

Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage Assessment

Cultural Heritage Assessment

- 8. Cultural Heritage Assessment2
 - 8.1 Introduction.....2
 - 8.2 Baseline Assessment.....2
 - 8.3 Results / Assessment Findings3
 - 8.4 Mitigation.....4
 - 8.5 Summary of Effects5

8. Cultural Heritage Assessment

8.1 Introduction

An assessment of the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Cultural Heritage values of the site was carried out by Australian Cultural Heritage Management (ACHM) in conjunction with the Peramangk Traditional Owners (represented by the Mannum Aboriginal Community Association Inc. [MACAI]). The assessment included an initial desk top assessment followed by a site assessment of the proposed wind farm footprint, taking into account Aboriginal (anthropological and archaeological) and European cultural heritage.

A summary of ACHM's report is provided here and the full report is presented as Appendix F.

8.2 Baseline Assessment

8.2.1 Methodology

An assessment of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultural heritage was carried out by desktop research of available information at a local, State and Commonwealth level. This initial desk top assessment was followed by a site inspection.

Desk top Assessment

Prior to the site inspections, the following databases were reviewed:

- DPC-AARD Central Archive
- South Australian Museum Anthropology Database
- Australian Heritage Database
- South Australian Heritage Register

These searches returned information on the existence of Aboriginal and European sites within or near the project area. In addition all relevant and accessible anthropological and archaeological literature relating to the project area and to the history of the MACAI people was reviewed.

Site inspection

The site investigation comprised both anthropological and archaeological surveys.

The anthropological site inspection was undertaken on 18 April 2011 by an anthropologist from ACHM and MACAI representatives who were consulted about the cultural significance of the site and the project area in general.

The archaeological survey was conducted on foot on 19-20 April 2011 by archaeologists from ACHM accompanied by representatives from MACAI. The assessment involved a significance assessment of the landscape rather than a specific ground surface survey. Nevertheless, throughout the survey, the ground surface was monitored for the presence of sites or artefacts.

8.2.2 Assessment Aims

The aim of the site inspection was to identify and record any Aboriginal heritage sites and provide an archaeological profile of the area whereby areas were denoted as presenting a high, medium or

low risk of encountering surface or subsurface archaeological material. The archaeologist also documented any points of interest with regard to European heritage.

This initial site assessment was conducted in order to advise Pacific Hydro of any significant heritage concerns in the initial planning stages and make recommendations with regard to cultural heritage management. This information was then used to inform the layout and ensure that areas of high cultural sensitivity could be avoided or potential impacts minimised.

8.2.3 Further Assessment Required

As agreed between ACHM, MACAI and Pacific Hydro, a further archaeological survey of the precise final footprint will be conducted if the project is approved prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing work that occurs during construction.

8.3 Results / Assessment Findings

8.3.1 Desktop

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

A search of the DPC-AARD Central Archive found one registered site lies along the boundary of the proposed Keyneton Wind Farm, at the southeast section of the project area. The site is a scarred or culturally modified tree (AARD site 3910, Cambrai Scarred Tree). This site will not be affected by the proposed works. In addition, 15 other registered sites, including campsites, scarred trees, a painting site, a burial and a quarry, exist within 5km of the project area.

A search of the South Australian Museum Anthropology Database returned numerous results for artefacts and human remains found within the region, and although the records are not detailed enough to indicate the exact find locations, these results provide some indication of the extent of occupation of Aboriginal people within the region, and the likelihood of uncovering other such objects in the project area.

A review of relevant literature shows that the project area lies definitively within the traditional lands of the Peramangk, and records by early settlers document a population of several thousand living in large camps throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges. The literature, as well as the discovery of numerous rock art and campsites along the Marne River, shows that this area was part of an important trade route and cultural centre, with groups conducting meetings and ceremonies on the upper banks of Saunders Creek and the Marne River, near Springton and Eden Valley.

European Heritage

The Keyneton Wind Farm area is significant in terms of the history of European settlement. Keyneton was part of the early settlement of South Australia and the home of Joseph Keynes, who established a successful Merino sheep farming operation in the 1850s. A search of the Australian Heritage Database did not return any results within the project area. However, two sites registered on the South Australian Heritage Register lie near the project area, although not within it. These are a historic Engine House for the North Rhine Mine and a historic bridge (adjacent to the Angaston-Sedan Road to the east of Graetz Town).

Historic stone walls also criss-cross the project area, and were documented during the site inspection, although these walls are not registered.

8.3.2 Site Assessment

Anthropology

During the anthropological site inspection the majority of the proposed infrastructure was deemed, by Traditional Owners present, to be clear of anthropologically significant areas.

One area comprising a creek and spring within the northern cluster was deemed to be of anthropological significance. Although not enough detail was determined during the site visit to be able to register the creek or spring as an Aboriginal site under the terms of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988*, the MACAI representatives identified them as culturally significant and stated that they would like them to be protected. As a result, it was recommended that the turbine proposed for this area be constructed at a minimum of 50m from the creek, and that the associated access track and cable travel around the head of the gully, to the west, rather than through the gully.

The North Rhine River, which is crossed by an existing access track near the southwestern entry point to the project area, is also considered to be of likely anthropological significance.

Archaeology

The archaeological inspection identified one archaeological site (a scarred tree) and one potential archaeological site (a rock art site). Neither of these sites will be impacted by the development.

In addition, the archaeological site inspection resulted in the identification and subsequent mapping of areas of high, medium and low archaeological sensitivity, with the North Rhine River in the southwestern section of the survey area, the pockets of remnant vegetation located in the centre of the survey area and the spring site in the north of the survey area accorded high archaeological sensitivity status. Three minor creek ways in the south of the survey area were considered to be of medium archaeological sensitivity, with the remainder of the survey area considered to be of low archaeological sensitivity.

8.4 Mitigation

Following the site inspections, the following cultural heritage recommendations were made and have been adopted within the design:

- ACHM recommended that tower number 4 (with reference to 57 turbine layout) should be constructed at a minimum of 50m from the creek, to avoid damaging the creek and a spring identified as culturally significant. In addition the associated access track and cable should be rerouted around the head of the gully to avoid the creek and spring. Following this recommendation, turbine 4 was removed.
- All sites and potential sites recorded during the site inspection and during future surveys should be treated in accordance with the requirements of the South Australian *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988* i.e. should not be damaged, disturbed or interfered with without Ministerial approval.
- In the event that any sites are to be disturbed a prior application must be made to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation.
- Consideration should be given to designated areas of low, medium and high archaeological sensitivity, and any impact to areas accorded high archaeological sensitivity should be avoided. Impact to areas accorded medium archaeological sensitivity should be avoided where possible.
- Where infrastructure is still proposed within high and medium sensitivity areas it is recommended that on-site monitoring occurs during initial ground disturbing works. It is noted that a pedestrian archaeological survey could further refine this recommendation and the areas requiring monitoring.

- A thorough archaeological pedestrian cultural heritage survey should be undertaken of the final infrastructure footprint. This is particularly recommended where infrastructure will disturb areas designated as being of high or medium cultural sensitivity.
- A Cultural Heritage Management Plan should be developed to provide for the long term relationship between the development and heritage in the area. As part of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan, a site discovery procedure should be developed.
- Whilst the dry stone walls present on site are not currently registered or protected, it is recommended that the disturbance of historic dry stone walls within the project site is avoided wherever possible.
- Where impact is unavoidable to the dry stonewalls, the level of disturbance should be mitigated by use of careful de-construction methods. The walls will be re-established at the conclusion of construction and Pacific Hydro will seek the assistance of the Dry Stone Walling Association of Australia or other experienced "wallers" to repair or reconstruct any areas of dry stone wall that have been disturbed.

8.5 Summary of Effects

Following the site surveys and during the assessment process the wind turbine layout was revised due to a number of environmental factors including the identification of areas of high cultural sensitivity on the site.

As a result of these revisions, several of the proposed turbines have been removed from areas designated as having medium or high potential for archaeological sites to exist. Of the 42 turbines that form part of the revised layout, one turbine (turbine 5) and its associated access track lies within an area designated as being of high sensitivity, and one (turbine 23) intersects only slightly (likely to be overswept by the blades rather than ground disturbance) with the edge of an area designated as medium sensitivity. Tower number 4 of the original 57 turbine layout has been removed from the layout altogether.

Of the associated infrastructure, one site office, a section of overhead line (between the northern and southern clusters) and limited sections of access track remain within an area of high sensitivity.

A further pedestrian archaeological survey will be undertaken prior to any ground disturbing activities being carried out.

Where infrastructure is still proposed within high and medium sensitivity areas on-site monitoring is carried out during initial ground disturbing works unless further surveys suggest allow this recommendation to be refined.

With respect to the historic stone walls the turbine and access track layout has sought to minimise impacts on the walls, although some disturbance at site access points and to accommodate access tracks is expected. Where disturbance occurs, Pacific Hydro will seek the assistance of experienced "wallers" to repair or reconstruct any areas.

ACHM conducted a full site assessment with representatives of the MACAI. This assessment was used to inform the turbine layout and as a result a number of modifications have been made to ensure that any impacts on known or identified archaeological or anthropological values have been minimised. The MACAI representatives have reviewed and endorsed the ACHM report.