ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

69 ALLEN STREET LEICHHARDT
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SYNOPSIS

This investigation has been undertaken on behalf of the developer of the property and on the advice of the Department of Planning. The primary objective of the work was to establish the significance of artefact material recovered from under the former Heine factory building which occupies the site. Recommendations were to be made which arose from an assessment of that significance as well as an investigation of the entire occupancy of the site.

The subject area was originally part of a Crown grant of 1811 that was subsequently developed during the first half of the nineteenth century as Elswick Estate. Considerable improvements were made to this property but there is no evidence to show that any of these improvements were made on the subject area. Until c.1867 the subject area remained undeveloped.

After the first auction of this estate in 1867 the subject area was purchased by Malachi O’Neill, a labourer. He established a house and a boiling down works possibly on the adjoining land to the subject area. The boiling down works would certainly have utilised the stream which flowed across the subject area. After his death the land passed to his wife and then his children. His sons, prior to his death, established a brickworks, apparently on the site of the later Heine factory. They too must have used the stream on the subject area as part of the industrial process. This stream remained open at least until 1889. In 1892 the brickworks closed and in 1894 a map was prepared of the site which shows the first evidence for this stream being filled in, on the site of the later factory.

The subject area appears to have been leased and then finally sold in 1904. From c.1900 to 1918 it was used by dairymen. In 1919 Heine established his factory which is still on the site at this time.

The documentary evidence for the subject area indicates that it is highly improbable that any archaeological evidence pre-dating 1867 will be found during any future redevelopment. There is a strong probability that archaeological evidence of the industrial ventures of the later nineteenth century, particularly the brickworks, will be found. This evidence could take the form of building foundations, kiln foundations and waste material.

The evidence also indicates a strong likelihood for extant evidence of the filling and leveling programme which must have occurred to infill the stream and provide a level platform for later construction. This filling programme is likely to have occurred in c.1893. The artefacts which have been dug out of the site at this time certainly relate to this programme. They do not relate to any specific period of occupancy and are not chronologically viable as an archaeological tool other than for that single area of site interpretation.

The buildings and industrial relics contained within the Heine factory require independent assessment by an heritage architect and an industrial archaeologist.
1.0 PREFACE TO THE REPORT

1.1 Location

The subject area investigated during this programme is located at the corner of Francis and Allen Streets, Leichhardt. It is currently occupied by a factory complex formerly utilised by John Heine and Sons.

1.2 Initiative for Investigation

This investigation was initiated by the discovery and removal of certain artefacts from deposits underlying the factory site. An officer from the Department of Planning visited the site with this consultant to assess the possible significance of the material and recommend a future course of action. The developers for the site subsequently requested an investigation and advice from this consultant regarding the most appropriate action for this material.

1.3 Objectives

Three major objectives were defined for this work. These were:

- to carry out primary research sufficient to define the development of the subject site and, therefore, a probable data of, and reasons for, deposition of the artefact material

- to assess the significance of the artefact material in terms of its importance to the subject site and as an independent archaeological resource

- to provide recommendations for the future management of the archaeological resource in the event of the site's redevelopment

This report details this investigation and the recommendations which have been made based on the assessed significance of the material.

1.4 Methodology

Primary research has been carried out in the major archival repositories of the Mitchell and State Libraries, the State Archives Office of New South Wales, the Land Titles Office, the Lands Department, the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, the Royal Australian Historical Society and local history collections. The comprehensive data base gathered as part of the Leichhardt Heritage Study has also been used to provide an historical context for the site. The site and the artefact material has been viewed both by the consultant and an officer of the Department of Planning. Recommendations have been made regarding the significance of the industrial aspects and streetscape value of the site.
2.0 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The following discussion establishes the development of the subject site from primary sources. It is arranged according to the primary development phases as defined by that archival material. These are:

- 1788 - 1867 Elswick Estate
- 1867 - 1914 Suburbanisation
- 1914 - 1989 Industrialisation
2.1 1788 - 1867 Elswick Estate

The subject area was included in a Crown Grant of 1811 made to Hugh Piper. The grant encompassed 270 acres and was to be called "Macquarie Gift". Hugh Piper returned to England in the following year and, most likely, vested power of attorney for the land in his brother, John Piper. John Piper gained a possesory title to it in 1832.

John Piper was forced to sell some of his, then, considerable holdings in the latter day Leichhardt because of financial problems. These sales commenced in 1831, however, it is apparent that in 1828 he had already sold some of the former Macquarie Gift to James Foster, a Sydney solicitor. This included the subject area. The sale was not regularized until 1832, however, it seems certain that between 1828 and 1834 Foster built a residence, Elswick House, on this property.

In 1834 James Norton bought the estate, Elswick Estate, and its improvements from James Foster. The improvements made to the estate included the house and kitchen, various outbuildings, gardens and paddocks. Two inns stood on Parramatta Road. There is no evidence at all for the development of the subject area in any way as part of these estate improvements. The major developments centred around the house which was to the south of the subject area.

Additional improvements made to the estate during the 1840s and 1850s appear to have been concentrated on the house, for example additions to this building, and new accommodation made for servants. There is no evidence that any of these subsequent improvements encompassed the subject area.

James Norton lived at Elswick House until his death in 1862. Norton's widow, Marion, one of his sons, James, and a friend, Henry Allen, were granted probate of the will. In 1867 the decision was made to subdivide Elswick Estate. The position of the estate to the city made residential land in this location desirable.
FIGURE 1: Elswick Estate Improvements over the major subdivisions.

SOURCE: Cusick., 24
2.2 1867-1914 Suburbanisation

The first sale notices for the estate appeared in February 1867 and subdivision plans were issued in March of that year. They show five sections and fifty-two allotments with five new streets. The subject area was included in Section 5 as Lot 3.

The auction was not a success. Only one lot in one Section was sold. Lot 3 Section 5, the subject area. This was purchased by a labourer, Malachi O'Neill. The O'Neill house was built facing Allen Street but the majority of the site was left undeveloped for many years. A creek that flowed the entire length of the property facilitated a boiling down works run by O'Neill although the precise location of this establishment is unknown. It was probably located between Francis and North Streets further west of the Heine site.

The Leichhardt brickworks were also established on O'Neill’s property. This business was run by his sons after his death and up to 1892. It seems likely that the boiling down works was the father’s primary concern which, after his death, was superseded by the sons’ business interest, the brickworks. The precise location of the latter venture is also unknown although it appears most likely to have been on the Heine factory site itself. By 1889 Francis Street had been created on the eastern perimeter and this provides some guide for directory listings.

In those listings for the two establishments the boiling down works are listed from 1875 to 1883 and appear to occupy the site immediately adjacent and west of the factory. The brickworks commence listing in 1879 and conclude in 1892. This is listed as immediately preceding Francis Street. After 1892 the site is then listed as occupied by various O’Neills until 1899 at which time it was said to be occupied by W. Bucksworth, a tram conductor. In 1900 P. Maloney, a dairyman, occupied the site. In 1901 J. Ryan, a dairyman, was listed as occupant.

It seems likely, from this evidence, that in the final years of their ownership of the property the O’Neills leased it to these tenants.

The most detailed plans of the site are from 1889 and 1894. In 1889 the Heine factory site is shown with the creek still running across it although it had been fenced; the latter presumably relates to the brickworks although no buildings can be attributed to the establishment. The 1894 plan of the site shows the creek to cease just north of the factory site with only partial fencing. It is possible that, by this time, the creek had been partially filled although the evidence is ambiguous.

The twenty six acres purchased by O’Neill had passed to his widow, Catherine, in 1882. She passed on the land to her four children Alexander, Thomas, Francis and Kate in 1893. In 1904 the property was sold to Samuel Patterson, a builder. Between 1904 and 1917 W. Lambert, dairyman, is listed as occupying the site. It became vacant in 1918. In 1914 Patterson sold the site to a light industrial firm, John Heine and Son.
FIGURE 2: Plan of Site in 1889
Source: MWSDB Survey
FIGURE 3 Plan of site in 1894

Source: ML MSer 4 811.17/1 (Detail)
2.3 1914 - 1989 Industrialisation

Heine appears to have established his factory in 1919. Part of the site was leased to a bicycle firm, Cyclops and Lines Brothers Ltd in 1926. The lease expired in 1952 and Heine sold the two acres fronting William and Francis Streets to Cyclops and Lines, now Raleigh Industries (Aust) Ltd. All the current improvements to the site relate to this phase of development.
3.0 ASSESSMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

This section considers the potential archaeological resource which may be located on the site and the provenance of the artefacts which have been unearthed in light of the preceding documented evidence. It is considered according to the primary development phases defined by that evidence.

3.1 1788 - 1867 Elswick Estate

There is no evidence to suggest that the Elswick Estate was developed prior to the construction of Elswick House and its various outbuildings and gardens. Furthermore, superimposing the most detailed plans of the developed estate over a current street plan, there is no indication that the subject area was encompassed in any of the estate developments. These occurred to the south of the current factory site.

In summary; there is no evidence that the subject area was physically developed in any way during the period when it was included as part of the Elswick Estate. Therefore it may be assumed that the likelihood of locating any archaeological material from this phase during future redevelopment is minimal and highly improbable.

3.2 Suburbanisation 1867 - 1914

Between 1873 (possibly 1867 although there is no firm evidence for this date) and 1892 the O'Neili family operated both a boiling down works and a brickworks on their property. The boiling down works was in operation from 1873 (or 1867) to approximately 1880 and the brickworks from 1879 to 1892. The brickworks appear to have superseded the boiling down works. Both would have required the creek which crossed the entire property as part of their industrial functions.

There is no firm evidence for the location of either of the industrial sites although the documentary evidence infers that the boiling down works may have been on the site adjacent and to the west of the later factory site and the brickworks may have occupied the factory site. It is also unclear what buildings and facilities were utilised by either business although sheds and other buildings may be expected. The most likely and identifiable evidence of the brickworks would be the kilns required for firing the green bricks. It is clear from the available evidence, however, that, at least until 1889, the factory site was still crossed by an open stream and any buildings or features that may have been associated with either industry were located around it on some part of the block.
By 1894 it seems likely that, at least the land at the corner of Francis and Allen Streets, was partially filled; the stream is not shown as being open in this area of the site. Certainly the site had been filled by 1919 when Heine constructed his factory and oral historical accounts refer to the land being filled or at least level and used for dairying prior to that construction. The dairying function accords with the documentary evidence.

Hence the available evidence suggests that the land was probably filled and levelled at least between 1894 and 1904 at the time of the sale of the land. Certainly it has to have been filled after the closure of the brickworks which would have required the water source ie, post 1892. As the documentary evidence appears to show the site at least partially filled in 1894 the most likely period of filling and leveling for this part of the site is c. 1892/3.

This phase of occupation is certainly likely to have left archaeological material on the site. There is the potential for evidence of the industrial functions of the site, for example sheds and other building foundations and, in particular, kiln foundations. It is also probable that extensive areas of fill will be located on the site. The use of the site for dairy purposes is likely to have left little impact. The available evidence suggests that the operation was small scale and minimally developed, primarily open paddocks.

3.3 1914 - 1989 Industrialisation

The evidence of this phase of work is above ground and incorporated within the industrial buildings and relics of the Heine and Sons factory.

3.4 Conclusions

The evidence for the site indicates that:

- it is highly improbable that any in situ archaeological evidence will be located during future redevelopment which could relate to the Elswick Estate occupation i.e pre 1867.

- some evidence of the industrial functions of the site may be located during redevelopment. These may consist of building foundations, waste material (slag, "bad" bricks etc) and kiln foundations.

- that evidence of the filling programme will be located during redevelopment

- that little evidence of the dairying phase will be located because of its low impact on the site.
• that the primary evidence of the last industrial phase will be located within the structures and relics currently found on site.

3.5 The Excavated Artefacts as Archaeological Evidence

The artefacts which have been dug out of the site under the Heine factory to date have been examined and a broad chronological phase assigned to them. The chronological range of the material which includes ceramics, glass, worked and edible bone, clay pipes, metals etc, covers the last half of the nineteenth century and the first years of the twentieth century. This assessment has been made on the ceramic and glass styles, patterns and shapes.

The primary question which must be asked of a potential archaeological assemblage such as this is, does it have a firm provenance? That is, has the material derived from a specific period of use which has well defined chronological parameters and can it be used to examine broad archaeological trends as an independent and firmly provenanced data base. The answers to these questions determine the future investigation and use of the material. An example of the above would be an assemblage which accumulated under a floor of a house that could be dated to the time of its construction and destruction i.e. the accumulated artefacts would have a limited period of deposition between those two dates.

If the assemblage from the Heine site falls within the above definition the earliest period of deposition, based on styles within the assemblage, would be from the mid nineteenth century. However, the documentary evidence clearly shows that the site was not occupied at that time and that an open stream traversed the area of the artefact deposition. Clearly the material cannot have been deposited from the mid century in this stream without filling it. Later evidence shows the stream to have been still open in the 1880s. Therefore, material in the assemblage from this early period must come from a secondary source.

The material might be viewed as household waste associated with the O'Neill occupancy although the quantities involved are difficult to reconcile with even a large family wastage pattern. Furthermore, as the O'Neills did not arrive on the site until the later 1860s, this cannot explain the earlier mid century material indicated in the assemblage. It is also inconceivable that the stream, which is seen to be still open during 1889, would have been filled by those who must have been using it as part of their industrial ventures, brickworks and boiling down works both requiring a source of running water.

The only logical means of attributing this artefact material to a chronological period is after or during the period when the stream was filled. From the documentary evidence this appears to be c.1892/3. This means that the artefacts on the site are not successively stratified dumps associated with changing or evolving occupations they are the product of one or more massive dumping exercises to fill and level the land presumably prior to the dairy function of this property. The early twentieth century artefacts found in the assemblage suggest that some additional filling may have occurred prior to the construction of the Heine factory.
The bore logs taken across the site confirm this interpretation. The logs define a level of fill over most of the site to a depth of at least 0.5 to one metre although in a few instances the depth reached 2.3 metres. Significantly those occasions where the depth of fill was greatest are the logs taken over the course of the old stream. The fill from all logs was varied including clay and gravel and refuse including metal and glass.

The artefacts, therefore, are not chronologically stratified from the mid nineteenth century to the early twentieth century and therefore do not fill the criteria for a firmly provenanced archaeological assemblage. They have been dumped, obviously from an external source (which accounts for the mid nineteenth century date of some of the material) and may be interpreted only as fill. They cannot be used to interpret the site further, they do not relate to any specific occupation (other than the filling programme) and, because they have no firm provenance and are stratigraphically mixed, they have no particular use for archaeological purposes which require artefacts in well dated, documented and sealed deposits.

The practice of using nineteenth century garbage for filling programmes in Sydney is well demonstrated from a variety of sources. Large areas of Observatory Hill, East and West Circular Quay and the Domain have been observed by archaeologists during excavations to have very large quantities of mixed nineteenth century material imported and used for leveling purposes. The Leichhardt site is another example of the same. Any collection of material from this site would be for antiquarian or collectors purposes. The assemblage, although attractive because of its range of intact and aesthetically appealing pieces, is not of archaeological interest other than in confirming the archival evidence and in the single interpretation of the filling and leveling of the site.
4.0 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE POTENTIAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ITS MANAGEMENT.

4.1 The O’Neill Occupation and Industrial Sites

Any evidence which might be located of this period of use, particularly of the industrial sites, would be of high archaeological significance. Few sites of this local and urban industrial nature remain in the Leichhardt Municipal area and any evidence of the type and management of the sites would be of value to be recorded.

It is recommended that a watching brief be initiated during the redevelopment of the site to observe and fully record any evidence of this period of occupation which might be uncovered.

4.2 The Filling Material Including the Artefacts

The significance of the artefacts and fill from this site is low. It has historical significance in interpreting the later history of the site but it does not have further archaeological significance. There is no value or purpose in collecting samples of or excavating this unprovenanced material.

It is recommended that when the site is redeveloped the extent and depth of the material should be observed and recorded.

4.3 The Industrial Buildings and Relics

The significance of the buildings as streetscape and heritage items required independent assessment as do the remaining industrial relics.

It is recommended that advice be sought from a heritage architect and an industrial archaeologist to address the significance and management of these items.
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