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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 (hereafter NSW RMS) to prepare a Strategic Conservation Management Plan (hereafter SCMP) for Thompson Square in Windsor NSW. 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 Minister’s 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 (Application No SSI-4951). Information relating directly to the WBRP, including the conditions of consent and how they have been met, is located 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 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, 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 longevity following the conclusion of the WBRP. Volumes 1 and 2 contain information relevant to the long-term conservation and management of the study area, while Volume 3 contains the information specifically relevant to the WBRP. Volume 4 contains the results of the community consultation process undertaken as a part of this project. At the conclusion of the project, the information and policies presented in Volumes 3 and 4 will no longer be relevant; however, Volumes 1 and 2 will continue to provide the basis for the ongoing management of Thompson Square and environs.

1.3 Aims and Objectives of Volume 2

This report forms Volume 2 of the SCMP and is the principal guiding document for the conservation, reuse, interpretation and management of the heritage values of Thompson Square and environs. The objectives of Volume 2 are to:

- Conduct a survey and analysis of the heritage fabric within the study area, including built and landscape heritage, Aboriginal and historical archaeology, and other elements that contribute to the significance of the place.
• Assess the heritage values of the study area and contributing elements of the surrounding properties, through the preparation of a robust and analytical statement of significance for all individual listings within the study area.

• Develop conservation policies that either enhance or maintain the heritage significance of the study area, within the scope of the approved works and the constraints and opportunities arising. These policies need to consider the condition, statutory controls, ownership, management constraints and feasible future use of all heritage elements within the study area.

• Determine heritage design principles and implementation requirements for the study area, based on conservation policies aimed at retaining the heritage significance of the study area and any individually listed heritage items either within the study area or in close proximity to the study area.

• Specifically articulate within the SCMP why Windsor and Thompson Square are places of special heritage value.

• Provide guidance for the long-term conservation and management of the study area.

1.4 Audience

The audience for Volume 2 are groups with management responsibilities for the study area and areas adjacent to the study area. Principally this includes HCC (as the principal land manager and local regulator), OEH (as state regulator), public and private sector agencies that may conduct works within the study area in future and the private owners of properties within and adjacent to the study area.

Responsibilities for management of the study area are identified where possible and are referred to as the Relevant Consent or Planning Authority (RC/PA).

1.5 Study Area

The study area is located in the centre of the town of Windsor, immediately south of the Hawkesbury River. It is defined in Appendix 2 of the Minister’s Conditions of Approval for the Windsor Bridge Replacement Project, plus an additional area of impact identified for the WBRP. In aggregate, the study area contains Thompson Square, the surrounding streets, the existing Windsor Bridge and the former turf farm north of the Hawkesbury River. Thompson Square is one of the oldest public squares in Australia and notable for the large number of colonial Georgian buildings that surround it. The site is made up of George Street, Bridge Street, Thompson Square and The Terrace, a series of roadways that surround a small turfed reserve. Directly north is Windsor Bridge, spanning the Hawkesbury River to connect with Wilberforce Road (Figure 1).

Note the boundary of the study area does not, and is not required to, accord with either of the statutory boundaries for the Thompson Square Conservation Area, as listed on the State Heritage Register (SHR) or Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan.
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).
2 Physical Analysis

AAJV carried out a physical assessment of the study area, including Thompson Square and surrounds, on multiple occasions between April and July 2016, and an archaeological test excavation between August and November 2016. The analysis involved an investigation into the built form and landscape setting, as well as Aboriginal and historical archaeological potential. This chapter does not provide a detailed investigation of all fabric but an overview of the elements of the place to assist in determining significance.

The study area consists of Thompson Square and the surrounding area, situated in the centre of the town of Windsor. The main features of the study area are Thompson Square itself, now a public park; Windsor Bridge and the Hawkesbury River; a variety of residential and commercial buildings surrounding Thompson Square on three sides; and a residential property on the northern side of the Hawkesbury River. The buildings date from the mid-nineteenth century through to the late twentieth century, and are interspersed with early and more recent landscape elements, monuments, interpretation elements and other public features. A variety of plantings exist throughout the precinct, including mature trees and smaller garden areas.

For the purposes of the physical analysis of the study area, direct access was only available to those areas in the ownership or control of NSW RMS, and areas otherwise in the public domain. Areas in private ownership have been inspected from the public domain only, and observations rely on visual analysis rather than detailed physical investigation. Figure 3 shows the land ownership boundaries across the study area.

An extensive programme of archaeological testing was completed in November 2016, which included investigations into the Aboriginal and historical archaeological potential of the study area. The results of those investigations are summarised here. For full details of the test excavation programme and findings, please refer to the WBRP Preliminary Archaeological Test Excavation Report (AAJV 2016).
Figure 3: Land ownership plan for the study area.
2.1 Context, Setting and Landscape

The terms context, setting and landscape, both abstract and real in nature, refer to concepts describing our perceivable environment at a physical and cultural level.

The following sections provide a descriptive assessment and discussion of the landscape setting of Thompson Square, Windsor Bridge, the river foreshore and the adjacent built fabric. They present a broad overview of the landscape evolution over time and discuss how landscape conservation is crucial to the long-term conservation of the site’s cultural and heritage values, particularly as the heart of the study area is Thompson Square, rather than simply a collection of buildings positioned in an arbitrary configuration.

An inventory of the existing landscape conditions is assessed, including topography, vegetation, connectivity and fabric, all of which contribute to the study area’s unique landscape character.

Through a discussion of both the natural environment and the historic and cultural landscape, it becomes clear that the significance of landscape in contributing to a sense of place is fundamental. It is also necessary to acknowledge in this discussion that the Thompson Square landscape, as it exists today, is very heavily modified from its original form and the current configuration is merely the latest in a series of changes that have occurred over more than 200 years.

Landscape significance is reaffirmed in the closing section of this chapter, through discussion and interpretation. The key landscape elements of the study area uncovered through assessment are reiterated in response to the principles of conservation, and a summary of landscape values is provided.

As ‘landscape’ has no borders, in abstract terms, and includes concepts of scenery and systems, assessments have also been made of the local and regional environs surrounding the study area, to provide context to the discussion.

2.1.1 Landscape Context

For the purposes of the landscape investigation, the study area has been divided into the following zones, as demonstrated in Figure 4:

- Zone 1 – Thompson Square, the adjacent built environment and the peripheral streets.
- Zone 2 – the Hawkesbury River, its banks/embankments, and Windsor Bridge.
- Zone 3 – the northern bank of the Hawkesbury River including the intersection of Wilberforce and Freemans Reach roads.
Figure 4: Three distinct landscape zones of the study area.
2.2 Regional Environment

The prevalent natural landscape feature of the site is that of the Hawkesbury River which runs north-easterly through the study area. The town of Windsor lies in the South Creek sub-catchment of the Hawkesbury-Nepean catchment, one of the largest coastal basins in NSW. Windsor and Richmond are the largest settlements along the Hawkesbury River, which flows northward in a meandering fashion. The South Creek sub-catchment is heavily degraded due to a historical sequence of vegetation clearing that occurred as the area became urbanised. Over time, this development pattern has significantly influenced the flood behaviour of the valley, leading to adverse effects for townships within the floodplain during flood periods. While much of the township of Windsor is built on a ridge, parts of the settlement including much of the site study area are located on low-lying areas and are subject to flooding during a one in five-year flood event. The flood history of the study area is discussed in more detail in Volume 1.

The vegetative community type of the sub-catchment is that of the Cumberland Plain Woodland. This distinct grouping of vegetation is bred from the clay soils of the undulating Cumberland Plain, a sub-region of the Sydney Basin bioregion. Although this bioregion is one of the most diverse in species in the state of NSW, the Cumberland Plain region is considerably degraded as a result of a high level of development within its extent. Today, less than 6 per cent of this original vegetation community remains in fragmented locations across the western suburbs of Sydney.

The study area today is a reflection of the degraded environment of the broader sub-catchment area. It is a highly modified landscape, representative of the European settlers’ desire to prescribe development and agricultural priorities. Minimal remnant native vegetation exists within the Windsor area generally and the study area specifically, mainly limited to remnants along the banks of the Hawkesbury. However, the integrity of this remnant vegetation remains threatened due to weed invasion and the planting of monocultures of species for erosion mitigation. Vegetation communities within the study area are either artificially constructed or modified natural communities. The parklands of Thompson Square to the south and Macquarie Park to the north of the study area are examples of artificial communities, while the riparian corridors along the banks of the river are reflective of a more natural vegetation community. Those remnant native vegetation communities within the study area are in poor condition and are of minimal ecological value. North of the river, the study area and beyond contains numerous turf farms and market gardens which are reflective of the rural industry of the broader context, predominantly to the north of the site towards Freemans Reach.

2.2.1 The Hawkesbury River and Embankments

The Hawkesbury River at Windsor flows within an alluvial channel and is tidal. The channel presently cuts into silt sands, which form fairly cohesive banks with inset sandy deposits of post-settlement alluvium.\(^1\)

Along the northern river bank, downstream of the bridge, the sandy riverbed ends relatively abruptly at a 1-metre-high steep batter composed of silt clay/sand. This bank has formed due to strong localised water flows. Scouring was also observed on the riverbed around obstacles such as a boulder.\(^2\) Around the piers of the existing bridge scouring is evident on the eastern side and downstream, with sediments appearing downstream.\(^3\)

On the southern side of the river, running parallel to the bank between the existing bridge and wharf, is a discrete densely packed expanse of cobbles. This feature has been interpreted as being cultural in origin, the ballast for the early nineteenth-century wharves at Windsor. Cobbles have also been noted elsewhere within the study area, through geotechnical and diving investigations; a small patch of such cobbles has been recorded upstream of the original bridge alignment, near the south bank,

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 55.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 51.
where the nineteenth-century punt operated. ‘Round hard stones mixed with loam, covered with black soil’ recorded on a circa-1870 plan of the proposed bridge location appear to be exposed natural strata that the recent geotechnical investigations have also identified in the area.4

Closer to the river bank there is rock armour characterised by a relatively steep gradient from the base of the riverbank towards the river which is composed of large, predominantly basalt-like rock, 300 millimetres to 600 millimetres across. There is also the occasional large fragment of concrete, as well as concentrations of sandstone kerbing up to 750 millimetres in length. The kerbing reportedly originated from the main road through the Windsor township and was deposited to retard bank erosion by the local council in the late twentieth century.

The rock armour itself was also deposited for this reason but it is not clear when this took place and whether it predates the installation of the gabion baskets that line the riverbank. The size of the rocks indicate that it was most likely deposited by machine. This would suggest that the deposit was formed, or at least commenced being formed, in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Laying atop the rock armour, particularly close to the river bank, are logs and branches while thick vegetation in part denies easy access to the bank. A small vegetated ‘island’ closer to the bridge appears to have been originally attached to the river bank but has broken away due to a combination of the weight of vegetation and evident erosion that is undermining the bank at this location.

Figure 5: Ballast deposits along the southern river edge.

The rock armour itself was also deposited for this reason but it is not clear when this took place and whether it predates the installation of the gabion baskets that line the riverbank. The size of the rocks indicate that it was most likely deposited by machine. This would suggest that the deposit was formed, or at least commenced being formed, in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Laying atop the rock armour, particularly close to the river bank, are logs and branches while thick vegetation in part denies easy access to the bank. A small vegetated ‘island’ closer to the bridge appears to have been originally attached to the river bank but has broken away due to a combination of the weight of vegetation and evident erosion that is undermining the bank at this location.

Exposed at certain points along the edge of the rock armour are concentrations of cobbles, rounded stones up to 300 millimetres across as well as sub-angular rock of similar size. The gradient of these deposits, downwards towards the centre of the river, is lower than that of the rock armour. This deposit is believed to have been the ballast laid over the bed logs for the late-eighteenth- or early nineteenth-century wharves. This formation would have extended towards the river bank and is likely to have been covered by the rock armour. The cobble ballast is covered with sand along the riverward edge. It is likely that the northern boundary of the ballast extends for a few metres further northward than is shown in Figure 5 above. Lying atop of this exposed expanse of ballast is the occasional larger angular rock and sandstone kerbing.

Cobbles have also been noted elsewhere within the study area, through geotechnical and diving investigations; a small patch of such cobbles were recorded upstream of the existing bridge near the south bank, where the nineteenth century punt operated. ‘Round hard stones mixed with loam, covered with black soil’ recorded on a circa-1870 plan of the proposed bridge location appear to be exposed natural strata that geotechnical investigations have identified in the area (BIOSIS EIS 2012 Plate 108).

Immediately beyond the rock armour and ballast is coarse, loose sand. The looseness and coarseness of the sand suggests a mobile riverbed. Towards the bridge there was evidence of scouring where an underlying substrate of gravelly sand was exposed. During the 2016 diving investigations a shopping trolley lying on its side was observed at one location. Only one corner was observed, indicating that somewhere between 0.5 and 0.75 metres of the object was buried. This means that the deposit of sand at this location is least 0.5 metres thick. Within the study area, the profile of the river channel on the northern bank is slightly asymmetric when compared to the southern bank. More specifically, the riverbed slopes down from the southern bank to a depth of 4 metres AHD past the centreline of the river, which is closer to the northern bank. It then rises relatively steeply towards the northern bank.5

The surface of the riverbed is mostly flat and featureless. Closer to the banks on both sides there is significant organic material, mostly tree branches covering the riverbed along with algae and other forms of aquatic vegetation. The maritime archaeological dive surveys recorded a mostly sandy riverbed with sand ripples/waves of up to 0.5 metres high in places, mostly close to the centre of the river.6 Larger and longer sand waves were observed on side-scan sonar imagery taken on the upstream side of the existing bridge.7

2.2.2 Local Landscape Evolution

For the purposes of the landscape analysis, this section provides a brief summary of the modifications to Thompson Square since its formalisation in 1811. A complete history of Thompson Square and its surrounds is provided in Volume 1.

Thompson Square was formalised and dedicated as open space by Governor Macquarie in 1811. Initially reflective of the township’s grid pattern dictated by Macquarie, the square was once a rectangular open space bordered by the river to the north-west. Buildings and allotments formed the other three perimeters of the square in the years preceding its formalisation. Of particular significance was the south-western perimeter of Thompson Square, which contained several privately owned allotments from Macquarie’s time onward and was shown with buildings erected on all four lots by 1827. The north-eastern boundary was formalised shortly after Andrew Thompson’s death in 1810, when his property was converted to Crown land and transformed into a government garden. This is shown in John Abbott’s 1831 survey of the square. The south-eastern perimeter along George Street was established as early as 1812, as shown on a survey plan by Meehan.

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid., Figure 43 and 47. See also Jacobs, Bathymetry Survey of Hawkesbury River, 2016.
Macquarie’s vision for Thompson Square as a formal public square was never quite realised. The imposition of his new town plan in 1812, integrating the already established government precinct of Green Hills with the new town of Windsor, saw that ‘Thompson Square’ became a secondary civic space to the already functioning town square of Green Hills. In order to push its status, the removal of a substantial number of buildings was ordered to see Thompson Square conform more to the standard ideal of a town square. It initially maintained a link to this genesis as the entire eastern side was prescribed to official purposes; yet, come the 1830s, the use of Thompson Square became more focused on the local community, for purposes such as weekly markets, rather than primarily a place for government business.

The evolution of Thompson Square’s internal configuration has been largely prescribed by various thoroughfares cutting through the site and leading to the river’s edge. It appears as if Thompson Square has been less a destination and more a route of direct travel for access, first to the punt in 1814 and, in later years, to the bridge.

The first sinuous path to impinge on Thompson Square crossed from the south-west corner diagonally across the open space to the punt in the north-eastern corner of the site. With the later addition of Old Bridge Street along the east of the park, the diagonal access path shifted north, providing a connection mid-way down Thompson Square Road. The imposition of Bridge Road in a diagonal cut of deeper proportions physically divided the open space of Thompson Square into two separate areas. Visual representations of these changes are shown in Figure 6 below.

The landscape character of the square has altered from an open, informal space with less defined boundaries and topological integrity, to a heavily vegetated open space with clearly defined edges and segregation in parkland levels. The introduction of arris rail fencing to the edges of Thompson Square in the 1880s coincided with ornamental planting, initially Araucaria spp. Following these early plantings was the introduction of a varied tree palette comprising native specimen trees such as the Silky Oak (Grevillea robusta) along with further exotic specimen trees such as the Plane Tree (Platanus x hybrida) and Jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia).

Today, Thompson Square maintains an informal parkland character; however, the spatial configuration of the area originally designated by Macquarie has been greatly disturbed and the site is no longer perceived as a unified square. Rather, it is now distinctly read as two smaller parkland areas, which will be rejoined by the replacement of Windsor Bridge. In conjunction with this spatial change, the vegetation of Thompson Square has transformed from an open landscape area to a heavily vegetated one with distinct boundaries.

---

8 The above summary of Thompson Square’s spatial evolution is supported by a visual depiction exhibited in section 3.4 of Replacement of Windsor Bridge: urban design and landscape concept report (2012) prepared by Spackman Mossop and Michaels for RMS.
Figure 6: Sequential impacts on Thompson Square between 1795 and 2016, showing the associated mapping and aerials.
2.2.3 Landscape Conservation

Landscape conservation aims to take a holistic approach to the challenges of site-based conservation, considering broader environmental attributes and systems alongside site-based characteristics of both natural and cultural importance. Analysis of the landscape character of Thompson Square has been undertaken in previous comprehensive reports.  

The analysis presented below reassesses the significant landscape components of the existing Thompson Square and surrounding study area, providing current information and reiterating the value of its cultural and natural layers. This forms the basis for the recommendations and policies for landscape conservation developed later in this document.

As becomes apparent from the analysis and assessment of the existing landscape character, there is compelling information to support the conclusion that the Windsor Bridge site is of high landscape significance and therefore landscape conservation is crucial to ensuring that the significance of this place is conserved.

‘Landscape character’ in this assessment encompasses both the physical and visual qualities of the present-day landscape, as well as the cultural values of the site including programme and community interaction. The analysis outlined below identifies and describes the unique elements and features of the present-day landscape which contribute to its sense of place. These elements and features have a cumulative effect on how the landscape is perceived, experienced and valued.

For a full review of the landscape setting of Thompson Square, see the Thompson Square Detailed Archival Recording prepared by AAAJ (2017).

2.2.4 Analysis and Assessment of the Existing Landscape Character

Built Form

The buildings surrounding Thompson Square are listed as components within the Thompson Square Conservation Area and are adjacent to the study area, and comprise a series of single- and two-storey residential and commercial buildings. The George Street shops are located along the ridge in a prominent position at the top of the square, signifying the commercial entrance to Windsor. The union of buildings within the Thompson Square Conservation Area is a reflection of the historic development of the site and contributes significantly to the sense of the age and identity of Thompson Square. This section provides an analysis of the landscape contribution of these built heritage items. It also provides a physical analysis of historic streetscape fabric such as kerbing, street furniture, retaining walls and monuments.

As noted earlier, a dominant built element that has significant presence within Thompson Square is Bridge Street, which provides access to Windsor Bridge by cutting diagonally through the parkland from east to west, dividing the square into two distinct open parkland spaces. The development of this arrangement over time is illustrated in Figure 6 above, and the two separated parts of the square will be reconnected by the replacement of Windsor Bridge. It is acknowledged, however, that the new bridge will change the relationship between the east and west sides of Thompson Square, through the introduction of a new modern structure. The old Windsor Bridge is located to the north of Thompson Square. This element is further discussed below.

A rotunda once occupied Thompson Square, as shown in Figure 7, as part of the beautification works to the reserve. The pavilion was removed in the early twentieth century and in the late twentieth century the Pioneers Memorial and park furniture such as picnic tables and benches were added. Another significant component of the built fabric are the sandstone kerbs still existing on the streets that form the periphery of Thompson Square. These elements collectively are of historic value and reflect the development of transportation changes in the area.

9 Spackman Mossop and Michaels, Replacement of Windsor Bridge: urban design and landscape concept report, 2012.

10 Note: The item numbers for these buildings relate to those outlined in the Minister’s Conditions of Approval.
Figure 7: 1889 photograph of Thompson Square, demonstrating tree planting, rotunda and arris fencing. (Source: HCC Library Services.)
Figure 8: Existing site layout showing all built heritage items relevant to the SCMP study area.
Existing Buildings

Table 1 describes the existing buildings that are associated with the SCMP study area. Unless otherwise specified, all images were photographed by AAJV. Items HI1–HI3 and HI20 (Windsor Bridge) have been excluded as they are not buildings. Further information on these can be found in sections 2.2 and 2.3 of Volume 1, and sections 2.2.4 and 2.6 of Volume 2.

Table 1. Existing buildings associated with the SCMP study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Thumbnail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI4</td>
<td>Doctors House 1–3 Thompson Square</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Sandstone and brick terrace building from the post-Macquarie era. It is Georgian in character with its typically symmetrical façade and some classical influences. The iron lacework on the front balcony is very elaborate. Other original or decorative features include polychrome brickwork accentuating windows and doors, elaborate scalloped fanlight above the main entrances, timber double-hung sash windows, slate roof cladding, and sandstone verandah and stairs. There is an unsympathetic extension to the rear of the building, visible from The Terrace. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI5</td>
<td>House &amp; Outbuilding 5 Thompson Square</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>An authentic early Victorian cottage. Brick laid in Flemish bond fashion, with slate hipped roof, timber doors, double-hung sash windows and verandah columns. The façade masonry has been painted; however, the brick detailing indicates it is likely polychrome brickwork, originally unpainted. Roof drainage and fencing all appear modern. The building footprint appears highly intact and has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI6</td>
<td>Hawkesbury Museum and Tourist Information Centre 7 Thompson Square</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Georgian-style, two-storey mansion, symmetrical down the centre, with broken hipped roof clad in modern corrugated steel sheet. There is a t-shaped, single-storey extension to the rear with a sympathetic roofline.</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI7</td>
<td><em>Macquarie Arms Hotel</em>&lt;br&gt;81 George Street</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>The hotel is a building of generous proportions, with sandstock brick walls, stuccoed over and painted white. It has two large Georgian doorways with semicircular traceried fanlights and sidelights, but the glass in the one facing George Street has unfortunately been painted over. The one opening onto Thompson Square can still be seen in its original state. The hotel retains its well-designed cedar joinery, its cedar circular staircase, its extensive stone flagged cellars, its turned wooden verandah columns, and its stone flagging. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI8</td>
<td><em>House</em>&lt;br&gt;4 Bridge Street (also identified as 8 Bridge Street)</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Weatherboard cottage with corrugated steel sheet roof and elevated on brick piers. The front verandah has been enclosed with weatherboard and glazing. This construction relates to the mid-twentieth-century development of the area. While the building is an appropriate scale, it is considered to be an unsympathetic infill with regards to materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI9</td>
<td><em>House</em>&lt;br&gt;6 Bridge Street</td>
<td>1860 (brick cottage)</td>
<td>Georgian cottage with hipped roof, brick (Flemish bond) façade. Much of the fabric is apparently modern, including the verandah elements and roof cladding. Areas of the masonry (above the verandah) and the chimney stacks are whitewashed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Thumbnail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI10</td>
<td>‘Lilburn Dale Hall’ House and Outbuildings</td>
<td>c. 1856</td>
<td>Two-storey, regency-style mansion constructed of painted rendered brick masonry, slate roof, elaborate stuccoed central pediment forming a roof parapet feature, elaborate iron lacework in a timber verandah structure. The paint scheme emulates a common Victorian scheme of deep reds, creams and salmons. The front timber palisade fence is likely modern fabric emulating a traditional style. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI11</td>
<td>School of Arts</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>A single-storey brick stuccoed Italianate hall with the later additions of side wings and a loggia. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI12</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>Date unknown – Federation era</td>
<td>The dwelling is a substantial Federation-era dwelling with a turret corner and garden setting. The building is not visible from Bridge Street and therefore has a low impact on the heritage character of the area.</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI13</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>Date unknown – early Victorian era (likely built by 1835)</td>
<td>A Georgian, single-storey brick cottage with corrugated-iron roof, of five bays. The façade has a painted, harled finish. The sandstone verandah flagging shows hand-tool marks throughout. There is an unsympathetic</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there is no evidence that this was the original intended finish for the brick masonry. There are concrete retained garden beds at the front of the building. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Thumbnail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI14</td>
<td>Shops – Former Hawkesbury Stores (64–68 George St) 62–68 George Street</td>
<td>62 George St – 1840</td>
<td>A single-storey Georgian cottage, originally forming the end terrace of a set from 62–68 George Street. Has elaborate cast-iron lacework columns, balustrading and valance. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shop 64–68 George St – c. 1880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Replaced earlier single-storey terrace houses and formed an extension to 62 George Street. A two-storey stuccoed brick mansion, currently heavily impacted by current retailers occupying the building. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI15</td>
<td>Shops - Former Hawkesbury Garage 70–72 George Street</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1920s, art deco–style rendered-brick building with modern glazed tiling and timber bay windows inserted into the wide front opening. Abuts directly against 68 George Street. While this is a later addition, the building is appropriate with regards to bulk and scale.</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI16</td>
<td>A. C. Stearn Building 74 George Street</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Highly intact Federation-style shop. Stuccoed, two-storey building with a parapet to the street front decorated by stuccoed vases, lettering and profiled string courses. Elaborate decorative iron lacework on the first-floor balcony, the ground floor is heavily impacted and obscured by the current occupying retailer. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Thumbnail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI17</td>
<td>Shop 80–82 George Street</td>
<td>80–82 George St – date unknown but built post 1970</td>
<td>Single-storey house converted into a retail shop. Constructed of brick (stretcher bond), with painted façade and high parapet. While the building is a later addition, the scale and form are appropriate and do not visually dominate the streetscape.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shop 82 George St – 1865</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-storey brick cottage converted into a retail shop. Has a short brick parapet over a corrugated steel-clad saltbox roof. Has a corrugated steel-clad ogee hipped verandah with cast-iron lacework valance and brackets. The sills and skirts are sandstone. The windows are covered with timber louvered shutters. There is a single front door opening offset from centre, with some infill brickwork adjacent indicating that there may have been a former window or door opening adjacent. There is a weatherboard skillion extension to the rear, as well as a standalone weatherboard structure/house at the rear of the property. Overall, the building has a positive heritage impact on Thompson Square and surrounds.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI18</td>
<td>Shops 84–88 George Street</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Federation-style, two-storey terrace shops, polychrome brickwork with a rendered parapet. There are timber bay windows with coloured glazing off the first floor. The ground floor façade is painted render. The building blends well within the historic streetscape.</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Thumbnail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI19</td>
<td>Two-storey building and shed 92–98 George Street</td>
<td>Two-storey building – c. 1860s</td>
<td>Victorian-era, two-storey double terrace constructed of brick with an ashlar-lined render coat. Timber two-storey verandah with concave corrugated steel-clad awning. There is a single-storey warehouse building in the rear with an M-shaped roof. The building blends well within the historic streetscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HI21   | Bridgeview Residence 27 Wilberforce Road | Date unknown – late Federation era | Bridgeview is a substantial single-storey house in the Federation bungalow style facing south-east to Wilberforce Road. It has a hipped roof, bellcast over the verandah, with decorative gables over the entry and over the side wings which terminate the verandah. Gablets provide ventilation and mark the square bay windows on the south and east corners of the house. There are three chimneys finished with roughcast render and brick caps.  
The roof is of corrugated steel, trimmed with plain timber barge boards, and the rafters are exposed on the eaves. The walls are of red face brick.  
The verandah faces the street, returning on the sides to terminate in gabled side wings. It is supported on timber posts with curved brackets and a slatted balustrade. The entry gable is marked with battened fibro above a slated arch.  
Casement windows are used on the corner bays and the bay in the side wings. Arched windows are either side of the entry. French doors also open to the verandah. The front door is a generous panelled door with art nouveau patterned leadlight to the door, sidelights and toplight. |           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI22</td>
<td>Green Hills Cottage</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>The site is divided into two portions. The upper portion of the site is level and grassy with gardens and remnant gardens and a c. 1920, single-storey, bungalow-style house with Dutch gable roof located at the front of the site. It has rendered masonry walls and a corrugated-iron roof. Decorative glass windows are evident. An open verandah is located on the south-east and south-west sides of the house. An additional verandah on the north-east side of the house has been enclosed to create additional internal space. A single garage is located on the north-east corner of the flat section of the site and accessed via an informal driveway. The front of the property is not fenced although a small retaining wall provides some assistance in maintaining the level character of the front portion of the site. The curve of George Street at this point still reflects the original bend in the road past the Government Cottage before 1810.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Streetscape Fabric**

In addition to the buildings that contribute to the significance of the Thompson Square Conservation Area, there are other physical elements in the public domain that add to the historic aesthetic. The locations of the various historic built elements that were visible from the public domain were identified onsite through a dedicated field survey. The results of the survey are tabulated below in Table 2, and illustrated in Figure 9 below. Unless otherwise specified, all images were photographed by AAJV.
Figure 9: Historic built fabric within the public domain of the SCMP study area.
Table 2. Built elements in the public domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item symbol in key</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Thumbnail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ===========         | Kerb         | Sandstone| - Sandstone kerbing around seating area on George Street was likely relocated/rearranged when the public domain was refurbished.  
- Sandstone kerbing around traffic island and lower parkland is low-quality, modern fabric in poor condition. | ![Historic: Sandstone kerb](image_url)  
![Modern: Sandstone kerb](image_url) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item symbol in key</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Thumbnail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gutter</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>- Likely late nineteenth/early twentieth century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path/Flagging</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>- c. 1980s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item symbol in key</td>
<td>Feature type</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Thumbnail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Drainpipe | Iron | - Iron pipe outside 92–98 George Street  
- Post-dates the kerb | | ![Drainpipe Thumbnail](image) |
<p>| Retaining wall | Sandstone | - c. 1920s | | <img src="image" alt="Retaining wall Thumbnail" /> |
| Retaining wall | Brick | - Various early brick retaining walls are located around the site | | <img src="image" alt="Retaining wall Thumbnail" /> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item symbol in key</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retaining wall</td>
<td>Rendered masonry</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thumbnail

![Retaining wall](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item symbol in key</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Thumbnail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Symbol" /> or <img src="image2.png" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>- Various types of timber fencing are located around the site. Those identified on the plan above are considered to be historic elements.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item symbol in key</td>
<td>Feature type</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Thumbnail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garden bed edging</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>- Reused/salvaged stone</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Garden bed edging" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ![star]           | Plaque       | Heritage building or historic event identification plaque | Retaining wall at 81 George Street  
- Transcript: ‘This wall was built in 1818 by Richard Fitzgerald with rejected bricks from St Matthews Church of Eng.’.  
- Transcript: ‘1867 Flood’  
7 Thompson Square  
- Transcript: ‘Shire of Hawkesbury: Classified as an item of Environmental Heritage’  
1–3 Thompson Square  
- Transcript: ‘Early Colonial Terrace’.  
Commercial strip seating area  
- Transcript: ‘Thompson Square Restoration. A N.S.W. Bicentennial Commemorative’ | ![Plaque](image) |

7 Thompson Square
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item symbol in key</th>
<th><strong>Feature type</strong></th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th><strong>Thumbnail</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project was officially opened by the Hon. N. Greiner, M. P. Premier of New South Wales on 23 April 1988</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1–3 Thompson Square</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial strip seating area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item symbol in key</td>
<td>Feature type</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building remnants</td>
<td>Concrete slab remnants</td>
<td>Potential cement slab remains from the former boathouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item symbol in key</td>
<td>Feature type</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic sign painting</td>
<td>Paint</td>
<td>Historic painted advertising/shop sign.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>Memorial Anchor and plaque</td>
<td>- Transcript: ‘This memorial is dedicated to the memory of all the pioneers of the Hawkesbury Valley. The descendants of the listed pioneer families who settled in the Hawkesbury prior to 1828 have contributed to the erection of this plaque’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item symbol in key</td>
<td>Feature type</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Thumbnail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public furniture</td>
<td>Water bubbler</td>
<td>- Relates to the late twentieth century</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3                  | Plaque        | Plaque on large rock in upper park | - Plaque dated from 1985  
- Transcript: ‘This plaque commemorates the 175th Anniversary of the Naming of Windsor, Richmond, Castlereagh, Pitt Town and Wilberforce on the 6th December 1810. Unveiled by D.G. Bowed. OAM. President Hawkesbury Historical Society 6th December 1985’. | ![Thumbnail](image2.jpg) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item symbol in key</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4                 | Plaque       | Plaque on concrete plinth | - Plaque dated 1995  
- Transcript: 'Hawkesbury City Council. These Tourist Facilities were funded by the Australian Government and opened by The Hon. Michael J Lee, MP Minister for Tourism and Minister for Communication and The Arts. In the presence of Maggie Deahm, MP Federal Member for Macquarie on Friday, 5th October 1995'. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item symbol in key</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5                  | Plaque       | Windsor Bridge | - Plaque dated 1988  
- Transcript: ‘Historic Bridges of New South Wales. Windsor Bridge over Hawkesbury River. “I hope this bridge will last longer than the life of the youngest child who passes over it today” said Minister for Works John Sutherland, when opening it on 20 August 1874, during the greatest gala day ever witnessed in Windsor. Constructed by Turnbull and Dixon for the Public Works Department, its completion was celebrated with a huge procession, bullock roast and grand ball. In 1896-7 the bridge deck was railed 2.4 metres’. Erected to celebrate Australia’s Bicentenary in 1988 by the Department of Main Roads and the National Roads and Motorists’ Association (N.R.M.A.).’ |
<p>| 6                  | Stair        | Timber    | - Relates to the late twentieth century                                                                                                                                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item symbol in key</th>
<th>Feature type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Thumbnail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fence/gate</td>
<td><em>Timber Fence</em></td>
<td>- Relates to the early twentieth century</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td><em>Sandstone</em></td>
<td>While the exact function and date of this sandstone is unknown, the item is likely a historic element relating to 1–3 Thompson Square (i.e. the 1840s)</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Landscaped seating area with flagpole and reused stone kerbing</td>
<td><em>Stone</em></td>
<td>1988 – Bicentennial works</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topography

Much of the township of Windsor sits on a ridge to the southern side of the river which steeply descends to the north towards the Hawkesbury River. Bridge Street follows this descent from the ridge towards the bridge and cuts through the parklands of Thompson Square, exposing the contours of the site. The open farmland setting on the northern side of the study area sits within the flat undulating floodplain of the valley and is predominantly level, up until the embankment to the Hawkesbury River where the land drops at a steep slope. The current landform is demonstrated in Figure 10.

The topography of the site has been modified over time as a result of the creation of pathways of least resistance to and from the river. The implementation of the existing Bridge Street in 1934 resulted in a profound division across Thompson Square, much more so than had ever existed previously. The significance of this cut through the current landform is evident in the contours shown in Figure 10.

The upper square is largely level and open, forming the dominant recreational space within the centre of Windsor. The land gently slopes towards the river (an approximate 5% fall) before Bridge Street cuts off the upper square, forming the north-easterly edge through a dramatic change in level. The upper square is directly connected to the surrounding streets with good pedestrian access.

The lower square slopes more steeply towards the river before levelling at the northern intersection with The Terrace. Views are focused towards the river from this elevated position, enforcing its connection to the river foreshore. There is limited pedestrian access to the lower square.

The topographic conditions of the immediate site and the wider contextual landscape result in frequent flooding of Windsor Bridge and, on occasion, the township of Windsor itself. Flooding has had a major impact on the township since early settlement, due to many parts of its built environment being located on active floodplain. Flooding events are a significant component of life for the residents of Windsor and a reminder of the township’s position within the greater natural systems of the landform. These events are a direct result of the unique topographic character of the region and contribute to the landscape character. The cycles of flooding both prior to and during the historic period have regularly impacted on the landform through deposition, scouring and erosion.
Figure 10: Existing contours – demonstrating the division between the upper and lower portions of Thompson Square.
**Soils**

The soil landscape of the study area is an alluvial soil type derived from the Narrabeen Group, Hawkesbury Sandstone and Wianamatta Group materials – typically, deep-brown sands and loam.\(^{11}\) It is dynamic in nature due to constantly occurring streambank erosion and deposition. This soil typology lies within the floodplains of the Hawkesbury River and is subject to scour or sheet during floods. Deep deposits of alluvial material occurring close to the river are highly fertile and facilitated the agricultural development of the area. The site’s landscape is highly erodible due to its soil composition which contains a high percentage of fine sand and a low proportion of organic matter.

As a result of development, areas under the existing bridge and along the southern banks of the river were observed to comprise fill material such as concrete, plastic, glass, rubbish and reworked natural material. Gabion baskets and other masonry material have been installed in some areas of the southern shoreline to provide scour protection around the base of the original bridge.

The sediments in the river around Windsor were included in a study on the concentrations of heavy metals in the sediments of the Hawkesbury-Nepean River in 1998.\(^{12}\) The sediment testing at Windsor recorded the highest concentration of heavy metals (including copper, zinc, nickel, cobalt, cadmium, manganese and iron) in the main channel. The average concentration of heavy metals around Windsor recorded at that time was below relevant guidelines and the water would be considered uncontaminated.

**Vegetation**

Following settlement on the site, clearing of all remnant indigenous vegetation within Thompson Square and the northern zone of the study area occurred. Evans’s 1807 view of Green Hills shows the study area completely cleared of all native vegetation (see SCMP Volume 1, Figure 17). Photographic evidence from the late nineteenth century shows Thompson Square devoid of vegetation save for low grass. The overall character of the site today is one of a highly modified landscape with the exception of the existing vegetative communities occurring along the edge of the Hawkesbury River, comprising River Flat Forest and Freshwater Reed Swamps.

These communities are a direct result of the river’s sediments and represent the dominant presence of native vegetation remaining within the study area. The archival images shown in Figures 11, 13–15 demonstrate how the entire site was cleared and terraced by 1888. Further images depict the planting of what appears to be Norfolk Island Pines (*Araucaria heterophylla*) throughout Thompson Square in 1889 (see 1 and 5; however, the only remaining evidence of Norfolk Island Pines today is located opposite Thompson Square within the site of the Macquarie Arms Hotel.

---


\(^{12}\) Birch et al., 1998.
Figure 11: Thompson Square in 1888, showing clearance of entire site and terracing of roads. (Source: Reproduced in Proudfoot, H., The Historic Buildings of Windsor and Richmond, Kangaroo Press, Kenthurst, 1987.)

Figure 12: The low-level Windsor Bridge around 1880, showing cleared land to the north of the bridge. (Source: State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, bcp 04404r.)
Figure 13: Photograph of Thompson Square from the corner of the present George and Bridge streets, c. 1890s, showing clearance of the entire site. (Source: NSW State Library, digital order number d1_06257.)

Figure 14: A view from the north side of Windsor Bridge, showing Thompson Square c. 1890s. (Source: NSW State Library, digital order number d1_06263.)
Figure 15: Thompson Square, the wharf and Windsor Bridge around 1900. Smaller planted shrubs are apparent. (Source: State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, Small Picture File.)

Figure 16: Thompson Square in 1929, during the October flood, from the north, showing some modern plantings in the two reserves. (Source: Aerial photograph, courtesy of Carol Roberts, from the collection of her mother, the late Iris Cammack. Photographer, Frederick Halpin Willson, RAAF, 1929.)
The subsections below provide a description of the current vegetative conditions within the study area, broken up as per the three main zones.

**Zone 1: Thompson Square**

Today, the parkland of Thompson Square is comprised of a mix of both exotic and native species, planted in a deliberate but naturalistic fashion. The largest and most iconic specimen tree in this zone is the Hoop Pine (*Araucaria Cunninghamii*) located along the Bridge Street frontage of the upper square. It is estimated that the tree was planted in the 1880s due to its common use as a specimen tree during this period, as a way of establishing navigational markers throughout rural Australia.

The most dominant tree species within this zone is the Silky Oak (*Grevillea robusta*) – the largest species of the genus *Grevillea*. Although native, it occurs naturally only as far south as Coffs Harbour and is therefore not indigenous to the local area. Other notable mature tree species within Thompson Square include White Cedar (*Melia azedarach*), Plane Tree (*Platanus x hybrida*), Chinese Elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) and Jacaranda (*Jacaranda mimosifolia*).

Minimal understorey planting along with a completely maintained exotic grass cover is reflective of the idealised naturalistic character of the cultural landscape in the era in which it was established. The historic photographs above suggest a lack of understorey planting was the aesthetic intention; however, in recent years, mass planted garden beds have appeared predominantly along the edge of the Bridge Street escarpment in the upper square (Figure 25 - Vista 04), and predominantly along the lower square’s interface with The Terrace (Figure 24 - Vista 03 and Figure 27- Vista 06).

**Zone 2: Hawkesbury River**

Two predominant communities occur along the banks of the Hawkesbury River. Riparian Casuarina Open Forest, located on the south-western bank of Windsor Bridge, is a community commonly occurring on the alluvial soils of the Hawkesbury River. This narrow strip along the bank is likely to be regrowth following the historical land-clearing era at Windsor and is altered in structure through replanting.

The second community, Modified Riparian Corridor, exists along the majority of the northern banks and are likely the result of highly modified regrowth or of being completely reinstated following the historic land-clearing era. There are multiple groupings of Swamp She-Oak (*Casuarina glauca*) growing along the river’s edge on both sides. The lower riverbanks are largely infested with various weed species due to the fertile river flat environment.

A comprehensive Arboriculture Development Assessment Report has been prepared for the purpose of collecting appropriate tree-related data on the trees within the Windsor Bridge replacement study area. It identifies all tree species within the study area and contains an assessment of their condition and approximate age.

**Zone 3: North of the Hawkesbury River**

The majority of the zone north of the Hawkesbury River consists of cleared grassland. In the first decade of the colonisation of Windsor, the land would have been cleared for the purposes of intense land use and agriculture. The creek bank is dominated by exotic planting – namely, herbs and grasses. The only existing species of Eucalyptus currently found onsite in the study area are Sydney Blue Gum (*Eucalyptus saligna*), located within this northern zone.

---

Figure 17: Indicative diagram of Cumberland Plain vegetation present, prior to 1780.
Figure 18: Indicative diagram of planted vegetation within Thompson Square, c. 1880.
Figure 19: Existing vegetation.
**Aspect**

The open vistas and views from within Thompson Square are oriented towards Windsor Bridge and the Hawkesbury River, giving the site a dominant north-west aspect. This is reinforced by the topographic nature of the site which steeply descends towards the river, paying homage to the vast agricultural plains in the north-west.

Due to the site's unimpeded northern boundary and the low height and significant set-back of the built form surrounding the remaining perimeters of the site, Thompson Square receives ample sunlight throughout the majority of the day. Overshadowing from the surrounding built form is non-existent and the predominant shade comes from the mature tree plantings within Thompson Square itself. This level of sun exposure and localised tree shading lends itself to the use of the square's open space for recreational purposes.
Figure 20: Aspect plan showing the topography, built form, vegetation and sun path information for the study area.
Views and Vistas

Due to the topography on which the township of Windsor is located, approaching the study area from the southern Bridge Street connection presents a disjointed scene of Thompson Square. From the top of the ridgeline (running south of the Hawkesbury River) where Bridge and George streets intersect, views are focused into the upper square and the connection between this part of Thompson Square and the adjoining George Street becomes apparent. From within the upper square, views are strongly connected to the urban setting. In turn, this anchors the park as a civic space in the heart of the community.

As one moves north through Thompson Square, the physical disparity between the upper and lower sections of the square is visually reinforced due to the restriction of views northwards towards the river by the presence of mature trees. Visual connection with the river can only be obtained by moving towards the northern end of Thompson Square Road, where its elevated position provides vistas to the river and overlooks the majority of Thompson Square (Figure 25 – Vista 04).

The lower square has a stronger connection to the river as the topography consists of steeper slopes northwards (Figure 24 – Vista 03), and has been artificially mounded forming a viewing point out towards the river and northern riverbank. There is limited visual connection back to the upper square and George Street, which adds to the sense of isolation of this portion of the square, reinforced by the presence of Bridge Street (Figure 27 – Vista 06).

As Windsor Bridge sits low in the landscape and is mostly obscured from view from the town centre and upper parts of Thompson Square, its presence in the landscape is most apparent when one approaches the township from the northern side (Zone 3 of the study area) due to the elevated position of the current road alignment and lack of obscuring vegetation (Figure 22 – Vista 01). The view across this part of the river to the north is identifiable as a gateway to Windsor both historically and presently.

Upon crossing Windsor Bridge, a strong visual connection is made with the Hawkesbury River. Key views open up along the river, giving a sense of expansiveness both downstream and upstream (Figure 23 – Vistas 2 a, b, c). It is important to note, however, that these vistas are not readily accessible as the footpath on the bridge is narrow which discourages lingering visitation on the bridge itself. This visual engagement and experience with the river is also obtainable from along The Terrace and, even more strongly, from the existing wharf. The sense of expansiveness, however, is somewhat lost from these vantage points, as vistas upstream and downstream terminate closer (Figure 26 – Vistas 5 a, b).
Figure 21: Key views and vistas to and from the study area.
Figure 22: Key view 1 of the study area towards Windsor Bridge. Refer to Figure 21.

Figure 23: Views 2 a, b, c – 360-degree vista from Windsor Bridge towards Thompson Square, and upstream and downstream of the Hawkesbury River. Refer to Figure 21.

Figure 24: View 3 – Key view from lower Thompson Square carpark to river. Refer to Figure 21.

Figure 25: View 4 – Key view of Thompson Square and Windsor Bridge from elevated position on Thompson Square Road. Refer to Figure 21.
Edges

As previously discussed in section 2.1.1 on Local Landscape Evolution, the spatial configuration of Thompson Square has evolved since its formation as a dedicated open space in 1811, and this has been largely attributed to its varying edge condition. Historically, the built fabric surrounding Thompson Square formed a distinct edge to three sides of Thompson Square’s parkland open space. Today, the edge condition of the built form remains largely intact; yet, since the introduction of Bridge Street in 1934, the road alignment has been perhaps the greatest influence on the spatial configuration of Thompson Square.

As the dominance of the motor vehicle increased, with it came a greater need to provide access to Windsor Bridge from the top of the township ridge. This resulted in a drastic diagonal cut through the landform of the square from east to west. The retaining wall of the approach road has created two distinct open spaces, forming a physical edge to both the upper and lower portions of Thompson Square.
Figure 28: Edge types defining Thompson Square.
Connectivity and Accessibility

The upper area of Thompson Square provides the best pedestrian connectivity to the town due to the topography being largely flat and level with the adjacent commercial buildings along George Street. The lower area of the square is much more difficult for pedestrians to access, and is only effectively approachable from Old Bridge Street. The presence of Bridge Street cuts off direct pedestrian access from the lower to the upper square.

Pedestrian access to the river, wharf and bridge is also limited to just two options: the Old Bridge Road route down to the wharf on the eastern side of Windsor Bridge which connects to the pedestrian access over Windsor Bridge; or along Thompson Square Road, which runs at an accessible grade down to The Terrace at the river. Continued access from this point along the riverfront is then only available by directly crossing Bridge Street which is inherently dangerous due to the speed of moving vehicles and limited sightlines back up the embankment. While there is currently a timber walkway under the bridge, as of this report it has been closed due to its condition.
Figure 29: Pedestrian connectivity and accessibility in Thompson Square.
Programme and Uses

Thompson Square was designated as an open space area by Governor Macquarie for use by the inhabitants of Windsor. The space initially had more of a utilitarian function as it was predominantly used to access the river. However, over time it has assumed a more civic role and has become an important recreational space for the community. Its proximity to the network of open spaces along the riverbank emphasises its importance as a place for recreational activities in a town that is increasingly becoming urbanised.

Recreational uses are concentrated within the upper square due to its high level of accessibility and flatter terrain from George Street and the urban surrounds. A small area of the lower square near the carpark provides a desirable setting for picnics although this is a less accessible space within the parklands of Thompson Square.

2.2.5 Summary

All of the components evaluated in this section contribute to the rich layering of the site. The cumulative effect of these elements lends itself to the familiarity and strong character of Thompson Square which is most valued by the local community.

It is apparent that Thompson Square is read as two distinct spaces – with the upper square relating strongly to the life of the town’s civic heart and the lower square relating more strongly to the Hawkesbury River due to its proximity and strong visual connections to the river. However, this condition of segregation, reinforced by the 1934 addition of Bridge Street, can be thought of as another layer in the historical reconfiguration of Thompson Square. Access to the river and the bridge has always taken precedence throughout planning history so that the current form Thompson Square has become the ‘left-over’ space.

The parkland of Thompson Square as it lies today strongly exhibits an informal and unstructured character which is a reflection of its historical development. Asymmetry, planting and spatial delineation reflect that of the picturesque landscape design of the eighteenth century. These ideals should be conserved and reflected in the future management of the landscape of Thompson Square.

The square’s informal plantings, soft landscaping, open space and views to the river and adjacent historic buildings all contribute towards that character. Hard landscaping, terracing, formalised garden beds and other interventions which would diminish the informal character of the open spaces in Thompson Square should therefore be avoided.

2.3 Aboriginal Heritage

This section provides information on the Aboriginal heritage of the region and study area. It also includes details of the consultation undertaken with the Aboriginal community as part of the field investigation programme.

2.3.1 Aboriginal Consultation

Aboriginal consultation is being undertaken for the WBRP in accordance with RMS’s (2011) Procedures for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation. The primary purpose of the consultation work is to identify and document the cultural values of the study area to the Aboriginal community so that those values can be considered in the excavation and salvage, and in the development of future management and impact mitigation measures within the SCMP.

Consultation is ongoing with the Aboriginal stakeholders and organisations involved in the earlier stages of the project, including:

- Deerubbin LALC
- Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation
- Darug Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessments
- Darug Land Observations
- Darug Tribal Aboriginal Corporation
To date, consultation has been focused on the archaeological investigations, and has included the distribution of an excavation methodology on 18 March 2016, twenty-eight days to provide written comment, and a focus group meeting that was held shortly after to receive further feedback.

All stakeholder groups were invited to, and participated in, the archaeological test excavation work undertaken in the latter half of 2016. Further consultation has been undertaken with these groups in relation to the results of the testing programme, which were used to develop the recommendations for further archaeological salvage work and the archaeological management framework developed for the SCMP. In general, the groups have been supportive of the archaeological testing undertaken to date, and the proposed future archaeological salvage work. Additional consultation was undertaken in 2017 in relation to the interpretation within the study area, particularly the need to interpret the early conflicts and violence between local Aboriginal people and the European settlers. Feedback from that process has been incorporated into the Interpretation Plan. Full details of the consultation process are contained in Volume 4 of the SCMP.

2.3.2 Ethnographic Context

The Study Area

AAJV maintains a database of historically documented interactions with Aboriginal people between 1788 and 1837. The database was created by systematically reviewing the early primary sources for the Sydney region and mapping any site-specific ethnographic evidence. The sources consulted ranged from James Cook’s visit to Botany Bay in 1770 through to Missionary James Backhouse’s visit to the colony in 1835–37. The survey produced over 270 plotted markers, and included seven Aboriginal tracks (covering a combined distance of over 100 kilometres) and the locations and ‘boundaries’ of particular ‘tribes’ and ‘clans’ as interpreted by a range of researchers. Historical evidence indicates that the local Aboriginal group for the Windsor region was the Boorooberongal.14

In the case of the Windsor area generally, there are six known contact sites between Aboriginal people and Europeans documented within the vicinity of the study area, which occurred from 1791 to 1835 (Figure 30). What the accounts demonstrate is that there were distinct groupings of Aboriginal people living within the Windsor area prior to the earliest European settlement, with sufficient longevity of residence to be aware of the propensity of the river to flood periodically, and sometimes dramatically.15 The early interactions are recorded as cordial16 but by the early 1800s there are records of violence on both sides. This suggests that, as the settlement became more established, there arose greater reasons and opportunities for conflict.

The earliest accounts indicate that the groups in this region were living relatively traditional lifestyles, but quickly changed and adapted to the presence of the Europeans. One account17 records the theft of a musket by a local Aboriginal group, which was then linked to a number of incidents of violence.

15 Governor Hunter to the Duke of Portland, 1 May 1799, in Historical Records of Australia, Series 1, Volume 2, 1797-1800, Governor’s Despatches to and from England (Sydney: The Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, 1914), 354-355.; Governor King to Earl Camden, 7 April 1806, Historical Records of Australia, Series 1, Volume 5, July 1804-August 1806, Governor’s Despatches to and from England (Sydney: The Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, 1915).
16 Watkin Tench, A Complete Account of the Settlement at Port Jackson (London: G. Nicol and J. Sewell, 1793), 14 April 1791
17 Governor King to Earl Camden, 30 April 1805, Historical Records of Australia, Series 1, Volume 5, July 1804-August 1806, Governor’s Despatches to and from England (Sydney: The Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, 1915), 306.
Much later accounts\textsuperscript{18} reveal the partial assimilation of Aboriginal people, including the adoption of European dress and attendance at school.

This is suggestive of a not unusual pattern of interaction, whereby early friendly relations later turned sour, as there was greater social pressure from European settlement, with the consequences of loss of land, impact of disease and displacement of local Aboriginal people. This pattern of displacement was later replaced with the partial integration of some Aboriginal people into the local community, albeit at a lower position in the social order.

Figure 30 below identifies, insofar as possible, the locations of these historically recorded interactions in the vicinity of the study area.

2.3.3 Cultural Values

A focus group meeting was convened with the registered Aboriginal stakeholders identified during the process of Aboriginal stakeholder notification and registration. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and identify the Aboriginal cultural importance of the study area related to traditional, historical and contemporary values. It was also intended as a forum for discussing the archaeological investigation methodology. The focus group meeting was seen as an initial phase of a staged approach to engagement with Aboriginal community representative organisations, traditional owner claimants and knowledge holders.

During the focus group meeting, one of the stakeholders recalled a story of two Aboriginal boys being killed in the vicinity of the bridge. There is a relatively well-known story of two Aboriginal boys who were murdered in September or October 1799 at Robert Forrester’s Grant, some 1.5 kilometres west of the study area.\textsuperscript{19} However, it is yet to be determined whether this reflects the same story, or some other event closer to the study area.

\textsuperscript{18} James Backhouse, Narrative of a Visit to the Australian Colonies (London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1843), 303-304.

\textsuperscript{19} Court of Criminal Jurisdiction, \textit{Minutes of Proceedings}, State Records N.S.W., X905, pp. 323, 329–62.
Figure 30: Map of ethnographic sites in the Windsor region based on a review of historically documented interactions between Aboriginal people and Europeans.
2.3.4 Aboriginal Archaeological Context

This section discusses the regional and local Aboriginal archaeological context of the study area. Archaeologists examine regional and local trends in the distribution of known sites, consider such sites in relation to environment and topography, and use this analysis to assist in modelling the patterns of other settlement and site locations. This provides evidence about past economic and social systems and also assists archaeologists in predicting likely site types, site locations and the nature of the archaeological resource in any given area. This is a brief summary only, and a more detailed review of the archaeological context of the region can be found in the *Thompson Square Archaeological Test Excavation Report*.

Summary

Previous investigations in the Sydney region and at Windsor indicate that:

- The Aboriginal colonisation of the Sydney Basin may have occurred as early as 40,000 years BP (in the Pleistocene), with reliable evidence of occupation along major river corridors and a focus on local resources and raw material, from about 35,000 BP. Several sites in the Windsor region have produced some of the earliest evidence of these activities along the banks of the Hawkesbury River.

- These areas remained occupied, and their use was intensified, during the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) – a period of extreme aridity – with recent models highlighting the Sydney Basin as a likely refuge.

- Infilling and intensification use of the Sydney Basin, including along lesser creeklines, occurred in the late Holocene (from about 5,000 BP to the present) – with the vast majority of the 12,000 or so sites recorded in the Sydney Basin indicative of this period.

- Understanding of the post-LGM period remains poor, with archaeological deposits continuing to show refugia-like behaviour despite improving climatic and resource conditions. Further characterisation of deposits from this temporal period is essential to improve our understanding of past society behaviour; and currently the best known of these deposits in NSW are along the Hawkesbury River corridor.

- Occupation of the region over the past 8,000 or so years is also yet to be definitively understood, with several sites suggesting a possible abandonment of the region in the mid-Holocene (8,000–5,000 years BP) despite climatic amelioration. This was followed by significant recolonisation and intense use of the region in the past few thousand years. The high quantities of silcrete during this later period is strongly indicative of close links with and/or regular movement to other parts of north-west Sydney, such as Plumpton Ridge and Riverstone.

- The previous studies undertaken in the study area indicate the presence of high densities of cultural deposits within the study area and the presence of a sand body. Previous investigations at Windsor Museum and Pitt Town reveal that similar sand body landforms have the potential to contain deep cultural sequences extending from the late Holocene back into the Pleistocene period.

An extensive programme of Aboriginal archaeological testing was undertaken in the latter half of 2016 by AAJV. This revealed little evidence of Aboriginal occupation north of the river, but extensive results on the southern part of the study area, particularly the lower areas of Thompson Square closest to the southern river embankment. This included good evidence of the Hawkesbury River sand body formation, which has yielded scientific testing dates of 23,000 BP in some areas. The results of these works are summarised below.
Figure 31: Registered Aboriginal sites within the study area, as identified by KNC (2012).
Figure 32: Study area showing elevation. Note the elevated areas in the south are centred on the junction of Windsor Road and George streets.
2.3.5 Overview of Previous Aboriginal Archaeological Investigations in the Southern Study Area

Previous archaeological investigations in the Windsor area have revealed a highly complex archaeological landscape. The area contains evidence of over 30,000 years of Aboriginal occupation and over 200 years of historical occupation. During the historic period, at least twenty-one buildings were constructed in the study area, the remains of which constitute potential historical archaeological sites.

Recent archaeological investigations along the Hawkesbury River corridor have identified the presence of very old and significant cultural deposits, usually on elevated terraces or ridgelines and associated with large sand bodies (either source-bordering dunes or dune fields). Most notable among these are those excavated by the AHMS in Pitt Town between 2008 and 2012, which recovered a large stone artefact assemblage dated to 36,000 years BP – some of the oldest cultural material in Australia; and Austral’s excavation of the Windsor Museum site in 2012, which recovered similar cultural material in deposits dated to at least 20,000 years BP. The previous phase of WBRP investigations carried out by KNC\(^{20}\) indicates that there is potential for such deposits to exist within the study area and the Minister’s Conditions of Approval (B3f and B4f) requires their specific management. These clauses within the Minister’s Conditions specifically state that the study include areas of construction associated with the removal of the current bridge and the construction of the new bridge, as well as including the general ‘Hawkesbury River area’.

KNC (2012) undertook Aboriginal heritage test excavations as part of the Environmental Assessment for the WBRP. These excavations consisted of nine test pits distributed sporadically across the development area (Figure 33). Five were situated in the southern study area, primarily on the edges of Thompson Square and within the roadway to the Windsor Wharf. A series of geotechnical investigations was also undertaken. The results indicate the presence of highly variable subsurface stratigraphy, with some test pits showing deep sand profiles of over 1 metre deep and others displaying clear evidence that historical developments had more or less completely truncated the surface deposits with potential to contain archaeological remains.

One hundred and eighty-five Aboriginal objects (artefacts) were recovered from the archaeological testing, the majority of which came from a test pit in close proximity to the George Street/Windsor Road roundabout (n=114). Of note was that the majority of the assemblage was composed of tuff raw materials, which in this region is strongly indicative of Pleistocene (>10,000 years ago) occupation. Unfortunately, no dating of the soil profile was attempted as part of these works to verify the age of the soil deposits.

Our review indicates that the KNC (2012) scope of work needs to be augmented with a more detailed phase of test investigation to assess the nature, extent and significance of Aboriginal sites and objects within the study area. In particular, the age and geomorphic provenance of the sand bodies need to be established in order to assess the significance of the cultural deposits contained within the sand body deposits. The spatial and vertical distribution of Aboriginal cultural deposits also needs to be better understood in order to inform development of the final SCMP document.

Based on our wider knowledge of the region, including the findings of extensive works carried out at the Windsor Museum and Pitt Town, significant cultural materials in this area are usually constrained to the elevated ridgeline overlooking the river or within deep sand profiles. In the case of Pitt Town, the cultural assemblage was routinely found at 1.2–1.4 metres below the surface, and between 22 and 25 metres AHD. Windsor Museum similarly contained cultural deposits at depths of over 1 metre deep, but at elevations of closer to 15 metres AHD. An examination of the results obtained by KNC and the elevations of the southern study area suggests that the southern study area has high potential to contain stratigraphically thick, culturally significant deposits at depth within an area extending from around 10 metres north of the Macquarie Street/Windsor Road junction across the

entire study area to around 30 metres north of George Street. Further to this, at lower elevations, probably within the modern floodplain, we consider that two additional locations require consideration:

1) An identified site documented by KNC (2012) as WSP 45-5-3581, located below 11 metres AHD and in close proximity to the river, but visually having a sand profile deposit.

2) Areas immediately along the banks of the Hawkesbury River that would be subject to some of the most significant impacts of the WBRP development, but which were not investigated as part of the EIS works.

2.3.6 Previous Aboriginal Archaeological Investigations in the Northern Study Area

KNC (2012) undertook a test excavation of four test pits within the northern WBRP development area. All four test pits were excavated in conjunction with the geotechnical investigations described above. These identified a homogenous soil profile, which was considered to have low potential to contain significant Aboriginal cultural materials. KNC argued that the history of regular flooding of the area may have discouraged occupation within the flood zone and periodic flood scouring would have eroded and removed cultural deposits. The KNC excavations were undertaken to a total depth of 1 metre, with some six Aboriginal objects (artefacts) recovered in the upper 600 millimetres. No dating of the soil profile was undertaken as part of the testing works to verify the age or significance of these artefacts, or the sequence in general.

The 2016 archaeological testing programme was designed to augment the work of KNC (2012) with a more detailed phase of test investigation to assess the nature, extent and significance of Aboriginal sites and objects within the northern study area.

In particular, there was a need for excavation to a greater depth to demonstrate the presence or absence of deeply buried Pleistocene cultural deposits, which are regularly encountered at depths exceeding 1 metre below modern ground surfaces. This was required to determine whether the top 1 metre of the soil profile represents the entire archaeological record or simply the post-contact period (twentieth-century relics were reported at these depths in the BIOSIS 2012 report). While the upper 3.7 metres of the soil profile appeared similar and homogenous, numerous studies along the Hawkesbury River have demonstrated that cultural materials in this region can occur even deeper than this. Investigations at Cranebrook Terrace recovered artefacts from over 8 metres in depth, while recent excavations by AHMS at Peachtree Creek retrieved Aboriginal objects at 4 metres in depth (dated to only 8,000 years BP). It was therefore considered that both a greater spatial and, more importantly, increased depth of excavation were required to identify whether any deeply buried cultural materials are present in the northern study area.

2.3.7 Results of the 2016 Aboriginal Test Excavations

An extensive programme of Aboriginal archaeological test excavation was undertaken in late 2016, the full details of which are contained in the Thompson Square Archaeological Test Excavation Report (AAJV 2017). The results of that testing programme are briefly summarised here.

The archaeological programme was designed and implemented in accordance with a research design approved by NSW RMS, DPE, and the Registered Aboriginal Parties. The excavation was undertaken over a 9.5-week field programme between 22 August and 17 November 2016, by a core team of four archaeologists, an artefact manager, and seven Aboriginal representatives. Archaeological excavations consisted of supervised mechanically dug test pits across the project area, with all sediment recovered in spits and wet-sieved for cultural material.

Overall, the excavations revealed ten discrete sedimentary (or geomorphological) layers across the two project areas. Throughout these layers some 1,434 stone artefacts were recovered – twenty-three from the northern project, and the remainder from the southern project area. The depth of the artefacts was variable, but often deep, ranging between 120 and 240 centimetres below current surface in the northern project area, and 70–210 centimetres below current surface in the southern
project area. From these data, four distinct archaeological landscapes were developed to describe the past Aboriginal occupation of and activity within the study area (Figure 36), as outlined below:

- **Ridgeline** – extending across George Street, the southern edge of Thompson Square, Macquarie Street, and parts of Old Bridge Street. This landscape reveals a disparate shallow soil profile, often beneath historical overburden. Much of this landscape has been heavily affected by modern and historical activities, with only pockets of soil profile (and any associated stone artefacts) being present across the landscape. The deposit contained discrete concentrations of Aboriginal stone artefacts up to 50 square metres, which compositionally appeared to represent a mixture of several different phases of use over the past 30,000 years.

- **Source-Bordering Dune** – extending across upper and lower Thompson Square, with truncated and/or discrete patches of the deposit in The Terrace, Old Bridge Street and George Street. This landscape was composed of two different layers of sand, formed by both river and wind processes over at least the past 82,000 years. The majority of the Aboriginal stone artefacts (995) within the southern project area were recovered from these layers. Compositionally, the artefacts could be divided into three different periods of visitation and/or occupation of the project area: at 27,000–17,000 years ago, 7,000–5,000 years ago and early post-European settlement (AD 1784–1830s). The majority of the Aboriginal stone artefacts date to between 27,000 and 17,000 years ago, and provide some of the earliest evidence of populations in the Sydney Basin, and importantly evidence of a major climatic downturn – the LGM\(^{21}\) – which saw the abandonment of extensive tracts of Australia. (Therefore, finding areas where Aboriginal populations survived and lived through this period is relatively rare.) A number of glass artefacts (n=3) were also found in the upper parts of the deposit and demonstrate post-contact interactions between Aboriginal people and early European settlers. Other historical material found in association, and past records of Windsor, suggest that the artefacts likely date to between AD 1794 and the 1830s.

- **River’s Edge Alluvium** – encompassing the entire northern project area, and the lower areas of the southern project area, including The Terrace, the wharf area and surrounding carpark. This landscape consisted of thick, dark-brown sand and clay, and was likely formed through low-energy deposition by the Hawkesbury River, probably in the past 6,500 years, if not much more recently. Aboriginal stone artefacts are found throughout the deposit in low numbers (<5 square metres), with many of them potentially reworked either naturally or via human processes from other nearby archaeological landscapes.

- **River’s Edge (Reclaimed/Introduced Fill)** – disparate pockets of introduced and/or modified natural deposits used to infill and landscape areas primarily along the southern bank of the Hawkesbury River. Aboriginal stone artefacts were found throughout the deposit in low numbers (<5 square metres), with many of them potentially reworked either naturally or via human processes from other nearby archaeological landscapes.

Overall, the assessment found nine test pits of very high or high (regional/State) significance, three of moderate significance, and thirty-four of low or very low significance. All those identified as high or very high value were situated within the Source-Bordering Dune archaeological landscape. The identification of these areas as high or very high value was based on the significant age and integrity of the cultural deposit, and its ability to provide information on the behaviour, mobility and populations

\(^{21}\) The Last Glacial Maximum is a well-documented global event dating to between 24,000 and 18,000 years ago. This was the height of the last glacial period, and saw extremely cold and arid conditions across much of Australia.
of Aboriginal people during the initial colonisation of south-east Australia, and through the LGM (24,000–18,000 years BP) – a significant climatic period of drying and cooling. These deposits also contained glass artefacts, and demonstrate post-contact interactions between Aboriginal people and early European settlers, thereby meeting historical significance thresholds.

The main areas of Aboriginal archaeological sensitivity are in the southern portion of the study area. The areas north of the river yielded a negligible result, as did the testing carried out south of the roundabout on George Street. Substantial intact deposits, particularly of the sand sheet, were found in and adjacent to Thompson Square, particularly in the northern (lower) portion of the area. Future works in these sensitive areas will require detailed archaeological salvage excavation, monitoring or, at a minimum, stop work protocols, if sensitive areas cannot be avoided.
Figure 33: The proposed and actual test pit locations for the southern study area.
Figure 34: The proposed and actual test pit locations for the northern study area.
Figure 35: Artefact densities at test pit locations.
Figure 36: Archaeological landscapes within the study area, based on the 2016 test excavation.
Figure 37: Test pit significance within the study area.
Figure 38: Potential source-bordering dune deposit depths within the study area. Depths are measured from the top to the bottom of the deposit.
Figure 39: Areas of Aboriginal heritage sensitivity.
2.4 Historical Archaeology

2.4.1 Overview of Previous Historical Archaeological Investigations

Most of the archaeological work undertaken at Windsor has been completed since 1977, when the NSW Heritage Act was gazetted. Only one archaeological project was completed in the town before that year. Much of the earliest work in the 1970s and 1980s was firmly focused on recording archaeological features to prevent the loss of information that would ensue from the development of various sites. The study area south of the Hawkesbury River was originally centred around the historic core of Green Hills and, later, Windsor. It contained early wharves, gardens and buildings related to the earliest phases of European settlement of the area. In addition to the location of Andrew Thompson's original leased allotment, the southern study area potentially contains archaeological remains of many of the earliest colonial structures, including the granary, barracks, Commissariat and Thompson’s house. North of the river, the area was known to include the site of the Squatters Arms Inn, located near the punt and northern end of Windsor Bridge.

For example, Holmes's 1976 excavation of the Windsor guardhouse site was undertaken in response to an immediate threat from roadworks and sought to record features and collect artefacts from deposits already removed or disturbed by workmen. Gregson, in his work at Bowman Cottage in the early 1980s, was the first archaeologist able to explicitly state a set of research aims for the area, with this information to contribute to the Conservation Management Plan for the site.

Much archaeological work has been undertaken on the site of the Hawkesbury Museum, on the western side of Thompson Square. Work from the late 1980s by Higginbotham at 7 Thompson Square (rear of Hawkesbury Museum) was focused on the recovery of structural information and sequences of deposits prior to the development of the lower rooms of the house. This work also sought to identify information related to the structural development of the site, and the results were framed as recommendations for the future management of the site and of the artefact resources recovered by the excavation. The phases of the archaeological findings did not necessarily correspond to the identified historical phases of site development. One reason for this, identified by Gregson, was the residual nature of many of the excavated artefacts. Work by Cultural Resources Management in Baker Street (for the Museum extension) identified original and altered topography, structural features, pits and refuse and evidence of the clean-up after the 1867 flood.

Other examples of similar research objectives, focusing on the dating, function and use of structures on a site, include CRM's excavation at Hawkesbury Hospital, Higginbotham’s monitoring of 232 George St, and the excavation by Archaeological Management and Consulting (AMAC) at 29 North Street. Further archaeological testing was undertaken in 2012 as part of the early investigations for the WBRP, followed by an independent expert review, and later the extensive programme of archaeological test excavation by AAJV in 2016.

2.4.2 The 2016 Historical Archaeological Test Excavations

A series of fifteen test trenches were excavated to investigate the presence of historical archaeological remains (see Figure 42 and Figure 44). These comprised five test trenches in the northern area, and ten in the southern area. All trenches were excavated with mechanical assistance under supervision and ranged in size from 2–10 metres long, 1–2 metres wide, and up to 2.5 metres

---

25 Part of an Aeolian sand dune with potential for Aboriginal cultural material to be present.
in depth. A surface scatter of mid- to late-nineteenth-century artefacts was discovered on part of the northern area, which led to an expansion of the test excavation programme.

The testing works in the northern area, however, produced a nil result in terms of in-situ historical archaeological material. The artefact scatter proved to be related to imported fill associated with the agricultural use of the land. No evidence was found related to the site of the Squatters Arms Inn and the excavations revealed extensive deposits of alluvium and introduced modern fill. The northern part of the study area is considered to have little archaeological potential or significance.

In the southern part of the study area, the area south of the roundabout at Bridge and George streets again produced only limited results, as it appears that the majority of cultural materials have been removed by previous roadworks. Remnant sections of Telford paving were found along some areas of the west side of Bridge Road south of the roundabout, and along the south side of George Street. At the southern extreme of the study area, the test pit at the intersection of Windsor and Macquarie streets did reveal some limited artefactual material at depths of more than 1.5 metres, suggesting that there is a greater potential for surviving archaeological materials in that area, which historically was on the edge of a marshy area.

Archaeological structural remains were found in situ in two areas: immediately to the east of the roundabout in George Street (in Aboriginal test pit SA25 – see Figure 40); and along the east edge of Bridge Street, in the footpath and road verge (in historic test trench SH6). In both cases, there were early sandstock brick footings, which appear to be pre-1850s. There was little in the way of directly associated artefactual material, as in both cases the brickwork had been partially disturbed by previous services or roadworks. The remains in George Street were 220 millimetres below the existing road surface and appeared to be no more than two to three courses of brick high, again suggesting that previous roadworks have removed much of the upper portions of the original ground surface. The footings in trench SH6 were somewhat larger, but had been disturbed by previous services and thus were less intact. In both cases, the remains were left in situ following recording.

Figure 40: Footings found in SA25.
In other test pits within Thompson Square, Bridge Street and The Terrace, east of Bridge Street, were found historical artefactual material from the nineteenth century and some limited evidence of postholes in some pits, but no other structural remains or anything that can be clearly linked to the known historical record. To the far east side of the study area, Aboriginal test pit SA37 contained a significant amount of modern rubbish fill, likely relating to the localised infilling of a void along the river’s edge in the late twentieth century. The western section of The Terrace demonstrated little in the way of historical material, and is considered to have limited archaeological potential.

What is clear through the testing is that, while some archaeological potential survives in the study area, past works have heavily disturbed some areas of the site. It is likely that the best preserved archaeological remains associated with the early history of Windsor survive within the private lands to the east of the study area.

Historical artefactual materials were also found in test trenches within the lower portion of Thompson Square and in historical fill closer to the southern edge of the river. The potential remains of a historic path may have been found in one of the trenches close to the river, and it is possible that brick footings visible above ground within the garden of the residence at No. 4 Bridge Street are also the archaeological remains of early-nineteenth-century structures.

In general, it was found that historical archaeological materials have been partially disturbed, through construction activities, services installation works or roadworks as well as by flood action. Testing revealed that the surviving historical archaeological resource within the study area contains evidence of the mid- to late-nineteenth-century use of Thompson Square, with less evidence of the late-eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century uses. Earlier deposits may survive at a greater depth in some areas, and collectively the resource provides an insight into the use and development of Thompson Square and aspects of the development of the community of Windsor which are otherwise not documented in the historical record.
Figure 42: Historic test trench excavation status in northern project area.
Historic Test Trench Excavation Status
(As of end of test excavation 2016-11-21)

- Excavation complete

Figure 43: Historic test trench excavations in southern project area.
Figure 44: Location of archaeological test pits during the 2016 testing programme that produced evidence of historical archaeology.
Figure 45: Historical archaeology management zones.
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**Historical archaeology management zones**

- Salvage excavation *(confirmed in situ archaeological remains of high significance)*
- Archaeological monitoring *(confirmed disturbed or lower significance archaeological remains)*
- Unexpected finds procedure *(no confirmed archaeological remains, but some potential)*
- Maritime archaeological investigation *(confirmed in situ maritime archaeological remains)*
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2.5 Maritime Archaeology

The maritime archaeological potential of the study area consists of three main areas:

- remains of historic wharf structures
- evidence of early boatbuilding
- evidence of the punt that operated from 1810 to 1874.

In December 2008, Cosmos Archaeology undertook a maritime archaeological survey with the primary objective of examining the location of the circa-1814 wharf on the southern side of the Hawkesbury River, downstream of the current road bridge. This underwater survey was conducted as part of the early stages of investigating the proposed new bridge crossing over the Hawkesbury River at Windsor.

A series of transects were run in the general area of the former wharf to identify whether relics relating to the former wharf were present, or had the potential to be present on the riverbed. This survey identified areas of stone ballast along the riverbed and several logs which are likely to be evidence of earlier wharf structures. A benching sandstone outcrop was also observed. There was no evidence that the sandstone had been modified for use in the punt landing, although the punt operators may have used this feature as it was located 15 metres from the current riverbank. The area has silted over closer to the bank, and the sandstone bench could not be seen.

In 2012, a side-scanning sonar survey was undertaken along the southern edge of the riverbank, but did not identify any elements that were clearly cultural in nature. This survey was followed up by further archaeological dive surveys, which, aside from the ballast and logs, did not identify any other cultural features. The area of the former punt on the south embankment was also inspected, but no evidence of the punt was found.

The diving survey and test excavation took place over five days in late August and early September 2016. Conditions were generally good and tidal currents were noticeable but had a negligible effect on the underwater tasks being undertaken. Water visibility was at best 0.2 metres which was better than anticipated. Each diver transect scanned a corridor of around 0.5 metres. Therefore, the underwater survey could not visually examine the whole of the underwater area of the former wharf site. The visibility was considered just sufficient for video; however, the quality is not optimum given the challenging conditions (see Figure 477 and 48).

Wharf features previously observed in the 2008 survey were photographed and positioned using a total station. The riverbank was more overgrown than it had been in 2008, and there were more wharf features observed closer to the current bridge, which seem to have been exposed due to erosion. These features were also recorded.

Seven 20-metre-long diver transects were undertaken perpendicular to the riverbank, mostly in front of the exposed former wharf remains. Two transects of approximately 80 metres were undertaken parallel to the riverbank. One transect was in wading depth close to shore and the other followed the toe of the rock armour batter where it became covered in sand, from the downstream bridge pier and the public wharf.

For each transect the diver carried a 4-metre staff with a prism. At 2-metre intervals the diver stopped to have his/her position recorded using a total station. At each 2-metre position the diver noted the riverbed composition. Extra positions were taken at the interface between the rock and sand riverbed as well as for the test trenches.

The survey found that relatively large rocks of > 500 millimetres across were concentrated close to the bank and formed a relatively steep slope (see Figure 46). In front of the exposed above-water remains of the former wharf the large rocks gave way to smaller rounded rocks of up to 300 millimetres across (cobble ballast). The edge of the rock rubble was covered with coarse sand.

The exposed rock rubble ended at 8–10 metres (slope distance) from the riverbank. The exposed tip of a shopping trolley laying on its side was observed in the sandy riverbed just beyond the rock rubble. This suggests that the outer extremity of the rock rubble, in particular the cobble ballast, is currently buried for a distance of another 1–2 metres.
The smaller rounded stone expanse is likely to be the ballast for the 1790s and 1810s wharves. The larger rocks appear to have been deposited by machine and likely date from the 1970s onwards. These rocks overlay the ballast layer for the most part except for the outer fringes, which are in turn partially buried by sand.

Two diver transects amounting to 80 metres in length were conducted in the area where the supposed second wharf was located. The riverbed at this location is composed of sandy silt and the diver was able to thrust their arm easily into the seabed up to their elbow. No cultural material of heritage significance was found. If there was a wharf in this area, any remains are completely buried at present.

Three test trenches were excavated and contained similar stratigraphy. The uppermost layer was composed of rounded cobbles and smaller angular stone (fragments of sandstone and mudstone up to 150 millimetres across). This layer ranged between 100 and 150 millimetres in thickness. In UWTT01 and 02 the next layer was composed of cobbles packed with gravel, which varied in thickness of between 200 and 400 millimetres. Under this layer there was a 50–100-millimetre layer of sand. These two trenches bottomed out onto stiff black clay. For UWTT03 the layer of sand was between the uppermost cobbles layer and the cobble/gravel layer. This trench bottomed out, after 1 metre, onto a concreted sand/gravel matrix.

It has been interpreted that the cobbled and cobbled/small rock layers are ballast while the stiff black clay and concreted sand/gravel matrices are natural.

Because of the compacted nature of the cobbled/gravel layers, the water dredge was deployed to break up this matrix. Artefacts were found within the cobbled and cobbled/gravel layer in all three trenches. The relative thinness of the sand layer between the compacted cobbled/gravel matrix and the clay did not readily allow for the isolation of artefacts coming from that layer. Therefore, for the purposes of this test excavation, there was no differentiation recorded between artefacts coming from the cobbled/gravel and sand layers.

Those artefacts that could be readily dated on the spot ranged in age from recent times to the mid-nineteenth century. Their material type included glass, ceramic, lead, copper alloy and ferrous concretions. The majority of finds came from UWTT02 which was only 0.4 metres deep and was smaller than 0.5 metres across, as it abutted larger rocks and a large (circa 0.4 metres in diameter) timber log laying horizontal on the riverbed and parallel with the riverbank (Figure 48). It would appear to be imbedded in the clay. Approximately 1.5 metres of this log was exposed and the exposed part was largely worm eaten. This is the right size, location and size for a bed log into which wharf piles were checked. This was the prevailing technology for wharf construction in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Adjacent to the log was another log laying alongside. It is more buried, set lower down and appears to be of a smaller diameter. It is possible that what has been observed are the wharf bedlogs for two different phases of wharf construction from the 1810s or as early as the 1790s. The maritime archaeological investigations did not reveal any potential for archaeological materials in the main river channel, or along the northern embankment.
Figure 46: Plan of the southern river embankment and maritime survey area.
Figure 47: Video screen grab of west face of UWTT02.

Figure 48: Video screen grab of timber log against which UWTT02 abuts.
Figure 49: Maritime test trench locations.
2.6 Windsor Bridge

General

Windsor Bridge is a concrete beam and slab bridge of twelve spans, carried on ten piers comprising pairs of concrete-filled, cast-iron piers and one reinforced concrete pier on Monier concrete piles. It is 144 metres in length, with a 6.2-metre-wide roadway between kerbs. It carries a 1-metre-wide pedestrian footway on the downstream side and stands 6.8 metres above normal river level.

The bridge was originally built in 1874 as a timber beam bridge on cast-iron piers, rendering redundant the punt that previously supplied a river crossing just upstream. The deck of the bridge was replaced with new timber and raised in 1897 to address flooding, with consequential modifications to the abutments made in concrete. The bridge was substantially rebuilt again in 1922, using pre-cast concrete structural elements, replacing all earlier fabric save for the cast-iron piers. Subsequently, a pedestrian footway was added in 1968, as were modern guardrails, paving and lighting. The various elements of the bridge are discussed individually below.

The Superstructure

The superstructure of the bridge consists of a cast-in-place, reinforced concrete road deck, carried on eight pre-cast, reinforced concrete girders. The girders are arranged as two sets of four beams under each side of the centreline, with the central pair in close proximity (reflecting the construction of the bridge in two separate halves). The girders were each separately cast on the land adjacent to the bridge and lifted into place, with the hook ends of the reinforcing bars exposed on the upper face. The concrete deck was then cast over the beams, around the exposed reinforcement.

The concrete girders are separate over each pier, resting on a reinforced concrete headstock spanning the tops of the two piles. The deck over the beams is continuous across the piers. The headstock was pre-cast in two halves and lifted into place prior to the placement of beams.

The road deck is bound on each side by a concrete kerb approximately 20 centimetres in height, cast integrally with the deck on top of, and flush with, the outer girder on each side. Each of these kerbs carries a continuous steel pipe, approximately 10 centimetres in diameter, on steel brackets, forming a continuous guardrail along each side of the roadway. The road surface is sheeted with an asphalt pavement, which is doubtless just the most recent in a series of surface treatments that have been applied to the bridge deck since 1920.
Figure 50: Road deck. (Source: AAJV.)

Figure 51: Concrete girders. (Source: AAJV.)
The Footway

The footway was added to the bridge in 1968. It is supported by cantilevered steel brackets bolted on each side of each headstock, which support via steel corbels the ends of the pairs of rolled steel joists (RSJs) which span the piers. The RSJs support cast-concrete paving slabs which originally formed the pavement of the footway but have been sheeted over with a composite material.

The roadway side of the footway is bound by the roadway kerb and guardrail. The outer side is fenced by a steel pipe and expanded wire mesh fence mounted on fabricated brackets.

The footway structure also carries several service conduits beneath the footway, including a water main mounted between the RSJs.

Figure 52: Detail of the footway. (Source: AAJV.)

The Piers

There are eleven piers (see Figure 53 and Figure 54), ten of which are comprised of pairs of cast-iron cylinders and one of which comprises a pair of Monier concrete piles. The cast-iron cylinders are 1.1 metres (3 feet, 6 inches) in diameter and each cylinder is made up of approximately 1.84-metre (6-foot) vertical sections connected by internal flanges. The cast-iron cylinders were cast at Mort's Dock and Engineering Works in Balmain and date from the construction of the original bridge in 1874.

The cylinders are sunk through 3.7 metres (12 feet) of water, 7.7 metres (25 feet) of sand and mud on the riverbed and 1.2 metres (4 feet) of rock. The base of each cylinder is secured to the bedrock by Lewis bolts, which have a wedge-shaped end set into a hole made in the bedrock and filled with concrete. The completed cylinders are filled with a ring of bricks enclosing a cone of concrete.

The cast-iron cylinders were extended in height in 1896 by the addition of a 2.5-metre (8-foot) high steel cylinder of the same internal and external dimensions, bolted to the lower cylinder around an external flange. The additional cylinders were then filled with mass concrete to their top level.

Each pair of cylinders is cross-braced by two systems. The lower sets of braces comprise pairs of back-to-back, C-section, diagonal steel beams, riveted to flanges attached to the sides of the cylinders and riveted to each other at their junction. The lower sets of braces sit below the level of the top of the original cylinders. The upper braces are attached to the upper (added) cylinders only.
and comprise cast-in-situ reinforced concrete beams over steel diagonals. Each headstock has a central leg which rests on the top of the concrete cross-brace.

The single concrete pier is the first pier from the north end and comprises a pair of Monier concrete cylinders, driven to bedrock and concrete-filled, with similar external dimensions as the iron cylinders. The piles are braced to each other by a reinforced concrete beam, detailed to match the encased steel cross-braces of the rest of the bridge. A concrete sill connects the piles below the waterline.

Figure 53: Cast-iron pier detail. (Source: AAJV.)

Figure 54: Overview of Monier concrete pier. (Source: AAJV.)
The Abutments

Abutment A
The southern abutment (see Figure 55), at the Windsor end, comprises three cast-iron cylinders connected by a concrete headstock cast in two halves (as with the rest of the bridge). The piers are of a smaller diameter to the piers in the stream. Behind the cylinders is a cast-in-situ concrete retaining wall with wing walls.

Figure 55: Abutment A. (Source: AAJV.)

Abutment B
The northern abutment (see Figure 56), at the Wilberforce end, is formed of a reinforced concrete wall and crosshead arrangement on top of nine driven concrete piles. The deck girder ends are encased in the concrete panels of the abutment. Reinforced concrete wing walls extend backwards on either side and a concrete apron extends towards the waterline. On the northern side, the wing wall sits behind an additional wall of driven steel sheet piling.

Figure 56: Abutment B. (Source: AAJV.)
The only fabric that survives from the original 1874 bridge are the cast-iron support piers. When the bridge deck was replaced and lifted in the 1920s, all original deck fabric was removed and replaced. The method of construction for this refurbishment was itself interesting: the bridge was closed and rebuilt in halves, to allow one lane to be kept open throughout the construction. The bridge deck support structure consists of largely pre-cast concrete elements from the 1920s, with the deck-top elements, including the road surface, fences and guardrails, dating from the latter half of the twentieth century.

2.7 Cumulative Impacts of the Modification of Thompson Square

Thompson Square has been progressively modified throughout its history. Collectively, these changes have affected the potential survival of archaeological materials in some areas of Thompson Square, particularly its lower northern half, which has been most affected by past roadworks and is most susceptible to inundation. While this does not impact the function and significance of Thompson Square as a social space within the centre of Windsor, it does affect the archaeological potential of the area, and suggests possible future directions for managing the periphery of Thompson Square.

Figure 57 and Figure 58 below show the cumulative impact of the known major disturbance history of the site (that is, principally road realignments, major cuts and associated works), based on the overlay of the figures in Volume 1, section 2.4. The second figure shows the aggregated impacts, in that red areas have been substantially disturbed by previous works, while the green areas are those that are largely unmodified (although by no means untouched).

The archaeological testing programme has shown that there is some historical archaeological potential within the northern green area, although that potential is not linked to specific known structures from the historical record. This area will be impacted in part by the construction of the new Windsor Bridge (discussed in Volume 3). This northern green zone also contains Aboriginal archaeological potential associated with the sand sheet, but that potential is not unique to the study area, or the wider area.

The southern green zone is the area of least disturbance, but also has limited historical archaeological potential as it does not accord with any known historical structures or uses. As it is higher on the ridge, the area also contains a shallower depth of deposit likely to contain Aboriginal archaeological materials., any future works in this area should take into account the archaeological potential of this zone.

As noted above, due to the cumulative impacts of roadworks and other municipal projects, the Thompson Square area has been very heavily disturbed. It is likely that the best preservation of historical archaeological material from the earliest phases of Green Hills and Windsor will be found in the private lands surrounding Thompson Square, particularly to the east of Bridge Street. These areas, while disturbed by later buildings, have not been cut down as substantially, nor have they been the subject of multiple phases of excavation and works. All parts of the study area and surrounds have, however, been affected by flooding and the associated scouring and deposition. The areas of archaeological sensitivity noted above are those most likely to retain intact archaeological remains of high significance.

One notable aspect of the proposed replacement of Windsor Bridge with a new bridge along the eastern edge is that it will allow the reconnection of the upper and lower parts of Thompson Square, which have been separated since the construction of the first bridge in the late nineteenth century – a division that was dramatically expanded by the formalisation of Bridge Street in 1920. While the overall size of Thompson Square will be reduced by the new bridge, it will once again be an integrated public space, rather than two disconnected sections – one easily usable by the public, the other (lower) section much less so. The new bridge will, however, alter the relationship between the east and west sides of Thompson Square.
The overall presentation of Thompson Square is of a modified nineteenth-century public space and surrounding cultural landscape. While many of the buildings on the edges of the square are early to late nineteenth century, there are a substantial number of other buildings dating from the early to late twentieth century which means that the architectural character of the square is, at best, mixed. The previous and ongoing impacts to the square have seen it reduced in size and, to a degree, configuration; however, it still reads as a rectilinear north–south oriented public space.

The landscape character of Thompson Square has also changed over time, from an open, largely unadorned space throughout much of the nineteenth century, to a more landscaped, park-like space from the late nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.
Figure 57: Cumulative impact plan of Thompson Square. Note that this is surface disturbance only, and earlier deposits may have been cut down or covered with fill.
Figure 58: Cumulative impact plan showing all phases of change in Thompson Square. Note that this is surface disturbance only, and earlier deposits may have been cut down or covered with fill.
2.8 Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis of other like places has been undertaken to assist in determining the relative values of the place. This is particularly important in the overall assessment of significance of places, as comparable site types or elements become increasingly rare through progressive disturbance and development. The method of comparison has concentrated on illustrating how Thompson Square relates to comparable sites developed in NSW during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

2.8.1 Colonial Sydney

The British settlement in NSW evolved around the available resources and terrain of Sydney Cove. The earliest sketch plan of Sydney Cove, prepared by Captain John Hunter and dated July 1788, marks out the immediately necessary functions of the settlement – a Governor’s house, nine acres dedicated to farming, a church, a hospital, a courthouse, and a ‘principal street’, which later became George Street. At this time, no town square had yet been set aside, though in these very early days of the settlement, when the population consisted essentially of convicts and the military, and the survival of the colony depended more on arranging its administration and resources, the lack of allocation for a public common space could be excused.

Farm Cove, east of the main settlement at Sydney Cove, was an ‘undeveloped’ space established early by Governor Phillip in 1788. It was set aside as a farm to provide for the new settlement’s needs; however, small private leaseholds were permitted, also for farming purposes. In that sense, it was far removed from a civic square. In 1792, Governor Phillip reserved a large area south of the main settlement for the purposes of a town common. The space was open to all persons in Sydney for the use of gathering firewood and grazing livestock. The site, today occupied by Hyde Park, was selected because of its natural features – a mostly level piece of land on an elevated position adjacent to the town. It eventually became a popular spot for casual recreational activities such as cricket matches and horseraces. Other common spaces in the early colonial settlement of Sydney included a ‘market place’ (which was apparently inconveniently located) as well as a small square in front of St Phillip’s Church. These small common spaces were very much established and evolved naturally according to the community’s needs.

Lachlan Macquarie arrived in Port Jackson on 28 December 1809; four days later he was sworn in as the fifth Governor of NSW to replace the deposed William Bligh. Under the leadership of Governor Macquarie, the colony underwent a huge amount of public works, change and reform, with his massive building, urban settlement and infrastructure projects as legacies that are still evident today. The historical records of NSW demonstrate that, in the first months of Macquarie’s appointment, he had already taken great steps to elevate the perceptions of the hard penal colony as demoralised and uncivilised. On 6 October 1810, Macquarie made a proclamation regarding the organisation of the Sydney public domain into districts, which included details such as the permanent naming of streets. Related to this public order, Macquarie discussed several ‘Open Spaces’ which he officially proclaimed to be for the public. First, he spoke of the ‘open space of ground or area whereon the church of St Phillip now stands, and which is hereafter to be formed into a handsome square … named Charlotte Square’ – present-day Lang Park, north of Wynyard Station. In the same proclamation, he declared his intention to create another public open space called Macquarie Place. Macquarie detailed his plans to remove any existing structures within the space bordered by the Government Domain on the east, Tank Street to the west and houses to the north belonging to the Judge-Advocate, Commissary, Chaplain and Secretary. Once cleared, the area was to be nominated as a public open space. Macquarie Place Park is still in place today, bounded by Loftus Street, Bridge Street and Macquarie Place.

29 Ibid.
Finally, he discussed ‘the Common’ designated by Governor Phillip in the 1790s, also known at the time as the ‘Exercising Ground’, the ‘Cricket Ground’ and the ‘Racecourse’. Macquarie named it Hyde Park and reserved it as a public recreation space for the people of Sydney. Those who used the Common for grazing purposes were displaced, and Macquarie assigned 1000 acres as a new common for grazing and common pasturage, to be known as the ‘Sydney Common’. That area lay south-east of the Sydney town, and was bounded to the north by South Head Road, and is situated in the present-day Moore Park and Centennial Parklands. Sydney’s public areas designated by Macquarie fulfilled more of a recreational than a civic centre function, and were designed to support the whole range of community needs, from a marketplace, to administration, governance and community gatherings.

2.8.2 The Macquarie Towns

Governor Macquarie was the driving force behind the establishment of eleven major towns during his stewardship (not including the various small farming settlements and communities). Two of those towns were already established – Sydney and Parramatta – by the time he became Governor. The settlements in these two locations were established as government farms, predominantly of a penal nature, with only a small number of free settlers being granted landholdings. Sydney’s settlement layout was very much determined by resources, with growth centred on the Tank Stream, the harbour industries from Sydney Cove (Circular Quay) to Cockle Bay (Darling Harbour), and around the major civic buildings. There was very little opportunity to implement the spacious and grand street alignments that were idealised by Governor Phillip. The penal settlement at Parramatta was also established shortly after the Sydney Cove landing. Phillip’s vision of Parramatta was quite simplistic but embedded in colonial hierarchy – the Governor’s house on the hill overlooking the settlement connected to the river landing by a wide central avenue or ‘principal street’ occupied by the convicts and their modest dwellings. When Governor Macquarie came into office, he did as much as he could to reorganise and reshape Sydney and Parramatta’s urban landscape to fit his structured, hierarchical ideal, though the opportunities were limited.

The ‘Macquarie Towns’ share common urban characteristics such as the grid-plan layout and a consistent street naming convention familiar today – including, for example, George Street, Church Street, Market Street, Phillip Street and Macquarie Street. In accordance with instructions given to him in his general commission from the King, Macquarie was also charged with ensuring that each settlement was provided with appropriate ‘town and pasture lots’ sufficient to sustain a number of families, an area for a barracks, a church, a town hall and other civic institutions as necessary. Although not explicitly written, a reserve set aside as a commons would have also been considered a standard feature – a purposely undeveloped space usually located in the centre block of a grid layout. The commons in this colonial period generally served the purposes of ‘common use’ such as for gathering wood and grazing stock. The requirement for a commons within a township was based more on expectation and necessity than on engendering any sense of community or civic purpose.

The potential for these common civic spaces was far more achievable at the new settlement sites, where, discounting local leaseholds and farms, Governor Macquarie’s ideal for town planning based on the ordered and highly planned grid layout represented an opportunity to start afresh. During his country tour in the first year of his office, Macquarie established six new towns: one at Liverpool and five along the Hawkesbury-Nepean River at Windsor, Richmond, Pitt Town, Wilberforce and Castlereagh.

At Liverpool, called ‘the Cowpastures’, Macquarie expressed how the town was ‘admirably calculated for trade and navigation’ along the Georges River. While previous governors had already allocated small riverside grants in the area, Governor Macquarie was key to marking out the township of

---

31 Historical Records of Australia, series 1, volume 1, p. 198.
33 ‘Government and General Notice’, Saturday 15 December 1810.
Liverpool in December 1810. He immediately identified the value of the town in terms of agriculture, navigation and trade, and was keen to elevate the district’s status to one of a civilised townscape. Here, Macquarie allocated a town common for the use of all persons for grazing. Along with the erection of various other town structures like a church and schoolhouse, his vision for the town was that it ‘will have the liberty of a large and contiguous common for grazing cattle, which is assigned for the benefit of the townships’. The original boundaries of this common are uncertain, but it would appear that it was also used as an area of public convict punishment, as it contained the stocks and gallows, whipping triangles and a stockade. Although the town had been sited and well surveyed from 1815, the first detailed plan of it was not submitted to Governor Macquarie for approval until 1819. Two town reserves were sited on this plan, Bigge Square abutting the river and named after the arrival of Commissioner Thomas Bigge in 1819, and a church reserve on the west side of town.
The five Hawkesbury-Nepean towns were also declared in 1810. For these townships, the details of street layout and town requirements were specified with precision. In Pitt Town, Wilberforce, Richmond and Castlereagh, the streets were to be 20-metre wide, principal streets positioned 100 metres apart, and cross streets were to be laid perpendicular to the principal streets at 240-metre intervals. Windsor’s streetscape was a little narrower probably due to the amount of land available. Within the town, a central reserve was a necessity, with an additional block directly adjacent ‘for the purpose of erecting a Church, Schoolhouse, a Gaol and Guard house in’. The township of Wilberforce fits the Macquarie model town ideal perfectly, in being precisely symmetrical in grid layout with fifteen blocks or sections, and the government reserve positioned directly in the centre. Castlereagh also had a conforming grid pattern.

---

39 Jack, op. cit., p. 29.
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Figure 60: Four of the five Hawkesbury-Nepean Towns (not including Castlereagh), map drawn by GC Stewart, 1822. (Source: Jack, *Macquarie Towns*, op. cit., p. iii.)
Figure 61: Impressionistic plan of Wilberforce sent to Britain by Commissioner Bigge, 1821. (Source: Jack, *Macquarie Towns*, op. cit., p. 64.)

Figure 62: Grid layout of Castlereagh in relation to surrounding existing grants, 1835. (Source: Jack, *Macquarie Towns*, op. cit., p. 81.)
The township at Richmond had two reserved spaces allocated, one as a government reserve and the other as a church reserve. The government reserve was positioned in the centre of the town grid, while the church reserve was adjacent to the church and burial ground on the town’s periphery, similar to the allocations at Liverpool.

Figure 63: Richmond town plan, 1827. (Source: Jack, *Macquarie Towns*, op. cit., p. 54.)

Pitt Town was originally sited in 1811 along the western boundary of the Nelson Common; however, it was relocated in 1815 due to the inconvenient proximity of the original site to the lowland farms around the river. No plans of the original 1811 site exist, yet once it was relocated, the position and topography of the site resulted in a slightly awkward and triangular settlement. In 1815, the town reserves were located at the western end of the settlement, where the township came to a point, with a government and church reserve adjacent to each other. By 1829, the government reserve had been fully repurposed for the Presbyterian Church.
Figure 64: Pitt Town plan approved by Governor Macquarie, 1815. The government reserve was located in the triangular allotment at the end of town. (Source: Jack, Macquarie Towns, op. cit., p. 74.)

Figure 65: Pitt town plan in 1827. By this time, the government reserve had been reallocated to the Presbyterian Church. (Source: Jack, Macquarie Towns, op. cit., pp. 76–7.)
Windsor, the third largest settlement in NSW after Sydney and Parramatta, was unique among the Hawkesbury-Nepean towns in that it incorporated an existing village at Green Hills, and grew up around the existing cleared space there, named ‘Thompson’s Square’ by Macquarie. The small village was in itself quite unique throughout the small colony in that it functioned more as a military outpost, containing government buildings, granaries, stores, a guardhouse and barracks to facilitate the storage and distribution of supplies under military organisation. The sloping land above the punt was cleared of vegetation to provide clear access as goods made their way to the river for transport back and forth between Sydney. In addition to these military functions, the clearing was the place where community activities, such as assembling for musters and picking up provisions, took place. It did not appear to be used as a regular ‘town commons’ for communal grazing and other common activities. This mix of functions gave the space a truer sense of civic purpose. When Governor Macquarie proclaimed the establishment of a township at Windsor in 1810, his intention was to move the town south, centring it on St Matthews Church. However, the important civic functions of Thompson Square were far from redundant and indeed were thriving. Therefore (and again unique among the Hawkesbury-Nepean towns) Windsor developed around the existing village and, specifically, around Thompson Square. Nevertheless, a second square, referred to by Macquarie as the ‘Great Square’, was declared near St Matthews, and surveyed by Meehan in 1811. It was later enlarged in 1827 and named McQuade Park after the mayor of Windsor John McQuade, who served on the council in the 1870s.\(^{42}\)

Figure 66: Windsor town plan in 1827. The main grid-laid plan set out to the east, while the small settlement around Thompson Square has also been maintained, at the far right of the plan. (Source: Jack, *Macquarie Towns*, op. cit., p. 43.)

Of the Macquarie towns established during this first country tour of 1810, the space allocated as the government reserve is still discernible at Windsor, Richmond, Wilberforce and Liverpool. As mentioned above, the government reserve at Pitt Town was transferred over to the Presbyterian Church by 1829. At Castlereagh, the allotment boundaries still exist, and the reserve has been

retained as one parcel; however, its use is now purely residential. The reserves at Richmond and Liverpool have been reduced in size, with areas reallocated for residential or other public uses, yet the main portion of the area is still used as a public reserve. Major changes in regard to street alignments have been made to Thompson Square at Windsor, changing and reducing the footprint of the original area over a number of years. Its function as a public space is secondary now to its more primary function as a vehicle thoroughfare. The government reserve/town square that is most intact is the allotment at Wilberforce, now called Wilberforce Park, which has maintained in full its footprint bounded by Macquarie Road, Church Street, George Road and Duke Road. While the town has expanded a little around the periphery, the main grid layout remains predominantly intact, with Wilberforce Park still commanding the central square position in the grid. No development has taken place in the park and its primary use is as a public park.

2.8.3 Maritime Structures, Archaeology and Heritage

The maritime test excavations undertaken at Windsor in 2016 identified the remains of what appear to be the 1814 timber wharf. This section provides a comparative analysis of this and other wharf structures in NSW and throughout the country.

There are five wharves/jetties currently on the NSW Heritage Register registered as being of state significance, two of which – Echuca and Tathra wharves – are the only nineteenth century wharves dating from the 1860s. On the NSW State Heritage Inventory there are a total of 137 wharf sites listed. Of these, three (Booral Wharf and wharf remains at Wharf Road and Bedlam Point in Ryde, Sydney) were constructed after 1830 from sandstone masonry.

Late-eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century archaeological remains of maritime infrastructure in NSW and particularly the Sydney region have not been well documented to date. This is because these site types are mostly located under foreshore reclamation and can generally only be studied where excavations are required for redevelopment. Recent excavations in Darling Harbour, particularly at Barangaroo, have uncovered sections of 1820s/30s waterfront, including a stone-faced slipway and shore-side timber decking remnants resting on bedrock that were associated with a (long demolished) early wharf at Moore’s Cove (known as Moore’s Wharf), situated on the northern side of the Barangaroo Headland.

The only currently known and accessible jetty/wharf site contemporary with the 1795 and 1814 jetty/wharves in Windsor was recently recorded on the Parramatta River at the former Squires Estate at Putney. During the latter years of the 1790s, James Squire established a brewery and tavern, The Malting Shovel, on his property. It was probably around this time that he constructed the jetty which was a prominent feature of the shoreline for around forty years.

The superstructure of the wharf as depicted in the 1830s (Figure 67) comprised a timber deck resting on two rows of piles. In the absence of an archaeological investigation, it is not possible to tell whether the piles were driven directly into the riverbed or were checked into transverse bedlogs.

In February 2015, the site was inspected for the purposes of identifying its extent and nature. The remains of Squires Wharf showed a linear arrangement of roughly quarried stone ranging in size from 400 to 1000 millimetres across (Figure 68). No squared blocks were observed, or any distinct wall alignments. These observations suggest that the wharf was not of a stone pier type where the outer edges were faced with coursed squared blocks and the interior filled with rock rubble. However, it is possible that, if this wharf were such a structure, the majority of the stone blocks would have been robbed, leaving only the lower course. These, in turn, would be covered by the rock rubble, which would have spread over a wide area once the walls were removed. The inspection did not test this scenario for construction/demolition as it would have disturbed the rock rubble. Yet the presence
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44 Cosmos Archaeology, Halvorsen’s Boat Building Complex, Maritime Archaeological Assessment, prepared for Drivas Property Group, March 2015, section 4.4.3.
of a highly degraded timber log, seemingly set into the rock rubble perpendicular to the axis of the rubble alignment, suggested that the wharf in this location had a timber superstructure (Figure 69).

Figure 67: Wharf depicted in the 1830s. (Source: ‘Squire’s Brewery, Kissing Point.’ Tooth & Co. Collection, Powerhouse Museum, Image 86/3866.)

Figure 68: Remains of Squires Wharf, dated as early as the 1830s. Photograph taken 19 January 2015.
Prior to the introduction of steam-driven and screw pile technology to Australia in the latter half of the nineteenth century, piling directly into the ground was limited to areas of relatively soft sediments. In areas where the sediment was compact or there was bedrock, the solution for creating a timber piled structure was to build a timber trestle structure. Such structures were constructed with timber piles checked into bedlogs or sills set into the ground, seabed or riverbed. Figure 70 shows the design of one such structure that would be contemporary with Squires Wharf – noteworthy is the cross bracing and raking of the piles.

The cultural heritage assessment of which the February 2015 inspection formed a part found that the Squire’s Estate period (1790s–1840s) was of State significance with regard to its historical and archaeological values.
Figure 70: Design that would be contemporary with Squires Wharf. (Source: Archives Office of Tasmania Plan/Drawing No. 227 – survey of jetties at Coal Point, CON87-1-74.)
3 Assessment of Heritage Significance

This chapter outlines the methodology and process for assessing heritage significance in NSW, identifies the heritage significance criteria and applies these criteria to Thompson Square.

Cultural significance is defined in The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (2013), published by Australia ICOMOS, as:

Aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present and future generations.\(^{45}\)

Setting out the cultural significance of a place assists in identifying what elements of the place contribute to that significance and the relative contribution of the various elements to that cultural significance. Understanding the significance of a place is crucial to its management because it provides guidance for future work and may inform policy that, if followed, would ensure that the significance is retained.

3.1 Criteria for Assessing Cultural Heritage Significance

The NSW Guidelines Assessing Heritage Significance were developed by the Heritage Council of NSW to provide the basis for an assessment of heritage significance of historical heritage items and places. This is achieved by evaluating the significance of a place or items with reference to specific criteria, which can be applied at a national, state or local level. This publication also provides guidance on the reasons for the inclusion or exclusion of items under individual criteria. A more detailed explanation of the significance assessment process is provided in that publication.

Table 3: Criteria for assessing cultural heritage significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion (a)</th>
<th>An item is important in the course, or pattern, of the cultural or natural history of the Australian, NSW or local area;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion (b)</td>
<td>An item has a strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW's cultural or natural history;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion (c)</td>
<td>An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion (d)</td>
<td>An item has a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion (e)</td>
<td>An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW's cultural or natural history;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion (f)</td>
<td>An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW's cultural or natural history;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion (g)</td>
<td>An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of Australia, NSW or local areas: Cultural or natural places; or Cultural or natural environments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{45}\) The Burra Charter, published by Australia ICOMOS, 2013, p. 2.
As a cultural landscape, Thompson Square and the surrounding parts of the study area have a range of interwoven and overlapping aspects of heritage significance. Based on the review of the history, archaeology and fabric of the place, the study team wrote individual significance assessments for the various elements of the study area. At the end of this section, an integrated Statement of Heritage Significance is presented which incorporates these elements into an overarching understanding of the significance of the place.

### 3.2 Existing Statements of Significance

Thompson Square Conservation Area and all of the surrounding heritage items have been previously assessed for heritage significance. Those existing Statements of Significance, where available, are reproduced here. Many of the individual buildings do not have specific Statements of Significance, but are noted as contributing to the value of the Thompson Square Conservation Area. As the purpose of this document is to provide a strategic overview of the study area, detailed research into individual buildings has not been undertaken, nor have these buildings been investigated in terms of their fabric or intactness. The study area for the SCMP stops at the front boundaries of the buildings adjoining Thompson Square. In future, should these detailed investigations be undertaken for individual structures, it will be possible to provide updated Statements of Significance for these items.

The significance analysis below therefore focuses on the overarching heritage significance of the study area, including the significance of the built fabric, landscape, Aboriginal, historical and maritime archaeology. The existing Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area, as shown on the NSW OEH listing sheet for the item, is as follows:

*Thompson Square is one of the oldest public squares in Australia and notable for the large number of Colonial Georgian buildings which surround it. It is the only public space remaining from the original town and has played an important part in the history of the town. It is the only remaining civic space as laid out by Governor Macquarie and is a vital precinct in the preservation of the early Colonial character of Windsor. The Square reflects Macquarie’s visionary schemes for town planning excellence in the infant colony (Sheedy 1975).*

Table 4: Existing Statements of Significance for items in or abutting the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Statement of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI4</td>
<td>Doctors House 1–3 Thompson Square</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area, as stated above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI5</td>
<td>House &amp; Outbuilding 5 Thompson Square</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Statement of Significance</th>
<th>Thumbnail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI6</td>
<td>Hawkesbury Museum and Tourist Information Centre 7 Thompson Square</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI7</td>
<td>Macquarie Arms Hotel 81 George Street</td>
<td>SHR Statement of Significance: Opened in 1815 and constructed by emancipist Richard Fitzgerald in response to specific directions from Governor Macquarie, the Macquarie Arms Hotel is of exceptional significance as the most sophisticated and most intact major commercial building dating to the pre-1820 colonial period of Australia’s history. Playing a pivotal role in Macquarie’s town plan for Windsor, the Macquarie Arms Hotel is the most substantial building to form part of Thompson Square, the best Georgian town square on mainland Australia. The building contains numerous rare and aesthetically superior elements, and continues to be widely recognised for its importance to the understanding of settlement, urban design, and architecture during the colonial period, while its historic associations carry strong cultural messages of the period’s society and government. It has been long established by art and architectural historians, and has a prominent place in the contemporary social life of Windsor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI8</td>
<td>House 4 Bridge Street (also identified as 8 Bridge Street)</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI9</td>
<td>House 6 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI10</td>
<td>‘Lilburn Dale Hall’ House and Outbuildings 10 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Statement of Significance</td>
<td>Thumbnail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI11</td>
<td>School of Arts 14 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI12</td>
<td>Cottage 20 Bridge Street</td>
<td>There is no existing Statement of Significance for this property.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI13</td>
<td>Cottage 17 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI14</td>
<td>Shops – Former Hawkesbury Stores (64–68 George St) 62–68 George Street</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI15</td>
<td>Shops - Former Hawkesbury Garage 70–72 George Street</td>
<td>Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area.</td>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Thumbnail" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Statement of Significance</td>
<td>Thumbnail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HI16   | A.C. Stearn Building  
74 George Street | Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area. | ![Image](image1.jpg) |
| HI17   | Shop  
80–82 George Street | Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area. | ![Image](image2.jpg) |
|        | Shop | Site included within the SHR Statement of Significance for Thompson Square Conservation Area. | ![Image](image3.jpg) |
| HI18   | Shops  
84–88 George Street | There is no existing Statement of Significance for this property. | ![Image](image4.jpg) |
| HI19   | Two-storey building and shed  
92–98 George Street | There is no existing Statement of Significance for this property. | ![Image](image5.jpg) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Statement of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HI20   | **Windsor Bridge**              | **LEP Statement of Significance:**
> The Windsor Bridge has a high level of historic, technical, aesthetic and social significance as an important historical and physical landmark in one of the State's pre-eminent historic towns, and in the wider Sydney region. It is the oldest extant crossing of the Hawkesbury River. Together with the successive crossings upstream at Richmond, this bridge has played a major role in shaping the history of the Hawkesbury area, functioning for well over a century as an all-important link between the communities on either side of the River and as an essential component in a through route of importance in the development of the Sydney region. The series of major alterations to the structure since its construction articulate the continuing difficulties of negotiating a crossing of this major waterway with its frequent floods. The Windsor Bridge has landmark qualities as one of only two bridge crossings of the Hawkesbury River in the Hawkesbury area and as such it defines the surrounding network of roads. It is a large structure, and although simple in appearance, impressive. The bridge represents a major engineering project in the State for its time. The addition of a reinforced concrete beam deck to replace the timber deck in the 1920s is a relatively early use of this technology. The River and this crossing of it has defined the life of several generations of local inhabitants on both sides of the River. As the suburban outskirts of Sydney widen and come closer to the still distinct and distinctive Macquarie towns, the rich history of the area and its physical remains become increasingly important to the community’s sense of identity. The Windsor Bridge is thus an important part of Windsor’s history and identity. |
| HI21   | **Bridgeview Residence**  
> 27 Wilberforce Road | **LEP Statement of Significance:**
> Bridgeview is of aesthetic significance as a good and substantial example of a Federation bungalow which displays a high degree of integrity. Its location overlooking Windsor Bridge and Thompson Square makes it a local landmark. |
| HI22   | **Green Hills Cottage**  
> 41 George Street | **SHR Statement of Significance:**
> The site and its views have outstanding State significance as evidence of the earliest development of the Hawkesbury district, its initial role as the Commandant's cottage quickly establishing its symbolism as an important representation of the presence of government and military control in the district. The high potential of existing archaeological features and deposits in a site where key
elements in shaping the development of the district have converged - the arrival of the man who shaped the development of the district (Macquarie), the presence of the cottage on a site which captured Macquarie’s aesthetic interest and the role of the cottage in trips to name and mark out the five Macquarie Towns - creating a landmark site in the historical development of the site representative of the birth of the Hawkesbury district as it is understood today. It is likely to be the site of one of the earliest Government Cottages constructed outside the Sydney colony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Statement of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elements in shaping the development of the district have converged - the arrival of the man who shaped the development of the district (Macquarie), the presence of the cottage on a site which captured Macquarie’s aesthetic interest and the role of the cottage in trips to name and mark out the five Macquarie Towns - creating a landmark site in the historical development of the site representative of the birth of the Hawkesbury district as it is understood today. It is likely to be the site of one of the earliest Government Cottages constructed outside the Sydney colony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Assessment of Archaeological Significance

#### 3.3.1 Aboriginal Heritage Significance

**Basis for Assessment and General Discussion of Significance**

Aboriginal sites in NSW are assessed in terms of three significance criteria: Archaeological (scientific), Cultural (Aboriginal) and Public Significance. These criteria recognise that Aboriginal sites are valuable in a number of ways – namely to the:

- Aboriginal community as an aspect of their cultural heritage and as part of continuing traditions
- broader community, for educational, historical and cultural enrichment values
- scientific community for potential research value.

Based on the archaeological test excavation, four archaeological landscapes can be identified across the study area: Ridgeline, Source-Bordering Dune, River’s Edge – Alluvium, and River’s Edge – Reclaimed/Introduced Fill. The higher resolution recovery of Aboriginal objects across the project area from the 2016 test excavations, compared with previous studies provides a far greater understanding of the archaeological resource and its significance, as well as raising additional questions on the nature and use of the area by Aboriginal people in the past.

Specifically, the test excavations revealed that the Thompson Square park areas on either side of Bridge Street contain the remnants of a source-bordering dune, which formed a key locale of Aboriginal visitation and occupation prior to 23,000 years ago. The abundance and diversity of the cultural material suggest prolonged and/or repeat occupation, with a focus on the exploitation of the river’s resources, especially large cobbles for artefact and tool production. The Source-Bordering Dune deposit is likely a continuation of the finds at the nearby Windsor Museum, which shows Aboriginal occupation by 33,000 BP, and ongoing use of the site through to 8,000 BP, which suggests that the cultural assemblage in the project area is likely to be of a similar age and duration. Along with the findings of other regional work undertaken, such as that at Pitt Town, the assemblage at Windsor lends strong support to the conclusion that Aboriginal populations were exploiting and using the Hawkesbury River corridor by ~30,000–35,000 BP, representing some of the earliest evidence of Aboriginal populations in south-east Australia. With the exception of a handful of

---


artefacts at the base of the Cranebrook Terrace\(^{49}\) (frequently disputed), these cultural assemblages also represent the earliest evidence of people in the Sydney Basin. While the earliest occupation of this deposit is understood, the later use of the site is still subject to investigation, with some evidence of a Holocene peak in artefacts near the top of the stratigraphic unit. Of key note, however, is the presence of several glass artefacts within the lower square that demonstrate post-contact interaction between the Aboriginal population and early European settlers. These artefacts appear to date to between 1794 and around the 1830s, during a period when corroborees were documented in Thompson Square.\(^{50}\)

Despite evidence indicating that parts of the deposit have been disturbed, with an overlying layer of historical overburden through the park areas, and localised impacts (including a former road and a sewer main through the centre of the lower park), the cultural deposits do not appear to have been subject to high levels of post-depositional change. The deposit can therefore be considered to have stratigraphic robustness, and therefore provides a rare window into the Pleistocene occupation of the region. The scale and diversity of the cultural assemblage are also extensive, enough to give it significance in its own right.

### Aboriginal Cultural Significance

This area of assessment concerns the relationship and importance of sites to the Aboriginal community. Aspects of cultural significance include traditional and contemporary links with a given site or landscape as well as an overall concern by Aboriginal people for sites and their continued protection.

Unmodified natural features in the landscape can signify sacred sites/places of significance. As such, they are archaeologically invisible and can only be identified with the aid of Aboriginal interpretation. If such sites are known they may hold particular cultural significance to contemporary Aboriginal communities. Furthermore, sites of significance are not restricted to the period prior to contact with Europeans. Often events related to the post-contact period may be so important to local Aboriginal communities that they have become significant. If these events relate to a specific place in the landscape, then that place may become sacred or highly significant to the local Aboriginal communities.

Cultural significance of the place is a matter for the local Aboriginal community, traditional owner descendants and knowledge holders to assess and determine. The process of engagement with registered Aboriginal stakeholders, including traditional owner claimants and knowledge holders, aims to identify the cultural values of the study area and establish parameters around the conservation, interpretation and management of those values.

It is clear that the Hawkesbury River is a very important cultural feature in the landscape, as a place of very early occupation during the Pleistocene, an important transit route, a major resource zone, a shared boundary between a number of clan and language groups, the site of the important early Sackville Missions and for the river’s associations with creation stories and traditional beliefs. The river represents the longevity of Aboriginal ownership and cultural survival in the region, across thousands of years through the harsh conditions of the Pleistocene and the dislocation and dispossession that occurred during the late eighteenth century and nineteenth century. The colonial settlement of Windsor is also important as an early point of engagement with colonial government on matters ranging from the settlement of disputes to blanket distribution. Windsor was an important manifestation and symbol of colonisation and the imposition of European control over traditional Darug lands. The area therefore meets this criterion at a local level of significance.

---

\(^{49}\) 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, pp. 72–8.

\(^{50}\) Walker 1890
Public Significance

This category concerns a site’s potential to educate people about the past. It also relates to the heritage value of particular sites as being representative examples of past lifestyles, why they are important, and why they should be preserved.

Scientific dating of the Aboriginal test excavation has identified Pleistocene cultural deposits within the sand body deposits, which have considerable public significance in marking a place of early human occupation of the Sydney Basin – demonstrating the longevity of Aboriginal life on the Hawkesbury River and providing insights into the nature of life and adaptation to changing environmental and climatic conditions over thousands of years. The presence of Aboriginal cultural deposits within one of the earliest sites of European settlement on the Hawkesbury-Nepean River also has public value, as it demonstrates the survival of Aboriginal cultural evidence even in places that have been used and modified by European settlement over a period of more than 200 years. This has been confirmed by both the historical record and the archaeological record through the evidence of European glass artefacts which have been reworked by Aboriginal people, demonstrating the continuation of cultural practices and cultural adaptation post European colonisation. These values have particular importance for the presentation and interpretation of the Aboriginal history of the area to the public.

The study area meets this criterion at a local level, and, through the detailed analysis and presentation/interpretation of findings, has the potential to meet it at a State level of significance.

Scientific Significance

The objective of undertaking scientific significance assessment for a site is to determine its research potential to contribute knowledge about the past. The criteria used to evaluate scientific potential include condition/integrity, representativeness and rarity.

When considering the significance criteria, the Source-Bordering Dune deposit (including archaeological test pits SA 4, SA 8-11, SA 24, SA 25, SA 28, SA 29 and SA 32) is considered to meet State significance thresholds in several respects. Scientifically, the site is demonstrated to contain deposits that can provide significant information on how Aboriginal people lived and occupied the region over the past 30,000 years or more, and into the post-contact period. These deposits provide the opportunity to better understand the behaviour of some of the earliest populations within south-east Australia during their initial occupation and survival through the LGM. Further to this, they contain material that could be used to explore past spatial and temporal inter- and intra-site relationships between local populations at Windsor Museum, Pitt Town and other early sites along the Hawkesbury River. While a range of Pleistocene sand dune sites are known in the region, there are few where significant cultural material has been recovered in a controlled fashion, and with good chronological control. In this regard, this site can be considered rare and intact, and is one of the most representative sites of its type, with only six other sand bodies with stratified cultural deposits.
known in NSW – at Warkworth\textsuperscript{51}, Pitt Town\textsuperscript{52}, Windsor Museum\textsuperscript{53}, Parramatta\textsuperscript{54}, Glenrowan (Tarro)\textsuperscript{55}, and Hunter Street (Newcastle)\textsuperscript{56}.

The Source-Bordering Dune deposit can therefore be considered to have high/very high scientific significance at both the local and State level due to the presence of a stratified deposit that includes a high number and diversity of artefacts in a subsurface context. From an aesthetic perspective, given the quantity of cultural materials and their great antiquity, along with evidence of post-contact interactions, it is considered that the deposit would elicit a sensory-emotional response from the local community, and therefore can be considered to meet moderate thresholds for this criterion. The presence of post-contact cultural materials with good temporal resolution and which can be potentially linked to known interactions within the study area also supports that this deposit meets thresholds for the historical significance criterion. While no formal written feedback from the Aboriginal stakeholders has been received regarding cultural significance as yet, several onsite discussions identified the site as being of high importance to the RAPs.

The Ridgeline landscape was found to contain patches of high artefact densities (in excess of 40 square metres), and can similarly provide information on the past use of the region by Aboriginal populations. However, the shallow soil profile on the Ridgeline, often heavily truncated, limits the stratigraphic information that can be obtained from these deposits. For this reason, this deposit does not meet several of the threshold criteria, and is considered of moderate to low scientific significance. This significance ranking is primarily associated with the size of the cultural assemblage, and the technological attributes that can be obtained from them, rather than the context, composition or location of the deposit. While no formal written feedback from the Aboriginal stakeholders has been received regarding cultural significance, several onsite discussions identified the site as being of moderate to low importance to the RAPs.

With respect to the other archaeological landscapes (River’s Edge – Alluvium, River’s Edge – Reclaimed/Introduced Fill), while cultural materials are found throughout, they are often in very low densities and frequently disturbed and/or have post-depositional mixing. The findings suggest that many of the artefacts in these landscapes are likely reworked and deposited through alluvial processes from upriver and/or eroded from deposits upslope. The cultural assemblage contains rare Aboriginal objects with research potential, including two edge-ground axe fragments; however, overall it is more indicative of only transient or ephemeral occupation in the past 10,000 years. As such, the deposits are considered to have low scientific, aesthetic and historical significance.

South of the Hawkesbury River, cultural material of considerable antiquity has been identified, dating back into the early Holocene and Pleistocene within deep, well-preserved sand body deposits. Such deposits have considerable significance for their potential to inform understanding of the timing and nature of early occupation of the Hawkesbury-Nepean river system and of social and cultural responses to climatic and environmental change over an extended period of time. Such information

\textsuperscript{51} Hughes, P., Spooner, N., Questiaux, D., 2014. The central lowlands of the Hunter Valley, NSW: Why so few early sites have been found in this archaeologically-rich landscape. \textit{Australian Archaeology}, 79: 34-44. Scarp 2008

\textsuperscript{52} Williams et al., op. cit., 2012, 2014.

\textsuperscript{53} Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd, \textit{Windsor Museum, NSW: Aboriginal archaeological and cultural salvage excavation, AHIP #2119}, report to Hawkesbury City Council, 2011.


\textsuperscript{55} Archaeological and Heritage Management Solutions, 2015. Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment – SIMTA Intermodal Terminal, Moorebank, NSW. \textit{AHMS Report for Hyder Consulting Pty Ltd.}

adds to a small but growing body of data collected from excavations carried out on the Hawkesbury at Windsor Museum and Pitt Town.

In the context of cumulative impact, the distribution of sand bodies with the potential to contain early evidence of Aboriginal occupation during the Pleistocene is very limited. The sand bodies that remain intact and have not been truncated or removed by development, quarrying or flood scouring are limited and must be considered to have rarity and a high level of archaeological research potential and significance. The archaeological deposits within the southern portion of the study area, particularly within intact portions of the sand body profile, have a high level of archaeological scientific significance. In the part of the study area north of the Hawkesbury River, little in the way of archaeological materials was identified, and therefore this area is not considered to have Aboriginal heritage significance.

**Statement of Aboriginal Cultural Significance**

As noted earlier, the archaeological test excavation revealed four archaeological landscapes across the project area: Ridgeline, Source-Bordering Dune, River’s Edge – Alluvium, and River’s Edge – Reclaimed/Introduced Fill. The higher resolution recovery of Aboriginal objects across the project area compared with previous studies greatly enhances understanding of the archaeological resource and its significance, while also highlighting additional questions on the nature and use of the area by Aboriginal people in the past. Those landscapes south of the river have high archaeological potential and significance, particularly the Source-Bordering Dune deposits, which are significant at a State level due to the demonstrated presence of Pleistocene-age artefact deposits, and the opportunity these provide to better understand the early Aboriginal occupation of the Sydney Basin. From an Aboriginal community perspective, the place is significant at a local level, due to its association with both the pre-colonial use of the area, and Thompson Square and Windsor more generally, as a place of early interaction, conflict, dispossession and engagement with the settler community. From the perspective of the general public, the area has significance at a local level in relation to presenting the life stories of the local Aboriginal inhabitants. These deposits also have the potential to be of State significance through the analysis, presentation and interpretation of the findings of the archaeological programme and consultation with the local Aboriginal community.

**3.3.2 Historic Archaeological Heritage Significance**

Historical archaeological significance refers to the heritage significance of known or potential archaeological remains of historical occupation (that is, after 1788). The archaeological remains of such sites are an essential component of the overall significance of a place. Assessment of archaeological significance is challenging, as the extent and nature of archaeological features are often unknown and judgement is usually formulated on the basis of predictable or likely attributes indicated by research and archaeological site inspection. The assessment of historical archaeological significance of the study area has been prepared based on historical research, predictive analysis and the results of the archaeological testing programme undertaken from August to November 2016.

The following significance assessment of the study area’s historical archaeological resource is carried out by applying criteria set out in the publication *Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and ‘Relics’*. The heritage criteria are organised in a manner to reflect their ability to contribute to our understanding of the culture and history of the nation, state and the site itself as part of its local setting. Well-preserved archaeological remains that can provide information about little-known and/or unrecorded aspects of history as well as answers to important research questions would be considered highly significant. In addition, Bickford and Sullivan formulated three questions essential to establishing the scientific significance of an archaeological site or individual features and deposits, which are also considered within this assessment. The above-mentioned
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57 Heritage Division, OEH, *Assessing significance for historical archaeological sites and ‘relics’*, December 2009.
considerations inform the assessment of significance of identified and potential historical archaeological remains within Thompson Square.

The following discussion focuses solely on the additional significance values of the archaeological evidence in light of the discoveries made during the 2016 testing programme. A more detailed assessment of the archaeological significance values will be prepared as part of the final excavation report.

**Historical Archaeological Assessment Criteria**

In general, the level of historical archaeological significance defines the degree of impact or tolerance for change to which the archaeological resource can be subjected, and determines the level of investigation, recording and conservation that is required. While archaeological resources form an integral component of the overall significance of a place, their significance is assessed independently from above-ground and other heritage elements. This is because the extent and nature of archaeological features and deposits are often unknown.

The four NSW heritage criteria for assessing significance related to archaeological sites and relics are:

- Archaeological research potential (NSW Criterion E).
- Associations with individuals, events or groups of historical importance (NSW Heritage Criteria A, B and D).
- Aesthetic of technical significance (NSW Heritage Criterion C).
- Ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains (NSW Heritage Criteria A, C, F & G).

These assessment criteria for historical archaeological sites are supplemented by the established assessment framework that was developed by Anne Bickford and Sharon Sullivan in 1984. It comprises three key questions generally used as a guide for assessing the significance of an archaeological site.

**Discussion of Historical Archaeological Significance**

The results of the 2016 testing programme indicate that, despite a significant level of disturbance by various site formation processes, the study area has the potential to yield information that could contribute to a better understanding of the development of early Windsor (that is, Green Hills and Mulgrave Place). The new evidence in turn has the potential to inform research into settlement and agricultural use in the early colonial period. This research value principally derives from the identified structural and artefactual remains (and any other associated remains that are yet to be identified), as well as remnant cultural landscape at the site. During the area’s 220 years of European settlement, the landscape has been dramatically altered through the initial clearance of native vegetation, agricultural activities, frequent flooding and redevelopment. The change in the landscape is evident and, as such, contributes to an understanding of the continuous impact of settlement on the natural environment.

The 2016 test excavation programme identified a number of archaeological features and deposits across the site of varying levels of significance. Some features and deposits are assessed as having local significance, while others qualify for state significance.

Of particular importance is the group of related structural remains comprising the brick footing of the Government Cottage and domain entry gate and the stables of the Government compound at the corner of George Street, as well as the associated brick and stone surface and the brick drain in Old Bridge Street. These archaeological features and the retrieved artefact assemblage provide an important resource for further research into this site, which formed part of the early colonial establishment that exploited convicts to build a new nation. Together with the preserved foundations of the guardhouse located at the south end of Bridge Street, they provide a direct link to Australia’s early colonial history.
This collection of archaeological remains has historical, associative, social, technical/research and rarity significance. It is representative of the evolution of the place from a colonial agricultural settlement, consisting of modest huts and government stores and offices, to the newly laid out town with an established boat construction manufactory and river trade. This collection of remains is considered to be of state significance.

The artefact collection recovered includes rare examples of imported or locally made objects, as well as those providing evidence of contact between the new settlers and local Aborigines which have a high research value through their ability to demonstrate the interactions between Aboriginal and European peoples and the adaptation of traditional lifeways through the use of newly introduced materials such as glass. Any additional artefact-bearing deposits and individual artefacts (such as knapped/modified European objects) representing direct contact between the settlers and local Aborigines would be of state significance.

Further research potential is contained in the evidence of the original landscape and how it has been changed by natural and/or human impacts following initial settlement. This includes evidence of burning, stumping and fire clearance; flooding and remediation; pollen evidence of natural and/or introduced vegetation; and cutting and filling associated with the introduction of various different infrastructure, such as the bridge and associated roadway.

Archaeological evidence of public infrastructure such as a range of roads, the Telford roadbase, various connecting paths, fence lines and other infrastructure elements from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century development phases are significant at a local level.

In summary, the historical archaeological remains identified within the study area's substantially modified cultural landscape have the ability to address a range of research questions associated with the early phases of colonial settlement; early marine activities and river traffic; the life of convicts, emancipists and military, and their ability to manage their existence and social progression; and the success of early emancipated convicts and those who had the patronage of Governor Macquarie. The artefacts and remains may also have the ability to address questions relating to the evolution of the landscape, townscape, diet, lifeways and contact between settlers and Aboriginal people.

Cumulatively, both the recorded archaeological remains and the areas identified as having archaeological potential can make a significant contribution to our understanding of the history and development of Windsor and NSW at both the State and local levels. The identified archaeological remains contribute significantly to our ability to interpret State and local cultural heritage that resonates with local communities and the general public.

**NSW Heritage Criteria for Assessing Significance related to Archaeological Sites and Relics**

**Associations with individuals, events or groups of historical importance (NSW Heritage Criteria A, B & D)**

The archaeological relics exposed at and around Thompson Square link to a number of historic themes including cultural landscape, interaction between Aboriginal and European cultures, convictism (the settlement of convicts for confinement), the establishment of early towns and industries, transport and domestic life.

The archaeological relics identified within the study area are able to further illustrate the lifeways of the fledgling colony. Artefacts provide insight into the life of early settlers, including ex-convicts and emancipists, and members of the military. The reworked fragments of glass illustrate the interaction between Aboriginal and European peoples and the adaptation of local Aboriginal groups to the availability of new materials.

The site retains a historical association with several individuals of note, who have influenced the development of the place. It is directly associated with Andrew Thompson, a significant figure in the history of the town as a convict and one of the first settlers who managed to raise his status to become highly respected by several governors, including Governor Macquarie with whom he had a personal friendship. The archaeological testing programme, however, did not reveal any specific evidence of this phase of site development.
The material evidence embodied in artefacts and legible structural remains has symbolic value for local community groups as well as wider audiences interested in history for providing the opportunity to connect with the past. The investigation and presentation of the historical archaeological finds of local- and State-level significance can potentially generate a high degree of interest within the local and wider communities.

The historical archaeological remains at the study area meet these criteria at a State level.

Aesthetic or technical significance (NSW Heritage Criterion C)
The archaeological testing programme has not identified highly intact archaeological structural remains that would be suitable for preservation and display on a permanent basis. The structural remains identified thus far are fragmentary and/or located within areas of public roadways. Further areas of investigation are likely to have a similar level of disturbance given the current understanding of previous impacts on the study area. It is unlikely that any historical archaeological remains will be in a condition or location suitable for permanent, in-situ display.

On this basis, the historical archaeological remains in the study area do not meet this criterion.

Archaeological Research Potential (NSW Heritage Criterion E)
The study area south of the Hawkesbury River was predicted to contain the potential for historical archaeological evidence related to the early settlement of Green Hills, the early nineteenth-century expansion of Windsor and the ongoing use of the area over the following 200 years. The area north of the river was predicted to have remains related to the nineteenth-century Settlers Arms Inn. The archaeological test excavations demonstrated that the entire study area has had a degree of disturbance ranging from minor to major, due to subsequent development, infrastructure works and flood impacts. If present, these early colonial remains would provide a rare, but not unique, insight into the development of early settlement in the areas surrounding Sydney.

The area south of the river contained the moderately disturbed remains of mid- to late-nineteenth-century structures, particularly along the eastern edge of Old Bridge Street and east of the roundabout at the junction of Bridge and George streets. A path, potentially relating to Government House, was found near the northern end of Old Bridge Street. Due to the level of disturbance and the cutting down of areas by past roadworks, there was little in the way of in-situ occupation deposits in the tested areas. Testing within Thompson Square itself did not reveal any structural remains or substantial occupation deposits; however, the lower square area did provide evidence of postholes which may relate to early structures. Other areas of the roadways provided evidence of early road surfaces, and further excavation of these areas may reveal earlier remains below.

The historical archaeological remains located along Old Bridge Road and within lower Thompson Square are of state-level research significance due to their ability to contribute to an understanding of the early to mid-nineteenth-century occupation and development of the study area. It is likely that other archaeological deposits exist in areas adjacent to the study area, which have been subject to less disturbance and therefore are likely to be better preserved.

The remains of earlier road surfaces are typical nineteenth-century paving details and are therefore of local heritage significance only. They may, however, lie above other archaeological deposits of local or State research significance.

The area north of the river did not reveal any historical archaeological remains and is therefore considered to have nil archaeological research potential.

Ability to demonstrate the past through archaeological remains (NSW Heritage Criteria A, C, F & G)
Thompson Square comprises a comprehensive archaeological footprint that spans the period from the earliest phase of human presence, including Aboriginal occupation, to the present day. Thompson Square and its surrounds is an area of early contact with Aboriginal people.

The known and potential historical archaeological resources at the site have the ability to expand our understanding of the use and development of the site throughout the past 220 years of its history and beyond. The historical archaeological record provides the basis for building on the knowledge
contained in the documentary record, and has the potential to verify aspects of the site’s history which are ambiguous or unknown in that record. The integrity, extent and nature of the potential archaeological remains at the site could provide a required degree of legibility for further site interpretation. The continuity of use of the site could be enriched by recognition and celebration of the archaeological evidence associated with the first settlement of Green Hills, as well as of the successive Macquarie-era town.

The historical archaeological remains meet these criteria at a *State* level.

**Research Potential**

The above significance assessment criteria for historical archaeological sites are supplemented by the established assessment framework that was developed by Anne Bickford and Sharon Sullivan in 1984.58 It comprises three key questions generally used as a guide for assessing the significance of an archaeological site.

**Can the site contribute knowledge that no other resource can?**

The research undertaken as part of this project has included an evaluation of documentary evidence that was available at the time of the preparation of the report. Although the historical evidence is not exhaustive, a great deal is already known about the historical development of the site and the specific land-use over time. Nevertheless, there are a number of gaps in the historical record, particularly those related to the early years of the settlement of Green Hills at the end of the eighteenth century that may be addressed through archaeological investigations and analysis. Information associated with any material evidence of structures or artefact-bearing deposits may provide insight into the details of the lives of the former occupants of the site, and their habits, trends and activities.

Although historical records available from as early as 1794 reveal the location, general fabric and function of the previous structures, archaeological investigation may yield additional information about the site’s early structures that formed the core of the town’s development. Archaeological investigation of this site could provide a more detailed insight into the history of a multilayered site like this.

The 2016 test excavations revealed the partially disturbed historical remains of structures dating to the mid-nineteenth century, and potentially earlier, in certain parts of the study area. These remains warrant further investigation to enhance our understanding of the development and use of the Windsor area. This site can therefore likely contribute information that is significant at both a *local* and *State* level.

**Can the site contribute knowledge that no other site can?**

The study area contains archaeological remains dating to the early to mid-nineteenth century, if not earlier, based on the testing results. Other remains may exist in untested areas, below historic road surfaces (which were left in situ during testing) and in areas adjacent to the study area. Collectively, these archaeological remains can provide an insight into the development and expansion of the early historic settlement of the Sydney Basin, the reordering of a relatively unplanned rural community into a more formalised government town, and the interaction between the Europeans and local Aboriginal groups. The early date of settlement of the area means that the historical archaeological resource, even where disturbed and partially fragmented, provides a rare insight into this early phase of Australia’s colonial history.

This study area can therefore contribute information that is significant at a *State* level.

**Is this knowledge relevant to general questions about human history or other substantive questions relating to Australian history, or does it contribute to other major research questions?**

This site was part of the historical development and expansion of the colony. The establishment and expansion of early agriculture, shipbuilding, food transport and the transition from an informal agricultural settlement to a more rigidly defined government town are all areas of investigation for the study area. It further provides an opportunity for comparative analysis with the other ‘Macquarie Towns’ and the development of early colonial life. These questions are significant at a State level.

The demonstrated presence of ‘contact’ remains and the reuse of European materials by Aboriginal people also represents a rare opportunity to investigate this aspect of Aboriginal/European relations and the adaptation of indigenous culture. This area of interest is therefore also significant at a State level.

The study area would have a limited ability to provide answers to broader research questions related to the archaeology of early colonial life in NSW, the development of institutions and the commerce at the site. This would, however, depend on the level of integrity of any surviving remains at the site. The information that might be derived from this site would primarily address site-specific research questions, and, as such, would be significant at a local level.

**Statement of Historical Archaeological Significance**

Thompson Square and its immediate surrounds have been occupied since the last years of the eighteenth century, with the first development documented in 1794. The potential archaeological resource of the study area has the capacity to provide tangible links to this earliest phase of historical development. As one of the earliest rural settlements in the colony, which included land grants to ex-convicts and free settlers within the military setting, the site retains evidence of various phases of European occupation based on agriculture and small industrial development.

The results of the 2016 testing programme indicate that, despite a significant level of disturbance by various site formation processes, the study area has the potential to yield information that could contribute to a better understanding of the development of early Windsor (that is, Green Hills and Mulgrave Place). In turn, the new evidence could potentially inform research into settlement and agricultural use in the early colonial period. This research value principally derives from the identified structural and artefactual remains (and any other associated remains yet to be identified), as well as remnant cultural landscape at the site.

The 2016 test excavation programme identified a number of archaeological features and deposits assessed to be of both State and local significance.

Of particular significance is the group of related structural remains comprising the brick footing of the Government Cottage and domain entry gate or the stables of the Government Domain at the corner of George Street, and the associated brick and stone surface and brick drain in Old Bridge Street. These archaeological features and the retrieved artefact assemblage provide an important resource for further research into the site, that formed part of the early colonial establishment which exploited convicts to build a new nation. Together with the preserved foundations of the guardhouse located at the south end of Bridge Street, they provide a direct link to Australia’s early colonial history. Collectively, these remains are of State heritage significance.

This uncommon collection of archaeological remains has historical, associative, social, technical/research and rarity significance, representative of the evolution of the place from a colonial agricultural settlement consisting of modest huts and government stores and offices to the newly laid out town with an established boat construction manufactory and river trade. This group of remains is considered to be of State heritage significance.

Any further artefacts recovered, including rare examples of imported or locally made objects, as well as those providing evidence of contact between the new settlers and local Aborigines, also have a high research value. Any artefact bearing deposits and individual artefacts (such as knapped/modified European objects) representing direct contact between the settlers and local Aborigines would be of State significance.

Further research potential is contained in the evidence of the original landscape and how it has been changed by natural and/or human impacts following initial settlement. This includes evidence of burning, stumping and fire clearance; flooding and remediation; pollen evidence of natural and/or...
introduced vegetation; and cutting and filling associated with the introduction of different infrastructure, such as the bridge and associated roadway.

Archaeological evidence such as the Telford roadbase, various connecting paths, fence lines and other infrastructure elements from the later nineteenth and early twentieth century development phases are significant at a local level.

During the area’s 220 years of European settlement, the landscape has been dramatically altered through the initial clearance of native vegetation, agricultural activities, frequent flooding and redevelopment. The change in the landscape is evident and as such contributes to an understanding of the continuous settlement impact onto the natural environment.

In summary, the historical archaeological remains identified within a substantially modified cultural landscape have the ability to address a range of research questions associated with the early phases of colonial settlement; evidence about the early marine activities and river traffic; the life of convicts, emancipists and military and their ability to manage their existence and social progression; the nature of successful life of early emancipated convicts and those who had the patronage of Governor Macquarie. The artefacts and remains may also have the ability to address questions relating to the evolution of the landscape, townscapes, diet, lifeways and Aboriginal contact.

Cumulatively, both the recorded archaeological remains and the areas identified as having archaeological potential can make a significant contribution to our understanding of the history and development of Windsor and NSW at both the State and local levels.

3.3.3 Maritime Heritage Significance

The maritime heritage of Windsor and Thompson Square relates to the wharves used to ship produce downriver to Sydney, the maritime construction industry which included small-scale shipbuilding, and the punt that operated across the Hawkesbury River prior to the construction of Windsor Bridge. No above-ground remains of any of these phases of maritime history and development survive; any remains are archaeological only, and primarily contained to areas within the Hawkesbury River, or are potentially buried within the southern river embankment.

Windsor Jetty (1795 – circa 1800) and Windsor Wharf (circa 1814 – circa 1940)

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

The construction of a wharf at Windsor was an integral part of the establishment and development of dispersed frontier farming and the township. The first maritime structure in the area, a jetty was constructed in 1795 and used to supply the military garrison and first store built in the location of Thompson Square. By this time, the surrounding area was being used for farming purposes and the jetty was likely used to transport crops out to the settlement in Sydney. This mode of transport was likely faster than the overland route, which was not formally established until 1816.

The second structure, a wharf – first constructed in 1814, subsequently expanded but then destroyed by floods and rebuilt by 1820 – served as the nexus between land and water for the transfer of goods, produce and people to and from the mosquito fleet that plied the Hawkesbury River and beyond. Such was the importance and volume of the water-borne trade that a temporary wharf was established in 1855.

The wharf was again rebuilt in 1874 after floods in the 1860s and the construction of the current bridge appears to have altered the shape of the riverbank. However, by this stage the river trade had begun to decline as a result of siltation reducing the size of vessels that could access the wharf. The introduction of the motor vehicle accelerated this decline and, though the wharf was again refurbished in 1934, its function had become more focused on recreational activities rather than trade. By the middle of the twentieth century the wharf had fallen into disrepair.
The construction of both wharves at Windsor are associated with the survival of the early colony, providing a means of transporting agricultural crops out of the greater Windsor area back to the main settlement at Port Jackson in Sydney.

The jetty and wharf built at Windsor (1795 – circa 1800 and circa 1814 – circa 1940, respectively) are considered to be State significant under this criterion on the basis that they formed part of critical transport and trade infrastructure for one of the earliest European settlements in Australia – a settlement that was vital for the survival of Sydney as a viable colony.

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

The earliest version of the Windsor Wharf built in circa 1814 was associated with two important personages in the early colony – Governor Macquarie who commissioned its construction in 1814, and Francis Greenway who oversaw its final construction in 1820. Three years earlier, Macquarie had developed a plan for the formation of a township at Windsor, as well as four other townships on the Hawkesbury River. While it was not in the original plan for the establishment of a formal town, the need for adequate loading facilities on the river was later identified and endorsed by Governor Macquarie.

The wharf was built by John Howe and James McGrath, both early land grantees at Mulgrave, (who also improved the road from Parramatta to Windsor and searched for an overland route to the Hunter River. After the wharf was damaged in a flood in 1816, Macquarie ensured its survival by granting further funding to complete the wharf. Oversight of the construction was entrusted to Francis Greenway, who completed the structure in 1820. While Greenway was well known for his flamboyant yet sound design principles, it is not known whether his flair was translated into the construction of this structure. The enlarged 276-foot wharf, proposed and commenced in 1815, was ambitious but may have been designed prior to Greenway’s involvement in the project. That the wharf constructed under his supervision appears to have lasted for fifty years before a major refurbishment is possibly testament to his skills as both an architect and a builder.

The second wharf at Windsor, built in circa 1814 – circa 1940, has a strong association with Governor Macquarie and Francis Greenway, both important figures in the history of NSW, and, as such, the wharves built at Windsor are considered to be State significant under this criterion.

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

Limited archaeological remains associated with the circa 1814 – circa 1940s wharf are visible from the current road bridge or via boat. These remains are limited to the twentieth-century phase of construction and consist of the lower support components of the wharf, such as bracing and deck beams, and therefore are not considered to be aesthetic characteristics or to demonstrate creative or technical achievement. The former wharf site, particularly the nineteenth-century manifestations, are likely only to exist within the archaeological record, including on and below the riverbed, and as such these wharves are not considered to meet the requirements of this criterion.

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

The early maritime infrastructure at Windsor – a jetty in 1795 and later a wharf from circa 1814 to circa 1940s – was used for the supply of the early land grants and later formal settlement at Windsor,
as well as to assist in transporting agricultural crops out to the settlements at Parramatta and Sydney. The evolution of the wharf from a major transportation hub for cargo and passengers continued until the early twentieth century. Although the wharf was used by the larger community for transportation needs, there were no single particular community or cultural groups who can be associated with either of the wharves built at Windsor. As such, the wharves built at Windsor are not considered to meet the requirements of this criterion.

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

The archaeological investigations carried out in 2008 and 2016 have shown that there is considerable archaeological potential regarding the remains of the circa-1814 – circa-1940s wharf and possibly the 1795 – circa-1800 jetty. There is very little historical information on the jetty and that which is available for the wharf indicates broad dimensions but little in the way of detail for the various designs and rebuilds that occurred in the 1810s. The 2016 investigation took place in the footprint of the former Windsor Wharf and found what appeared to be two adjacent bedlogs of differing diameter. They probably relate to two different wharf-building phases in the early nineteenth and possibly late eighteenth century.

Physical evidence that has survived in the archaeological record has the potential to provide new information relating to the construction techniques and material that were used, specifically the types of wood used, fastenings, bracing and pile information as well as quality of workmanship and materials. Information about any repair work to the wharf undertaken can also be determined from the remains in the archaeological record of wharf sites, such as from the driving in of repair ‘sister’ piles or the addition of extra bracing or fastenings.

Artefacts discarded, accidentally or deliberately, from the wharf and vessels moored alongside can contribute towards knowledge of the variety of traffic and goods that passed through this portal between Windsor and Sydney over time.

The archaeological site associated with the former jetty and wharf built at Windsor, both above and below the low waterline, has the potential to contribute to a greater understanding of settlement before and during the Macquarie era. As such, the archaeological site associated with both former structures built at Windsor is considered to be State significant under this criterion.

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

The archaeological site associated with the former Windsor jetty and wharf is considered to be a rare and endangered archaeological resource. Wharf/jetty redevelopment within major ports and harbours has occurred continuously as required to maintain the function of these ports. Through this process infrastructure is updated and wharves are demolished and rebuilt. Wharf/jetty sites along major rivers and secondary ports are likely to exist, both intact and as an archaeological resource, as redevelopment of these sites is less likely to occur given the development of other transportation advances, such as rail or road infrastructure. Aspects of the wharf that are present in and behind the riverbank at Windsor are likely to be intact, and may provide information regarding design and construction techniques that are directly associated with the early settlement of NSW.

The 1820 reconstruction of the wharf was supervised by renowned architect Francis Greenway. As far as is known, this is the only in-water construction of maritime infrastructure within his repertoire of public works.

The physical and archaeological remains of the former jetty and wharf built at Windsor are therefore considered to be State significant under this criterion.
Criterion g) An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s cultural or natural places; or cultural and natural environments

The sites of the former jetty and wharf at Windsor are represented by fragmentary remains that can be seen from certain vantage points, such as on the river, while the primary remains of the wharves are likely to be present within the archaeological record. As such, the sites are not considered to retain the principal characteristics of its type or design. The maritime infrastructure at Windsor is not considered to meet this criterion.

Statement of Maritime Archaeological Significance

The jetty and later wharf at Windsor represent important elements of the infrastructure development that was part of the early settlement and development of the township. The construction of the jetty in 1795 allowed for supplies to be unloaded safely at the early store and military garrison and for farm crops to be exported out. The construction of a more substantial wharf, which commenced in circa 1814 as part of the formalisation and development of the Macquarie town, reinforced the importance of the settlement and the need for maritime infrastructure as part of that plan. This wharf was rebuilt soon after – it was commissioned by Governor Macquarie and its construction was overseen by Francis Greenway.

The wharf was an integral part of the Windsor township until the expansion of rail to Windsor. Larger maritime infrastructure at Brooklyn on the Hawkesbury River meant that the use of the wharf was likely limited to public recreational uses after this time. The archaeological resource present on the site is considered to be a rare and endangered resource that can provide new information on the design and construction of wharves built during the early settlement of NSW and Australia. The late-eighteenth-century jetty and early to mid-nineteenth-century version of the wharf at Windsor are assessed to be of State significance.

3.4 Assessment of Landscape Heritage Significance

3.4.1 Overview

An assessment of the significance of the cultural and natural landscape endeavours to establish why a place is important. Significance is embodied in the physical and spatial fabric of a place, and its settings and relationship to the wider environmental context.

Cultural landscape significance denotes values embedded in the natural and cultural landscape that are social, aesthetic, historic and engender a sense of community for past, present and future generations. Natural landscape significance is formulated on values relating to the geography, biodiversity and ecology of a place and its position within broader landscape systems.

The following is a summary of the key landscape elements that contribute most prominently to the cultural and natural landscape of the study area and the town of Windsor. These elements and features have a cumulative effect on how the landscape of the study area is perceived, experienced and valued.

3.4.2 Key Landscape Elements

The Built Fabric, Edges and Structures

The site retains significant associations with the development of the early colony of NSW and contributes to an understanding of NSW’s settlement history, in particular through:

- Built form – the surrounding buildings represent most of the historical phases of the township, from the Macquarie Arms Hotel built in 1815 through to the cottage built on Thompson’s allotment in 1955.
• Bridge Street – although its introduction in 1934 created the deepest division of Thompson Square’s parklands in history, it is part of Windsor’s history and speaks of its economic landscape.

• Windsor Bridge – represents a history of technical achievement and social importance. Although in dire condition now, the bridge is a familiar component of the local and regional cultural landscape and represents a construction feat of local history.

Open Space and Planting
It is the open space itself that was declared ‘Thompson Square’ by Governor Macquarie and formed the civic heart of Windsor, making it the earliest declared civic square in Australia.

The open space on the north side of the river retains the rural uses and minimal development that have characterised the area since it was initially cleared of vegetation during early colonial settlement. The continuation of this character into the modern age is reflective of the early colonial concept of ‘taming the wilderness for agricultural purposes’.

The existing vegetation along the riverbanks supports remnants of the River Flat Forest vegetation, an endangered ecological community listing under the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. This community is also of cultural heritage value as it reflects the dominant vegetation of the study area prior to colonial settlement.

Although the existing planting elsewhere in the study area is highly modified, its character reflects the developmental progression of Windsor and speaks of historic movements of cultural landscape design and urban planning. The asymmetry and unstructured character of the current condition reinforces the informal landscaping approach prevalent throughout the evolution of Thompson Square.

These aspects of the study area are significant at a State level.

Topography and Soils
The topography of Thompson Square has been transformed through periods of development to allow for ease of access to the river. The steepness of the topography from the township ridge down to the river is one of the key reasons for the dominance of roads within the open space of Thompson Square over time. While Thompson Square itself has undergone significant topographic modifications, the peripheral landform, including the southern and northern banks of the adjacent river, are largely reflective of the precolonial landscape. Exposure of the Wianamatta geology of the ridge through the Bridge Road cutting reflects the original topography of the place that prevailed prior to European settlement.

Remnants of soils that identify the natural landform and river systems of the wider region are still evident within the study area. The alluvial soil type typical of the Hawkesbury River floodplains supports the River Flat Forest vegetation community which is still present but dwindling in the wider area.

These aspects of the study area are significant at a local level.

Views and Vistas
Largely due to the natural topography of the inherent landform of the site, current views and vistas to the township and Thompson Square from the north (the Wilberforce side of the study area) are of high significance as they reflect historic notions of the gateway to Windsor. The George Street and Bridge Road intersection on the south side of the river is also significant as a key arrival point into Windsor.

Thompson Square itself maintains important visual connections to George Street and reinstates its presence as the civic heart of the township. The vantage point from the intersection of George and Bridge streets is an important one as it offers a good view of the parkland open space in its entirety, including the physical separation of the upper and lower squares.

These aspects of the study area are significant at a local level.
3.4.3 Statement of Landscape Heritage Significance

It is evident from the summary of the key landscape elements above that the cultural and natural landscape of the Windsor Bridge study area is of significance at a State level. The analysis of the immediate study area and assessment of the sense of place it creates have revealed that the Windsor Bridge and Thompson Square site is a unique place of inherent cultural and natural landscape significance.

Thompson Square’s current character of an informal open space sloping down to the river can be seen as a reflection of the political landscape of the early colonial era, whereby Macquarie’s vision for Thompson Square as a formal public square was never quite realised. This present character is, however, the result of a long series of uncoordinated changes to the area, with limited regard for the original vision for the place.

Although the community relinquished the form and role of Thompson Square into a large open parkland that was occupied by primarily utilitarian functions, it has gradually assumed the role of Macquarie’s initial vision – as a setting for civic and recreational activities at the heart of the Windsor township. This role is likely to be strengthened over time and the square’s presence, in conjunction with the river foreshore, facilitates greater recreational opportunities in the future.

The remaining natural landform contains evidence of historical landscape transformation processes at both a local and regional level, such as on-site relics, remnants and the existing landscape composition. Threatened ecological communities and vegetation are present on-site in the form of regrowth and suggest the natural vegetative conditions of precolonial times.

Thompson Square and surrounds retain evidence of the original colonial landscape and carry the title of ‘The oldest surviving public square in Australia’ – a title of place that has strong associations to the cultural and heritage values of the area and the state.

In summary, the natural and cultural landscape of the study area is significant at a State level.

3.5 Assessment of Built Heritage Significance

3.5.1 Graded Levels of Significance

Graded levels of significance are a management tool used to assess the relative significance of elements within an item, place or site, and assist in decision-making regarding individual elements of a place. The integrity of elements and their relationship with other elements should be considered in management decisions, along with graded levels of significance.

In order to manage the significance of a place, it is important to define what elements of the site contribute to that significance. Depending on the nature of the significance of the place, as detailed in Chapter 2 above, this may include buildings and building elements, machinery, plant, freestanding structures and landscape elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>General conservation principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Elements of exceptional significance are key to the understanding of the place, as they represent its major characteristics and are generally original elements. They may also be rare or exceptional examples of their type. Fabric of exceptional significance must be conserved and restored. In the case of failure, fabric of exceptional significance must be reinstated using the same materials and, where possible, traditional methods. These elements should not be removed or replaced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of significance | General conservation principles
---|---
| obscurity obscured by future works. Where such elements are missing, concealed or damaged, they should be restored.

**High**
Elements of high significance are major components of the place and important to understanding its significance and development over time. These elements may include later but sympathetic additions to the place or original elements, which have been altered sympathetically.

Fabric of high significance should generally be retained, conserved or restored using sympathetic methods and materials. Minor changes or alterations to fabric of considerable significance are permissible, where changes are relatively minor, fabric is not obscured and changes are reversible.

**Moderate**
Elements of moderate significance have some heritage value but are not key components to understanding the place or its significance. This may include later, introduced fabric or elements in poor or modified condition, which cannot be reasonably conserved.

Fabric of moderate significance may be altered if necessary provided such alteration does not compromise the overall significance of the heritage item.

**Little**
Elements of little significance are minor components of the site, elements which have been altered over time or which make little contribution to the significance of the place. They may include items such as fittings and fixtures which have been changed many times over the life of the item.

Fabric of little significance may be altered, removed or replaced as necessary, but such actions should not damage or obscure fabric of higher significance.

**Intrusive**
Intrusive elements are those later additions to a site which obscure or compromise elements of the site’s significance. Such elements are not sympathetic to the site and may obscure the understanding of the place.

Wherever possible, intrusive elements should be removed and replaced (if necessary) with new elements which are sympathetic to the place. New intrusive elements should not be introduced to a place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>ELEMENT (description)</th>
<th>Graded level of significance</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HI4 | Doctors House 1–3 Thompson Square | High | A high-quality colonial-style, sandstone-brick terrace building from the post-Macquarie era. The item is significant in its own right (historic associated with the
<p>| HI5 | House &amp; Outbuilding 5 Thompson Square | High | An authentic early-Victorian cottage that provides a positive contribution to the character of Thompson Square. Helps define the south-western boundary of Thompson Square. |
| HI6 | Hawkesbury Museum and Tourist Information Centre 7 Thompson Square | High | A high-quality Georgian-style house that relates to the early development of Windsor in the post-Macquarie era. The building is significant in its own right and for its contribution to the aesthetic and historic values of Thompson Square. Helps define the south-western boundary of Thompson Square. |
| HI7 | Macquarie Arms Hotel 81 George Street | Exceptional | The Macquarie Arms is of exceptional significance as the only intact, and most substantial, building of the original Macquarie-era Thompson Square. The item relates to the original Macquarie subdivision and contains numerous rare and aesthetically superior elements. |
| HI8 | House 4 Bridge Street (also identified as 8 Bridge Street) | Little | The existing dwelling is of low significance, relating to the late-twentieth-century development of the area. The property itself is significant as the site of emancipist Andrew Thompson’s cottage and garden. |
| HI9 | House 6 Bridge Street | Moderate | Unaltered mid-Victorian cottage. Helps define the north-eastern boundary of Thompson Square. Historic associations with the provision of private education in Windsor. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building to the rear</th>
<th>HI10</th>
<th>HI11</th>
<th>HI12</th>
<th>HI13</th>
<th>HI14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Lilburn Dale Hall' House and Outbuildings 10 Bridge Street</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts 14 Bridge Street</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage 20 Bridge Street</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage 17 Bridge Street</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops – Former Hawkesbury Stores 62 George Street</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64–68 George St</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **HI10**: A substantial early Victorian, two-storey building that defines the street corner, the crest of the hill, and is part of a row of buildings that defines the north-eastern edge of Thompson Square.

- **HI11**: The Italianate building provides a positive contribution to the character of Thompson Square. It was used to provide social, recreational and educational opportunities for the community.

- **HI12**: The dwelling is a substantial Federation-era dwelling with a turret corner and garden setting. Although the site is not visible from Thompson Square, it is significant in its own right and for its contribution to the historic values of Thompson Square.

- **HI13**: Early Georgian-style terrace that defines the eastern entry to Thompson Square and contributes to the aesthetic values of the precinct.

- **HI14**: Item forms part of the mixed development of the 1840s–1880s with historic associations with the Moses family. Helps to define the south-eastern edge of Thompson Square. Representative of early commercial growth.
| HI15 | Shops – Former Hawkesbury Garage 70–72 George Street | High | Historic associations with Clement's Hawkesbury Garage. Helps to define the south-eastern edge of Thompson Square. Representative of the transition of Thompson Square to the George Street commercial strip. |
| HI16 | A.C. Stearn Building 74 George Street | High | Highly intact Federation-style shop. Helps to define the south-eastern edge of Thompson Square. Representative of the transition of Thompson Square into the George Street commercial strip. |
| HI17 | Shops 80 George Street | Little | Building has low heritage significance as it relates to the late-twentieth-century development of the site. An aerial photograph from 1970 shows a vacant lot where the existing building is standing. |
|      | 82 George Street | High | While it was originally constructed as a residence, the building was later utilised as part of the transition of Thompson Square into the George Street commercial strip. |
| HI18 | Shops 84–88 George Street | High | These Federation-style shops help to define the south-western edge of Thompson Square and are representative of the transition of Thompson Square to the George Street commercial strip. |
| HI19 | Two-storey building 92–98 George Street | High | The Victorian-era-style shops contribute towards the aesthetic and historic significance of the precinct. The site is also representative of the early transition of Thompson Square to the George Street commercial strip. The shed has low significance. |
| HI21 | Bridgeview Residence 27 Wilberforce Road | Moderate | A substantial late-Federation dwelling located on a prominent corner overlooking Windsor Bridge. The item |
3.5.2 Statement of Built Heritage Significance

The built heritage of Thompson Square and the adjacent study area ranges from items of exceptional, State heritage significance, and items of moderate local significance, to items of little or no heritage significance. The built fabric represents a range of ages from circa 1815 through to the 1970s and includes residential, civic and commercial buildings of a range of styles and qualities. The early to mid-nineteenth-century buildings reflect the development of the early settlement of Windsor and its progressive formalisation around Thompson Square. The presence of commercial buildings along the periphery of the square is representative of its importance as a civic space within the developing community of Windsor. The later commercial and infill buildings speak to a period of change from the early to mid-twentieth century, when there was less concern with the colonial period of the study area and a desire for modern buildings to serve a growing local centre. The mix of buildings provides a picture of the development of the study area, Thompson Square and the centre of Windsor as it changed and evolved from an important, rural colonial outpost into a modern local centre. Therefore, in relation to built heritage significance:

- The buildings identified as having exceptional or high significance are significant at a State level.
- The buildings identified as having moderate significance are significant at a local level.
- The buildings identified as having little significance are not considered to meet the threshold for local significance.

It is to be noted that all buildings within or adjacent to the study area (with the exception of Bridgeview north of the river) are within the Thompson Square Conservation Area.

### HI22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Hills Cottage</th>
<th>Little (existing house)</th>
<th>Exceptional (archaeology)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 George Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dwelling on-site has low significance, relating to the early twentieth-century development of the area. It is also symbolic of the original Government Cottage which was constructed in a similar position.

The site and its views have outstanding State significance as evidence of the earliest development of the Hawkesbury district and the site of the Government Cottage.

3.6 Summary Assessment of Significance

The subsections below provide an aggregated assessment of the heritage significance of the study area, for built, landscape and archaeological values, against the NSW heritage significance criteria. This assessment builds on and summarises the detailed significance assessments of the individual aspects of the site’s heritage value set out above.
**Criterion (a)**  
*An item is important in the course, or pattern, of the cultural or natural history of the Australian, NSW or local area.*

The Hawkesbury River basin was a key element supporting the early food security of the fledgling colony of NSW, from the late eighteenth century onwards. The fertile floodplains drove early colonial settlement of the area, which also consequently exacerbated the dispossession of the land from Aboriginal people. Historically, the area is associated with the early settlement of Green Hills and the later formalisation of the town of Windsor by Governor Macquarie in the early nineteenth century. As one of the Macquarie Towns, Windsor was part of Macquarie’s vision for the evolution of the colony of NSW in general, as well as the formalisation of the civic space in Windsor through the declaration of Thompson Square as the earliest town square in Australia. While modified, the general configuration of Thompson Square reflects its early boundaries and provides an insight into the early colonial development of Windsor and colonial Australian towns.

The study area meets this criterion at a *State* level.

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

The study area is associated with a number of notable individuals from NSW’s early colonial history. The primary association is with the work of Governor Lachlan Macquarie, who, in 1811, declared the area of Thompson Square to be the first public square in Australia. The area also has a strong association with Andrew Thompson, emancipated convict, colonial entrepreneur and magistrate. Thompson’s appointment to a position of governmental authority was a significant moment in the social progress of former convicts. The area also has associations with other key figures from the colonial period, including Governor John Hunter and Reverend Samuel Marsden. These associations continue to be reflected in place names, and the configuration of Thompson Square.

These associations are significant at a *State* level.
**Criterion (c)**

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

The study area contains Thompson Square, now highly modified from its original configuration but still recognisable and a key element within central Windsor. It is possible to understand the arrangement of the early Thompson Square and its function as a key civic space for the growing community. The surrounding building stock, particularly that dating from the early nineteenth to late nineteenth centuries, provides a significant insight into the growth and development of Windsor, and fine examples of historic building stock ranging from the circa-1815 Macquarie Arms Hotel, to the circa-1844 Doctors House and the commercial buildings along the south side of Thompson Square. Collectively, these add to the sense of place and enhance the character of Thompson Square as a civic square and the heart of Windsor.

Thompson Square and the surrounding buildings meet this criterion at a State level.

**Criterion (d)**

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

Thompson Square has been central to the Windsor community, from its time as unallocated government land in the eighteenth century, through to Andrew Thompson’s lease and the square’s subsequent establishment by Macquarie as a civic square. The area has been used and reused by the community and by government, for a range of purposes, and has changed in accordance with changing community needs and perceptions. As a destination and location, however, it is primarily of value to the local community, who continue to make use of the area on a daily basis, as well as a location for special events.

The study area meets this criterion at a local level.

**Criterion (e)**

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

The study area has demonstrated high archaeological potential for Aboriginal, historic and maritime archaeological values, south of the Hawkesbury River. The sand sheet that underlies much of Thompson Square and, potentially, the surrounding area has been scientifically dated to the Pleistocene through to the Holocene, and provides some of the earliest datable evidence of the settlement of the Sydney Basin by Aboriginal people. The historical remains include elements of the early nineteenth-century settlement of the area, albeit with significant disturbance in some areas. Evidence of reworked glass, illustrating contact between Aboriginal and European peoples, and the adaptation of Aboriginal lifeways to the use of new materials, has also been found in association with early colonial archaeological remains. Evidence of the circa-1814 wharf has been located in the river near the southern embankment, representing early evidence of the maritime industry along the Hawkesbury River, which was critical to supplying food to the growing colony.

These archaeological resources are collectively and individually significant at a State level.
Criterion (f)  

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

Thompson Square and the surrounding area is one of the few remaining early civic squares in NSW. While it has been significantly modified over time, it has continued to serve as a focal point for the community. Collectively, Thompson Square and its surrounding buildings and relationship to the river provide a strong sense of place, rooted in the early nineteenth-century landscape.

The study area meets this criterion at a State level.

Criterion (g)  

An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of Australia, NSW or local areas:

Cultural or natural places; or Cultural or natural environments.

As one of the Macquarie Towns, Windsor and the Thompson Square area demonstrate Governor Macquarie’s vision for a more orderly colony in NSW. Thompson Square, while modified, reflects the early vision of the place, building on the earlier roots of Green Hills and formalising the area into a central civic space for Windsor, and the surrounding district. Despite the modifications, it is possible to read this early civic intent in the arrangement of the square, and its relationship to the surrounding buildings and the river.

The study area meets this criterion at a State level.
Figure 71: Plan showing the graded level of significance for built heritage in the study area.
3.7 Summary Statement of Heritage Significance for Thompson Square and the Study Area

Note: The statement of significance for the project area, outlined here, is different from the gazetted statement of significance for the Thompson Square Conservation Area as listed on the State Heritage Register.

The study area for the SCMP is of State-level heritage significance for built, Aboriginal, historic, archaeological and landscape values. The area was used by the local Aboriginal people at least as early as 23,000 BP – representing some of the earliest known dates for Aboriginal habitation in the Sydney Basin. The sand sheet that extends through much of the study area is likely to contain additional significant remains of early Aboriginal habitation which will broaden the understanding of early lifeways in the Sydney Basin through future archaeological investigation. Later period (Holocene) Aboriginal cultural material will provide further detail on a better understood period of Aboriginal habitation, and the opportunity for comparative analysis with equivalent deposits in areas such as the Windsor Museum site and Pitt Town. The general area is also a known site of interaction between local Aboriginal people and colonial settlers, with archaeological evidence of Aboriginal reuse of colonial glassware and documented accounts of both friendly interaction and violent conflict in the historical record.

Historically, the area is associated with the early settlement of Green Hills and the later formalisation of the town of Windsor by Governor Macquarie in the early nineteenth century. As one of the Macquarie Towns, Windsor was part of Macquarie’s vision for the evolution of the colony of NSW in general, as well as the formalisation of the civic space in Windsor through the declaration of Thompson Square as the earliest town square in Australia. While modified, the general configuration of Thompson Square reflects its early boundaries and provides an insight into the early colonial development of Windsor and colonial Australian towns.

Thompson Square also has a strong association with colonial figure Andrew Thompson, a freed convict turned entrepreneur, who demonstrated the social mobility between the convict and freedman classes early in the history of Australia. His friendship with Governor Macquarie and his memorialisation through the naming of Thompson Square are important symbols of the changing social position of and attitudes towards freed convicts in the early settlement. The present Thompson Square is largely based on the land leased and later granted to Andrew Thompson. Following the establishment and formalisation of Thompson Square, it became an important civic space for the growing community of Windsor.

The landscape of Thompson Square and the study area reflects the changing needs and ambitions of the local community over time. The early square was used as a place of public gatherings, markets and even executions, while the purpose changed in the late nineteenth century so that the space assumed a more park-like function. The construction of Windsor Bridge in the late nineteenth century led to the first of many impacts on Thompson Square as roads were established, altered, expanded and realigned through the transition from pedestrian and horse-drawn vehicles to private motor vehicles and heavy vehicles, reflecting the growth in trade and development of the consumer economy in the twentieth century. The vegetation and landscape elements of the park reflect this change in use from a utilitarian public space used for a variety of functions to a space for passive recreation. The landscape also reflects the cumulative and ongoing impact of flooding in the area, through the periodic inundation of Thompson Square and the surrounding area.

Windsor Bridge replaced the earlier punt crossing of the river and reflects the importance of the transport routes through Windsor and the increasing importance of road traffic over river traffic for the shipping of goods. The bridge was modified on several occasions to address issues related to flooding and the increased impact of modern traffic, particularly with the pre-cast, reinforced concrete modifications in the 1930s, which reflect technological innovation at the time. The new Windsor Bridge will continue the tradition of progressive alterations of the river crossing in response to changing needs and technology, and will reflect the continued importance of Windsor as a transport route.
The historical archaeological remains within the study area include partial remains of some early colonial structures, particularly along the eastern side of the study area. These provide an important opportunity to investigate the undocumented aspects of the area’s history and development, through future excavation, conservation and interpretation. It is likely that even more substantial archaeological remains of the colonial period exist in the private lands on the periphery of the study area, which have been subject to lesser impacts over the past 200 years. The identified archaeological remains of the circa-1814 wharf are an important example of an early colonial maritime structure and provide an opportunity to study and interpret the maritime history of the area.

The collection of buildings adjoining the study area reflect the continual development of the area since the 1810s through to the 1970s. Buildings such as the Macquarie Arms Hotel reflect the earliest phases of development and buildings constructed from the nineteenth century demonstrate the early character of the area. The later twentieth-century buildings show the change of Windsor and the need for modern buildings to serve the growing town.

The parts of the study area north of the Hawkesbury River are significant for the vantage they provide back towards Thompson Square and the surrounding area, and give an opportunity to reflect on the changes in the area from the colonial period to the present. The surrounding landscape is, however, utilitarian farmland which, while reflective of the European modification of the area for agriculture, is not itself significant. Little in the way of significant Aboriginal or historical archaeology was identified north of the river.

Collectively, these elements of the study area contribute to the significance of Thompson Square at a State and local level.

3.8 Curtilage

The definition of curtilage of a heritage item is established by OEH as the ‘setting’ or space around an item or place that is required to preserve the significance of that place. The curtilage is adopted in order to recognise the importance of the immediate and broader setting of the item to the retention of its significance.

Factors to be considered in determining the curtilage of an item or place include the:

- views to and from the item
- potential need for a buffer zone between the curtilage and adjoining properties
- visual and historical relationship between the item and its setting.

The study area for this document overlaps with the existing SHR and LEP curtilages for the Thompson Square Conservation Area, as well as the curtilages for the individual heritage items within and adjacent to the study area. There are also sites containing buildings of little or no significance that adjoin the study area and these listed curtilages may warrant inclusion within an amended curtilage, to guide future development on those sites in a manner that enhances the heritage significance of the study area and Thompson Square precinct generally. It is desirable to rationalise these curtilages, to ensure consistent planning controls between the various levels of government and to reflect the findings of the SCMP. As the study area boundaries for the SCMP were dictated by the WBRP, they do not have any long-term relevance to the management of the area and are therefore not reflected in the curtilage recommendations.

The overlapping and conflicting nature of the listed curtilages for the study area is shown below in Figure 72 (also Figure 8 in Volume 1):
Figure 72: Overlapping and conflicting curtilages within the study area.
3.9 Conclusion

Note: The curtilage as defined by the project and outlined here is different from the gazetted curtilage for the Thompson Square Conservation Area as set out in both the SHR and LEP.

It is recommended that the curtilage for Thompson Square and the surrounding area be expanded and altered as per the following plan. This plan includes areas such as:

- the former punt location
- the location of the circa-1814 wharf
- the southern river foreshore generally to the immediate north of Thompson Square
- the riverbed from the southern high watermark north for 20 metres, to encompass the areas of the former wharves, potential archaeological deposits in the riverbed and the former shipyard
- the entire lots of all buildings immediately adjacent to Thompson Square, regardless of significance
- buildings up to the corner of Baker Street to the west and the Windsor Museum site, to provide opportunity to control future development on these sites in a manner sympathetic to the area
- the entirety of Thompson Square (its existing and original extent) and the surrounding road system
- the southern abutment location of the replacement Windsor Bridge.

The justification for the inclusion of these additional areas is the presence of significant archaeological remains, the potential for improved outcomes through future redevelopment of structures of little significance, the need to retain control of the foreshore area to retain views, and the potential future impacts of infrastructure maintenance and upgrades to the area.

The curtilage recommendations exclude:

- all parts of the study area north of the Hawkesbury River
- the extant 1874/1934 Windsor Bridge, including abutments
- the area of the replacement Windsor Bridge north of the southern embankment
- the modern wharf
- the southern end of Bridge Street, south of the roundabout at the intersection of Bridge and Macquarie streets.

The justification for the exclusion or removal of these areas from the curtilage is based on the lack of any defined heritage values, the approved removal of the structures in question, the lack of significance of proposed new structures, and the absence of significant structures or archaeological remains.

The recommended curtilage shown below should be adopted for both the SHR listing and the LEP listing for the Thompson Square Conservation Area.
Figure 73: Curtailage map.
4 Conservation Management Issues

Volume 1 of the SCMP sets out the history and inventory of the site, while the first three sections of Volume 2 aid understanding of the values and significance of the fabric and features of the study area. This section provides an overview of the management issues facing Thompson Square as it stands today, discusses the owner’s requirements for the square and briefly describes the statutory constraints affecting the square.

The assessment provides a basis for developing an overall conservation philosophy and policy framework for future conservation and management of Thompson Square.

Specific details of conservation principles, constraints, opportunities and policies with respect to the WBRP are contained within Volume 3.

It should be noted that the principles and policies developed here are limited by the fundamental constraint of the replacement of Windsor Bridge in its approved form.

4.1 Client and Consent Authority Requirements

This SCMP was commissioned by NSW RMS to achieve the following objectives:

- To implement the requirements of the Minister’s Conditions of Approval for the WBRP.
- To provide heritage guidance and input to the detailed design of the new bridge and surrounding areas.
- To identify and develop ways of avoiding, minimising and mitigating the heritage impacts of the WBRP.

The broader objectives for the SCMP, following the completion of the WBRP, are:

- To gain a greater understanding of the cultural significance of the site, its curtilage and individual components.
- To formulate policies, strategies and guidelines that will direct future management, conservation, maintenance, adaptive reuse, new work and interpretation of the site.

4.2 Stakeholder and Community Consultation

The development of the SCMP has been underpinned by the development of an SCMP Methodology Document, which was informed by consultation and feedback from OEH, NSW RMS and DPE in February 2016. This was followed by a Preliminary Draft (outline form only – April 2016) and a First Draft (60% complete – July 2016), which again were reviewed by RMS, DPE and OEH. The document has been substantially amended following the receipt of comments on each of those documents.

The Second Draft of the SCMP was provided for select stakeholder consultation, including OEH, Hawkesbury City Council (HCC) and the RAPs.

Consultation was also undertaken with RAPs with respect to the archaeological test excavations, and representatives from these groups participated in the test excavation programme.

The Final Draft SCMP was provided to the select stakeholders above, as well as being made available for public comment. Two public information sessions were held at the Windsor Library in 2017 for invited stakeholders and the general public.

The Final SCMP has been amended following receipt of the aggregated comments from these consultation and review processes. See Volume 4 for full details of the consultation process.
4.3 Principles
The most appropriate and sensitive options for the site include that:

- Future works should aim to respect and, where possible, reinstate Thompson Square and the study area as a formal town square.
- Future development should respect the form, scale and character of the area.
- New works should be of a high quality of design and use appropriate materials, colours and textures to enhance the historic fabric of the study area.
- The presentation and interpretation of all facets of the area’s history should be integrated into the future design and development work in the area.

General conservation principles for the study area are to:

- protect significant fabric and historic associations
- allow for interpretation and public access
- inform and engage the community.

4.4 Opportunities, Issues and Constraints – Significance
The study area is a place of State-level cultural significance. Therefore, certain opportunities, issues and constraints are imposed on the site.

The fundamental constraint that must be acknowledged is the establishment of the new bridge over the Hawkesbury River, the new abutment and approach spans along the eastern edge of Thompson Square, and the new roadworks that will be required north of the river. These works will have physical, archaeological and visual impacts which are already approved and cannot be completely mitigated or removed.

Within this context, however, there are opportunities to enhance the physical environment and its utility, mitigate elements of the impact of the new bridge (see Volume 3), guide future works in a sensitive manner, and enhance and celebrate the understanding of the precinct and its history.

Aspects of the site’s significance – particularly its Aboriginal, historical and maritime archaeological significance – are presently concealed from view by previous changes to the area, and in many cases have been partially or heavily disturbed by past works. The best opportunities for enhancing understanding and celebration of these aspects of the site’s significance are through a combination of archaeological investigation and heritage interpretation.

In relation to the landscape significance of the study area, the main drivers of the conservation of significance lie in the opportunities created by reuniting the two segments of Thompson Square, the filling in of the road cutting that currently divides the square, and the opening up of the square through the removal of inappropriate plantings. Historically, Thompson Square was an open area, relatively uncluttered and used as a flexible focal point for the community. Over time, that aspect has been eroded through the introduction of additional structures, encroachments by roadworks and the progressive introduction of plantings. Providing for a more stripped-back, but historically appropriate, landscaping treatment will allow for greater flexibility of use of the area by the community and will reopen views that are presently limited by later plantings.

The built environment along the edges of Thompson Square is the third major element of the significance of the place, and the one most visible on a day-to-day basis. While there are many important buildings along the edges of the square, their condition and modifications have not all been reflective of the significance of the place. Similarly, some infill buildings on the square do not enhance its character, nor do some of the public domain works. Major opportunities therefore exist, subject to the willingness of the public and private stakeholders to engage in the process, to greatly enhance the built environment of Thompson Square and its environs.
4.5 Opportunities, Issues and Constraints – Australia
ICOMOS Burra Charter

The Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter is widely accepted in Australia as the underlying methodology used for all works on sites/buildings identified as having national, State and/or regional significance.

Thompson Square is of demonstrated cultural significance. Therefore, procedures for managing changes to and activities at the site should be in accordance with the recognised conservation methodology of the Burra Charter and any requirements of the site’s listing on the SHR and any other statutory register.

The relevant principles established in the Articles of the Burra Charter are provided below.

Cautious Approach (Article 3)
All conservation work should be based on a respect for the original fabric, should involve the minimum interference to the existing fabric and should not distort the evidence provided by the fabric.

Location (Article 9)
A building or work should remain in its historical location.

Contents (Article 10)
Contents, fixtures and objects contributing to the cultural significance of a place should be retained at that place.

Change (Article 15)
The contribution of all periods to the place must be respected, unless what is removed is of slight cultural significance and the fabric which is to be revealed is of much greater cultural significance. Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit.

Adaptation (Article 21)
Adaptation is acceptable where it does not substantially detract from the cultural significance of the place and involves the minimal change to significant fabric.

New Work (Article 22)
New work may be acceptable where it does not distort or obscure the significance of a place. New work should be readily identifiable as such on close inspection.

Use and Conserving Use (Article 7 and Article 23)
Where the use of a place is of cultural significance it should be retained and a place should have a compatible use.

Modifying or reinstating a significant use may be appropriate and a preferred form of conservation.

Managing Change (Article 27)
Existing fabric, use, associations and meaning should be recorded before disturbance occurs.

Disturbance of Fabric (Article 28)
Minimal disturbance of fabric may occur in order to provide evidence needed for the making of decisions on the conservation of the place.

Responsibility for Decisions (Article 29)
The decision-making procedure and individuals responsible for policy decisions should be identified.

Direction, Supervision and Implementation (Article 30)
Appropriate direction and supervision should be maintained at all stages of the work.

Records (Article 32)
A record should be kept of new evidence and future decisions and made publicly available.

**Removed Fabric (Article 33)**

Removed significant fabric should be catalogued and protected in accordance with its cultural significance. Where possible it should be stored on site.

### 4.6 Opportunities, Issues and Constraints – Statutory Heritage Controls

This section refers to the statutory heritage controls for the place, and is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all legislative requirements that may affect the study area and, particularly, Thompson Square. Other legislation that may affect the study area from time to time includes:

- **Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983 (NSW)**
- **Electricity Supply Act 1995 (NSW)**
- **Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW)**
- **Roads Act 1993 (NSW)**
- **State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (NSW)**
- **Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth)**
- **Telecommunications Act 1997 (Cth)**
- **Work Health and Safety Act 2011 (Cth)**
- **Building Code of Australia.**

It should be noted that, unless explicitly stated in the individual piece of legislation, these and other acts and regulations do not override any of the heritage or planning legislation, or remove the requirements to assess and mitigate heritage impacts, or obtain heritage approvals.

It should be noted that the legislative summary below is a high-level review of the key legislative requirements relating to or potentially affecting heritage values within the study area, however it is not exhaustive and the site generally and the surrounding buildings specifically have not been assessed for compliance against these requirements except where specifically noted.

Thompson Square is affected by the following NSW statutory heritage controls:

- **Heritage Act 1977** (SHR, historical and maritime archaeology)
- **Hawkesbury Local Environmental Plan 2012** (local heritage items)

Nothing within the study area is presently listed on the Commonwealth, National or World Heritage List and therefore the requirements of the **Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth)** do not apply.

#### 4.6.1 Heritage Act 1977 (NSW)

The NSW **Heritage Act 1977** was established to conserve the environmental heritage of NSW. Section 4 of the Act describes State heritage significance as:

> In relation to a place, building work, relic, movable object or precinct, means significance to the State in relation to the historic, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, natural or aesthetic value of the item.

The Act set up the Heritage Council of NSW, which is the consent authority for items considered to be of State significance and subsequently listed on the SHR.
Thompson Square is listed on the NSW SHR (item #00126) as are many of the adjacent properties. This listing recognises the site as being of State significance and provides statutory protection under the Heritage Act.

**Built Heritage**

Under section 57(1) of the Heritage Act, approval from OEH is required for works to an item listed on the SHR, unless those works fall within the Standard Exemptions, or site-specific exemptions. With respect to works within Thompson Square and the study area, this will include works such as:

- landscaping and public domain works
- addition or removal of cultural plantings
- addition or removal of structures
- modifications to state-significant structures
- changes to street furniture and utility infrastructure
- other works that may impact upon the heritage values of the place.

Some works may be in accordance with the Standard Exemptions from Heritage Council Approval. The Standard Exemptions should be reviewed when works are proposed to determine whether the works fit within the definition of exempt works. If they do not, works will require assessment and approval under the Heritage Act.

It is to be noted that the exercise of the Standard Exemptions generally requires the concurrence of OEH.

Some types of infrastructure works undertaken by public authorities may be subject to the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007*; however, any such works still require impact assessment and, potentially, approval under the Heritage Act.

Minimum standards of maintenance and repair established under Section 118 of the Heritage Act apply to all items on the SHR, including any items so listed within the study area of the SCMP. The responsibility for managing items in accordance with these standards rests with the landowner or manager.

It is to be noted that it is possible to establish site-specific exemptions under the Heritage Act. No site-specific exemptions presently exist for the study area; however, this document provides the basis for the establishment of site-specific exemptions in future. Any such exemptions should be prepared by the primary site manager (in this case, HCC) to cover routine low-impact works that are outside the scope of the Standard Exemptions, but can be undertaken with little or no impact on the significance of the place.

**Historical Archaeology**

Most, but not all, of the study area for this document is contained within the Thompson Square Conservation Area, listed on the SHR. For areas within the SHR curtilage, the same procedures apply for historical archaeology as for built and landscape heritage noted above.

Principally, these procedures entail a need for consent to undertake works affecting archaeological heritage, under Section 57 of the Heritage Act, as detailed above.

For lands that are outside the SHR curtilage, including The Terrace, the river edge, all land north of the river and the lower areas of Bridge Road south of the roundabout, the ‘relics provisions’ under Section 139 of the Heritage Act apply. Under this section, an archaeological assessment must be undertaken if known or suspected historical relics may be affected, and an excavation permit obtained prior to works.

**Maritime Archaeology**

Maritime archaeological relics are protected under a similar mechanism to that for terrestrial archaeological relics under the NSW Heritage Act. Again, depending on whether works are inside or
outside the SHR boundary for the site, a Section 60 or Section 140 approval under the Heritage Act may be required.

4.6.2 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NSW)

In NSW, Aboriginal objects, whether recorded or as yet undiscovered, are afforded statutory protection under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974. Under section 86 of the Act it is an offence to disturb, destroy or deface Aboriginal objects without the approval of the Director General of OEH. OEH provides a series of guidelines as a framework for identifying and managing Aboriginal heritage and the cultural heritage interests of Aboriginal parties within development planning contexts. These include the:

- *Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in NSW* (DECCW 2010)
- *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents* (DECCW 2010)
- *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (DECCW 2010).

The Due Diligence process is the first step and is outlined in the *Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in NSW* (DECCW 2010) guidelines, and intended to identify whether or not a proposed activity is likely to harm Aboriginal objects. Where harm is identified, an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment in accordance with the *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (DECCW 2010) is required to further characterise and assess the significance of any cultural materials, and potential impact on them. It also provides the documentation required to obtain an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) from OEH in the event that harm is anticipated.

The Aboriginal test excavations (discussed in section 2.3.7 of this volume) demonstrated that some portions of the project area were heavily modified, with parts of the upper soil profile either introduced and/or substantially reworked through historical and modern activities. These findings indicate that in some areas the survivability of Aboriginal objects – if they were ever present – would now probably be low. However, Aboriginal objects were found in the upper ‘disturbed’ soil profile. For this reason, it is recommended that any future activity within the project area undertakes the due diligence process as a first step towards ensuring robust consideration of Aboriginal heritage before any works are implemented.

4.6.3 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW)

The NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act is the primary tool for the assessment of development in NSW. For environmental assessment purposes, under Part 5 of the Act, section 111(1) requires that a determining authority ‘examine and take into account the fullest extent possible all matters affecting or likely to affect the environment’ with respect to the proposed works.

The specific requirements of what must be contained in an environmental assessment are set out in Schedule 2 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 2000*. Heritage matters fall within the scope of ‘environment’ in relation to this Act.

4.6.4 Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983 (NSW)

The Aboriginal Land Rights Act acknowledges the traditional ownership and occupation of the state of NSW by the Aboriginal people. This Act has established Aboriginal Land Councils at the state,
4.6.5 Work Health and Safety Act 2011 (Cth)

The Commonwealth Work Health and Safety Act 2011 (WHS Act) aims to protect the health, safety and welfare of people at work. The provisions of the WHS Act cover every place of work in Australia and every employer, employee, student, contractor and visitor. Future works within Thompson Square must comply with the WHS Act or seek alternative solutions.

Works required under the WHS Act still require assessment for heritage impact and approval under relevant heritage legislation.

4.6.6 Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth)

The Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (DDA Act) is Commonwealth legislation that requires the provision of equal opportunities for people with a disability to participate in cultural activities. In this regard, areas that may need to be addressed at Thompson Square include disabled access, support for vision impairment, and the provision of ramps and rails.

Works required under the DDA Act still require assessment for heritage impact and approval under relevant heritage legislation.

4.6.7 Building Code of Australia

The Building Code of Australia (BCA) is concerned with establishing uniform building regulations across Australia. The BCA has been developed by the Australian Building Codes Board (ABCB) and is a national performance-based document, implemented in NSW through the Local Government Act 1993.

The main provisions of the BCA concern structural requirements, fire resistance, access and egress (including provisions for people with disabilities), services and equipment, and health and amenities. Generally, minimum standards need to be reached in building works.

Works required under the BCA still require assessment for heritage impact and approval under relevant heritage legislation.

4.7 Opportunities, Issues and Constraints – Physical Condition

4.7.1 Vandalism

As a significant public space, the potential for vandalism in Thompson Square will remain high, despite the significance of the place. Given the highly public nature of the study area, however, this is likely to be limited to small-scale acts of graffiti and similar issues. In general, the approach to vandalism in the study area should be:

- Once vandalism has been reported, it should be inspected and assessed by the relevant authority (generally HCC for the public domain).
- If the vandalism is not affecting historic fabric, it can be repaired as required; however, this should be undertaken in a way that does not impact upon the heritage significance of the place.
- If the vandalism affects significant historic fabric (such as sandstone), specialist advice should be sought in regard to cleaning, repair or replacement.
- Vandalism should be repaired as quickly as possible, to not attract other vandalism or antisocial behaviour.
- Anti-graffiti coatings should not be used on historic fabric under any circumstances.
• The design of interpretive media and devices should be suitably robust and cleanable to minimise the impact of future vandalism.

4.7.2 Maintenance

The need for continual maintenance is a significant constraint for owners, both financially and in relation to future works to the site. It is important to provide an effective and manageable maintenance system.

As an update to existing maintenance plans, a revised maintenance plan should be prepared for the study area, which identifies the nature of the fabric in the area (whether historic or modern) and the techniques for its maintenance. This should clearly delineate the frequency of maintenance and the responsibility for maintenance.

Where possible, a Schedule of Exemptions for routine maintenance works for infrastructure and public space within the study area should be developed and submitted to the Heritage Council for endorsement and gazettal.

4.7.3 Significant Fabric

The need to preserve and not adversely impact significant early fabric can be a constraint for planned future works. However, it may also provide an opportunity to reinvent original forms or spaces and facilitate an active public use of the space.

Future works within the study area should ensure that impacts on historic fabric are adequately identified, avoided or mitigated. The use of materials in future works should be complementary to historic fabric without attempting to mimic that fabric or present a false impression as to what is historic and what is modern.

4.7.4 Archaeology

Much of the study area is affected by archaeological constraints. These are briefly summarised below. The general approach should be to minimise or avoid impacts on archaeologically sensitive areas.

Any earthworks required to implement future landscape proposals must be minimal and respectful of the informal nature of the existing terrain and must be designed to protect identified in-situ archaeological material. Where opportunities exist to interpret the archaeological evidence and where it is compatible with the historic character of the precinct, the designers should consult with the archaeological and interpretive consultants to integrate interpretation into the landscape or built landscape elements.

Aboriginal

Excavation impacts of greater than 300 millimetres should be avoided in areas of identified Aboriginal archaeological sensitivity.

Historical

Excavation impacts of greater than 200 millimetres should be avoided in areas of identified historical archaeological sensitivity.

Particularly within the roadways off George Street, to the east and west of the intersection with Bridge Road, archaeological testing has demonstrated that in-situ archaeological remains of early to mid-nineteenth-century materials are situated no more than 220 millimetres below the present road surface.

Maritime

Areas of maritime archaeological sensitivity are primarily located along the southern riverbank, between the modern wharf to the east and the original bridge to the west. The zone of sensitivity includes the identified wharf remains below the high watermark, associated ballast and artefactual deposits. Based on the likely scale of the original wharf, the zone of maritime archaeological
sensitivity is considered to reach 20 metres north of the southern embankment, from the mean high water
mark.

Further maritime archaeological remains may exist related to the shipyard which was known to have been built on the southern embankment, which may include a slipway and may be buried beneath fill and the existing scour protection works. Care should be taken if any substantial excavation is proposed in this area as the 2016 testing regime did not reach archeologically sterile soils.

4.7.5 Landscape

There are opportunities to reshape and reconfigure the two reserves of Thompson Square by infilling the existing 1934 road cutting from George Street to Windsor Bridge, consolidating the upper and lower sections, reinstating the character of Thompson Square’s formative years and bringing back vistas currently blocked by self-sown trees. Access to the river foreshore from Thompson Square could also be improved, along with pedestrian and cycling access along the southern foreshore and across the river to Macquarie Park.

There is an opportunity to improve historic views to and from Thompson Square, through vegetation management and the replanting of appropriate vegetation (as per the recommended species list in the following section).

**Issue: Historical views are obscured from both banks of the river from and to town.**

Mitigation: Remove weed growth along the north and south riverbanks using bush regeneration techniques and selectively remove self-sown trees and recently planted trees that are not compatible with the historic colonial/Georgian character of the site. Replant using species from remnant vegetation communities. If replanting the riverbank with *Casuarina* species, ensure tree spacing that preserves and frames views into the future. Prepare a programme of maintenance to ensure that weeds do not proliferate again.

**Issue: The 1934 changes to the road isolated the lower portion of public open space, making it difficult to access.**

Mitigation: Ensure a contiguous and unified ‘square’ that reinstates as near as possible the landform to the pre-1934 road changes and cutting, and improves accessibility. Unify the river frontage and make it easily accessible from town via Thompson Square.

**Issue: The density of ornamental plantings within Thompson Square, exacerbated by the subsequent self-sown trees, has diminished the pre-1880 open and informal character of the space.**

Mitigation: Consider removal of selected self-sown and inappropriate trees, particularly *Melia azedarach*, *Jacaranda*, *Ulmus parvifolia*, *Olea europaea* and *Schinus areira*. Remove and do not reinstate ornamental mass-planted garden beds. Reinstate an informal grassed ground plane.

**Issue: The palette of tree species has been expanded to include species that are not compatible with the formative period of Thompson Square.**

Mitigation: Avoid new species. When choosing species for planting, preference existing species as seen in the earliest plantings, which include *Brachychiton populneus*, *Araucaria cunninghamii* and *Grevillea robusta*.

Use *Casuarina glauca* and *Casuarina cunninghamiana* for riverbank stabilisation.
Issue: In recent times, additions and renovations to Thompson Square have introduced inappropriate materials that do not reflect the former utilitarian and informal character of Thompson Square.

Mitigation: Materials should reflect the simple, informal and utilitarian nature of the Georgian square. (Use stone kerbing; honey-coloured, crushed, coarse, aggregate-rich bitumen paths; gravel; and arrised timber fences in favour of concrete, unit paving and aluminium or steel fences.)

Issue: Future works have the potential to reduce the asymmetry of Thompson Square’s layout.

Mitigation: Ensure that landscape improvements do not add symmetry to the layout. Maintain the informal character of Thompson Square’s layout.

Issue: Implementation of flood protection measures has the potential to detract from the historic character.

Mitigation: Protect against floods in a way that complements the former natural creekbank and reinstates the natural and informal landform. Use appropriate vegetation from remnant riparian communities (*Casuarina Sp.* and others) for riverbank stabilisation (these were still in evidence within the precinct in photographs taken up until 1949) and topsoil/lawn grass over engineering structures where appropriate.

Issue: The power lines that cross the river and are aligned along Old Bridge Street are visually intrusive and also a major impediment to significant tree planting.

Mitigation: Investigate undergrounding the power lines so that trees can be planted on the current power line alignment along the eastern side of Thompson Square.

Issue: The poor pedestrian environment along Old Bridge Street and generally from one side of Thompson Square to the other restricts the opportunity for experiencing the view to the river and beyond.

Mitigation: Together with designing improvements in accessibility, consider opportunities for framing vistas using existing and new trees.

4.7.6 Urban and Landscape Design Objectives

**Objective 1:**

Provide an integrated engineering and urban design outcome that fits sensitively into the Thompson Square contextual and community environment, aligns with its cultural and heritage values, and is consistent with the adjoining streetscape typology.

**Objective 2:**

Contribute to the accessibility and connectivity between Windsor town centre and the river.

**Objective 3:**

Support the public life of the people within the local community and provide space for gathering and events.
Objective 4:
Retain and contribute to Thompson Square’s recognisable sense of place, and its historical and scenic qualities.

Objective 5:
Ensure that all elements are safe, robust, durable and low maintenance.

Objective 6:
Ensure that modern recessive design is used for new works that respects the historic character of the area (historical pastiche or speculative reconstruction is not acceptable).

4.7.7 Future Expansion – Opportunity Sites

The significance assessment of the study area has identified a number of ‘opportunity sites’ adjacent to Thompson Square and either within or immediately adjacent to the study area. These are sites of little or moderate significance, and provided there are sound reasons and a good design process, their redevelopment or substantial modification to enhance the overall precinct should be encouraged over the longer term. As most of these sites are in private ownership there is no power to compel specific activities on them; but as opportunities arise in future, it will be worth considering ways in which changes to these sites could serve the overall strategic goal of enhancing Thompson Square and the surrounding area.

Table 7: Opportunity sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage item # (if any)</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI8</td>
<td>4 Bridge St</td>
<td>House (c. 1955)</td>
<td>Undistinguished mid-nineteenth-century house of little significance. Could be replaced by an infill building of appropriate scale and sympathetic design. Site does have potential for significant archaeology, particularly in the north garden area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI12</td>
<td>20 Bridge St</td>
<td>Cottage (c. 1920s)</td>
<td>Moderate significance but atypical for the vicinity. Deep setback limits contribution to the square and precinct. Infill adjacent to public domain could provide street activation opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI17</td>
<td>80 George St</td>
<td>Shops (c. 1970)</td>
<td>Undistinguished modern commercial building of little significance. Sympathetic infill of appropriate scale and detailing could improve streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>52–54 George St</td>
<td>Windsor Motel</td>
<td>Undistinguished late-twentieth-century motel building. Sympathetic infill of appropriate scale and detailing could improve streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>89 George St</td>
<td>Fitzgerald House</td>
<td>Undistinguished mid-twentieth-century commercial building. Sympathetic infill of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These sites are all twentieth-century structures of little or moderate heritage significance (within the study area) or no heritage significance (outside the study area).

The main aim of any project to redevelop or substantially change these sites should be to ensure that the scale and design of new structures are appropriate and sympathetic to the Thompson Square area. In general, this would translate into:

- no more than two storeys in height
- rendered or face brick for main construction
- corrugated metal hipped or peaked roof structure, preferably unpainted galvanised metal
- timber windows, doors and verandahs/awnings
- minimal or no setback from the footpath and public domain.

Where necessary, HCC should encourage the use of the heritage incentive clauses under the LEP to achieve these outcomes.

### 4.7.8 Balancing Competing Requirements

Thompson Square and the surrounding study area is a multi-use public space with competing uses and generating competing expectations. At a minimum, the existing uses of the study area include:

- residential dwellings
- commercial – retail
- commercial – office
- commercial – food service
- commercial – accommodation
- museum
- public recreation (passive)
• transport corridor
• tourism.

The long-term strategic management of this place will require the acknowledgement and balancing of these competing requirements over time. Doubtless new uses and requirements will come to light in future that cannot be anticipated by this document. However, the principles and frameworks set out herein should provide the basis for guiding the future use of the place.

A critical aspect of this planning is the need to acknowledge the high heritage value of the precinct and its fragile nature. It has already been substantially impacted by past and approved future works, and therefore it will be more important than ever to ensure that future change is designed to be sympathetic to and minimal in its impact on the heritage values of the place.

To improve the long-term conservation of the place, enhance its heritage values and make it a valued spot for tourism, recreation and day-to-day living, future works and change must be guided by the principles set out in this SCMP, ensuring that decision-making will be guided towards outcomes that best enhance the conservation of the place. This will require leadership at the local level and a coordinated approach among residents, businesspeople, owners and government authorities. While this document alone cannot achieve these goals, it sets the framework for such actions in future.

4.8 Opportunities, Issues and Constraints – Long-term Management of Thompson Square

Much of the study area for the SCMP is in the control of local government, which will have the day-to-day responsibility for managing the public domain; assessing, conditioning and approving new works in the study area; and managing community expectations and ambitions for the place. The long-term management of Thompson Square will, however, require the cooperation and coordination of a range of interested parties. At a minimum, these include:

• public authorities
  o HCC
  o Heritage Council of NSW
  o OEH

• infrastructure agencies
  o RMS
  o Sydney Water
  o Endeavour Energy
  o Jemena
  o Telstra, NBNCo and other telecommunications providers

• local parties
  o residential landowners
  o commercial landowners
  o public land managers (mainly HCC)
  o residential and commercial tenants
  o Aboriginal community stakeholders
  o public interest groups
  o future project and development proponents.
In order to implement the conservation of Thompson Square and the adjacent parts of the study area, and to drive the adoption and implementation of the strategic policies of this SCMP, it will be necessary to establish a body for coordination, implementation, action planning and monitoring. While it is not for this document to mandate that this occur, it is, however, strongly recommended that a Steering Committee be established to manage these issues and their coordination.

As the local council, HCC is in the best position to take on the initial coordination of such a Steering Committee, ideally with the assistance of OEH. The Steering Committee will need to establish the long-term vision for the place, and the Action Plan for its delivery. The SCMP provides the framework for conserving and enhancing the heritage values of the study area within that process.

4.9 Opportunities, Issues and Constraints – Heritage Interpretation

The heritage values of Thompson Square are complex and overlapping and range from the early Aboriginal history of the Hawkesbury area (from circa 23,000 BP) through the contact and colonial settlement period to the present day. It should be noted that there are aspects of the history of colonisation and interaction between the early colonists and local Aboriginal people that were fraught with conflict, but these should not be glossed over when exploring the history of the place. The interpretation of Thompson Square, Green Hills and Windsor; the Aboriginal history of the area; and the colonial and modern history has a role to play in telling the story of the place.
5 Policy

5.1 Preamble

This section sets out a policy framework for the future management of the heritage significance of Thompson Square by looking at the various elements of, uses of and associations with the place. The policies are based on the issues raised in the analysis, assessment and procedure sections of this report, with particular emphasis given to the significance of the place.

The policies provide guidance yet, while prescriptive with respect to the management of heritage values and fabric, they cannot anticipate every possible circumstance that may arise on a site. Where this document does not provide sufficient guidance for a proposal or in relation to a heritage item, a separate Conservation Management Plan should be commissioned.

The conservation policies for Thompson Square and surrounds have been prepared to provide advice on how to manage the site and conserve its identified cultural heritage values. The aim of these policies is to provide a solid foundation for all future conservation recommendations. The policies aim to find a viable balance between the requirements for ongoing use and the need to retain and conserve the fabric while facilitating appropriate interpretation and potential future improvements to the precinct, which will enhance its heritage significance.

It should be borne in mind that this document is a Strategic Conservation Management Plan and therefore provides high-level policy advice for the conservation of the study area as a whole, rather than item- and fabric-specific conservation policies and recommendations, except insofar as these relate to the public domain. There are many heritage items adjacent to the study area, which will require separate analysis by others; however, any such site-specific analysis should endeavour to align with the policies of the SCMP, to ensure consistency on key matters.

The policies set out in this chapter have been individually addressed in Volume 3 with respect to the Windsor Bridge Replacement Program.

5.2 Policy Discussion/Vision Statement

The future of Thompson Square is dependent on developing uses for the square and surrounds that enable:

- it to be identified as a place of high heritage value
- it to be publicly accessible
- it to be recognised as a place that provides an understanding of the history and development of Windsor
- its owners to retain, conserve and restore, where appropriate, the significant fabric and elements of the site.

The policies described in this SCMP aim to establish appropriate and viable uses for Thompson Square and adjacent areas of the public domain that support the retention of the site and its significance. The policies aim to facilitate this vision and ensure that the place is conserved and actively used.

5.2.1 Articulating a Long-term Vision for Thompson Square and the Study Area

A key aspect of the long-term management of Thompson Square and the surrounding study area is for the major stakeholders to come together to articulate a shared long-term vision for the place. This document offers some guidance with respect to the conservation of the heritage values and fabric of
the place, but these are just a few aspects shaping the ongoing life and use of the place. Other matters that need to be considered include:

- how Thompson Square and environs will function in the civic, social and economic life of Windsor
- what the shape and scale of change to the place will be in the longer term
- how the various stakeholders, particularly HCC and local property owners, will work together and interact and, ideally, cooperate in realising a shared vision.

The SCMP is merely one step in the process of managing Thompson Square in a strategic fashion in the longer term. This document provides guidance in the form of recommendations, policies and actions, but is not prescriptive. The strategic management of the place will require local and state government, local property owners, residents and interest groups to come together in a cooperative fashion, to not only implement elements of this document but also to address other important matters related to the place, which are beyond the scope of the SCMP.

RMS will provide a copy of the SCMP to all relevant parties (private and government).

Insofar as possible, responsibilities for the various recommendations of this document are indicated below. Where there are overlapping statutory responsibilities, this is noted as the responsibility of the Relevant Consent or Planning Authority (RCPA).

**Policy 1: This SCMP should be acknowledged as a document recommending planning principles and the guiding framework for the future management of the heritage values of the area.**

**Policy 2: The SCMP should be reviewed and amended as required, but no less frequently than every ten years.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement of SCMP as document with recommended principles – HCC, OEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of vision – RC/PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Action Plan – RC/PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and amendment – RC/PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.3 Fabric**

**5.3.1 Built Heritage**

The buildings that abut Thompson Square make important contributions to the overall feeling and impression of the space as a town square. The built fabric ranges in age from the early nineteenth to the late twentieth century. Most, but not all, make an important contribution to the environs of Thompson Square. See section 2.2.4 for an overview of significant built heritage.

A major long-term aim for the study area is to see the progressive improvement of the built environment at the boundaries of the square. This will require the cooperation and agreement of the private building owners, HCC, OEH and other stakeholders. As most of these buildings are in private
ownership, there is limited recourse to compel a particular course of action, and therefore a cooperative framework should be established for the long-term management of the place.

**Policy 3:** Review and, where appropriate, establish a future management approach to the identified ‘opportunity sites’ adjacent to Thompson Square.

**Policy 4:** Progressively remove unsympathetic accretions to individual buildings and the public domain, and reinstate buildings to their original façade configurations where these are viewed from the public domain.

**Policy 5:** Encourage the replacement of unsympathetic buildings in identified opportunity sites with high-quality, appropriately scaled and designed buildings.

### Actions

- Consider establishing an incentive or grants programme to assist and encourage property owners to conserve their properties.
- Work undertaken on heritage buildings within the study area should be guided by conservation documentation appropriate to the scale of the work.
- In general, the aim should be to remove modern and unsympathetic accretions from buildings, and to use materials, colours and textures that are period-appropriate to the building in question.
- Alterations to the facades of buildings should be discouraged except where they support the above goals and contribute to the overall enhancement of the built environment.
- Ensure that new construction, or the replacement of unsympathetic buildings, is not undertaken in a ‘mock heritage’ style, but in a manner that is appropriate to the scale and texture of the surrounding buildings.
- Consider establishing formal design guidelines to guide new development within the Thompson Square Conservation Area.

### Responsibility

- Heritage grants programme – RC/PA
- Monitoring and enforcing design compliance with the SCMP – RC/PA

### 5.3.2 Management of Historic Fabric

**Policy 6:** Extant building fabric from all significant periods of construction that contribute to the overall significance of Thompson Square should be retained and conserved.

- Future programmes of conservation, interpretation, reuse, alterations and additions should respond to the relative levels of significance identified in section 3.5.1 of this volume, on Graded Levels of Significance.
Policy 7: Ongoing preservation and maintenance of original and significant fabric must be carried out using appropriate methods.

- Works are to be carried out by tradespeople and contractors who have skills and experience in maintaining historic fabric and historic construction and maintenance techniques.
- Traditional materials and techniques are to be adopted in carrying out work on significant fabric unless modern equivalents provide substantial conservation benefits or work is to be carried out on non-significant fabric.

Policy 8: New extensions, fixtures and fittings are to be designed to be sympathetic with the existing fabric and to minimise loss of significant fabric.

5.3.3 Future Infrastructure

The ongoing presence and future upgrading of infrastructure within Thompson Square and the study area generally is an inevitable consequence of Windsor being part of a modern city. Public infrastructure such as water, sewer, stormwater, gas, electricity, transport and telecommunications infrastructure will continue to exist, be expanded and be renewed into the future. Wherever technically feasible, this should be done in a manner that minimises both direct heritage impacts (such as attachment to heritage buildings, or excavation in archaeologically sensitive areas) or long-term indirect impacts, such as visual impact. For works that are undertaken under the scope of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, an assessment of their potential impact will be required within the context of this document as well.

Policy 9: New or upgraded infrastructure should be sited to minimise or avoid heritage impacts. This should be done with reference to the policies outlined in this document.

Policy 10: Wherever possible, new utility infrastructure should be located underground, in areas that are not identified as archaeologically sensitive, ideally in existing service trenches.

Policy 11: For existing above-ground infrastructure (particularly utility lines), efforts should be made to place such infrastructure underground in the longer term.

Policy 12: Where new infrastructure is connecting into heritage buildings, connections should be done below ground level, and, wherever possible, should reuse existing penetrations into the building.

**Actions**

- Identify the infrastructure owners within the study area and put in place a mechanism or forum for discussing future infrastructure works.
- Identify where it may be feasible to relocate or underground existing services.
5.4 Maintenance

Regular maintenance will be required to ensure the long-term conservation of Thompson Square and the adjacent areas of the public domain. The bulk of this responsibility falls to HCC as the local authority. Existing and future planned maintenance works should take into account the significance of the place and the policies presented in this document. In general, maintenance work should be routine, low-impact works that can be undertaken as exempt work.

Policy 13: Existing maintenance plans for Thompson Square and the adjacent areas of the public domain should be reviewed and updated in line with the policies outlined in the SCMP.

Policy 14: Regular inspections are to be carried out by qualified contractors as required.

Policy 15: Any replacement work on significant fabric or elements should only be carried out as a last option and should be based on existing or historical evidence rather than conjecture.

Policy 16: Maintenance works should be assessed for their suitability as exempt works, not requiring consent under the Heritage Act 1977.

Policy 17: Relevant authority to implement the maintenance programme across Thompson Square and surrounds.

Actions

- Public authorities should liaise and work with private property owners to advise them about appropriate methods of maintenance.

Responsibility

- Day-to-day public domain maintenance – RC/PA
- Preparation of a public domain maintenance budget – RC/PA

5.5 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

Thompson Square has primarily been recognised for its importance in the early colonial history of the Hawkesbury region. Historical research and archaeological testing have, however, demonstrated a long association between the Aboriginal community and Thompson Square and surrounds specifically, and the region as a whole more generally. Historical accounts exist of interaction
between Aboriginal people and colonists, and archaeological evidence exists for the Aboriginal use of Thompson Square from the contact period, as well as through the Holocene and into the Pleistocene (circa 23,000 BP). The long association with and value of the place for Aboriginal people should therefore be recognised, celebrated and interpreted.

Policy 18: The Aboriginal community is recognised as the primary guardians and caretakers of Aboriginal cultural heritage values embodied in the Windsor area and the Hawkesbury River; they will be fully consulted in relation to all activities within Thompson Square and the adjacent public domain.

Policy 19: Any interpretation works should include Aboriginal heritage, subject to consultation with the Aboriginal community.

### Responsibility

- Seek Aboriginal community views – RC/PA
- Statutory approvals for Aboriginal heritage matters – RC/PA

### 5.6 Landscape and Environs

#### 5.6.1 General

Thompson Square was quickly established as a cleared, central space which served as a focus for the early colonial settlement of the area. Historical maps, plans and images from the nineteenth are early twentieth century indicate that the space was largely open, and unadorned with furniture, vegetation or decorative plantings. Its function was as a town square used for a variety of purposes, rather than as a park or garden used for passive recreation.

Reinforcing Existing Character

Policy 20: The informal, asymmetrical character of the site should be maintained as a reflection of its historic evolution. Symmetry and overly formal layout should be avoided with any redesign or introduction of new elements. The topography should remain undulating and formal terracing should be avoided.

Policy 21: No new landscape elements should be introduced that would visually overwhelm or detract from the open character of the precinct, or shield the place from view.

Policy 22: The incursion of vegetation that could impact on the open and informal character of the precinct and the views to and from it should be avoided.

Policy 23: No new landscape elements such as additional boat servicing infrastructure, viewing platforms or public amenities should be introduced for which there is no historical precedent or interpretative relevance.

Controlling and Managing Vegetation
Policy 24: Vegetation within the Thompson Square precinct should be managed in recognition of Thompson Square’s early colonial history as informal parkland with an open character and with a limited planting palette which avoids ornamental, mass-planted garden beds.

Policy 25: Selected inappropriate and self-sown trees should be removed (Melia azedarach, Jacaranda, Ulmus parvifolia, Olea europaea and Schinus areira) and replacement trees should be confined to species used in the earliest colonial plantings (Brachychiton populneus, Araucaria cunninghamii and Grevillea robusta) or other (especially native dry rainforest) species that were popular at the time of the earliest colonial tree plantings. Species from remnant native vegetation communities would also be acceptable.

Policy 26: Degraded, weed-infested areas on the perimeter of the precinct (particularly along the riverbanks) should be restored. Weed species should be removed and a weed control programme implemented that is focused on invasive or environmental weed species. Remnant native riparian vegetation and species such as Casuarina glauca and Casuarina cunninghamiana should be used for riverbank stabilisation. Vegetation along the riverbank should be either low in scale or kept in isolated clumps in order to retain views to and from the square.

Managing New Elements

Policy 27: Finishes of new introduced elements, such as bright metal finishes, are not preferred as they are inconsistent with the original character of the place. Modern materials and finishes should be recessive and complementary to existing historic fabric.

Policy 28: All fences should be maintained in a style and condition consistent with the arrised timber post and rail fences, painted white, as shown in early photographs of Thompson Square – unless changes are required to meet identified public safety needs or in areas where no fences existed previously, and where the fence does not impinge upon the visual curtilage of the square.

Policy 29: Existing road surfaces and paths should be reviewed with the aim of eliminating all harsh modern surface finishes within and adjacent to Thompson Square. Any replacement road surfaces and paths should relate more closely to the traditional gravel and honey-coloured crushed, coarse, aggregate-rich bitumen surfaces (such as using aggregate derived from Nepean River gravel or similar).

Policy 30: Concrete kerbs and gutters should be considered for replacement with sandstone kerb and gutter except where they have a vital function in preventing erosion and managing storm water.

Policy 31: Construction of retaining walls should be avoided where possible. However, should they be necessary, single taller walls are preferred to avoid evoking a suburban character of multiple walls or terracing.
Policy 32: Any earthworks required to implement the landscape concept proposals should be minimal and respectful of the informal nature of the existing terrain and designed to protect identified in-situ archaeological material. Where opportunities exist to interpret the archaeological evidence and where it is compatible with the historic character of the precinct, the designers should consult with the archaeological and interpretive consultants to integrate interpretation into the landscape or built landscape elements. In general, no new landscape elements should be introduced for which there is no historical precedent or interpretative relevance.

**Actions**

- Develop a planned approach to future landscape management RC/PA

**Responsibility**

- Landscape maintenance – RC/PA

5.6.2 Public Domain Environment

Thompson Square is the key public domain element of this area of Windsor; however, the public domain also encompasses the surrounding public lands, including footpaths, medians, roadways and other public spaces. The existing public domain is a mix of mid- to late-twentieth-century materials and installations, with remnants of earlier materials such as kerbing and guttering intermixed. In general, there is little harmony or consistency among these materials, which leads to a disjointed appearance and experience of the space. Furthermore, progressive encroachment of the roadways over time has reduced the size of Thompson Square and consideration should be given, where possible, to re-establishing the earlier boundaries of the square.

Policy 33: Traditional materials, including sandstone and painted timber, should be used for public domain elements, in preference to modern materials such as concrete and polished or painted metal.

Policy 34: Where modern materials must be used for reasons of safety, security or operational effectiveness, these materials should be of a high quality, well designed and act to complement the heritage values of the place.

Policy 35: ‘Mock heritage’ public domain elements (such as faux gas lights) should not be used.

Policy 36: Wherever possible, cluttered elements (such as modern signage, lighting and bubblers) should be removed and modern elements, where possible, should be consolidated into discrete areas, or offer shared functions, to limit new additions to the public domain.

Policy 37: If possible, the western edge of Thompson Square should be realigned to its earlier alignment.
5.6.3 Commercial Activities within the Public Domain

At present, there are some commercial activities being undertaken within the public domain of the study area. Principally, these are represented by outdoor seating for the restaurants along the south side of Thompson Square, along George Street. These activities have a visual impact upon the public domain through obscuring the heritage buildings, the inconsistent styles and materials used for elements such as awnings and marquees, and, in some cases, the relatively low quality of the outdoor pavilions themselves. Ideally, an alternate approach to outdoor dining should be taken along George Street, which limits the number of permanent structures in the area and reopens the streetscape to public view.

**Policy 38:** The scale and bulk of the outdoor dining facilities along George Street should be reduced, as these detract from the historic streetscape character and obscure the facades of the heritage items.

**Policy 39:** Consistent guidelines and approaches for any new outdoor dining facilities within the study area should be established, with a high baseline of design that is sympathetic to the heritage values of the site.

**Policy 40:** Commercial activities within Thompson Square itself should be restricted to short-term activities (that is, weekends only) that require no permanent infrastructure.

**Actions**

- Liaise with the business owners along George Street to discuss alternative approaches to outdoor dining.
- Consider minimalist approaches to outdoor dining facilities, such as a shared lightweight pavilion, retractable awnings, or permanent but sympathetic awning extensions to restaurant buildings.

**Responsibility**

- Guide the design of new outdoor dining – RC/PA
- Control commercial activities within Thompson Square – RC/PA
5.7 Aboriginal Archaeology

**Policy 41: An archaeological assessment or statement should be prepared where required for future works.**

Archaeological test excavations have revealed that the remains of previous Aboriginal occupation of the area are found throughout the study area south of the Hawkesbury River. These remains have included evidence of the reworking of European glass (contact and colonial period), Holocene occupation (10,000–0 years BP) and Pleistocene occupation (27,000–17,000 years BP). While the Holocene occupation of the Greater Sydney area is relatively well understood and documented within the archaeological record, contact period and Pleistocene sites are rare and highly significant. Care therefore needs to be taken in the future excavation of areas that have been identified as archaeologically sensitive for Aboriginal remains. Where possible, excavation in these areas should be avoided.

Within the undeveloped areas of Thompson Square and beneath The Terrace road corridor, Aboriginal archaeological deposits of moderate to very high (state) significance are found beneath a layer of historical/modern overburden, which ranges in depth from 30 to 50 centimetres. The same deposit is present in George Street (east of the roundabout) at slightly shallower depths (<20 centimetres).

Parameters have been established in the policies below as to which works are minor with low risk of impacting significant Aboriginal heritage, and which activities require further assessment and/or approval.

**Policy 42: Any activities that require minimal ground disturbance to <20 centimetres (such as returfing, top-dressing and road resurfacing) can be undertaken without the need for further archaeological assessment or mitigation.**

**Policy 43: Any activities that require ground disturbance to >20 centimetres (such as watering systems and utilities) would require archaeological assessment and investigation by an Aboriginal heritage specialist. Where significant cultural deposits are identified, the activity should be redesigned to avoid impacts.**

**Policy 44: Where impacts to Aboriginal archaeological heritage cannot be avoided, an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit will be required under section 90 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974.**

**Policy 45: Any maintenance of existing subsurface infrastructure where impacts are constrained to existing trenches and/or areas of disturbance can be undertaken without further archaeological assessment or investigation.**

**Policy 46: Any maintenance of existing subsurface infrastructure that requires impact to surrounding natural soil deposits, and which is greater than 20 centimetres, would require archaeological assessment and investigation by an Aboriginal heritage specialist. Where significant cultural deposits are identified, the activity should be redesigned to avoid impacts.**

**Policy 47: For all activities proposed for areas of Aboriginal archaeological significance, indirect impacts should be managed, including compaction from heavy vehicles, vehicle slewing, equipment storage, site sheds and fencing. Where indirect impacts are considered likely, surface protection should be established before the activity is initiated.**
Policy 48: Given that the depth of the archaeological deposits within Thompson Square and The Terrace can exceed 1.5 metres below the existing ground surface, any future archaeological or heritage investigations should ensure that appropriate excavation methods are employed to assess the significance of deposits that would be impacted by development and to appropriately manage any such impacts.

Policy 49: Significant archaeological deposits found within Thompson Square and The Terrace should be registered on the OEH Aboriginal Heritage Information Management Systems to ensure future identification and management. Artefacts produced from any archaeological investigations should be managed and stored as determined through consultation with the local Aboriginal community.

Policy 50: Thompson Square should be assessed for potential listing as an Aboriginal Place under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 to ensure its future protection and management.

Policy 51: Future interpretive opportunities should include Aboriginal heritage values associated with Thompson Square and The Terrace, such as early evidence of colonisation, survival through the Last Glacial Maximum, and nineteenth-century interactions between Aborigines and early European settlers.

### Responsibility

- Managing future impacts to Aboriginal archaeological heritage – RC/PA Approvals – RC/PA

### 5.8 Historical Archaeology

The extensive programme of historical archaeological testing undertaken in 2016 revealed that the land within Thompson Square and the adjacent public domain has been partially to heavily disturbed by progressive road development and flood impact. The depth of historical archaeological materials ranged from 22 centimetres below ground level at the top of the ridge along George Street, to more than 200 centimetres below existing ground surfaces along the southern side of the river and northern edge of Thompson Square, due to the deposition of alluvial material and land reclamation and infilling. North of the river, the study area revealed no evidence of historical archaeological remains.

All historical archaeological remains were at least partially disturbed by past road and service works, or flooding. It is likely that more intact archaeological remains survive in the adjacent areas of private land, particularly along the eastern side of Thompson Square.

The Heritage Act 1977 states that any excavation where relics may be disturbed requires approval. Sites of historic archaeological potential are protected under various provisions of the Act, depending on whether they are within or without the SHR curtilage of Thompson Square Conservation Area.

Policy 52: Any potential archaeological resources should be conserved in accordance with the requirements of the Heritage Act 1977 and their potential for interpretation considered.
Policy 53: All archaeological work should only be carried out under the supervision of a suitably qualified and accredited archaeologist.

Policy 54: Excavation works in areas identified as archaeologically sensitive should be managed in accordance with the relevant sensitivity zoning in this SCMP (see Figure 45) and the requirements of the Heritage Act 1977. The following guidelines should also be followed:

- **Avoidance** – wherever possible, works should avoid known archaeologically sensitive areas. If avoidance is not possible, the mitigation measures listed below should be considered.

- **Stop work protocol** – works in these areas only require a ‘stop work’ protocol in the event of an unexpected discovery.

- **Monitor and record** – works in these areas should be monitored for potential historical remains. Prior to commencement, the works will require a section 139 or section 57 approval under the Heritage Act 1977, depending on their location.

- **Conserve in-situ or salvage excavation** – works in these areas are known or highly likely to contain intact and significant historical archaeological materials, including structural remains and deposits. Wherever possible, these areas should not be excavated. If there is no alternative, the area should be subject to full archaeological excavation. Prior to commencement, the works will require a section 139 or Section 57 approval under the Heritage Act 1977, depending on their location.

- **Artefacts generated through any historical archaeological work should be stored and managed by Hawkesbury City Council or the Windsor Museum.**

Policy 55: Wherever possible, new works or infrastructure such as landscaping and the installation of new services should avoid identified areas of high archaeological sensitivity.

Policy 56: Any maintenance of existing subsurface infrastructure where impacts are constrained to existing trenches and/or areas of disturbance can be undertaken without further archaeological assessment or investigation.

Policy 57: For all activities proposed for these areas, indirect impacts should be managed, including compaction from heavy vehicles, vehicle slewing, equipment storage, site sheds and fencing. Where indirect impacts are considered likely, surface protection should be established before the activity is initiated.

Policy 58: In the event that archaeological material is unexpectedly discovered during any works within Thompson Square and the adjacent public domain, work should immediately cease in the affected area and the Heritage Division of OEH be contacted for advice.

**Responsibility**

- Managing future impacts to historical archaeological heritage – RC/PA Approvals – RC/PA
5.9  Maritime Archaeology

The maritime heritage of the study area relates to three main areas of former activity: the various wharves that have existed on the southern side of the riverbank; shipbuilding activities along the southern riverbank; and the punt, which operated between the south and north shores of the river. To date, no archaeological evidence has been found for the punt or shipbuilding activities; however, remains of the circa-1814 wharf were found during the 2016 maritime test excavations. Due to the alterations to the southern bank of the river through past erosion, deposition, scouring and the installation of scour mitigation measures (in the form of gabion baskets), it is possible that buried remains of maritime activities may survive in areas of deeper deposits (greater than 1500 millimetres below the ground surface at the southern riverbank). There is no evidence of the existence of any maritime heritage items or relics within the river channel or along the northern riverbank, nor is there evidence of any shipwrecks within the study area.

The Heritage Act 1977 states that any excavation where relics may be disturbed requires approval. Sites of maritime archaeological potential are protected under various provisions of the Act.

*Policy 59: Areas of identified maritime archaeological sensitivity should ideally be avoided in terms of future excavation impacts or disturbance.*

*Policy 60: All archaeological excavation work should only be carried out under the supervision of a suitably qualified and accredited maritime archaeologist.*

*Policy 61: Where impacts are unavoidable in the zone of maritime archaeological sensitivity (the area of the circa-1814 wharf), an assessment of those impacts should be undertaken and an excavation permit obtained under section 139 of the Heritage Act 1977. Maritime archaeological excavation will likely be required in that zone.*

*Policy 62: Where deeper excavation (greater than 1500 millimetres) is proposed along the southern riverbank, including works to reclaim land, scour protection works or replacement of the existing gabion baskets, an excavation permit under section 139 of the Heritage Act 1977 should be obtained for archaeological monitoring.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing future impacts to maritime archaeological heritage – RC/PA Approvals - RC/PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.10  Interpretation

The history of Thompson Square and surrounds is a rich and complex one, stretching from (at least) the inhabitation of the area by Aboriginal people from the Pleistocene (circa 23,000 BP), through to the early phases of colonisation and contact, and the subsequent development and expansion of Green Hills and Windsor. There is also a significant environmental history to the area, in terms of the impact of flooding on both the Aboriginal and European inhabitants of the area, and the manner in which the flooding itself made the Hawkesbury valley an attractive place to live and farm. Not all elements of this history are, however, without conflict, and there is substantial historical evidence of the conflicts between Aboriginal people and European settlers, and the impacts of dispossession, disease and violence. All of these stories are important aspects of the area’s history, and their interpretation should be a key element of future work in the precinct.
Interpretation strategies represent an opportunity to reveal long-term connections with our cultural identity, reveal storylines within a community and increase public understanding and appreciation of, and access to, Thompson Square. An Interpretation Strategy was prepared by AAJV in April 2017, in fulfilment of Condition B1. This report is a preliminary investigation to support an Interpretation Plan.

The purpose of the interpretation plan for the WBRP is to make the archaeological, historical and cultural significance of Thompson Square, Windsor Bridge and surrounds accessible and relevant to the wider community. There are a number of important historical themes that can be emphasised through interpretation, ensuring that the significance of the site is appropriately portrayed and emphasised for the community. These historical themes include:

- **Aboriginal occupation and European contact** – Archaeological and primary sources demonstrate that Aboriginal people occupied the study area beside the Hawkesbury River for millennia prior to European colonisation.

- **Thompson Square** – The square is one of the oldest designated public squares in Australia. The space was cleared and remained open for public use since 1795, several years prior to Governor Lachlan Macquarie’s official allocation of the space as a public square. This makes the space one of the earliest, continuously used public spaces in Australia. Over time, it has been used as a meeting place, public muster, military post, colonial stores, and a place of transport and embarkation.

- **Hawkesbury River, transport and industry** – The space played a critical role in shaping the importance (and exploitation) of the Hawkesbury River to the survival of the new colony. Thompson Square was the location of the first wharf and punt where boats would dock in order to collect valuable supplies for the main colony at Sydney Harbour. The fertile lands around the Hawkesbury-Nepean River basin were a key factor in the success and survival of the new colony.

- **Important historical persons** – The site has direct connections with persons who are historically significant in the development of the new colony in Sydney. Governor Macquarie was one of the most influential people in colonial Australian history and played a critical role in the development and evolution of Sydney settlements such as Parramatta, Liverpool and Windsor. Andrew Thompson was a local constable who was granted land just outside the square prior to Governor Macquarie’s leadership. He was a well-known local publican and the first ex-convict in Australia to become a magistrate. As a testament to his good character, the square was named after him by Governor Macquarie.

Various landscape studies have identified potential locations, zones and precincts in the study area where installation of interpretation would be successful. These areas will provide good access for the local community and visitors, and interpretive installations in these locations would have a positive impact on the surrounding built and natural environment. Finally, interpretation would not only bring to light important historical narratives of the area, but also ultimately enhance the heritage significance of the place. Precincts with potential include:

- **Macquarie Park** – This park is located at the north-east corner of Windsor Bridge. The space is presently a park with modern playground and public amenities including parking, toilets and barbecues. It lies directly opposite and has clear views of Thompson Square and its full form. It would be an ideal location for interpretation that demonstrates the location of former wharves and punts, and how the natural landform lent itself to its function as a point for river embarkation and, subsequently, the colonial food storage supplies.

- **Thompson Square** – The square is clearly the best location for the installation of interpretation about the square specifically, its historical significance as a public common space, its connection to characters such as Andrew Thompson and Governor Macquarie, and the gradual development of its appearance over time.

- **The existing riverwalk** – There is also potential to integrate new, rejuvenated interpretation among the existing devices along the riverfront south-west of Windsor Bridge. Some investment has already been made in refreshing the public amenities (the footpaths and picnic seating) in the area. New interpretation would be integrated into the existing environment to ensure a consistent and cohesive appearance.
Policy 63: An interpretation plan should be prepared as part of major future works that affect the public domain. Future interpretation should take a consistent approach to interpreting the site.

Policy 64: Interpretation programmes should be accessible to the public.

Policy 65: Interpretation programmes should encourage an appreciation of the significance of the site and long-term conservation for present and future generations.

Policy 66: The Thompson Square Interpretation Strategy (AAJV 2016) should be adopted as the key guiding document for heritage interpretation in the area.

Policy 67: Future interpretation should include elements from all aspects of the area’s history, and should not shy away from telling the stories of conflict.

Policy 68: Stakeholder groups should be involved in the development of detailed interpretation proposals.

Policy 69: Future interpretive works should be robust and well-designed, and should not conflict with other uses of the precinct.

Policy 70: Interpretive works should be regularly maintained for wear and tear, graffiti and other impacts over time.

Policy 71: Interpretive works should be planned with the aim of refreshing every five to ten years. It is not necessary to interpret all aspects of the site’s history at every opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Adopt Interpretation Strategy – RC/PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and refresh of interpretation – RC/PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintenance of interpretive media – RC/PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.11 **Vistas, Views and Setting**

The primary historic views to and from the study area have been from the ridge at the south end of Thompson Square towards the Hawkesbury River and, equally, the view south from the north bank of the river back to Thompson Square. Subsequent plantings within Thompson Square and the mixture of deliberate and self-seeded plantings along the southern riverbank have obscured these views. Where possible, these views should be reopened and maintained, particularly from the viewing areas on the north and south sides of the river, as recommended in the Interpretation Strategy. The view to the north will be affected by the future construction of a traffic circle; however, the view to the south will continue to encompass Thompson Square and the adjoining areas and
historic buildings. Decisions about alterations to vegetation should also take into account the potential environmental impacts (such as impacts to bank stabilisation).

**Policy 72:** The vegetation in Thompson Square and the southern riverbank should be managed to open up views of Thompson Square and adjacent areas from the northern interpretive viewing area, at the eastern edge of Macquarie Park.

In the longer term, it may prove desirable to limit the view to the traffic circle on the north side of the river through plantings along the northern riverbank. Any such plantings must, however, be managed in a manner that does not cause issues related to traffic flow and visibility.

### Responsibility

- Managing riparian vegetation – RC/PA
- Approvals – RC/PA

### 5.12 Procedural Requirements

#### 5.12.1 Archival

Management records associated with the conservation of the place and major changes are an important part of the ongoing recordkeeping. It is important that these records be stored in a safe, publicly accessible place. Records relating to Thompson Square are held by HCC, the Windsor Museum and the State Library of NSW.

**Policy 73:** Where new records are generated, copies should be lodged with, at a minimum, Hawkesbury City Council and the Windsor Museum.

**Policy 74:** Major changes to Thompson Square, the surrounding area and adjacent heritage items should be archivally recorded in accordance with Heritage Council guidelines.

#### 5.12.2 Statutory Approvals

**Policy 75:** The listing of Thompson Square on the SHR requires that approval for changes to the place be obtained from the:

- Heritage Council of NSW and OEH and heritage (for places listed on the SHR, or unlisted historical and maritime archaeological sites and relics outside the SHR curtilage), as per the Heritage Act 1977
- OEH, for Aboriginal objects and places, including the Hawkesbury Sand Sheet, as per the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974
- Hawkesbury City Council, for integrated development applications for items on the SHR, or development applications for items on the LEP, or unlisted items and areas within the study area, as per the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
- determining authorities undertaking infrastructure works as listed in (and as per) the State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007.
Due to the significance of the place, in all cases, except for minor works as noted above, an appropriate impact assessment should be undertaken to inform any approval under the above or other legislation as relevant.

5.12.3 Improving Understanding of the Study Area

A great deal of historical research has been undertaken for this SCMP, which has identified some areas of new information, as well as gaps and errors in some previous information regarding the precinct. Additionally, discrepancies between different heritage listings have been identified, which have led to a duplicative and, at times, unclear regulatory environment for aspects of the area’s heritage management. The SCMP provides an opportunity to update and improve the quality of information regarding the study area, to facilitate better management outcomes in future.

Policy 76: Rationalising of the SHR and LEP curtilages to the same boundary should be considered.

Policy 77: Expanding the boundaries of the Thompson Square Conservation Area north to incorporate the southern embankment and maritime heritage zone, and the opportunity sites identified along the boundaries of Thompson Square, to provide greater control of future development outcomes, should be considered. A Schedule of Exemptions to accommodate future routine maintenance work to infrastructure and public space within the Conservation Area should be developed.

Policy 78: Copies of all heritage information should be lodged with the Windsor Museum, Hawkesbury City Council and other public archives as appropriate. Ideally this information should be made available online as well as in hard copy.

Policy 79: Update the individual SHR and LEP listing cards for the individual sites within and adjacent to the study area, to reflect the updated historical information from the SCMP.

Responsibility

- Curtilage rationalisation – OEH RC/PA
- SHR update – RC/PA
- LEP update – RC/PA
- Information lodgement – RMS (for SCMP only)

5.13 Consultation

Policy 80: Ongoing discussion with all stakeholders in relation to future action or development of Thompson Square should continue so as to ensure the retention of the cultural significance of the site.
Responsibility

- Ongoing discussion – HCC

5.14 Security

As a public space, used primarily for passive recreation, there is the potential for risk to be identified to the public using or passing through the space. In some instances, it may be necessary to undertake works to accord with the requirements of the Building Code of Australia, Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth) or Work Health and Safety Act 2011 (NSW). The need to undertake such works does not, however, remove the need to assess and minimise heritage impacts and obtain all necessary approvals.

Policy 81: Proposed works or actions designed to minimise risk within Thompson Square or the adjacent areas should be designed so as to not adversely impact on the character of the site.

Policy 82: Where proposed works have the potential to impact upon the heritage values of the place, the identified risk and proposed solution should be reviewed by a BCA, risk or disability access consultant with experience in working with heritage places, to determine whether an alternative solution can be found to address the risk and requirements.
6 Implementation

This SCMP has been prepared to provide guidelines for the conservation, reuse, interpretation and management of Thompson Square to ensure that the heritage value of the square and environs is maintained and enhanced.

This section sets out a range of actions that should be undertaken on the site to conserve its significance and address any outstanding issues relating to fabric condition. It also identifies opportunities for heritage interpretation on the site.

6.1 Minimum Standards of Maintenance and Repair

Sites listed on the SHR are required to be maintained in accordance with the Minimum Standards of Maintenance and Repair (Minimum Standards) under section 118 of the Heritage Act. The Minimum Standards can be found in the Heritage Regulation and set out basic standards for key maintenance activities such as weatherproofing, fireproofing and site security.

As the SCMP is concerned solely with the strategic management of the study area, and Thompson Square specifically, none of the Minimum Standards are relevant in this instance. However, for clarity, the relevant measures are detailed in Table 8 below.

No comment is made in relation to the compliance of any of the adjacent properties within the Thompson Square Conservation Area or individually listed on the SHR with these Standards. Responsibilities related to those properties rest with the individual property owners.

Table 8: Compliance with Minimum Standards of Maintenance and Repair for Thompson Square and the Study Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Complies (y/n)</th>
<th>Work Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Inspect Manually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather protection</td>
<td>Maintain:</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• subsurface drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• roof &amp; guttering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• damp proofing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ventilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• lightning conductors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>Remove rubbish &amp; vegetation</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fire control systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• safe storage of inflammables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• building services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Complies (y/n)</td>
<td>Work Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional fire protection for unoccupied buildings</td>
<td>If unoccupied for more than sixty days:</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• disconnect oil/gas services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• install monitored fire protection system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Install appropriate fencing &amp; security systems</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair or board up openings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional security measures for unoccupied buildings</td>
<td>If unoccupied for more than sixty days:</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• install monitored security alarm, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• undertake regular surveillance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential maintenance and repair</td>
<td>Maintain and/or repair:</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pest control measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• structural defects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• significant finishes and fittings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Works required to comply with the *Minimum Standards* should be undertaken within six months of the date of this document, unless the particular *Standard* specifies a shorter period.

### 6.2 Urgent and Structural Works

Works that are considered urgent are those that may compromise the safety of the public or workers on the site, or the operation or structural integrity of the heritage item. Where this relates to a building element, the element may have failed or be likely to fail within the next six months. Any such issues should be investigated without delay and stabilised while a permanent solution is developed.

Stabilisation works should be reversible and should not involve the removal of fabric of exceptional or high significance unless no alternatives exist. Any elements of exceptional or high significance that are removed during repair works should be safely stored onsite and reinstated during permanent repair works.

Permanent repair works should reflect the intentions of the policies in this document and be designed to be sympathetic to the site.

No urgent works have been identified to any fabric within the study area.
6.3 Conservation Works

Conservation works are those works required to conserve, protect or enhance building fabric of moderate, high or exceptional significance where that fabric is in less than optimal condition. This may include works to key building elements such as walls and roofs that are damaged, or work to decorative or redundant elements and fittings that contribute to the significance of the place.

Conservation works may also be required as a result of recommendations to remove fabric that has been assessed as being of little significance or that is intrusive to the site, where that fabric is damaging or obscuring fabric of a higher level of significance. They may also include minor repair works to building services which have been recommended to enhance the functionality of the site.

Conservation works do not include major new works, extensions or refits. Any works of that nature need to be developed with consideration of the policies in this document and assessed for heritage impacts.

Conservation works are, in general, not urgent but should be undertaken within one to three years. As the SCMP is concerned with the strategic management of the area, specific conservation works are not identified in this document. Again, this only applies to the public domain areas of the study area, and may not necessarily apply to any of the buildings adjacent.
7 Bibliography


Barrallier, F, ‘Journal of the expedition, undertaken by order of His Excellency Governor King, into the interior of New South Wales’, in *Historical Records of New South Wales*, vol. V.


Blanket Returns for the Windsor District (Putty, Colo, Kurrangj & South Creek), unpublished, NSW State Records Office, AO 4/24331, 1839.


Criminal Letters: His Majesty’s Advocate against Thompson and Aitkins, 31 August 1790: JC12/21, GC166, Jedburgh Court Transcripts, September 1790.


Fitzgerald, J C L, Those were the days: more Hawkesbury history, NSW Bookstall Co, Sydney, 1923.


*Hawkesbury Courier*.

Hawkesbury Heritage Inventory, SHI no. 1740427.


*Historical Records of Australia [HRA]*.


Howe Papers, State Library of NSW, Mitchell Library, ML MSS 106.


John Harris against A F Kemp, Court of Civil Jurisdiction, CY1093, SRNSW.


King to Lord Hobart, *Historical Records of NSW [HRNSW]*, vol. 5, 20 December 1804.


Land and Property Information.

Land Grant Register, Book 2, SRNSW.
Nanson, G C, Young, R W, Stockton, E D, ‘Chronology and palaeoenvironment of the Cranebrook Terrace, near Sydney, containing artefacts more than 40,000 years old’, Archaeology in Oceania, 1987, 22, 72–8.
National Library of Australia.
Phillip in Hunter, 1793 [1968].
Records of the Scottish High Court during Autumn Circuit at Jedburgh, Register House, Edinburgh JC26/257, GC173, Declaration of Andrew Thompson, 25 August 1790.
Registrar General, NSW. Register of Grant, series 2.
State Library NSW.
Steele, J, Early days of Windsor, Kessinger Publishing, 1916.
Sydney Gazette.
Sydney Morning Herald.
Tench, W. Sydney’s first four years: being a reprint of ‘A narrative of the expedition to Botany Bay’ and ‘A complete account of the settlement at Port Jackson’, ed. L.F.
The King v. Powell, Freebody, Metcalf, Timms and Butler (1799) NSW Sup C7


*Windsor and Richmond Gazette.*


Yeldap, ‘The good old days’, *Windsor and Richmond Gazette*, 5 August 1893.

Table 9: 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>Archaeological and Heritage Management Solutions</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td><em>Windsor Roman Catholic cemetery Windsor, NSW: research design and excavation methodology</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological and Heritage Management Solutions</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td><em>No. 5 New Street, Windsor historical archaeological &amp; development impact assessment</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological and Heritage Management Solutions</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment – SIMTA Intermodal Terminal, Moorebank, NSW. <em>AHMS Report for Hyder Consulting Pty Ltd.</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td><em>1A Greenway Crescent, Windsor NSW: final archaeological report</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td><em>29 North Street Windsor NSW: archaeological monitoring</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAC</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td><em>29 North Street Windsor NSW: archaeological assessment and exemption notification</em></td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austral Archaeology Pty Ltd</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td><em>Built heritage &amp; archaeological landscape investigation: Windsor Bridge options, preliminary environmental investigation</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosis</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td><em>Archaeological assessment and research design former military barracks, Windsor police station</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosis</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td><em>Windsor Bridge Replacement Project historic heritage assessment &amp; statement of heritage impact</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosis + Thorp</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td><em>Historical heritage assessment for Windsor Bridge Replacement Project: test excavation report</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC Consulting Services</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td><em>68 George Street, Windsor: heritage impact statement</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td><em>Proposed museum site service area Baker Street, Windsor: application for S140 excavation permit</em></td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td><em>Museum site Baker Street Windsor: archaeological investigation final report</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td><em>Proposed museum site service area Baker Street, Windsor: archaeological assessment</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td><em>Museum extension site Baker Street, Windsor: report on test trenching</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Steele Consulting Archaeology.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Interim archaeological excavation report and application for a section 90 heritage impact permit NPWS site 45-5-2865 former Hawkesbury Hospital Windsor NSW</em></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoarchaeology and Prospection</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td><em>Exploratory ground penetrating radar survey at Thompson’s Square Windsor</em></td>
<td>Remote Sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Report on the archaeological excavation of the site of the extensions to the Hawkesbury Museum, 7 Thompson Square, Windsor, N.S.W.</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td><em>Report on historical and archaeological investigation of the Hawkesbury Museum, 7 Thompson Square, Windsor, NSW</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td><em>Report on archaeological monitoring programme during redevelopment of 232 George Street, Windsor, NSW</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td><em>Historical and archaeological investigation of Thompson Square, Windsor</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higginbotham E</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td><em>Report on historical and archaeological investigation of the Hawkesbury Museum, 7 Thompson Square, Windsor, NSW</em></td>
<td>Excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</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>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>1982</td>
<td>Bowman Cottage historical study 1982</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>