of ‘Little Meadow’ Public School – ‘Tent School’ 1882 -1884

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit of former 1880s tent school

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The location, irrespective of physical remains, has historical significance in demonstrating the development of public school sites in the late nineteenth century and the interrelation between the Berry Estate and Government authorities.

The ‘Little Meadow’ tent school PAD at G2B H91 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (a).

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The ‘Little Meadow’ tent school PAD at G2B H91 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The ‘Little Meadow’ tent school PAD at G2B H91 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the ‘Little Meadow’ tent school PAD at G2B H91. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the function and material culture of tent schools, and public education between a tightly defined time period of 1882 and 1884.

The ‘Little Meadow’ tent school PAD at G2B H91 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The recognition of former tent school sites where there also exists the potential for archaeological deposits is likely to be rare.

The ‘Little Meadow’ tent school PAD at G2B H91 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (f).

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The ‘Little Meadow’ tent school PAD at G2B H91 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.
Statement of heritage significance:

The ‘Little Meadow’ tent school PAD at G2B H91 is assessed as locally significant due to its important role in the development of public school sites in the area, its likely rarity, and its potential to contribute to an understanding of the function and material culture of tent schools, and public education between a tightly defined time period of 1882 and 1884. This significance assessment is subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

This site is significant within a local context.
Heritage Item: G2B H92

Name/Description: Site of former mid nineteenth century Berry Estate tenant farm buildings

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

Criterion (a): important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings at G2B H92 is not notable in the course or pattern of local cultural history. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (b): strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

The site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings at G2B H92 does not have strong or special association with the life or works of a person or persons of local importance. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (c): important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

The site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings at G2B H92 is not notable in terms of aesthetic characteristics nor does this item demonstrate a high degree of technological or creative achievement. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (d): strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

There are no known strong or special community or cultural associations with the site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings at G2B H92. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (e): potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

If archaeological deposits remain at this site, they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the management and development of the Berry Estate lands, and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.

The site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings at G2B H92 is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings at G2B H92 is not rare or uncommon. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings at G2B H92 does not demonstrate the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place. This item is assessed as not having significance against this criterion.

Statement of heritage significance:

If archaeological deposits remain at this site of former Berry Estate tenant farm buildings (G2B H92), they would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the management and development of the Berry Estate lands, and the development of the Meroo Meadow locality in particular.

This significance assessment is subject to confirmation through archaeological excavation.

This site has potential significance in a local context.
**Heritage Item:** SICPH CL

**Name/Description:** Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape

**Item/Site Type:** Cultural Landscape

**Criterion (a):** important in the course, or pattern, of cultural history

The SICPH CL is of importance in the course of local history as an artefact of over 150 years of pastoral activity.

The cultural landscape contains readily identifiable evidence for a variety of historically significant themes including general land clearance and alienation, establishment and operation of the Berry Estate, development of nineteenth and twentieth century homesteads and development of the transport network that interlinked these places and joined them to places across the broader landscape of NSW.

The SICPH CL is assessed as being of local significance against Criterion (a).

**Criterion (b):** strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or persons

Creation of the SICPH CL has direct links to Alexander and David Berry through their roles in the establishment and operation of the Berry Estate. The evolution of this landscape can also be linked to important groups of people such as other early land grantees, tenant farmers and Robertson Land Act selectors, all of whom were important in local history.

The SICPH CL is assessed as being of local significance against Criterion (b); this is primarily due to the readily identifiable physical evidence of private towns, in particular Berry, and tenant farms created as components of the Berry Estate.

**Criterion (c):** important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement

One of the most significant aspects of the SICPH CL is the aesthetic value of the cleared pastoral landscape nestled at the base of the wooded Illawarra Escarpment. This striking contrast in natural landforms and differing extent of human impact creates a unique landscape quality. There is no comparable landscape displaying this aesthetic characteristic within NSW.

The SICPH CL is assessed as being of State significance against Criterion (c).

**Criterion (d):** strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group

The area encompassed by the SICPH CL has a strong and special association with the local Aboriginal community in terms of places with cosmological, ceremonial, traditional and historical importance. It includes elements such as Coolangatta Mountain and Toolijooa Ridge that are examples of places of particular significance to the local Aboriginal community. The SICPH CL also includes Aboriginal pathways, historical encampments and Aboriginal reserves.

The SICPH CL is assessed as being of local significance against Criterion (d).

**Criterion (e):** potential to yield information that would contribute to an understanding of cultural history

The SICPH CL contains evidence for a variety of phases of human occupation, including evidence of a variety of activities and historical themes. Given that this southern portion of the Illawarra coastal plain hinterland has been subject to relatively limited impacts from twentieth century urban development, there is enormous potential for archaeological and historical research into this landscape at micro and macro levels. Such research would have the potential to contribute significantly to an understanding of settlement history within the Berry Estate, the Illawarra as a whole and the history of land use across NSW as a whole.
The SICPH CL is assessed as being of local importance in particular, and to a lesser extent State significance, against Criterion (e).

Criterion (f): possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of cultural history

The combination of nineteenth century landscape structure with the aesthetics of the landforms present in the SICPH CL makes this cultural landscape unique within NSW. The juxtaposition between the Illawarra Escarpment and the coastal plain is of itself unique within the State. Moreover, the Southern Illawarra component is the only portion of this landscape that has not been significantly impacted by urban infill over the past 50-100 years. As such, the SICPH CL is a rare and endangered landscape at local and State levels.

The SICPH CL is assessed as being of local and State significance against Criterion (f).

Criterion (g): important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural place

The SICPH CL is important at local and State levels as a landscape that demonstrates readily identifiable and interpretable examples of nineteenth century private towns, tenant farms, private road transport corridors and the influence of these features on the modern landscape (eg the way in which the alignment of the current highway relates to homesteads and roads established by David and Alexander Berry). This item is an excellent example of a cultural landscape with multifaceted layers that are quite easily discerned by the viewer. It is also an excellent example of the relationship between European pastoral practices and broader topographic landforms.

The Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape is assessed to have local significance against Criterion (g).

Statement of heritage significance:

The SICPH CL is of local significance in terms of its historical associations and importance in the pattern of local history. It is also locally significant in terms of its strong and special association with the local Aboriginal community.

More notably, it is of local and State significance in terms of its aesthetic qualities, which relate in part to the unique natural character of the junction of the coastal plain with the Illawarra escarpment, and in part from the striking contrast between the culturally modified elements of the landscape and the more natural elements. The clearly identifiable nineteenth century structure of the landscape also contributes to its aesthetic value.

The SICPH CL is a rare landscape type, both in terms of its natural features and also the retention of such clear examples of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century pastoral landscape and associated private towns. It is the only remaining such portion of the broader Illawarra cultural landscape that has not been substantially impacted by urban infill. As such it is also representative of its type and displays considerable research potential in terms of historical themes at local and State levels.

Taken as a whole, the SICPH CL has significance within a local context. Some individual values can also be assessed, in varying degrees, at a State level.
Appendix E
Statements of heritage impact
Appendix E – Statements of heritage impacts

**Heritage Item:** G2B H1

**Name/Description:** ‘Mount View’

**Item/Site Type:** Early twentieth century farmhouse

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- Construction of the proposal would result in substantive impact to the visual and contextual values of the item (including artificial light and noise).

---

**The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:**

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (f) and (g).
- There would be no physical impacts to the heritage significance of this item.
- In order to retain as much of an effective curtilage, it is recommended that all feasible and reasonable actions be taken to minimise the loss of open space on the eastern side of the ‘Mount View’ homestead (G2B H1), and to maintain this space as an effective curtilage between the building and the upgraded highway. While this does not enhance the heritage significance of this item, it does respect it.

**The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:**

**Visual impact**

- The upgraded highway corridor boundary would occur within four metres of the building’s front veranda, thus imposing a high degree of impact to the context of this house.

**Impact on existing structures**

- The upgraded highway corridor boundary would remove most of the enclosed front garden, but would not impact existing structures related to this item.
Impact on relics

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (f) and (g)), above ground structures which contribute to this significance, and any related archaeological deposits comply with the definition of a relic. No such relics would be directly impacted by the proposal.

Summary

- The upgraded highway corridor would have some visual and contextual impacts to the east of the homestead.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- There are no known or potential archaeological deposits associated with this heritage item which would be impacted by the proposal.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
**How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?**

- It is recommended that all feasible and reasonable actions be taken to minimise the loss of open space on the eastern side of the item, and to maintain this space as an effective curtilage between the building and the proposal. This may be achievable by modifying the upgraded highway corridor boundary and/or careful management of that section of the corridor adjacent to the G2B H1 building during the operational phase.

- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the remainder of the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.

- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H2

**Name/Description:** Abernethys Creek Bridge

**Item/Site Type:** 1929 reinforced concrete bridge

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- Construction of the proposal would result in the loss of the whole of the known extent of the item.

---

**Figure E.2 Location of G2B H2**

---

**The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:**

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (a) and (g).
- It is proposed to conduct an archival recording of this item prior to any direct impact. The creation of the record addresses the need to realise the representative value and information potential of the item. The resulting record would respect those values and provide a degree of mitigation.

**The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:**

**Visual impact**

- Construction of the proposal would remove the bridge, as well as its immediate landscape setting and visual context.

**Impact on existing structures**

- All structures being part of this item would be directly impacted.

**Impact on relics**

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (a) and (g).), above ground structures which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic. These structures would be directly impacted.

---

**Summary**

- Construction of the proposal would result in direct impact to the whole of the bridge.
Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.
  - Avoid direct and/or indirect and contextual impacts to surrounding sites G2B H77 or H87 that would be realised in the event that a western or eastern deviation from the current highway corridor was adopted to avoid direct impact to G2B H2.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- There is no potential for archaeological deposits to be associated with this heritage item.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on a new alignment, either to the west or the east of the G2B H2 bridge. Both alignments would impact adjoining properties over an approximate interval of between 1000 and 1300 metres.
- An eastern deviation would place the highway platform and its road reserve immediately adjacent to the G2B H87 residence (local significance under criteria b. f and g). Any future requirement to build northbound off-ramps at the Pestells Lane and Meroo Road interchange would necessitate direct impact and consequential demolition of the structure.
- A western deviation would require the movement of the Pestells Lane and Meroo Road interchange substantially to the west and would place the highway platform and its road reserve within approximately 50 metres of the ‘Exeter’ homestead, G2B H77 (local significance under criteria c and f). This would substantially alter and reduce the aesthetic and contextual values of this item.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

The bridge could not continue to be used as a component of an upgraded highway because it does not comply with the flood level and carriageway elevation requirements of the proposal. Avoidance of the bridge would necessitate a considerable deviation from the existing highway alignment and would have major property and heritage impacts to either side of the bridge. In this instance, the preparation of an archival recording is the most effective form of impact mitigation.

It is recommended that:

- An archival recording should be conducted of G2B H2, prior to any clearing, demolition or construction impact. The recording should be inclusive of any item portions which would be conserved, so that the full context of the item and their current condition are recorded.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H4

**Name/Description:** Former Meroo Meadow public school and residence

**Item/Site Type:** Former public school house and schoolmasters residence, and potential archaeological deposits

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- Construction of the proposal would result in substantive impact on the visual and contextual values of the known extent of the item (including artificial light and noise).

**The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:**

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (b), (d), (e) and (g).
- There would be no physical impacts to the heritage significance of this item.
- It has been recommended that an area in front of (to the east and downslope of) the buildings, corridor be fenced off as a no-go area. The downslope extent of the no-go area should be as large as feasible and reasonable. This area is currently informally managed as a garden and open space area, and acts as an open space curtilage in front of the buildings. With regard to the operational life of the proposal, it is recommended that a portion of the highway corridor adjacent to the former school and residence buildings be managed as an open space curtilage. While this does not enhance the heritage significance of this item, it does respect it.

**The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:**

**Visual impact**

- The existing highway corridor boundary passes approximately one metre from the front wall of the schoolhouse.

**Impact on existing structures**

- The carriageway would be seven metres closer to G2B H4 and the existing vehicle entrance to the property would be replaced by a new driveway on an existing ramp. There would be no direct impact to structures. There would be no change to existing property boundaries required, however the existing front garden (which acts as an open space curtilage around the buildings) occurs within current highway corridor.

**Impact on relics**

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (b), (d), (e) and (g)), above ground structures which contribute to this significance, and any related archaeological deposits comply with the definition of a relic. No such relics would be directly impacted by the proposal.

**Summary**

- The upgraded highway corridor would have significant visual and contextual impacts on the item and associated grounds.
**Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?**

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

**Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?**

- There is potential for archaeological deposits to be associated with this heritage item; however they are not expected to be impacted by the proposal.

**What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?**

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

**Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?**

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

- A no-go area should be defined and fenced off within the existing highway corridor, adjacent to, and on the east side of the former Meroo Meadow Public Schoolhouse and residence (G2B H4). The downslope extent of the no-go area should be as large as feasible and reasonable.
- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
- With regard to the operational phase of the proposal, it is recommended that a portion of the highway corridor adjacent to G2B H4 (Former Meroo Meadow Public School and residence) be managed as an open space curtilage.
Heritage Item: G2B H5

Name/Description: Avenue of planted road-side trees, Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

Item/Site Type: Highway tree avenue

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- Construction of the proposal would result in the loss of part of the known extent of the item – all of the trees on the northern side of the highway, and where necessary, some trees on the southern side.

![G2B H5 Location Map](image)

Figure E.3 Location of G2B H5

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (c) and (g).
- Physical impacts to this item would be partial only.
- The proposal has been positioned in such a way as to maximise the potential for the retention of trees (where feasible and reasonable), on the south side of the highway. This southern row of trees was assessed as having higher conservation priority than the northern row, due to the presence of Bunya Pines and a larger number of planted trees (as opposed to wild seeded trees).
- Tree plantings on Turners Lane (part of the G2B H5 recording), would not be directly impacted.
- It is proposed to conduct an archival recording of the whole plant group prior to any direct impact. The creation of the record addresses the need to realise the research and information potential of the item. The resulting record would respect those values and provide a degree of mitigation.
- It is recommended that all feasible and reasonable actions be taken to minimise direct impact to the southern row of trees in the G2B H5 tree avenue.

The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact

- All of the trees on the northern side of the highway would need to be felled. Some trees on the south side would also need to be felled,

Impact on existing structures

- No structures are associated with the item.
Impact on relics

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (c) and (g)), the trees which comprise this item would comply with the definition of a relic. Based on the current design all but the trees on Turners Lane would need to be felled.

Summary

- Construction of the proposal would result in direct impact to the part of the tree alignment.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- There is no potential for archaeological deposits to be associated with the item.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- Due to the limited distance between the tree rows at G2B H5 (west of Wileys Creek), conservation of the entire avenue would not be possible unless the highway were completely realigned either to the north of south. Such a revision would have major consequential impacts, and be equivalent to a bypass, rather than an upgrade of the current highway corridor. The significance of the tree avenue is not of an order which would justify such a revision.
- The positioning of the proposal over the northern tree row was a consequence of giving priority to the minimisation of direct impact to the southern row. This row is assessed as having higher conservation priority.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

- It is noted that all trees on the northern side of the highway would be directly impacted by the proposal, and that this is a consequence of the placement of the proposal in such a way as to reduce impact on the southern side plantings which have a higher conservation priority.

- It is recommended that all feasible and reasonable actions be taken to minimise direct impact to the southern row of the G2B H5 tree avenue. An archival recording should be conducted of the whole planted group prior to impact. In order to ascertain the age of the original planting, it is recommended that dendro-chronological analysis be conducted on samples recovered from the felled trees. This is required to better understand the item and place the planting within an historical context.

- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and remaining trees, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area. The requirement to demarcate no-go areas does not include any portions of the highway carriageway which may be included within the defined boundary of the heritage item.

- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H7

**Name/Description:** Remnant portion of mid nineteenth century Berry Estate road

**Item/Site Type:** Mid nineteenth century road remnant

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

*What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?*

- Construction of the proposal would result in the loss of part of the known extent of the item.

![Figure E.4 Location of G2B H7](image)

*The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:*

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (a), (b), (e) and (f).
- Physical impacts to this item would be partial.
- The conduct of an archival recording prior to any direct impact is considered to be an appropriate mitigation strategy, and respects the heritage significance of this item.

*The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:*

**Visual impact**

- Construction of the proposal would remove part of a remnant portion of the item.

**Impact on existing structures**

- Impact would occur at eastern end of remnant. The remnant is small and this degree of impact would reduce heritage value substantially.
Impact on relics

- Given that the definition of a ‘relic’ (s.4 Heritage Act 1977), is interpreted by the NSW Heritage Branch to exclude [earth] ‘works’ (refer Section 8.1.5 of this report), the ‘relic’ status of the road remnant is difficult to determine based on the current data. If the road is only evidenced by ground surface relief, then it may not constitute a relic. If there is a subsurface foundation or constructed road surface, then these may constitute a relic.

Summary

- Construction of the proposal would result in direct impact to the part of the remnant portion of the item.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- There is no potential for archaeological deposits to be associated with the item.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

More remnants occur of a slightly earlier estate road between Berry and Gerringong, however all but one of these would be directly impacted by the proposal (NOHC 2012). Any remaining remnants therefore, despite their underwhelming appearance and form, are worthy of conservation consideration where feasible and reasonable, and archival recording where not. The G2B H7 remnant is small, eroded and fragmentary, and is of a lesser quality and size compared to the other remnant G2B H9, situated on the opposite side of the Jaspers Brush Ridge. In this context the conduct of an archival recording is considered to be an appropriate mitigation strategy.

It is recommended that:

- An archival recording be conducted of G2B H7 prior to any clearing, demolition or construction impact: The recording should be inclusive of the road portion which would be conserved, so that the full context of the item and their current condition are recorded.
- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the remainder of the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.
- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
Heritage Item: G2B H44

Name/Description: ‘Hotel Woodbyne’ former Jaspers Brush public school

Item/Site Type: Late nineteenth century public schoolhouse and 1920s residence

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- Construction of the proposal would result in impact on the visual and contextual values of the known extent of the item.

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (d) and (e).
- There will be no physical impacts to the heritage significance of this item.
- The loss of bordering vegetation may have a small visual impact on the heritage significance of this item. The fact that there would be no significant change to the distance of the carriageway, and only a minor change to the property boundary respects the heritage significance of this item.

The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact

- Construction of the proposal would result in loss of bordering vegetation.

Impact on existing structures

- There would be no significant change in distance to carriageway and minor change required to property boundary. No existing structures relating to this heritage item would be directly impacted.

Impact on relics

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (d) and (e)), above ground structures which contribute to this significance, and any related archaeological deposits comply with the definition of a relic. No such relics would be directly impacted by the proposal.

Summary

- The upgraded highway corridor would have some visual impact on the item and associated grounds.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
- Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.

- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

*Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?*

- Potential archaeological deposits may remain within the grounds and along the adjacent creek bank. If present these would have potential to contribute to an understanding of the evolution of the school and local education. These deposits are not expected to be impacted by the proposal.

*What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?*

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

*Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?*

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

*How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?*

- The visual screening function of vegetation within the existing highway corridor adjacent to site G2B H44 should be maintained and/or replicated through planting of appropriate vegetation within the new proposal corridor.
- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.
- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H46

**Name/Description:** ‘Pomona’

**Item/Site Type:** Late nineteenth century dairy farm complex

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

*What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?*

- The construction impact of the proposal would be mostly indirect (visual and contextual), with the exception of the existing entrance gateway which would need to be demolished.

---

**Figure E.5 Location of G2B H46 and impact mitigation strategies**

- Dismantle and reassemble front gate at new boundary location.
- Revise proposed upgraded highway corridor boundary (red dashed line) so that it excludes the fenced off front yard around the ‘Pomona’ homestead (portion of fence enclosed within current boundary shown in thick blue).
The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (b), (c) (e) and (g).
- Physical impacts to this item would be partial.
- In order to maintain the integrity of this farm complex and its contextual landscape values it is recommended that, if feasible and reasonable, the entrance gateway should be carefully disassembled and reconstructed at a new entrance location, to be determined in consultation with the owner. Prior to any impact, the entrance gateway should be the subject of an archival recording. The reconstructed form of the entrance gateway should be as close to the original as is practical, feasible and reasonable. These recommendations respect the heritage significance of this item.

The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact
- The carriageway would be 13 metres closer to G2B H46 and the upgraded highway corridor boundary would encroach to within 10 metres of farmhouse and approximately two metres within the existing fenced front garden enclosure.

Impact on existing structures
- The entrance gateway would be totally impacted and removed.

Impact on relics
- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (b), (c) (e) and (g)), above ground structures which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic. No such relics would be directly impacted by the proposal. The entrance gateway would be directly impacted.

Summary
- The upgraded highway corridor would have mostly a visual and contextual impact (indirect impact) on the item and associated grounds, as well as a direct impact of the entrance gateway.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.
Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- There is no potential for archaeological deposits to be associated with the areas of direct impact.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

It is recommended that:

- Where feasible and reasonable, the entrance gateway should be carefully disassembled and reconstructed at a new entrance location, to be determined in consultation with the owner. Prior to any impact, the entrance gateway should be the subject of an archival recording. The reconstructed form of the entrance gateway should be as close to the original as is practical, feasible and reasonable.
- The proposed upgraded highway corridor boundary should be revised so that the existing enclosed front garden and yard around the ‘Pomona’ homestead (G2B H46) is excluded from the highway corridor.
- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the remainder of the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.
- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H66

**Name/Description:** ‘Westbury’

**Item/Site Type:** Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- Construction of the proposal would result in impact on the visual and contextual values of the known extent of the item.

**The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:**

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (a), (b), (e) (f) and (g).
- There would be no physical impacts to the heritage significance of this item.
- In the case of the ‘Westbury’ property (G2B H66), it is recommended that the mature Camphor Laurel trees on either side of the current driveway be retained, either by ensuring that they remain outside of the upgraded highway corridor, or conserving them within the new corridor, and defining no-go areas around the trees during construction. Such recommendations respect the visual and contextual significance of this heritage item.

**The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:**

**Visual impact**

- The carriageway would be four metres further away from G2B H66, however the upgraded highway corridor boundary would include boundary plantings of mature Camphor Laurel trees.

**Impact on existing structures**

- There would be no significant change in distance from existing structures to the carriageway and minor change would be required to the property boundary. No existing structures relating to this heritage item would be directly impacted.

**Impact on relics**

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (*Criteria (a), (b), (e), (f), and (g)*), above ground structures which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic. No such relics would be directly impacted by the proposal.

**Summary**

- The upgraded highway corridor would have a visual impact on the item and associated grounds.
Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- There is no potential for archaeological deposits to be associated with the item.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

It is recommended that:

- If feasible and reasonable, any of the mature camphor laurel trees at G2B H66 (‘Westbury’) which may, due to property acquisition, become incorporated into the highway corridor, should be conserved, and no-go areas defined around the trees.
- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the remainder of the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.
- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
Heritage Item: G2B H67
Name/Description: Site of former Meroo Meadow Public Hall
Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- This is the site of the former Meroo Meadow public hall. The site has already been impacted by previous highway widening (which required the demolition of the building).

![Figure E.6 Location of G2B H67](image)

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criterion (d).
- Physical impacts to this item would be partial.
- The site has already been impacted by previous highway widening (which required the demolition of the building), and is unlikely to contain archaeological deposits of any appreciable significance. However the site has considerable social value to the local community and its former presence and role in the community should be commemorated and interpreted. Such actions would respect the remaining heritage significance of this item.

The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact
- The carriageway would be seven metres closer to G2B H67, however the upgraded highway corridor boundary would encroach 20 metres into the site, leaving a six metre interval of the site remaining outside the corridor.

Impact on existing structures
- There are no existing structures remaining at this site.
Impact on relics

- This site is not a relic as the physical remains of the former Meroo Meadow Public School are no longer present. This heritage recording is instead defined as a place.

Summary

- The site has already been destroyed by a previous proposal. However, the site has considerable social value to the local community and its former presence and role in the community should be commemorated and interpreted.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- There is no potential for archaeological deposits with heritage significance, to be associated with the item.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

- Given that the proposal would further truncate and remove the former site so that less than half of the original building site remains, it would be appropriate for RMS to initiate and establish some form of commemoration and interpretation. It is recommended that this be done in an appropriate form and method. Consideration could be given to the creation of a physical memorial, signage and the use of printed and/or electronic media.
Heritage Item: G2B H68
Name/Description: Site of former Jaspers Dairy Co. and Jaspers Brush Dairy Co. factory
Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- Construction of the proposal would result in the loss of part of the known extent of the item.
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The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (b), (c), (e) and (g).
- Physical impacts to this item would be partial.
- The first management strategy would be to avoid impact if and where feasible and reasonable. In the event that avoidance is not found to be reasonable and direct impact is anticipated, then it is recommended that an archaeological program of test excavation be conducted within the area of anticipated impact, with the aim of determining if significant archaeological deposits would be impacted. Based on the findings of the test programs, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or at a later stage, providing some form of site interpretation. These mitigations strategies respect the heritage significance of this item.

The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact
- Visual impacts will be limited to the highway corridor expanding into a portion of this area of potential archaeological deposit.
Impact on existing structures

- There would be no impact on existing structures.

Impact on relics

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (b), (c), (e) and (g)), any archaeological deposits which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic.

Summary

- The upgraded highway corridor would have a minor impact on the item and associated grounds.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- Yes. This site is a potential archaeological deposit and direct impacts would be expected to occur within a small portion of this item.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

- If feasible and reasonable, direct impact should be avoided to the area of G2B H88, and to the land to the north of the current Jaspers Brush Road corridor (Part of G2B H68). If direct impact to either or both of these items is anticipated then an archaeological test excavation program should be conducted in the areas of anticipated impact with the aim of determining if significant archaeological deposits would be impacted. Based on the findings of this program, any further necessary management actions should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include salvage excavation and/or providing some form of site interpretation.

- The interpretation of the cultural values of the proposal area would be best promoted, interpreted and presented using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP). It is recommended that a HIP should be drafted with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, landowners and local councils. Options to be considered should include physical memorials; interpretive signage; on-site public access and/or viewing points; printed, internet and/or electronic media; and supporting local museum displays.

- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the remainder of the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.

- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
Heritage Item: G2B H71
Name/Description: ‘Fair View’
Item/Site Type: Late nineteenth or early twentieth century Victorian farmhouse and outbuildings

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- Construction of the proposal would result in impact on the visual and contextual values of the known extent of the item.

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (e) and (g).
- There would be no physical impacts to the heritage significance of this item.
- The loss of bordering vegetation may have a small visual impact on the heritage significance of this item. The fact that there would be no significant change to the distance of the carriageway from G2B H71, and no changes to the property boundary respects the heritage significance of this item.

The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact
- There would be a potential visual impact from loss of bordering vegetation.

Impact on existing structures
- There would be no significant change in distance from H2B H71 to the carriageway and to the property boundary.

Impact on relics
- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (e) and (g)), above ground structures which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic. No such relics would be directly impacted by the proposal.

Summary
- The upgraded highway corridor would have a visual impact on the item and associated grounds.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
- Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.

- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

**Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?**

- There are no known or potential archaeological deposits associated with this heritage item which would be impacted by the proposal.

**What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?**

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

**Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?**

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

**How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?**

It is recommended that:

- The visual screening function of vegetation within the existing highway corridor adjacent to site G2B H71 should be maintained and/or replicated through planting of appropriate vegetation within the new proposal corridor.
Heritage Item:  G2B H75
Name/Description:  Approximate site of former Meroo Meadow Dairy Co. factory
Item/Site Type:  Potential archaeological deposit (approximate location)

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- The exact location of the factory is not known. The area within which the factory was probably situated includes the eastern side of the existing highway corridor, either side of Meroo Road. Despite minimal extension of the highway platform in this direction, this area would probably be impacted by construction works for the Tullian Creek bridge and nearby interchange works.

![Figure E.8 Location of G2B H75](image)

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criterion (e).
- Direct physical impacts are expected to occur in the general vicinity of this potential archaeological deposit.
- A program of archaeological test excavation should be conducted to determine the presence and nature of any archaeological deposits within that portion of the proposal area which occurs within the area that may contain the remains of the former Meroo Meadow Diary Co. factory (recording G2B H75). This program may not be required if future historical analysis conducted prior to construction, determines that the factory was located outside of the proposal area. Based on the findings of this program, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This mitigation strategy respects the heritage significance of this item.

The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact

- The overall landscape context of the site would be marginally impacted by the creation of an overpass some 30 metres from the boundary of G2B H75.corridor

Impact on existing structures

- There would be no impact on existing structures as none are known to exist.
Impact on relics

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (*Criterion (e)*), potential archaeological deposits which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic. Such relics may be directly impacted by the proposal.

Summary

- The upgraded highway corridor could have a direct impact on the item.

*Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?*

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

*Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?*

- The presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.

*What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?*

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

*Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?*

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

- A program of archaeological test excavation should be conducted to determine the presence and nature of any archaeological deposits within that portion of the proposal area which occurs within the area that may contain the remains of the former Meroo Meadow Diary Co. factory (recording G2B H75). This program may not be required if future historical analysis conducted prior to construction, determines that the factory was located outside of the proposal area. Based on the findings of this program, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or providing some form of site interpretation.

- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the remainder of the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.

- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.

- The interpretation of the cultural values of the proposal area would be best promoted, interpreted and presented using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP). It is recommended that a HIP should be drafted with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, landowners and local councils. Options to be considered should include physical memorials; interpretive signage; on-site public access and/or viewing points; printed, internet and/or electronic media; and supporting local museum displays.
Heritage Item: G2B H77
Name/Description: ‘Exeter’
Item/Site Type: Federation/Edwardian style farmhouse with Arts and Crafts features, and remnant silo

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- Construction of the proposal would result in impact on the visual and contextual values of the known extent of the item.

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (c) and (f).
- There would be no physical impacts to the heritage significance of this item.
- While the upgraded highway corridor boundary would encroach 35 metres onto the property adjacent to the farmhouse, this would still be 100 metres away from the heritage item, thus respecting the heritage significance of this item.

The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact

- The upgraded highway corridor boundary would encroach 35 metres into the property adjacent to farmhouse; however this would be 100 metres from the farmhouse. The farmhouse is locally elevated and the Meroo Road interchange, overpass and ramps would be visible 130 and 200 metres away.

Impact on existing structures

- There would be no significant change in distance to carriageway and minor change required to property boundary. Existing structures of this heritage item would not be directly impacted.

Impact on relics

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (c) and (f)), above ground structures which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic. No such relics would be directly impacted by the proposal.

Summary

- The upgraded highway corridor would have a visual impact on the item and associated grounds.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.

All anticipated impacts can be mitigated to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.

The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:

- Minimise land take and property severance.
- Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

**Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?**

- There are no known or potential archaeological deposits associated with this heritage item which would be impacted by the proposal.

**What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?**

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

**Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?**

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

**How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?**

- Visual and contextual impacts (including viewsheds, noise and artificial light), to and from G2B H77 should be mitigated through urban design and the establishment of appropriate vegetation and/or other appropriate barriers.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H78

**Name/Description:** Avenue of planted road-side trees, Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow

**Item/Site Type:** Highway remnant tree avenue

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

*What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?*

- Construction of the proposal would result in the loss of part of the known extent of the item.
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*The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:*

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (c) and (d).
- There would be partial direct physical impacts to the heritage significance of this item.
- This remnant tree avenue could not be conserved in its entirety due to the vertical and horizontal alignment requirements of an upgraded highway platform. A number of trees, however, including some older and more vigorous trees, could be conserved in the vicinity of the Meroo Union Church, and on the opposite side of Boxsells Lane. These trees should be defined as no-go areas and fenced off for the duration of construction activities. Such action respect the heritage significance of this item.

*The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:*

**Visual impact**

- The pine trees adjacent to the Meroo Meadow Union Church property would not be impacted. Nor would one tree on south side of Boxsells Lane. All other trees would need to be felled. This direct impact on many trees that make up this avenue would have a significant visual impact on this item as a whole.
Impact on existing structures

- There are no existing structures associated with the item.

Impact on relics

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (c) and (d)), the trees which comprise this item would comply with the definition of a relic. The pine trees adjacent to the Meroo Meadow Union Church property would not be impacted. Nor would one tree on south side of Boxsells Lane. All other trees would need to be felled.

Summary

- The upgraded highway corridor would have a direct impact on the item and associated grounds.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- There is no potential for archaeological deposits to be associated with the item.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The single remaining tree row at (G2B H78), south of Tadingulla Creek, cannot be conserved in its entirety due to the vertical and horizontal alignment requirements of the proposal.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

The single remaining tree row at (G2B H78), south of Tandingulla Creek, cannot be conserved in its entirety due to the vertical and horizontal alignment requirements of the proposal. A number of trees, however, including some older and more vigorous trees, could be conserved in the vicinity of the Meroo Union Church, and on the opposite side of Boxsells Lane. These trees should be defined as no-go areas and fenced off for the duration of construction activities.

It is recommended that:

- If and where feasible and reasonable, impact to existing large and mature trees in the heritage tree planting G2B H78 should be avoided.

- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and remaining trees, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area. The requirement to demarcate no-go areas does not include any portions of the highway carriageway which may be included within the defined boundary of the heritage item.

- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.

- In order to mitigate the loss of aesthetic and cultural landscape values currently vested in the tree plantings, it is recommended that where direct impacts would be substantial, new plantings should be established (if and where feasible and reasonable) using the same or similar tree varieties in an appropriate and safe configuration. The aim of this strategy is to maintain or restore and support the landscape character and heritage values of the plantings. The type and variety of plantings used in new replacement plantings should (subject to contemporary regulations and horticultural considerations), seek to replicate those felled, and/or be locally prominent and contribute to the existing local landscape character.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H80

**Name/Description:** Site of former Berry Estate tenant farm ‘house’

**Item/Site Type:** Potential archaeological deposit

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- Construction of the proposal could potentially result in the loss of the whole of the extent of the item. The uncertainty in the predicted extent of impact is because the location of potential archaeological deposits is known only approximately. Portions of the deposit may be situated outside of the proposal area.

---

*Figure E.10 Location of G2B H80*

**The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:**

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criterion (e).
- It is proposed to conduct a program of archaeological salvage excavation of that portion of the G2B H80 subject to direct impact. The archaeological record generated by this action would address the need to realise the research, interpretation and information potential of the deposit. The resulting record would respect those values and provide a degree of mitigation.

**The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:**

**Visual impact**

- The construction footprint would extend 26 metres into an area which potentially contains archaeological remains. The upgraded highway corridor boundary extends 40 metres into same area, representing approximately ¾ of the area of archaeological potential.
Impact on existing structures

- All structures being part of this item would be directly impacted.

Impact on relics

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criterion (e)), potential archaeological deposits which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic. These structures would be directly impacted.

Summary

- Construction of the proposal would result in direct impact to all of the potential archaeological deposit associated with the original location of the tenant farmhouse at this site.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- Yes. The site location is approximate and the presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
• The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

**How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?**

It is recommended that:

• A program of archaeological test excavation should be conducted within that portion of site G2B H80 within the construction footprint, to determine the presence and nature of any archaeological deposits, and any required management strategies. Based on the findings of this program, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or, at a later stage, providing some form of site interpretation.

• The interpretation of the cultural values of the proposal area would be best promoted, interpreted and presented using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP). It is recommended that a HIP should be drafted with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, landowners and local councils. Options to be considered should include physical memorials; interpretive signage; on-site public access and/or viewing points; printed, internet and/or electronic media; and supporting local museum displays.
**Heritage Item:**  G2B H81

**Name/Description:**  Agricultural earth dam and former associated pipeline easement

**Item/Site Type:**  Agricultural earth dam and potential archaeological deposit

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- Construction of the proposal would result in the loss of part of the known extent of the item.

---

**Figure E.11 Location of G2B H81**

---

**The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:**

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (f and (g).
- Physical impacts to this item would be partial.
- The conduct of test and/or salvage archaeological excavation is the recommended strategy. Excavation would be required in this instance as the construction footprint would impact a portion of potential archaeological deposit associated with this site. This mitigation action respects the heritage significance of this item.

---

**The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:**

**Visual impact**

- There would be no visual impact.
Impact on existing structures
- No substantive impact to reservoir dam which would be 170 metres upslope of the upgraded highway corridor boundary. If a remnant section of the pipeline remains within/under, and/or to either side of the current highway platform, then this would be impacted within the construction footprint which would extend eight and 31 metres to the north and south (respectively) of the existing platform.

Impact on relics
- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (f and (g)), above ground structures as well as any potential archaeological deposits which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic.

Summary
- The upgraded highway corridor would have no impact on the item but a direct impact on the remnant section of the pipeline that may exist sub-surface.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?
- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?
- Yes. A portion of the potential archaeological deposit associated with this site would be directly impacted by the proposal.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?
- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

It is recommended that:

- A program of archaeological test excavation should be conducted within that portion of site G2B H81 within the construction footprint, to determine the presence and nature of any archaeological deposits, and any required management strategies. Based on the findings of this program, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or, at a later stage, providing some form of site interpretation.

- The interpretation of the cultural values of the proposal area would be best promoted, interpreted and presented using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP). It is recommended that a HIP should be drafted with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, landowners and local councils. Options to be considered should include physical memorials; interpretive signage; on-site public access and/or viewing points; printed, internet and/or electronic media; and supporting local museum displays.
Heritage Item: G2B H86
Name/Description: Row of planted road side trees, Meroo Road and Fletchers Lane, Meroo Meadow
Item/Site Type: Road side tree planting

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- Construction of the proposal would not result in the direct or physical impact of this item, however as works will occur very close to this item, a mitigation strategy will be put in place to prevent inadvertent physical impacts.

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criterion (c).
- It is recommended that the item be fenced off and defined as a ‘no-go’ area around trees in close proximity to construction works to prevent accidental damage. This recommendation respects the heritage significance of this item.
The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

**Visual impact**
- The alignment of the proposal would not affect this item from a visual standpoint.

**Impact on existing structures**
- There are no known structures associated with the item.

**Impact on relics**
- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (*Criterion (c)*), the trees which comprise this item would comply with the definition of a relic. These items would not be physically impacted.

**Summary**
- The upgraded highway corridor would have a visual impacts, as well as possible indirect impacts on the item.

**Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?**
- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

**Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?**
- There is no potential for archaeological deposits to be associated with the item.

**What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?**
- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

It is recommended that:

- Impact to the trees in G2B H86 should be avoided. The trees should be fenced off and defined as a no-go area for the duration of construction works.

- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and remaining trees, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area. In the case of tree alignments, the requirement to demarcate no-go areas does not include any portions of the highway carriageway which may be included within the defined boundary of the item.

- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H87

**Name/Description:** [Unnamed] early twentieth century Bungalow style farmhouse and dairy

**Item/Site Type:** Farmhouse and dairy

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- Construction of the proposal would result in impact on the visual and contextual values of the known extent of the item.

**The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:**

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (b), (f) and (g).
- There would be no physical impacts to the heritage significance of this item.
- There would be no significant change in the distance to the carriageway. This respects the heritage significance of this item.

**The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:**

**Visual impact**

- Provision for the proposed Meroo Road interchange southbound off and on ramps) would necessitate the upgraded highway corridor boundary to encroach 35 metres towards the farmhouse. Ramps would be elevated and visible from house.

**Impact on existing structures**

- There would be no significant change in distance from G2B H87 to the carriageway. Existing structures of this heritage item would not be directly impacted.

**Impact on relics**

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criteria (b), (f) and (g)), above ground structures which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic. No such relics would be directly impacted by the proposal.

**Summary**

- The upgraded highway corridor would have a visual impact on the item and associated grounds.

**Why is the proposal required to traverse through/near the identified heritage item?**

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
- Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.

- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

**Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?**

- There are no known or potential archaeological deposits associated with this heritage item which would be impacted by the proposal.

**What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?**

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

**Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?**

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

**How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?**

- Visual and contextual impacts (including viewsheds, noise and artificial light), to and from G2B H87 should be mitigated through urban design and the establishment of appropriate vegetation and/or other appropriate barriers.
Heritage Item: G2B H88

Name/Description: Site of former ‘hut’ building, part of former Estate ‘Meroo Station’

Item/Site Type: Potential archaeological deposit

Statement of Heritage Impact

What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?

- The location of the former hut has been identified from historical mapping and interpretation of the micro-topography. There would be potential for direct impact to the portion of the item within the existing corridor.

Figure E.13 Location of G2B H88 (the yellow rectangle shows the approximate location of the hut, based on an historical map overlay, refer Figures C-282 and C-285.

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criterion (e).
- Direct physical impacts are expected to occur in the general vicinity of this potential archaeological deposit.
- The first management strategy would be to avoid impact if and where feasible and reasonable. In the event that avoidance is not found to be reasonable and direct impact is anticipated, then it is recommended that an archaeological program of test excavation be conducted within the area of anticipated impact, with the aim of determining if significant archaeological deposits would be impacted. Based on the findings of the test programs, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or at a later stage, providing some form of site interpretation. These mitigations strategies respect the heritage significance of this item.
The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

Visual impact
- There would be no change to property boundaries. The area of recording occurs partially within existing highway corridor and within adjacent property.

Impact on existing structures
- There would be no impact on existing structures.

Impact on relics
- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (Criterion (e)), any archaeological deposits which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic.

Summary
- The upgraded highway corridor would possibly directly impact on the item.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?
- The site location is approximate and the presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?
- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

- If feasible and reasonable, direct impact should be avoided to the area of G2B H88. If direct impact is anticipated then an archaeological test excavation program should be conducted in the areas of anticipated impact with the aim of determining if significant archaeological deposits would be impacted. Based on the findings of this program, any further necessary management actions should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include salvage excavation and/or providing some form of site interpretation.
- The interpretation of the cultural values of the proposal area would be best promoted, interpreted and presented using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP). It is recommended that a HIP should be drafted with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, landowners and local councils. Options to be considered should include physical memorials; interpretive signage; on-site public access and/or viewing points; printed, internet and/or electronic media; and supporting local museum displays.
- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the remainder of the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.
- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
**Heritage Item:** G2B H91

**Name/Description:** Site of ‘Little Meadow’ Public School – ‘Tent School’ 1882-1884

**Item/Site Type:** Potential archaeological deposit of former 1880s tent school

---

**Statement of Heritage Impact**

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- The exact location of school tent is not known, however it is likely to have been close and parallel to the (1882) road formation. There would be potential for direct impact to the portion of the item within the existing corridor.

---

**The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:**

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under Criteria (a),(e) and (f)
- Physical impacts to this item would be partial.
- The conduct of test and/or salvage archaeological excavation is the direct recommended strategy. Excavation would be required in this instance as the construction footprint would impact a likely location of archaeological deposits. Such recommendations respect the heritage significance of this item.

**The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:**

**Visual impact**

- The proposed upgraded highway corridor boundary extends around 20 metres from the existing highway platform.

**Impact on existing structures**

- There are no known structures associated with the item.

**Impact on relics**

- Based on the local level of assessed significance for this item (*Criteria (a),(e) and (f)*), any archaeological deposits which contribute to this significance comply with the definition of a relic.
Summary

- The upgraded highway corridor would have a direct impact on a portion of this potential archaeological deposit

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors.
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.
- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- The site location is approximate and the presence of archaeological deposits is subject to confirmation.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- The alternative would be to construct the proposal on an altered alignment.
- This alternative has been rejected based on the poor balance of outcomes which would result relative to the objectives to:
  - Avoid or minimise impacts to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Minimise land take and property severance.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
- The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.
How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?

- A program of archaeological test excavation should be conducted within that portion of sites G2B H91 within the construction footprint, to determine the presence and nature of any archaeological deposits, and any required management strategies. Based on the findings of this program, any further management actions, as found necessary, should be conducted prior to construction impact. This could include the conduct of salvage excavation and/or, at a later stage, providing some form of site interpretation.

- The interpretation of the cultural values of the proposal area would be best promoted, interpreted and presented using formats, locations and strategies developed by, and defined in a Heritage Interpretation Plan (HIP). It is recommended that a HIP should be drafted with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, landowners and local councils. Options to be considered should include physical memorials; interpretive signage; on-site public access and/or viewing points; printed, internet and/or electronic media; and supporting local museum displays.

- Where feasible and reasonable, temporary fencing should be erected between the construction zone and the remainder of the site, with the aim of defining a ‘no go’ area.

- Where the erection of temporary fencing is not found to be feasible or reasonable, an alternative strategy should be adopted which adequately demarcates the boundaries of the ‘no-go’ area.
**Heritage Item:** SICPH CL  
**Name/Description:** Southern Illawarra Coastal Plain and Hinterland Cultural Landscape  
**Item/Site Type:** Cultural Landscape

---

### Statement of Heritage Impact

**What is the nature and extent of anticipated impact of the proposal?**

- The proposal would impose a modern structural component onto the landscape. The formal traits of the proposal would contrast with those of the existing landscape:
  - The horizontal alignment of the proposal would be curvilinear within the constraints of standardised and even radius curves. This would contrast with most of the existing broad scale man made landscape features which are based on grids, right angles, or straight intervals joined by relatively tight curves.
  - The vertical alignment of the proposal would be gradual and incremental, and would include ramps, embankments and cuttings to maintain standard rates of climb or descent. This is in contrast to most of the existing broad scale man made landscape features which are more reflective of natural gradients and elevations.
  - The width of the proposal corridor (including the carriageways, overpasses, ramps and associated corridor) would vary from around 100 metres to up to 200 metres. This is in major contrast to existing man made corridors which are nearly all less than 50 metres in width.
  - Unlike the alignment of existing roads which, through their curves, and opportunistic alignments, manifest the natural topography they are traversing, the proposal alignment would create its own topography of cuttings and embankments as required by limited tolerances in vertical and horizontal alignment. As a consequence the proposal may run contrary to the natural flow of ridges, valley orientation, and slope contours.

- Whereas the overwhelming character of property boundaries, field delineation, and secondary and minor roads is one of a grid and rectangular divisions, the proposal would superimpose this patchwork with a visually dominant and curvilinear corridor, following its own independent directional agenda.

### The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item for the following reasons:

- This item has an assessed local level of significance under all Criteria (a),(b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g).

- Apart from the construction of a number of significant interchanges the proposal would follow the existing Princes Highway alignment between Berry and Bomaderry. This existing corridor generally follows the first European road constructed in the region – the 1856 Berry Estate Road. This provides a degree of historical and functional integrity to the proposal. It would remain a modern manifestation of an original mid nineteenth century access and transport corridor.

- It is proposed to minimise and ameliorate adverse visual impacts of the proposal, through careful design of the proposal corridor and its infrastructure, minimising cuttings, embankments and carriageway elevation where feasible, and the establishment of vegetation.

### The following aspects of the proposal would detrimentally impact on heritage significance:

**Visual impact**

- The proposal would impose a visually obtrusive and modern contrasting structural feature across a largely nineteenth century landscape character.
Impact on existing structures

- A very limited number of structures would be impacted by the proposal. None of the structural impacts to these individual heritage items will result in significant detrimental impacts to the overall visual and heritage character of the landscape.

Impact on relics

- The identification of relics sits uncomfortably with the scale of cultural landscapes. Due to the constraints inherent in its statutory definition and interpretation the identification of relics remains most effective at the smaller scale of sites, structures, objects and deposits. Refer to the individual impact statements for each item for the assessment of relics.

Summary

- The proposal would impose a visually obtrusive and modern contrasting structural feature across a largely nineteenth century landscape character.

Why is the proposal required to traverse through the identified heritage item?

- The proposal design has been determined following the consideration of multiple environmental, social, economic, design and engineering factors. Many of the constraints and opportunities posed by these factors present conflicting values and objectives. In these cases, proposal design has been drafted following a comparative assessment of the impacts and relative values. With regard to cultural heritage values, the proposal alignment was formulated with the following objectives:
  - Avoid impact to cultural heritage values where feasible or where significance values warrant compromise in other factors
  - Minimise impact to cultural heritage values where feasible and where warranted by significance values.
  - Mitigate all anticipated impacts to a substantial degree through the conduct of management and salvage actions.

- The location of the proposal across this heritage item is required in order to:
  - Minimise land take and property severance.
  - Maximise the use of the existing highway alignment and corridor.

Will any known or potentially significant archaeological deposits be subject to development impact?

- The following items consist of, or include, known or potential archaeological deposits which would/may be subject to direct impact from construction of the proposal: G2B H44, H68, H75, H80, H81, H88, and H91.

What alternatives to the anticipated development impact have been considered? Why are they rejected?

- There are no feasible alternatives to the upgrading of the Princes Highway in such a way that its form and visual impact would not pose an impact to the heritage values of the cultural landscape it traverses.

Has the advice of a heritage specialist been sought? Has the consultant’s advice been implemented/adopted?

- This assessment constitutes the advice sought and accepted from a heritage specialist (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd), to the proponent (RMS).
The advice of the consultant is incorporated as the recommended management strategies in this report.

**How is it proposed that development impact be avoided, minimised or mitigated?**

- Where feasible and reasonable, the construction and finishing of the proposal corridor, embankments and cutting faces should be conducted in such a way to minimise and ameliorate adverse visual impacts, and facilitate the re-establishment of vegetation.

- The establishment of appropriate forms of vegetation along the proposal corridor and adjacent areas should be an important strategy in mitigating the broad scale landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This should be conducted with an awareness of maintaining important vistas from the proposal, and the use of vegetation boundaries and alignments which conform to the rectangular patchwork of the surrounding landscape and serve to breakup or scatter the dominant curvilinear of the proposal corridor.

- Where there is an opportunity to incorporate artistic elements in structures adjacent to the carriageway, (such as bridgework and retaining and noise abatement walls), it is recommended that designs derived from local cultural heritage themes be considered, especially at locations in close association to places of heritage significance.
Appendix F

ISEPP consultation, comments and responses
Appendix F – ISEPP consultation, comments and responses

A draft of this report was provided to the Shoalhaven City Council in July 2013 as part of consultation undertaken in accordance with Clause 14 of ‘State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure)’. A number of comments were provided by Council in response to the draft report (letter dated 22 July 2013, from Mr Tim Fletcher to Mr Nick Boyd, Council reference: 1992e). These are presented and addressed in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Items in Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (SLEP) 1985</th>
<th>Shoalhaven City Council comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Meroo Union Church Lot 4 DP 249776. 8 Boxsells Lane, MEROO MEADOW 2540 | Mitigation measures are supported and it is recommended that the pine trees, boundary and item are avoided to minimise impact. | The recommendations made in this assessment are compatible and consistent with the Shoalhaven City Council comments:  
- Direct impact to the Meroo Union Church (G2B H3) would be avoided, (recommendation no. 1).  
- No-go areas would be defined around church boundary trees, (recommendation no. 2 and 5).  
- If and where feasible and reasonable, direct impact to trees adjacent to church within tree alignment (G2B H78) to be avoided, (recommendation no. 2 and 5).  
- Archival recording of trees (G2B H78), including those adjacent to church, would be compiled prior to construction works, (recommendation no. 7).  
- If direct impact to tree alignment (G2B H78), was substantial, then new plantings to be established, (recommendation no. 9 and 10). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Items in Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (SLEP) 1985</th>
<th>Shoalhaven City Council comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The federation farmhouse located at Lot 8 DP 1007274 55 Fletchers Lane, Meroo Meadow</td>
<td>Item is listed as a Heritage Item in SLEP 1985 and is approximately 830 metres from the existing highway boundary. This item is considered to be a key component in the Berry Bolong Pastoral landscapes near Bomaderry and the Technical Paper should be amended to assess the impacts of the highway upgrade on this item.</td>
<td>This building, including the lot it is situated on, is located 514 metres from the intersection of Fletchers Lane and Meroo Road. This intersection marks the closest extent of the proposal and highway corridor to the item. As such, this item falls outside of the geographic scope and the specified survey area of the assessment for the proposal. The assessment scope and survey area is defined as the proposal corridor (defined as the proposed road reserve for the upgrade), together with an area contained within a radius of 200 metres from boundaries of that corridor (Non-Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Technical paper page 7). Given the distance of the item from the proposal corridor, the location of the item on a no-through road, and the low relief, alluvial plain context of the item, the proposal and construction works does not pose any potential for direct impact or appreciable indirect impact to the item (such as visual or noise impacts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Items in Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (SLEP) 1985</td>
<td>Shoalhaven City Council comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ‘Pomona’ Late nineteenth century Dairy farm complex C360 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow Lot 2 DP 620160 | The proposed mitigation measure to carefully disassemble and reconstruct the entrance gateway in consultation with the owner, as well as archival recording is supported. The preferred mitigation measure is to revise the alignment to exclude Pomona homestead, grounds and entrance gateway from the highway easement. A ‘no-go’ area is supported during the construction phase to ensure impacts are minimised. | The mitigation measure suggested and preferred by the Shoalhaven City Council would involve revision of the proposal alignment to exclude impact to the Pomona grounds and entrance gateway. This measure would result in a substantially greater net impact to the cultural heritage values of the Meroo Meadow locality than the current proposal alignment. This is because the suggested realignment of the upgraded carriageway to the west would necessitate the following:  
- Direct impact to the grounds of the Meroo Union Church (G2B H3), situated on the opposite side of the highway, and the removal of trees on the eastern boundary of the church grounds (part of recording G2B H78).  
- Substantial encroachment of the realigned carriageway upon the curtilage of the former Meroo Meadow school house and residence (G2B H4), situated 350 metres to the north.  
- Possible direct impact to the former Meroo Meadow school house (G2B H4), necessitating its demolition.  
By comparison, the current proposal alignment would provide a more balanced compromise, which would allow for:  
- Maximum use of the existing highway road reserve.  
- The limitation of direct impacts to the western margin of the Pomona grounds and its entrance gateway (G2B H46).  
- The opportunity to conserve, where feasible and reasonable, the church ground boundary trees.  
- Minimisation of impact to the curtilage of the former Meroo Meadow school and residence (G2B H4).  
The current proposal would therefore constitute the least net-impact to cultural heritage values. On this basis, the suggested revision of the alignment is not considered to be necessary or required. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Items in Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (SLEP) 1985</th>
<th>Shoalhaven City Council comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Meroo Meadow School &amp; School Master's Residence C385 Princes Highway, Meroo Meadow Lot 1 DP716569</td>
<td>The proposed mitigation measures are supported and impacts to the item, grounds and curtilage should be avoided if possible. The no-go area should be as large as feasible and reasonable (as detailed in Appendix E - Statements of Heritage Impact).</td>
<td>The current proposal does not avoid impact to the open space, or curtilage, in front of this item (G2B H4), however the degree of impact has been minimised within the context of the overall proposal design. There would be no direct impact to the buildings, and impact to the freehold land on which they are situated would be limited to any necessary modification of the existing access driveway. The proposal carriageway would be closer to the buildings, and this would reduce the open space in front of the buildings (much of which occurs within the current highway road reserve), and constitute an indirect impact to the item. Any revision of the proposal alignment to avoid this indirect impact would necessitate a higher degree of direct impact to the Pomona property (G2B H46), and to the site of the Meroo Meadow Public Hall (G2B H67). It can therefore be concluded that the current proposal constitutes the least net-impact to cultural heritage values, and a revision of the alignment is neither considered to be necessary or required based on heritage grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Items in Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (SLEP) 1985</td>
<td>Shoalhaven City Council comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Hotel Woodbyne' Former Jaspers Brush Public School complex and gardens4 O'Keefes Lane Jaspers Brush Lot 1 DP872572</td>
<td>The extent of vegetation removal is not known and as per the proposed mitigation measures, the visual screening function of vegetation should be maintained and the highway easement be realigned to avoid impact to the item, grounds and bordering vegetation. Shoalhaven Heritage Inventory also notes that plantings at the site include a number of mature trees that are estimated to be over 100 years old (not confirmed).</td>
<td>The current proposal would not involve direct impact to the former Jaspers Brush Public School complex and its gardens, as they are defined in the assessment (G2B H44). Recommendation numbers one and two stipulate that direct impact be avoided and appropriate no-go areas be defined. The extent of potential vegetation removal associated with the current proposal would be limited to the existing highway road reserve, and a small portion of the southwestern corner of Lot 1. The portion of Lot 1 subject to impact consists of cleared creek flats and a section of an adjoining embankment. None of the old-growth plantings associated with the former school grounds occur within or near to the areas of potential vegetation clearance. Due to past changes in the alignment of the highway, a substantial portion of the original nineteenth century road and associated former road reserve survives adjacent to the current highway. This remnant is situated between the current highway road reserve and the original school grounds and now forms part of Lot 1. This area, and its vegetation, would act as a buffer to any changes that would occur as a result of the proposal within the current reserve. The extent to which the existing vegetation within the current road reserve would need to be removed is not known, and as such, the recommended strategy (recommendation no. 16) is precautionary in nature. The recommendation states that: the visual screening function of vegetation within the existing highway corridor adjacent to site G2B H44 should be maintained and/or replicated through planting of appropriate vegetation within the new proposal corridor. Based on these considerations, and the potential for maximum use of the existing highway road reserve afforded by the current proposal, a revision of the proposed upgrade alignment is not considered to be necessary or required based on heritage grounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>