Right. A yard deposit to the east of the house. Upper surface soil and mixed early and recent material with signs of former paving set on a bed of coke. Below the coke, a mixed deposit of yard soil above the original clayey soil or subsoil giving way to bedrock. No sign of dump material. There was probably a stone ledge or sudden drop in level between the yard and the house site, the rubbish being thrown into the low ground. Machine excavation, August 9, 1996.

Below. Machine excavation over the house site, showing the sandy quarry tailings and dump deposit with the unstable sides of the excavation. Quite a number of artefacts were found here. August 8, 1996.
of artefacts going into preconstruction times, that is before the late 1870s. Came into coarse sand layers, most likely originating from a nearby quarry.

Later wrote up the findings and listed the bags of artefacts after artefact cleaning, sorting and labelling. Sent a four page account with a list of the proceedings and conclusions to Jennifer Hill. Sent a second fax regarding Heritage Branch advice.

23 July 1996: Discussed site and heritage problems with Jennifer Hill in regard to the faxes sent earlier.


28 July 1996: Processing of site artefacts. Analysis to ascertain a date for the ‘dump’ layer artefacts.

5 August 1996: Telephone call from Dennis Lidis of Dennis & Dennis Investments Pty Ltd regarding the commencement of mechanical excavation work on Wednesday (but it turned out to be Thursday because they could not get the required machinery or ?). He wanted the site excavated and the new footings poured on the same day. Dennis asked Sam to phone me to work out the details, which we did.

8 August 1996: Supervised mechanical excavations, photographic recording and retrieving artefacts from the excavated material.

Delays with the site because of the depth of the mechanical excavations to get to solid rock for new footings. The sides of the excavations unstable resulting in soil disturbance more than wanted. I was warned out of the holes because of the instability of the sides. The stone footings and plinths were removed and dumped to the edge of the site so that I could examine them, ditto regarding the soil. Round-sectioned forms were installed ready for the concrete but the concrete did not come.

A fair amount of ceramics, ‘black’ glass, drinking glass fragments, leather etc., turned up. Some fine transfer printed ware and glassware. All the material recovered pre-dated the house. Seems to have been the site of a domestic dump.
Above. Drainage pipes from the east end of the yard probably dating to 1878/1879. Above the pipe mixed deposits of coke, yard dirt, construction material, above which, asphalt and early brick pavers. As it happened, there was no provision to properly examine the yard. August 9, 1996.

Below. The larger foundation stones and plinth stones. August 8, 1996.
9 August 1996

Mechanical excavation work continued on site. I retrieved what I could but the site became so congested that the piled earth became too large to examine properly. The last of the excavations brought up very little. Dennis Lidis visited the site and spoke to all and took leave. The concrete arrived at 3.20 and I left the site for the last time at 3.30.

Later artefact cleaning, processing and bagging.

11 August 1996: Typed letter to Jennifer Hill regarding the satisfactory completion of the project, suggested report options. Telephone call ditto

---------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------
Facsimile Transmission

ROBERT V J VARMAN Ph D (Syd) ARCHAEOLOGIST
HERITAGE CONSULTANT

31 WOMBAT STREET BERKELEYVALE CENTRAL COAST, NSW 2261
Mobile 0411 550427 Telephone (043) 882169 Facsimile (043) 8984500
APPENDIX I Internet varman@ozemail.com.au

Attention: JENNIFER HILL, Director
Company: ARCHITECTURAL PROJECTS
Subject: Comm: Hami Street (10-46) + East Street, Pyrmont.

Date: 20 JUNE 1996
Pages: 1

COMMENTS:

Dear Jennifer,

Thanks for the meeting with you, Colyn Pergelli and representing Architectural Projects.

Just to confirm my initial observations:

1. The bricks, mortar, stonework (not too useful as a diagnostic tool), some of the timber work (didn't get to have a detailed look - as per the nails) etc., leads me to suggest that the age of the structure (as surviving) easily fits the date you mentioned as a candidate, 1879. Dry press bricks were just beginning to be accepted by builders. Lock line mortar, wire nails (some square headed) half plus plaster bricks + other bricks make it certain that the building can not be older than 1870.

2. If the remains must be demolished - Demolish to stone plinth + fire place head but 50mm level for further archaeological assessment. Remove the sand only inside the building. Clear the yard to previous ground level (brick + demolition pile).

3. If the remains must be demolished keep a good sample of all the building materials. Keep intact the Heissmann
Collection-type shops, windows, doors, and any architectural furnishing. I presume that you've recorded close inside and outside of the building (thinking of Heritage Brand).

4. The brick-end holes along the north are more complex than I thought. To some extent, there was a brick wall there before the main building was built. We will need to pay close attention to the holes ground footings.

5. Had a quick look at the other brick buildings along Scott Street — all are of a similar date — despite appearances none earlier than the 1870s. Noticed fairly old plumbing hard to tell if upgraded or if of a later date — chimney gone! This means there may not be a long drop (hitching wall?) hole. The ash pit might have been disturbed already. However, a test square and trench would still be in order. The underfloor area might be more potential.

Jennifer, let me know if you wish me to present a more formal report based on the above — otherwise, let me know when the place has been cleared for the second inspection.

Best wishes,

[Signature]
COMMENTS:

Dear Jennifer,

Just a few points in case an excavation is warranted:

1. The works will need a Section 60 – depending on the arrangement with the Heritage Branch.

2. To apply for a Section 60, I'll need a good site plan (+ elevations if possible) – and the historical research as backing documents. Processing usually takes about 30 days.

I will see you around 1:30.

Best wishes,

Robert

[Signature]
ATTENTION: JENNIFER HILL  
Company: ARCHITECTURAL PROJECTS 

Subject: HARRIS + SCOTT STS, PYRMONT  

COMMENTS:

Dear Jennifer

Good to see you again on site. Just a few observations:

1. Spoke to Tom later, seems he wasn’t informed that the stratigraphy or architectural furniture were to be preserved. I just wonder if he is “covered” for such instances as hand-removal of debris + disturbances regarding archaeology/heritage? It’s cheaper for them to do the sensitive bits clean up - hand-removal of sand in the foundations. Stick rubble directly over the old yard level. ...

2. Could you ask them to first remove all the timber on site + pile up in a safe spot. I noticed the drop windows fragments all over the site. Even the small bits.

3. To confirm that the building rubble is to be removed from the yard and foundation area - the sand for archaeological assessment. And as it’s OK to demolish the foundations that Tom can demolish the top of the wall along Scott Street so as to scrape out the demolition material (after the timber bits are removed).
If there is some doubt about the strength of the walls, the excavation of the inside area of the building will soon tell you what is on bedrock or not, and solve the archaeology at the same time. The excavation could be confined to the periphery of the internal walls (4-5 rooms, if including the east addition). We'll need the earlier excavation report to weigh up things.

Confirm the Heritage Act standing of the site to see if I'll need to apply for a Section 60. If the site is to be grubbed out, I wouldn't need a permit to excavate the building site.

Include an indicative plan of the site as a memory jogger.

Let me know when next to visit the site. I'm in Pamamatta-report-writing-mode, so will be at home most time. Send for if you have difficulty contacting me. Notice to visit the site - one day in advance while I'm in report-writing mode! (Any excuse to get out of the house at present).

Sue Wulfe
**Indicative Profile**

**Corner of Harris and Scott Sts**

**Pyrmont**

---

**Bedrock** is uneven but seems to slope broadly speaking toward the water and secondarily from east to west.

A 30 cm deep loam layer of silt and clay was encountered at the site. Although it was not possible to identify the exact nature of this layer, it was likely related to the site's history and could have included evidence of activities from different periods. The site was heavily disturbed by后期 activities, making it challenging to interpret the remains accurately.

---

**Indicative Plan**

**Timber Cottage**

- **Former Structure**: Part of which (branched structure) pre-dated the house—seen in brickwork.
- **Possible Site of Ledge/Panelling**
- **Fence Unmarked**
- **Wall of House**
- **New White PVC White Pipe—Dean Pipe** (15 July 1996)

---

**Possible Wall Site (Not a Pit)**

**Adding Back**

**Brick Wall**

---

**Former Shed?**

---

**Former Site (just a pit?**

---

**Sight of Drain Old Path**

---

**Harris Street**

---

**Above Plinth Demolished by 15 July 1996**

---

**Stone in Present**

---

**Former Wall**

---

**Reverse from Collapsed Walls**

---

**The Place**
Dear Jennifer,

Did the south-east room, south-east corner. Again an orderly progression to pre-structure times. As in Wendy's report, there is a dump layer which predates all building on the site. In today's excavation the dump layer was about 200mm thick in a sandstone origin) with various layers - some of the stone suggests a nearby road. The bulk of the deposit is quarry waste mixed in with 1850-1870s material.

The wall here, as the Engineer found, does not rest on solid rock, rather a dump of quarry waste - larger lumps of stones - as in the N-W room. I decided the walls - all of one period, would fit either 1869 or 1879 but the brick walls were more likely to have been 1879, rather than 1869.
The upper layer of quarry tailings + artefacts seems a fairly contemporary fill.

What you need to know is:

1. The footings are not earlier than 1869. The structure was circa 1879 - suspect that the whole was built then. There may have been a prefabric building there before, if the research is right.

2. The dumps deposit is of local significance - and in earlier building range of dates. 1840s-1870s & knowing the site history, seems to be circa 1860s (the earlier ceramics conservative on "hand-me-downs").

3. Evidence of changes were found to the structure - as built in 1879 - mostly confined to the east elevation regarding doors + a chimney (by 1882).

4. The quarry tailings + artefacts second deposit in 1879 seem thrown in soon after or rather immediately after construction (earlier stone line deposit in the North-West section).

5. If grubbing out the foundations is permissible, the earth should be retained on site to remove artefacts - esp. those under the footings. The profile of the excavation be recorded.

6. The artefacts, 1840s-1870s, relate to households nearby, or in the case of the mid-1879 fill, whenever they got the fill from (which considering carting costs would have been fairly local).

7. The timber from the windows etc., need a storage site.

8. There are some good pieces, although small, for a display reflecting the site history - coins from 1547-1549, + 3 iron pots from the Depression period (1869-1913). Some fragmented ceramic design, building materials etc.
Dear Jennifer,

I'll be as brief as possible about my findings so far. Had to revisit the site yesterday because it seemed from Friday's examination that much of a late 1870s (mixed with earlier stuff) still remains. Not only that, there is a logical sequence of reports from pre-settlement times to the present including evidence of a construction phase. Also rubbish did get through (as stated was highly unlikely by the previous reports, probably originating from the George Mackay report) - this has implications for the other buildings. As at the Hyde Park Barracks, rats or mice tunneled in the softer fill and dragged in what they fancied (usually bones but sometimes human artefacts). I can't understand Wendy Chay's conclusions, unless the area she selected was radically different to mine. It is clear that she did not excavate the whole underfloor area (not that she was briefed to do that, it just wasn't clear from her...
excavation report). There is evidence of changes, made to doorsways along the eastern side.

I'd like till another few hours on the site to judge the date of the wall. The surprising sequence of the stratigraphy (implications on the phasing of the building) took up my time when there.

I would suggest that you check with the Heritage Branch about the new footings because in Wendy's first report (April 1995—which you + Dennis arranged for me in pretty strong (see 6.3+general 6.4.2). Her archaeology report (October 1995) seems to clear the underfloor area (2.3) but I don't think she anticipated that the entire structure would be removed. I believe that she underestimated the value of the below-floor deposits.

If the Heritage Branch allows you to remove the footings, I would suggest that:

1. The threshold stones be carefully removed + reused.
2. The plinth stones be carefully removed + reused on the new building or be incorporated into the landscape design at the back of the building.
3. That the surviving archaeologists be able to retrieve artifacts—excavate & record the treads within a day's grace to do so.
4. As the building in to go into the yard—chat that should be done under supervision—short preliminary study.

This has the makings of a new Section 60 but you will have to square the position with the Heritage Branch. Will be on site tomorrow afternoon + will let you know the results on Tuesday or Wednesday. Enjoy some preliminary drawings, [Signature]
NO52 HARRIS STREET, PYRMONT

SOUTH-EAST ROOM.
SOUTH-EAST CORNER.

SOUTH WALL

SOUTHERN + DRESSED PLINTH STONE.

EAST WALL

THIS SKEW IN THE WALL
A LARGE FEATURE
AS VENTILATION
FOR THE PCE 1887
SKILLION ADDITION

FILL OF ROOFING
SLATES, CEILING LATH + PLASTER
FRAGMENTS OF THE STAIRS, CEILING + ROOF
MIXED IN WITH BLACK SOIL FROM FILL
ABOVE MIXED WITH DACK PAINT

LATER QUARTZITE BREEZE BLOCK

YELLOW SANDSTONE SAND
QUARRY CHIPS AND
BANDS OF COKE
(CONE MINI PIT 1887 SNEAKER
AND SOME FOLLOWING OLD HOUSE
HOLES, HARD AGAINST EAST WALL.

DISTINCT OLD SURFACE
LOAMY SAND (TOOTING SPINE
ORIGIN).

WHITE/VERNILISH SANDSTONE SAND
IN A DISTINCT BAND, COEX PARTLY
UNDER THE FOUNDATION

A DISTINCT LAYER OF ROUNDED STONES

DARKER SANDSTONE SAND
SOME CLAY CONTENT
NOTE: ABOVE SUNSET 22 JULY 1996

SUBSOIL BELOW THIS?

STRATIGRAPHY
CONTINUES UNDER WALL
AT ABOUT 800MM (AS SHOWN).

NB: SHOW STRATIGRAPHY IN COLOUR

SCALE 1:10

DRAWN
22.07.1996

ARCHAEOLABOR.
SOUTH-EAST ROOM, SOUTH-EAST CORNER
22 JULY 1996 (INCLUDING MISC PLASTER SAMPLES).

1. DEMOLITION MATERIAL - ROOFING, SLATE, ROOF ETC NAILS, MATERIAL FROM OLD STAIRCASE - SURFACE RUBBAGE, DUMP LEVEL 150mm - 410mm - ALL MEASUREMENTS FROM THE LOWER INTERNAL PLINTH

2. MISC. SURFACE (SOUTH SIDE OF HOUSE).

3. PLASTER WEST WALL FOOTING

4. SOUTH WALL

5. MIDDLE WALL NORTH-SOUTH DIRECTION, FROM FOOTING

6. MIDDLE WALL EAST-WEST DIRECTION

7. EAST WALL FOOTING

8. NORTH WALL

9. AT CA 850mm - AS FOR 6 BUT SLIGHTLY LOWER "dark tinged sand layer under rubble layer".

10. AT CA 850mm - same origin light sand

11. AT CA 500mm - sandy layer

12. AT 780mm - absolute surface of sand layer.

13. AT 780 - 850mm sand, soil becomes lighter

14. AT 1000mm - loose as far as excavator

15. AT 950mm - sand becomes stony - interbedded with local sand stone

16. AT 880mm - light sand becomes darker

17. AT 550mm - as for 15

18. FROM SLOPING SURFACE OF SAND+SAIDSTONE 510-550mm TO ABOUT 780mm

19. FROM SLOPING SURFACE 510mm - 530mm - SURFACE OF SAND+SAIDSTONE LEVEL

20. SURFACE OF DUMPED SAND+SAIDSTONE - 530mm (height at ca 16) - 3X PINS
08:08:96

Dell's Angel type site - Ashburn
31 bricks of stuff
enough material
comes, pottery
site (well etc)
- didn't enlighten
---

To me at length earlier talking about
he said that he'd been
him so did S but
so got onto that a
himself formally in
found out that he was
here but 20 years
eyelashers - medium

The cement men?
the scoop. Well, S
these were pens. I
not the interior deep
was used to
base seen some of the
retrieved what S could
only one bit of a
goblet (bowl), a nice
coat) to take it home
place but had been for

Stayed till about 5.45
the kitchen + goats
FAX TO
- Cordi Shelgrove
Dear Jennifer,

I finished up at No 52 today. Witnessed the excavations + report keeping today + yesterday afternoon. The footings (pier) were being buried as of 3:20 today.

1. Found some good material for a display from the dump under the 1879 footings - parts of plates, platters, cups, bowls - one really good transfer were pictorial - base of a small bowl. It's a good cross-section of mainly 1870s stuff.

2. What sort of report would you like: (a) Summary of the broad findings - 2 hours (b) Ditto extended with overview of the artefacts - 10 hours (c) as specified at $65. per hour.

3. The window (shop window) await a decision. Could Sam store them in one of the nearby buildings?

4. Sam tells me what there is no space for landscaping at the back of the building (used for parking). So what should be done with the stone (some nice blocks there)? Sam said he needs a "prunts" instruction.

That's about all,

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]