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1 Introduction

1.1 Project Description

In December 2015, the Austral AHMS Joint Venture (AAJV) was commissioned by NSW Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) to prepare a Strategic Conservation Management Plan (SCMP) for Thompson Square. The purpose of the report is to provide a framework for managing the heritage significance of Thompson Square within its context as an important and historic town centre.

The preparation of an SCMP for the study area is one of the Conditions of Approval for the Windsor Bridge Replacement Project (hereafter WBRP). This project was approved on 20 December 2013 by the NSW Minister for Planning (hereafter the Minister) (Application No SSI-4951). Information relating directly to the WBRP, including the conditions of consent and how they have been met, have been included in Volume 3 of this SCMP.

This SCMP has been prepared in accordance with the standards and guidelines of the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) and Heritage Council, the principles of *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* and best heritage practice.

1.2 Structure of SCMP

This SCMP has been divided into an Executive Summary and four volumes, aimed at providing specific information for targeted audiences. The structure of the SCMP is as follows:

- Volume 1: Site Identification, Historical Background and Heritage Status
- Volume 2: Physical Analysis, Assessment of Significance, Constraints and opportunities, Policies and Implementation (this volume)
- Volume 3: Windsor Bridge Replacement Project (WBRP) specific information, including related policies and recommendations
- Volume 4: Consultation Report.

Volumes 1 to 3 have been prepared by the AAJV. Volume 4 has been prepared by RMS.

This document has been structured to ensure its own longevity following the conclusion of the WBRP. The Executive Summary contains the project brief, a summary of conclusions and recommendations. Volumes 1 and 2 contain information relevant to the long-term conservation and management of the study area, while Volume 3 contains information specifically relevant to the WBRP. At the conclusion of the WBRP, the information and policies in Volume 3 will no longer be relevant; however, Volumes 1 and 2 will continue to provide the basis for the ongoing management of Thompson Square.

1.3 Aims and Objectives of Volume 1

This report forms Volume 1 of the SCMP and is intended as a background document to Volumes 2 and 3. The objectives of Volume 1 are to:

- identify the study area in detail
- examine the natural environment and its setting, in order to determine how this influenced Aboriginal and European occupation of the area
• provide information regarding the Aboriginal use of the area, based on historical sources and
  the results of archaeological testing
• provide detailed documentary evidence of the historical development of the study area
• identify the heritage status of the study area and neighbouring properties.

This information has been used to inform the policies and recommendations for the future
management, adaptive re-use, new works and interpretation of the study area (as outlined in
Volumes 2 and 3), to ensure that the values of the place are maintained and, where appropriate,
enhanced.

1.4 Audience

The audience for Volumes 1 and 2 includes the general public and non-government stakeholders,
local landowners, Hawkesbury City Council (HCC), National Trust of Australia (NSW) including its
local Hawksbury branch, OEH, and NSW RMS.

The audience for Volume 3, which is primarily concerned with the implementation of the SCMP
policies on the WBRP, is NSW RMS (as project proponent), the Department of Planning and
Environment (DPE, as consent authority) and OEH (as regulatory advisor to DPE) and
representative of the NSW Heritage Council.

All volumes are intended to be publicly available.

1.5 Study Area

The study area is that area specified in Appendix 2 of the Minister’s Conditions of Approval for the
WBRP, and the additional areas of project impact as agreed with RMS. It does not (nor is it required
to) encompass all land contained within the Windsor Bridge Conservation Area (as defined by either
the State Heritage Register [SHR] or the local environmental planning instrument).

The study area includes Thompson Square, located in the centre of the town of Windsor, immediately
south of the Hawkesbury River. Thompson Square is the oldest public square in Australia and
notable for the large number of Colonial, Georgian and nineteenth-century buildings that surround
it. The study area includes sections of George Street, Bridge Street, Thompson Square and The
Terrace, a series of roadways surrounding a small turfed reserve. Directly north is Windsor Bridge,
spanning the Hawkesbury River to connect with Wilberforce Road. The former turf farm adjacent to
the north bank of the Hawkesbury River, opposite Thompson Square, is also included (Figure 1).
Figure 1: Roadmap indicating the location of the SCMP study area, including Thompson Square Conservation Area and Windsor Bridge, within the wider area of Windsor.
Figure 2: Aerial indicating the location of the SCMP study area (in red).
1.6 Approach and Methodology

The preparation of an SCMP for the study area is one of the Conditions of Approval for the WBRP. This project was approved on 20 December 2013 by the Minister (Application No SSI-4951). The relevant condition is:

**B1 – the Applicant shall submit a Strategic Conservation Management Plan (CMP) to the Director-General for the project area on the southern side of the Hawkesbury River as shown in Appendix 2 Strategic Conservation Management Plan study area. The CMP shall be prepared by appropriately qualified and/or experienced heritage consultants. The nominated heritage consultant(s) is to have appropriate experience and skills including land and maritime archaeology, landscape, engineering and built heritage expertise and documented experience in the preparation and implementation of CMPs.**

The Applicant shall not carry out any pre-construction or construction activities on the southern side of the Hawkesbury River for the SSI [State Significant Infrastructure approval] before the CMP has been approved by the Director-General. The CMP is to provide for the conservation of the Thompson Square Conservation Area. The CMP shall be prepared in consultation with the Heritage Branch, OEH and in accordance with the relevant guidelines of the NSW Heritage Council and include, but not limited to:

- **a)** Identification of the heritage value of the Thompson Square Conservation Area, including statements of significance for the Thompson Square Conservation Area and any individual listings within the conservation area of local, state or national heritage items;
- **b)** The development of heritage design principles for the project to retain the significance of the Thompson Square Conservation Area and any individually listed item within the conservation area or in proximity to the site, with the exception of Item 3 (the Thompson Square lower parkland area) and Item 20 (Windsor Bridge) in Table 1 of Appendix 1;
- **c)** Specific mitigation measures for the Thompson Square Conservation Area and individually listed items to minimise impact and to ensure that final measures selected are appropriate and the least intrusive option;
- **d)** Changes to the detailed design of the SSI to mitigate heritage impacts.

The majority of information specific to the WBRP is located in Volume 3; however, all four volumes act in aggregate to fulfil this condition.

Guidelines, standards and other documents relied upon for the preparation of the SCMP include:

- *Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and Relics*, NSW Heritage Office.

It should be noted that there is no established standard for what constitutes a ‘strategic’ conservation management plan, as opposed to a conservation management plan. The dictionary definition of ‘strategic’ is:
relating to the identification of long-term or overall aims and interests and the means of achieving them.¹

In this regard, the report’s authors view the SCMP as providing high-level policy advice for the ongoing conservation of the study area, acknowledging the existing constraints, identifying future opportunities and setting long-term goals to achieve conservation outcomes. The SCMP also provides specific guidance for the WBRP, including on the mitigation of its heritage impacts and the interpretation of the area’s heritage values.

The SCMP has been prepared in consultation with the Heritage Division of the OEH and in accordance with the relevant guidelines of the NSW Heritage Council, as noted above. The SCMP only extends to the front facades of the buildings within the study area on the southern side of the Hawkesbury River. It considers the public domain contribution of these buildings to the study area, but does not provide a detailed assessment of their fabric or detailed recommendations for the conservation of individual structures.

The methodology incorporates the following sections: Historical Background, Physical Analysis, Assessment of Significance, Conservation Management Issues, Policies and Implementation. The historical overview provides sufficient background to enable understanding of the place in order to assess the heritage significance in accordance with the NSW heritage assessment process and to provide relevant recommendations; however, it is not intended as an exhaustive history of the site.

The methodology used in the preparation of this plan follows that set out in *The Conservation Plan* (7th edition) by James Semple Kerr. The basic methodology of this process is to:

- research the history and development of the place (Volume 1)
- identify the significance of the place and its elements (Volume 2, Chapters 3)
- assess the significance of the place and its elements (Volume 2, Chapter 3)
- develop recommendations for the management of the significance of the place and its elements (Volume 2, Chapters 4 and 5 for the general study area, and Volume 3 for the WBRP).

Site inspections of the study area were carried out between April and July 2016. The general locality was also inspected. An extensive programme of historic, Aboriginal and maritime archaeological testing was undertaken between August and November 2016. A summary of the results of this testing have been incorporated into the SCMP; however, detailed discussion of the archaeological findings is contained within the Archaeological Test Excavation Reports. A Preliminary Test Excavation Report was prepared in December 2016 to guide archaeological salvage works, and the complete Test Excavation Report was finalised in August 2017. Wherever possible, recommendations and policies presented in those documents are included within the SCMP.

This SCMP has relied upon a range of primary and secondary sources, as well as heritage and environmental reports prepared for the WBRP and other projects, as relevant. A full bibliography may be found at the end of this document; however, key sources have included:


• **Windsor Museum, NSW: Aboriginal archaeological and cultural salvage excavation. AHIP #2119. Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd (2011).**

• The extensive collection of early photos of Windsor from the Government Printing Office, held by the State Library of NSW.

• Commentary from contemporary sources, such as government dispatches within the *Historical Records of Australia* and *Historical Records of New South Wales*.

• *Early Days of Windsor* by Jas Steele (1916).

### 1.7 Limitations

This SCMP has been prepared within the context of the approved project to replace the existing Windsor Bridge and provide new approaches to the north and south of the Hawkesbury River.

The project was the subject of a challenge in the NSW Land and Environment Court (LEC) by a community group called Community Action for Windsor Bridge (CAWB). This court challenge was unsuccessful, and on 27 October 2015 the court ruled that the Minister had the authority to approve the project under the terms of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.*

The SCMP has therefore been prepared with the approved project and its impacts as a given; the document does not contemplate alternatives to the approved project, and nor is it required to under the Minister’s Conditions of Approval. However, the SCMP does provide guidance on the mitigation of the specific impacts of the WBRP (in Volume 3), as well as on the long-term strategic management of the Thompson Square precinct following completion of the approved works (in Volume 2).

Inspection and testing have been limited to lands that are under the ownership and/or control of NSW RMS or otherwise within the public domain, including the riverbed. There has been no access to any privately owned land or property. Any observations and recommendations related to privately owned property relate solely to observations made from the public domain, and how the heritage significance of the study area can best be managed and conserved within that public domain interface.

Although AAJV makes every attempt to minimise the error in its maps, the very nature of amalgamating data from multiple sources means that discrepancies will arise in alignment. Aerial photography, in particular, is very prone to alignment errors as a result of orthorectification and registration, and it is rare that aerial imagery will perfectly match with other data, such as cadastral. Early maps and plans, even when prepared by a surveyor, may be considerably less accurate than modern information, again leading to potential misalignments. Nonetheless, based on AAJV’s experiences working with the data on this project, and observations of built fabric and historical archaeological materials located during testing, the project team is confident that geographical displacement should be no more than approximately 2 metres, depending on the data sources being used.

### 1.8 Ownership

The SCMP study area is in multiple ownerships, including state and local government, as well as the private commercial and residential sectors (Figure 3). The land in the study area is also affected by easements for public and private utilities (such as water, electricity, gas and telecommunications).

The road reserves, Windsor Bridge and the areas for which the new bridge approaches are planned are owned by NSW RMS.

---

The public domain land of Thompson Square is owned and managed by HCC.
The buildings within and along the boundaries of the study area are owned by a variety of private owners.
Infrastructure within the study area is owned by a variety of utility providers including Sydney Water Corporation (water and sewer), Endeavour Energy (high- and low-voltage electricity), Jemena (gas) and a variety of telecommunications companies.
Figure 3: Land ownership in and around the study area.
1.9 Heritage Status

The study area consists of two main heritage items, listed on the following statutory registers:

- NSW SHR, item #00126 as Thompson Square Conservation Area
- RMS Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register (S170), item #4309589 as Hawkesbury River Bridge, Windsor
- Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012, item #I00126 as Thompson Square and item #I276 as Windsor Bridge.

The study area also includes the following non-statutory heritage listings:

- National Trust of Australia (NSW) Register under IDs S10510 and S11456 as Thompson Square Precinct.

The study area boundaries do not, and are not required to, accord exactly with the boundaries of the various conservation areas. The study area is as defined in Appendix 2 of the Minister’s Conditions of Approval plus those additional areas of project impact agreed to by RMS.

There are also numerous buildings adjacent to the study area, which are discussed later in this report and are listed on the SHR and LEP.

Figures 4–11 below show the coverage of heritage listings in the study area. During the mapping process, it became clear that there are several issues in the listing data at both the state and local levels, as follows:

- As shown in Figure 9, there is a slight variation across conservation area curtilages.
- The boundary for the SHR conservation area has some errors, with a small portion in the south-eastern boundary excluded from the curtilage, as shown in Figure 5.
- As shown in Figure 4, the lower parkland is not labelled as Thompson Square in the LEP, but rather as ‘McQuade Park’, which is located 1 kilometre west of the site.

Where necessary, the incorrect references have been corrected in this document, for the sake of clarity.

A detailed review and rationalisation of state and local listings and curtilage boundaries throughout the study area site may be required in the future.

For full details of all heritage items within and adjacent to the study area, see Chapter 3 of this volume.
Figure 4: Plan of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge indicating all heritage items relevant to the SCMP study area.
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1.11 Terminology

The terminology used in the SCMP follows the definitions presented in *The Burra Charter*, Article 1, supplemented by additional terminology where required.

Table 1: Terminology definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal object</td>
<td>A statutory term defined under the <em>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</em> as ‘any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises New South Wales, being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non-Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Changing a place to suit the existing use or a proposed use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeolian</td>
<td>Describing sediment that has been deposited through wind-blown processes (e.g. sand dunes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial</td>
<td>Describing sediment that has been deposited through deposition by water processes (e.g. floodplains adjacent to a river).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvium</td>
<td>A deposit of clay, silt and/or sand left by flowing floodwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>An object demonstrating evidence of use of the area by people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>The connections that exist between people and a place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatible use</td>
<td>A use that respects the <em>cultural significance of a place</em>. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>All the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural landscape significance</td>
<td>Denotes values that are social, aesthetic and historic, and possess a sense of community for past, present and future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural significance</td>
<td>Denotes aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>All the physical material of the place including elements, fixtures, contents and objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial</td>
<td>Describing sediment that has been deposited/reworked by processes directly associated with rivers or streams. In the context of this report, fluvial is represents deposits within the active river corridor (e.g. bank erosion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>All the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolated find</strong></td>
<td>Usually considered a single artefact or stone tool, but can relate to any product of prehistoric Aboriginal societies. The term ‘object’ is used in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to reflect the definitions of Aboriginal stone tools or other products provided in the <em>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape character</strong></td>
<td>Encompasses both the physical and visual qualities of the present-day landscape and the cultural values of the site including programme and community interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>The continuous protective care of a place, and its setting. Maintenance is to be distinguished from repair which involves restoration or reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meanings</strong></td>
<td>Denote what a place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses to people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural landscape significance</strong></td>
<td>Values relating to the geography, biodiversity and ecology of a place and its position within broader landscape systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>A geographically defined area. It may include elements, objects, spaces and views. Place may have tangible and intangible dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD)</strong></td>
<td>An area assessed as having the potential to contain Aboriginal objects. PADs are commonly identified on the basis of landform types, surface expressions of Aboriginal objects, surrounding archaeological material, and disturbance, among a range of other factors. While not defined in the <em>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</em>, PADs are generally considered to retain Aboriginal objects and are therefore protected and managed in accordance with that Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Maintaining a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstruction</strong></td>
<td>Returning a place to a known earlier state by the introduction of new material (as distinct from restoration).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related place</strong></td>
<td>A place that contributes to the cultural significance of another place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related object</strong></td>
<td>An object that contributes to the cultural significance of a place but is not located at that place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relic</strong></td>
<td>Any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that: (a) relates to the settlement of the area that comprises NSW, not being Aboriginal settlement; and (b) is of State or local heritage significance, as defined under the <em>Heritage Act 1977</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restoration</strong></td>
<td>Returning a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or reassembling existing elements without the introduction of new material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
<td>The immediate and extended environment of a place that is part of or contributes to its cultural significance and distinctive character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site (archaeology)  An archaeological site is an area that contains one or more archaeological relics. This may be in an Aboriginal, historical or maritime context.

Unexpected find A potential relic discovered during the course of work in an area that may have been assessed as having a nil or low potential to contain such material.

Use The functions of a place, including the activities and traditional and customary practices that may occur at the place or are dependent on the place.

1.12 Abbreviations

The abbreviations shown throughout the three volumes of this report are listed below.

Table 2: Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAJV</td>
<td>Austral AHMS Joint Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCB</td>
<td>Australian Building Codes Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHIP</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIR</td>
<td>Aboriginal Site Impacts Recording Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>Building Code of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Before present (AD 1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWB</td>
<td>Community Action for Windsor Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHMP</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPTED</td>
<td>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>Disability Discrimination Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPE</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Environmental Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>Hawkesbury City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka</td>
<td>Abbreviation for thousands of years ago (e.g. 1 ka equals 1,000 years ago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEC</td>
<td>NSW Land and Environment Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGM</td>
<td>Last Glacial Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPW Act</td>
<td>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEH</td>
<td>Office of Environment and Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Registered Aboriginal party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Roads and Maritime Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSJ</td>
<td>Rolled Steel Joist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S170</td>
<td>Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMP</td>
<td>Strategic Conservation Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR</td>
<td>State Heritage Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSBA</td>
<td>Surface Supplied Breathing Apparatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>State Significant Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDLP</td>
<td>Urban Design and Landscape Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBRP</td>
<td>Windsor Bridge Replacement Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Thompson Square Historical Background

2.1 Historical Overview

2.1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a background to the natural, Aboriginal, colonial and contemporary history and development of the study area and, where relevant, the surrounding area. This history has been prepared to identify places, themes and stories of heritage significance to the study area, and thereby to guide understanding of the heritage significance of the place, the policies that relate to its future conservation and the aspects of the study area that require interpretation. This history is not meant to be the definitive history of the Windsor region or Thompson Square, but rather an exploration of the aspects of the place’s history that can most usefully inform understanding of heritage significance and conservation policy in this context. There are aspects of the history of the study area that are glossed over or omitted due to reasons of space, time and project relevance. There is ample scope for researchers and historians to add to the understanding of the place, its history and development in future, particularly as new sources of evidence come to light. It is therefore important to view the history presented here as part of a process of understanding the place, rather than a product that provides the final word on the history of Thompson Square and Windsor. It should also be noted that the development of a historical understanding of a place is not based on the identification of single sources to verify specific events or activities; rather, it is a process of reviewing and interpreting various primary and secondary sources, some of which may be in conflict, and interpreting the history based on the expert judgement of historians.

Furthermore, there are aspects of every history that are contested. This history is based on the knowledge, experience and interests of those who prepared it. It is possible, and perhaps likely, that there will be alternate interpretations of aspects of the study area’s history presented here. Where there are strongly contested aspects of this history, or where the project team has not been able to reach a unanimity of views, this is identified through footnotes, without any attempt to argue that the views here are definitive. Wherever possible, this history is supported by factual information drawn from primary sources. It is to be noted that historical sources, where quoted, are placed in block italic text and have not been edited from their original textual presentation.

2.1.2 Key Events in and Physical Changes to the Study Area

Table 3 below provides an overview of the key events and physical changes related to Thompson Square that have occurred during its known history. The table is not intended to be an exhaustive history, but a summary that provides a context for the detailed history presented later in this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1788</td>
<td>Aboriginal occupation of the study area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details related to heritage interpretation are contained in the Thompson Square Interpretation Strategy (AAJV October 2016), which provides the high-level framework for interpretation, and the Thompson Square Interpretation Plan (AAJV, March 2017 – in development), which provides the detailed interpretive locations and media.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Government makes 118 land grants along the Upper Hawkesbury, creating the district of Mulgrave Place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Civic square and Government Precinct established in the approximate location of present-day Thompson Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First wharf constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1796</td>
<td>Andrew Thompson takes up informal occupation of a cottage near the granary in what later becomes Thompson Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Civic square fixed in form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1795 wharf destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 October 1799</td>
<td>Andrew Thompson granted a formal lease on 1 acre of land, forming the eastern boundary of the later Thompson Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800–01</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name Green Hills formally used for the area around the civic square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>Two major floods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1810</td>
<td>Governor Macquarie announces that Andrew Thompson is to be the colony’s first emancipist magistrate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1810</td>
<td>Andrew Thompson dies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1810</td>
<td>Governor Macquarie announces the creation of five new towns on the high land along the Hawkesbury-Nepean River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Hills is renamed Windsor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Existing civic square officially named Thompson Square after Andrew Thompson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>A regular punt service begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Turning place for carts created in the vicinity of the new wharf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815–16</td>
<td>Barrel drain constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New wharf constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1815 wharf destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816–17</td>
<td>New wharf begun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>New wharf completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>A temporary additional wharf erected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Greatest flood in the history of Windsor, reaching 63 feet (19.2 metres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Windsor Bridge opened. Redundant punt moored out in the river just downstream from Windsor Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 1894</td>
<td>Open space of Thompson Square divided into two separate parts running north–south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896–97</td>
<td>Windsor Bridge raised by 2 metres. Punt brought briefly back into service before the temporary Windsor Bridge ready for use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>The two open areas of Thompson Square declared public recreation reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>A reinforced concrete slab bridge replaced the timber deck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Wharf renovated. New road cutting made from Windsor Bridge approach across Terrace Road to give more convenient vehicle access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>A new approach road to Windsor Bridge from George Street established, which created the present deep cutting going north-west to south-east on Bridge Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948–49</td>
<td>Boathouse constructed on Lower Thompson Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 1961</td>
<td>Boundaries of Thompson Square more formalised than ever before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 1970</td>
<td>Carpark established on lower Thompson Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Restoration programme undertaken – extensive restoration of important buildings in Thompson Square along with improvements in the open areas. Wharf rebuilt and re-sited downstream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 1990</td>
<td>Present-day layout of Thompson Square established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Former boathouse building within Thompson Square removed. Thompson Square road narrowed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.1.3 Environmental History

The Hawkesbury River, which flows through the study area at Windsor, is one of the most significant riverine systems on Australia's east coast. The study area has a complex geomorphological history of fluvial and aeolian processes that created Windsor's contemporary landscape. Studies to the south, at Cranebrook Terrace, suggest that the riverbanks and surrounds are founded on Tertiary clays and gravels (greater than 2.6 million years old), and that they formed over the past 100,000 years. Archaeological investigations at Pitt Town and the site of the Windsor Museum indicate that initial deposition of alluvial sand deposits within the soil profile at these sites began about 150,000 years ago. These sand bodies are vast. At Cranebrook Terrace, they are over 20 metres thick. At Pitt Town, they are about 2.5 metres deep and have been deposited on a terrace that is over 20 metres above water. Within the study area, the northern portion (that is, the left bank) is based on Quaternary alluvium, demonstrated elsewhere to be between 4 and 8 metres thick. These deposits may also extend to the area immediately around the banks on the south side of the river. Recent archaeological work (discussed below) suggests that these deposits formed rapidly, and may be less than 15,000 years old.

To the south of the study area, the geological landscape is characterised by a natural ridge of Tertiary clay. Archaeological excavations in 2012 indicated that this ridge is overlain by yellow-brown loamy sand up to 80 centimetres deep. This sand is similar to the surface deposits found at Pitt Town and the Windsor Museum, and was probably formed by a combination of low-energy flooding and aeolian reworking. These sand deposits are horizontally distinct due to the undulating nature of the Tertiary clay surface found below them. In addition, their thickness and distribution within the study area are likely to have been affected by numerous and extensive historical development episodes, as detailed later in this document.

Low-lying parts of the study area are regularly inundated by river flooding; the erosive and depositional characteristics of these actions are the principal factors that shaped local topography over a very long period of time. The recorded flood history extends from 1799 through to 1992 (with a 6-metre rise in river level recorded as recently as June 2016). Not only did flooding and its impacts shape Windsor’s environmental history, but also the deposition of fertile flood-borne sediments (and their agricultural potential) was a major factor that influenced the choice of the place as an outlier township during the early historical period.

The series of figures below illustrate the physical extent of recorded flooding on the landscape incorporating the study area during the historical period (Figure 12 to Figure 18).

What this sequence of overlays illustrates is the degree to which flooding has occurred on a regular basis throughout the period for which historical records are available. The aggregated physical impact of this flooding is difficult to quantify; however, it has involved the deposition, removal and re-deposition of material by floodwaters throughout the study area and wider region. The cumulative effects of this over both the historical period and for many thousands of years previously have impacted upon the survival of archaeological remains from both the colonial and pre-colonial periods.

---


The flood history of the area is therefore essential to understanding the topographical development of the area during both Aboriginal and European colonisation.

The final figure (Figure 18) within the flood mapping sequence demonstrates the aggregated extent of flooding across the landscape incorporating the study area, based on data sourced from HCC covering the period 1867 to 1988. As can be seen, with the exception of the tops of the ridge, virtually the entire area has been subject to extensive flooding on many occasions within the past 200 years. The combined evidence of this data, the historic maps and the 1816 360-degree illustration of Windsor in flood (Figure 12 to Figure 15) reveals a flood cycle that has been regularly occurring within this district for thousands of years.

The influence of the river on Windsor’s cultural, economic and social history is explored in chronological order in the following sections.
Figure 5: Extent of the 1857 Hawkesbury River flood showing the SCMP study area.
Figure 6: Extent of the 1867 Hawkesbury River flood showing the SCMP study area.

**Study Area**

**Historic map date: 1841**

**1867 Flood Level**

Flooding levels are indicative only and are based on historically recorded maximum flood levels for the entire Hawkesbury River system.
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Data sources: AAIW, ESRI, Hawkesbury City Council, NSW State Library, OpenStreetMap
Figure 7: Extent of the 1904 Hawkesbury River flood showing the SCMP study area.
Figure 8: Extent of the 1956 Hawkesbury River flood showing the SCMP study area.
Figure 9: Extent of the 1961 Hawkesbury River flood showing the SCMP study area.
Figure 10: Extent of the 1974 Hawkesbury River flood showing the SCMP study area.

Historic aerial date: 1970

1974 Flood Level

Footnote:

Flashwater levels are indicative only and are based on historically recorded maximum flood levels for the entire Hawkesbury River system.

Data from:
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Projection: GDA 1994 MGA Zone 56

Data sources:
AAW, ESRI, Hawkesbury City Council, NSW State Library, OpenStreetMap
Figure 11: Historic flood levels 1867 to 1988 within the wider Windsor area.
Figure 12: Section AB of 360-degree panorama of the Windsor district, showing the area in flood on Sunday 2 June 1816. Artist unknown. (Source: Anon., ‘Sketch of the inundation in the neighbourhood of Windsor 2 June 1816’, SLNSW, Call Number PX*D 264.)

Figure 13: Section BC of 360-degree panorama of the Windsor district, showing the area in flood on Sunday 2 June 1816. Artist unknown. (Source: Anon., ‘Sketch of the inundation in the neighbourhood of Windsor 2 June 1816’, SLNSW, Call Number PX*D 264.)
Figure 14: Section CD of 360-degree panorama of the Windsor district, showing the area in flood on Sunday 2 June 1816. Artist unknown. (Source: Anon., ‘Sketch of the inundation in the neighbourhood of Windsor 2 June 1816’, SLNSW, Call Number PX*D 264.)

Figure 15: Section DA of 360-degree panorama of the Windsor district, showing the area in flood on Sunday 2 June 1816. Artist unknown. (Source: Anon., ‘Sketch of the inundation in the neighbourhood of Windsor 2 June 1816’, SLNSW, Call Number PX*D 264.)
2.1.4 Aboriginal History before 1788 and Early Contact

Aboriginal people occupied the study area beside the Hawkesbury River for millennia prior to European colonisation. Upstream in the Nepean gravels, evidence has been found of Aboriginal use of the riverbanks from at least 40,000 years ago.9 More recent research at Pitt Town has reconfirmed this early occupation, with substantial evidence of people utilising the river by at least 36,000 years ago.10 Aboriginal cultural deposits on the present Hawkesbury Regional Museum site, on the western side of Thompson Square, were found in an aeolian sand dune, and demonstrated continuous occupation from 33,000 years ago into the Holocene.11 On the basis of such evidence, previous researchers have noted that ‘the potential for more evidence of Aboriginal life being found within the study area’ is highly likely.12

Thorp concluded that the early topography of the study area, as reflected in the George William Evans image of 1809 (Figure 30), ‘suggests that the original topography survives beneath modifications added in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’ and this image therefore may help us to visualise the landscape as it was before it was altered by European land uses.13

The Hawkesbury-Nepean river corridor contains some of the earliest evidence of Aboriginal occupation in Australia. The recovery of five flaked pebbles from the base of the Cranebrook Terrace, dating to about 40,000 years BP, represents the earliest evidence of past human activity in the locality.14 More compelling evidence of Aboriginal use of the river has been provided by excavations undertaken in advance of residential development at Pitt Town. These excavations, of a total area of 250 metres located across a kilometre section of the ridgeline (PT-12) overlooking the Hawkesbury River, recovered over 10,000 stone artefacts from depths of up to 1.3 metres below the ground surface. They were dated to between 36,000 and 8,000 years ago.15 Similar findings were made in advance of development at the Windsor Museum, where a 1.8-metre deep sand body recovered 12,000 stone artefacts dating to between 34,000 and 8,500 years ago.16 Recent excavations on the banks of Peachtrees Creek (a tributary of the Nepean River near the centre of Penrith) recovered a handful of stone artefacts at a depth of 4 metres below the surface dating to about 15,000 years ago.17

These assemblages were all dominated by indurated mudstone, tuff and/or volcanic raw materials, most of which could be found in the Nepean River gravels, and suggest that Aboriginal populations were small, highly mobile and exploiting the river corridor during periods of climatic aridity and generally poorer resource availability.18 More practically, they also demonstrate that evidence of Aboriginal occupation along the river corridor can be found at significant depths below the present-day land surface and can contribute significant information about Australia’s Aboriginal past.

While the detail of Aboriginal cultural lifeways in the Hawkesbury during the early Holocene (that is, between about 8,000 and 5,000 years BP) is poorly understood, there is some evidence of changes

---

9 G. C. Nanson, R. W. Young and E.D. Stockton, ‘Chronology and palaeoenvironment of the Cranebrook Terrace, near Sydney, containing artefacts more than 40,000 years old’, Archaeology in Oceania, 1987, 22, 72–8.
13 Thorp.
15 Williams et al., ‘A Terminal Pleistocene open site on the Hawkesbury River’.
16 Austral Archaeology.
17 AHMS Pty Ltd, Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment: Peach Tree Creek stabilisation works, Penrith, NSW (Penrith LGA), unpublished report to Penrith City Council, 2014.
in the use of the region during this time. In comparison, there is a strong record of Aboriginal occupation and cultural activity during the past 5,000 years. This is most evident through the extensive documentation of the ‘surface workshops’ of stone artefacts and grinding groove sites between Castlereagh and Emu Plains. Excavations at Lapstone Creek rockshelter and KII rockshelter immediately west of the river showed that these sites also contained dense records of occupation over the past 4,000 years, as did the upper 50 centimetres of PT-12. These assemblages were dominated by silcrete and quartz raw materials that typically suggest an increasingly sedentary and technologically invested society, driven by regional demographic pressure which impeded mobility across the landscape.

Within the study area, excavations undertaken in 2012 recovered evidence that generally supports the archaeological narrative presented above. On the north embankment within the study area, these excavations were too shallow to determine past use of the area but the deposits appear similar to those at Peachtree Creek. To the south (that is, immediately below the township), the sand deposits investigated are very similar, albeit much shallower, to those observed at the Windsor Museum and Pitt Town, both of which contained extensive, significant cultural materials of great antiquity. The assemblage recovered in 2012 was small and contained a mixture of tuff, indurated mudstone and silcrete raw materials. Interpretations by KNC (2012) suggest that the assemblage probably dated to the past few thousand years but KNC concluded that, based on the evidence, there was potential for older cultural material (possibly intermixed with the physical remains of the historic occupation).

There is ongoing debate about the nature, territory and range of the pre-contact Aboriginal language groups of the Greater Sydney region. These debates have arisen largely because, by the time colonial diarists, missionaries and ethnographers began making detailed records of Aboriginal groups in the late nineteenth century, pre-European Aboriginal groups had been broken up and reconfigured as a result of European colonisation. This was due both to the restriction of access to traditional lands and the decimation of populations through introduced illnesses such as smallpox, influenza and measles. Attenbrow cautions:

> Any boundaries mapped today for (these) languages or dialects can only be indicative at best. This is not only because of an apparent lack of detail about such boundaries in the historical documents, but because boundaries between language groups are not always precise lines.

The following information relating to the Aboriginal people of the Lower Hawkesbury is based on generally accepted information. To source further discussion about Sydney Aboriginal language groups and social organisation, the reader can view references in the bibliography to a range of books and articles.

**Language Group**

Darug was first described as a language (or dialectic group) by pioneer surveyor, anthropologist and linguist R. H. Mathews in the opening decade of the twentieth century. Mathews described the extensive range of this language group as follows:

> The Dharruk speaking people adjoined the Thurrawal on the north, extending along the coast to the Hawkesbury River, and inland to what are now Windsor, Penrith, Campbelltown and intervening towns.
Since Mathews’s time, some historic and linguistic research has suggested that the Darug people were principally an ‘inland’ group, most associated with the Cumberland Plain, and distinct from the Aboriginal people of Coastal Sydney. Others divide the language group into Inland Darug and Coastal Darug.

Clans and Families

Day-to-day Aboriginal society was organised around smaller family-based groupings referred to by early ethnographers as clans: extended family or descent groups with territorial or social affiliations with a given area.

The northern-most clan of the Darug group were the Boorooberongal, whom Governor Phillip indicated were located to the north-west of Parramatta. It seems likely, without more specific information in the historical record related to the study area, that this group were the traditional owners of the study area at the time immediately prior to the arrival of Europeans.

Language groups

While many early observers used the term ‘tribe’ to apply to the overarching social group, this term has been challenged by later researchers and Aboriginal people generally. There is concern that this is an anthropological term that has specific meaning, and is not always congruent with the social structure of the groups being labelled as such. Rather, the recorded names more accurately refer to overarching language groups which incorporated a number of more or less independent family groups that together shared a common language and were bound by cultural practices and ceremony.

In the Greater Sydney region, cultural groupings were rapidly disrupted as a result of European occupation. Colonial sources reported that Aboriginal groups were often aggregations of Aboriginal people from various clans, who had banded together ‘to provide mutual protection and to maintain viable social and economic units’. The formation of these groups undoubtedly followed established protocols around obligation and kinship. As Dr John Dunmore Lang, an early principal of the Sydney College and Hawkesbury chaplain, noted in the 1830s:

> The whole race is divided into tribes, more or less numerous, according to circumstances, and designated from the localities they inhabit; for although universally a wandering race, their wanderings are circumscribed by certain well defined limits, beyond which they seldom pass, except for purposes of war or festivity. In short every tribe has its own district, the boundaries of which are well known to the natives generally.

Ignorant of the dynamic of cultural and social organisation among Aboriginal people, many reports simply named Aboriginal groups encountered after the area in which they were most commonly located (though they were occasionally named after a noted individual in a particular group). For example, Aboriginal groups of the Lower Hawkesbury referred to in historic newspaper articles and other documents included the Hawkesbury River Tribe, the Windsor Blacks, the Branch Natives, the Caddie Tribe, and the Richmond Tribe.

For the purposes of this historical overview, the discussion is focused on general Aboriginal associations with the study area and surrounds, as well as specific events, people and places.

---

26 Ross, 1990, 31–33.
27 Phillip in Hunter, 1792 [1968], 514–23.
Resources of the River

Fish and fishing were of major social, spiritual and economic importance to Sydney Aboriginal people. Early colonial observer and diarist Watkin Tench wrote that ‘Fishing, indeed, seems to engross nearly all of their time, probably from its forming a chief part of their subsistence’.31 Further upstream, as one moved inland away from the coast, people relied heavily on terrestrial food sources as well.32

Dr Lang, writing in the 1830s, also noted:

> It is well known that these aborigines in no instance cultivate the soil, but subsist entirely by hunting and fishing, and on the wild roots they find in certain localities (especially the common fern), with occasionally a little wild honey; indigenous fruits being extremely rare.

The methods utilised by Aboriginal people to obtain fish on the Hawkesbury and its tributaries were varied; however, the principal methods appear to have been line fishing, spearing and netting. Generally, the type of fishing appears to have been allocated according to gender – Aboriginal women line-fished the river and creeks from bark canoes, while men speared fish from canoes and riverbanks. Netting was undertaken by both men and women.

Canoe Fishing

Bark canoes were used both for travelling along the river and its tributaries, and as mobile fishing platforms. The watercraft used on the Hawkesbury were the same as those utilised on the coast.33 Generally these craft were between 2.5 and 6 metres long, made of bark, and propelled by wooden paddles between 0.6 and 0.9 metres in length. Small fires were kept alight on clay beds in the centre of the canoes to provide light and warmth and to cook meals. Captain James Cook was one of the first to describe the fishing canoes of the Sydney Aboriginal people when he noted during the Endeavour’s voyage to Botany Bay:

> Three canoes lay upon the bea(c)h the worst I think I ever saw, they were about 12 or 14 feet long made of one piece of bark of a tree drawn or tied up at each end and the middle kept open by means of pieces of sticks by way of thwarts.

The bark used to build such canoes in the Greater Sydney region was often sourced from the Grey or Saltwater Swamp She-Oak (Casuarina glauca), Bangalay (Eucalyptus Botryoides) and several species of stringybark (Eucalyptus agglomerata and acmenoides). Canoe bark was removed from trees with stone axes and, in the post-contact period, with metal axes. Plant fibres bound the canoes together at each end. As suggested by Cook’s comments, the bark canoes were suited to sheltered waterways and not the open sea. In order to keep them operational they were occasionally patched with the resin from grass trees (Xanthorrhoea sp.) and lined with Cabbage Tree Palm leaves (Livistona australis).35

Canoes facilitated access to fishing locations that could not be reached from shore such as deep holes, drop-offs, snags and weed beds, where fish were speared or line-caught. Spearing involved the use of long wooden spears with a multi-pronged tip36, while line fishing, generally the domain of women, utilised twine fishing line and baited shell or animal bone hooks. Catch rates on hook and

---

31 Tench, 1793
32 See the account of the meeting between Governor Phillips’s party and the Buruberongal on 12 April 1791.
34 Cook, James, Journal of H.M.S. Endeavour, 1768-1771, Manuscript Collection, MS1, Transcript (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2004); Curby, 1998, 3.
35 Notes from the Australian Museum Exhibition ‘Catching Sydney Harbour’ – ‘Building a Canoe’.
36 Multi-pronged spears were called ‘fizz gigs’ by early colonists. The shafts of these spears were up to 6 metres long and made of the wood or stems of flowering Xanthorrhoea grass trees. The prongs of fishing spears were barbed or pointed with stone, shell, hardwood, fish teeth, sharpened animal bone and stingray spines which were bound with two-ply rope or plant fibre and coated in plant resin. Fish spearing was predominantly used in shallow water contexts where stealthily wading fishermen used them to pin mullet, whiting, flathead and bream. (Refer: Notes from the Australian Museum Exhibition ‘Catching Sydney Harbour’ – ‘Making Spears’; Dunn, 1991, 17.)
line appear to have been improved by ‘ground baiting’ or burleying. Lieutenant David Collins noted in his account of Sydney Aboriginal people published in his *Account of NSW* in 1798 that, ‘While fishing, the women generally sing: and I have seen them in their canoes chewing muscles or cockles and spitting them into the water as bait’.37

Netting

Along the Australian east coast and contributing rivers, fish were also caught in casting nets and traps. One method of net fishing (utilised to trap shoaling mullet) involved a ‘drive’ along shallow creeks where Aboriginal people advanced abreast to a netted end point.38 As with the fishing lines, these nets were likely made of plant fibres. Techniques such as this may well have been utilised in the study area, where mullet was the most plentiful type of fish.

Resources of the Land

The land adjacent and distant to the Hawkesbury River and its feeder creeks provided Aboriginal people with terrestrial animal and birds, plant foods and the various resources offered by the wide variety of plants, grasses, roots, fruits and flowers.

Watkin Tench noted that, when fish were not to be depended on, ‘their principle [sic] support is derived from small animals which they kill and some roots which they dig out of the earth’.39

The ‘roots’ described by Tench are generally believed to be yams which appear to have formed a significant component of the Aboriginal vegetable diet in the Hawkesbury-Nepean area. Captain Hunter recorded evidence of yam digging at the junction of the Grose and Nepean rivers in July 1789:

> On the banks here also we found yams and other roots, and hade [sic] evident marks of the natives frequenting these parts in search of them for food. They have no doubt some method of preparing these roots, before they can eat them; for we found one kind which some of the company had seen the natives dig up; and with which being pleased, as it had much the appearance of horse-radish, and had a sweetish taste, and having swallowed a small quantity, it occasioned violent spasms, cramps in the bowels, and sickness at the stomach: it might probably be the casada root.40

Yams are the bulbs of a variety of creepers and vines as well as the so-called native or wild yams (of which there are three species). Aboriginal people living on and around the Hawkesbury ate a range of these yams. Some, such as *Dioscorea transversa*, could be eaten directly after being dug up, while others were poisonous and required detoxifying prior to use. The use of yam varieties appears to have been related to seasonality, with few of the species growing all year round.41

There are many plants and plant parts that were likely utilised for food in the Hawkesbury area, including:

- Fern Roots (*Dicksonia antarctica, Cyathea australis, Cyathea cooperi* etc.)
- Port Jackson Figs (*Ficus rubiginosa*)
- Banksia Blossoms42

---

38 Yeates, 1993a, 13.
39 Tench, 1793 [1979], 121.
40 Hunter 1793: 6 July 1789 diary entry.
41 Ross, 1990, 37; Attenbrow, 78
42 Ross, 1990; Attenbrow.
Native Cherry (Exocarpos strictus)

Geebung (Persoonia sp.)

Bracken fern (Pteridium esculentum)

Wild Parsnip (Trachymene incisa)

Wattle seeds (Acacia sp.)

Apple Berry (Billardiera scandens).

It is possible that Aboriginal people also farmed the fertile river flats. Hynes and Chase\(^43\) note that ‘the categorising of certain human groups as hunters and gatherers has resulted in the view that they operate within “wild” resources, as opposed to “domestic” environments and resources of agricultural and horticultural peoples’ and this despite the fact that ‘unilinear theories of development based on resource activities are no longer acceptable in anthropology’. Using evidence from Cape York Peninsula, they propose instead a more complex relationship between Aboriginal people and the propagation and active encouragement of certain food plants to secure regular harvests, which they refer to as ‘domiculture’. More recently, Pascoe (2014) revisited early explorers’ accounts of seeing women harvesting yams and onions, and cultivating the land.\(^44\)

**Trees**

Ethno-historical records indicate that the Aboriginal people of Sydney made use of a variety of tree species for such things as the sourcing of food products, the production of canoes and the manufacture of tools and implements, as outlined below:

- Coastal timber was used for the manufacture of clubs and spears, and bark from select eucalypts was used for the production of canoes and shields.

- Aboriginal women wove the bark fibres from the Hibiscus trees that grew along creek lines to produce fishing nets, which were cast over shoals of mullet. Other fibres were used to produce fishing lines and twine.

- Babies were wrapped in soft tea-tree bark and slung in woven fibre bags.

- Saps and gums were used as adhesives.

- Flowers, nectars, leaves and fruits were collected for processing as food, drinks and medicaments.

- Leaves of sandpaper figs were used to polish and shape timber and bone tools.

In addition to providing the raw materials needed to produce products that were utilised in everyday life, trees also provided access to the birds and animals that made use of them. Tree climbing allowed Aboriginal people to access a variety of foodstuffs including wild honey, possums, flying foxes (fruit bats), koalas and bird eggs.\(^45\)

---


\(^45\) Collins, 1798 [1975]: 456; Phillip in Hunter, 1793 [1968], 507.
Hunting in Woodland and Grassland

The more open areas along the Hawkesbury River were grazing areas for macropods and these, too, formed an important part of the economy of the Hawkesbury Aboriginal people.

Surveyor, engineer, artillery officer and explorer Francis Barrallier recorded the Aboriginal method of catching kangaroos in Sydney's west in the very early nineteenth century. Barrallier's account highlights communal hunting and the use of fire:

> they form a circle which contains an area of 1 or 2 miles, according to the number of natives assembled. They usually stand about 30 paces apart, armed with spears and tomohawks [sic]. When the circle is formed, each one of them holding a handful of lighted bark, they at a set signal set fire to the grass and bush in front of them. In proportion as the fire progresses they advance forward with their spear in readiness, narrowing the circle and making as much noise as possible, with deafening shouts, until, through the fire closing in more and more, they are so close as to touch one another. The kangaroos try to escape in various directions, and the natives frightening them with their shouts throw spears at the one passing nearest them. By this means not one can escape.

While the above method was suitable for woodland and grassland, it was not suited to the more elevated, rockier landscape where a different method of catching macropods was utilised. Mrs Felton Matthews, wife of the famous nineteenth-century surveyor, wrote about life on the Hawkesbury in her diary while journeying with her husband in 1833. On one occasion, near the MacDonald River, she recorded Aboriginal wallaby hunting on rocky ground above the river:

> The lofty rocky ranges which border this river on either side I have frequently described, and there is nothing either to describe or relate during this journey: the dead unbroken silence which prevailed all around was extremely oppressive, and the voices of some natives which broke on the ear after some time, was really quite a relief; on nearer approach we found they were hunting wallabi or what they call wallabunging, a number of them assemble, and while some run along the tops and sides of the rocky heights shouting and screaming, drive down the poor little frightened inhabitants to the flats below where others attack them with their spears and dogs; we saw three of these little creatures hopping along with speed, followed by dogs and blacks at full cry.

Aboriginal people ate a wide variety of other land animals including koalas, wombats, echidnas, grubs, birds, snakes and lizards.

Lagoons and Swamps

Resource-rich swamps and lagoons, such as that within Mitchell Park (Cattai), were important hunting places for inland Aboriginal people. Within these small freshwater bodies were eels, fish and a variety of shellfish including freshwater mussels (*Velesunio ambiguus*, *Hyridella australis* and *Hyridella depressa*). The swamps also harboured water rats, frogs, echidnas, as well as a variety of birdlife including ducks. Birds, in particular, were targeted in a number of ways and harvested by nets, ensnared in pit-traps and hand-caught by Aboriginal people using fish pieces as bait.
Early Conflict

A short distance down river from where the European square (now Thompson Square) was to evolve, Phillip’s exploration party in 1791 spent the evening conversing happily with clan leaders Gombeeree, Yellomundee and Yellomundee’s son Deeimba. Unfortunately, this harmony quickly evaporated once Europeans colonised the area and land acquisitions forced Aboriginal people from the resource-rich river lands. From 1794, the Buruberongal people were forced off their land by European farmers and relationships soon deteriorated as Aboriginal people were denied access to the resources they depended on for survival. Crops, fencing and permanent buildings began to rapidly create a new landscape. European diseases and attacks on Aboriginal people took their toll on the local community. Aboriginal people rallied against their ill-treatment and retaliated by burning and ransacking the crops of colonisers and spearing the animals taking over the lands formerly grazed by kangaroos. Aboriginal attacks were followed in turn by European revenge attacks which started a cycle of violence. Violence involving European and Aboriginal people probably occurred from the period of earliest white colonisation in the mid-1790s, but was most marked at the turn of the eighteenth century. Probably the first recorded instance of Hawkesbury River racial violence occurred in 1794, when an Aboriginal boy was murdered:

the settlers tied his hands and feet together, and dragging him several times through a fire, threw him in the river and shot him.53

Aboriginal people retaliated, killing a local colonist and a convict, before eight Aboriginal people were subsequently shot.54

Five years later, five white colonists55 appeared before a court charged with the murder of two teenage Aboriginal boys in the Hawkesbury district.56 Though the men were found guilty, the panel of judges was divided and referred the case to London for instruction – ultimately all accused were acquitted.57 Governor Hunter made note of the event in 1800 when he reported:

Two native boys have been most barbarously murdered by several of the settlers at the Hawkesbury River, not with standing orders have upon this subject been repeatedly given pointing out in what circumstances only they were warranted in punishing with severity.58

The peaks in conflict coincided with periods of colonisation intensification along the river and its tributaries, initially with first occupation in the mid-1790s, and the second coinciding with the expansion of European settlement into additional lands in the years 1803–4.59

In 1803, a petition purportedly signed by colonists at Portland Head was forwarded to Governor King requesting that they be allowed to shoot Aboriginal people found on their farms. This document turned out to be a forgery, and the forger was jailed for several days.60 Despite the fact that the letter was a forgery, disquiet in the vicinity of the study area bothered Governor King, who canvassed three local Aboriginal people about their concerns:

On questioning the cause of their disagreement with the new settlers, they very ingeniously answered that they did not like to be driven from the few places that were left on the banks of the river, where alone they could procure food; that they had gone down the river as the

51 Tench, pp. 229–37.
52 M. Gilmore, More recollections, Sydney, Australia, Angus & Robertson, 1935; Attenbrow.
53 Rex v. Powell (1799) NSW KR 7; Barrallier, p. 136.
54 Bowd, 1982, 33.
56 The King v. Powell, Freebody, Metcalf, Timms and Butler (1799) NSW Sup C7
57 HRA 1(1), 401–22; Nichols, 4–5.
58 Hunter to the Duke of Portland, Historical Records of New South Wales [HRNSW], 4, 1.
59 See, for example, King 3rd April 1805 and King 4–7 April 1805.
60 Nichols, 5.
white man took possession of the banks; if they went across white men's grounds the settlers fired upon them and were angry.\(^{61}\)

The Aboriginal people interviewed requested that they be given land to compensate them for their loss, at which point King assured the group that there would be no further occupation down the river.

In June 1804, probably not long after King's interview with these local Aboriginal people, District Magistrate Arndell received a dispatch from King allowing for a group of Europeans to pursue Aboriginal people in order to question them about alleged crimes (referred to as 'numerous outrages') committed at Portland Head. The group subsequently encountered a large group of Aboriginal people at an unknown location in the mountains. They claimed that some of the Aboriginal people wore clothes stolen from settlers and possessed stolen corn. The colonists claimed that, when questioned about the stolen items, the Aboriginal people justified their actions by stating that 'they wanted, and would have, corn and whatever else the settlers had before throwing down spears in a defiant manner'. The colonists then opened fire; it is unrecorded how many Aboriginal people were wounded or killed on this occasion.\(^{62}\)

The conflicts continued and, two weeks after the reporting of the above episode, the Sydney Gazette reported that:

_Further to our former accounts respecting the hostile hordes whose conduct of late has been worthy of attention, we have to add, that among the reaches about Portland Head their ravages have been felt with much greater severity than elsewhere…_

_Last Friday se'nnighi the farms of Crumby and Cuddie at the South Creek were totally stripped by a formidable body of natives supposed to be about 150 in number whom darted their spears at a labouring servant, who fortunately effected an escape without receiving a wound…_

_The above persons have thrice been plundered in the space of a very few months and have now lost not only their crops but their whole flock of poultry, together with their bedding, wearing apparel, and every other movable._\(^{63}\)

Arndell appears to have remained level-headed, and engaged with Richmond Hill Aboriginal chiefs Yarramundy and Yarogowhy in an attempt to ease hostilities in the region. The Gazette reported the communications between Arndell and the Richmond Hill chiefs as follows:

_Two of the Richmond Hill chiefs, Yaragowhy and Yaramandy were sent for the day after the firing by Rev. Mr Marsden and Mr. Arndell, residentiary magistrate, who received them in a most friendly manner, and requested that they would exert themselves in putting a period to the mischiefs, at the same time loading them with gifts of food and raiment for themselves and their friendly countrymen._\(^{64}\)

Despite Arndell's entreaties, hostilities again broke out around Portland Head in the winter of the following year (a time when displaced Aboriginal people were most vulnerable). Firesticks were thrown onto the farm of Henry Lamb, and William Stubbs was robbed of his clothing and food reserves.\(^{65}\)

**Growth of the Macquarie Towns and Violence**

In December 1810, Governor Macquarie held a dinner in the Government Cottage, where he announced the creation of five new towns on high land along the Hawkesbury-Nepean River. Windsor, so named by Macquarie on 6 December 1810, was to be the principal town. Unlike the other new towns – Pitt Town, Wilberforce, Richmond and Castlereagh – Windsor already had a

---

\(^{61}\) King quoted in HRA, 5, 166.  
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rudimentary urban development and an informal civic square, the value of which Macquarie recognised.

Macquarie came to Australia with instruction relating to the native population: 'enjoying all our subjects to live in harmony with them [Aboriginal people]' and it was early in his administration that attempts by the government and church to 'civilise' Aboriginal people commenced in earnest. From 1810 to 1821, Macquarie pursued a policy of assimilation aimed at encouraging Aboriginal people to abandon their traditional culture and adopt European ways. Central to Macquarie’s vision were plans to provide land and farming equipment to select Aboriginal people, and establish an Aboriginal school or Native Institution, as it came to be known. However, his efforts to establish and encourage peaceful relations between Aboriginal people and colonists were not based on any understanding of Aboriginal land tenure and he failed to understand the need to negotiate around the acquisition of resources and land.

The Native Institution, established at Parramatta in 1815, was to be the showpiece of Macquarie's plan. By 1816, however, after several years of intensive colonisation, drought and renewed racial conflict (including major attacks by Aboriginal people at South Creek), Macquarie lost patience with the traditional owners, ordering three punitive expeditions against offending Aboriginal people and pursuing a policy of partial segregation. Macquarie justified his actions by stating that, over the course of three years, Aboriginal people had:

committed most atrocious and wanton Barbarities murdering Men, Women, and Children, killing Cattle, and plundering the grain and property of Settlers on Nepean, Grose, and Hawkesbury.

As a consequence, Macquarie ordered that Aboriginal people were not to appear within 1 mile of an established European colony with arms of any kind, and that not more than six unarmed Aboriginal people were permitted to 'lurk' about farms. In addition, Aboriginal people were instructed to desist from engaging in traditional tribal fights.

In April 1816, with outbreaks of violence continuing in the Nepean-Hawkesbury districts, Macquarie directed three detachments of the 43rd Regiment to the areas of the Nepean (Cow Pastures), Hawkesbury and Grose. While most parties met no resistance, and saw few Aboriginal people, the detachment sent to the Appin and Airds districts, under the direction of Captain Wallis, surprised a native encampment and killed fourteen people and took five prisoners to Liverpool.

This massacre took place at Appin, on the Nepean River, near where a number of Aboriginal people had been camping at a colonist's farm. Among the dead were women and children. The men, who were hung from the trees by the soldiers, included Durelle, believed to be a Tharawal tribesman, and Cannabayagal, a Gandangara man. Tharawal men Gogy, Bundle and Budburry were all utilised as guides during the punitive expedition but, perhaps not surprisingly, their employment resulted in the capture of no Aboriginal people and they all escaped before the final brutal massacre at Appin. After the massacre, a patrol of soldiers remained in the various districts to protect farms and round up Aboriginal people perceived as troublemakers.

The effect of Macquarie's 1816 punitive expeditions targeting the Aboriginal people of the Hawkesbury-Nepean region put an end to organised Aboriginal resistance on the Cumberland Plain.

2.1.5 Aboriginal Assimilation and the Mission System

Devastated by the impacts of colonisation including dislocation and depopulation due to illnesses such as small pox and influenza, neglect and violence, and with reduced access to traditional food
resources and reserves, Aboriginal groups became more dependent on Europeans to provide them with food, clothing and shelter.\textsuperscript{72} While the white population of the Hawkesbury continued to grow through the 1820s and into the 1830s, the Aboriginal population commenced a serious decline as a result of these impacts.

Some Aboriginal people continued to live their lifestyle with little impact from European colonisation, particularly in more remote areas of the Greater Sydney district, yet many remnant bands of Aboriginal people began to congregate on the fringes of white settlement and on some larger estates. For example, Aboriginal people referred to at the time as the South Creek Tribe often camped at Mamre, Charles Marsden’s property near the junction of South and Eastern Creeks; and a clan group of the Tharawal, the Cubbitch-Barta, resided on John Macarthur’s property at Camden.\textsuperscript{73}

In 1827, records of the number of Aboriginal people who returned blankets and clothing distributed by the government revealed a total of 114 Aboriginal people at Portland Head in that year. The breakdown of the district groups was as shown in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aboriginal Group</th>
<th>Males, Females &amp; Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mangaroo Tribe</td>
<td>9; 5; 4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Arm Tribe</td>
<td>8; 6; 8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet Island Tribe</td>
<td>4; 5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Branch Tribe</td>
<td>25; 22; 18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was only eleven years after one source had recorded ‘not less than 400 blacks’.\textsuperscript{74} By the 1850s, there were fewer local Aboriginal people still, with Reverend T. C. Ewing, a regular visitor to the Hawkesbury and Pitt Town Parson, noting, ‘we see no blacks here now’.\textsuperscript{75}

While the Hawkesbury Aboriginal people were fewer in number, they had not disappeared. Some members of the Aboriginal community left to seek refuge with neighbouring groups, others obtained work on the properties of colonists who afforded them some degree of protection and allowed them to maintain a connection to country, while some congregated in fringe camps. One property within the broader area that provided work and rations for Aboriginal people was the farm of the Hall family at Lilburndale on the West Portland Road.\textsuperscript{76} With regards to the fringe camps, a number of informal communities consisting of Aboriginal people from elsewhere established themselves periodically at Richmond, Windsor and Sackville Reach.\textsuperscript{77}

In 1883, a Board for the Protection of Aborigines was established by the State Premier and the Colonial Secretary to manage Aboriginal Affairs.\textsuperscript{78} The aims of the Board, which comprised officials and ‘gentlemen’ who had ‘taken an interest in the Blacks’, were assimilationist and included: to provide asylum for the aged and sick, and train and educate the young so that they would fit into the rest of society.\textsuperscript{79} Part of the Board’s responsibility was the establishment and management of
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Aboriginal reserves and mission stations. The Board was also instrumental in removing children from their families and putting them into alternate care and education. This Board, and other iterations that followed, left a legacy of pain through the removal of children who are now referred to as the ‘stolen generations’. The removal of children and the forced relocation of people to other geographic areas by governments, churches and welfare bodies such as this Board did more harm than any other single action – breaking cultural, spiritual and family ties which caused intergenerational impact on the lives and wellbeing of Aboriginal people.

In the Hawkesbury, the Board continued to supply blankets and clothing to Aboriginal people on a near-annual basis at Windsor. This allows some insight into the numbers of Aboriginal people living in the area, although these figures should be regarded as a minimum as it is unlikely that all Aboriginal people made use of these distributions. Table 5 below presents a summary of the number of blankets and supplies provided by the Board to Aboriginal people at Windsor between 1884 and 1888.

Table 5: Aboriginals Receiving Blankets and Supplies at Windsor: 1884–88. (Source: Blanket Returns for the Windsor District [Putty, Colo, Kurrajong & South Creek]. 1839. Unpublished. NSW State Records Office, AO 4/24331.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Adults &amp; Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>7; 9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>21; 11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>18; 22</td>
<td>40(^{80})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>15; 7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>31; 30</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fluctuating figures in Table 5 reflect periodic influxes of people to the area as well as periodic depopulation. In addition, Aboriginal people were not always reliant on the Board and many in the area acquired seasonal work in the district, which meant they required no aid.

Aboriginal people had been camping at Sackville Reach for much of the nineteenth century and, in 1889, two Aboriginal reserves were created for the Aboriginal people of the Hawkesbury district at Sackville. The two reserves, one of 150 acres on the Cumberland Reach and another of 50 acres on the Kent Reach, were proclaimed by the Minister for Lands on 18 December.\(^{81}\) On the larger reserve, four slab huts were built and by the turn of the century there was also a church meeting room, and 50 Aboriginal people living on this reserve.

There is no recorded history that provides an Aboriginal account of these places and we therefore must read between the lines of the infrequent references in newspapers and other colonists’ accounts. The \textit{Windsor & Richmond Gazette} reported that these reserves functioned well as an Aboriginal village, where the Aboriginal people had access to transport, children were able to attend the public school and learn to read and write, and adults engaged in fishing to supplement rations.\(^{82}\)

The Sackville Reserve functioned from the 1880s and into the twentieth century as something of a base for dislocated Aboriginal people. While Aboriginal people based themselves at Sackville, many took on employment on homesteads and farms within the broader community.

Not all interactions between Aboriginal people and colonists were negative in this period. Many of the Sackville Aboriginal people worked at the Tizzana Vineyard operated by Dr Thomas Henry

\(^{80}\) In addition to blankets a set of boat oars were also provided.


\(^{82}\) Fish was also sold.
Fiaschi. Fiaschi was an Italian immigrant and Windsor hospital surgeon from 1876. He was very involved with the Hawkesbury Aboriginal people and his Aboriginal workers participated in rowing regattas and attended the annual Christmas parties. In addition, during the 1910s, members of the Sackville Aboriginal community formed an Aboriginal cricket team, consisting of talented players who played in open competition in the district.

The Sackville Reserve was an important focus for Hawkesbury Aboriginal people (and Aboriginal people from elsewhere) until May 1946 when both reserves were revoked and set aside for public recreation. After this time, some Aboriginal people from the reserves stayed in the Sackville area, while others moved on into the wider area.

2.1.6 Mulgrave Place (from 1794 onwards) and the Civic Square (from 1795)

In the first years after European colonisation, there was a recurrent shortage of food in the colony. In response, from 1794 the colonial government provided land grants along the upper Hawkesbury, where the soils of the floodplain were superior to those already exploited around Sydney, Parramatta and Toongabbie, to encourage farming. Acting Governor Francis Grose granted Charles Williams and James Ruse, along with twenty other colonists, land along the banks of the Hawkesbury River and South Creek. Major Grose is quoted in 1794 saying:

they chose for themselves allotments of ground conveniently situated for fresh water, and not much burdened with timber, beginning with much spirit and forming themselves very sanguish hopes of success. At the end of the month they had been so active as to have cleared several acres, and were in some forwardness with a few huts.

The new colony was called the district of Mulgrave Place by Acting Governor Grose when he agreed to its foundation. The central part of the district, on the southern bank around Windsor Reach, became commonly known as ‘Green Hills’ from around 1800, with the title of Windsor only bestowed on the new township in that area established by Governor Lachlan Macquarie in 1810.

By the end of 1794, the new Mulgrave Place district comprised the 118 farming grants promised on the fertile lowlands on both sides of the river, in a location that was distinct and distant from the other two established mainland settlements, which formed hubs around Sydney and Parramatta. In total, eighty-five farms had been established and there was a population of 400 persons. All of the 1794 Mulgrave Place farms hugged waterfrontages to the Hawkesbury River and South Creek, stretching from today’s North Richmond to Cattai downstream, although not all the soldiers, ex-soldiers and ex-sailors among the grantees began farming that year. The eighty-five active farms belonged to ex-convict grantees, with the exception of four free arrivals.

In the centre of the southern bank of what is today Windsor Reach, the ridge lands had been left as vacant Crown land among the allocated farmlands between the river and South Creek. Along this stretch of high land, a suitable inlet with a small stream was found which became the site for the government facilities. It offered substantial space where stores could be brought in by boat and wheat and maize taken back to Sydney. The new Government Precinct (also referred to as the Government Domain) occupied higher and less fertile land than the local farms. The civic square complex, later known as Thompson Square, was to be part of this larger area, occupying a section of the western end of this 46-acre (18.3-hectare) government precinct, from the top of the ridge northwards to its waterfrontage. Direct boat access was essential, as no good cart road existed to the settlement. It was to be this waterfrontage aspect of the civic square and the fact that the square
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sat inside a government precinct that ensured it would never be absorbed into the growing surrounding urban development like other similar public spaces.

The colony was established as a collection of farms, but there was little in terms of infrastructure to manage the products of successful farming. Despite promising crops of wheat, there were no means of storing excess grain when the harvest was due in March 1795. Yet it was imperative that the harvest surplus be transported to the Sydney Commissary Stores for, as mentioned earlier, in the six years since the colony had begun, there had been a recurrent shortage of food. The Commissariat needed to distribute government provisions to the settlers, and the colony came to depend on Hawkesbury grain, stored in the facilities in the civic square.88 However, in 1794, such facilities were non-existent.

One year into the settlement of the Mulgrave Place district, in January 1795, Acting Governor Paterson requested that the local farmers supply timber and sent the government carpenters along with the Commissary John Palmer to supervise the construction of the first buildings required to house the crops and government provisions, and then to oversee the orderly process of stocking them.89 The presence of the Commissary himself was an acknowledgement of the growing importance of the new district. This was an unusual beginning for the government presence in this district, for, in the two previous areas settled on mainland Australia, a military presence had accompanied the settlers and convicts from the beginning and facilities had been built for them immediately, along with provision stores and granaries on various government sites.90

The urgent need to complete the storage facilities in 1795 led to a much more cohesive and concentrated government presence at Mulgrave Place. This gave the area that was later to be called Green Hills its unique characteristic of having a civic square within a government precinct. The precinct was bounded by the down-river 1794 grant to ex-convict Samuel Wilcox and, on the south-west, by the eastern boundary of another farm promised to ex-convict James Whitehouse in 1795 but not registered until 1797. Whitehouse Farm was soon bought by William Baker, who had been sent as the government storekeeper in charge of the complex being built in January 1795. With very few exceptions, all grants promised in 1794 were between 25 and 30 acres (Figure 23), but as the Hawkesbury lands were expected to produce over 30 bushels per acre, the excess grain grown in the first few years was expected to be substantial, and much needed in Parramatta and Sydney.

A Government Precinct

The early government precinct stretched south-west onto the slope of the upland from the present Arndell Street, south-east to upper South Creek and further south-west to the southern side of Baker Street. From 1795, the buildings in and around the civic square were constructed methodically by the government carpenters, possibly working under the colony’s master carpenter, John Livingstone. First a wharf was keyed into the sloping bank and then nearby the storehouse was built to house the provisions for the settlement. Judge Advocate Collins wrote in his diary how, once the roof was on and the flimsy house was able to be locked up, the goods for the settlers were landed from the government vessel.91 The unloaded provisions were put under the protection of a small military guard of privates and a sergeant, all initially to be accommodated within that structure.92 From the evidence of the proven positioning of later buildings, discussed below, it is almost certain that the first wharf and provision store were close to the water on the north-western side of Thompson Square.

88 Barkley-Jack, Hawkesbury Settlement Revealed, p. 177.
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Figure 16: Land grants promised at Mulgrave Place by December 1796. (Source: Map compiled by Tom Sapienza – content sourced from Jan Barkley-Jack from Land Grant Registers 1 and 1A, and drawn by A. Wilson, Archaeological Computing Laboratory, University of Sydney, 2009.)
Granaries

Next constructed was the granary, also from timber. However, so inadequate was this grain storage facility – labelled a 'shed' – that in August 1796 Governor Hunter was forced to rebuild it, to the usual specifications of log construction with a thatched roof, similar to that built at Parramatta. He then described it as 'a large granary for the reception of wheat and maize'. Hunter prioritised those items related to the 'preservation of our crops', and it soon became obvious that a separate granary was required for each of the grains grown at Mulgrave Place. By 1798, another log granary had been built abutting what would become a lease within the future Thompson Square. Both granaries were enclosed for added security by a paling fence and a guardhouse located close by.

By the time G. W. Evans first painted Green Hills from the northern side of the river at Mulgrave Place in 1807, the earlier of the two granaries had been removed, but the other, likely to be the 1798 granary, is shown clearly on the north-eastern side of the civic square (Figure 24 and Figure 25). The two Hunter granaries were built close to one another and were fairly close to the waterway, but above the lowest levels of the bank.

The position of the two Hunter granaries is established from both Evans's painting and the documentary source of the terms of a lease given beside the structures in October 1799. The lease to the constable, Andrew Thompson, refers specifically to 'public store houses' in the plural, and provides that, should they need to be enlarged, part of the lease area would return to the government. Evans's painting shows that these storehouses were granaries, the location of Thompson's lease is well documented on the north-eastern side of the open area and government records also make clear that there were only two granaries at that time.

In more detail, the lease given to Andrew Thompson stated:

should the Government after the period of three years deem it expedient to build or enlarge the public store houses adjacent thereto so much of the land here demised and let to the said Andrew Thompson as may be required to enlarge those buildings shall revert to the Crown on condition that the Government shall cause to be paid unto the lessee the expenses ... so taken which expenses shall be appreciated according to a fair valuation ... John Hunter, 1 October 1799.

Evans's watercolour is one of the earliest depictions of the Green Hills district, and the future Thompson Square in particular. The study area is shown as an open common surrounded by modest huts and cottages to the south-west (right) and by more impressive government buildings to the north (left). This includes the old Government House (also known as Government Cottage – on land now known as 41 George Street) perched on the top of the hill to the very left of the image. At the top of the hill also stood the bell post used to summon villagers in time of peril and to mark the work times of convict labours. To the north-east (left), below the government buildings, is the entrepreneur Andrew Thompson's 1 acre of land, leased in 1799.
Figure 17: The Government Precinct at Green Hills in 1807, with the Governor Bligh under construction in the centre. The study area is overlaid in red outline. (Source. G. W. Evans, watercolour, image courtesy of Hordern House Rare Books, Sydney. Overlay by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)

Figure 18: The granary built by Governor Hunter between 1796 and 1799 on the eastern side of Thompson Square. The paling fence had been constructed at the same time and a small guardhouse installed (to the right of the granary in the illustration) to ensure the safety of the grains. (Source. G. W. Evans, watercolour, 1809, ‘Settlement on the Green Hills’, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, PXD 388, vol. 3, fol. 7.)
Soldier’s Barracks

All the government buildings constructed before 1796 in the civic square at Mulgrave Place were shoddily put together and quickly needed replacement. The first dedicated soldiers’ barracks were built after mid-1795, when a detachment of almost 100 men was stationed in the Hawkesbury area. The numbers of soldiers fluctuated over the years; at the end of 1801 there were just thirty privates under a subaltern ‘for the protection of settlers and their grain, as well as the public stores kept there’. However, the need for a proper military establishment was always evident. At first, the soldiers had camped or were billeted until, in 1795, a crude building was constructed. In 1796, Governor Hunter described the soldiers’ barracks as a ‘miserable building’ and, by 1800, had replaced the original barracks with a new building.

Based on the military’s long association with provision store duty, as well as the fact that in 1810–11 the soldiers’ barracks were still on the south-western side of the square, despite the provision stores having moved eastward, it would seem likely that these successive soldiers’ barracks were always located on the south-western side of the square, probably by 1800 near the top of the ridge. There, marked out by government fence lines of paling, various other buildings for the military had accumulated on the slope by 1807–8 and remained there in 1812.

Commandant’s Barracks

Almost simultaneously with the establishment of the soldiers’ barracks, a well-built, commodious weatherboard dwelling was constructed for the Commandant of the settlement, Edward Abbott (Figure 26). Directly overlooking the river and the civic square from the north-eastern-most part of the government precinct, the Commandant’s Barracks was to become Government House (also called Government Cottage) and magistrate’s residence in 1800, when civil rule was introduced. The Deputy Surveyor, Charles Grimes, was the first resident magistrate at Hawkesbury, followed by the First Fleet surgeon, Thomas Arndell, in April 1802. It also became the residence of governors when they were visiting the district.

Governor Hunter declared that he had:

Built a framed and weatherboard house on the Green Hills at the Hawkesbury for the residence of the commanding officer of that district. The house was shingled, and furnished with a cellar, a skilling kitchen, and other accommodation, enclosed round with paling.

Civil Establishment

As part of the establishment of civil rule under John Hunter, law and order became the responsibility of elected constables, including within the Hawkesbury district from 1796. Ex-convict and farmer Thomas Rickaby was in charge as chief constable. A young ex-convict by the name of Andrew Thompson, who was appointed as a junior constable to the district, and another Sydney ex-convict, John Harris, who had previously been a successful police constable elsewhere, became the only two men to be given leaseholds on the government precinct. Their fourteen-year leases allowed them to develop land in the heart of the government precinct. Both leases were on the eastern side of the precinct, with Harris’s lease stretching from mid-way beyond Government House down the slope to South Creek from January 1798, and Andrew Thompson’s within the developing square. Thompson’s 1-acre lot stretched between the river frontage to the top of the ridge between the granary and the Commandant’s Barracks (Figure 27). As Thompson was already in occupation of
the land included in his lease, it would seem that the small cottage located within the grant was his residence as a constable, probably from soon after his arrival in 1796, handy to the watchhouse in the civic square.107

Andrew Thompson was to become the Hawkesbury’s chief constable and a leading farmer and businessman, and Governor Macquarie saw him as the ‘father and founder’ of Green Hills.108 Born in Scotland in 1773, Thompson was sentenced to fourteen years’ transportation. In Scotland, Thompson had stolen from his family, as well as eighteen bolts of material from a Yetholm merchant, totalling over 177 metres, and worth more than £33.109 He arrived in Sydney in 1792 and, through his significant involvement with land acquisition and trade, quickly became one of the largest grain growers and wealthiest settlers in the colony.110 On 1 October 1799, Thompson received a lease of 1 acre on the government reserve, bound to the north by the Hawkesbury River and on all sides by ground reserved for the use of the Crown. As stated in the Register of Grants, the site was ‘let for the purposes of building on’ for a period of fourteen years.111 Thompson’s lease is shown in G. W. Evans’s 1807 painting (Figure 28) and on the plan of Windsor dated 1812 (Figure 27).

The tiny whitewashed cottage, just beside the fence outside the area of the Hunter granary, became Thompson’s residence between 1796 (predating the formal lease), when he came to the district as a junior constable, and early 1799 (Figure 28). It is likely that the cottage preceded the granary since, with an acre to choose from, Thompson may not have wished to have his home so close to the public grain store.

108 Macquarie, Journals of his Tours in New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land, 1810-1822, p. 43.
109 Records of the Scottish High Court during Autumn Circuit at Jedburgh, Register House, Edinburgh JC26/257, GC173, Declaration of Andrew Thompson, 25 August 1790; Criminal Letters: His Majesty’s Advocate against Thompson and Aitkins, 31 August 1790: JC12/21, GC166, Jedburgh Court Transcripts, September 1790
111 Land Grant Register, Book 2, p. 320.
Thompson’s cottage is shown in all the early paintings and etchings of the study area. The 1-acre lease marked the eastern boundary of the civic square officially from October 1799 with the granting of Thompson’s lease. Effectively, the civic square was fixed in form before the end of the eighteenth century and, based on comparative evidence presented in the next section of this historical overview, is the only eighteenth-century civic square remaining in Australia.

**Shipbuilding**

Andrew Thompson built at least four vessels, with at least one constructed on his lease at Windsor. The first recorded vessel was the 16-ton *Hope* launched in 1802, and his final build on this site was the 100-ton schooner *Governor Bligh*, in 1807.\(^{112}\) The sloops *Nancy* and *Hawkesbury* were also possibly built at the yard.

At the time when Thompson was building his vessels the colony was in great need of shipping to link satellite agricultural settlements such as Windsor with Sydney. Apart from intra-colonial trade opportunities there was also the newly identified sealing grounds in Bass Strait which provided access to a high-value commodity for trade with China.\(^{113}\) Two of Thompson’s vessels, *Nancy* and *Governor Bligh*, went on to work in the collection of seal pelts.\(^{114}\)

Thompson began building his vessels not long after Governor Hunter’s strict controls on colonial shipbuilding and ownership were relaxed.\(^{115}\) He was one of a dozen identified shipbuilders in the colony at this time.\(^{116}\) These first shipbuilders:

> showed enterprise, courage and ingenuity. They had to invest labour and capital in yards and slipways, sail-lofts and sheds. There must always have been shortages of equipment and skilled labour. Even more formidable than building vessels from local materials in such conditions was the task of keeping them seaworthy year after year.\(^{117}\)

---


\(^{114}\) Purtell, 20.


\(^{116}\) Hainsworth, p. 119.

\(^{117}\) Hainsworth, p. 116.
Figure 20: 1812 plan of Windsor, showing the October 1799 lease given to ex-convict constable Andrew Thompson in the civic square. He was already occupying the land prior to that date as a government employee on Crown land. (Source: J. Meehan, Plan of Windsor, 1812, SRNSW, Map SZ 529.)
Figure 21: The small white-washed cottage of Andrew Thompson (to the left of the granary) on Andrew Thompson’s lease of October 1799, shown adjoining the paling fence of the Hunter granary in 1807, along with Thompson’s orchard which is running down to the river. The present study area is illustrated in red. (Source: G. W. Evans, watercolour, 1807, image courtesy of Hordern House Rare Books, Sydney, overlaid by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)

Figure 22: The white-washed cottage of Andrew Thompson, as portrayed by Philip Slaeger in 1812 or 1813, on the eastern side of Thompson Square. While the specific detail of the house as stylised by Slaeger differs from that portrayed by G. W. Evans, the general aspect and fencing shown after the Hunter granaries had gone and after Thompson was dead are consistent with other evidence. (Source: Philip Slaeger, ‘A View of Part of the Town of Windsor’, etching published by Absalom West, Sydney, 1813.)
Law Enforcement

Associated with the police presence in the civic square was the watchhouse, in existence from 1798.\(^{118}\) This watchhouse became, in 1799, the focal point of the first stirrings in Australia by former convicts to test their legal equality with free settlers and the military élite.

Prior to Harris’s detention by the Commandant, ex-convict radical activism had been frequently and publicly exercised but never tested legally.\(^{119}\) The study area in 1798 is the crucible in which such passions flamed and hardened, influencing the course of Australian democratic process. Harris’s defence of his rights as a free person, once his sentence had ended, was on public display, supported by the Reverend Samuel Marsden, the Hawkesbury’s magistrate. Marsden gave evidence on behalf of Harris and ensured that, for the first time, an ex-convict had legal rights and legal success against the military abuse of power in a civil society.

The problem had begun on 11 December 1798 when Harris ordered one of his two government men to set his dogs onto Kemp’s pigs ‘to drive them off the land Harris leased in the government precinct near South Creek’. Kemp was furious and threatened Harris, viewing his actions as insulting and his language radical, when Harris refused to punish his government servant despite Kemp’s insistence. Harris subsequently declared that he ‘was free and a Citizen of the World’, and so had a right to protect his property. In anger and against the advice of Magistrate Marsden, Kemp escalated the argument, after imprisoning Harris in the watchhouse, even though he had no legal grounds to do so. On being discharged by Marsden, Harris declared that he would prosecute Kemp for wrongful imprisonment. Harris won the case and, for the first time, ex-convict rights were legally upheld in Australia – in a landmark case originating in the fledgling civic square. A whiff of the French Revolution thus reached the ordinary Windsor citizen in what later came to be known as Thompson Square.\(^{120}\)

From the Thompson Square case of 1799, the implications rippled out gradually into colonial life, and were directly influenced by the French Revolution and English radical society. The friends of ex-convict John Harris, the man who prosecuted an officer in the 1799 case, were John Boston and Scottish Martyr Thomas Fyshe Palmer, both British radicals. Harris left the colony in Fyshe Palmer’s private ship with them. These radicals had been transported for their agitation in Britain and for vocally supporting radical changes to the British Government, based on the principles laid down by the French revolutionaries. The connection to the French is evident in their writings. Prior to their convictions for distributing literature about political freedom as a ‘Citizen of the World’, Mealmaker, another radical transportee, and Fyshe Palmer had both attended the Radical General Convention as delegates in 1793, and Mealmaker’s pamphlet of 1797 discussing the English crackdown against radicals contained the words ‘our English Robespierrians’ – a reference to the French extremist radical. The words ‘Citizen of the World’ had been used by Harris to Commandant Kemp, who claimed them to be radical based on their origins in the French Revolution.\(^{121}\) By 1793, details had reached NSW about the after-effects of the French Revolution and the information about French revolutionary principles and resultant happenings in France was conveyed by officer Neil McKellar in a letter to his friend and fellow soldier, John Piper, residing on Norfolk Island at the time. The letter included McKellar noting that ‘This I hope will give you a general idea of the cause … of the French Revolution with which you ought not to [be] unacquainted’.\(^{122}\)

---

120 Ibid., 362–73.
The other leaseholder on the government precinct, John Harris, found himself illegally imprisoned in the watchhouse after a dispute over his neighbour’s pigs. Unfortunately for Harris, the irascible Commandant Anthony Fenn Kemp was his neighbour.

The Reverend Samuel Marsden was very much associated with Thompson Square from its earliest days. He had first visited it just six months after its beginnings, when, in October 1795, he arrived from his Parramatta residence where he had lived as Assistant Chaplain for the colony. Marsden stated:

*I am going to preach at the Hawkesbury on Sunday next, twenty miles distant from Home, and I know no more where I shall sleep, or perform Divine Service, than you.*

On this visit, Marsden would have spent time in the embryonic civic square, as the only two men he knew in the settlement, government store-keeper William Baker and Commandant Captain Edward Abbott, were stationed there. Perhaps another visiting officer, like John Palmer the colonial Commissary, was there at that time, since Marsden attended the Hawkesbury Muster of 3 October 1795.

Marsden may have preached in the only large public building at Mulgrave Place that year – the civic square’s new granary shed – although since this was almost immediately condemned as too small for the grain, it may be that Marsden preached in the open air of the square. Certainly, Marsden’s wife Elizabeth complained in 1796 that her husband ‘had to preach sometimes … in a place appropriated for Corn’. Marsden was to make many trips to the civic square during his ongoing visits to the Mulgrave Place district, as both chaplain and magistrate for the district. So regular were his visits that, by 1797, he had purchased a 50-acre property there, just a short distance from the study area. While Marsden is supposed to have been stingingly critical of the industry of the Hawkesbury farmers generally, he was regarded as more even-handed in his duties as magistrate, helping ex-convict John Harris and others. Harris, when told that Marsden was to investigate his case, had replied, ‘I am very glad of it for now Mr Kemp would be answerable for his improper conduct’.

Marsden was instrumental in bringing reliable justice, religion and order to the vital grain-growing settlement of Mulgrave Place, which was so important to the survival of the colony. Without Marsden, and his officiating from Thompson Square, the colonial-based legal inequalities between the ‘came free’ elite and ex-convict society would have persisted much later than 1799. Furthermore, the spiritual needs of the isolated community would have remained neglected, for it was Marsden who recruited the first trained clergymen to work out of Thompson Square from 1810 until 1822, when a new church was consecrated. The ridgetop within the study area continued to be the centre of education from 1804 until around 1880.

In mid-1799, the Hawkesbury River severely flooded. The original provision store, built in 1795 on a lower terrace some 2 metres above normal river level, was washed away and all the settlement’s provisions it contained were lost. The river level reached over 10 metres in Thompson Square. Hunter acknowledged that the floods generally had ‘proved a most distressing circumstance to the settlers … where we have in some seasons raised from fifteen to twenty thousand bushels of wheat’. As Mulgrave Place was so important to the colony’s survival generally, the effects of the

124 HRA, ser. 1, vol. 1, 12 November 1796, p. 678.
126 An Account of Lands Granted or Leased in His Majesty’s Territory of New South Wales and its Dependencies by His Excellency, Governor Hunter, from the 1st of August 1796 , to the 1st of January 1800, both days inclusive, 6 February 1800, HRA, ser. 1, vol. 2, p. 458; Land Grant Register, Book 2, SRNSW, p. 149, ‘June 1797 ‘Marsden Farm’; Detail of ‘Sketch of the Inundation in the neighbourhood of Windsor, …2 June 1816, watercolour by an unknown artist, panorama in four panels, Mitchell Library, State Library of NSW, call no. PX*D 264; Petty Sessions, Reel 655, pp. 61, 62, 25 August 1798; John Harris against A.F. Kemp, Court of Civil Jurisdiction, SRNSW May-June 1799, evidence; p. 48, Thomas Rickaby 10 June 1799.
flood extended far beyond Thompson Square, where the government controlled its purchased grain, with shortages being felt as far as Parramatta and Sydney. The replacement provision store was built in 1799, probably, like its predecessor, on the south-western side of Thompson Square, but on a higher part of the bank above the known flood level, as the north-eastern side had already been taken up with the granaries and constable's cottage by then. With few carts and wagons available, the provision stores needed to be near the unloading vessels on the river.

The 1809 (Figure 30) watercolour painting of Windsor by G. W. Evans depicts the barracks near the top of Thompson Square on the western side, probably enlarged from around 1800, completely surrounded by typical government paling. It shows a series of buildings along the riverside, some of which have round ventilation openings. Others are asymmetrical and different in shape from Evans's usual depiction of living quarters, with a central door flanked by two windows, making it likely that these are the provision storage sheds of 1799. These buildings are shown in Evans's paintings of 1807 and 1809 but not in his painting of circa 1811, when the new brick provision stores built by Governor King were proving sufficient, and Governor Macquarie determined that the 1799 group could safely be removed, replaced by town grants.129

Figure 23: The provision stores rebuilt in 1799 are likely to be the collection of two small buildings with high ventilation openings in the upper gable, together with the sheds and skillions along the front of this detail of Evans's painting of 1809. The military barracks, probably that built between 1796 and 1800, but with ongoing additions, are the cluster of buildings on the skyline, with the fenced paddock running down to the provision stores. (Source: G. W. Evans, 'The Settlement on the Green Hills', watercolour, 1809, Mitchell Library, State Library of NSW, PXD 388, vol. 3 fol. 7.)

**Village of Green Hills**

Visitors to the district during this period now saw how Governor Hunter had improved the built fabric of the township and transformed the rural settlement into the village of Green Hills. As Governor, John Hunter visited the Hawkesbury on several occasions. In early January 1797, he led a repeat muster and gave notification to the settlers of several Government Orders. The district's residents were mustered outside Government House on the verge of Thompson Square, where Hunter was staying. Towards the end of October 1798, Hunter was again in the vicinity of Thompson Square

---

fixing public regulations and orders.\textsuperscript{130} All the governors from that time through to Lachlan Macquarie knew the civic square at Hawkesbury well through staying at Government House.

Those from afar, who visited Windsor to attend the annual musters held initially in the vicinity of Government House and Thompson Square, used the square as a place to catch up on their dealings with each other or to hear of the happenings in the district.\textsuperscript{131} Regular visitors, as indicated throughout this report, included Judge Advocate David Collins, the Commissary John Palmer, the Reverend Samuel Marsden and Deputy Surveyor Charles Grimes, while some, like John and Elizabeth Macarthur, came only on a few occasions. Some of the élite of the colony were later to recount the hospitality they received during their stay as guests of Andrew Thompson when, in the middle of the first decade of the nineteenth century as Hawkesbury’s Chief Constable and leading citizen, he built a luxurious house and business premises on his leasehold.\textsuperscript{132}

A schematic representation of the civic square in 1795 is shown below in Figure 24.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{civic_square_1795}
\caption{Schematic representation of the civic square in 1795.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{131} HRNSW, vol. 3, p. 217.
\textsuperscript{132} Elizabeth Macarthur in 1795, HRNSW, vol. 2, p. 510.
Figure 24: Schematic representation of the area now known as Thompson Square in 1795. (Source: Compiled by Tom Sapienza – content sourced by Jan Barkley-Jack, drawn by Jonathan Auld, 2012.)
Trade

All the earliest Hawkesbury settlers frequented Thompson Square regularly, getting provisions, storing the grain they wished to sell to the government or seeking the help of the constables, military or magistrate. Many landed in the vicinity of Thompson Square in their small boats, which became more common after 1796 when local settlers like James Webb became boat-builders. The growing number of government officers were based in the square and ordinary settlers were welcome at the barracks and even allowed to work alongside the military in some circumstances.133

The square became a hub for the growing overland transportation of produce, with settlers coming from their farms or Sydney and Parramatta along the Old Hawkesbury Road, as improvements were made to it. From 1798, some began transporting produce to and from Sydney by wagon, led by John Stogdell, the agent for John Palmer.134 After the road was terminated on the Sydney side of South Creek, the foot and cart traffic reaching the storehouses and granaries in the square became relatively light, so the bulk of goods and people continued to come from the river. The volume of pedestrians travelling from the south began to increase once Andrew Thompson built the first bridge across South Creek in 1802.135 From then, an increasing number of carts and later carriages crossed the creek on Thompson's land and wound their way up to the top of the ridge in the vicinity of Arndell Street and Government House, although the river remained the cheapest and preferred means of entry.136

By 1800, Hunter had plans for a brick replacement of the provision store and granary buildings high along the ridge above Thompson’s lease. It was Governor King who, in 1803, built the new three-storey brick provision stores and granary building, quickly followed by the mooted school building and chapel.137 In 1804, the stores and granary became associated with the end of another radical protest – the rebellion of Irish convicts. After the Battle of Vinegar Hill, the Irish leader, Phillip Cunningham, was ‘to be publicly executed on the Stair Case of the Public Store [at Green Hills], which he had boasted in his march he was going to plunder’.138

The hanging of Cunningham from the new provision store was a significant event in the fledgling square for the Irish throughout the colony. The Green Hills square was chosen as the best place to demonstrate what happens to perceived traitors as it was central to the settlement and regularly frequented by most of the population of the district. Hanging Cunningham from the provision store was a symbolic gesture to make a point to the wider Irish population, and in particular any supporters of the rebellion in the Mulgrave Place district. The Irish and radical supporters of the rebellion were already distrusted by Governor King, and the rebels had tried to make their way to the upper Hawkesbury River settlement expecting local support.139

Subsequent governors continued to improve the infrastructure in the Hawkesbury’s civic square. In his short time as governor, Governor Bligh had plans for better facilities there, having Andrew Thompson supervise the making of pews for the church. He also improved Government House. In the military barrack paddock on the western side of the square, soldiers burned an effigy of Governor Bligh in January 1808 on hearing that their peers in Sydney had deposed him. The facsimile copy of the petition they circulated and sought to force settlers to sign, in an attempt to prove belated support for the deposition from the unwilling Hawkesbury farmers, was conceived and written in Andrew Thompson’s pub adjacent to Thompson Square.140

---
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The Evans paintings show clearly that, as more and more government workers were needed in the civic facilities in the square, the number of small private houses grew and the remaining open space was, by 1807, denuded of trees. Gradually, the area took on the look of a small village, with the civic square at its centre, the population of which continued to rise, especially after Thompson built his new lodgings and retail store on the upper part of his lease, probably around 1807 (Figure 25).

More and more of the adjacent uplands were sold to entrepreneurs like Andrew Thompson and others, often widows or single women with children, who lived on allotments near the civic square, subdivided from the Whitehouse, Smallwood and Rickaby farms, and so the village started to extend to the south-west (Figure 26).

Figure 25: Thompson’s store, at the top of Thompson Square, eastern side, facing south-west across Thompson Square, drawn in 1820. (Source: State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, Bonwick Transcripts, box 10, p. 4259.)

Figure 26: The south-western side of Thompson Square and private houses by 1813. (Source: P. Slaeger, ‘A View of Part of the Town of Windsor’, etching published by Absalom West, Sydney, 1813.)

2.1.7 The Macquarie Period and its Aftermath in Thompson Square

When Macquarie arrived in 1810 to restore normal government, he quickly found Thompson to be an invaluable adviser on Hawkesbury affairs. Thompson solved a couple of the Governor’s pressing problems. In early January 1810, Thompson rode out from the civic square with the Hawkesbury Commandant to appeal to the settlers in the district to sell any extra grain they may have been
holding and put it into government storage. Thompson’s local popularity ensured his success and the Governor got the grain supplies he needed. Thompson also provided a house of quality for Judge Ellis Bent in Sydney by giving up his new waterside residence in Sydney Cove, thereby assisting Macquarie by providing Judge Bent with a house Bent regarded as suitable to his status after he had rejected all other potential residences suggested by Macquarie.

Judge Ellis Bent described the importance of Andrew Thompson’s position in the colony as extending well beyond his influence at Mulgrave Place. Despite previously distancing any dealings with ex-convicts, Bent saw in Thompson someone who was redeemed socially, and appreciated Thompson’s almost unique status as one of the foremost men in the colony. Thompson also arranged staff for the Bent household: a colonial-born housemaid from the Hawkesbury and Thompson’s own footman, Joseph, with Joseph’s wife as cook. Bent related the favour Thompson had shown him to his mother:

I was much surprised and pleased by a letter from the Governor saying that Colonel Foveaux had got a Mr Thompson to lend us his house ready furnished … Mr Thompson … is now, I may say, one of the first men, if not the first in the Colony. He possesses an amazing herd of cattle, a most extensive property at Hawkesbury, where he generally lives. Besides, he has to the amount of £50,000 engaged in different pursuits. He has established a Tanyard, a Salt Works etc. The house is … one of the prettiest in Sydney.141

Recognising Thompson’s qualities, Macquarie announced on 14 January 1810 that, in keeping with his philosophy of benevolence to any ex-convict in the settlement whose good behaviour illustrated genuine reform, Thompson was to be the colony’s first ex-convict magistrate, stationed at Hawkesbury.142

Another significant factor seen as demonstrating Thompson’s commitment to reforming himself was his heroic efforts during some of the highest floods in the Hawkesbury. He used his own boats to personally help rescue hundreds of settlers stranded on the roofs of their crumbling homes. Macquarie’s words, which were later placed on Thompson’s altar monument, acknowledged this:

By these means he raised himself to a state of respectability and affluence which enabled him to indulge the generosity of his nature in assisting his Fellow Creatures in distress … in the Calamitous Floods of the river Hawkesbury in the Years 1806 and 1809 … In consequence … Governor Lachlan Macquarie appointed him a Justice of the Peace.143

Thompson’s appointment predated the similar appointment of Simeon Lord, also an ex-convict, to the magistracy. Macquarie stated:

I am aware that [the appointment of ex-convicts to elevated government positions] … is a Measure which must be resorted to with great Caution and Delicacy … The number of persons of this Description whom I have yet admitted to my Table consist of only Four, Namely, Mr D'Arcy Wentworth, Principal Surgeon, Mr William Redfern, Assistant Surgeon; Mr Andrew Thompson, an opulent Farmer and Proprietor of Land, and Mr Simeon Lord, an opulent Merchant … they have long Conducted themselves with the greatest Propriety, and I find them at all times ready to come forward in the most liberal Manner to the Assistance of Government. In order to mark my Sense of the Merits of Mr Andrew Thompson, I have already appointed him a Justice of the Peace and Magistrate at the Hawkesbury … and I intend to Confer the same Marks of Distinction on Mr Wentworth and Mr Simeon Lord when Vacancies … may occur.144

Thompson’s appointment as the first ex-convict in the colony to become a magistrate marks him off from all other ex-convicts as the primary example of Macquarie’s controversial policy of

141 Ellis Bent to his mother, Bent’s Letter Book, 4 March 1810, National Library Canberra, research of John Byrne, M.A. Thesis, University of Sydney, p. 245
142 Sydney Gazette, 14 January 1810, p.2.
143 Transcribed from grave altar monument, St Matthew’s Anglican Church cemetery, Windsor.
benevolent governing. Macquarie was well aware that this was a new line of conduct within the New South Wales (NSW) settlement, but was passionate in his belief that, for anyone proven of worth in helping society via exceptionally good behaviour and industriousness over a long period, their behaviour could ‘restore him to that rank in Society which he had lost’. This appeared to Macquarie to be ‘the greatest Inducement … for Reformation of Manners’.\textsuperscript{145} Although Macquarie believed this approach to be consistent with British colonial policy, and the British Government did not formally dispute this, the policy was to cause bitter conflict later with people such as Samuel Marsden who refused to serve with ex-convict appointees.\textsuperscript{146}

The honour of being the very first ex-convict magistrate places Andrew Thompson in a unique position in Australia’s history. It imbues him with significance beyond the distinction of his own many valuable and officially recognised contributions to the survival of both the Hawkesbury district and the colony generally. Macquarie’s ex-convict policy has been a much-debated feature of this country’s early march towards nationhood, and its application, especially in this first instance, gives both Thompson and the square named after him rare status in our historical record.

Thompson’s health had been impaired by his vigorous relief efforts during the flood of 1809 and, on his premature death in October 1810, Macquarie pledged to provide a suitable headstone for his grave at Windsor. The Governor praised his friend:

Andrew Thompson … may justly be said to be the father and founder of the village hitherto known by the name of the Green Hills; there being hardly a vestage [sic] of a single building here, excepting the Government Granary, when he first came to reside on the Green Hills ten years ago.\textsuperscript{147}

In December 1810, Governor Macquarie held a dinner in the Government Cottage, where he announced the creation of five new towns on high land along the Hawkesbury-Nepean River. This December visit was the first Macquarie had made to the village of Green Hills, and he next returned on 12 January 1811, walking around the village to look closely at the north-eastern end of Richmond Common and the existing civic square, where he intended to establish his town of Windsor.

**Establishment of Windsor**

Windsor was unique among Macquarie’s new towns, as it incorporated an existing village which had had its own governing presence for fifteen years prior. Macquarie quickly gave the Deputy Surveyor-General James Meehan instructions to carry out a detailed survey of the new town. By 24 July 1811, the principal streets were clearly defined, with the main street (George Street) named by Macquarie after George III.\textsuperscript{148} The new town was designed on a grid and located on high land to avoid floodwaters, although there were still two places where the land dipped, and high floodwaters could enter. These spots were located on George and Macquarie streets, between Johnston and New streets.\textsuperscript{149} Most importantly, Macquarie recognised the value of the existing civic square, incorporating it into the town plan (Figure 34), and formally naming it Thompson Square, in honour of Andrew Thompson.\textsuperscript{150}

In Sydney, Parramatta and Toongabbie, which were the only other urban centres of the time, no early squares had been formed. In Sydney, Governor Phillip’s grand hopes for a planned environment had been thwarted and every governor until Bligh had postponed the translation of the temporary built environment of colonial Sydney into planning that would include the creation of a larger public area in an enduring form.\textsuperscript{151} Even Bligh did not plan a civic square. The earliest informal

---
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meeting places in Sydney along the waterfront have disappeared with redevelopment, as have other informal spaces in Sydney.\textsuperscript{152}

It was not until Macquarie’s administration from 1810 that the designation of formal civic spaces, modelled on those he had known in Edinburgh in his youth, became a reality in NSW town planning. It is clear from Macquarie’s wording announcing Thompson Square that none of the open spaces in Sydney prior to his arrival had been the equivalent of a community square, even informally, including the church ground. In Macquarie’s Government and General Orders issued in October 1810, he referred not to the continuation of Sydney’s first two public squares but very clearly to their creation, along with a dedicated park to be known as Hyde Park. The announcement stated:

\textit{the open space of Ground or Area, whereon the Church of St Phillip now stands, and which is hereafter intended to be formed into a handsome Square (the Street hitherto known by the Name of Church Street forming the West Side thereof), has been named “Charlotte Square”}

\textit{...}

\textit{It being intended to remove all those old Buildings and Enclosures now on the space of Ground which is bounded by the Government Domain … [civil offices] on the South … and by the Houses [on the waterfront] … on the North, and to throw the same into an open Area, the said … space of Ground, has been named Macquarie Place.\textsuperscript{153}}

Thompson Square had existed for fifteen years before new urban squares were created in Sydney. In Parramatta, the focus had been on the colony’s second Government House, from which the streets were aligned, and which was joined by George Street to the wharf. Toongabbie did not have a dedicated community space and instead consisted of only three streets with no public congregation area.\textsuperscript{154} There remain today four surviving squares in Richmond, Wilberforce, Liverpool and Windsor (Thompson Square).

\textsuperscript{152} Ritchie, evidence of Governor Bligh, John Macarthur and others, pp. 58, 277; Map of Sydney, 1788, Ashton and Waterson, 2000, p. 9; ‘A Survey of the Settlement of New South Wales’, 1792 map of Sydney, annotated by Governor Phillip, State Records NSW, Map SZ 430; W. Bradley, A Voyage to New South Wales, 1802, reprint 1969, chart 7; Sydney Gazette, 6 October 1810; Map of Sydney, 1788.; Plan of Parramatta, c.1796, (with no evident dedicated community space), copy in State Library of NSW, Bonwick Transcripts, BT 36 map 17.

\textsuperscript{153} \textit{Sydney Gazette}, 6 October 1810, p. 1.

Figure 27: Early town plan of Windsor, showing original grid plan. (Source: Thompson 1827, NSW SRNSW, Map SZ526.)

Figure 28: Windsor in 1811, showing Green Hills in the background across the Hawkesbury River. (Source: G. W. Evans, ‘Head of Navigation, Hawkesbury River’, watercolour, 1811, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, SV1B/Wind/6, a 1328032r.)
Establishment of Thompson Square

It is Macquarie himself, in an entry in his journal in January 1811, who gives legitimacy to the claim of the existence of ‘a square’ predating Macquarie’s governorship in the village of Green Hills. Unequivocally Macquarie states in his writings that the public area he saw was what he already understood to be ‘a square’: that is, in the European sense of an open space that is contained by associated surrounding buildings and which in that combination had a civic role. A month after Macquarie first sighted the civic area at Green Hills, he referred to it as ‘the present square’, without having altered it or its surrounds in any way from its 1809 appearance.155

The composition of a civic square was thus regarded by Macquarie as flexible in terms of its components, able to include public facilities like the granaries and provision stores, an associated church and wharf, as well as private dwellings like that of Andrew Thompson (Figure 28. These were the same elements he envisaged for the squares he was himself was to create: churches and church ground, as in the ‘great square’ (now McQuade Park in Windsor) with St Matthew’s Anglican Church and burial ground and the Catholic land donation on the opposite diagonal (now the Catholic Cemetery land); and similarly at Wilberforce. Adding an inn or other commercial building as well as private housing, as was the case with the ‘great square’, was just the type of modification that all civic squares underwent over time. This includes the Green Hills civic square before Macquarie, for Thompson had established a shop and large dwelling in the square and an inn adjacent before 1807. Macquarie began tidying the existing square at his new town of Windsor in late 1811, removing a small number of the straggling old buildings, but never saw a need to change the general form of Thompson Square from its existing boundaries and still useful buildings that had existed from 1800.156 He had no hesitation in naming the existing square Thompson Square after Andrew Thompson, using the same terminology of ‘a square’ both before and after the civic area’s naming.

Macquarie’s journal entries are detailed and unambiguous in describing the Green Hills civic space as it was when he first saw it. He makes it explicitly clear that he instantly recognises this space as a ‘present square’ in the 1800 form and at no stage comments on any deviation from his own definition of such a space. The first two entries in Macquarie’s journal, which record his first perceptions of the civic space and its surrounds, are:

Thursday 6th Decr. 1810 … a convenient part of [Richmond Common] … it is now my intention to appropriate for a large town and township for the accommodation of the settlers inhabiting the south side of the River Hawkesbury, whose farms are liable to be flooded … and to connect the present village on the Green Hills with the intended new town and township.157

…

Saturday 12th Jany. 1811 … I rode out … to survey … the ground marked out for the town and township of Windsor, which having finally fixed on … I walked over the whole of the present village on the Green Hills, forming the beginning or basis for the new town of Windsor, in which I planned a square and several new streets; directing the old ones to be enlarged and improved in various respects … The principal street in the present town of Windsor, running in a westerly direction from the Government Garden or Domain towards the new township, I have called George Street … and which street from the present square to the new intended one in the township, will be nearly an English mile long. The square in the present town I have named Thompson Square in honour of the memory of the good and worthy late Andrew Thompson.158

155 Macquarie, Journal of his Tours in New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land.
157 Macquarie, Journals of his Tours in New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land 1810-1822, p. 31
158 Ibid., p. 42.
In setting out the new town of Windsor, the Governor made a division between Thompson Square and the governor’s residence (including garden). This officially included all the land from the river up the bank to the ridge, along what used to be the western line of Thomson’s lease, right up to present-day Arndell Street, which was the boundary with Wilcox Farm (Figure 29). On Andrew Thompson’s death, the lease reverted to the Crown, but the buildings became part of his estate. All this later came to be known as the Governor’s Domain, although maps show a fluid north-eastern boundary for Thompson Square, in that the cottage of Andrew Thompson and his orchard’s eastern boundary clearly remain perceived as part of Thompson Square into the twentieth century. The south-eastern boundary was not defined but always seems, based on illustrations of the time, to have been the curtilage of the buildings on the top of the ridge on modern-day George Street. The south-western side of Thompson Square remained part of the square frontage as had always been the case, and therefore the new buildings remained part of its curtilage through to Baker Street. Macquarie laid out some allotments to infill between this open area of Thompson Square, and west to the northern-eastern boundary of Whitehouse Farm.\(^{159}\)

This farm had always marked the south-western edge of the old square and the government precinct. The instructions regarding these allotments were strict:

> marking out several new allotments in the town for building new houses according to a prescribed plan not to be deviated from. I gave Mr. Fitzgerald a large allotment in the square on the express condition of his building immediately thereon a handsome commodious inn of brick or stone and to be at least two stories high [the surviving Macquarie Arms].\(^{160}\)

The civic square was near the north-eastern end of the elevated land on which the grid pattern of Windsor was laid out in 1811. A second square was laid out closer to the centre of the new town, adjacent to the new cemetery where Thompson was buried and St Matthew’s Anglican Church was later built between 1817 and 1822. For Thompson’s contributions to the Hawkesbury settlement, Macquarie gave Thompson a special posthumous honour by naming the 15-year-old civic square after the magistrate on 12 January 1811.\(^{161}\)

\(^{159}\) Abbott, map 1831, no.1816, SRNSW; Slaeger, 1812-1813, copy in possession of author; Detail of survey of Thompson Square by Charles Scrivener, December 1894, LPI, Crown Plan R.2026.1603; Aerial photograph of Thompson Square, taken in 1929. North is at the bottom. Courtesy of Carol Roberts, Windsor, from the collection of her mother, the late Iris Cammack. Photographer Frederick Halpin Willson, RAAF, 1929 see Figure 55.

\(^{160}\) Macquarie, Journals of His Tours of New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land 1810-1822, p. 42

Figure 29: 1820s–1830s plan showing the Thompson Square area. Existing cadastre is depicted in pink. (Source: Galloway 1820s-1830s, State Library NSW Call Number 5966.)
2.1.8 The Development of Thompson Square and Adjoining Areas

Early Development

At the highest point of the colonial square was a significant landmark: a bell mounted on a high post, used for summoning people, especially convicts, but also acting as a regular meeting place. The bell-post is shown in all the early watercolours and etchings of Green Hills. It stood in the middle of the present Bridge Street, just south of its intersection with George Street. According to James Padley, a local journalist writing in the 1890s as Yeldap and drawing on the memories of elderly residents, the bell was rung every morning at 6 am to summon convict servants to breakfast.

Adjacent to the bell-post were stocks and a pillory for public punishment. Stocks for a single person are clearly shown in Evans’s 1807 and 1809 paintings. Though they are omitted from his 1811 view, there is a crude depiction of a double-stocks as well as a rather different bell-post in Slaeger’s etching of 1813 (Figure 30 and Figure 31).

Figure 30: The bell-post and single stocks in Thompson Square in 1809. (Source: G. W. Evans, ‘The Settlement on the Green Hills’, watercolour, 1809, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, PXD 388, vol. 3, fol. 7.)

---

164 Steele, p. 139.
Slaeger was correct about the capacity of the stocks, for John Tebbutt the astronomer, who was born in 1834, recalled seeing two men in the stocks at the same time, punished for drunkenness.\(^{165}\) Old Dan Mayne, who was born in 1831, recalled the same, but had never seen anyone in the pillory.\(^{166}\) This implies that the stocks were still there and still in use into the 1840s.

The bell-post was a widely known landmark. In 1822, for example, the Provost Marshal in Sydney advertised the sale of a debtor’s cattle ‘at the Bell-Post, Windsor’.\(^{167}\) Before local newspapers were common, notices might be attached to the bell-post. In 1844, a man trying to clear his name of receiving a stolen saddle proclaimed his innocence ‘by public advertisement … stuck on the Bell post’.\(^{168}\) The post was also the natural terminus for a regular wheelbarrow race from the toll-house down by South Creek in the 1850s.\(^{169}\)

It is not clear when the bell-post was finally removed from Thompson Square. The author of ‘Old Windsor: A Reverie’ starts his nostalgic 1896 article:

> Stand at ‘the Bellpost’, that central spot which claims so extensive a view and so many strange and romantic associations.\(^{170}\)

In 1902, a local novel by ‘Josephine’ was entitled \textit{Hanged at the Bellpost}.\(^{171}\) These references to the post, however, seem to be allusions to a well-remembered feature of Thompson Square, lost in mid-Victorian times, possibly when the new bridge was built in 1874.

Thompson Square does not consist solely of the public space but also the built environment that came to border it on three sides. The Thompson Square Conservation Area which is inscribed on the SHR includes the buildings around it and their own individual curtilages. This comprises a substantially larger area than the study area, but the tempo of developmental change on these three sides and around the wharf and punt access beside the river is a critical element in defining the values of the area.

To the north-east, the civic square was bounded initially by the Government Domain (the term generally used to refer to the government precinct after Thompson’s death), which remained in government control until the 1850s.

The government buildings shown and identified in Meehan’s plan of 1812 (Figure 32) are:

---

\(^{168}\) \textit{Hawkesbury Courier}, 9 June 1845, p. 2. This newspaper was not established until three months after the incident reported.
\(^{169}\) \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 17 December 1856, p. 1.
\(^{170}\) \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette}, 12 December 1896, p. 19.
\(^{171}\) \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette}, 12 April 1902, p. 1.
• No.1 – the schoolhouse/church of 1803–4.
• No. 2 – the granary/store of 1803.
• No. 3 – Government House of 1796.
• No. 4 – the military barracks of 1800.

Meehan also depicts the military barracks (No. 4) on the south-west hinterland of Thompson Square. However, the military were soon to move down to Bridge Street and, by 1811, Governor Macquarie was already in the process of transforming the south-west side of the civic space from military and store use to four promised town grants. The initial survey of these intended grants is shown by Meehan in dotted lines extending north from George Street (Figure 32). All these grants lie just outside the present study area. All four offers were taken up but only the land on the corner with George Street, earmarked for the Macquarie Arms, was officially granted, to Richard Fitzgerald. This was the largest of the four, at around 1 acre. Fitzgerald’s new inn, begun in 1812, was opened for business as the Macquarie Arms by the eponymous governor in 1815.172

This new residential area constituted ‘the aristocratic quarter of old Windsor town’, in the later words of the newspaper editor G. C. Johnson.173 The qualities of this part of Windsor at its best were described eloquently by a visiting Scot, John Hood, who, in 1841, admired the Fitzgerald family’s private cottage, a long rectangular building addressing George Street beside the Macquarie Arms. It was the very beau idéal of a cottage. As Hood wrote:

Its extreme neatness; its shape and size; the creepers on the walls; its pomegranates, rich in flower and fruit; its figs; its cages full of birds; the scent of its roses; the perfect loneliness of its retired situation; left nothing for the imagination to wish.174

The Fitzgerald residence, now demolished, was still affectionately known simply as ‘The Cottage’ in the 1920s.175 The other three town allotments on the south-west side of Thompson Square, north of the Macquarie Arms, were, for some unexplained reason, left without any registered title. Nonetheless, the private ownership of this land abutting Thompson Square on the south-west was recognised from Macquarie’s time onward and buildings were soon erected on all three lots and are shown on surveyors’ plans by 1827, under the names of Howe (29 in Map SZ 526, street no. 7), Loder (30, no. 5) and Doyle (31, nos 1–3) (Figure 33). However, there was still need in 1903 for a report from the Chief Surveyor into these ‘ungranted allotments’ and two others nearby, and the official investigation into the irregularity was still ongoing in the 1940s.176

The footprints shown in White’s map of 1827 are only schematic but more detailed representations of the substantial buildings, as they had become by the mid-1830s, are available from a very detailed plan drawn by G.B. White in 1835 (Figure 34) and confirmed by J.J. Galloway in another great plan in 1841.177 No building is shown on Loder’s allotment either in 1835 or 1841, although White had shown one in 1827 (Figure 33).

172 Macquarie, Journals of his tours in New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land, p. 42; Land and Property Information, Grants Register 2 fol. 131; P. Slaeger, ‘A View of Part of the Town of Windsor’, etching published Absalom West, Sydney, 1813; Sydney Gazette, 29 July 1815, p. 2.
174 J. Hood, Australia and the East, Murray, London, 1843, p. 258. The cottage is identified, and sketched, by the author in his presentation copy of his book to his son in 1843 (State Library of NSW, Dixon Library, 84/254).
176 Annotation on G. H. White’s plan of Windsor, 1827, State Records NSW [SRNSW], Map SZ 523; Lands Department, Alienation Branch and Sale Branch correspondence, paper trail created by the constantly transferred file, SRNSW, from 11/20944 item 18/9939 to 11/21412 item 40/8894.
Figure 32: Thompson Square in 1811–12. (Source: J. Meehan, plan of Windsor, 1812, SRNSW, Map SZ 529.)
Figure 33: The south-west side of Thompson Square in 1827, with detailed footprints of several buildings showing the new building allotments. (Source: White, Town of Windsor, 1827, SRNSW, Map SZ524.)
Figure 34: The south-west side of Thompson Square in 1835, with detailed footprints of several buildings. (Source: G. B. White, plan of Windsor, 1835, SRNSW, Map 5968.)
South-West Side of Thompson Square

The streetscape on the south-west side has retained remarkable integrity over 150 years (Figure 35). The present Howe’s House, part of Windsor Regional Museum, seems to have supplemented and then replaced an earlier large house on the allotment closer to Baker Street in the 1830s. A ‘newly erected’ house was offered for lease in 1837, with a description conforming to the present building, but it had already figured on White’s detailed 1835 map (Figure 44) in the same form as shown in 1841.178 The cottage on Loder’s grant next door was probably built in the 1850s.179

The house in Thompson Square closest to the river replaced an inn run by the original grantee, James Doyle, which is shown in the 1835 and 1841 plans. Doyle had died in 1836 and his widowed sister and her son-in-law, Edward Burke, demolished the inn in 1844 and built the present spacious duplex with two storeys, attic and large cellars. Since medical men have occupied one or both parts of the building since the 1870s until very recently, it has become known as the Doctors House.180

Figure 35: Clive Lucas’s drawing of the elevations on the south-west side of Thompson Square in 1975. From the left, the houses are: Macquarie Arms, Howe’s House, the 1850s cottage on Loder’s land and the Doctors House. The lower drawings include proposed conservation to Macquarie Arms. (Source: Fisher Lucas, ‘Thompson Square: A Concept Plan for Future Development’, report to Windsor Municipal Council, 1975, p. 47.)

Thompson’s Lease

Adjacent to the north-east corner of Thompson Square, the lease held by Thompson within the government area had reverted to the Crown on his death in 1810, but is still shown on Meehan’s map of 1812 as Thompson’s ‘premises’ (Figure 44).

Thompson had planted fruit trees on the lower part of his leasehold land, sketched by Evans, and this established orchard was transformed by Macquarie into a garden for the Government Domain.181 The careful layout of this garden was recorded elegantly by the surveyor John Abbott in 1831 (Figure 45). By incorporating Thompson’s orchard into the Government Domain land, Macquarie clearly defined the boundary between the domain and the north-east side of the public area. Because the garden, and Thompson’s leasehold before that, lay at an angle to the general layout of the domain, the civic square became broader as it approached the river. Abbott’s plan of 1831 shows this clearly and accentuates the boundary by colouring government buildings red and private buildings blue (Figure 45).182 The government buildings above the garden, to the south, shown in footprint by Abbott, are the police barracks (‘g’), the police stables to the right (‘e’) and the prisoners’ barracks, formerly Thompson’s store (‘f’), fronting Thompson Square.

178 Sydney Herald, 27 March 1837, p. 3.
179 Bowd, Hawkesbury Journey, p. 88.
181 See the watercolours by Evans painted in 1807 and 1811.
182 J. Abbott, plan of school lands in Windsor, 1831, SRNSW, Map 1816.
George Street did not extend north-east beyond Thompson Square, blocked as it was to the public by the Government Domain. The old granary (‘c’) was, by 1831, known as the Commissariat Stores: its site lies partly within the study area. The old schoolhouse/church of 1804–5 (‘b’) was still standing just east of the Commissariat Stores, although St Matthew’s Anglican Church a kilometre away had, since 1822, taken over its religious functions. A newer, small watchhouse had been built on Bridge Street close to the Commissariat Stores and is shown as ‘d’. 183

Figure 36: Thompson's lease of 1799. (Source: J. Meehan, plan of Windsor, 1812, SRNSW, Map SZ 529.)
Figure 37: The development of the Government Domain and Thompson Square at Windsor by 1831. (Source: Detail of plan of school land by surveyor John Abbott, 1831, SRNSW, Map 1816.)
North-East Side of Thompson Square

The government presence on the eastern side of Thompson Square diminished in the early Victorian period. White’s plan of 1835 (Figure 42), with elaborate footprints for the buildings, shows that there had been changes since 1831. The police barracks were no longer occupied, the prisoners’ barracks had been reduced in size and, in that group, only the government stables remained intact.

These stables were demolished after the handsome two-storey house called Lilburn Hall (10 Bridge Street) was built in 1856 by Dr Dowe. Lilburn Hall was used for a variety of purposes. It was a private home for Dowe (1856–60), for Dr Callaghan from 1887 until he took the Doctors House in 1903, and then for local politician, Brinsley Hall, until 1919. In the meantime, between Dowe and Callaghan, it was a private school. After Brinsley Hall left, it became a maternity hospital under the name of Craigneish until 1934. It has had various commercial uses, during which it acquired accretions which have now been removed. It is an important element in Thompson Square, as demonstrated in the elevation drawn in 1975 by Clive Lucas (Figure 46).

![Elevations along Bridge Street from Thompson Square, drawn by Clive Lucas in 1975. Lilburn Hall is in the dominating central position. To the right is the School of Arts, erected in 1861. To the left of Lilburn Hall is a cottage, no. 6 Bridge Street, built about 1860. (Source: Fisher Lucas, ‘Thompson Square: A Concept Plan for Future Development’, report to Windsor Municipal Council, 1975, p. 47.]

Below Lilburn Hall, the former government garden was abandoned in 1852 so that the Presbyterian Church could build a manse. Although the church never built upon this flood-prone land, the realignment of the property boundaries straightened what is currently known (misleadingly) as Old Bridge Street, until the resumption in 1896 of a triangle of land (coloured pink in Figure 47) to enhance the vehicular turn from the wharf and the bridge during the major bridge works then underway.

---

184 Bowd, Hawkesbury Journey, p. 91.
1894 Plan of land to be resumed under the
Public Roads Act of 1897
*NSW LPI #R6026*

![Survey of Thompson Square by Charles Scrivener, showing realignments after government land on the north-east was transferred to the Presbyterian Church in 1852. (Source: Surveyor Charles Scrivener, 1894, LPI, Road Plan, R.6026.1603.)](image)

Figure 39: Survey of Thompson Square by Charles Scrivener, showing realignments after government land on the north-east was transferred to the Presbyterian Church in 1852. (Source: Surveyor Charles Scrivener, 1894, LPI, Road Plan, R.6026.1603.)
The sandstock brick wall with shell lime mortar that partially survives below the house at 4 Bridge Street (built in 1955) does not seem to have been accurately surveyed and was ignored in the heritage inventory of the house, but is likely to be the sole surviving element of the boundary of the original government garden.\textsuperscript{185} It features by name in the remarkable panorama drawn in June 1816 during a 14-metre flood (Figure 48). The brick wall marked ‘c c’ in the bottom right-hand corner of the detail shown in Figure 48 is identified in the manuscript key as ‘Wall, Govt. House Garden’. Since the fencing around the area when it was leased by Andrew Thompson is shown as paling in all of Evans’s views and no fencing around the area is visible in the Slaeger view of 1812–13, the brick wall must have been constructed by the Macquarie administration between 1813 and early 1816. A century ago, it was well known that this wall had ‘formed part of the block of buildings occupied by Lachlan Macquarie’ and its precise location ‘near to the approach to the Windsor wharf’, as observed in 1914, leaves no doubt that the artefact described is the surviving fragment of walling.

Between 4 Bridge Street and Liburn Hall, there is an attractive 1860s cottage, at 6 Bridge Street, which was used as a private school in the 1870s and early 1880s.\textsuperscript{186}

---

\textsuperscript{185} Hawkesbury Heritage Inventory, SHI no.1740427, Windsor and Richmond Gazette, 12 December 1896, p. 19, 13 November 1914, p. 7. For a brief assessment of the brick wall, see E. Higginbotham, \textit{Historical and Archaeological Investigation of Thompson Square, Windsor, NSW}, report to Hawkesbury Shire Council, 1986, photograph, inventory no. 15.

\textsuperscript{186} Bowd, \textit{Hawkesbury Journey}, p. 90.
South-East Side of Thompson Square

The final element in the built environment of Thompson Square is the group of commercial premises at 62–74 George Street, which are included in the SHR Conservation Area listing (Figure 49). They demonstrate evolution over more than a century of Thompson Square, consisting of a range of buildings from the early to late Victorian.

The single-storey cottage on the corner of Bridge Street, on the left of the street elevation above, is the earliest element. It first appears on White’s plan of 1835 as no. 27 (Figure 51) but is omitted from Thompson’s 1827 plan.187

This building at 62 George Street is part of the oldest and most significant bakery in Windsor, which stayed in the Moses family for almost a century. Uriah Moses, a convict who gained his freedom in 1821, operated various businesses, with baking being a particular occupation, until he died in 1847. It is likely that he built the surviving cottage around 1830. His son Henry, born in 1832, was a successful baker and miller, as well as the local member of parliament from 1869 until 1880. It was Henry who demolished the western half of the old cottage and built the large two-storey addition, with commercial space below and living accommodation above. His youngest son, William, inherited the George Street bakery, known as the Hawkesbury Stores, until he transferred the business to new premises further down George Street in 1920.188

To the west of the Moses family’s store there was a well-known hotel, licensed from 1865 until 1911. The building was demolished in 1913 after a fire. A garage was built on the site in 1923, succeeded by a plumbing business in 1974. It is now occupied by three eateries (70–72 George Street).189

The final contributor to this suite of premises is the A. C. Stearn building, at 74 George Street. Stearn was a prominent businessman who extended a single-storey shop upwards in 1907 with a distinctive balcony (now demolished) and parapet, much used for decorations and fireworks during public celebrations in Thompson Square.190

Further east along George Street, just outside the study area, the old Government House (core and cellar built in 1796) survived in increasing disrepair until 1921, when, despite widespread protest, it was finally pulled down. Although a house (at 41 George Street) was built over part of the eighteenth-century foundations, there remains archaeological potential on the site.191
Figure 42: George Street south of Thompson Square during the 1870s. (Source: HCC Library.)
Figure 43: The built environment on George Street opposite Thompson Square in 1835. ‘No. 27’ is marked in the top right, just to the left of the second ‘t’ in [S]treet’. (Source: G. B. White, plan of Windsor, 1835, SRNSW, Map 5968.)
Thompson Square Reserve

Over time, there have been attempts to construct buildings within the open area of Thompson Square, where reserves had been established. The earliest was a hexagonal wooden summerhouse or pavilion at the top of the open space, close to George Street. This was originally erected in 1882 at the cost of £32.10s, more than $7,000 in modern money.\textsuperscript{192} It aroused instant controversy. Councillors talked of it as an ‘abortion’ and proposed its conversion to a public urinal, preferably at McQuade Park.\textsuperscript{193} In the 1890s, it was denounced as an ‘eye-sore’ and described as a ‘place of refuge’ for Aboriginal people when they came to town.\textsuperscript{194} Finally, the Municipal Council had it removed in 1900.\textsuperscript{195}

When the realignment of the bridge access road to its present configuration was under active consideration in 1933, the Country Women’s Association attempted to build a restroom and baby health centre in the upper reserve, near George Street, which was described as the ‘ideal site’; but this was not approved by the Municipal Council.\textsuperscript{196} In 1935, the Ladies Section of the Upper Hawkesbury Motor Boat Club sought premises in the lower reserve.\textsuperscript{197} This too was refused, although a public toilet ‘behind the boatshed’ was approved.\textsuperscript{198}

Where the ladies had failed, the gentlemen succeeded. In 1948, the Upper Hawkesbury Motor Boat Club persuaded the Council to lease them part of the lower reserve (changed by the new road alignment). In February 1949, the Club held its first meeting in its newly completed club room (Figure 52). It was demolished in the 1990s.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{club_room.png}
\caption{The club room of the Upper Hawkesbury Motor Boat Club, centre front. (Source: Postcard by Sandscene International, postmarked 1978.)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{192} \textit{Australian}, 25 March 1882, p. 2; \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette}, 26 April 1902, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{193} \textit{Australian}, 4 November 1882, p. 2; 21 April 1883, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{194} \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette}, 10 January 1891, p. 4; 3 October 1891, p. 3; 10 September 1892, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{195} \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette}, 17 February 1900, p. 3; \textit{Hawkesbury Advocate}, 9 February 1900, p. 4; 23 February 1900, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{196} \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette}, 1 September 1933, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{197} \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette}, 22 March 1935, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{198} \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette}, 9 August 1935, pp. 7–8.
2.1.9 Physical Changes to Thompson Square before 1820

Thompson Square was the commercial and administrative centre of young Windsor as it had been during the Green Hills era. The appearance and contours of Thompson Square have naturally been affected by human agency over time, as well as the repeated river flooding in the prehistoric and historic periods.

When John Howe and James McGrath were contracted in 1814 and 1815, respectively, to build new wharfage in front of Thompson Square, discussed in detail below, they were also required to alter the landscape of the open space. The steepness of the slope down to the river shown in the Evans and Slaeger views was diminished in 1814 by ‘piling the Front of Thompson’s Square for filling up the same and reducing it to a gradual slope from the Rise or Ridge on which His Majesty’s Store stands’. 199

Further alteration of the natural landscape was undertaken in 1815:

the Bank to the westward of the New Wharf and adjoining to that part of the River [upstream] where the Punt and Ferry Boats land is to be cut away sufficiently wide to admit of Carts turning at the Landing Place. 200

No views of Thompson Square are known to exist from the period immediately after Howe and McGrath completed their works, so it is not possible to accurately document the extent of these topographical modifications.

2.1.10 The Barrel Drain of 1815–16

The wharf contracts of 1814 and 1815 specified that Howe and McGrath were also to build either one ‘sewer’ in the middle of Thompson Square, or two sewers, ‘one on each side of the Square’. 201 The contractors chose to build a single central drain. They were required to make a large number of bricks, between 120,000 and 150,000, to complete the drain. The brick barrel drain constructed around 1815–16 has left substantial physical remains, which have been described and speculated on from time to time but never systematically excavated archaeologically.

In 1924, the antiquary George Reeves discussed what he called ‘the large bricked 8 x 10 conduit tunnel leading from where Thompson’s store site was [at the top of Thompson Square] to the river’. Reeves recalled that William Smith, a local man who was a boy in the 1820s, had told him many years before that he remembered ‘the long shingled structures that used to go down to as far as the river bank’. 202

Reeves dismissed the common belief that the tunnel carried waste water away from the old jail near Court Street and maintained that it had been built by Andrew Thompson to convey illicit barrels of rum to his store from river-boats. 203 This theory is patently untenable and Thompson had, in any case, been dead for four years before Howe was commissioned to build the drain. However, this is doubtless the origin of the rumoured ‘smuggler’s tunnel’ that is periodically claimed to exist within the study area.

The local historian William Freame had no doubts about such claims and, in 1929, graphically described how Thompson distilled spirits on Scotland Island, shipped the kegs to Windsor, and manhandled them ‘through a tunnel to a secret vault under Thompson Square’. 204 Freame returned to the charge in 1931 when he led a visit from the Royal Australian Historical Society to ‘a cave in Thompson Square’. He then claimed that the cave had been built by convict labour in 1816, which aligns with the timing of Howe’s contract. The opening of the ‘cave’ was alleged to be on the upper
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part of Thompson Square and, Freame claimed, it was possible to enter, but none of the fifty or so historians present ‘ventured to explore it for fear of snakes and vermin’.205

The accessibility of the drain seems to have varied over these inter-war years. In 1926, the local Gazette noted that, although the ‘inlet’ to the tunnel ‘can now hardly be detected’, ‘it conveys the impression that an ordinary person could comfortably walk into the tunnel’.206

Sections of the drain have been exposed on various occasions during roadworks and other excavations (Figure 45), and there has been confusion created by the conviction that a similar tunnel exists joining the basement of the Macquarie Arms with the river. In 1975, the archaeologist Ted Higginbotham examined and photographed what appears to be the outlet of the Howe-McGrath drain on the bank of the river, behind the wooden remains of an early wharf, and commented, without giving details, on ‘several reports of its exposure’ in the middle of Thompson Square. While elements of the drain may yet survive underground, no evidence of such was located during the extensive archaeological test excavations undertaken in 2016.

Figure 45: The exit of the 1814–15 drain on the riverbank. (Source: E. Higginbotham, ‘Historical and Archaeological Investigation of Thompson Square, Windsor, NSW’, report to Hawkesbury Shire Council, 1986, inventory no. 9.)
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2.1.11 Road System and Reserves

After Macquarie created Windsor, the existing square was substantially cleared of the huts that had been informally erected there. The dynamic for this growth and its sudden end are graphically depicted in the four views completed between 1807 and 1813. This left the central area of Thompson Square in an open state, which it basically retains today. Initially, there was no formal roadway constructed within Thompson Square, although there were well-used tracks. When Howe and McGrath completed their 1815 contract for the drain, they cut away the riverbank in the vicinity of the new wharf, so that there was a turning place for carts. This adjustment to the bank also assisted access to the new punt, inaugurated by Howe in 1814.

The Hawkesbury River at Windsor was crossed as early as 1814 by Howe’s Ferry and the ferry/punt was used for many years. Plans for a road bridge were put forward by the Honourable William Walker after the opening of the railway in 1864. The possibility of a road bridge was discussed at length in the NSW Parliament for the next few years, with those involved concerned about whether it should be a high- or low-level bridge. A design was settled on in 1872, with the bridge planned at 14.5 feet above the tidal level. Windsor Bridge was opened on 20 August 1874. It was 480 feet long and cost £10,280. The opening consisted of a great procession through the town and, in the evening, a dinner in Thompson Square.\(^\text{207}\) Between 1896 and 1897, the bridge was raised by placing new cylinders on top of the old piers and constructing a new pair of piers at the Wilberforce end. Concrete decking and kerbing replaced the timber originals circa 1920.\(^\text{208}\)

The plans of the 1820s and 1830s do not reveal any formal road system within Thompson Square, just as the images by Evans and Slaeger in the earlier period suggest a minimum of organised routes. The first map that clearly shows a cart road leading down to the river through Thompson Square is in a private subdivision plan of 1842, which depicts a road turning off George Street in front of the Macquarie Arms (then a military mess-house) and curving north across Thompson Square before descending to the west onto the riverbank where the punt docked (Figure 54). The wharf is not shown.

This road, with a tighter curve, continued to serve the Windsor Bridge when it was opened in 1874, while also serving the wharf downstream from the bridge. As the volume of traffic increased, the road effectively divided the open space of Thompson Square into two separate parts. This is clearly shown in Scrivener’s plans of Thompson Square in 1894, which reveal the road diverging to the bridge on the west and to the wharf on the north (Figure 55). The road immediately adjoining the bridge was adjusted in 1896, when the bridge was raised by more than 2 metres, but the curve of the roadway bisecting Thompson Square remained largely unchanged until the present realignment and cutting were implemented in 1935.

\(^{207}\) Steele, p. 184.
\(^{208}\) Higginbotham, p. 30.
Figure 46: The first depiction of a cart road through Thompson Square, 1842. (Source: Detail of map by J. Armstrong, ‘CXXIII Building & Cultivation Allotments comprising the Peninsular Farm adjoining the town of Windsor, to be sold at Auction on 5th Feb 1842 by Mr Laban White at Windsor’, Baker’s Lithography, King Street, Sydney 1842, privately owned.)
Figure 47: Road system to Windsor bridge and wharf in 1894. (Source: C. Scrivener, plan of Thompson Square, 1894, LPI, Road Plan R 1009.3000.)
The 1890s saw the formal creation of three reserves between George Street and the river. In conjunction with the heightening of the bridge, Reserve 24075 was proclaimed in May 1896: a long narrow strip along the riverbank on both sides of the bridge. This reserve was primarily for ‘traffic and wharfage’ but also developed a recreational aspect as the ‘River Reserve’. In 1899, the two areas of Thompson Square divided by the roadway were declared public recreation reserves: Reserve 29900 was the southern area up to George Street and Reserve 29901 was the smaller northern section opposite the Doctors House. The contrasting characters of the three reserves are vividly shown in various early photographs of the site (Figure 48 to Figure 50) and an oblique aerial view taken in 1929 (Figure 54).

Figure 48: Photograph of Thompson Square from the corner of the present George and Bridge streets, c. 1890s, showing a diagonal track west to east through Thompson Square. The existing buildings at 1–7 Thomson Square Road are shown lining Thompson Square. (Source: NSW State Library, digital order number d1_06257.)
Figure 49: A view from the north side of Windsor Bridge, showing Thompson Square c. 1890s. (Source: NSW State Library, digital order number d1_06263.)

Figure 50: Thompson Square, the wharf and Windsor Bridge around 1900. There are few plantings shown in Thompson Square. All four buildings in the centre of the photograph still survive with reasonable integrity. (Source: State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, Small Picture File.)
Figure 51: View south along Windsor Bridge facing Thompson Square. N.d. but circa 1920. (Source: Kurrajong-Comleroy Historical Society Photo Collection, Item #120118.)
Figure 52: View of Windsor Bridge and Thompson Square facing south-west from the north side of the river. N.d. but circa 1920. (Source: Kurrajong-Comleroy Historical Society Photo Collection, Item #081205.)

Figure 53: Windsor Bridge facing north-east across the river, from the northern end of Old Bridge Street. N.d. but circa 1920. (Source: Kurrajong-Comleroy Historical Society Photo Collection, Item #130506.)

Figure 54: Thompson Square in 1929, during the October flood, from the north, showing some plantings in the two reserves, 29900 (upper) and 29901 (lower). It also shows part of the river, or wharf, reserve, along the
riverbank. (Source: Aerial photograph, courtesy of Carol Roberts, from the collection of her mother, the late Iris Cammack. Photographer, Frederick Halpin Willson, RAAF, 1929.)

Figure 55: Windsor Bridge under flood, facing north-east from the southern approach. N.d. but circa 1920. (Source: Kurrajong-Comleroy Historical Society Photo Collection, Item #120119.)

There were numerous attempts to plant trees, shrubs and flowers in the three reserves. As soon as the reserves were gazetted, the Council trimmed and pruned existing trees. In 1897, ‘a few good trees’ and seats were added to the small riverside reserve.209 In 1907 new young trees in triangular guards and four new seats were installed, and by 1915 fifty more trees had been supplied by the government botanist for the reserves and McQuade Park. Palm trees, which became a recurrent feature of Thompson Square, but which never prospered there, were first introduced in 1915. Despite waterpipes being laid in both reserves within Thompson Square, all the plantings died within a year and forty-three replacement trees and shrubs were planted in the square and McQuade Park in 1916.210

By 1919, when Mrs Alsop, who lived in the Doctors House and chaired a Thompson Square Committee, suggested the creation of a Victory Garden to celebrate those who had fallen in World War I, only ten healthy trees remained. She saw the need to add more shrubs and trees, and proposed that a tablet be erected at the foot of each tree bearing a soldier’s name. Although the concept of a war memorial had some traction, with counter-proposals varying from the erection of a

209 Windsor and Richmond Gazette, 11 July 1896, p. 3; 27 February 1897, p. 3; 14 August 1897, p. 4; 4 September 1897, p. 3.
fountain and a drinking fountain with an obelisk, to a grand architectural feature, nothing was done. Instead, a new row of palms was planted in 1919 – a gift from the Hawkesbury Agricultural College – and 100 canna bulbs taken from Centennial Park in Sydney were embedded in the following year.

However, upkeep was again lacking, and in 1922 six new palms and some young Christmas trees were introduced, so that by 1923 the reserves in Thompson Square resumed ‘a nice appearance’, with flowers and trees. But two years later the reserves had reverted to ‘weeds and rank grass’, discouraging all recreational purposes after a proposal to build a bowling green was declined. The Windsor Town Improvement Association took an interest and argued for the installation of a fountain in 1929, but no substantial change happened until 1930.

The appearance of the reserves in the 1920s is captured in an aerial photograph taken in 1929 (Figure 59). When this view is compared with photographs from the late nineteenth century (Figure 94 – Figure 100), it is clear that there had been some progress over the intervening twenty years. The 1929 image shows that the principal plantings surviving in the upper reserve, No. 29900, were on the western side – a row of some eight trees facing the Macquarie Arms and Howe’s House – although there were only a few shrubs elsewhere in the square. The lower reserve, No. 29901, was, by contrast, populated with five fairly mature trees, whose foliage spread over much of the small trapezium. The narrow reserve along the river was largely unvegetated in 1929.

In 1930, the open space within the upper reserve was put to an entirely new use. From December 1930 until May 1932, this reserve adjoining George Street was leased as a mini golf course. Dan Whyte, who ran a fish shop in Windsor, paid £1 a year to run the course, which was to be planted with ornamental trees, flowers and rockeries. Public access to the reserve was to be maintained. The mayor opened the course, which had the grandiose name of Riverview Golf Links. It was enthusiastically described as having ‘turf-like greens and fascinating hazards’. Powerful electric lights were installed to permit play after dark, but the weather was not kind and patronage was limited; so Whyte was forgiven his rent and the course was temporarily closed in mid-1931. By October 1931 the upper reserve had reverted to ‘wilderness’, yet Whyte bounced back and reopened the course in November on Fridays and weekends.

In January 1932, the Council decided that the lights were to be removed from the golf course and transferred to the bowling green in McQuade Park for night play there. Re-erection of the lighting was completed by 14 March 1932. By May 1932, the golf course had finally closed after little more than a year of operation and Thompson Square was quickly castigated as ‘a disgrace’ again.

Palm trees seemed to be the default planting choice at the time, so the Council agreed that the twelve palm trees should all planted in the square, using the labour of unemployed ex-servicemen. The palms soon perished, but members of the community still hankered after them. In 1935, the Country Women’s Association, which had hoped to build a baby health centre on the site of the golf course, asked the Council to plant more palms along the border of the upper reserve, along with some shrubs and beds of pigface (the native flower *Carpobrotus glaucescens*). The Parks Committee approved some plantings, but the details are not known.

This configuration of Thompson Square continued until 1935 when, after lengthy debate within the community and government, a new approach road to the bridge was established from George Street, which created the present deep cutting running north-west from the extension of Bridge Street. The new road cutting intersected the Victorian roadway which lay on the opposing diagonal. In a plan
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surveyed in 1946, the parts of the earlier diagonal roadway that were now closed and added to the reserves No. 29900 and No. 29901 are coloured blue (Figure 56). The new configuration is also shown in several photographs (Figure 57 to Figure 59). The northern area was redefined as Reserve No. 74215 in 1951.

The Windsor Town Improvement Association also took an initiative to improve Thompson Square, with the inclusion of mown grass and young trees. To this end, subscribers raised £7 12s. 6d. by November 1935. Two flowerbeds, both 4-feet wide, were approved along George Street, but suggestions for terracing in the upper reserve were dropped because of the expense, and a similar fate met the proposal for a new summerhouse. Finally, in 1936, three seats were installed, embedded in concrete, and two more in the river reserve, along with a children’s playground with sandpits and a slippery dip. A privet hedge was also planted by a private individual along the George Street frontage in the same year.220 The Town Improvement Association disbanded in 1936 and handed over to the Council all responsibility for the maintenance of Thompson Square.

Interest in Thompson Square plantings continued for a short time. Some of the palms survived into 1937 and the Council then planted twenty-five new pine trees and some Christmas bush. Three weeks later, the Methodist minister, W. T. Dyer, donated thirty rose cuttings. Although some attempts at redesigning the layout of the reserves were made by the local Japanese philanthropist Tom Mina, nothing much seems to have been achieved.221

Little happened in Thompson Square during World War II, and a letter to the local press in 1946 complained that Windsor was now ‘a very shabby town’ and that the reserve contained only ‘a litter of papers and unhappy-looking trees’. The aggrieved former resident followed up her letter with a gift of some young jacaranda trees which were gratefully accepted.222 The lower reserve lost much of its remaining tree cover in 1948, when the area was leased to the Upper Hawkesbury Motor Boat Club to build a clubhouse, which opened early in 1949.223 In the following year, 1950, the upper reserve was equipped with two concrete tables with draughtboards and two moveable seats.224
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Figure 56: The present road alignment within Thompson Square, showing in blue the previous diagonal going south-west to north-east. (Source: C. Seccombe, plan of Main Road 182, 1946, LPI, road plan, R.23477.1603.)
Figure 57: Thompson Square in 1978, showing the Upper Hawkesbury Motor Boat Club-house in the lower centre, in the middle of Reserve no. 29901. (Source: Postcard in private ownership.)

Figure 58: View looking south from Windsor Bridge in 1934, showing east to west roadway through Thompson Square. (Source: State Library of NSW, digital order number d1_01880.)
Figure 59: View looking north from Thompson Square, showing east to west roadway through Thompson Square down to Windsor Bridge, 1934. (Source: State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, Small Picture File, digital order number d1_01879.)
2.1.12 Wharfage

Wharfage was an important consideration at Thompson Square from the beginning of settlement in 1795. The wharf built by February 1795 was destroyed in the 1799 flood and its replacement suffered a similar fate either in 1800–1801 or in the two floods of 1806. No jetty is shown in any of the Evans watercolours between 1807 and 1811. The only landing facility was on the river verge at that time.

A critical reason for the development of Thompson Square was the natural configuration of the riverbank at this point. Small boats could be pulled up just beyond the waterline, as vividly shown in Slaeger’s 1812–13 etching (Figure 62 and Figure 62). This was also the area where, on government land adjacent to Andrew Thompson’s lease, a schooner named Governor Bligh was built and launched for Thompson in 1807.
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Figure 61: P. Slaeger, ‘A View of Part of the Town of Windsor’. (Source: Published by West, Sydney, 1813.)

Figure 62: Beaching facilities for small boats in front of Thompson Square in 1812–13. (Source: Detail from Slaeger 1813, above.)
In August 1814, Governor Macquarie commissioned the local entrepreneurs, John Howe and James McGrath, to construct a new wharf that was 50 feet in length, projecting 18 feet into the river and supported by piles ‘16 to 18 inches thick’. Part payment was made in November but a further contract was issued in April 1815, which commissioned a larger wharf, 3 feet higher than the one largely completed. Wharves were sometimes constructed at different levels to accommodate tidal changes or minor flooding. In June 1815, the Sydney Gazette described the first Howe wharf as projecting over 20 feet into the river, 6 feet high and 65 feet in length.227

The detailed contracts for both wharves survive among the Howe family papers. In 1815, it was specified that the new ‘Wharf or Platform’:

shall extend the width of the square in a line with the present Jetty or Wharf but three feet higher, the said Wharf to be constructed to have two Rows of Piles without [i.e., outside] the present Platform, and one Row behind the Whole to be well secured with Land Tyes and Caps and planked with sound two inch Planks, and not more than six inches wide to be spiked with five inch spikes.228

The Gazette claimed in June that the width of the reconstructed wharf would be 33 feet and that the length was to be 276 feet, more than four times the length of the 1814–15 wharf.229

Part payment was made to McGrath for ‘enlarging’ the wharf in November 1815230 but this new wharf was largely destroyed by a high flood on 2 June 1816. Early in July, a report to the Governor concluded pessimistically that ‘all the planking is carried away and there is no part of the wharf that can be built on again’.231

The wreckage of this wharf was speculatively recreated in an etching made in 1817 (Figure 63).

In November 1816, Francis Greenway, the Acting Colonial Architect, prepared plans for ‘repairing and completing’ the wharf ‘in a solid and durable manner’. Howe and McGrath were given eight months to complete this work but there was another great flood in February 1817, followed by another in February 1819. The expensive wharf works, costing in all over £1,000, were not finalised until early in 1820.232

Although there is no predictability about Hawkesbury floods, there has been an observed pattern of groups of severe floods separated by a longish gap. After three major floods between 1816 and 1819, there were no other floods exceeding 6.4 metres until 1857.233 So, it is likely that the wharf finally completed to Greenway’s design in 1820 had an easier life than its predecessors. It may be the footprint of Greenway’s wharf that is drawn both by White in 1835 and Galloway in 1841.

The location of the wharf in 1835 is shown on the north-east side of Thompson Square in White’s plan, well to the east of the punt mooring, which is also depicted (Figure 64). White, unlike Galloway, seems to show six piers projecting into the river just beyond the decking of the wharf, likely to have been fender piles for protecting the structure and for tying off, perhaps remnants of one of the three rows of piles specified in the 1815 contract.234
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Figure 63: The ruins of the wharf damaged by the 1816 flood. (Source: ‘A View of Hawkesbury and the Blue Mountains’, etched by W. Preston in 1817 from a watercolour by J. Wallis dated 1815 which does not show a wharf. Courtesy of St Andrew’s College.)
Figure 64: Greenway’s wharf surveyed in 1835. (Source: G.B. White, plan of Windsor, 1835, SRNSW, Map 5968.)
The increasing use of the river by steamships for pleasure as well as commerce put pressure on Windsor Wharf and, in 1855, a temporary additional wharf was erected at the expense of the steamship companies.  

The extension of the railway system to Windsor in 1864 stimulated business at the wharf, as small boats brought farm produce upriver for transfer to Sydney by rail. The great floods from 1857 to 1879 were disruptive but they scoured the river, clearing away accumulated siltation and deepening passages. One of the river captains later recalled that, in the late 1860s, except during actual flood episodes:

one could see, any Tuesday morning, quite a fleet – twenty or more in number – of craft of all sizes lying alongside Windsor wharf, laden with maize, poultry, watermelons, etc. in galore.

G. C. Johnson, who had been a young journalist in Windsor in the 1860s, later offered a vivid impression of the bustling commercial scene in Thompson Square at that time:

the loading and unloading; the perspiring horses and the cracking of whips, as the heavily-laden drays were hauled up the Punt Hill [the curving road through the square]; the chaffing and chiacking of the boatmen … These were gay old times, and one cannot easily forget the picturesque scenes at the wharf on the arrival of the river fleet.

The building of the bridge over the Hawkesbury in 1874 created more business for the wharf, since the heavy timbers to be used in construction were brought in by boat, but modifications to the wharf itself were necessary given the increased traffic flows through Thompson Square. Very soon the wharf was rebuilt slightly upstream from Greenway’s construction, closer to the bridge.

The construction of the bridge altered not only the road approach but also the alignment of the riverbank, so that the new wharf came to occupy a small promontory, with its own dedicated approach road, as shown in Scrivener’s survey plan of 1894 (Figure 65). The raising of the bridge in 1896–7 further accentuated the changed littoral adjacent to the wharf.

235 Sydney Morning Herald, 6 February 1855, p. 5.
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237 Quoted in Purtell, p. 48.
Figure 65: The wharf surveyed in 1894. (Source: C. Scrivener, plan of Thompson Square, 1894, LPI, Road Plan, R 1009.3000.)
River trade, however, sharply diminished between 1874 and 1896. Siltation of the river after 1880, when the series of major floods ceased for a decade, created sandbanks which made it difficult even for small boats to reach Windsor Wharf. Deeper-draught vessels rarely ventured beyond the wharf at Sackville. When, moreover, the railhead at Brooklyn opened in 1887, most farmers found it more convenient to send their produce to the Sydney markets than to try to reach Windsor.

Views of the wharf in the late Victorian and Edwardian period show a much quieter environment (Figure 66 to Figure 69). Although Thompson Square remained a significant civic, commercial, medical and educational centre, Windsor ceased to be a meaningful river port by the early twentieth century.238

In 1934, the wharf was renovated and a new cutting was made from the bridge approach road across Terrace Road to provide more convenient vehicular access to the wharf.239 In the late twentieth century, the wharf was again rebuilt and relocated downstream (Figure 70).

Figure 66: The wharf, on the left, and the low-level bridge in 1888. (Source: State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, bcp_04405r.)

238 Purtell, pp. 49–51.
239 Windsor and Richmond Gazette, 23 February 1934, p. 4.
Figure 67: The wharf and Windsor Bridge in 1883. (Source: W. Andrews, watercolour, December 1883, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, SV1B/Wind/7, c1528435r.)

Figure 68: The wharf and Windsor Bridge soon after the raising of the bridge in 1896–97. (Source: State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, Small Picture File.)
Figure 69: Windsor Wharf in the early twentieth century. (Source: State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, Small Picture File.)

Figure 70: Windsor Wharf on a modern postcard, c. 2000, showing the remnant of the former wharf to the west and between the current jetty and bridge. (Source: Postcard, c. 2000.)
2.1.13 The Punt: 1814 to 1874

A regular punt service across the Hawkesbury was started by John Howe in 1814, a short distance upstream from the landing place. The punt master initially occupied a small cottage between the garden of the Doctors House (1–3 Thompson Square Road) and the river, as shown in Thompson's 1827 map (Figure 75) and White's 1835 plan (Figure 73). By 1835, however, the punt master’s house had been substantially enlarged (Figure 74). Its site is within the study area; however, no evidence of it was located during the 2016 archaeological testing programme.
Figure 72: Plan showing the punt over the Hawkesbury River, and the punt master’s cottage before (1827) and after (1835) extension. (Source: J. Thompson, plan of Windsor, 1827, SRNSW, Map SZ 526.)
Figure 73: The punt master’s cottage before (1827) and after its apparent (1835) extension is the house nearest the river and within the study area. (Source: G. B. White, plan of Windsor, 1835, SRNSW, Map 5968.)
The punt, which ran intermittently for sixty years from 1814, crossed the Hawkesbury in a north-north-west direction and reached the inland bank of the Hawkesbury just upstream of the bridge, which replaced it in 1874 (Figure 72). A surviving photograph, taken about 1870, shows the punt transporting horse-drawn vehicles and people (Figure 75).

Although there was a house for the punt master on the Windsor side of the river, there was an ongoing relationship between him and the Squatters Arms on the opposing bank and, for a while, the lessee of the Squatters Arms and its 15-acre farm was also the punt master. As J. C. L. Fitzgerald, the newspaper editor, noted:

*It frequently happened that something went wrong with the punt – a fresh [breeze] would cause it to overturn, or it would get stuck in the mud at low tide, and then team after team would line the two roads [Wilberforce Road and Freemans Reach Road] for a considerable distance. This, of course, brought grist to the mill of Tom Ryan [the licensee of the Squatters Arms in the mid-nineteenth century] … During Tom Ryan’s time his brother, John, had charge of the punt.*

When the bridge over the Hawkesbury was opened on 20 August 1874, the redundant punt was symbolically moored out in the river just downstream. When the level of the bridge was raised in 1896, the punt had to be brought briefly back into service before the temporary bridge was ready for use.
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2.1.14 Windsor Bridge

For the first twenty years of European settlement in the Windsor area, the crossing of the Hawkesbury River occurred only infrequently. A small population and no settlement on the western side meant that there was initially little motivation to cross the river. Over the ensuing decades, expansion of the settlement, particularly after Governor Macquarie’s approval of the township of Windsor and the founding of the town of Wilberforce on the northern side of the river in 1810, led to increasing cross-river traffic. A permanent crossing was established in 1814 with the commencement of Howe’s Ferry and this service operated under various ownerships for the next sixty years.

A Government Bridge

During the 1840s and early 1850s in NSW, government buildings and public works were the responsibility of the Colonial Architect’s Office and the Colonial Public Works department under the Colonial Engineer. However, subsequent to the establishment of democratic self-government in 1855 and the state’s population explosion following the discovery of gold (coinciding with wars and famines in Europe), the demand for public works exceeded the capacity of the Colonial Architect’s Office and a new government agency, the Public Works Department (PWD), was established in 1859. There was, naturally, an intention to minimise demands upon the public purse and, typically, the government encouraged private enterprise to provide items of infrastructure such as bridges, except on a small number of designated government roads. The first Pyrmont Bridge, in 1858, and Glebe Island Bridge, in 1860, for example, were built by private companies and their crossing required payment of a toll. In 1857, the Richmond Bridge Company was formed to replace the existing ferry over the Hawkesbury River at North Richmond, and a wooden bridge was built across the river in 1860. It was designed and its construction supervised by E. O. Moriarty, the company’s Engineer-in-Chief (also, at that time, Engineer-in-Chief for harbours and river navigation in the NSW Department of Works).

At Windsor, the road to Sydney was one of the ‘public roads’ of the colony and was administered by a Road Trust. To enter Windsor, a bridge over South Creek was necessary and there had been various structures since the 1820s. In the late 1850s, as the bridge at Richmond was nearing
completion, there were several proposals for the formation of a similar company to erect a bridge at Windsor but, as reported in 1864:

A public meeting, convened by a requisition signed by a number of the leading inhabitants of Windsor, and advertised in Saturday's Herald, took place at the School of Arts on the afternoon of Monday last, for the purpose of considering the propriety of petitioning the Government and Legislature to erect a bridge across the Hawkesbury at Windsor. There was a large attendance, principally of the residents of Wilberforce ... At North Richmond, a most excellent bridge had been erected by a company but it was well known that that company had great difficulties to contend with – that in fact some three or four thousand pounds had been frittered away in its erection at the commencement, and that it had cost nearly double what its projectors originally intended. Up to the present time the proprietors had not received any return, but he was glad to learn that they were now in a fair way of getting interest for their money. The present meeting they would observe had been called to consider the propriety of petitioning the Government to erect a bridge. It would, therefore, be for them to determine whether they would do so or not. In this opinion there would be insurmountable difficulties, in the present depressed state of the district, in the way of getting up any company, and great delay would arise in making the attempt. As to the Government, it seemed they had erected bridges in other parts of the colony – at the Paterson, for instance where they were much less required than at Windsor.243

By October 1864, a petition had been presented to the NSW Parliament by the local Member of the Legislative Assembly, Mr Piddington, and the Under-Secretary for Public Works provided the following reply:

Department of Public Works, Sydney, 8th October, 1361.

Sir,

In reference to the petition presented by you and Mr. Cunneen, from certain of the inhabitants of Windsor and neighbourhood, praying that a bridge may be erected over the Hawkesbury, at Windsor, I am directed by the Secretary for Public Works to Inform you that the Engineer-in-chief for Harbours and Rivers has been instructed to have a survey and soundings made of the river at once, and to submit estimates for an iron and wooden bridge.

2. I am to add that if, when these estimates are received, the proposal to erect the bridge meets with the approval of the Government, a sum of money will be placed on the Additional Estimates for 1865, for its construction.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

(Signed) Gerald Halligan, for the Under-Secretary.244

However, successive governments postponed the budget allocation and it was not until 1871 that the funding was finally provided. Moriarty, Engineer-in-Chief for Harbours and River Navigation, advised that there were:

two sites near the town on either of which the bridge might be erected. Mr. Moriarty said that if the bridge were erected at the site of the present ferry, it would be necessary, on account of the rocky nature of the locale, to construct the bridge of wrought iron piles; but the lower site would only necessitate the use of materials used on ordinary wooden bridges.

Some discussion ensued, during which the Engineer-in-Chief stated that the Richmond Bridge cost about £8000; and he had no doubt that a bridge of a similar kind could be constructed at Windsor for £7000. The MINISTER instructed the Engineer-in-Chief to draw up the plans and specifications of both descriptions of bridges, and of the two sites referred to.245
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The new bridge opened in 1874 – a timber beam bridge standing on wrought-iron piles. The design was by the Engineer for Roads, W. C. Bennett, and construction was by contractors Messrs Turnbull and Dixon.

The bridge, or rather the superstructure, is supported by ten iron cylindrical piers, each three feet six inches in diameter, filled with concrete and twenty feet apart, held together with diagonal bracing of channel iron. Its length, exclusive of approaches, is 455 feet and the breadth 20 feet clear. The deck is ironbark planking and the handrail of 1 3/4 inch gaspipe, so erected that each section can be disconnected and let down longitudinally, protecting it from floating debris in time of flood. The operations in connection with the building were commenced about two years and a half ago, and the cost, it is understood, is about £10,000 with the approaches.246

Ten pairs of cylindrical iron piers of 3 feet 6 inches in diameter, filled with cement, were placed 20 feet apart and sunk into bedrock. The iron superstructure was diagonally braced and the 455-foot length was decked with 5-inch ironbark planking. The handrail was skilfully designed so that it could be let down outside the decking to protect the bridge from debris swept down by floods.247

Work was delayed by three floods of over 8 metres and forty lesser floods, but the official opening on 20 August 1874 was ‘the greatest gala day’ ever witnessed by the Sydney Morning Herald correspondent. In fact, the opening had been pre-empted on 10 July by the need to bury a Wilberforce man at St Matthew’s in Windsor while the punt was out of order. However, the procession with two bands across the bridge, the triumphal arch declaring ‘WELCOME’, the public holiday for everyone in the town and the bullock roasted whole in Thompson Square made Thursday 20 August 1874 ‘a red-letter day in our history’ (Figure 79).248

After the opening of the railway to Richmond via Windsor in 1864, Windsor changed from a place where local farmers loaded produce onto boats and ships (for transport to Sydney) to a place to which farmers brought their produce by boat and loaded it onto trains. There was a substantial population in the district by this time and, with ready access to Sydney suppliers, Windsor quickly became the primary commercial and administrative centre in the north-west.

There had been some debate regarding the height of the bridge and the regular flooding of the Hawkesbury River. The Minister for Works, the Honourable John Sutherland, in his speech at the opening, stated:

the facts connected with its erection, and pointed out why a low-level bridge was erected in place of a high-level structure. While the former cost but £10,000, the latter would have cost upwards of £60,000. In regard to levying of tolls, he promised that there would be no charge made for foot passengers, and that the scale of charges for animals and vehicles would be as low as that of any other bridge in the colony ... and would, he thought, bear favourable comparison with the charges levied on the bridge higher up.249

The materials and design of the bridge were a reflection of government policy. In 1861, the government had decreed that local materials (stone, brick and timber) must be used in preference to wrought iron for public works, as capital expenditure on imported wrought-iron structures represented a significant burden to government budgets. This directive was largely aimed at John Whitton, Engineer-in-Chief for the railways. Nonetheless, Whitton had convinced the government to finance large wrought-iron bridges at Menangle (1863) and Penrith (1867) for the railway lines west and south, for which the combined completed cost was £194,562 – an enormous sum for the colonial government. Consequently, road bridges in NSW, with slower, lighter traffic, were dominated by cheaper construction in timber.
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In most circumstances, timber beam bridges offered the cheapest and quickest solution, with simple construction details using local hardwoods. Thousands of these bridges were built, some as independent structures and some as approach spans to major bridges. Where larger spans were needed, laminated timber arches were the usual solution, although these did not have a long service life (a three-span timber laminated arch bridge over South Creek on the eastern side of Windsor only lasted from 1853 to 1881). By the mid-1870s, the PWD engineers were experimenting with timber truss bridges and, by the 1880s, engineers John MacDonald and Percy Allan had developed well-engineered timber truss bridges that were economical to erect and maintain, which became the mainstay of bridging in NSW until the 1920s.

The provision of a bridge across the Hawkesbury at Windsor greatly improved the position of those who lived on the farms around Wilberforce and Ebenezer, providing them with ready access to Windsor railway station and its direct links to Parramatta and Sydney. The bridge also joined the Windsor road system to the Putty Road, leading to the Hunter, where many Hawkesbury families had settled since the early nineteenth century and which was developing industrial importance through the coal industry. In contrast, the other road bridge across the Upper Hawkesbury which was opened at North Richmond in 1860, and replaced by the present bridge in 1904, gave access mainly to Kurrajong and Bells Line of Road, which remained primarily a stock route for its first century and more.

The road curving through Thompson Square had a sharp bend onto the new bridge but the exit on the inland side was straight until it turned right into Wilberforce Road.

**A Higher Level**

A low-level bridge is usually placed at a certain height above normal water level, sufficient that the bridge is available for traffic in times of small floods, yet low enough to be submerged to a sufficient depth to allow drift timber to pass safely over in a major flood. The original Windsor Bridge was placed at 4.3 metres (14.5 feet) high above the tidal level; at Windsor, floods up to 10.8 metres (35 feet) above normal water level are relatively common and the flood of 1867 reached 20.6 metres (67
feet) above normal tide level. Consequently, it was relatively common for the Windsor Bridge to be inundated by the many small floods that affected the Hawkesbury River, as well as the larger ones. By the mid-1890s, with the bridge approaching two decades in service and requiring substantial maintenance, the decision was made to raise the deck level of the bridge, to reduce the number of occasions that it was impassable owing to flooding.

The works to raise the bridge were approved in June 1895 and completed in mid-1897 by Mr James McCall. The construction of the temporary bridge alongside the existing bridge, to carry traffic during works, was commenced on 9 September 1896. The temporary bridge was 460 feet long and was completed and opened for traffic in six weeks. The permanent bridge was raised by 2.5 metres (8 feet), by placing iron cylinders on top of the old ones; all corbels and girders were refitted and those that were unfit to be used again were replaced by new ones. The works also required modifications to the abutments, by inserting concrete ‘strips’ to stabilise the compacted earth on the new elevated approach alignment. At its new height, the bridge was longer by 6.1 metres (20 feet), with a new timber pier and abutment at the Wilberforce end. A new 10-centimetre (4-inch) tallowwood deck was laid diagonally, with new ironbark kerb logs and new iron handrails. The work was supervised by McCall, who also constructed a temporary bridge alongside it. The approach roads were improved and readjusted and the higher-level bridge was opened in April 1897.

---
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Figure 77: The alignment of Windsor Bridge, opened in 1874. (Source: G. Matcham Pitt, plan of Freemans Reach Road, 1878, LPI, R 1533.1603 sheet 1.)
New Deck; New Technology

By the end of World War 1, some two decades after its reconstruction in 1895, the Windsor Bridge was again in need of extensive renovation. Percy Allan, recently appointed as Chief Engineer, National and Local Government Works, determined that the economical solution was to construct a bridge on the existing piers, utilising the relatively new technology of reinforced concrete. A concrete slab and girder bridge was proposed, of similar profile to the existing timber bridge with respect to floodwaters, but which would be more durable.

Reinforced concrete owes its origins to the intuitive work of a number of French and English builders in the mid-nineteenth century, who used iron rods to stiffen monolithic concrete constructions. In the 1850s, Joseph Monier began using wire mesh in concrete to create a better flowerpot and developed the technique to use metal wire grids in concrete for columns and girders. He was granted a patent in 1873 for the construction of bridges and footbridges made of iron-reinforced cement and, in 1875, he built the world’s first reinforced concrete bridge – a four-beam footbridge of 13.8 metre span and 4.25 metre width at the Castle of Chazelet in France.

This work was quickly understood to have important implications for the construction industry and, in 1879, German engineer G. A. Wayss purchased Monier’s patents and added a scientific dimension to the manufacture of reinforced concrete over the next decade. The engineering contractors Wayss, Frietag and Schuster built the first commercial reinforced concrete bridges in Europe: the Monierbrau footbridge with a 40-metre span in Bremen, Germany; and the Wildegg...
Bridge in Switzerland, spanning 37 metres. It is reported that they had built 320 concrete arch bridges by 1891.253

In Australia, W. J. Baltzer, a German engineer in the Sewerage Branch of the NSW PWD, became aware of this emerging technology through his brother in Germany. In 1890, he travelled to Germany to gather information but, on his return, was unsuccessful in piquing the interest of the department. Instead, he joined with several businessmen to form a company, Carter Gummow & Co, to obtain licences from Wayss to use the technology in Australia. Notably, Baltzer translated the existing German manuals on the engineering of reinforced concrete, allowing other engineers to grasp the underlying physics of the material, and the firm was subsequently awarded a contract to construct two sewerage aqueducts at Annandale (Whites Creek Aqueduct and Johnsons Creek Aqueduct, both still in service). Subject to potentially punishing contractual guarantees, the work was completed in 1897 and was universally considered a success. It initiated a long period of experimentation in the use of reinforced concrete for a wide range of applications.

By 1899, the first Monier concrete arch bridges had been built in NSW and Victoria (Monash & Anderson, the engineering consultancy of John Monash in Victoria, purchased the rights to use the Monier patents in Victoria and South Australia), and Monier pipes had been developed to a high degree. A reinforced concrete wall was erected at Parramatta Gaol in 1899 and, from 1902, pre-cast concrete panels on pre-cast concrete trestles were being erected as rat-proof seawalls around the waterfrontages of Sydney. In 1904, a new road bridge across the Hawkesbury River at Richmond was erected which used Monier reinforced concrete arches.

The first concrete beam bridge built in NSW was a small bridge over Muddy Creek on the Princes Highway at Rockdale, constructed in 1907, and other beam bridges were erected over American Creek near Figtree in 1914 and Throsby Creek, Wickham, and Shark Creek, Maclean, in 1916. The oldest extant concrete slab bridges in NSW are over Muttama Creek at Cootamundra (RTA Bridge No. 6438) and Surveyors Creek at Walcha (RTA Bridge No. 3485), both built in 1914.254

Concrete slab bridges, in this era, were universally cast in place, with timber formwork erected to form the mould around the concrete. The deck slab and the beams below the deck were formed as a single casting, allowing maximum structural capacity to be achieved in a single stage of work. For the Windsor Bridge, however, a new, unique approach was adopted. One criterion for the upgrade of the Windsor Bridge was that it must remain open to traffic throughout the replacement process. In 1895, this was achieved by the use of a temporary bridge but, for unknown reasons, a temporary bridge was not erected in 1920. Instead, the existing bridge was upgraded in two longitudinal half sections, with half the bridge remaining open while the other half was reconstructed. The logistics of this requirement meant that formwork construction was constrained and, for this reason, the concrete structural beams were individually cast in moulds on the riverbank adjacent to the bridge and lifted into place by crane when ready. The deck was then cast in place as a flat slab lying on the beams between piers.

The construction of the reinforced concrete elements of the Windsor Bridge was undertaken by the State Monier Pipe and Reinforced Concrete Works, a state government enterprise formed in 1915 when the NSW Government purchased the operations and intellectual property of Carter Gummow & Co. The bridge extended to 144 metres (468 feet) in length, with an additional (reinforced concrete) pier at the Wilberforce end, and 6.2 metres (20 feet) between kerbs. Its final height was 6.8 metres (22 feet) above normal river level (Figure 79).
2.1.15 Bridge Street

Bridge Street was created in 1814, soon after the completion of the new bridge over South Creek (Figure 80) changed the alignment of the road entrance to the town from Sydney and Parramatta. The same contractors, Howe and McGrath, completed the construction of both the South Creek Bridge and the new Bridge Street.\textsuperscript{255} South Creek was crossed by two bridges by the mid-nineteenth century – a low timber trestle pedestrian bridge and a higher laminated-timber arch bridge, trafficable by carts (Figure 84).

Bridge Street, however, was a very short thoroughfare, ending at present-day George Street, and there was no clearly defined road through early Thompson Square. Off Bridge Street itself, Court Street, leading to the Greenway courthouse, went off to the north-east, while Macquarie Street ran to the south-west. Until the 1850s and the opening up of the old Government Domain, George Street did not extend across Bridge Street to the north-east.

Just above the corner of Bridge and Court streets, quite close to Howe’s Bridge, new military barracks were built in 1817–18, replacing the old site which had been privatised in 1811. The new barracks were enlarged in the 1830s and a separate guardhouse first appears on a plan in 1835 (Figure 82).

\textsuperscript{255} Bowd, \textit{Macquarie Country}, pp. 59–60; Col. Sec. Correspondence, SRNSW, Reel 6044, 4/1730 pp.360-361.
Figure 80: 1842 map showing Thompson Square in relation to South Creek. (Source: Map by J. Armstrong, ‘CXXIII Building & Cultivation Allotments comprising the Peninsular Farm adjoining the town of Windsor, to be sold at Auction on 5th Feb 1842 by Mr Laban White at Windsor’, Sydney 1842, privately owned.)
Figure 81: The South Creek bridges in the 1850s. (Source: Drawn by F. C. Terry in 1853 and published in 1855 in his Landscape Scenery Illustrating Sydney, Sands & Kenny, Sydney, 1855, plate 29.)
Figure 82: The military barracks complex in Bridge Street, marked ‘Ordinance’. The guardhouse is the small rectangular building lining Court Street. (Source. G.B. White, map of Windsor, 1835, SRNSW, Map 5968.)
The military withdrew from Windsor in the 1840s and the barracks were occupied by police from the 1860s until 1924. The guardhouse located at the Bridge Street entrance had been used partly as a police lock-up and was in some measure rebuilt. Based on photographic evidence, the building appears to have been demolished some time before 1879.

A later photograph, looking south-east down Bridge Street towards the South Creek Bridge around 1890, clearly shows the gateway to the present study area (Figure 83).

The road that Howe had made in 1814 had been widened by 1890, with stone kerbing and ample footpaths. The two girls in pinafores seen in Figure 83 are playing hopscotch in the middle of Bridge Street (called Sydney Road in the photograph) halfway between Macquarie and George streets. On their left is the wooden fencing of the Anglican schoolhouse and, beyond that, the walled military barracks, now the police station; the old guardhouse has disappeared.

The complex foundations of the guardhouse, measuring 3 x 12 metres, were archaeologically excavated by Kate Holmes and the University of Sydney in 1976–7 and are preserved on the footpath adjacent to the southern limit of the study area (Figure 84 and Figure 85).
Figure 84: Plan of the guardhouse to the military barracks in Bridge Street excavated in 1976–77. (Source: K. Holmes, *Windsor Barracks: The Guardhouse*, Australian Society for Historical Archaeology, Occasional Paper 6, University of Sydney, 1979, plan 3, p. 15.)

Figure 85: The foundations of the guardhouse exposed after excavation in December 1976. (Source: K. Holmes, *Windsor Barracks: The Guardhouse*, Australian Society for Historical Archaeology, Occasional Paper 6, University of Sydney, 1979, plate 2, p. 12.)
2.1.16 The Study Area North of the Hawkesbury River

On the inland side of the river, the area includes the bridge itself and sections of both Wilberforce Road and Freemans Reach Road, as well as the southern part of portion 69 in Wilberforce parish, known as Whittons Farm. The study area stops short of the present house called Bridgeview (27 Wilberforce Road) but includes part of the site of its predecessor, the Squatters Arms Inn. An 1878 plan of the area is shown in Figure 86.

It was on the eastern side of portion 69 that George William Evans sat in 1807, in 1809 and again in 1811 to prepare his watercolours of Green Hills across the river (Figure 88). The fence on the artist’s left is the boundary between two eighteenth-century 30-acre farms named after their original grantees, Edward Whitton and William Cuckow, though neither Whitton nor Cuckow was still there when Evans settled down to sketch. All the documented early buildings on Cuckow Farm were between Wilberforce Road and the river, so it is likely that Evans was sitting on the Windsor side of the road.

Turf Farming

The upper Hawkesbury Valley has dominated the commercial production of turf for many years. By the early twentieth century, it was producing half the turf in NSW and a quarter of all Australian turf. The study area north of the river and surrounds was used for turf farming and market gardens from the 1920s, with turf farming ceasing operations only in early 2016.

The Hawkesbury turf farming industry started in the 1920s with Gordon Johnston and Allan Melville hand-cutting kikuyu with axe and spade on former pasture land near Cattai and Clarendon. After the intermission of World War II, couch grass was sown, initially near Pitt Town, and cut by the Brown and Courtney families. Since turf did not suffer terminal damage from floodwater, which deeply affected vegetable and maize growers, turf farming was an attractive alternative for local farmers, especially in a period when dairying was in decline and refrigerated vegetables were increasingly being trucked into Sydney from further afield.

Various forms of mechanisation were introduced in the late 1950s and 1960s and the turf industry grew rapidly at various places along the floodplain, including Sackville and Cornwallis. Freemans Reach, on the inland side of the river, did not become dominant until the 1970s, initially under the Miller family.

The year 1970 was a critical turning point when the NSW Government agreed to classify turf farming in the Hawkesbury as agriculture. Previously turf farms had been subject to land tax as an extractive industry. Since turf farming in the rest of the state did not enjoy this reclassification until 1993, the Hawkesbury industry had an advantage for a quarter of a century.

The Turf Growers Association of New South Wales was inaugurated at a meeting held at the Hawkesbury Agricultural College at Richmond in 1985 and Hawkesbury growers, including John Tebbutt, Terry Allen and Greg Miller, remained very influential on its committee. The founding of the Association coincided with a rapid expansion of turf farms along Freemans Reach.

Buffalo grass, in various forms, was introduced on a commercial scale in the 1990s and paspalum in the 2000s. Because the irrigated water from the tidal Hawkesbury was saline, salt-resistant turfs were developed and improved. A leader in this movement was Greg Miller, who brought Sea Isle
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grass (a paspalum) from America. In 2006, he was Young Farmer of the Year in the state and in 2007 Miller’s Turf at Wilberforce was Hawkesbury Business of the Year.268

The turf industry along the Hawkesbury quite close to Windsor occupies some 1500 hectares and comprises around sixty farming companies with numerous employees, supplying rolls of turf to a wide range of private gardens, parks, sporting fields and golf courses.

Figure 86: The study area north of the Hawkesbury, overlaid on a plan of portion 69. The ‘house’ shown, the former Squatters Arms Inn, was demolished in 1914. The study area was overlaid in red outline by Tom Sapienza, 2016. (Source. G. Matcham Pitt, 1878, LPI, Crown Plan R 1533.1603.)
Edward Whitton was a convicted highway robber who had been transported to NSW in 1788. He lived with an Irish convict woman, Anne Slater and, in December 1794, received a grant of 30 acres, henceforth known as Whittons Farm. By 1801, Edward and Anne and their three children had cleared all but 5 acres, had 20 acres under wheat and maize, and owned ten pigs. Edward died in 1802. Anne inherited the farm, and quickly remarried but died in 1806. When Evans was making his recurrent visits to the district, the property was run by Anne’s second husband, John Norman, a local constable, and his new wife, Margaret McCarthy. The owner was, however, the daughter of Edward and Anne, Mary Whitton, born in 1796 or 1797. She had been placed in the Parramatta orphan asylum after her mother’s death but, in 1811, she married Richard Barnes and soon reclaimed her...
property. In 1816, Barnes divided the 30 acres into two equal parts — long narrow strips divided by Freemans Reach Road for the most part — and sold the western 15 acres to Thomas Clarkson.269

The western half of Whitton’s Farm passed from Clarkson to Robert Smith, who developed the cottage as a public house. Smith ran two other inns in Windsor town, became severely indebted and, in 1839, was obliged to sell parts of his estate, including his half of Whitton’s Farm, to Thomas Chapman.270 In 1841, Chapman sold the 15 acres to Michael McQuade, who was the licensee of the Commercial Hotel on the corner of Tebbutt and George streets in Windsor.271 The inn built by Smith was apparently allowed to fall into disrepair and, in 1846, McQuade leased the 15-acre farm to John Cunningham and his son, also called John, farmers of Windsor, for five years, with the stipulation that they should build and license another inn on the property. The Cunninghams opened the Squatters Arms within a few months of taking up the lease.272

The eastern half of Whitton’s Farm had been acquired by an absentee owner, John Eggleton (or Eccleston — records are unclear) of Adelong, whose family retained it into the twentieth century. Although the two strips were under different ownership, both were leased from the 1860s until 1913 to farmer Johnny Ryan. Ryan also ran the Windsor punt until 1874, while his brother Tom held the licence to the Squatters Arms until the flood of 1867 closed its doors permanently.273

The pub, a long rectangular building with six or seven rooms, lay on the section bought by McQuade, right on the western corner of the junction of Freemans Reach and Wilberforce roads (Figure 89). After 1867, the building was used as a stable for Ryan stock as well as ‘a camping ground for tramps’. By 1915, the old pub building had become ruinous and was demolished.274 No evidence of the Squatters Arms was uncovered during the 2016 archaeological test excavations. Alluvial deposits in excess of 2 metres were uncovered, which may indicate that any remains were either washed away by previous flooding, or remain much more deeply buried by deposited sediments.

After the McQuade family sold the land to Robert Judd, yet another Windsor publican, the pub was replaced by the present Federation cottage called Bridgeview, which lies a short distance to the north-west of the pub site.

---
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Figure 89: The disused Squatters Arms on Whittons Farm, shown as ‘house’ in this 1878 plan, in the right angle between Wilberforce Road and Freemans Reach Road. (Source: G. Matcham Pitt, 1878, LPI, Crown Plan R 1533.1603.)
2.1.17 Late Twentieth Century Development

General Overview

The latter half of the twentieth century through to the present day has seen significant change in and around the study area, both in terms of the configuration of Thompson Square and the public open spaces surrounding the square. On a macro level, the built fabric on the perimeter of Thompson Square has remained largely unchanged.

The site remained the natural venue for public celebrations, due to its central position in Windsor. The Bicentenary of European settlement in Sydney and later on the upper Hawkesbury were celebrated in Thompson Square in 1988 and 1994 (Figure 90). In 1988, federal Bicentennial funds made possible an extensive restoration of the important buildings in Thompson Square and improvements within the open areas, as had been recommended in 1975 and again in 1981 by Clive Lucas and his firm, Fisher Lucas Architects. This restoration programme included attention to the important sandstone kerbing surviving around parts of Thompson Square. Windsor Wharf was also reconstructed using these Bicentennial funds.275

The Hawkesbury Gazette reflected the temper of the times on 20 April 1988 (p. 4) when it praised the ‘resurrection’ of this ‘unique jewel in our nation’s treasury of colonial heritage’, with ‘the participation of public and private property owners’.

There are annual commemorations in Thompson Square of the proclamation of the Hawkesbury towns by Governor Macquarie in 1810, with red-coats and ritual musket volleys. Although the 1949 proposal from the Royal Australian Historical Society that an obelisk to Governor Macquarie be erected in the square was not accepted by the local council, a memorial to the early European settlers was erected in 1988. An anchor symbolises the importance of the river trade throughout the nineteenth century and the names of many early farmers are recorded on the plaque. As a result, a number of the periodic reunions of old Hawkesbury families are held in whole or in part in Thompson Square.

Immediately adjacent to the anchor memorial, members of a vigorous local community group who oppose the building of the replacement bridge have kept a 24-hour vigil, seven days a week, since 21 July 2013. This group, known as Community Action for Windsor Bridge (CAWB), has not only exceeded all known records for such a protracted heritage vigil, but has also collected over 30,000 signatures for their petition seeking to stop the project.

Changes Notable in Historic Aerial Photographs

Physical changes to Thompson Square throughout the latter half of the twentieth century can be tracked via a series of aerial photographs (Figure 91 to Figure 97).

By 1961, the boundaries of Thompson Square were more distinct and formalised than they had been previously, particularly along the western and northern edges, and a paved road led down to the location of the wharf. A concrete boat ramp had been constructed at the present wharf location. There had been little or no change to the landscape within the current study area north of the river since 1956, with turf farming and market gardens still present.

By 1970, the only substantial change to the landscape appears to have been the establishment of a carpark to the north-east of Thompson Square, with some minor amendments to the fence lines previously established and visible in the 1956 aerial photograph (Figure 93). The riverbank to the north of the river had been revegetated and a secondary boat landing had been constructed in the area between the bridge and the boat ramp on the present-day wharf site.

By 1982, Thompson Square Road (formerly known as Callaghan Street) to the west of the site had been substantially widened, cutting into the open space (Figure 94). Some public domain works had been constructed opposite Thompson Square, on the south side of George Street, and again there appear to have been some changes to fence lines. A painted lane divider had appeared on the bend immediately north of the bridge, which may reflect an increase in vehicular traffic, necessitating new road safety measures. In 1988, some Bicentennial landscaping works were done.

By 1991, the former boathouse building within the northern portion of Thompson Square had been removed and Thompson Square Road narrowed, reinstating some of the public domain along the west edge of the square (Figure 95). A roundabout had been placed at the junction of Bridge and George streets and the pedestrian island on the south side of George Street had increased in size. A new wharf had been built and the boat landing appeared to be disused. North of the bridge, a major scour or embankment failure is noted to the east of the northern embankment. The vegetation had been entirely cleared from the northern and southern embankments, and a viewing platform (now derelict) had been constructed to the east of the southern abutment.

By 2013, the southern embankment had reasonably mature, formalised tree plantings (Figure 95). The northern embankment had also been allowed to revegetate but in a less planned manner. The
road to the wharf had been improved and paved carpark areas had been established immediately south of the wharf and within the northern portion of Thompson Square previously occupied by the building. The road on the east side of Thompson Square had become more formalised and another small, alienated parcel of land between the houses to the east of Thompson Square had been created. The footpath along the south side of George Street had been widened and marquee structures had appeared in front of most of the commercial buildings.

By the time of writing in 2017 (the date of this document), a new wharf has been constructed. Additional works have been undertaken to the pedestrian refuge area on the south side of George Street and the traffic island south of the roundabout has been removed to facilitate archaeological testing in the roadway. There appear to be no other major changes to Thompson Square or its environs. North of the river there has been no significant change, other than the turf farm ceasing operation in early 2016. A major programme of archaeological test excavation was undertaken throughout the study area in the latter half of 2016, which is discussed in Volume 2 of this report.
Figure 91: 1956 Aerial of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge, Windsor. The current cadastre is shown in purple. (Source: LPI, Overlay by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)
Figure 92: 1961 Aerial of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge, Windsor. The current cadastre is shown in purple. (Source: LPI, Overlay by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)
Figure 93: 1970 Aerial of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge, Windsor. The current cadastre is shown in purple. (Source: LPI, Overlay by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)
Figure 94: 1982 Aerial of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge, Windsor. The current cadastre is shown in purple. (Source: LPI, Overlay by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)
Figure 95: 1991 Aerial of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge, Windsor. The current cadastre is shown in purple. (Source: LPI, Overlay by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)
Figure 96: 2013 Aerial of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge, Windsor. The current cadastre is shown in purple. (Source: LPI, Overlay by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)
Figure 97: 2016 aerial of the study area. The current cadastre is shown in purple. (Source: LPI, Overlay by Tom Sapienza, 2016.)
### 2.2 Summary History of Built Fabric

The following tables provide a chronological summary of the key physical changes to Thompson Square and its immediate surrounds between 1795 and 2016.

Table 6: Green Hills (1975–1810)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Civic square cleared of vegetation and a wharf erected, along with a storehouse, soldiers’ barracks and a granary for local grain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Better soldiers’ accommodation constructed on the western side of Thompson Square. Granary replaced by a more substantial wooden building in the middle of the eastern side of the present square. A weatherboard cottage for the Commandant erected near the north-eastern edge of the Government Precinct at 41 George Street, where a 1920s cottage now sits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>A small, thatched watchhouse built on future site of Thompson Square near the Commandant’s house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Soldiers’ accommodation moved to higher ground; a second granary added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Earlier log and thatch granaries were soon replaced by a three-storey brick building on top of the ridge to the south-east of Thompson Square. Slipway for shipbuilding constructed around this date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804–1805</td>
<td>To the east of the new brick granary, a two-storey schoolhouse/chapel and schoolmaster’s residence built, which also served as a courthouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>West of the brick granary, Andrew Thompson built a three-storey store facing Thompson Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: Macquarie Era (1810–1821)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1810 | Macquarie announced creation of the town of Windsor.  
Meehan planned town of Windsor, retaining part of the vacant government land as the location of the future Thompson Square.  
Lease of Andrew Thompson reverted to the Crown upon his death. |
| 1811 | Civic square named Thompson Square after Andrew Thompson by Governor Macquarie.  
Andrew Thompson’s land became the government garden.  
Macquarie made four town grants on south-west boundary (now 1–7 Thompson Square and 81 George Street). |
| 1814 | Bridge Street created to replace road from original South Creek crossing.  
A new wharf constructed at 50 feet long, projecting 18 feet into the river and supported by piles ‘16 to 18 inches thick’.  
Howe and McGrath contracted to do significant works within Thompson Square. The steepness of the slope shown in the Evans and Slaeger views was diminished by putting piles in the lower sector of Thompson Square near the river and using fill to reduce it ‘into a gradual slope’ down from the major store on top of the ridge.  
A regular punt service started. The punt master occupied a small cottage between the garden of the Doctors House and the river, as shown in Thompson’s 1827 map, where the Doctors House is No. 31. |
| 1814–1815 | A single brick sewerage drain likely constructed through Thompson Square. |
| 1815 | Macquarie Arms Inn completed (81 George Street) (still extant).  
The riverbank cut away in the vicinity of the new wharf to create a turning place for carts. |
| 1816–1817 | Wharf updated, but major flood destroyed it.  
A further contract was issued in April 1815 commissioning a larger wharf that was 3 feet higher and on top of the existing one – built in 1816. |
| 1817–1818 | Military barracks constructed. |
| 1820 | New wharf completed under Francis Greenway.  
Military hospital known as the ‘Colonial Hospital’ built in Macquarie Street by Governor Macquarie. |
### Table 8: Post-Macquarie Era (1822–1842)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>62 George Street (formerly the Hawkesbury Stores) erected around 1830 by William Moses for his bakery and store. 62–68 George Street was owned by the Moses family until the early twentieth century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Police barracks and stables constructed by 1831, beside the government garden; a new watchhouse built on Bridge Street close to the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>7 Thompson Square (now the Hawkesbury Regional Museum) constructed as a new house on John Howe’s grant (<em>still extant – part of the museum complex</em>). Site underwent multiple changes of use; it was an inn known as the Daniel O’Connell (1837–48), an office and printing works of the local newspaper (1871–99) and a residence (1911–67) before becoming a museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1841</td>
<td>Formal open space laid out, as shown on 1841 plan of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Civilian Administration Era (1843–99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>‘The Doctors House’ at 103 Thompson Square constructed (<em>still extant</em>) by Edward Burke, and has been historically associated with doctors since 1877.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850s</td>
<td>The fully developed, privately owned western side of today’s Thompson Square in place by the 1850s. Across Thompson Square, the earlier buildings (police and military barracks and stables) had disappeared. Government stables built at the northern corner of Bridge Street and George Street, which were demolished soon after Lilburn Hall (10 Bridge Street) was built in 1856.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>The government garden abandoned for the construction of a Presbyterian manse. The property boundary was straightened in what is currently known as Old Bridge Street. A residence constructed at 5 Thompson Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Lilburn Hall House constructed at 10 Bridge Street by Dr Joshua Dowe. It was later used as St Katherine’s private school for young ladies (1875), Dr J. Callaghan’s house (1887), Brinsley Hall (1903–19) and a maternity hospital (1923–34).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Major flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>John Young Hotel built on the site of 70–72 George Street (currently the Former Hawkesbury Garage). 92–98 George Street constructed (<em>still extant</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>A cottage built at 6 Bridge Street (<em>still extant</em>), which from 1913 was owned by Leo Armstrong who was associated with the Windsor Fire Brigade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>14 Bridge Street constructed (<em>still extant</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>82 George Street constructed (<em>still extant</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Greatest flood in the history of Windsor, reaching 63 feet (19.2 metres) – ‘water lapped the steps of the Doctor’s house in Thompson Square’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>A school building built at rear of 6 Bridge Street (<em>still extant</em>). The school was operated by Eliza Hopkins 1871–86.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>64–68 George Street constructed (<em>still extant</em>). Replaced several single-storey terraces attached to 62 George Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Federation Era (1900–45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>A.C. Stearn Building at 74 George Street built by A. C. Stearn (<em>still extant</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>84–88 George Street constructed (<em>still extant</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>John Young Hotel at 70–72 George Street demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Old Government House on George Street demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A cottage at 41 George Street built over part of the original site (<em>cottage still extant</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Former Hawkesbury Garage constructed at 70–72 George Street by H.A. Clements (<em>still extant</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Two major floods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>New diagonal road through Thompson Square from George Street to Bridge Street built.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

276 Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Flood Management Review Stage One, Department of Primary Industries, March 2014.
277 History Teacher’s Association, ‘Richmond, Windsor, Wilberforce, Ebenezer’, p. 15.
Table 11: Late Twentieth Century Development to Present Day (1946–2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Richmond and Windsor municipal councils amalgamated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>A dwelling constructed at 4 Bridge Road (<em>still extant</em>). This was the site of Andrew Thompson's Windsor property, previously containing a cottage and garden before being used as a Government Garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1990</td>
<td>Existing site layout of Thompson Square established, as shown on the aerial photo of the site. A viewing platform established adjacent to the south-east bridge abutment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Boathouse in northern part of Thompson Square demolished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>WBRP approved. CAWB protest established on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 2014</td>
<td>New wharf structure constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Land and Environment Court challenge to the WBRP is unsuccessful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Major archaeological test excavation programme carried out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Development of Existing Built Heritage

The following section briefly summarises the history of existing built heritage related to the SCMP study area. Specifically, it outlines the construction date, original use and later uses of the sites.

Figure 98: Plan of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge indicating all heritage items relevant to the SCMP study.
Table 12: Development of existing fabric within SCMP study area. Where other structures have predated the existing structures, they have been excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number (as per conditions of consent)</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Original Use</th>
<th>Later Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI4</td>
<td>1–3 Thompson Square</td>
<td>Doctors House</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Commercial - Historically associated with doctors since 1877</td>
<td>Possibly residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI5</td>
<td>5 Thompson Square</td>
<td>House &amp; Outbuilding</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Part museum complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI6</td>
<td>7 Thompson Square</td>
<td>Hawkesbury Museum and Tourist Information Centre</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Commercial - Inn known as the Daniel O’Connell (1837–48)</td>
<td>Commercial - Office and printing works of the local newspaper (1871–99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (1911–67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Hawkesbury Museum (1968 – present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI7</td>
<td>81 George Street</td>
<td>Macquarie Arms Hotel</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI8</td>
<td>4 Bridge Street (also identified as 8 Bridge Street)</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Residential Andrew Thompson house and garden</td>
<td>Public - Government garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (1955 – present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI9</td>
<td>6 Bridge Street</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>1860 (brick cottage)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1871 (brick building to the rear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI10</td>
<td>10 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Lilburn Hall House and Outbuildings</td>
<td>c. 1856</td>
<td>Residential - Dr Joshua Isaac Dowe</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item number (as per conditions of consent)</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Year Constructed</td>
<td>Original Use</td>
<td>Later Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House (1856–60)</td>
<td>St Katherine’s private school (1875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr J. Callaghan’s house (1887)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brinsley Hall (1901–19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maternity Hospital (1923–34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI11</td>
<td>14 Bridge Street</td>
<td>School of Arts</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Government - Windsor Council (1874–76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Centre (1900–47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Boot factory (1947 - ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI12</td>
<td>20 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>Date unknown - likely built in Federation era</td>
<td>Likely residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI13</td>
<td>17 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>Built in the early Victorian era – likely built by 1835</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI14</td>
<td>62–68 George Street</td>
<td>Shops – Former Hawkesbury Stores (64-68 George St)</td>
<td>62 George St – 1840, 64–68 George St –1880s</td>
<td>Commercial Hawkesbury Stores - grocery and bakery</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item number (as per conditions of consent)</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Year Constructed</td>
<td>Original Use</td>
<td>Later Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI15</td>
<td>70–72 George Street</td>
<td>Shops - Former Hawkesbury Garage</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Commercial – motor garage</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI16</td>
<td>74 George Street</td>
<td>A. C. Steam Building</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Commercial - shops</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI17</td>
<td>80–82 George Street</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>80 George St – Date unknown but built late twentieth century (site vacant in 1970 aerial)</td>
<td>80 George St - Commercial</td>
<td>80 George St – No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82 George St - 1865</td>
<td>82 George St - Residential</td>
<td>82 George St - Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI18</td>
<td>84–88 George Street</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI19</td>
<td>92–98 George Street</td>
<td>Two-storey building and shed</td>
<td>Two-storey building - c. 1860s</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shed – unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI21</td>
<td>27 Wilberforce Road</td>
<td>Bridgeview Residence</td>
<td>Date unknown - Late Federation</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>No change in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI22</td>
<td>41 George Street</td>
<td>Green Hills Cottage</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Residential Government cottage</td>
<td>Residential Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site of Government Cottage Archaeological Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 99: Construction dates relating to built heritage items within the Thompson Square study area.
Figure 100: Original site use of existing built heritage items within Thompson Square study area.
2.4 Major Modifications to Thompson Square 1795–2016

Thompson Square has been progressively modified throughout its history. Most of the major modifications were the result of the formalisation of the road network around Thompson Square in the early twentieth century, and the progressive modification for the bridge approaches in the late nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries.

Modification also came from the impacts of flooding to Thompson Square, including some major floods, such as the 1867 flood which completely inundated the study area and much of the town of Windsor. These floods have had some degree of impact in terms of scouring and disposition of alluvial soils within the study area, which will have seen the ground surface eroded and built up in different locations over time. This is a natural part of the cycle of the floodplain in which Windsor is situated.

Other modifications occurred as a result of building activity within Thompson Square and subsequent removal. Some of the lost buildings have been located from the historical record, whereas the location of others is speculative. The majority of the existing building stock ranges in age from the 1810s to the 1920s, with a few later infill items.

Routine activities undertaken in Thompson Square as a central public space for the Windsor community also had a degree of impact over time, including:

- provision of municipal services such as water, electricity and drainage
- landscaping, including placement seating, tables and monuments
- tree planting (and removal)
- events
- building roads to service Thompson Square, wharf and bridge
- demolition of the boatshed in lower Thompson Square
- undocumented (and potentially unauthorised) disturbance.

Based upon the available historic maps and aerial imagery, shown throughout this chapter, it is evident that there were five main phases of change within the Thompson Square ‘open space’ precinct between 1795 and 2016. These changes have had a heavy impact upon the boundaries, configuration, landscaping and survival of archaeological materials within Thompson Square, and are briefly explained below and best demonstrated via a series of illustrations.

Phase 1: 1795–1841

The original Thompson Square precinct arose out of the need for a government presence in the rapidly growing agricultural centre of Green Hills. It was established in 1795, when a portion of land fronting the Hawkesbury River was retained by the Crown and cleared of vegetation. The precinct of some 17 hectares (40 acres) was bounded on the north-east by the present Arndell Street, on the south-east by South Creek, on the south-west by the present Baker Street, and on the north-west by the Hawkesbury River. See Figure 101 for an illustration of this arrangement.

Phase 2: 1841–94

While the area around Thompson Square underwent many construction and subdivision changes throughout the early nineteenth century, the Thompson Square boundary went largely unchanged until circa 1841 when a formal square boundary was established, framed by several roadways. The establishment of the bridge in 1874 saw more formalised road access through the square. See Figure 102 for an illustration of this arrangement.

Phase 3: 1894–1951
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With likely increasing traffic to Windsor Bridge and the wharf during the latter part of the nineteenth century, a carriageway was put through the centre of the Thompson Square precinct in 1894. The circa 1894 modification connected Thompson Square Road and Bridge Street, and permanently separated the lower portion of the park from the upper portion. By the turn of the century, Thompson Square had been formalised into a much smaller area, which was fenced and concentrated to the upper portion along George Street. A new road cutting was established north to the bridge in 1935. See Figure 103 for an illustration of this arrangement.

Phase 4 – 1951–90
Around 1950, a deep diagonal cutting was made through Thompson Square to allow modern motor transport to reach the bridge by a more direct route. See Figure 105 for an illustration of this arrangement.

Phase 5 – 1990–2016
In the late twentieth century, the lower portion of Thompson Square was modified to include a new roadway through the lower Square and a new road island and a carpark near the wharf. The circa 1950 carriageway through the centre of the two parklands towards Windsor Bridge was retained. See Figure 106 for an illustration of this arrangement.
Figure 101: Phase 1, land clearance between 1795 and 1841.
Figure 102: Phase 2, formal square boundary established between 1841 and 1894.
Figure 103: Phase 3, first public road put through square separating parkland into two sections between 1894 and 1951.
Figure 104: Thompson Square in 1929 viewed from the south, showing public road through the centre of the site. (Source: Aerial photograph, courtesy of Carol Roberts. Photographer, Frederick Halpin Willson, RAAF, 1929.)
Figure 105: Phase 4, second public road put through square further separating the parkland between 1951 and 1900.
Figure 106: Existing site layout, established between 1990 and 2016.
Figure 107: Sequential impacts to Thompson Square between 1795 and 2016, showing the associated mapping and aerials.
### 2.5 State and National Historical Themes

The Heritage Council of NSW has formulated a set of ‘Historical Themes relevant to New South Wales’ that provide a historical context within which a value of a heritage item can be understood and evaluated. Based on the above history, Table 13 outlines the themes relevant to Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge. These themes have been used to inform the Interpretation Strategy for Thompson Square (AAJV 2016).

Table 13: Historic themes relevant to Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian Theme</th>
<th>NSW Theme</th>
<th>Explanatory Notes</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Tracing the natural evolution of Australia</td>
<td>Environment – naturally evolved</td>
<td>Features occurring naturally in the physical environment that have shaped or influenced human life and cultures.</td>
<td>Embodied in the original river shoreline and potential remains associated with river crossing and flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Peopling Australia</td>
<td>Aboriginal cultures and interactions with other cultures</td>
<td>Activities associated with maintaining, developing, experiencing and remembering Aboriginal cultural identities and practices, past and present; with demonstrating distinctive ways of life; and with interactions demonstrating race relations.</td>
<td>Square was a place of interaction between local Aboriginal people and the new settlers. Pre-contact Aboriginal cultural evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convict</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities relating to incarceration, transport reform, accommodation and working during the convict period in NSW (1788–1850).</td>
<td>Many of the first settlers included ex-convicts, who undertook farming. Evidence of convict-built structures, convict barracks and convict labour. Naming of Thompson Square marking Andrew Thompson the most prominent emancipist of the early Macquarie period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Developing local, regional and national economies</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Activities relating to the cultivation and rearing of plant and animal species, usually for commercial</td>
<td>Evidence of early farming, orchards and government gardens; granaries and barns. Palynological evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Theme</td>
<td>NSW Theme</td>
<td>Explanatory Notes</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Activities relating to buying, selling and exchanging goods and services.</td>
<td>The first government store, which was swept away in the 1799 flooding, is likely to have been constructed within the study area. The wharf which was a nexus for trade. Commerce in various inns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment – cultural landscape</td>
<td>Activities associated with the interactions between humans, human societies, and the shaping of their physical surroundings.</td>
<td>Evidence of changing landscape embodied in various cuts for construction of roads leading to the river and the bridge; flood-associated soil residues; market gardens. Changing flood regimes associated with massive land clearance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Activities associated with the manufacture, production and distribution of goods</td>
<td>Evidence associated with the wharf, shipbuilding yard and slipway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Activities associated with the moving of people and goods from one place to another, and systems for the provision of such movements.</td>
<td>The section of the riverbank at the base of Thompson Square was the location of the former wharf and associated tollhouse. Track and paths would have been established from early days of the civic precinct. The punt (1814–74).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Building settlements, towns and cities</td>
<td>Towns, suburbs and villages</td>
<td>Activities associated with creating, panning and managing urban functions, landscapes and lifestyles in towns, suburbs and villages.</td>
<td>Town plan, streetscape, village reserve, concentrations of urban functions, civic centre, subdivision pattern, abandoned town site, urban square, fire hydrant, marketplace,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Theme</td>
<td>NSW Theme</td>
<td>Explanatory Notes</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>abandoned wharf, relocated civic centre, boundary feature, open land, concentrations of urban functions, abandoned wharf, locus for protest and urban parks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Governing  
Government and administration  
Activities associated with the governance of local areas, regions, the state and the nation, and the administration of public programmes — includes both principled and corrupt activities.  
The study area was in the vicinity of government house, military barracks and officers’ dwellings, the precise location of which is not known.  
Formalisation of township - extension of government control and bell tower.

8 Developing Australia’s cultural life  
Domestic life  
Activities associated with creating, maintaining, living in and working around houses and institutions.  
Domestic artefact scatter, kitchen furnishings, bed, clothing, garden tools, shed, arrangement of interior rooms, kitchen garden, pet grave, chicken coop, home office, road camp, barrack, asylum.

9 Developing institutions of self-government and democracy  
Protesting  
Local activities of the twenty-first century.  
CAWB.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a background to the natural, Aboriginal, colonial and contemporary history and development of the study area and, where relevant, the surrounding area. This history was prepared to identify places, themes and stories of heritage significance to the study area, to guide the understanding of the heritage significance of the place, the policies that relate to its future conservation and the aspects of the study area that are recommended for interpretation.²⁷⁸

²⁷⁸ Details related to heritage interpretation are contained in the Thompson Square Interpretation Strategy (AAJV October 2016), which provides the high-level framework for interpretation, and the Thompson Square Interpretation Plan (AAJV, November 2017 — in development), which provides the detailed interpretive locations and media.
History shows that, prior to European colonisation, Aboriginal people occupied the study area beside the Hawkesbury River for millennia. With the settlement of the Mulgrave Place district in the late eighteenth century, Windsor evolved and changed considerably. The study area of Thompson Square was the centre of much of this change, seeing many public and private buildings added and removed throughout the nineteenth century, and the establishment of Windsor Bridge in 1874 which necessitated a road (Bridge Street) through Thompson Square. Available mapping shows that the boundaries of Thompson Square were broadly established by 1811, with a town plan laid out and a range of buildings established on the periphery of the square. The notable exception to this is the commercial strip opposite Thompson Square on the south side of George Street, which includes a number of early twentieth century commercial buildings.

A major historical theme for Thompson Square and Windsor in general was the impact of major floods on the Hawkesbury River. These regular floods drove some major physical changes in the study area, including the construction of several wharfs and buildings, and most importantly, Windsor Bridge itself. They have also affected the evidence of Aboriginal and early colonial settlement, through a process of scouring, deposition and impact on landforms and structures.

Since the first major changes for the construction of Windsor Bridge, Thompson Square has been altered on multiple occasions to suit the needs of the area. The initial road through Thompson Square traversed from west to east, from the top of the hill, but was altered from east to west in the twentieth century. Perimeter road alignments have changed on multiple occasions, particularly along the west and north edges of Thompson Square. Good records have existed since 1799 of the natural action of erosion and sedimentation through flooding – processes that doubtless have been occurring for thousands of years. The plantings and landscape elements of Thompson Square have been reworked and replaced due to changing uses, changing needs, public demands and perceptions regarding open space and damage from activities such as flood.

All of these events and physical changes have had a cumulative impact on Thompson Square. However, it remains a place with a rich history and is valued highly by the community, for both its physical amenity and what it represents about the history of Windsor and the early colony of NSW.
3 Heritage Status

3.1 Study Area Heritage Listings

The majority of the buildings, structures and elements relevant to the study area are subject to one or more heritage listings. These heritage items are in a variety of ownerships, including state and local government and the private sector. The contribution of these elements to the overall significance of Thompson Square will be considered in Volume 2. The following figures (Figure 111 to Figure 117) show the coverage of heritage listings in the study area.

Note: During the mapping process, it became clear that there are several issues in the listing data across the state and local levels:

- As shown in Figure 114, there is a slight variation across Conservation Area curtilages, between the SHR and LEP listings.
- The boundary for the state conservation area has some errors, with a small portion in the south-eastern boundary excluded from the curtilage as shown in Figure 114.
- As shown in Figure 4, the lower parkland is not labelled as Thompson Square in the LEP, but rather ‘McQuade park’ which is located 1 kilometre west of the site at 361 George Street (Lot 1 DP 556829).

A review of state and local listings around the site to reconcile these discrepancies may be required in the future.
Figure 108: Thompson Square conservation area SHR boundary.
Figure 109: Thompson Square conservation area LEP boundary.
Figure 110: Heritage items included within the LEP listing.
Figure 111: Overlay of heritage listings relevant to the SCMP study area.
Figure 112: SHR heritage items relevant to the SCMP study area.
Figure 113: LEP heritage items relevant to the SCMP study area.
Figure 114: Listed archaeological sites.
Statutory Listings within Study Area

The study area consists primarily of two heritage items, listed on the following statutory registers, shown in Table 14 below.

Table 14: Heritage items within SCMP study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>LEP 2008 number</th>
<th>LEP 2012 number</th>
<th>Hubert SHI number</th>
<th>Hubert study no.</th>
<th>SHR Number</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Square</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>I00126 [Map C4]</td>
<td>1740417</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Thompson Square Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Bridge</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>I276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>S.170</td>
<td>Hawkesbury River Bridge or Windsor Bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Map C4]
Figure 115: The SHR curtilage gazettal plan for the Thompson Square Precinct SHR listing (listing # 00126). Note the listing excludes the Bridge Street approach to the existing bridge.

Non-statutory Listings Within Study Area

National Trust of Australia (NSW)

Thompson Square is identified by the National Trust of Australia (NSW) under listing ID’s S10510 and S11456 as Thompson Square Precinct.

3.2 Heritage Items Adjacent to Study Area

A substantial number of heritage items abut the Thompson Square Conservation Area. These are items that face or back onto Thompson Square. The majority of these items are in private ownership and include the items outlined in Table 15 below.
Table 15: Heritage items abutting SCMP study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>LEP 2008 number</th>
<th>LEP 2012 number</th>
<th>SHR Number</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 [8]</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Lilburn Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Former School of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>I 147</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–27</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>I 151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jolly Frog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32–34</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>I 148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Guardhouse ruin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32–34</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>I 157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Barracks wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32–34</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>I 01018</td>
<td>01018</td>
<td>Stables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32–34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.170 Former police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>I 10843</td>
<td>10843</td>
<td>Government Cottage site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64–68</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Moses’ store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–72</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>A. C. Stearn Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 [99]</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00041</td>
<td>00041</td>
<td>Macquarie Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00126</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LEP 2008 number</td>
<td>LEP 2012 number</td>
<td>SHR Number</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00005</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>Doctors House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>273 pt.</td>
<td>I 00005</td>
<td>00005</td>
<td>House and Outbuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilberforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>I 274</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bridgeview Residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3 Heritage Items in the Wider Vicinity (500 metres from edge of site)

The wider vicinity of central Windsor also has a substantial number of identified heritage items.

Table 16: Heritage items in wider vicinity of SCMP study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>LEP 2012 number</th>
<th>SHR Number</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East (to Palmer St)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 George St</td>
<td>I166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hannabas Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 George St</td>
<td>I167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 George St</td>
<td>I168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 George St</td>
<td>I169</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 George St</td>
<td>I170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 George St</td>
<td>I171</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 George St</td>
<td>I173</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 George St</td>
<td>I174</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 George St</td>
<td>I175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 North Street</td>
<td>I00107</td>
<td>00107</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–28 North Street</td>
<td>I00108</td>
<td>00108</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 North Street</td>
<td>I00109</td>
<td>00109</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–33 North Street</td>
<td>I00142</td>
<td>00142</td>
<td>Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 North Street</td>
<td>I00150</td>
<td>00150</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Court Street</td>
<td>I00804</td>
<td>00804</td>
<td>Windsor Court House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 George St</td>
<td>I01843</td>
<td>01843</td>
<td>Government Cottage Archaeological Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LEP 2012 number</td>
<td>SHR Number</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (to South Creek)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Anschau Cresent</td>
<td>I138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anschau House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Bridge Street</td>
<td>I149</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Bridge Street</td>
<td>I150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Toll House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–27 Bridge Street</td>
<td>I151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Windsor Tavern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Bridge Street</td>
<td>01018</td>
<td>01018</td>
<td>Stables of rear of police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (to Fitzgerald St)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kable Street</td>
<td>I139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Uralla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Baker Street</td>
<td>I140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Baker Street</td>
<td>I141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Fitzgerald Street</td>
<td>I161</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sunny Brae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 George Street and 9B Baker Street</td>
<td>I176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 George Street</td>
<td>I177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Former House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 George Street</td>
<td>I178</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Former House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 George Street</td>
<td>I180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House and Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 George Street</td>
<td>I181</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 George Street</td>
<td>I182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 George Street</td>
<td>I183</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>House and Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 George Street</td>
<td>I184</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Former House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 George Street</td>
<td>I185</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 George Street</td>
<td>I186</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 George Street</td>
<td>I187</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 George Street</td>
<td>I188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fitzroy Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160–160A George Street</td>
<td>I189</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162–166 George Street</td>
<td>I190</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>LEP 2012 number</td>
<td>SHR Number</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167–169 George Street</td>
<td>I191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 George Street</td>
<td>I192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bussel Bros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 George Street</td>
<td>I193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 George Street</td>
<td>I235</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Former Windsor Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Kable Street</td>
<td>I239</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Former Masonic Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Macquarie Street</td>
<td>I476</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Elourea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 George Street</td>
<td>I00003</td>
<td>00003</td>
<td>Loder House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 17: Previous archaeological reports relevant to the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHMS</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Windsor Roman Catholic cemetery Windsor, NSW: Research Design and Excavation Methodology</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHMS</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>No. 5 New Street, Windsor Historical Archaeological &amp; Development Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1A Greenway Crescent, Windsor NSW: final archaeological report</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>29 North Street Windsor NSW: archaeological monitoring</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAC</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29 North Street Windsor NSW: archaeological assessment and exemption notification</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Built Heritage &amp; Archaeological Landscape Investigation: Windsor Bridge Options, Preliminary Environmental Investigation</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosis</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Archaeological assessment and research design former military barracks, Windsor police station</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosis</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Windsor Bridge Replacement Project Historic Heritage Assessment &amp; Statement of Heritage Impact</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosis + Thorp</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Historical Heritage Assessment for Windsor Bridge Replacement Project – Test Excavation Report</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC Consulting Services</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>68 George Street, Windsor: Heritage impact statement</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>Proposed museum site service area Baker Street, Windsor: application for S140 excavation permit.</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Museum site Baker Street Windsor: archaeological investigation final report</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Proposed museum site service area Baker Street, Windsor: archaeological assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Museum extension site Baker Street, Windsor: report on test trenching</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Steele Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim archaeological excavation report and application for a section 90 heritage impact permit NPWS site 45-5-2865 former Hawkesbury Hospital Windsor NSW</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoarchaeology and Prospection</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Exploratory Ground Penetrating Radar Survey at Thompson’s Square Windsor</td>
<td>Remote Sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Report on the Archaeological Excavation of the Site of the Extensions to the Hawkesbury Museum, 7 Thompson Square, Windsor, N.S.W.</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Report on Historical and Archaeological Investigation of the Hawkesbury Museum, 7 Thompson Square, Windsor, NSW.</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Report on archaeological monitoring programme during redevelopment of 232 George Street, Windsor, NSW</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Historical and archaeological investigation of Thompson Square, Windsor</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Report on historical and archaeological investigation of the Hawkesbury Museum, 7 Thompson Square, Windsor, NSW</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes K</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>The Windsor Military Guardhouse, Windsor Archaeological Investigation.</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCIS</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Archaeological monitoring electricity supply upgrade works: Thompson Square, Windsor</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCIS</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment of 6-8 Pitt Street Windsor</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavelle S</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Historical archaeological assessment 232 George Street, Windsor, NSW</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavelle S</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Information to accompany excavation permit application under section 60, NSW Heritage Act, 1977: 226 George Street, Windsor, NSW</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavelle S</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Report on archaeological monitoring 226 George Street, Windsor, NSW</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Moor</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>Hawkesbury Hospital, Windsor: conservation plan and planning assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedinger Heritage and Archaeology</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Monitoring excavations in Bridge Street, Windsor, N.S.W.</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorp W</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment. 23-39 North Street, Windsor.</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Gregson J</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Bowman Cottage. A Reconnaissance by Historical Archaeology.</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Gregson J</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Bowman Cottage Excavation Report II.</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>