



S90/02268/10

HISTORICAL AND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSESSMENT
OF THE
AUSTRALIAN SUGAR
COMPANY MILL,
SUGAR HOUSE ROAD
(FORMERLY CHURCH
STREET),
CANTERBURY,
N.S.W.



Edward Higginbotham,
MA (Cambridge), PhD (Sydney),
MAACA.

EDWARD HIGGINBOTHAM
& ASSOCIATES PTY LTD.

Archaeology • History • & Heritage

A.C.N. 072 316 968.

HISTORICAL AND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSESSMENT
OF THE
AUSTRALIAN SUGAR COMPANY MILL,
SUGAR HOUSE ROAD
(FORMERLY CHURCH STREET),
CANTERBURY,
N.S.W.

Edward Higginbotham
MA (Cambridge), PhD (Sydney), MAACAI.
EDWARD HIGGINBOTHAM & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD
140A Smith Street
SUMMER HILL, NSW 2130.
PO Box 97
HABERFIELD, NSW 2045.
Phone. (02) 9716-5154
Fax. (02) 9716-8547.

For
Gold Abacus Developments
&
Woodhouse & Danks Pty Ltd

May 2000

CONTENTS.

1. INTRODUCTION.	1
1.1. Background.	1
1.2. Brief.	1
1.3. Location of site.	1
1.4. Study methodology and limitations.	2
1.5. Author identification.	2
2. SEQUENCE OF DEVELOPMENT.	5
2.1. Introduction.	5
2.2. History of the Site.	6
2.2.1. Sugar Mill	6
2.2.2. Proposed Reformatory.	13
2.2.3. Engineering Works.	14
2.2.4. Food processing works - Hutton's Bacon Factory.	16
2.3. Chronology.	20
2.3.1. Sugar Mill.	20
2.3.2. Proposed Reformatory.	21
2.3.3. Engineering Works.	21
2.3.4. Food processing works / Hutton's Bacon Factory.	22
2.4. Maps, plans and views.	24
3. SITE SURVEY.	50
3.1. Introduction.	50
3.1.1. North Side of Mill.	50
3.1.2. East Side of Mill.	51
3.1.3. South Side of Mill.	52
3.1.4. West Side of Mill.	53
3.2. The Buildings Sequence.	54
3.2.1. Phase 1 - Canterbury Estate, 1803 - 1840.	54
3.2.2. Phase 2 - Sugar Mill, 1840 - 1855.	54
3.2.3. Phase 3 - Disuse, 1855 - 1884.	56
3.2.4. Phase 4 - Blacket & Company, 1884 - 1900.	56
3.2.5. Phase 5 - Denham Bros 1900 - 1908.	57
3.2.6. Phase 6 - J.C. Hutton & Company. 1908 - 1983.	58
3.2.7. Phase 7 - Nick Scali. 1983 to date.	60
3.3. The Proposed Development.	61
3.4. Disturbance.	61

3.4.1. North Side of Mill.	61
3.4.2. East Side of Mill.	62
3.4.3. South Side of Mill.	62
3.4.4. West Side of Mill.	62
3.4.5. Mill Building.	62
3.5. Plans.	63
3.6. Photographs.	65
 4. CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE.	 72
4.1. Cultural significance.	72
4.2. Technical / research significance and archaeological significance.	73
4.3. Social significance and educational or public significance.	74
4.4. The significance of the cultural landscape.	75
4.5. The heritage significance of the subject site.	75
 5. CONSERVATION GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	 77
5.1. Principal issues relating to the redevelopment of the subject site.	77
1.1.1. The Relics Provisions of the NSW Heritage Act.	77
5.1.2. The condition of the archaeological remains.	79
5.1.3. Proposed redevelopment.	79
5.1.4. The requirements for the conservation of the archaeological sites.	79
5.2. General recommendations.	80
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 83
 APPENDIX 1. STATE HERITAGE LISTING.	 85

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The author would like to thank

Client: Mr. William Mao, Gold Abacus Developments.
Mr. Laurie Chiarella, Woodhouse & Danks Pty Ltd

1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Background.

This report was commissioned by Woodhouse & Danks Pty Ltd in May 2000.

Preparation of an historical and archaeological assessment report was required by the Council of the Municipality of Canterbury as part of development consent.

The Australian Sugar Company Mill was classified by the National Trust of Australia (N.S.W) on 25 June 1979.¹ In 1985 it was listed by the Heritage Council of New South Wales and the Australian Heritage Commission.² The mill is also included in the Local Environment Plan for Canterbury Precinct by Canterbury Council. The site was formerly covered by a Permanent Conservation Order and is now listed on the State Heritage Register.³

To comply with the requirements of the Heritage Council of New South Wales a conservation plan was prepared in 1995 for Platino Pty Ltd by Ron Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd.⁴

1.2. Brief.

The purpose of this report is to identify historical archaeological sites within the study area, to assess their archaeological significance and to make recommendations for their management and conservation prior to and during development.

1.3. Location of site.

The subject site is located near Canterbury Railway Station in south-western Sydney (Figure 1.1). The study area comprises Part Portion 143 (Conv. No. 106, Bk. 3568), Part Portion 533 and Part of the Reservation fronting the Cooks River. It is bounded on the west by a factory complex, on the south by the Cooks River, on the east by

¹ Reference No. 9130-262456, Classified in the category of Agricultural and Pastoral Technology (Rural).

² File Reference H.C. 32866, Plan H.C. 7/4.

AHC. Reference No. 003328 1/16/011/0001/01, March 6, 1985.

³ PCO No. 290. Government Gazette No. 143, P. 5451 18 October, 1985.

Search of the State Heritage Register undertaken on 11 May 2000.

⁴ Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd. *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury : Conservation Management Plan* March, 1995.

Sugar House Road (previously part of Church Street), and on the north by an extension of Hutton Street giving access to Railways land (Figure 1.2).

1.4. Study methodology and limitations.

This report has been prepared in accordance with the Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning *NSW Heritage Manual*, as follows:

1. Historical research.
2. Site survey.
3. The assessment of the archaeological significance of the site.
4. Recommendations for management and conservation, appropriate to the present proposal for redevelopment.⁵

Visibility during the survey of the site was limited in parts by vegetation, by demolition material along the east side, and along the north by elements recovered after a fire which gutted the Mill. Other sections on the north and west are covered with a bitumen access road and car park.

The interior of the Sugar Mill was not accessible for inspection and the assessment of the disturbance to the internal spaces is provided on the basis of the available plans and not from any physical inspection.

The report does not include any assessment of the likelihood of discovering Aboriginal relics on the site.

1.5. Author identification.

Site survey was undertaken by Dr Edward Higginbotham and Kevin Hickson on 5 May 2000. This report was prepared by Kevin Hickson, and edited by Dr Higginbotham.

The historical research for this report was undertaken by Terry Kass, historian.

⁵ Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. *NSW Heritage Manual*.

Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. *Heritage Assessments*.

Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. *Archaeological Assessments. Archaeological Assessment Guidelines*.

2. SEQUENCE OF DEVELOPMENT.

2.1. Introduction.

The following history of the A.S.C. Mill site was prepared by Terry Kass in May 2000. It outlines the sequence of owners, occupiers, land use and improvements. Historical documentation and plans have been used to predict the location of archaeological remains relating to the use of the site.

Briefly, the occupation of the site may be summarised as follows :

• 1803-1840	Part of Robert Campbell's Canterbury Estate, possibly used for running cattle. ⁶
• 1840-1855	Australian Sugar Company, later the Australasian Sugar Company, later the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. Mill constructed in 1841 and in production from 1842. Various outbuildings added before mill closed in 1855.
• 1855-1884	No known activity. Mill assessed by Colonial Architect as possible reformatory for boys in 1862-66, but the building was not deemed suitable.
• 1884-1900	Blacket & Company, an engineering firm producing ironwork for railways. Possibly operating after bankruptcy proceedings of 1886-87, but probably idle from 1890. A series of mortgages and sales, and north section sold in 1897 for proposed railway. Howard states the site was also used as a butter factory by Foley Bros after Blacket & Company ceased operating. ⁷

⁶ Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd. *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury : Conservation Management Plan* March, 1995. This use was suggested by Rod Howard, apparently because Campbell purchased imported cattle rejected by the Government. Source is ADB 1788-1850, p.205.

⁷ Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd. *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury : Conservation Management Plan* March, 1995. p.9.

• 1900-1908	Denham Brothers 'Canterbury Bacon Factory' or 'Refrigerating Works'. The mill chimney demolished during this period.
• 1908-1983	J.C. Hutton & Company, ham and bacon curers. Internal renovation of the mill and various outbuildings constructed. Most of the outbuildings were demolished in the late 1970s and early 1980s after Hutton built a new plant at Canterbury, with the Mill converted to staff canteen and medical centre. ⁸
• 1983-2000	Nick Scali and Co. Pty Ltd, no activity.

2.2. History of the Site.

The Canterbury Sugar Mill lies within land which was long owned by Robert Campbell, but he did obtain a secure title founded on a Crown Grant for this part of his Canterbury Estate until after he had alienated the land to the Sugar Company. Robert Campbell had purchased the Canterbury Estate on 27 May 1803. This was made up of land originally granted to various other people. For part of this land, an area of almost 80 acres, he had no secure title. Governor Richard Bourke then promised him a grant for this land in recognition of his 30 years of possession.⁹ However, in the meantime, the Australian Sugar Company had been formed and he had sold part of that land to the Company before the grant was issued.

2.2.1. Sugar Mill

In England, Francis Kemble, a gentleman with an entrepreneurial bent, but with underdeveloped scruples, who had some experience of sugar production, persuaded William Knox Child, the Lieutenant of the County of Kent and director of the London and County Joint Stock Bank to finance a sugar company in Australia. Won over by Kemble's optimism and apparent expertise in the magical art of sugar manufacture, Child set about readying himself for travel to Australia and forming a company to

⁸ Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd. *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury : Conservation Management Plan* March, 1995. p. 11.

⁹ Grants, v. 61 (orig B5), No 48, LTO

manage the enterprise. In 1839, the Australian Sugar Company was formed in London.

Historical geographer, G J R Linge, has noted how it was unusual for overseas capital to be directly involved in the creation of industrial enterprises in Australia. However, an important exception was the Australian Sugar Company.¹⁰

On 11 March 1840, the vanguard of this richly endowed enterprise, was under way for Sydney, when the directors of the company and 40 mill staff with their families set sail for Sydney. On 12 July 1840, they had arrived in Sydney. To further the success of their venture, they had brought with them, "1 sugar plant (complete), 76 packets hops, 18 bundles wire and sieves, 5 cases ironmongery and toys, 4 puncheons wirework etc, 2 casks gin", as well as William Knox Child and his family, Francis Kemble and his family, plus 30 bounty immigrants who were to be employed by the company.¹¹

The directors searched for a site, which had plentiful supplies of timber for fuel for the mill plus fresh water. At that time, the Cooks River was in the process of being dammed to create a barrier between the salt water of Botany Bay into which the river emptied its load and the fresher water of the river. A site along the river, near Sydney, which would be the principal market for the company's sugar would be an excellent choice, it seemed.

The directors had selected their site by August 1840. In that month, the surveyor engaged by the company, John Williams, was advertising for builders and contractors to undertake the work of erecting the sugar mill at Canterbury.¹²

The directors had been treating with Robert Campbell, the ostensible owner of the site for some time, it appears. On 3 and 4 December 1840, by a lease and release, Robert Campbell, of Sydney, esquire, conveyed the title to Francis Kemble, Canterbury esq, William Knox Child, Canterbury, esquire, Walter Roxburgh Kemble, Canterbury, esquire & Coles Child, Canterbury, esquire, directors of the Australasian Sugar Company, a total of 60 acres of land at Canterbury for £1,200, to be held in trust prior

¹⁰ G J R Linge, *Industrial Awakening: A Geography of Australian Manufacturing 1788 to 1890*, Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1979, p. 101

¹¹ L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 142

¹² L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 144

to the formal setting up of the company.¹³ The transfer was actually completed for the issue of twenty four £50 shares in the company to Robert Campbell.

On 11 & 12 February 1841, this land was mortgaged by Francis Kemble, William Knox Child, Walter Roxburgh Kemble and Coles Child, directors of Australasian Sugar Company to the Union Bank of Australia for £6,000, due on 12 May 1841 at 10% p. a.¹⁴ The mortgage was intended to provide working capital until the company was in production.¹⁵

Lesley Muir has detailed the acrimonious relations between William Knox Child and Francis Kemble, which developed as Child became increasingly aware that Kemble had a more detailed knowledge of promoting investment schemes than he had of the intricate process of sugar production. Francis Kemble had sold a thirty year old sugar plant to the company and had been lax in working to make the venture a success. As the two principals in the company fell out with each other, they rallied the other directors and large investors behind them. William Knox Child was initially more successful than Kemble at lobbying and drawing the support of others. On 30 & 31 March 1841, a conveyance in trust by directors of the company passed the title to the land and mill site to Randolph John Want, a Sydney solicitor, in trust to vest land in the name of William Knox Child and Coles Child, in lieu of the earlier directors.¹⁶ This agreement gave himself and his son, Coles Child, control of the property of the company.¹⁷

By this time, Scottish stonemasons employed by the company under the management of David McBeath were cutting stone on the site and to the east of the site. Ironbark was cut across the river for the building.¹⁸

To raise further capital, the Company engaged W H Wells to subdivide their land into allotments for sale to speculators. The Sugar Company's estate was auctioned by Samuel Lyons on 30 July 1841.¹⁹ Although it was seen as a positive sign of success

¹³ LTOD, No 421 Bk 9

¹⁴ LTOD, No 883 Bk U

¹⁵ L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 146

¹⁶ LTOD, No 422 Bk 9

¹⁷ L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 149

¹⁸ B Madden & L Muir, *Canterbury Farm: 200 Years*, Canterbury & District Historical Society, Canterbury 1993, p. 9

¹⁹ L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 154

at the time, Lesley Muir is less sanguine about the success of the mill. She reveals that of the land "sold" by the company, there is evidence to suggest that it was conveyed to Directors and employees in lieu of wages or for work done.²⁰ By May 1843, the Company's shares had been sold and the last were sold that month. It was seen as a sign of future prosperity.

The plan prepared for the 30 July 1841 auction sale of the sugar company's land shows the outline of the works, plus two L-shaped buildings to the north as well as a quay on the river bank in front of the mill, plus various outbuildings nearby but none upon the subject site.²¹

The mill building was mainly complete by 28 September 1841. A press description from *The Australian* outlines the layout of the mill,

They are built on a portion of the Canterbury Estate, lately bought by the Company of Robert Campbell, esq, M.C., and will be about five miles distant from Sydney when the new road, now in formation, by the Petersham Gate, is completed. The Sugar-house is placed within one hundred feet of Cook's River, which is shortly expected to be fresh water, the Dam being quite closed, and is built of beautiful white sandstone. It is one hundred feet in length, sixty feet in width, and sixty feet high, with a fine chimney shaft, one hundred and thirty feet from the round. The house contains six spacious floors, mill-house, engine-house, boiler-house, stove, and store-rooms, all heated and worked by a steam-engine of considerable power, which also drives a mill of great capabilities, for the purpose of grinding animal charcoal. There is also a complete set of retorts for the purposes of the manufactory, and two smaller steam-engines of twelve horse power to act as a crane, to do the work of the house. The whole arrangements shew that Mr Outtrim, the Company's engineer, and surveyor, Mr Williams and the contractors, Messrs Macbeth and Co are men of judgment and thoroughly understand their respective departments.

²⁰ L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 161

²¹ W Baker, *Plan of 95 Allotments at Canterbury adjoining the Australasian Sugar Company's Works*, M L Map M 2 811.1829/1841/1

About 100 men were employed whilst the mill was being built at cost of £30,000. Sugar mill workers were housed nearby in slab huts and a school was already in operation for over 40 children.²² The builder's name was actually David McBeath.

It was not until 7 January 1842, that a grant for 177 acres 1 rood was issued to Robert Campbell, senior, of George Street, Sydney, for the land on which the sugar mill lay.²³ He had already sold that land to the company some months earlier. On 10 January 1842, William Knox Child and Coles Child mortgaged the mill site to William Wright and George Cooper Turner. On 21 May 1842, the mortgage was transferred to George Cooper Turner and Oswald Bloxsome.²⁴ From this time onwards, the Company never had full equity on the mill site. The land was mortgaged and the mortgage was transferred or the current mortgage was paid off and the land immediately re-mortgaged on different terms. Such a position emerged from the difficulties, which were crowding about the sugar manufacturer.

Disputes between William Knox Child and Francis Kemble, which had already made the management of the company unstable, coupled with poor trade conditions, caused the original sugar company to be dissolved. Francis Kemble, trading upon his untested reputation as an expert in sugar production, began to spread rumours about the likely success of the company without his active involvement. Hence, major investors took fright and ensured that a new company was formed - the Australasian Sugar Company with Francis Kemble as Director. However, it retained William Knox Child as co-Director.²⁵ On 31 March 1842, the deed of settlement for the Australasian Sugar Company, which replaced former company was completed.²⁶ Kemble had been trying to have William Knox Child removed from his post and finally succeeded on 1 October 1842 and had himself installed as Director.²⁷

Almost as an anti-climax, the company was ready to commence the production of sugar, which was under way by September 1842.²⁸ Sugar was imported from Manilla

²² *Australian*, 28 Sept 1841, p. 2

²³ Grants, v. 61 (orig B5), No 48

²⁴ LTOD, No 512 Bk 23

²⁵ L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 163-4

²⁶ A G Lowndes, (ed), *South Pacific Enterprise: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1956, p. 12

²⁷ L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 169

²⁸ A G Lowndes, (ed), *South Pacific Enterprise: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1956, p. 13

and it was worked into loaf sugar at the mill.²⁹ The mill produced loaf and crushed sugar, plus molasses and vinegar from the raw sugar which came to the plant.³⁰

The production process was described in detail in a press article of 13 December 1842. This source described the mill as being six stories high and it employed 30 people. The floors of the building were very low and, due to the large number of steam pipes which ran through the building, it was also very hot. The manufacturing process commenced when raw material was taken to the top of the building, where it was dissolved in two large "blow up cisterns" along with lime water, charcoal and other ingredients and was stirred with poles to produce the liquor. From there it entered a smaller shallow cistern. It was then run through various filters to remove the impurities. The filters consisted of cloth tubes, 4 inches in diameter, with cloth bags stuffed into the tubes to provide thousands of minute holes to filter the sugar solution through. By this time, the solution was much cleaner but with a reddish colour. It was then run through a bed of powdered charcoal three feet thick which removed the colour. It was then boiled in a vacuum pan, from which the air had been excluded so that the lower boiling point would prevent the sugar decomposing. The resulting mixture was then run off as crystals mixed with treacle. It was poured into loaf vessels and allowed to cool. The next day, when cool, the crystalline sugar would have separated from the treacle in the mould. A small hole was let into the mould and the treacle was allowed to drain away. The material which drained out was then taken away to be reprocessed into an inferior grade of loaf sugar. A solution of sugar in water was then run through the sugar remaining in the moulds a number of times until the syrup was fully drained away and the sugar in the mould perfectly white. After being allowed to dry it was taken to the shops to be sold as loaf sugar.³¹

From this time onwards, however, the mill was not a successful investment. The Company limped along, since the economic depression of the early 1840s had reduced the market for fine loaf sugar considerably.³² In December 1843, the Company made an attempt to have the raw sugar it imported for its Canterbury operations made free of customs duty. This was the first instance in the 1840s of a

²⁹ A G Lowndes, (ed), *South Pacific Enterprise: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1956, p. 13

³⁰ B Madden & L Muir, *Canterbury Farm: 200 Years*, Canterbury & District Historical Society, Canterbury 1993, p. 9

³¹ *SMH*, 13 Dec 1842, p. 2

³² L. Muir, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984, p. 172

company trying to obtain such a concession from the government.³³ Although the attempt to gain the concession may have been an instance of entrepreneurs seeking to reduce the cost of their inputs, it may also show how desperate the company was financially.

From 1843 until 1846, the mill was managed by Edward Knox (no relation to William Knox Child) who was a close friend of Robert Campbell.³⁴ Edward Knox was a Dane, who had business connections with the Australian Auction Company and Union Bank.³⁵

There are a number of plans from about this time, which shows some detail of this site. A plan of the Canterbury Estate drawn after 1842 shows the mill buildings plus some of the nearby buildings. Its accuracy is uncertain.³⁶ Another plan of May 1843, completed as the sale plan for the Campbell land nearby, shows the sugar mill but only schematically.³⁷

The works appears to have limped along. About 1853 the Australasian Sugar Company took over the rival sugar works, operated in Sydney by T W Bowden.³⁸ In 1854, the Australasian Sugar Company was dissolved. On 1 January 1855, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company was formed in its stead with the assets of the old company.³⁹ CSR decided to close the Canterbury works and centralise their operations in George Street, Sydney.

On 3 April 1855, a formal deed of surrender vested the Canterbury Mill in the new company. Rev Coles Child, Scone, clerk in holy orders, transferred the property to Ralph Mayer Robey, Clark Irving and Edward Knox. The land was described as measuring 11 acres 2 roods 38 perches, and was bounded the south by Cooks River, on the east by the road of Robert Campbell Esq, on the north by the land of the Sugar Company, and on the west by Robert Campbell. The site also included, "all that stone

³³ G J R Linge, *Industrial Awakening: A Geography of Australian Manufacturing 1788 to 1890*, Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1979, p. 105

³⁴ A G Lowndes, (ed), *South Pacific Enterprise: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1956, p. 13

³⁵ A G Lowndes, (ed), *South Pacific Enterprise: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1956, p. 16

³⁶ Anon, Plan of the Canterbury Estate, ML Map M2 811.1829/1842+/1

³⁷ J Armstrong, Plan of the Village of Canterbury on Cooks River, M L Map M2 811.1829/1843/1

³⁸ G J R Linge, *Industrial Awakening: A Geography of Australian Manufacturing 1788 to 1890*, Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1979, p. 769

³⁹ A G Lowndes, (ed), *South Pacific Enterprise: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1956, p. 13

built Sugar house slated with the Steam Engine Machinery Plant Apparatus Cistern double Mill Works Stone Cottages and all other erections and buildings".⁴⁰ A deed signed the next day, confirmed the interests of the current mortgagees. Ralph Mayer Robey, Clark Irving and Edward Knox confirmed the mortgage made out to Oswald Bloxsome and Thomas Iceton, of the same land, subject to a proviso for redemption. In this instance, the description of the other assets on the land differed in some detail, noting that it included, "all that stone built three pan sugar house slated with the three steam engines machinery plants apparatus cisterns double boilers mill works retort works chimney shaft bone works and two stone cottages erected and built upon the said land."⁴¹

2.2.2. Proposed Reformatory.

The mill was idle for some years, before it again came into use. Between 1862 and 1866, the Colonial Architect assessed the former sugar mill as a possible site for a boy's reformatory after the owners had offered it to the government.

A description of the mill building was prepared by the Colonial Architect on 9 May 1862, but he did not recommend that the building be used for a reformatory, suggesting that the military barracks at Newcastle was far more suitable place for the care of delinquent boys.⁴²

A further report by James Barnet, completed on 25 April 1866, when he reported on the building, described the stone walls as being from 2 feet to 2 feet six inches thick. The structural timber was colonial hardwood, blackbutt and ironbark. The floors were of pine mainly covered with sheet iron. Gutters on the building were of lead. The doors were of iron and the rest were of timber although they were in poor condition. The ventilators and skylight in the roof were also deteriorated. He also provided a detailed bill of quantities of materials in the building.⁴³

On 7 January 1881, Edward Knox, of Sydney, the current director of the Sugar Company, conveyed the mill and its site to Frederick Clissold, of Ashfield, esquire, for £2,450. The land consisted of 11 acres 2 roods 28 perches, plus an adjacent parcel

⁴⁰ LTOD, No 384 Bk 37

⁴¹ LTOD, No 385 Bk 37

⁴² Colonial Architect, Canterbury Sugar Mill, SRNSW 2/640A

⁴³ Colonial Architect, Canterbury Sugar Mill, SRNSW 2/640A

of 2 acres 2 roods 26 perches.⁴⁴ On 22 January 1881, Clissold mortgaged the site to Edward Knox, for £1,500 for 2 years at 6%.⁴⁵

2.2.3. Engineering Works.

On 12 March 1884, Clissold conveyed the site to Owen Blacket, of Sydney, esquire. A more accurate description of the site, formerly listed as 11 acres 2 roods 28 perches, now measured the main parcel of land as 1 acres 3 roods 20 perches. Along with 2 acres nearby, the land sold to Blacket for £5,000.⁴⁶ On the same day, Blacket mortgaged the land to Clissold, for £3,750 for 3 years at 6%.⁴⁷ Owen Blacket was the son of Edmund Blacket, the noted architect. He was to conduct an engineering works there and set it up with sophisticated machinery.⁴⁸ The firm produced ironwork for railways.

Blacket had two partners in his enterprise. On 21 May 1884, Blacket conveyed the land to himself, John Vine Hall, master mariner, and Selwood Smyth, merchant and engineer, as tenants in common. These other two men were the partners in his engineering works.⁴⁹

According to *The Echo* in 1890, the firm installed turning lathes, moulding machines, punching and screwing machines. The building was divided into machinery, moulding and pattern maker's shops. Internally, there were two smelting cupolas plus travelling cranes both inside and outside the building to carry the castings. By 1890, when the report was written the plant was idle.⁵⁰ The Company had established itself adjacent to the surveyed route of the railway line, but the promised line was slow to arrive and in the meantime the company had gone bankrupt.⁵¹

On 16 November 1886, Blacket & Company, engineers, whose principals were Owen Blacket, John Vine Hall and Selwood Smyth, petitioned for voluntary bankruptcy.

⁴⁴ LTOD, No 991 Bk 214

⁴⁵ LTOD, No 992 Bk 214

⁴⁶ LTOD, No 33 Bk 286

⁴⁷ LTOD, No 34 Bk 286

⁴⁸ B Madden & L Muir, *Canterbury Farm: 200 Years*, Canterbury & District Historical Society, Canterbury 1993, p. 14

⁴⁹ LTOD, No 963 Bk 288

⁵⁰ *Echo*, 2 Oct 1890, p. 3

⁵¹ B Madden & L Muir, *Canterbury Farm: 200 Years*, Canterbury & District Historical Society, Canterbury 1993, p. 14

They cited the cause of their bankruptcy as the impending sale on 16 November 1887 under a warrant of execution of their mill and its assets to settle a debt for £100 proved in the Supreme Court. They sequestered to forestall the sale and thus enable them to meet the demands of all of their other creditors.⁵²

An almost illegible Inventory of goods taken on 16 November 1887 for their bankruptcy showed that at their mill, there were various items of furniture in the office. As well, there was an Engine Shop with grinding and working machinery and castings. In the Pattern Shop, there were tools and wooden patterns. In the Cellar, there were stores and castings. In another [illegible] shop there were castings & [illegible] vessels. In the Foundry, there were cooling boxes, [illegible] and lathes, castings, circular loom mill, grindery mill, pig iron [illegible], moulding boxes, boxes of castings, barrows, travellers [cranes?] and tubs.⁵³

By the mutual consent of all their creditors they were released from their bankruptcy on 24 March 1887.⁵⁴

The partnership possibly recommenced operations, but it is noted by 1890, according to *The Echo*, that the engineering works was idle. On 16 September 1887, Frederick Clissold of Sydney, gent, the current mortgagee, sold the property to Henry Parker Tidswell, Balmain, merchant, for £3,950, due to default of the mortgage.⁵⁵ Tidswell mortgaged the land back to Clissold the same day for £3,550 at 6.5% for 3 years.⁵⁶ This mortgage was paid out and the title reconveyed in July 1892.⁵⁷

Tidswell mortgaged the land again on 6 July 1892. By this time, he was a merchant living at Bexley. He mortgaged the mill to Frederick William Parsons, Victoria Arcade, Castlereagh Street, agent, for £3,700.⁵⁸ However, he was soon declared bankrupt. When the right of way was finally being acquired for the proposed railway, the part of the route which passed through the mill land was conveyed on 9 June 1897 by Parsons, the mortgagee, and the assignees of Tidswell's bankrupt estate, plus Owen Blacket, who held some residual title to the land, to the Minister for Public Works.

⁵² Supreme Court, Insolvency Files, O Blacket and others, 16 Nov 1886, No 21384 SRNSW 2/10291

⁵³ Supreme Court, Insolvency Files, O Blacket and others, 16 Nov 1886, No 21384 SRNSW 2/10291

⁵⁴ Supreme Court, Insolvency Files, O Blacket and others, 16 Nov 1886, No 21384 SRNSW 2/10291

⁵⁵ LTOD, No 527 Bk 371

⁵⁶ LTOD, No 528 Bk 371

⁵⁷ LTOD, No 653 Bk 443

⁵⁸ LTOD, No 762 Bk 493

The land consisted of 1 rood 9 perches and 1 acres 3 roods on the land near the Sugar Works, plus other parcels of land nearby for £1,461/3/6.⁵⁹

Until 1899, Blacket & Company, ironfounders, were still listed in the directories with A. Harding as caretaker at the mill's address.⁶⁰ It may be that they may have undertaken some work, but it is more likely, judging from the 1890 report, that the mill remained idle.

2.2.4. Food processing works - Hutton's Bacon Factory.

On 31 May 1900, Frederick Parsons, the current mortgagee, plus the assignees of Tidswell's bankrupt estate and Owen Blacket conveyed the land on which the mill stood, plus other parcels nearby, to Edward William Denham of 15A Sussex Street, Sydney, produce merchant, for £2,300. The parcel containing the sugar mill was described as 3 acres 2 roods.⁶¹

From 1901 until 1907, the Canterbury Bacon Factory was listed here in the directories, with Robert Curtis as manager in 1904 and 1905 and Robert Rason/Raison as manager for 1906 and 1907.⁶² Denham Brothers appear to have used the mill as the Canterbury Bacon Factory. A subdivision plan for an auction of May 1902 shows the mill as "Denham Bros Refrigerating Works".⁶³ About this time, the mill chimney was demolished.

Denham mortgaged the mill to National Mutual Life Association of Australia Ltd on 31 January 1907 for £2,000 for 6 years at 5.5%.⁶⁴ This mortgage was discharged on 15 October 1907.⁶⁵

On 26 March 1908, Edward Richard William Denham, produce merchant sold the mill to J C Hutton Pty Ltd for £5,500. Various parcels of land were included in the conveyance including the 3 acres 2 roods, on which the former sugar mill stood.⁶⁶

⁵⁹ LTOD, No 936 Bk 602

⁶⁰ Sands, *Directories*, 1899, p. 246

⁶¹ LTOD, No 824 Bk 665

⁶² Sands, *Directories*, 1901-07

⁶³ Sydney Subdivision Plans, ML Canterbury

⁶⁴ LTOD, No 856 Bk 819

⁶⁵ LTOD, No 909 Bk 841

⁶⁶ LTOD, No 784 Bk 851

The firm had been established by James Carruthers Hutton in Melbourne in 1872. It had become a company by 1907, with branches across Australia.⁶⁷

J C Hutton, ham and bacon curers, were first listed on this site in the 1909 Sands Directory.⁶⁸ Between 1908 and 1919, various buildings were added to the site as seen in the Water Board plan.⁶⁹ Internally, the four low floors in the main mill building were reduced to two and the basement was converted into cold storage rooms.

An article published in 1911 on Hutton's method of producing ham and bacon noted that the manner in which the pig was fed immediately before being made into ham and bacon was crucial to quality. Hence the company did the final "topping off" or feeding before slaughter itself. This was done at all company's plants, Zillmere in Queensland, St Leonards in Tasmania, Preston in Victoria and Canterbury in NSW. The paddock across Minter Street was the final feeding paddock before the pigs were slaughtered and processed.⁷⁰

Shortly afterwards, Canterbury Council sought to have the 100 feet reservation above the high water mark on river become an active reserve. A survey of the 100 feet reservation in this area was completed after the surveyor was able to gain access to the bacon factory site from a reluctant Hutton's. The survey disclosed that Hutton's had built within this 100 feet reservation.⁷¹ The Company was asked to apply for a Special Lease of Permissive Occupancy or alternatively to remove its buildings. The company would not admit any encroachment since they bought the land in good faith and that the government had never entered into possession of the 100 feet reserve. J C Hutton's had expended several thousand pounds on improvements on the site after their purchase and they were understandably reluctant to remove them. The Company wanted to obtain a title to that land by a Special Purchase but the Minister was not agreeable.⁷² On 10 March 1915, Hutton's applied for special purchase of land in 100 reservation, which was later refused.⁷³

⁶⁷ 'The J C Hutton Proprietary Pine-apple Hams and Bacons', *Lone Hand*, 1 Aug 1911, pp. 386-9

⁶⁸ Sands, *Directories*, 1909, p. 286

⁶⁹ Detail Survey, Canterbury, Sheet 23

⁷⁰ 'The J C Hutton Proprietary Pine-apple Hams and Bacons', *Lone Hand*, 1 Aug 1911, p. 388

⁷¹ Ms.4294.3000, Lands Plans Room

⁷² At Ms.14/17260 in Lands, Special Bundles, Ten 1957/3148, J C Hutton's lease of 100 ft reservation, SRNSW 3/8194

⁷³ Ms.4617.3000, Lands Plans Room

The survey of the land in question was completed by A J Ryan, surveyor on 12 October 1915. He noted that there were extensive improvements on the land consisting of an engine room, curing room, lavatories, extensive septic tank, stone retaining wall, all of a value he estimated at £2,000. He noted that, "They are very necessary to the working of the bacon curing establishment of which they form part." A nearby smithy and shed he valued at £20.⁷⁴

Another survey of the 100 feet reservation was completed on October 1916 and it also showed buildings on site south of main stone building.⁷⁵ The matter reached as far as the Minister, but no common ground could be found, with the Lands Department refusing to allow Hutton's to purchase the land. Advice was sought from the Crown Solicitor.

On 24 January 1918, Owen Blacket was interviewed for the Crown Solicitor about occupation of the site. He remembered "a stone wall existed on the said reservation which was apparently erected about the same time as the old stone building which is situated north of the reservation..." This stone wall still existed in 1918 and was shown on the plans. Blacket's other evidence showed that only part of the land set aside as a reservation had been occupied for 60 years or more, as required before adverse possession could be claimed against the Crown.⁷⁶

Thus, on, 18 March 1918, the Crown Solicitor advised that on the basis of the evidence notably that provided by Blacket and the absence of any other "old residents" being produced to certify any early occupation, that the company had only occupied part of the land for more then 60 years and so could not claim adverse possession.⁷⁷ The Company was still prepared to put in a Special Purchase for the land but this did not eventuate. On 21 September 1921, J C Hutton applied for a Special Lease for 1 a 3 r 2 p of land within the 100 feet reservation. It was granted the Special Lease for a term of 28 years from 1 January 1922 to 31 December 1949.⁷⁸

A description of the bacon factory in January 1924 noted that the chimney had been removed some years ago due to its alarming and dangerous lean. The original four

⁷⁴ At Aln 15/8775 in Lands, Special Bundles, Ten 1957/3148, J C Hutton's lease of 100 ft reservation, SRNSW 3/8194

⁷⁵ Ms.4617.3000, Lands Plans Room

⁷⁶ At Ms 18/2232 in Lands, Special Bundles, Ten 1957/3148, J C Hutton's lease of 100 ft reservation, SRNSW 3/8194

⁷⁷ At Ms 18/2232 in Lands, Special Bundles, Ten 1957/3148, J C Hutton's lease of 100 ft reservation, SRNSW 3/8194

⁷⁸ Ms.4617.3000, Lands Plans Room

floors of the building had been changed into two. The basement which was the original location of the engines and boilers was then used as cold storage rooms.⁷⁹

In the 1950s, the killing license for the site had expired. Pigs could no longer be "topped off" in the adjacent paddock. Carcasses had to come from other abattoirs.

As late as 22 January 1965, the Special Lease of the 100 feet reserve was still renewed by J C Hutton.⁸⁰ In time, the works was no longer viable at this site and it was sold to Nick Scali & Co Pty Ltd in the 1980s.

⁷⁹ *SMH*, 19 Jan 1924 p. 17

⁸⁰ Ms.7716.2030, DLWC Plans Room

2.3. Chronology

27 May 1803

Robert Campbell purchased Canterbury Estate

2.3.1. Sugar Mill.

1839

Australian Sugar Co formed in London

11 March 1840

A S C directors and 40 mill staff with their families set sail for Sydney

12 July 1840

Arrival of A S C directors and 40 mill staff with their families at Sydney

3 and 4 December 1840

Conveyance, Robert Campbell, Sydney esquire to Francis Kemble, Canterbury esq, William Knox Child, Canterbury, esquire, Walter Roxburgh Kemble, Canterbury esquire & Coles Child, Canterbury, esquire (Directors do Australasian Sugar Co. of 60 acres of land at Canterbury

11 & 12 February 1841

Mortgage, Francis Kemble, William Knox Child, Walter Roxburgh Kemble and Coles Child, directors of Australasian Sugar Co to Union Bank of Australia

30 & 31 March 1841

Conveyance in trust by Directors to Randolph John Want, in trust to vest land in name of William Knox Child and Coles Child in lieu of earlier directors

30 July 1841

Plan prepared for auction sale of sugar company land shows outline of the works

28 September 1841

Mill building mainly complete

7 January 1842

Grant of 177 acres 1 rood to Robert Campbell senior of George Street Sydney

10 January 1842

Mortgage by WK and C Child to William Wright and George Cooper Turner

31 March 1842

Deed of settlement for Australasian Sugar Co which replaced former company was completed

21 May 1842

Transfer of mortgage to George Cooper Turner & Oswald Bloxsome

September 1842

Production of sugar commenced

1843 until 1846

Mill managed by Edward Knox

May 1843

Sale plan for Campbell land nearby shows sugar mill but only schematically

December 1843

Company made an attempt to have the raw sugar it imported for its Canterbury operations made free of duty

c. 1853

The Australian Sugar Co took over the rival sugar works operating in Sydney by T W Bowden

1854

Australian Sugar Co dissolved

1 January 1855

Colonial Sugar Refining Co formed

1855

CSR decided to close works and move operations to George Street Sydney

3 April 1855

Surrender, Rev Coles Child, Scone, clerk in holy orders to Ralph Mayer Robey, Clark Irving & Edward Knox

4 April 1855

Surrender, Ralph Mayer Robey, Clark Irving & Edward Knox to Oswald Bloxsome & Thomas Icton

2.3.2. Proposed Reformatory.

9 May 1862

Description of the building by Colonial Architect

25 April 1866

Report by James Barnet on building

7 January 1881

Conveyance Edward Knox, Sydney to Frederick Clissold, Ashfield, esquire

22 January 1881

Mortgage Frederick Clissold , to Edward Knox

2.3.3. Engineering Works.

12 March 1884

Conveyance Clissold to Owen Blacket, Sydney esquire

12 March 1884

Mortgage Blacket to Clissold

21 May 1884

Conveyance by Blacket to self, John Vine Hall, master mariner and Selwood Smyth, merchant and engineer as tenants in common

16 November 1886

Petition for voluntary bankruptcy by Blacket & Co, engineers,

24 March 1887

By mutual consent of all of their creditors they were released from their bankruptcy

16 September 1887

Conveyance by Frederick Clissold, Sydney, gent to Henry Parker Tidswell, Balmain merchant

16 September 1887

Mortgage Tidswell to Clissold

July 1892

Reconveyance

6 July 1892

Mortgage Tidswell, of Bexley merchant to Frederick William Parsons, Victoria Arcade, Castlereagh St, agent

9 June 1897

Conveyance of part of land by Parsons the assignees of Tidswell's bankrupt estate and Blacket, as holding some residual title to land to Minister for Public Works for railway construction.

2.3.4. Food processing works / Hutton's Bacon Factory.

31 May 1900

Conveyance by Parsons, assignees of Tidswell's estate and Blacket to Edward William Denham, 15A Sussex St, produce merchant

1900 until 1908

Used by Denham Brothers as the Canterbury Bacon Factory.

31 January 1907

Mortgage by Denham, to National Mutual Life Association of Australia Ltd

15 October 1907

Mortgage discharged

26 March 1908

Site sold to J C Hutton & Co. Edward Richard William Denham, produce merchant to J C Hutton Pty Ltd

October 1913

Survey of 100 feet reservation shows buildings on site in outline

10 March 1915

Hutton's applied for special purchase of land in 100 reservation

12 October 1915

Survey of the land in 100 feet reserve by A J Ryan

24 January 1918

Owen Blacket was interviewed about occupation of the site

18 March 1918

Crown Solicitor advised that company could not claim adverse possession.⁸¹

⁸¹ At Ms 18/2232 in Lands, Special Bundles, Ten 1957/3148, J C Hutton's lease of 100 ft reservation, SRNSW 3/8194

21 September 1921

Hutton's applies for Special Lease for 1 a 3 r 2 p of land in 100 feet reservation

1950s

Killing license for the site had expired

22 January 1965

Special Lease of this 100 feet reserve to J C Hutton

3. SITE SURVEY.

The site survey of the study area was completed by Dr Edward Higginbotham and Kevin Hickson on 5 May 2000.

3.1. Introduction.

Apart from the historical mill building, the subject site is mostly derelict, with one brick building of c. 1980 construction attached to (and hiding most of) the west face of the mill structure itself. A car park is also located on the west side of the site, excavated into the original hill slope (Plate 3.12). There were indications of recent clearing activity along the east side, and a building had been very recently demolished in the north-west area. A survey plan supplied by the client and last annotated 1995 indicates this was a brick structure was used as an office (Figure 3.1).

Since the Mill Complex comprised a central mill building with various other structures attached or freestanding on different sides at different times, each side will be discussed separately.

3.1.1. North Side of Mill.

No significant archaeological features were visible in this section of the site. On the western part of this area, bare soil marked the site of a building recently demolished, with a row of concrete piers left standing in the slightly higher area along its northern edge or boundary of the site. In the central area, material recovered from the mill after the fire has been stored, mostly sections of burned timbers, with metal fittings, sitting in grass (Plate 3.1). The concrete piers continued along the northern edge or boundary of this area. On the eastern part of the area, a footing of dry pressed bricks was visible, as were patches of natural bedrock (sandstone).

Running east-west, adjacent to the Mill, is a bitumen road with a shallow, concave, concrete drain along its south side. Adjacent to this are two areas of vegetation, separated by a concrete ramp, providing access to the Mill (Plate 3.2). This passes over a retaining wall of dry pressed brick with a cement render capping (Plate 3.3). The retaining wall serves to separate the surrounding terrain from the lowest floor level of the Mill. The wall continues east to attach to the Mill Extension at the north

east corner of the Mill, but also continues west, where it gives way to the stone retaining wall of the car park.

The front of the Mill shows damage from a structure previously attached to this wall, covering the two upper rows of arches and probably the main doorway. Blocks between these upper windows have been replaced or reinstalled, suggesting a large opening below the pediment. Similar replacement occurs at the same level on the west side, and the top of the main doorway has been reshaped. The remainder of the facade appears intact.

The facade or north face of the Mill Extension, at the north-east corner of the Mill, appears basically intact, except for small attachment holes occurring in lines and in association with white paint. There is also a later cut through the lower wall at the eastern corner (Plate 3.4). Another small garden area and concrete path sits in front of this building.

3.1.2. East Side of Mill.

Sloping to the east and toward the river, this area revealed structural remains visible at surface level, and changes or alterations to the Mill facade.

The Mill Extension has a dry pressed brick retaining wall along the east side, which is similar to the retaining wall on the north front of the Mill (Plate 3.5). A structure has been previously attached to the side wall of the Mill Extension. Evidence of this structure includes the following elements. Near the northern end of the Mill Extension side wall is a remnant footing of dry pressed bricks running east. In the face of the Mill Extension side wall can be seen two lines of holes for insertion of joists and rafters, with a line for roof flashing above (Plate 3.6). The part of the wall which was the internal space of the attached building has been cement rendered and painted white. Openings on the side wall may have been altered with the attachment of this former building.

The relationship of the retaining wall and this former attached structure is unknown. The brick retaining wall may post-date the structure, but the relationship should be confirmed during archaeological investigation.

In the southern part of the east side, there are several expanses of concrete slab, adjacent to the Mill and the Mill Extension. Two remnant footing lines of dry pressed

bricks are also evident in the slabs and indicate at least three rooms. The walls indicate a former attached building of two levels. The space on the ground floor adjoining the Mill and Mill Extension was probably a coolroom, since it was lined with cork several centimetres thick and sealed between two layers of cement render (Plates 3.7 - 3.8). There may have been a smaller coolroom adjacent on the south, its wall marked by dry pressed bricks keyed into the Mill structure next to a doorway cut into its wall.

Adjacent to the coolroom is a major cut into the Mill wall. Presumably this was open at some stage and later filled by a dry pressed brick wall with a doorway. On its south side, an area of cement render identical to that in the coolroom, and with the same discolouration produced by the cork layer, probably denotes another coolroom area. Its southern wall alignment is marked by a second instance of dry pressed bricks keyed into the Mill wall. South of this wall joint, there appears to be one more room, entered through a doorway made by cutting away the top of one of the large, ground floor arches and filling the side areas with dry pressed bricks (Plate 3.9). With its concrete slab extending beyond the rear line of the Mill this room might have been open-sided or, more likely, the footing for its south wall is not visible.

The upper storey of these former buildings or extensions is marked by extensive cement render, doors and holes cut into the Mill wall, and by pitched roof lines (Plate 3.8). There is some evidence that the extensions may have been added at different times on the basis of the irregular roof lines.

Along the east boundary wall and partially over the floor slabs of the former buildings described above, there is an irregular pile of sandstone blocks and other stones, possibly dumped by machine, although the source is unknown.

3.1.3. South Side of Mill.

The south side of the Mill is mostly part of riverside reserve, though it is clear from the alterations to the lower parts of the south wall of the Mill that structures with two levels previously stood here (Plate 3.10). These are marked by white painted cement render, rafter holes, rectangular cuts through the Mill wall, and what appears to be the stub of a concrete slab. On the west corner, dry pressed bricks have been keyed into the Mill wall. This evidence, combined with the render and paint, suggests that they indicate a continuation of the buildings to the south.

The evidence on the ground surface to the south of the Mill is uncertain. Small patches of concrete and sandstone are visible through the grass, and in one instance appear to be part of a slab and footing (Plate 3.11). In other cases so little is visible that it could be simply demolition rubble rather than foundations. That sandstone and brick fragments can be seen along the edge of the drop to the river bank strongly suggests that the area - or part of it - was levelled with demolition debris.

3.1.4. West Side of Mill.

Only the upper half of the west wall of the Mill can be seen and nothing of the area in front, due to a structure built c. 1980, apparently a garage or workshop (Plate 3.12). It was observed above that the dry pressed bricks keyed into the Mill wall at the south-west corner appear to mark westward continuation of the southern building. This wall may have also served for a structure along the west side, but there is no clear evidence since the majority of the west wall of the Mill is obscured. However, markings along the wall may be seen just above the roofline of the 1980s building and indicate the former presence of buildings attached to the west wall of the Mill (Plate 3.13).

There are several courses of weathered and stained blocks of sandstone below the roof of the Mill on this side. Beneath these blocks are courses of clean stone. Parts of about two thirds of this lower section bear white paint that ends in a vertical line towards the north end and just short of the south end. Similar to the front wall, there has also been replacement of blocks in four areas. That at the north end indicates a doorway-sized cut, the central one much larger, and two below the upper line of window arches at the south end are smaller. With such large openings and evidence for internal painting there can be no doubt that at some stage a structure almost as high as the Mill stood attached on the west side.

Any archaeological remains further west are hidden from view by the car park and westward extension of the road running along the front of the Mill. On the north the car park is bounded by a sandstone retaining wall and wood barrier that continues the function of the dry pressed brick wall along the front of the Mill. On the north-west is a sloping garden area containing a large sandstone block with an oblique face carrying marks of metal attachments (Figure 3.14). Its significance is not known, but it is assumed to be part of the original Mill Complex.

At the south-west corner of the Mill are two concrete lined drainage pits, one large and one small. It is believed that they carried stormwater to the Cooks River.

3.2. The Buildings Sequence.

This section attempts to integrate the available historical data with the results of site survey, in terms of visible remains, alterations to the Mill and potential changes to the site topography.

3.2.1. Phase 1 - Canterbury Estate, 1803 - 1840.

There is no evidence that any structures stood on the site during this period. Howard suggested that Campbell acquired Canterbury Estate for running cattle, though did not say if these were beef cattle or a dairy herd.⁸² Associated infrastructure might consist of no more than a hut and yards, but in the instance of a dairy herd there would also be milking bails and other improvements. The Mill Complex only forms a small part of the Canterbury Estate and there is no indication whether improvements of this sort are on the subject site.

3.2.2. Phase 2 - Sugar Mill, 1840 - 1855.

Additional to the main structure of the Mill, the sugar works was equipped with the large chimney stack above the site of the boiler or engine house, which appears to have been a single storey structure attached to the south wall of the Mill, facing the Cooks River. The historical illustrations of the Mill from this time do not show clearly the side facing the river (Figures 2.6 - 2.7). The engine house was most probably constructed in sandstone and it was likely equipped with deep foundations. Howard asserts that the Mill Extension at the north-east corner was added during this phase, observing that stone detailing at openings and in the pediment of the north facade show evidence of classical influences from the early Victorian period.⁸³ In this case, absence on Fowles' watercolour of 1842-45 and the anonymous view of c. 1844 would indicate construction of the Mill Extension in c. 1845-55.

While certain structural discrepancies in these earliest views may be observed, the most significant difference is in depiction of topography. Fowles clearly shows the front of the building cut into a gentle slope down to the river. The anonymous view

⁸² Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd. *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury : Conservation Management Plan* March, 1995. p. 5.

⁸³ Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd. *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury : Conservation Management Plan* March, 1995. p. 24.

with five and possibly six rows of openings on the north facade makes it a basically level site. Later building up of the north frontage makes little sense, and the historical presence of the natural slope seems confirmed by the later view of 1859 and photograph of c. 1886 (Figures 2.8 and 2.12). The latter also shows what appears to be natural bedrock in the left foreground, essentially in the same position as found during the site survey. With the general topography of the area clearly indicating a slope to the river, there is good cause to accept Fowles on this detail. The dry pressed brick retaining walls along the north front of the mill and along the east side of the Mill Extension may well hide original retaining walls or other similar structures.

A stone retaining wall probably existed also along the south area, though the evidence for this is of much later date. In relation to a dispute about buildings on the riverside reservation, Owen Blackett said in 1918 that such a wall was apparently erected about the same time as the Mill. It appears on plans of 1912 and 1915 (Figures 2.17 & 19).

Fowles' view and Armstrong's portion survey of 1841 show no outbuildings (Figure 2.1). Giving the impression that the area north of the Mill was under trees, the anonymous view depicts only a chimneyed structure at some distance north-west. This may be one of the buildings shown on Baker's subdivision plan, also dated to 1841 (Figure 2.2). He also shows two L-shaped buildings immediately north of the Mill. In the same year *The Australian* described the Mill as being 60 feet wide and 100 feet long. It was equipped with an engine house, mill house, boiler house, stove, store rooms, retorts, one large engine for heating and working the above and for driving a mill for grinding animal charcoal. Two smaller engines acted as a crane. Whether any of these functions were housed in the L-shaped buildings is not known, and while there seems no reason to question their existence, there is some doubt about the accuracy of their placement.⁸⁴ Armstrong's subdivision plan of 1843 does not show these buildings and instead places a small structure north-west of the Mill (Figure 2.3). The suggested demolition of the L-shaped structures seems unlikely so soon after commencement of operations, and, as with Baker's plan, it should be

⁸⁴ Based on the 1995 survey plan (Figure 3.1) the actual Mill dimensions are 55 feet wide and 93 feet long. It seems then that the rear section was not included in the newspaper report of 60 x 100 feet, and the only guides to size are the early views which suggest it was approximately half the length of the Mill or a bit less. The entire structure might then be seen as around 135 feet long, giving an approximate length to width ratio of 2.5. Baker's plan shows a ratio of 3.3, and the size and position of the L-shaped buildings would vary according to whether the width or length was used for scale. In this regard it should be noted that his map was for a subdivision, and while it is the most comprehensive in showing structures in the area, accuracy may not have been the prime objective.

observed that this was a subdivision map and not necessarily an accurate survey of the neighbouring Mill.⁸⁵

With discrepancies and questions of accuracy about the early views and plans for this initial structural phase, it is possible that there were unknown buildings near to the Mill and within the study area.

3.2.3. Phase 3 - Disuse, 1855 - 1884.

The only source for this phase is the Lloyd watercolour of c. 1859 (Figure 2.8). It is extremely unlikely that any new buildings were erected in this time, and those shown in Lloyd's view should belong to the preceding phase. He shows two buildings to the north of the mill, which may in fact be the earlier L-shaped buildings, recorded by Baker.

Lloyd also seems to show an additional, smaller chimney stack near the River. It might belong to a closer building hidden by a stand of trees, or perhaps indicate a later Phase 2 addition at the rear of the Mill.

3.2.4. Phase 4 - Blacket & Company, 1884 - 1900.

In the photograph of c. 1886, the Mill appears to be in a derelict state (Figure 2.12). There are holes in the roof, vegetation growing out of the guttering and the engine house appears to be ruinous. It looks as if the machinery has been sold for scrap value or for reuse and the shell of the building left in disrepair.

The dating of this photograph does not equate with other historical documentation, which reveals that Blacket & Company installed new and modern equipment probably in 1884. The derelict state of the Mill in Figure 2.12 may therefore relate to the period just prior to acquisition by Blacket & Company.

The modernisation of the former sugar mill is shown in views from 1884 onwards. The small sketches of the Mill on the subdivision plans of 1884 suggest a lower chimney stack was situated on the east side, a situation confirmed by an anonymous

⁸⁵ Showing the Mill much too close to George Street suggests the intention was more one of general relationship to the new lots. It also shows the Mill with a length to width ratio of 2.0. On his earlier 1841 plan it is 2.7.

view, probably of the 1880s (Figures 2.9 to 2.11). It shows an addition with stack on the east wall of the Mill, south of the Mill Extension, and another building attached at the south-east corner of the Mill.⁸⁶ A smaller chimney stack stands south of this - perhaps that shown by Lloyd c. 1859 - but its relationship to the old structure(s) on the south side of the Mill is unclear. The view also shows a building with pitched or gabled roof set on the river bank near the Mill.

By 1895 several major changes and additions appear to have been made. A large building with pitched or gabled roof may have been added to the south end of the Mill, as shown in Lockley's watercolour of c. 1898 and a photographic view of c. 1895 (Figures 2.13 and 2.25). Lockley seems to also show two additional stacks set amid dark rectangular shapes, the general impression being a complex of structures around the south end of the Mill. The chimney stack and extension shown in earlier views of the east wall of the Mill have been demolished.

In the photograph of c. 1895, a structure with a gable roof stands to the south of the Mill and aligns with the west wall of the Mill (Figure 2.25). Between it and the Mill there is a further roof line. This evidence indicates the demolition or alteration of the earlier structures to the south of the Mill. The view also shows a low structure attached along the west side of the Mill, and a cut into the slope appears to have been made around it. This low building and the cut around it will have destroyed any archaeological remains of previous buildings in this location. The verandah attached to the front of the Mill Extension could account for the damage observed during the site survey. No structures appear along the north side, although a boundary wall is probably indicated by the parallel lines across the foreground of the photograph (Figure 2.25).

The evidence of the c. 1895 photograph and c. 1898 watercolour indicate the rejuvenation of the former sugar mill for new industrial purposes, either by Blacket & Company or a later occupant.

3.2.5. Phase 5 - Denham Bros 1900 - 1908.

Later Phase 4 adaptation for use as a butter factory may have partially facilitated occupation by Denham Bros. 'Canterbury Bacon Factory' or 'Refrigeration Works'..

⁸⁶ It is not known if installation of these structures involved further cutting of the slope along the east side, or whether cutting for Structure 1 had removed and levelled along the east side of the Mill.

Presumably further adaptation was required, but whether they demolished older buildings and erected new ones (e.g., a pig yard?) is not known. The Mill chimney was demolished at this time.

3.2.6. Phase 6 - J.C. Hutton & Company. 1908 - 1983.

A photograph of 1911 and a Water Board plan, updated in 1912 show a proliferation of buildings across the site (Figures 2.16 and 2.17). Some may be Denham Bros. construction, but most are probably associated with Hutton & Company.

An engine room had been built in the north-east corner of the site, and the Mill Extension was enlarged on both the east and south sides. A hanging room and stage were located along the east wall of the mill, and at the rear two stacks appear to abut the south wall. The low structure along the west wall of the Mill as shown in Figure 2.25 was retained, and across the west area were numerous buildings. The older gabled structure at the rear of the mill had been demolished by 1912, with a new complex of rooms built slightly to the west.⁸⁷ The 1912 plan also shows that the retaining wall at the north front of the Mill originally turned south and met the brick building attached to the west wall.

The next plans in the sequence relate to the dispute between the Government and Hutton's over encroachment upon the riverside reservation. That of 1913 does not show the northern area, and two inaccuracies can be seen (Figure 2.18). The west wall of the Mill Extension does not align with the east wall of the Mill, and the building south-west of the Mill is shown as a small rectangle. As shown on the 1912 plan, this was still in place in 1915 (Figure 2.19). Nevertheless, the plans of 1913 and 1915 accord in showing an L-shaped building attached across the south end and extending east, with various small attachments. South of this the 1913 plan shows a small structure, also shown in 1915 as a smithy with shed nearby. The latter plan also shows the stone wall still remaining. Along the east side, the 1913 plan indicates that some of the structure attached to the east side of the Mill had been removed, but at least two of the buildings on the western side of the works still existed, and so also the Pig Yard.

⁸⁷ Somewhere in the north centre of this complex would be where the two drains were observed in the site survey. There may be a relationship.

Along the west wall of the Mill, a structure longer than the Mill had been erected, apparently relacing the earlier low structure along this side. It is the building shown in a press snap of 1924 (Figure 2.20). The north end aligned with the Mill facade, meaning that the part of the retaining wall running south in 1912 (Figure 2.17) had been removed and the adjacent area cut away to accommodate this structure. An undated photograph shows the complex from the east (Figure 2.21).

The 1956 survey shows the Mill Extension had been entirely enclosed on the east and south sides, and except for a small opening at the south-east corner the Mill had attached structures all along the east, south and west sides (Figure. 2.22). The smithy and shed were gone and a new building erected slightly west. The nearby stone wall is not recorded but a paling fence seems to follow the same line. Older structures in the south-west area had been replaced by a garage, toilet and fibro building of unspecified function. Further west was another new structure, and towards the north-west a large coolroom had been built.

When damage to the central part of the north facade of the Mill occurred is not known, though it post dated 1924, since the photograph of that year (Figure 2.20) shows nothing there. An undated photograph shows some sort of chute structure punched through the upper central windows area and attached to the wall (Figure 2.26).

The sequence of plans and views shows that Phase 6 saw a continuous programme of demolition, construction and alteration. Without very detailed analysis, the various remains observed during the site survey cannot be definitively tied to the structures seen on the various plans. It is certain, however, that while some might date back to Blacket and Company at the end of the 19th century, the great majority of alterations recorded during the site survey belong to the period from 1908 to 1983.

The construction of the car park and brick building, attached to the west side of the Mill, will have destroyed remains of earlier development.

According to Howard, factory demolition proceeded in the late 1970s and early 1980s, after Hutton constructed a new plant at Canterbury.⁸⁸ The Mill became the staff canteen and medical centre. Around 1980 the large structure along the west wall

⁸⁸ Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd. *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury : Conservation Management Plan* March, 1995. p. 11.

was replaced by the building presently occupying this position. Any structures west of this presumably were also demolished to facilitate construction of the car park.

3.2.7. Phase 7 - Nick Scali. 1983 to date.

Further demolitions took place after purchase in 1983. Views taken in October of that year show that all the structures along the east side had been removed, and it is likely that all those along the south to south-west areas were likewise demolished by this time (Figures 2.23 and 2.24). They also show the engine house, other structures along the north-side and the caretaker's cottage(?) extant. By 1995, a survey plan shows only that the engine room and a brick office remained (Figure 3.1). When the engine room was demolished is not known, but it is certain that the structural remains observed in this area belong to it. The brick office was demolished just prior to the site survey, though how the concrete blocks across the rear of this area relate is not clear.

3.3. The Proposed Development.

In addition to conversion of the Mill and the Mill Extension to residential purposes, the development includes construction of two apartment buildings of two, three and four storeys with underground car parking (Figure 3.2). Building 2 runs north-east to south-west across the western area, and Building 3 runs east-west across the north area. They are to be joined on the west by an aboveground walkway and underground driveway. On the north side of Building 3, there will be a new retaining wall.

A utility room adjacent to security gates is proposed in the north-east corner, with a road sloping west to enter the underground parking of Building 3. Car park spaces are also to be installed on the north side of this road. Between the road and the Mill area are paths with landscaping. Around the Mill the old retaining wall is to be removed and a new wall installed several metres north. The retaining wall along the east side of the Mill Extension is also to be removed to allow for a patio area with new retaining walls. Two patio areas are also to be installed along the east wall and in the north-west corner. Along the east side of Building 2 five sets of stairways extend outwards giving access up to the apartments and down to the underground Carapook.

3.4. Disturbance.

With few exceptions the proposed development involves major excavation and removal of surface soils, especially in those areas of underground car parking. While some of the projected depths are fairly precise - the 1995 survey and the development plans showing RL levels in the same place - others are approximate based on survey values nearby.

Disturbance caused by new service trenches has not been assessed, since plans have not been made available at this stage.

3.4.1. North Side of Mill.

The development will lower the existing levels for the entrance road, associated car parking, the Utility Building, basement car parking in Building 3 and also for the construction of a new retaining wall on the north front of the Mill. Depths of disturbance will vary.

3.4.2. East Side of Mill.

The construction of a new retaining wall to the Mill Extension and new lower paving levels to the east of the Mill will result in the general lowering of levels in most of the area. Depths of disturbance will vary.

3.4.3. South Side of Mill.

Since the riverside reservation boundary passes very close to the Mill on the south side of the property, no excavations appears to be planned for this area.

3.4.4. West Side of Mill.

Levels on the west side of the Mill will be lowered near the Mill at its north-west corner, and also for the basement car parking in Building 2. Depths of disturbance will vary.

3.4.5. Mill Building.

The ground floor of the Mill will be lowered by the proposed development to approximately 5.3 metres AHD. Existing levels appear to be about 6 m AHD.

4. CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE.

4.1. Cultural significance.

The importance of the subject site will be assessed in general terms according to its cultural significance. The criteria for assessment have been standardised by the Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning in the *NSW Heritage Manual*.⁸⁹ They are summarised below:

Nature of significance.

Historical significance (evolution and association). An item having this value is significant because of the importance of its association with, or position in the evolving pattern of our cultural history.

Aesthetic significance (scenic / architectural qualities / creative accomplishment). An item having this value is significant because it demonstrates positive visual or sensory appeal, landmark qualities and/or creative or technical excellence.

Technical / research significance (archaeological, industrial, educational, research potential and aesthetic significance values). Items having this value are significant because of their contribution or positive contribution to an understanding of our cultural history or environment.

Social significance (contemporary community esteem). Items having this value are significant through their social, spiritual or cultural association with a recognisable community.

Degree of significance.

Representativeness. Items having this value are significant because they are fine representative examples of an important class of significant items or environments.

⁸⁹ Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. *NSW Heritage Manual*.

Rarity. An item having this value is significant because it represents a rare, endangered or unusual aspect of our history or cultural environment.

Level of significance.

Local. Comprises items significant in a local historical or geographical context or to an identifiable contemporary local community.

Regional. Comprises items significant in a regional historical or geographical context or to an identifiable contemporary regional community.

State. Comprises items significant in a state-wide historical or geographical context or to an identifiable contemporary state-wide community.⁹⁰

4.2. Technical / research significance and archaeological significance.

The term 'archaeological significance' may be defined as the extent to which a site may contribute knowledge, not available from other sources, to current themes in historical archaeology and related disciplines.⁹¹

In the assessment of archaeological significance, several factors or criteria have to be taken into account. Questions include:

1. Does the site contribute knowledge not available from other sources? In this respect, the preservation of the site, the availability of comparative sites, and the extent of historical documentation should be considered.

⁹⁰ The above assessment criteria were extracted verbatim from Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. *Heritage Assessments*. pp. 4-7.

⁹¹ This definition is based upon the following references; A. Bickford, & S. Sullivan, 'Assessing the research significance of historic sites', in S. Sullivan, & S. Bowdler, *Site survey and significance assessment in Australian archaeology*, Dept. of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, ANU, Canberra, 1984, pp. 19-26.; S. Sullivan, & S. Bowdler, *Site survey and significance assessment in Australian archaeology*, Dept. of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, ANU, Canberra, 1984, *passim*.

2. Does this knowledge contribute meaningfully to current research themes in historical archaeology and related disciplines? The level of this contribution may be assessed on the same basis as other aspects of cultural significance, for example, locality, region or state.

It is clear that the determination of archaeological significance is closely related and, in fact, dependent upon the development of current research themes in historical archaeology. Research themes will be discussed in this study, thereby giving the historical archaeologist a framework or starting point from which future research and site assessment may proceed.

4.3. Social significance and educational or public significance.

It is also necessary to clarify the significance of a site in terms of its ability to 'demonstrate a way of life, taste, custom, process or function of particular interest.'⁹² This factor was given greater emphasis by J. S. Kerr in the assessment of cultural significance in the second edition of his book, entitled *The Conservation Plan*.⁹³ This may be described as its educational or 'public significance', and may be recognised as social significance under the current guidelines.⁹⁴

The cultural landscape, the patchwork of human development, possesses this social significance, because of its educational value. The evidence provided by the physical remains complements historical documentation, but is often the only means whereby the ordinary member of the public may appreciate his or her surroundings.

Where an artifact, an archaeological feature or site only survives underground, it takes archaeological excavation to reveal its social or educational importance, as well as recover its archaeological significance. Providing the relics or sites are conserved in some way, then the social significance of the archaeological remains is recognised or is able to be recovered at some future date.

⁹² J. S. Kerr, *The Conservation Plan. A guide to the preparation of conservation plans for places of European cultural significance*, first edition, National Trust of Australia (N.S.W. Branch), Sydney, 1982, p. 4.

⁹³ J. S. Kerr, *The Conservation Plan. A guide to the preparation of conservation plans for places of European cultural significance*, second edition, National Trust of Australia (N.S.W. Branch), Sydney, 1985.

⁹⁴ M. Pearson, 'Assessing the significance of historical archaeological resources', in S. Sullivan, & S. Bowdler, *Site survey and significance assessment in Australian archaeology*, Dept. of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, ANU, Canberra, 1984, p. 32.

4.4. The significance of the cultural landscape.

Human settlement imposes on the landscape a distinctive pattern or patchwork of houses and other buildings, streets and roads, parks and reserves, communications and industry. This physical evidence enables an understanding of the landscape in terms of land use, sequence and nature of settlement and occupation. It complements the information that is available from historical research.

Thus all items in an inventory of sites possess **historical significance** as defined under current guidelines, although each will contribute in varying degree. The minimum degree of historical importance will be representative and the minimum level will be local. This means that at least an item will be important to the locality in terms of being representative of the nature of settlement. In many cases items may demonstrate a former use or continuity of use, thereby becoming important items in the historical landscape.

In as much as each item in an inventory contributes to an understanding of the human occupation and evolution of the rural or urban landscape, so too will it possess an educational role for the wider community. This is defined as **social significance** under current guidelines. Social significance may also extend to other values held by the community and placed upon the landscape or items within it, be they social, cultural, religious, spiritual, aesthetic or educational values.

4.5. The heritage significance of the subject site.

The former Australian Sugar Company Mill or Sugar House is significant because:

1. It is associated with the early historical development of the sugar industry in New South Wales.
2. It has strong associations with CSR, a company which has played a major historical role in the development of the sugar industry in Australia.
3. It is probably the earliest surviving structure associated with the sugar industry in New South Wales.
4. It is one of the earliest surviving industrial buildings in the Sydney Region, retaining much of its external form.

5. It is associated with a prominent and long standing Australian industry, J.C. Hutton & Company, ham and bacon curers.
6. It was a prominent local landmark in the 19th century development of the Canterbury area. Significant views of the Mill were available from near Canterbury Road, and in general from the river banks, both up and down stream of the Mill (see historical illustrations, Figures 2.8, 2.11, 2.14 and 2.21).
7. It has a strong geographical relationship with the Cooks River. The Mill was located on the banks of the Cooks River in order to facilitate access by shipping.
8. It has a strong geographical relationship with the site of the former dam on the Cooks River. The dam was constructed on the River, in order to supply fresh water to the mill.
9. It retains archaeological evidence of industrial development from the 1840s onwards, first of sugar processing, engineering, butter manufacturing, and finally bacon and meat curing. It may retain evidence of technological development, working and living conditions for staff and employees.
10. It has the potential to provide an educational resource for the industrial development of the site, the sugar and meat processing industries and the historical development of the neighbourhood of Canterbury.

5. CONSERVATION GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

5.1. Principal issues relating to the redevelopment of the subject site.

The following issues are relevant to the current proposal to redevelop the subject site.

1. Heritage legislation and other external factors.
2. The condition of the archaeological remains.
3. The nature of the proposed redevelopment.
4. The requirements for the conservation of the archaeological site.

These issues are considered separately below.

1.1.1. The Relics Provisions of the NSW *Heritage Act*.

The *Heritage Act* contains various legal measures to protect historical archaeological resources.

Where historical research has revealed the location of historical settlement, experience has shown that the discovery of relics is highly likely once the soil is disturbed. When relics are revealed the Heritage Council must be notified. This may involve delay until appropriate arrangements can be made to record the archaeological remains. As a result, developers and others are normally advised that excavation permits must be obtained prior to undertaking works, which involve excavation or the disturbance of historical sites. In this way most delays can be avoided.

The NSW *Heritage Act* defines a 'relic' as:

any deposit, object or material evidence -

(a). which relates to the settlement of the area that comprises New South Wales, not being aboriginal settlement; and

(b) which is 50 or more years old

Section 139 of the *Heritage Act* provides that:

(1). A person must not disturb or excavate any land knowing or having reasonable cause to suspect that the disturbance or excavation will or is likely to result in a relic being discovered, exposed, moved, damaged

or destroyed unless the disturbance or excavation is carried out in accordance with an excavation permit.

(2). A person must not disturb or excavate any land on which the person has discovered or exposed a relic except in accordance with an excavation permit.

If a site is the subject of an order under Section 130, an Interim Heritage Order, or is listed on the State Heritage Register, approval for an excavation permit is required under Section 60 of the *Heritage Act*.

If a site is not the subject of an order under the *Heritage Act* and is not listed on the State heritage Register, an excavation permit is required, in accordance with Section 140.

Section 146 of the *Heritage Act* requires that the accidental discovery of relics should be reported to the Heritage Council of NSW.

A person who is aware or believes that he or she has discovered or located a relic (in any circumstances, and whether or not the person has been issued with an excavation permit) must:

(a). within a reasonable time after he or she first becomes aware or believes that he or she has discovered or located that relic, notify the Heritage Council of the location of the relic, unless he or she believes on reasonable grounds that the Heritage Council is aware of the location of the relic, and

(b). within the period required by the Heritage Council, furnish the Heritage Council with such information concerning the relic as the Heritage Council may reasonably require.

When an item of heritage significance comes under the ownership or control of a public authority, the authority is required to record it in a Heritage and Conservation Register, under section 170 of the *Heritage Act*. The purpose of the provision is to alert the authority whenever works are proposed, which might affect the item.

Apart from the *Heritage Act*, the requirements of all other legislation is outside the scope of this report.

5.1.2. The condition of the archaeological remains.

The condition of the archaeological remains is described in Chapter 3.

5.1.3. Proposed redevelopment.

The proposed development is described in Chapter 3.

5.1.4. The requirements for the conservation of the archaeological sites.

The proposed development will generally impact on the existing ground levels and will lower these levels in most areas, including the ground floor of the Mill itself. Because of the complexity of the industrial development of the site, there is thus a general requirement for archaeological investigation prior to development over the whole of the proposed development site, including the mill itself.

The excavation of test-trenches as an initial archaeological programme is made redundant by the scale of the disturbance to the site by the proposed development. In order to effectively and rapidly establish the surviving archaeological resource, the external areas of the site should be opened up by mechanical excavator under archaeological supervision, in a manner similar to the process adopted for an area excavation. The archaeologist should manually excavate significant archaeological remains.

A similar process should be adopted for the interior spaces of the Mill itself. The inside of the Mill has not been inspected as part of this archaeological assessment, so that recommendations for this area may need to be updated. It is possible that the floor of the Mill is significant fabric.

The extent of archaeological investigation could be lessened if the proposed development was altered in order to minimise excavation into the ground by basement car parking and landscaping.

It is likely that significant fabric or relics of the Mill will be located beneath the Mill floor itself. It is also possible that significant fabric or relics may be located around the perimeter of the Mill, although the car park on the west side of the Mill may already have removed most significant archaeological evidence in this area.. Some of

these remains may require conservation in situ. Conservation of all significant fabric is a policy of the Conservation Plan prepared for the site.⁹⁵

The archaeological investigation should therefore precede development, so that any design changes required by conservation of significant fabric or archaeological remains may be integrated into the proposed development.

The Mill Complex should be subject to archival recording prior to and during development, so that a permanent record of all significant fabric may be kept.

View corridors across the Cooks River, as well as up and down the River should be maintained, enhanced or opened up, in order to restore the landmark significance of the site.

The proposed development should take advantage of the opportunity to interpret and display the significant fabric and archaeological remains of the site. Interpretation and display should provide a resource that is accessible to the general public, not only the residents of the Mill Complex. It should be noted that the area between the Mill and the Cooks River is likely to include surviving remains of the original engine house, built in 1839 - 1840, and later developments, right through to the 1980s. This area, which is partly in public ownership, would be an ideal focus for interpretation and display, satisfying the requirement for public access. It could be sympathetically landscaped to enable the archaeological remains to be put on display.

5.2. General recommendations.

The above issues relating to the proposed redevelopment may be resolved by undertaking the following recommendations.

It is recommended that:

1. Prior to the commencement of works, an excavation permit, under the Heritage Act of NSW, should be obtained.

⁹⁵ Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd. *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury : Conservation Management Plan* March, 1995.

The excavation permit may be obtained by a qualified archaeologist on behalf of the client. A permit may take 4-5 weeks to obtain from the Heritage Council of NSW.

Since the site is listed on the State Heritage Register the application should be made under s.60 of the Heritage Act. This will also cover areas outside the boundary of the State Heritage Listing, which are still within the site boundary.

2. The areas to be disturbed by the proposed development should be opened up by mechanical excavator under archaeological supervision, in a manner similar to the process adopted for an area excavation.

The excavator should have a range of buckets, but in particular should be provided with a mud bucket, or similar bucket without teeth, in order to clean down to archaeological layers.

Under supervision by the archaeologist, the machine should clear away deposits down to significant archaeological remains or to natural soils, whichever comes first.

3. The archaeologist should manually excavate significant archaeological remains, if they are to be disturbed by development, or should provide advice on the conservation of the remains, if they are to be left undisturbed or permanently conserved.

4. A process of archaeological investigation, similar to Recommendations 2 and 3 above, should be adopted for the interior spaces of the Mill itself.

The inside of the Mill has not been inspected as part of this archaeological assessment, so that recommendations for this area may need to be updated.

5. The archaeological investigation should precede development, so that any design changes required by in situ conservation of significant fabric or archaeological remains may be integrated into the proposed development.

6. Sufficient time and resources should be made available for the proper excavation and recording of archaeological features, discovered during the archaeological investigation.

7. The standard conditions of the excavation permit require the work to be completed to a high standard. The investigation should include:

1. A detailed record of all features and structures discovered, using plans, photographs and written records.
 2. A catalogue of all the artifacts and other relics recovered, including accurate provenance, description and interpretation.
 3. The stabilisation, cleaning and packaging of all the artifacts, and the placement of the collection in a permanent repository.
 4. The backfilling of the excavation, where appropriate.
 5. The preparation of a final report, including a description and interpretation of the excavation, detailed historical research, the contribution to research themes, and excavation method.
8. The Mill Complex should be subject to archival recording prior to and during development.⁹⁶

The archival recording should be completed in accordance with standard guidelines.⁹⁷

9. View corridors across the Cooks River, as well as up and down the River should be maintained, enhanced or opened up.

10. Significant fabric and archaeological remains of the Mill Complex should be interpreted and placed on display.

11. Particular attention should be given to the area between the Mill and the Cooks River for interpretation and display, since the area is likely to contain a whole range of significant archaeological remains, and will also provide public access to this important resource. The area should be sympathetically landscaped to enable the archaeological remains to be put on display.

⁹⁶ Condition iv of Heritage Council letter, dated 18 February 2000.

⁹⁷ Department of Planning (now DUAP) and the Heritage Council of New South Wales. 1994. *NSW Heritage. How to prepare archival records of heritage items.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Maps - Mitchell Library

Anon, Plan of the Canterbury Estate, M2 811.1829/1842+/1

Armstrong, J, Plan of the Village of Canterbury on Cooks River, M2 811.1829/1843/1

Baker, W, Plan of 95 Allotments at Canterbury adjoining the Australasian Sugar Company's Works, M 2 811.1829/1841/1

Sydney Subdivision Plans

Canterbury

Maps - Sydney Water Plans Room

Detail Series, Canterbury Sheet 23

Maps - DLWC Plans Room

Portion survey, Ph Petersham, 5 Oct 1841, J Armstrong, C.446.690

Plan of Portion 533 Parish of Petersham, 18 July 1956 J K Fallon Ms.7716.2030

Plan of the 100 Feet Reservation in Por 143 R Campbell's 177 ac 1 r Gt, 27 Oct 1913, S R Dobbie, Ms.4294.3000

Plan of 0 ac 1 r 8 1/2 p Being part of the 100 feet reservation in Por 143 R Campbell's 177 ac 1 r, 12 Oct 1916, A J Ryan, Ms.4617.3000

Pictorial Sources - Mitchell Library

Australian Sugar Company's Works, Canterbury, N.S.W., c. 1844, DG SVIA/13

Fowles, Joseph, Sugar Works at Canterbury, Watercolour, c. 1842-5, in Original sketches, f 1. PX*D 123

Lloyd, Henry Grant, Canterbury & Prout's Bridge, in Sketches of N. S. Wales, v. 1 f. 71, 1859, PX 42

Lockley, John G, The Old sugar mill at Canterbury on Cook's River, watercolour c. 1898, SVIA/CANT/2

Small Picture File

Sydney - Suburbs - Canterbury

LAND TITLES OFFICE

Deeds Registers, 1825 onwards

Grants Registers, 1792 onwards

Plans, Plans Room

Manuscript Sources - State Records of NSW

Colonial Architect, Canterbury Sugar Mill, 2/640A

Lands, Special Bundles,

Ten 1957/3148, J C Hutton's lease of 100 ft reservation, 3/8194

Lease Branch, Special Lease Cards, 9/1830 (none re Hutton's lease)

Supreme Court, Insolvency Files,

Blacket, Owen, and others, 16 Nov 1886, No 21384 2/10291

Newspapers

Australian, 1841-5

Echo, 2 Oct 1890

Sydney Morning Herald, 1842-5, 1924

Primary Sources - Printed Books and Articles

'The J C Hutton Proprietary Pine-apple Hams and Bacons', *Lone Hand*, 1 Aug 1911, pp. 386-9

Sands, John, *Directories*, 1880-1910

Secondary Sources - Printed Books and Articles

Jervis, James, *A history of the Municipality of Canterbury*, n. p. 1951

Larcombe, F A, *Challenge and Change: a history of the Municipality of Canterbury*, Canterbury Municipal Council, Canterbury 1979

Linge, G J R, *Industrial Awakening: A Geography of Australian Manufacturing 1788 to 1890*, Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1979

Madden, Brian & Lesley Muir, *Canterbury Farm: 200 Years*, Canterbury & District Historical Society, Canterbury 1993.

Lowndes, A G (ed), *South Pacific Enterprise: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company Limited*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1956

Unpublished Reports and Theses

Muir, Lesley, *A Wild and Godless Place: Canterbury, 1788-1895*, M A thesis, University of Sydney, 1984

Rod Howard Heritage Conservation Pty Ltd, *Former A.S.C. Sugar Mill, Church Street, Canterbury, Conservation Management Plan*, March 1995