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FIRST GOVERNMENT HOUSE PROJECT

SUMMARY OF REPORT

Introduction

1. Accepted conservation practice, and ICOMOS principles, dictate that the proper treatment of a site depends on its cultural significance.

2. First Government House is of great cultural significance because of its associations and the actual evidence it provides for a most important part of Australia's past.

3. The fact of this significance, and its character, described in this Report, dictates the proper treatment of the site.

Footings and Other Structures Found to Date

1. An attached plan details footings and other features located to date. In brief these are:
   - footings of the western and southern wall of Governor Phillip's house, 1788
   - 1788 footings and drains of the kitchen wing
   - remains of the office of Australia's first printing press, 1795
   - Governor Macquarie's 1811 alterations
   - Governor Darling's 1827 alterations
   - later buildings, including the "Tin Shed"

Investigations Not Completed by 7th November

1. Known structures partially excavated will require further work so that their function, meaning, and significance can be explicated. The actual extent of this further excavation is difficult to predict because of the complexity of the site, and doubts about its future.

2. A sampling strategy will be necessary for the remaining 50% of the site not yet excavated, to determine the existence of structures not shown on the 1845 plan.

3. The area behind the Young and Phillip Street terraces also needs investigation but this has a relatively low priority.

4. All this work is necessary to determine the extent and significance of remains within the development site.
Estimates of Time Required to Complete the Excavation

1. A substantial portion of FGH lies outside the development site in Bridge and Phillip Streets and Raphael Place. A sampling strategy in these streets is essential to determine the extent of the surviving remains, and the significance of the whole complex.

2. In general terms a ratio of 1:4 or 1:5 digging to research and analysis time is normal archaeological practice, and is necessary to achieve the aims of the project - understanding and interpretation of the site and the way of life of its inhabitants. By employing a number of the current team in the research and analysis periods this ratio may be able to be reduced by more than half. Archaeological work requires careful staging with some breaks to allow for research, for necessary leave, and for organization of the various stages of the work.

3. The season of excavation already undertaken, a 20 week season, will require a minimum of six to eight months ancillary research and analysis time for several people.

4. One more season of at least 12 weeks plus contingency time is needed, to complete the present work and establish the extent and significance of remains in the development site.

   The degree of extra work depends to some extent on the proposed future of the site.

   If excavation of the entire site is needed, a further six months excavation time, and from six to twelve months analysis time will be needed.

5. The FGH remains outside the development site will be the subject of a firm estimate giving various options, after the preparation of a sampling strategy. Final decisions on the necessity for, and extent of, excavation in this area must await the results of sampling, and other decisions on the future of the site.
Options Available to the Government

1. The full significance of the site cannot be elucidated without the further excavation and analysis outlined in this Report.

   Already it is clear that the site is of the greatest heritage significance to the people of Australia.

   The Government must either accept this decision and halt development plans now, or if it considers that more work is required to elucidate the significance further, it must avoid making any commitment to future development of the site until the archaeological and other research is completed and a full assessment is available.

   It is not acceptable conservation practice to carry out salvage work, or to make other irreversible decisions before the preparation and acceptance of a statement of significance.

2. Because of the significance of the remains, their extent, and their unique value, it appears that the Government has no option but to take whatever steps are necessary to preserve the site, and to retain its cultural significance.

3. This Report does not canvass the various development options, but attempts to lay down the basic requirements whereby the retention of cultural significance can be achieved:

   (i) The remains are of undoubted significance. But elucidation of this significance and the preparation of a final statement of significance will require considerably more excavation and detailed analysis and research.

   (ii) All significant remains must be permanently preserved, in situ, except where it is necessary to remove them for conservation, or to reveal further significant areas.

   (iii) The remains must be stabilised, and their long term conservation ensured. Activity in their vicinity which will jeopardize the stability of the remains is unacceptable.

   (iv) The significance of the area must not be jeopardized by unacceptable modern intrusions, or by the proximity of new structures, which may overwhelm the site, and hence reduce or damage its significance.

   (v) The area must be suitably interpreted to the public as an historic site, in a manner compatible with the statement of significance. This would involve an on-site museum and permanent staff.
INTRODUCTION

1.1 The First Government House (FGH) within the development site, on the corner of Bridge and Phillip Streets, Sydney, is being excavated by myself as Excavation Director, with a team of supervisors, specialists, and archaeological excavators, under contract to the Department of Environment and Planning (DEP).

1.2 In this Report the term "development site" refers to that part of the FGH which lies within the development area as outlined in the current contract between myself and the DEP of 30 May 1983. (see Plan 1).

The FGH building and its associated kitchen wing* covered parts of what is now Bridge and Phillip Streets (see Plan 2 - overlay of FGH on the site and surrounding streets). The term "site" refers to the site of the FGH as a whole, i.e. that within the development site, and those parts now lying under Bridge and Phillip Streets.

1.3 The contract for this season commenced on 30 May 1983, and it expires on 7 November 1983.

1.4 On 29 September 1983 the Secretary of the Premier's Department wrote to Mr. R.B. Smyth, Director, DEP, concerning the Government's need to examine the options available to it if the archaeological investigation is not finished by the end of the contract date.

In part the letter stated:

"I should be grateful if you would let me have a report giving details of:-
(i) the footings found;
(ii) investigations which will not be completed by the 7th November;
(iii) estimates of time required to complete the excavation;
(iv) options available to the Government (with estimates of cost)."

1.5 This Report will address these four questions based on the excavation up to the date Sunday 2 October 1983, with the provisos that in:

(i) other structures besides footings will be described
(ii) the estimates of cost will be set aside for the DEP to assess.
(iii) comment concerning development and conservation options for the site will also be provided by the DEP.

* The kitchen wing includes the service quarters and is an integral part of the occupation and use of the house.
2. THE SITE AND THE REMAINS

2.1 All decisions about places of cultural significance spring from two basic questions:
What is the significance of the place?
What action is necessary to conserve that significance?

All the questions raised at this time about the FGH relate to these two questions.

The details of the assessment of the significance of the FGH on the development site will not be provided in this Report, but be addressed in my Report as required by my contract, to the DEP on the completion of the contract on 7 November 1983.

2.2 The four questions presented here by the Premier's Department are all concerned with the issue of significance and conservation in its widest sense.

2.3 Therefore, before addressing these questions it is necessary to include a brief discussion of the cultural significance of the site (and the development site in particular), and also of the appropriate standards for conservation action.

2.4 The cultural significance of the site was discussed in Helen Proudfoot's Report for the Premier's Department and the DEP - "The First Government House Sydney and the Subsequent History of the Site After 1845, March 1983."

The excavation supports this statement of significance, and provides further tangible evidence of the FGH and the life of its inhabitants.

From this investigation it is now possible to confirm that the development site is of cultural significance not only because of its associations with the past but also because of its evidence of the past.

Undoubtedly, the whole development site is of cultural significance for what it tells us about the early life of the colony.

2.5 In respect of the appropriate action to retain and conserve cultural significance, the accepted standard for conservation practice is the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter. (see Appendix A).

2.6 In accordance with proper conservation practice, questions and decisions regarding the policy or action with regard to a place should only be made following the assessment of cultural significance. This Report departs from this practice only because of the request from the Premier's Department. Decisions about the conservation of the site should be made in full knowledge and consideration of its cultural significance, not only its archaeological significance. See Articles 6, 23, and 25 of the Burra Charter.
2.7 The statement of cultural significance prepared by Helen Proudfoot in:

The First Government House Sydney and the Subsequent History Of the Site After 1845


I have formulated below a Statement of Significance, following the practice adopted by Australia ICOMOS.

Statement of Significance

The site of the First Government House in New South Wales is of prime significance in the history of the Australian nation. The house was significant in the following ways:

(a) It was the Hub of the colony for 56 years, the focus of the town of Sydney, and its administrative and social centre.

(b) As one of the first group of permanent buildings erected on this continent, the First Government House has been called "the tap root of Australian architecture". It was the symbol of order and security in the antipodes.

(c) The house had a most significant location, on a spot, chosen by Governor Phillip obviously with tremendous discretion, which graduated from being the Hub of the colony to being the Hub of a great city and the centre of the State of New South Wales.

(d) The foundations of the building, now re-discovered after being virtually lost for 137 years, are our most tangible link with the foundation of white settlement on this continent, and as such are of the greatest symbolic importance.

Helen Proudfoot
March 1983
3. THE BURRA CHARTER

3.1 The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance was adopted by Australia ICOMOS on 23rd February 1981.

This document has been adopted by the Australian Heritage Commission and all other Australian heritage bodies, in response to Australia's obligations under the "Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage" to which Australia is a signatory.

3.2 Conservation of the Site.
The appropriate conservation process for the site, in terms of the Burra Charter is "preservation".

"Preservation" means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration. (Definitions: Article 1.6).

3.3 Articles 11 and 12 of the Burra Charter, together with the explanatory notes, set out the circumstances where preservation is appropriate, and how the practice of preservation should be applied.

3.4 Article 5, on conservation principles, states the principle that there must not be unwarranted emphasis on any one aspect of cultural significance at the expense of others.

These three articles are directly applicable to the preservation of the FGH site.
PREAMBLE
Having regard to the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1966), and the Resolutions of 5th General Assembly of ICOMOS (Moscow 1978), the following Charter has been adopted by Australia ICOMOS.

DEFINITIONS
1.6 *Preservation* means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES

ARTICLE 5. Conservation of a place should take into consideration all aspects of its cultural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one at the expense of others.

CONSERVATION PROCESSES

Preservation

ARTICLE 11. *Preservation* is appropriate where the existing state of the fabric itself constitutes evidence of specific cultural significance, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.

ARTICLE 12. *Preservation* is limited to the protection, maintenance and where necessary, the stabilisation of the existing fabric but without the distortion of its cultural significance.

Explanatory Notes
These notes do not form part of the Charter and may be added to by Australian ICOMOS.

ARTICLE 11
Preservation protects fabric without obscuring the evidence of its construction and use. The process should always be applied:
where the evidence of the fabric is of such significance that it must not be altered. This is an unusual case and likely to be appropriate for archaeological remains of national importance
where insufficient investigation has been carried out to permit conservation policy decisions to be taken in accord with Articles 23 to 25.
New construction may be carried out in association with preservation when its purpose is the physical protection of the fabric and when it is consistent with Article 8.

ARTICLE 12
Stabilization is a process which helps keep fabric intact and in a fixed position. When carried out as a part of preservation work it does not introduce new materials into the fabric. However, when necessary for the survival of the fabric, stabilization may be effected as part of a reconstruction process and new materials introduced. For example, grouting or the insertion of a reinforcing rod in a masonry wall.
4. QUESTION (i) THE FOOTINGS AND OTHER STRUCTURES FOUND

(see Plan 3. Colour coded and annotated - archaeological grid reference FGH Project - total area excavated by 2/10/1983)

4.1 Physical evidence of the FGH has been found in all the areas where the house stood that have been excavated so far. This can be seen by reference to Plan 5. Further, more footings of the FGH have been revealed since 2 October 1983, the date of Plan 3. This latest evidence is not shown.

4.2 The Reference Grid System

The site is divided into 2 metre squares. Each square is named by the point at the north-west corner of the square. The first number for the square is the north measurement; the second east, separated by the letter "R" meaning Reference Datum. Therefore the most south-westerly square excavated is called 14R4. Another example: the south-west corner of Governor Phillip's house is in square 38R18.

4.3 The Plan has been colour coded and is self-explanatory.

4.4 1788 footings of the western and southern walls of Governor Phillip's house with its associated drains and clay fill occur in the north-east corner of the development site. 1788 footings and drains of the kitchen wing occur in the north-west segment of the development site, and in the south-west segment in squares 25R6, 28R10, and 24 and 22R10.

4.5 Remains of the office of Australia's first printing press - revealing so far a water trough and drain, whose fill contains type from the press which began operation in 1795, occur in square 20R4.

4.6 In 1811 Governor Macquarie carried out major alterations to the house - demolishing the rear rooms of that part built by Phillip, though leaving the footings in place; adding other rooms, and a 50 foot room with a bay window facing south, behind Governor King's reception room. The construction trench and footings of the south-west corner of the bay window have been revealed in squares 34R36 and 34R38.

4.7 In 1827 Governor Darling built a room about 20 foot by 30 foot to the west of Macquarie's bay window room. The construction trench for the south-east corner of this room appears in squares 27R32 and 30R32. Some of the footings of the south-west corner of the room appear in square 30R24.

4.8 The other major building constructed on the development site was the Public Works Department offices known as the "tin shed." This building was commenced in 1912. The footings and drains of the tin shed appear in various squares on the western half of the site.
4.9 Drains and wall footings of the FGH which cannot be attributed to specific construction periods are colour coded on the Plan. The largest collection of these is in the north-west segment of the site, and the most substantial, of brick with stone capping, appears to have been built before Macquarie's governorship in 1810.

5. **QUESTION (ii) INVESTIGATIONS WHICH WILL NOT BE COMPLETED BY 7TH NOVEMBER**

5.1 In the current contract of 30 May with the DEP the areas behind the Young Street and Phillip Street terraces are included for investigation. In discussion with the DEP it has been agreed that as these areas are of low priority in relation to the FGH they will not need investigation under this contract.

5.2 By consulting Plan 4, Total Area Excavated By 2/10/1983 it can be seen that:
   - bedrock accounts for about 30%
   - squares excavated about 20%
   - squares not yet excavated about 50%

   of the development site.

5.3 It is possible that there may be remains of the FGH behind the Phillip Street and Young Street terraces. In any future contract it is essential that these areas be investigated.

5.4 It is not essential that the whole of the development site be excavated unless the whole of the unexcavated part of the site is to be destroyed in any future development. In an ideal situation permanent reference areas would be left for future research if thought necessary. However, on this site the stratigraphy is so complex, and there are so many intrusions into and additions on to existing structures, it is difficult to assess at the present stage of excavation where permanent reference areas could be left.

   On this site we have revealed 200 years of history - from 1788 to the present.

   In this season we have used the Colonial Architect Mortimer Lewis' 1845 plan of the site to indicate the remains of the FGH. But it should be noted that this plan does not show all the structures that were erected on the site. Mortimer Lewis' 1845 plan shows only what walls were present in 1845.

   Earlier plans, and drawings in the Watling Collection of the FGH to 1794, and other illustrations, indicate further outbuildings to the south of the main house and adjacent to the kitchen wing.

   These areas in the courtyard south of the main house and east of the kitchen wing must be investigated.
In any new contract for unexcavated areas a sampling strategy will have to be devised to reveal yet unknown structures.

5.4 Known structures already partially excavated will have to be more completely excavated so that their function, meaning, and relationship to the rest of the site can be understood. These can be seen on Plan 3 and are:
- the 1788 footings of Phillip's house and the subsequent additions to them by other governors;
- the stormwater, sewage, or waste drains which run beside and behind the building
  - the 1788 footings of the kitchen wing
  - the printing office of 1795
  - the garden wall and brick paving to the northwest of the kitchen wing
- the additions and accretions to the kitchen wing until it took its final form as shown in Lewis' 1845 plan.

6. QUESTION (iii) ESTIMATES OF TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE EXCAVATION

To answer this question a discussion of two relevant issues must first take place:

6.1 The First Government House Site as a Whole

6.11 It has been proven by our overlay of the Lewis Plan on the site as excavated (see Plan 5), and by the finding of the Townsend Plan of 1845 (see Plan 6), that a substantial portion of the FGH lies outside the development site.

The major part of the kitchen wing is in the development area, but the detached privy to the rear lies in the middle of Raphael Place.

The stable block to the rear of FGH was located in the area which is now mainly occupied by the Phillip Street terraces or modern office blocks.

6.12 That part of FGH lying outside the development area must be investigated so that the significance of the FGH site as a whole can be assessed.

6.13 A sampling strategy to execute this work in Bridge and Phillip Street and Raphael Place must be designed to be carried out in the future.
6.2 Correct Archaeological Practice

6.21 Archaeological activity is concerned with finding out about people's behaviour; not with finding things. The objects, their relation to each other, and the strata they lie in are clues to how people lived in the past. Therefore all excavation seasons lead to a corresponding research and analysis period - to make sense of the things found.

6.22 The archaeologist P.J. Fowler, in his book Approaches to Archaeology (A&C Black, 1977), states the issues here in this way:

Most truly archaeological activity i.e. creative research, like other research, can be broken down into phases of preparation, action, analysis, assessment and publication. If one is being systematic, they must take place in this order though of course phases can and do overlap in time e.g. analysis and assessment take place during the action. Converted into terms of excavation, phase 1 covers the identification of the problem, the drawing up of what American archaeologists aptly call a research design i.e. a systematic programme of investigation related to specific goals to be achieved within defined temporal and financial parameters, the raising of financial and other resources including staff, and all sorts of practical matters like access to the site, accommodation and commissariat—military analogies are difficult to avoid but in any case a considerable and time-consuming managerial task has to be successfully accomplished before any productive work begins. Phase 2 is the actual excavation. Phases 3 and 4 should begin during the excavation and will continue afterwards, each overlapping in time with the other. Phase 3 involves sorting out all the finds, samples and records, subjecting them to appropriate verbal, numerical, and scientific analysis—in other words, all the hard, unromantic 'backroom' graft which gives the mass of data 'meaning' (p. 131).

Phase 4 is probably the most difficult to accomplish satisfactorily not least because there is very little in the way of technique to fall back on here and also because, however much corporate endeavour has been involved up to this stage, here the situation sooner or later resolves itself into the silent room containing a lone person, a stack of data, a pen and a pad of blank sheets of paper. Those blank sheets of paper are probably the most fearsome sight in archaeology, so much so that many an archaeologist has not been able to face them. Remorselessly, however, let us move on to phase 5 which, if the previous four have been successfully achieved, should not be quite so difficult, that is preparing the academic report that is to be published and the total excavation product that is to become the permanent archive of the whole exercise. This phase will include the eventual secure deposition of that archive and dealing with the practical matters of publishing which may include popular booklets, exhibitions and T.V. and other audio-visual presentations as well as correcting proofs of the academic report (fig. 6.1).

I have to belabour the fact that, as should be perfectly clear, the act of excavation is but one part of a five-phase process. That in itself is answer to the question 'What do archaeologists do when they are not digging?'—'The other four-fifths of their job'. And in fact a time ratio of about 1:4 or 1:5 seems approximately right, that is from the director's point of view. On average, but perhaps minimally, a month's excavation creates 4-5 months' full-time work for the director and his immediate staff.
another way in percentage terms, the five stages of the excavation process respectively absorb about 10, 15, 30, 25 and 20 per cent of the total effort involved (though the 15% excavation part may well absorb 75% of the costs). For the site-workers, of course, the crew or team members with no academic or technical follow-up responsibilities, these figures do not apply: they can simply move on to the next site, or go back to work from their holiday, perhaps thinking how wonderful archaeology (=excavation) is. Perhaps if people only too eager to start an excavation themselves realised that, if they are to meet their consequential obligations, for every day they spend digging they are committing a week or so of their own time to the resultant work (assuming they have the competence to do it), then they might think twice before voluntarily taking on the responsibility. pp. 155-158.

6.23 Fowler stipulates a ratio of 1:4 or 1:5 digging to research and analysis time, if the follow-up work is done by the director and supervisors only.

If the excavation crew were employed in washing, analysing, and labelling the finds, with the supervisors assisting the director in research and writing, then this ratio could possibly be reduced to 1:1 or 1:2 or 1:3.

6.24 Excavations are conducted in "seasons". In the case of the FGH development site a 12 week season plus a 9 week contingency time might give rise to a further 16 to 25 weeks research, analysis, and report writing period, before returning to the site for a further excavation season.

6.25 During this research/analysis time further research on the history of the occupants and use of the site and the history, dating, and manufacture of the artifacts would take place.

6.26 Specialist advice on specific aspects of the site would be sought, to gain access to the work of researchers who had detailed information on certain aspects of the site - eg. The Sydney Gazette office and methods of printing; the construction of 19th century drains and privys etc.

6.27 Staged work such as this has been developed through time as standard archaeological practice. The breaks between excavation seasons allow the director and specialists to think through what has been done; look at the work from different perspectives, and modify the research design if it is necessary to pursue new goals.

6.28 It is also necessary after each season for the team to have a complete break of two or three weeks before commencing the analysis stage. Running an excavation of this kind takes enormous physical and intellectual resources. At least three professors and heads of archaeology departments who have inspected the site have asked me how can I keep up the pace of this excavation. To regularize the work into excavation and research/analysis seasons will mean that the team can continue to operate in an energetic and efficient manner.
6.3 **Estimates of Time Required to Complete the Excavation**

6.31 This season of excavation from 15 June to 30 October is a 20 week season.

To analyse the material and write up this excavation will take a minimum of six months for several people. The preliminary excavation in February will also have to be analysed at the same time.

6.32 There needs to be at least one more season of about twelve weeks plus contingency time to answer the questions already posed by the excavation of the development site. This does not mean the complete excavation of the development site.

6.33 How detailed the excavation of this area must be depends on the need to use the site for other purposes. If that part of the site not yet excavated is to be destroyed for development then the site will have to be fully explored archaeologically.

If the site is to be left substantially as it is and displayed to the public as a national monument, then the excavation strategy will have to be modified to meet this need.

6.34 As the occupation history of the development site is most complex it is possible to estimate the time required to complete the excavation only in the broadest terms.

6.35 From my understanding of the site from the excavation so far, I would estimate the time it would take to complete the excavation of the development site at a minimum of six to eight months.

6.36 A critical path analysis for excavation has been prepared by a planning engineer to support these estimates, and will be submitted to the DEP and Premier's Department as soon as possible. This analysis estimates with the present crew it will take six months digging, including estimates of time lost through rain, to excavate the whole of the development site not including the bike parking area or the area behind the terraces.

6.37 To complete the analysis and writing up of the excavated material may take a further six to twelve months.

6.38 These estimates would have to be revised every three months in the light of the evidence produced in newly excavated areas of the site whose depth and complexity are not yet known.

6.39 With regard to the FGH site outside the development zone in Bridge and Phillip Streets and Raphael Place, precise estimates of time required to complete the excavation there cannot be made until a sampling strategy is devised for the streets.
6.40 If the sampling suggests that there are substantial remains under the streets, then it will be necessary to investigate various options for closing the streets either fully or partially so that the remains can be excavated.

6.41 In accordance with correct archaeological practice and all conservation action such excavation should be undertaken at the same time and under the same direction as the excavation of the rest of the site.

6.42 If substantial remains of the FGH do occur under the streets then I estimate a time of from 12 to 24 months for the excavation and analysis of the material.

6.43 Estimates of time required for this work can only be general and must be revised every three months in the light of new discoveries.

7. **QUESTION (iv) OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE GOVERNMENT**

7.1 **Options for preservation of the site on a temporary basis**

7.11 The option to leave the site open and uncovered must be rejected because of the damage to the remains in situ, and the sections, from sun, wind, and rain.

7.12 The option to fill in all squares and areas not being currently excavated must be rejected because it is necessary to have such areas available for inspection to compare them with other excavated areas. This is essential for the proper interpretation and understanding of the site as it is being excavated.

7.13 The preferred option chosen - to protect the site from the weather on a short-term basis - is that already applied at present while excavation is taking place. These measures are:

- laying opaque white plastic over the structures on the base of the excavated squares
- covering the trenches with the plastic-covered frames made to protect the excavated areas
- constructing and maintaining site drainage to continue to drain off the site during rain. This drainage requires regular surveillance.

7.14 The remainder of the development site does not need any special protection from the weather.
7.2 Options for preservation of the site on a longer-term basis

7.21 For longer periods, including extended excavation and analysis periods, there are two preferred options, both involving the use of some form of protective structure.

7.22 The construction of any such structure in or near the area of the FGH footings must be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the remains are not damaged in any way by direct contact or by vibration from heavy machinery.

7.23 Having regard to 7.22 above, it would be possible to build a permanent building over the site and then excavate within it. Factors which would need to be taken into account are:

- the need to test the area of the footings for the new building for FGH remains
- a decision to be made about excavation under the streets. Either the streets would have to be tested and excavated first, before the new building was constructed, or it would have to be flexible enough to be able to be added on to if evidence of FGH were found under the streets.

7.24 The second preferred option is to construct a temporary light-weight structure which is capable of being expanded or added to, and dismantled easily.

Such a structure would provide protection for the excavation team and the ground from the heat and drying effects of the sun. Some form of imaginative and very careful design is necessary.

7.25 If the site were to be closed for a term longer than about 12 weeks, the excavated squares would need to be protected by:

- laying opaque white plastic over the base and sides of the squares
- filling the squares in completely with clean washed sand

This would protect the squares for a long period from excessive water damage, and could be dug out to reveal the sections and footings without damaging them.

Estimates for the cost of purchasing this sand and transporting it to the site have already been given by Mr. J. Pridgeon of Aardvark Destructions, who estimated the cost in the order of $6,000.

7.26 I rely for my advice on the protection of the sections and footings from Dr. George Gibbons, New South Wales Institute of Technology, who is a consultant to the Premier's Department on these matters at this time, and Mr. Roy Lawrie, NSW Department of Agriculture, to whom I addressed these questions some months ago. Their written advice to me has been submitted to the Premier's Department and the DEP at one of the Joint Steering Committee Meetings.

This advice has already been applied in relation to the preservation of excavated footings and other structures.
7.3 **Options for the permanent preservation of the site, after the excavation and analysis period**

7.31 Dr. George Gibbons is currently researching the matter of the permanent preservation of the footings and other excavated structures which are to be retained in situ, for the Premier's Department.

7.32 I will address here the more general issues of the permanent preservation of the in situ structures.

7.33 A structure will have to be built over the FGH site to preserve the remains in an environmentally safe situation.

7.34 This structure should be designed with the purpose of conserving, displaying, and interpreting the remains for the public.

7.35 A selection of the artifacts found should also be displayed in this building, which should be devoted to displaying the site and its finds.

7.36 It has been suggested that the best way to preserve the footings and other structures excavated is to bury them once they have been properly recorded.

This is not an acceptable option as the cultural significance of the site demands that the remains be visible to the public. (see Helen Proudfoot's Statement of Significance, part (d), 2.7 p.3).

7.4 **Archaeological options**

7.41 There are three options in terms of archaeological work on the site.

7.42 Option (i) is to stop all work on the site at the completion of the current contract on 7 November.

This is not acceptable as too many questions have been raised which will not be able to be answered by 7 November.

7.43 Option (ii) is to return to the site as soon as possible with a further season of excavation.

This is not acceptable as correct archaeological practice demands that a period of research, analysis, and writing of a report on the work to date be carried out before further excavation takes place.

7.44 Option (iii) is to proceed with the work in a season of excavation followed by analysis and report writing. Several such alternate seasons would be necessary to complete...
work on the site. Thus the present season of excavation should be followed by research and analysis.

This option is preferred as being the most efficient way for archaeological work to proceed. (see 6.2 Correct Archaeological Practice, especially 6.24 to 6.28).

7.5 Heritage conservation options

7.51 There are no options in respect of appropriate conservation policy and action.

The site should be kept free from development, and no works should take place except those necessary for the protection, security, and interpretation of the site.

7.52 Conserving the remains in the appropriate manner is only a matter of money. ie. Is the Government prepared to pay the cost?

7.53 But what is the cost? It the Government needs to consider the development site as an investment, then other alternative investments must be considered, such as demolishing the terrace houses and erecting the new development on their site. The Phillip Street terraces could be demolished, with the development built in their place and over Raphael Place.

So far I have not seen a report on these alternatives, although there has been much discussion about them in the press and by those people interested in the site.

7.54 At the moment it is not possible to say whether or not the retention of the site of the current excavation, not built upon, will forgo profit, ie. cost more than developing the site. Someone might have attempted to estimate this, but such a report is not known to me.

7.55 In considering these matters the benefits of tourism and employment for Sydney and NSW as a whole must be taken into account.

7.56 The question "Options available to the Government" means in essence - How should the excavation proceed now? or What should be done next?

7.57 Essentially, the answer to this question depends upon whether or not the Government wishes to use the site being excavated for development, and when.

7.58 If, for investment purposes, the site needs to be developed in say, two years, then the most appropriate action, having regard to the significance of the site and correct
archaeological practice, is to excavate the whole site, including Bridge and Phillip Streets.

7.59 There is information, understanding, and interpretation of the site which can only be gained by examining and analysing the whole site at the one time.

No matter how detailed the recording, such understanding can only be reached by observing the site and the remains themselves in situ. This is the reason why we keep excavated squares open while the excavation is taking place, and the preliminary analysis and interpretation is being developed.

7.60 The minimum time estimated for the excavation, research, and writing up of the FGH site as a whole would be between two and five years.

7.61 If the development site is not needed for development, then the whole site still needs to be excavated, but not in such haste. However, the preferred option for preservation on a temporary basis will still apply.

7.62 No matter what the Government chooses to do in relation to developing the site of the current excavation, ultimately, more excavation is necessary.

7.63 Therefore it will be necessary to draw up a new contract.

7.64 This contract should:
- engage most of the existing team, both to keep continuity of operations, and as the team has been trained to a useful level of expertise on a site of this nature.

7.65 Any new contract should involve additional expenditure on:
- salaries for the team and the specialist positions created in the course of this dig
- equipment needed during the course of the dig, eg. additional protective frames
- monies for advice from specialist consultants on specific short-term issues

7.66 A research design for the new excavation period should be drawn up addressing these issues:
- the completion of excavation within the development site
- the sampling of the site in Bridge and Phillip Streets and Raphael Place, and the possibility of excavating all these remains of the building in the streets
- research, analysis, and report writing periods for this work.
APPENDIX A

The Burra Charter

BURRA CHARTER

PREAMBLE
Having regard to the International
Charter for the Conservation and
Restoration of Monuments and Sites
(Venice 1966), and the Resolutions of
5th General Assembly of ICOMOS
(Moscow 1978), the following Charter
has been adopted by Australia ICOMOS.

DEFINITIONS
ARTICLE 1. For the purpose of this Charter:

1.1 Place means site, area, building or other
work, group of buildings or other works
together with pertinent contents and
surroundings.

1.2 Cultural significance means aesthetic,
historic, scientific or social value for past,
present or future generations.

1.3 Fabric means all the physical material of
the place.

1.4 Conservation means all the processes of
looking after a place so as to retain its
cultural significance. It includes mainten­
ance and may according to circumstance
includes preservation, restoration, recon­
struction and adaption and will be
commonly a combination of more than
one of these.

1.5 Maintenance means the continuous
protective care of the fabric, contents and
setting of a place, and is to be distinguished
from repair. Repair involves restoration
or reconstruction and it should be treated
accordingly.

1.6 Preservation means maintaining the fabric
of a place in its existing state and retarding
deterioration.

1.7 Restoration means returning the
EXISTING fabric of a place to a known
earlier state by removing accretions or by
reassembling existing components without
the introduction of new material.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.

Explanatory Notes

These notes do not form part of the Charter
and may be added to by Australia ICOMOS.

ARTICLE 1.1
Place includes structures, ruins, archaeological
sites and areas.

ARTICLE 1.5
The distinctions referred to in Article 1.5,
for example in relation to roof gutters, are:
maintenance — regular inspection and
cleaning of gutters
repair involving restoration — returning of
dislodged gutters to their place
repair involving reconstruction — replacing
decayed gutters.
1.8 Reconstruction means returning a place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state and is distinguished by the introduction of materials (new or old) into the fabric. This is not to be confused with either re-creation or conjectural reconstruction which are outside the scope of this Charter.

1.9 Adaptation means modifying a place to suit proposed compatible uses.

1.10 Compatible use means a use which involves no change to the culturally significant fabric, changes which are substantially reversible, or changes which require a minimal impact.

CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES

ARTICLE 2. The aim of conservation is to retain or recover the cultural significance of a place and must include provision for its security, its maintenance and its future.

ARTICLE 3. Conservation is based on a respect for the existing fabric and should involve the least possible physical intervention. It should not distort the evidence provided by the fabric.

ARTICLE 4. Conservation should make use of all the disciplines which can contribute to the study and safeguarding of a place. Techniques employed should be traditional but in some circumstances they may be modern ones for which a firm scientific basis exists and which have been supported by a body of experience.

ARTICLE 5. Conservation of a place should take into consideration all aspects of its cultural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one at the expense of others.

Words in Italics are defined in Article 1.

Explanatory Notes

These notes do not form part of the Charter and may be added to by Australia ICOMOS.
ARTICLE 6. The conservation policy appropriate to a place must first be determined by an understanding of its cultural significance and its physical condition.

ARTICLE 7. The conservation policy will determine which uses are compatible.

ARTICLE 8. Conservation requires the maintenance of an appropriate visual setting, e.g. form, scale, colour, texture and materials. No new construction, demolition or modification which would adversely affect the settings should be allowed. Environmental intrusions which adversely affect appreciation or enjoyment of the place should be excluded.

ARTICLE 9. A building or work should remain in its historical location. The moving of all or part of a building or work is unacceptable unless this is the sole means of ensuring its survival.

ARTICLE 10. The removal of contents which form part of the cultural significance of the place is unacceptable unless it is the sole means of ensuring their security and preservation. Such contents must be returned should changed circumstances make this practicable.

CONSERVATION PROCESSES

Preservation

ARTICLE 11. Preservation is appropriate where the existing state of the fabric itself constitutes evidence of specific cultural significance, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.

Explanatory Notes

These notes do not form part of the Charter and may be added to by Australia ICOMOS.

ARTICLE 8

New construction work, including infill and additions, may be acceptable provided:

- it does not reduce or obscure the cultural significance of the place
- it is in keeping with Article 8.

ARTICLE 9

Some structures were designed to be readily removeable or already have a history of previous moves, e.g. prefabricated dwellings and poppet heads. Provided such a structure does not have a strong association with its present site its removal may be considered.

If any structure is moved it should be moved to an appropriate setting and given an appropriate use. Such action should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.

ARTICLE 11

Preservation protects fabric without obscuring the evidence of its construction and use. The process should always be applied:

- where the evidence of the fabric is of such significance that it must not be altered. This is an unusual case and likely to be appropriate for archaeological remains of national importance where insufficient investigation has been carried out to permit conservation policy decisions to be taken in accord with Articles 23 to 25.

New construction may be carried out in association with preservation when its purpose is the physical protection of the fabric and when it is consistent with Article 8.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.
ARTICLE 12. Preservation is limited to the protection, maintenance and where necessary, the stabilisation of the existing fabric but without the distortion of its cultural significance.

ARTICLE 13. Restoration is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the fabric and only if returning the fabric to that state recovers the cultural significance of the place.

ARTICLE 14. Restoration should reveal anew culturally significant aspects of the place. It is based on respect for all the physical, documentary and other evidence and stops at the point where conjecture begins.

ARTICLE 15. Restoration is limited to the reassembling of displaced components or removal of accretions in accordance with Article 16.

ARTICLE 16. The contributions of all periods to the place must be respected. If a place includes the fabric of different periods, revealing the fabric of one period at the expense of another can only be justified when what is removed is of slight cultural significance and the fabric which is to be revealed is of much greater cultural significance.

ARTICLE 17. Reconstruction is appropriate where a place is incomplete through damage or alteration and where it is necessary for its survival, or where it recovers the cultural significance of the place as a whole.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.
ARTICLE 18. Reconstruction is limited to the completion of a depleted entity and should not constitute the majority of the fabric of a place.

ARTICLE 19. Reconstruction is limited to the reproduction of fabric the form of which is known from physical and/or documentary evidence. It should be identifiable on close inspection as being new work.

Adaptation

ARTICLE 20. Adaptation is acceptable where the conservation of the place cannot otherwise be achieved, and where the adaptation does not substantially detract from its cultural significance.

ARTICLE 21. Adaptation must be limited to that which is essential to a use for the place determined in accordance with Articles 6 and 7.

ARTICLE 22. Fabric of cultural significance unavoidably removed in the process of adaptation must be kept safely to enable its future reinstatement.

CONSERVATION PRACTICE

ARTICLE 23. Work on a place must be preceded by professionally prepared studies of the physical, documentary and other evidence, and the existing fabric recorded before any disturbance of the place.

ARTICLE 24. Study of a place by any disturbance of the fabric or by archaeological excavation should be undertaken where necessary to provide data essential for decisions on the conservation of the place.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.
and/or to secure evidence about to be lost or
made inaccessible through necessary conserva-
tion or other unavoidable action. Investigation of a place for any other reason which
requires physical disturbance and which adds
substantially to a scientific body of knowl-
edge may be permitted, provided that it is
consistent with the conservation policy for
the place.

ARTICLE 25. A written statement of conserva-
tion policy must be professionally prepared
setting out the cultural significance, physical
condition and proposed conservation process
together with justification and supporting
evidence, including photographs, drawings
and all appropriate samples.

ARTICLE 26. The organisation and individual
responsible for policy decisions must be
named and specific responsibility taken for
each such decision.

ARTICLE 27. Appropriate professional
direction and supervision must be maintained
at all stages of the work and a log kept of
new evidence and additional decisions
recorded as in Article 25 above.

ARTICLE 28. The records required by
Articles 23, 25, 26 and 27 should be placed
in a permanent archive and made publicly
available.

ARTICLE 29. The items referred to in
Article 10 and Article 22 should be profes-
sionally catalogued and protected.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.

This revised Charter was adopted on 23rd February, 1981.
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SUMMARY OF REPORT

Introduction

1. Accepted conservation practice, and ICOMOS principles, dictate that the proper treatment of a site depends on its cultural significance.

2. First Government House is of great cultural significance because of its associations and the actual evidence it provides for a most important part of Australia's past.

3. The fact of this significance, and its character, described in this Report, dictates the proper treatment of the site.

Footings and Other Structures Found to Date

1. An attached plan details footings and other features located to date. In brief these are:
   - footings of the western and southern wall of Governor Phillip's house, 1788
   - 1788 footings and drains of the kitchen wing
   - remains of the office of Australia's first printing press, 1795
   - Governor Macquarie's 1811 alterations
   - Governor Darling's 1827 alterations
   - later buildings, including the "Tin Shed"

Investigations Not Completed by 7th November

1. Known structures partially excavated will require further work so that their function, meaning, and significance can be explicated. The actual extent of this further excavation is difficult to predict because of the complexity of the site, and doubts about its future.

2. A sampling strategy will be necessary for the remaining 50% of the site not yet excavated, to determine the existence of structures not shown on the 1845 plan.

3. The area behind the Young and Phillip Street terraces also needs investigation but this has a relatively low priority.

4. All this work is necessary to determine the extent and significance of remains within the development site.
Estimates of Time Required to Complete the Excavation

1. A substantial portion of FGH lies outside the development site in Bridge and Phillip Streets and Raphael Place. A sampling strategy in these streets is essential to determine the extent of the surviving remains, and the significance of the whole complex.

2. In general terms a ratio of 1:4 or 1:5 digging to research and analysis time is normal archaeological practice, and is necessary to achieve the aims of the project - understanding and interpretation of the site and the way of life of its inhabitants. By employing a number of the current team in the research and analysis periods this ratio may be able to be reduced by more than half. Archaeological work requires careful staging with some breaks to allow for research, for necessary leave, and for organization of the various stages of the work.

3. The season of excavation already undertaken, a 20 week season, will require a minimum of six to eight months ancillary research and analysis time for several people.

4. One more season of at least 12 weeks plus contingency time is needed, to complete the present work and establish the extent and significance of remains in the development site.

The degree of extra work depends to some extent on the proposed future of the site.

If excavation of the entire site is needed, a further six months excavation time, and from six to twelve months analysis time will be needed.

6. The FGH remains outside the development site will be the subject of a firm estimate giving various options, after the preparation of a sampling strategy. Final decisions on the necessity for, and extent of, excavation in this area must await the results of sampling, and other decisions on the future of the site.
Options Available to the Government

1. The full significance of the site cannot be elucidated without the further excavation and analysis outlined in this Report.

Already it is clear that the site is of the greatest heritage significance to the people of Australia.

The Government must either accept this decision and halt development plans now, or if it considers that more work is required to elucidate the significance further, it must avoid making any commitment to future development of the site until the archaeological and other research is completed and a full assessment is available.

It is not acceptable conservation practice to carry out salvage work, or to make other irreversible decisions before the preparation and acceptance of a statement of significance.

2. Because of the significance of the remains, their extent, and their unique value, it appears that the Government has no option but to take whatever steps are necessary to preserve the site, and to retain its cultural significance.

3. This Report does not canvass the various development options, but attempts to lay down the basic requirements whereby the retention of cultural significance can be achieved:

   (i) The remains are of undoubted significance. But elucidation of this significance and the preparation of a final statement of significance will require considerably more excavation and detailed analysis and research.

   (ii) All significant remains must be permanently preserved, in situ, except where it is necessary to remove them for conservation, or to reveal further significant areas.

   (iii) The remains must be stabilised, and their long term conservation ensured. Activity in their vicinity which will jeopardize the stability of the remains is unacceptable.

   (iv) The significance of the area must not be jeopardized by unacceptable modern intrusions, or by the proximity of new structures, which may overwhelm the site, and hence reduce or damage its significance.

   (v) The area must be suitably interpreted to the public as an historic site, in a manner compatible with the statement of significance. This would involve an on-site museum and permanent staff.
INTRODUCTION

1.1 The First Government House (FGH) within the development site, on the corner of Bridge and Phillip Streets, Sydney, is being excavated by myself as Excavation Director, with a team of supervisors, specialists, and archaeological excavators, under contract to the Department of Environment and Planning (DEP).

1.2 In this Report the term "development site" refers to that part of the FGH which lies within the development area as outlined in the current contract between myself and the DEP of 30 May 1983. (see Plan 1).

The FGH building and its associated kitchen wing* covered parts of what is now Bridge and Phillip Streets (see Plan 2 - overlay of FGH on the site and surrounding streets). The term "site" refers to the site of the FGH as a whole, i.e. that within the development site, and those parts now lying under Bridge and Phillip Streets.

1.3 The contract for this season commenced on 30 May 1983, and it expires on 7 November 1983.

1.4 On 29 September 1983 the Secretary of the Premier's Department wrote to Mr. R.B. Smyth, Director, DEP, concerning the Government's need to examine the options available to it if the archaeological investigation is not finished by the end of the contract date.

In part the letter stated:

"I should be grateful if you would let me have a report giving details of :-
(i) the footings found;
(ii) investigations which will not be completed by the 7th November;
(iii) estimates of time required to complete the excavation;
(iv) options available to the Government (with estimates of cost)."

1.5 This Report will address these four questions based on the excavation up to the date Sunday 2 October 1983, with the provisos that in:

(i) other structures besides footings will be described
(ii) the estimates of cost will be set aside for the DEP to assess.
(iii) comment concerning development and conservation options for the site will also be provided by the DEP.

* The kitchen wing includes the service quarters and is an integral part of the occupation and use of the house.
2. THE SITE AND THE REMAINS

2.1 All decisions about places of cultural significance spring from two basic questions:

What is the significance of the place?
What action is necessary to conserve that significance?

All the questions raised at this time about the FGH relate to these two questions.

The details of the assessment of the significance of the FGH on the development site will not be provided in this Report, but be addressed in my Report as required by my contract, to the DEP on the completion of the contract on 7 November 1983.

2.2 The four questions presented here by the Premier's Department are all concerned with the issue of significance and conservation in its widest sense.

2.3 Therefore, before addressing these questions it is necessary to include a brief discussion of the cultural significance of the site (and the development site in particular), and also of the appropriate standards for conservation action.

2.4 The cultural significance of the site was discussed in Helen Proudfoot's Report for the Premier's Department and the DEP - "The First Government House Sydney and the Subsequent History of the Site After 1845, March 1983."

The excavation supports this statement of significance, and provides further tangible evidence of the FGH and the life of its inhabitants.

From this investigation it is now possible to confirm that the development site is of cultural significance not only because of its associations with the past but also because of its evidence of the past.

Undoubtedly, the whole development site is of cultural significance for what it tells us about the early life of the colony.

2.5 In respect of the appropriate action to retain and conserve cultural significance, the accepted standard for conservation practice is the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter.

(see Appendix A).

2.6 In accordance with proper conservation practice, questions and decisions regarding the policy or action with regard to a place should only be made following the assessment of cultural significance. This Report departs from this practice only because of the request from the Premier's Department. Decisions about the conservation of the site should be made in full knowledge and consideration of its cultural significance, not only its archaeological significance. See Articles 6, 23, and 25 of the Burra Charter.
2.7 The statement of cultural significance prepared by Helen Proudfoot in:
The First Government House Sydney and the Subsequent History Of the Site After 1845

I have formulated below a Statement of Significance, following the practice adopted by Australia ICOMOS.

Statement of Significance
The site of the First Government House in New South Wales is of prime significance in the history of the Australian nation. The house was significant in the following ways:

(a) It was the Hub of the colony for 56 years, the focus of the town of Sydney, and its administrative and social centre.

(b) As one of the first group of permanent buildings erected on this continent, the First Government House has been called "the tap root of Australian architecture". It was the symbol of order and security in the antipodes.

(c) The house had a most significant location, on a spot, chosen by Governor Phillip obviously with tremendous discretion, which graduated from being the Hub of the colony to being the Hub of a great city and the centre of the State of New South Wales.

(d) The foundations of the building, now re-discovered after being virtually lost for 137 years, are our most tangible link with the foundation of white settlement on this continent, and as such are of the greatest symbolic importance.

Helen Proudfoot
March 1983
3. THE BURRA CHARTER

3.1 The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance was adopted by Australia ICOMOS on 23rd February 1981.

This document has been adopted by the Australian Heritage Commission and all other Australian heritage bodies, in response to Australia's obligations under the "Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage" to which Australia is a signatory.

3.2 Conservation of the Site.
The appropriate conservation process for the site, in terms of the Burra Charter is "preservation".

"Preservation" means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration. (Definitions: Article 1.6).

3.3 Articles 11 and 12 of the Burra Charter, together with the explanatory notes, set out the circumstances where preservation is appropriate, and how the practice of preservation should be applied.

3.4 Article 5, on conservation principles, states the principle that there must not be unwarranted emphasis on any one aspect of cultural significance at the expense of others.

These three articles are directly applicable to the preservation of the FGH site.
PREAMBLE
Having regard to the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1966), and the Resolutions of 5th General Assembly of ICOMOS (Moscow 1978), the following Charter has been adopted by Australia ICOMOS.

DEFINITIONS
1.6 Preservation means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES
ARTICLE 5. Conservation of a place should take into consideration all aspects of its cultural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one at the expense of others.

CONSERVATION PROCESSES
Preservation
ARTICLE 11. Preservation is appropriate where the existing state of the fabric itself constitutes evidence of specific cultural significance, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.

ARTICLE 12. Preservation is limited to the protection, maintenance and where necessary, the stabilisation of the existing fabric but without the distortion of its cultural significance.

ARTICLE 11
Preservation protects fabric without obscuring the evidence of its construction and use. The process should always be applied:
1. where the evidence of the fabric is of such significance that it must not be altered.
2. This is an unusual case and likely to be appropriate for archaeological remains of rational importance
3. where insufficient investigation has been carried out to permit conservation policy decisions to be taken in accord with Articles 23 to 25.
4. New construction may be carried out in association with preservation when its purpose is the physical protection of the fabric and when it is consistent with Article 8.

ARTICLE 12
Stabilization is a process which helps keep fabric intact and in a fixed position. When carried out as a part of preservation work, it does not introduce new materials into the fabric. However, when necessary for the survival of the fabric, stabilization may be effected as part of a reconstruction process and new materials introduced. For example, grouting or the insertion of a reinforcing rod in a masonry wall.
QUESTION (i) THE FOOTINGS AND OTHER STRUCTURES FOUND

(see Plan 3. Colour coded and annotated - archaeological grid reference FGH Project - total area excavated by 2/10/1983)

4.1 Physical evidence of the FGH has been found in all the areas where the house stood that have been excavated so far. This can be seen by reference to Plan 5. Further, more footings of the FGH have been revealed since 2 October 1983, the date of Plan 3. This latest evidence is not shown.

4.2 The Reference Grid System
The site is divided into 2 metre squares. Each square is named by the point at the north-west corner of the square. The first number for the square is the north measurement; the second east, separated by the letter "R" meaning Reference Datum. Therefore the most south-westerly square excavated is called 14R4. Another example: the south-west corner of Governor Phillip's house is in square 38R18.

4.3 The Plan has been colour coded and is self-explanatory.

4.4 1788 footings of the western and southern walls of Governor Phillip's house with its associated drains and clay fill occur in the north-east corner of the development site. 1788 footings and drains of the kitchen wing occur in the north-west segment of the development site, and in the south-west segment in squares 25R6, 28R10, and 24 and 22R10.

4.5 Remains of the office of Australia's first printing press - revealing so far a water trough and drain, whose fill contains type from the press which began operation in 1795, occur in square 20R4.

4.6 In 1811 Governor Macquarie carried out major alterations to the house - demolishing the rear rooms of that part built by Phillip, though leaving the footings in place; adding other rooms, and a 50 foot room with a bay window facing south, behind Governor King's reception room. The construction trench and footings of the south-west corner of the bay window have been revealed in squares 34R36 and 34R38.

4.7 In 1827 Governor Darling built a room about 20 foot by 30 foot to the west of Macquarie's bay window room. The construction trench for the south-east corner of this room appears in squares 27R32 and 30R32. Some of the footings of the south-west corner of the room appear in square 30R24.

4.8 The other major building constructed on the development site was the Public Works Department offices known as the "tin shed." This building was commenced in 1912. The footings and drains of the tin shed appear in various squares on the western half of the site.
4.9 Drains and wall footings of the FGH which cannot be attributed to specific construction periods are colour coded on the Plan. The largest collection of these is in the north-west segment of the site, and the most substantial, of brick with stone capping, appears to have been built before Macquarie's governorship in 1810.

5. QUESTION (ii) INVESTIGATIONS WHICH WILL NOT BE COMPLETED

BY 7TH NOVEMBER

5.1 In the current contract of 30 May with the DEP the areas behind the Young Street and Phillip Street terraces are included for investigation. In discussion with the DEP it has been agreed that as these areas are of low priority in relation to the FGH they will not need investigation under this contract.

5.2 By consulting Plan 4, Total Area Excavated By 2/10/1983 it can be seen that:
- bedrock accounts for about 30%
- squares excavated about 20%
- squares not yet excavated about 50%
of the development site.

5.3 It is possible that there may be remains of the FGH behind the Phillip Street and Young Street terraces. In any future contract it is essential that these areas be investigated.

5.4 It is not essential that the whole of the development site be excavated unless the whole of the unexcavated part of the site is to be destroyed in any future development.

In an ideal situation permanent reference areas would be left for future research if thought necessary.

However, on this site the stratigraphy is so complex, and there are so many intrusions into and additions on to existing structures, it is difficult to assess at the present stage of excavation where permanent reference areas could be left.

On this site we have revealed 200 years of history - from 1788 to the present.

In this season we have used the Colonial Architect Mortimer Lewis' 1845 plan of the site to indicate the remains of the FGH. But it should be noted that this plan does not show all the structures that were erected on the site.

Mortimer Lewis' 1845 plan shows only what walls were present in 1845.

Earlier plans, and drawings in the Watling Collection of the FGH to 1794, and other illustrations, indicate further outbuildings to the south of the main house and adjacent to the kitchen wing.

These areas in the courtyard south of the main house and east of the kitchen wing must be investigated.
In any new contract for unexcavated areas a sampling strategy will have to be devised to reveal yet unknown structures.

5.4 Known structures already partially excavated will have to be more completely excavated so that their function, meaning, and relationship to the rest of the site can be understood. These can be seen on Plan 3 and are:
- the 1788 footings of Phillip's house and the subsequent additions to them by other governors;
- the stormwater, sewage, or waste drains which run beside and behind the building
- the 1788 footings of the kitchen wing
- the printing office of 1795
- the garden wall and brick paving to the northwest of the kitchen wing
- the additions and accretions to the kitchen wing until it took its final form as shown in Lewis' 1845 plan.

6. QUESTION (iii) ESTIMATES OF TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE EXCAVATION

To answer this question a discussion of two relevant issues must first take place:

6.1 The First Government House Site as a Whole

6.11 It has been proven by our overlay of the Lewis Plan on the site as excavated (see Plan 5), and by the finding of the Townsend Plan of 1845 (see Plan 6), that a substantial portion of the FGH lies outside the development site.

The major part of the kitchen wing is in the development area, but the detached privy to the rear lies in the middle of Raphael Place.

The stable block to the rear of FGH was located in the area which is now mainly occupied by the Phillip Street terraces or modern office blocks.

6.12 That part of FGH lying outside the development area must be investigated so that the significance of the FGH site as a whole can be assessed.

6.13 A sampling strategy to execute this work in Bridge and Phillip Street and Raphael Place must be designed to be carried out in the future.
6.2 Correct Archaeological Practice

6.21 Archaeological activity is concerned with finding out about people's behaviour; not with finding things. The objects, their relation to each other, and the strata they lie in are clues to how people lived in the past. Therefore all excavation seasons lead to a corresponding research and analysis period - to make sense of the things found.

6.22 The archaeologist P.J. Fowler, in his book Approaches to Archaeology (A&C Black, 1977), states the issues here in this way:

Most truly archaeological activity i.e. creative research, like other research, can be broken down into phases of preparation, action, analysis, assessment and publication. If one is being systematic, they must take place in this order though of course phases can and do overlap in time e.g. analysis and assessment take place during the action. Converted into terms of excavation, phase 1 covers the identification of the problem, the drawing up of what American archaeologists aptly call a research design i.e. a systematic programme of investigation related to specific goals to be achieved within defined temporal and financial parameters, the raising of financial and other resources including staff, and all sorts of practical matters like access to the site, accommodation and commissariat—military analogies are difficult to avoid but in any case a considerable and time-consuming managerial task has to be successfully accomplished before any productive work begins. Phase 2 is the actual excavation. Phases 3 and 4 should begin during the excavation and will continue afterwards, each overlapping in time with the other. Phase 3 involves sorting out all the finds, samples and records, subjecting them to appropriate verbal, numerical, and scientific analysis—in other words, all the hard, unromantic 'backroom' graft which gives the mass of data 'meaning' (p. 131).

Phase 4 is probably the most difficult to accomplish satisfactorily not least because there is very little in the way of technique to fall back on here and also because, however much corporate endeavour has been involved up to this stage, here the situation sooner or later resolves itself into the silent room containing a lone person, a stack of data, a pen and a pad of blank sheets of paper. Those blank sheets of paper are probably the most fearsome sight in archaeology, so much so that many an archaeologist has not been able to face them. Remorselessly, however, let us move on to phase 5 which, if the previous four have been successfully achieved, should not be quite so difficult, that is preparing the academic report that is to be published and the total excavation product that is to become the permanent archive of the whole exercise. This phase will include the eventual secure deposition of that archive and dealing with the practical matters of publishing which may include popular booklets, exhibitions and T.V. and other audio-visual presentations as well as correcting proofs of the academic report (fig. 6.1).

I have to belabour the fact that, as should be perfectly clear, the act of excavation is but one part of a five-phase process. That in itself is answer to the question 'What do archaeologists do when they are not digging?'—'The other four-fifths of their job'. And in fact a time ratio of about 1:4 or 1:5 seems approximately right, that is from the director's point of view. On average, but perhaps minimally, a month's excavation creates 4-5 months' full-time work for the director and his immediate staff. Or to put it
another way in percentage terms, the five stages of the excavation process respectively absorb about 10, 15, 30, 25 and 20 per cent of the total effort involved (though the 15% excavation part may well absorb 75% of the costs). For the site-workers, of course, the crew or team members with no academic or technical follow-up responsibilities, these figures do not apply; they can simply move on to the next site, or go back to work from their holiday, perhaps thinking how wonderful archaeology (= excavation) is. Perhaps if people only too eager to start an excavation themselves realised that, if they are to meet their consequential obligations, for every day they spend digging they are committing a week or so of their own time to the resultant work (assuming they have the competence to do it), then they might think twice before voluntarily taking on the responsibility.

pp 155-158.

6.23 Fowler stipulates a ratio of 1:4 or 1:5 digging to research and analysis time, if the follow-up work is done by the director and supervisors only.

If the excavation crew were employed in washing, analysing, and labelling the finds, with the supervisors assisting the director in research and writing, then this ratio could possibly be reduced to 1:1 or 1:2 or 1:3.

6.24 Excavations are conducted in "seasons". In the case of the FGH development site a 12 week season plus a 9 week contingency time might give rise to a further 16 to 25 weeks research, analysis, and report writing period, before returning to the site for a further excavation season.

6.25 During this research/analysis time further research on the history of the occupants and use of the site and the history, dating, and manufacture of the artifacts would take place.

6.26 Specialist advice on specific aspects of the site would be sought, to gain access to the work of researchers who had detailed information on certain aspects of the site - eg. The Sydney Gazette office and methods of printing; the construction of 19th century drains and privys etc.

6.27 Staged work such as this has been developed through time as standard archaeological practice. The breaks between excavation seasons allow the director and specialists to think through what has been done; look at the work from different perspectives, and modify the research design if it is necessary to pursue new goals.

6.28 It is also necessary after each season for the team to have a complete break of two or three weeks before commencing the analysis stage. Running an excavation of this kind takes enormous physical and intellectual resources. At least three professors and heads of archaeology departments who have inspected the site have asked me how can I keep up the pace of this excavation. To regularize the work into excavation and research/analysis seasons will mean that the team can continue to operate in an energetic and efficient manner.
6.3 Estimates of Time Required to Complete the Excavation

6.31 This season of excavation from 15 June to 30 October is a 20 week season.
To analyse the material and write up this excavation will take a minimum of six months for several people. The preliminary excavation in February will also have to be analysed at the same time.

6.32 There needs to be at least one more season of about twelve weeks plus contingency time to answer the questions already posed by the excavation of the development site. This does not mean the complete excavation of the development site.

6.33 How detailed the excavation of this area must be depends on the need to use the site for other purposes. If that part of the site not yet excavated is to be destroyed for development then the site will have to be fully explored archaeologically.

If the site is to be left substantially as it is and displayed to the public as a national monument, then the excavation strategy will have to be modified to meet this need.

6.34 As the occupation history of the development site is most complex it is possible to estimate the time required to complete the excavation only in the broadest terms.

6.35 From my understanding of the site from the excavation so far, I would estimate the time it would take to complete the excavation of the development site at a minimum of six to eight months.

6.36 A critical path analysis for excavation has been prepared by a planning engineer to support these estimates, and will be submitted to the DEP and Premier's Department as soon as possible. This analysis estimates with the present crew it will take six months digging, including estimates of time lost through rain, to excavate the whole of the development site not including the bike parking area or the area behind the terraces.

6.37 To complete the analysis and writing up of the excavated material may take a further six to twelve months.

6.38 These estimates would have to be revised every three months in the light of the evidence produced in newly excavated areas of the site whose depth and complexity are not yet known.

6.39 With regard to the FGH site outside the development zone in Bridge and Phillip Streets and Raphael Place, precise estimates of time required to complete the excavation there cannot be made until a sampling strategy is devised for the streets.
6.40 If the sampling suggests that there are substantial remains under the streets, then it will be necessary to investigate various options for closing the streets either fully or partially so that the remains can be excavated.

6.41 In accordance with correct archaeological practice and all conservation action such excavation should be undertaken at the same time and under the same direction as the excavation of the rest of the site.

6.42 If substantial remains of the FGH do occur under the streets then I estimate a time of from 12 to 24 months for the excavation and analysis of the material.

6.43 Estimates of time required for this work can only be general and must be revised every three months in the light of new discoveries.

7. QUESTION (iv) OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE GOVERNMENT

7.1 Options for preservation of the site on a temporary basis

7.11 The option to leave the site open and uncovered must be rejected because of the damage to the remains in situ, and the sections, from sun, wind, and rain.

7.12 The option to fill in all squares and areas not being currently excavated must be rejected because it is necessary to have such areas available for inspection to compare them with other excavated areas. This is essential for the proper interpretation and understanding of the site as it is being excavated.

7.13 The preferred option chosen - to protect the site from the weather on a short-term basis - is that already applied at present while excavation is taking place. These measures are:
   - laying opaque white plastic over the structures on the base of the excavated squares
   - covering the trenches with the plastic-covered frames made to protect the excavated areas
   - constructing and maintaining site drainage to continue to drain off the site during rain. This drainage requires regular surveillance.

7.14 The remainder of the development site does not need any special protection from the weather.
7.2 Options for preservation of the site on a longer-term basis

7.21 For longer periods, including extended excavation and analysis periods, there are two preferred options, both involving the use of some form of protective structure.

7.22 The construction of any such structure in or near the area of the FGH footings must be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the remains are not damaged in any way by direct contact or by vibration from heavy machinery.

7.23 Having regard to 7.22 above, it would be possible to build a permanent building over the site and then excavate within it. Factors which would need to be taken into account are:
- the need to test the area of the footings for the new building for FGH remains
- a decision to be made about excavation under the streets. Either the streets would have to be tested and excavated first, before the new building was constructed, or it would have to be flexible enough to be able to be added on to if evidence of FGH were found under the streets.

7.24 The second preferred option is to construct a temporary light-weight structure which is capable of being expanded or added to, and dismantled easily.

Such a structure would provide protection for the excavation team and the ground from the heat and drying effects of the sun. Some form of imaginative and very careful design is necessary.

7.25 If the site were to be closed for a term longer than about 12 weeks, the excavated squares would need to be protected by:
- laying opaque white plastic over the base and sides of the squares
- filling the squares in completely with clean washed sand

This would protect the squares for a long period from excessive water damage, and could be dug out to reveal the sections and footings without damaging them.

Estimates for the cost of purchasing this sand and transporting it to the site have already been given by Mr. J. Pridgeon of Aardvark Destructions, who estimated the cost in the order of $6,000.

7.26 I rely for my advice on the protection of the sections and footings from Dr. George Gibbons, New South Wales Institute of Technology, who is a consultant to the Premier's Department on these matters at this time, and Mr. Roy Lawrie, NSW Department of Agriculture, to whom I addressed these questions some months ago. Their written advice to me has been submitted to the Premier's Department and the DEP at one of the Joint Steering Committee Meetings.

This advice has already been applied in relation to the preservation of excavated footings and other structures.
7.3 Options for the permanent preservation of the site, after the excavation and analysis period

7.31 Dr. George Gibbons is currently researching the matter of the permanent preservation of the footings and other excavated structures which are to be retained in situ, for the Premier's Department.

7.32 I will address here the more general issues of the permanent preservation of the in situ structures.

7.33 A structure will have to be built over the FGH site to preserve the remains in an environmentally safe situation.

7.34 This structure should be designed with the purpose of conserving, displaying, and interpreting the remains for the public.

7.35 A selection of the artifacts found should also be displayed in this building, which should be devoted to displaying the site and its finds.

7.36 It has been suggested that the best way to preserve the footings and other structures excavated is to bury them once they have been properly recorded.

This is not an acceptable option as the cultural significance of the site demands that the remains be visible to the public. (see Helen Proudfoot's Statement of Significance, part (d), 2.7 p.3).

7.4 Archaeological options

7.41 There are three options in terms of archaeological work on the site.

7.42 Option (i) is to stop all work on the site at the completion of the current contract on 7 November.

This is not acceptable as too many questions have been raised which will not be able to be answered by 7 November.

7.43 Option (ii) is to return to the site as soon as possible with a further season of excavation.

This is not acceptable as correct archaeological practice demands that a period of research, analysis, and writing of a report on the work to date be carried out before further excavation takes place.

7.44 Option (iii) is to proceed with the work in a season of excavation followed by analysis and report writing. Several such alternate seasons would be necessary to complete
work on the site. Thus the present season of excavation should be followed by research and analysis.

This option is preferred as being the most efficient way for archaeological work to proceed. (see 6.2 Correct Archaeological Practice, especially 6.24 to 6.28).

7.5 Heritage conservation options

7.51 There are no options in respect of appropriate conservation policy and action.

The site should be kept free from development, and no works should take place except those necessary for the protection, security, and interpretation of the site.

7.52 Conserving the remains in the appropriate manner is only a matter of money. ie. Is the Government prepared to pay the cost?

7.53 But what is the cost? It the Government needs to consider the development site as an investment, then other alternative investments must be considered, such as demolishing the terrace houses and erecting the new development on their site. The Phillip Street terraces could be demolished, with the development built in their place and over Raphael Place.

So far I have not seen a report on these alternatives, although there has been much discussion about them in the press and by those people interested in the site.

7.54 At the moment it is not possible to say whether or not the retention of the site of the current excavation, not built upon, will forgo profit, ie. cost more than developing the site. Someone might have attempted to estimate this, but such a report is not known to me.

7.55 In considering these matters the benefits of tourism and employment for Sydney and NSW as a whole must be taken into account.

7.56 The question "Options available to the Government" means in essence - How should the excavation proceed now? or What should be done next?

7.57 Essentially, the answer to this question depends upon whether or not the Government wishes to use the site being excavated for development, and when.

7.58 If, for investment purposes, the site needs to be developed in say, two years, then the most appropriate action, having regard to the significance of the site and correct
archaeological practice, is to excavate the whole site, including Bridge and Phillip Streets.

7.59 There is information, understanding, and interpretation of the site which can only be gained by examining and analysing the whole site at the one time.

No matter how detailed the recording, such understanding can only be reached by observing the site and the remains themselves in situ. This is the reason why we keep excavated squares open while the excavation is taking place, and the preliminary analysis and interpretation is being developed.

7.60 The minimum time estimated for the excavation, research, and writing up of the FGH site as a whole would be between two and five years.

7.61 If the development site is not needed for development, then the whole site still needs to be excavated, but not in such haste. However, the preferred option for preservation on a temporary basis will still apply.

7.62 No matter what the Government chooses to do in relation to developing the site of the current excavation, ultimately, more excavation is necessary.

7.63 Therefore it will be necessary to draw up a new contract.

7.64 This contract should:
- engage most of the existing team, both to keep continuity of operations, and as the team has been trained to a useful level of expertise on a site of this nature.

7.65 Any new contract should involve additional expenditure on:
- salaries for the team and the specialist positions created in the course of this dig
- equipment needed during the course of the dig, eg.
- additional protective frames
- monies for advice from specialist consultants on specific short-term issues

7.66 A research design for the new excavation period should be drawn up addressing these issues:
- the completion of excavation within the development site
- the sampling of the site in Bridge and Phillip Streets and Raphael Place, and the possibility of excavating all these remains of the building in the streets
- research, analysis, and report writing periods for this work.
APPENDIX A

The Burra Charter

BURRA CHARTER

PREAMBLE
Having regard to the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1966), and the Resolutions of 5th General Assembly of ICOMOS (Moscow 1978), the following Charter has been adopted by Australia ICOMOS.

DEFINITIONS
ARTICLE 1. For the purpose of this Charter:

1.1 Place means site, area, building or other work, group of buildings or other works together with pertinent contents and surroundings.

1.2 Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations.

1.3 Fabric means all the physical material of the place.

1.4 Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance. It includes maintenance and may according to circumstance include preservation, restoration, reconstruction and adaption and will be commonly a combination of more than one of these.

1.5 Maintenance means the continuous protective care of the fabric, contents and setting of a place, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves restoration or reconstruction and it should be treated accordingly.

1.6 Preservation means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

1.7 Restoration means returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.

Explanatory Notes

These notes do not form part of the Charter and may be added to by Australia ICOMOS.

ARTICLE 1.1
Place includes structures, ruins, archaeological sites and areas.

ARTICLE 1.5
The distinctions referred to in Article 1.5, for example in relation to roof gutters, are:

- maintenance — regular inspection and cleaning of gutters
- repair involving restoration — returning of dislodged gutters to their place
- repair involving reconstruction — replacing decayed gutters.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.
1.8 **Reconstruction** means returning a place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state and is distinguished by the introduction of materials (new or old) into the fabric. This is not to be confused with either re-creation or conjectural reconstruction which are outside the scope of this Charter.

1.9 **Adaptation** means modifying a place to suit proposed compatible uses.

1.10 **Compatible use** means a use which involves no change to the culturally significant fabric, changes which are substantially reversible, or changes which require a minimal impact.

**CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES**

**ARTICLE 2.** The aim of conservation is to retain or recover the cultural significance of a place and must include provision for its security, its maintenance and its future.

**ARTICLE 3.** Conservation is based on a respect for the existing fabric and should involve the least possible physical intervention. It should not distort the evidence provided by the fabric.

**ARTICLE 4.** Conservation should make use of all the disciplines which can contribute to the study and safeguarding of a place. Techniques employed should be traditional but in some circumstances they may be modern ones for which a firm scientific basis exists and which have been supported by a body of experience.

**ARTICLE 5.** Conservation of a place should take into consideration all aspects of its cultural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one at the expense of others.

*Words in italics are defined in Article 1.*
ARTICLE 6. The conservation policy appropriate to a place must first be determined by an understanding of its cultural significance and its physical condition.

ARTICLE 7. The conservation policy will determine which uses are compatible.

ARTICLE 8. Conservation requires the maintenance of an appropriate visual setting, e.g., form, scale, colour, texture and materials. No new construction, demolition or modification which would adversely affect the settings should be allowed. Environmental intrusions which adversely affect appreciation or enjoyment of the place should be excluded.

ARTICLE 9. A building or work should remain in its historical location. The moving of all or part of a building or work is unacceptable unless this is the sole means of ensuring its survival.

ARTICLE 10. The removal of contents which form part of the cultural significance of the place is unacceptable unless it is the sole means of ensuring their security and preservation. Such contents must be returned should changed circumstances make this practicable.

CONSERVATION PROCESSES

Preservation

ARTICLE 11. Preservation is appropriate where the existing state of the fabric itself constitutes evidence of specific cultural significance, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.

ARTICLE 11. Preservation protects fabric without obscuring the evidence of its construction and use. The process should always be applied:
- where the evidence of the fabric is of such significance that it must not be altered. This is an unusual case and likely to be appropriate for archaeological remains of national importance
- where insufficient investigation has been carried out to permit conservation policy decisions to be taken in accordance with Articles 23 to 25.

New construction may be carried out in association with preservation when its purpose is the physical protection of the fabric and when it is consistent with Article 8.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.
ARTICLE 12. Preservation is limited to the protection, maintenance and where necessary, the stabilisation of the existing fabric but without the distortion of its cultural significance.

Restoration
ARTICLE 13. Restoration is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the fabric and only if returning the fabric to that state recovers the cultural significance of the place.

ARTICLE 14. Restoration should reveal anew culturally significant aspects of the place. It is based on respect for all the physical, documentary and other evidence and stops at the point where conjecture begins.

ARTICLE 15. Restoration is limited to the reassembling of displaced components or removal of accretions in accordance with Article 16.

ARTICLE 16. The contributions of all periods to the place must be respected. If a place includes the fabric of different periods, revealing the fabric of one period at the expense of another can only be justified when what is removed is of slight cultural significance and the fabric which is to be revealed is of much greater cultural significance.

Reconstruction
ARTICLE 17. Reconstruction is appropriate where a place is incomplete through damage or alteration and where it is necessary for its survival, or where it recovers the cultural significance of the place as a whole.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.
ARTICLE 18. Reconstruction is limited to the completion of a depleted entity and should not constitute the majority of the fabric of a place.

ARTICLE 19. Reconstruction is limited to the reproduction of fabric the form of which is known from physical and/or documentary evidence. It should be identifiable on close inspection as being new work.

Adaptation

ARTICLE 20. Adaptation is acceptable where the conservation of the place cannot otherwise be achieved, and where the adaptation does not substantially detract from its cultural significance.

ARTICLE 21. Adaptation must be limited to that which is essential to a use for the place determined in accordance with Articles 6 and 7.

ARTICLE 22. Fabric of cultural significance unavoidably removed in the process of adaptation must be kept safely to enable its future reinstatement.

CONSERVATION PRACTICE

ARTICLE 23. Work on a place must be preceded by professionally prepared studies of the physical, documentary and other evidence, and the existing fabric recorded before any disturbance of the place.

ARTICLE 24. Study of a place by any disturbance of the fabric or by archaeological excavation should be undertaken where necessary to provide data essential for decisions on the conservation of the place.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.
and/or to secure evidence about to be lost or made inaccessible through necessary conservation or other unavoidable action. Investigation of a place for any other reason which requires physical disturbance and which adds substantially to a scientific body of knowledge may be permitted, provided that it is consistent with the conservation policy for the place.

ARTICLE 25. A written statement of conservation policy must be professionally prepared setting out the cultural significance, physical condition and proposed conservation process together with justification and supporting evidence, including photographs, drawings and all appropriate samples.

ARTICLE 26. The organisation and individuals responsible for policy decisions must be named and specific responsibility taken for each such decision.

ARTICLE 27. Appropriate professional direction and supervision must be maintained at all stages of the work and a log kept of new evidence and additional decisions recorded as in Article 25 above.

ARTICLE 28. The records required by Articles 23, 25, 26 and 27 should be placed in a permanent archive and made publicly available.

ARTICLE 29. The items referred to in Article 10 and Article 22 should be professionally catalogued and protected.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.

This revised Charter was adopted on 23rd February, 1981.
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