This report has been produced as part of the assessment for ARCH8508, Directed Study in Cultural Heritage Management, graduate topic in the Department of Archaeology, Flinders University in association with the Florey Reconciliation Task Force.
2 Executive Summary

This report was produced for the Florey Reconciliation Task Force,

The goals of this project were:

• to conduct a systematic survey of Pine Park Reserve to identify any archaeological or heritage remains;
• to record all heritage aspects of the park;
• to conduct background research in order to contextualise the sites and places within the history and archaeology of the region;
• to assess the significance of the heritage of Pine Park in a local and state context;
• to recommend management strategies.
# Table of Contents

1. Cover Page
2. Executive Summary
3. Table of Contents
4. Introduction
   4.1 Industry Partner
   4.2 Objectives
   4.3 Pine Park Reserve Description
   4.4 Legislative Context
   4.5 Acknowledgements
5. History of Pine Park Reserve, Tea Tree Gully
6. Methodology
   6.1 Historical research
   6.2 Fieldwork
7. Analysis
   7.1 Research Findings
   7.2 Fieldwork Outcomes and Findings
8. Assessment of the significance of the Pine Park Reserve
   8.1 Indigenous areas of the reserve
   8.2 Built areas of the reserve
   8.3 Natural areas of the reserve
   8.4 Overall Significance
9. Recommendations
   9.1 Pine Park
   9.2 Council Chambers
   9.3 Pine Plantation
   9.4 Springs, Creek and Water Tank
   9.5 Gum Tree Section
   9.6 Quarry
10. Directions for future research
11. References
12. Appendix
4. Introduction

4.1 Industry Partner

This project was conducted at the request of the Florey Reconciliation Task Force, which is a group of community members who meet regularly at the office of Ms. Frances Bedford, the South Australian Parliamentary Member for Florey. The Task Force provides an opportunity for consultation between the local community and Ms. Bedford.

4.2 Objectives

The goals of this project were:

- to conduct a systematic survey of Pine Park Reserve to identify any archaeological or heritage remains;
- to record all heritage aspects of the park;
- to conduct background research in order to contextualise the sites and places within the history and archaeology of the region;
- to assess the significance of the heritage of Pine Park;
- to recommend management strategies.

The deliverables for this project are this report, a poster summarising this project and its outcomes, a presentation to be delivered to supervising staff at Flinders University and the Florey Reconciliation Task Force, and a draft interpretative brochure for Pine Park Reserve (poster and draft brochure submitted separately).
4.3 Pine Park Reserve Description

Formal Description of the study area:

The land included in the Pine Park Reserve is comprised of:

Section 949 in Deposited Plan 574, being the land contained in Crown Record 5754/371; Section 989 in Deposited Plan 574, being the land contained in Crown Record 5754/372; Lot 503 in Deposited Plan 45738, being the land contained in Crown Record 5508/183; Lot 500 in Deposited Plan 45721, being the land contained in Certificate of Title 5453/231; Lot 502 in Deposited Plan 45721, being the land contained in Certificate of Title 5875/813; Lot 54 in Deposited Plan 6169, being the land contained in Certificate of Title 5684/24, bounded by North East Road and Haines Road (Fig. 4.1).

Fig. 4.1. Map of the Pine Park Reserve and surrounds, including crown title references. City of Tea Tree Gully 2003:5.
General description

The City of Tea Tree Gully is situated about 15 kilometres northeast of Adelaide, and lies both on the plain and in the foothills of the Adelaide Hills (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:2). Pine Park is a council reserve located at the very edge of the Adelaide Hills Face zone, on the eastern boundary between the hills and the City of Tea Tree Gully. It is part of the Tea Tree Gully Historic Conservation Zone. Pine Park Reserve is bounded by North East Road to the south and Haines Road to the west, with housing and pasture to the north, and pasture and the historic Newman’s Nursery to the west. Pine Park Reserve contains a diverse range of historic and significant features. The Pine Reserve to the rear of the Council Chambers is included on the Local Heritage Register.
Due to the variety of heritage in Pine Park, it falls under a number of pieces of legislation. These pieces of legislation, and how they relate to different aspects of the Park, are outlined below.

The Council Chambers and the *Heritage Places Act 1993*

The Council Chambers are located on CT5754/372, 2 Haines Road, Tea Tree Gully and are currently listed under the *Heritage Places Act 1993* under the following categories:
a) *it demonstrates important aspects of the evolution or pattern of development of the State’s history*; the Council Chambers were the first local council chambers built in South Australia (Mark Butcher Architects 1997:48). The Tea Tree Gully District Council was one of the first districts formed after the November proclamation of the *Act to appoint District Councils 1852*, and the Council Chambers were built in 1855 (Mark Butcher Architects 1997:48). The chambers are also associated with the early development of the Adelaide Hills (Mark Butcher Architects 1997:48).

b) *it is an outstanding representative of a particular class of places of cultural significance*; in addition to being the first council chambers in the State, the design of the building is simple and novel, and retains many of its original features (Mark Butcher Architects 1997:48).

g) *it has a special association with the life or work of a person or organisation or an event of historical importance*; the building is particularly associated with the development of local government in South Australia, as well as with the development of the local District Council who organised for the building to be constructed (Mark Butcher Architects 1997:48). Additionally, it is associated with an important architect, William Weir, who designed a number of significant buildings in the early days of the colony of Adelaide (Mark Butcher Architects 1997:48).

The primary aims of the *1993 Heritage Places Act* are to recognise the important heritage places in South Australia and objects related to those places, and also to
recognise that the preservation of these places is important in understanding the history of South Australia. The legislation aims to provide a mechanism for identifying and documenting these places. The Act allows for the conservation and promotion of these places and their related objects, in order to encourage people to understand and appreciate them. The Act encourages the sustainable use and adaptation of these sites, where that usage and adaptation is consistent with high quality conservation practices and development policies that allow for these places to maintain their significance as heritage places.

The 1993 Heritage Places Act has a wide definition of ‘Heritage Place’; it may be a building, a piece of land or something that is permanently fixed or moored. It can be something associated with the historical development of the state, or a rare or endangered place of cultural importance, or contain information that relates to the cultural or natural history of the state, or a particularly beautiful or skilful example of a type, design or construction of a place, or a place that is or has been important to the cultural or spiritual activities of a group or the wider community, or a place that is in some way associated with an important person, group or event.

The Pine Reserve and the Development Act 1993

The Pine Reserve to the rear of the Council Chambers is located on CR5754/371, Haines Road, Tea Tree Gully, and is currently listed as a Local Heritage Place under the Development Act 1993 under the following categories:
a) *it displays historical, economic or social themes that are of importance to the local area*; the pines were planted in 1937 to celebrate 100 years of settlement in the district, and are associated with the Council Chambers.

f) *it is a notable landmark in the area*; due to the height and density of the mature pines (McDougall and Vines 1999:74).

The primary aims of this Act are to provide direction for planning and development in South Australia. The Act establishes objectives and principles of planning and development, a system of strategic planning governing development, and provides for the creation of Development Plans. A Development Plan governs a specific area with the goals of facilitating sustainable conservation, use, development and management of land and buildings. It encourages both sustainable environmental and economic management of places, technical requirements that are in the public interest – particularly with regard to safety – and appropriate public participation in planning processes.

**Pine Park Administration under the Tea Tree Gully Development Plan 2008**

The City of Tea Tree Gully Development Plan 2008 includes a number of objectives and principles that guide the administration of the Park. The most pertinent of the relevant objectives and principles are outlined below:
Objectives 20, 22 and 23 all relate to stormwater management (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:23). Principle 85.1.b states that local native flora should be planted along waterways, replacing exotic flora (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:24).

Objective 27 relates to the conservation, preservation and enhancement of scenic and attractive areas, including land adjoining waterways, in order to preserve the natural character of the Mount Lofty Ranges (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:41). Objective 28 discusses the preservation of buildings of significant, archaeological or scientific interest, and Objective 32 states that native vegetation should be retained. These three objectives all relate to conservation of resources in the Tea Tree Gully district, and the associated principles state that natural vegetation should be preserved where possible and replanted where practical, that the natural character of creeks and rivers should be preserved, that development should not impair the character or nature of buildings or sites that have been identified as possessing historical interest or natural beauty (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:43). Principle 119 states that native vegetation should not be cleared if it has high amenity value or if it has a high value as a remnant of vegetation associated with a district prior to extensive clearance for agriculture (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:43). Principle 120 states that native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing will contribute to soil erosion or decrease soil stability (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:43).

Objectives that relate to heritage state that heritage should be preserved (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:50). Related to this section, principle 145 states that development should not damage Aboriginal heritage sites (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:51). In
general the principles state that development or use of heritage places listed in the State Heritage Register should not destroy or impair the heritage value of the place, should occur in a manner that enhances the heritage value of the place and the character of the locality, and should seek to retain the mature vegetation that complements the heritage place (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:51).

Principle 245 states that the natural cover of land should be restored to quarries once they are no longer in use (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:80). Principles 274, 275 and 276 are related to watercourse management, and state that watercourses should be protected and enhanced by stabilisation of the banks, retaining them in their natural state as far as possible, and should not be drained (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:87-88). Specific provisions that relate to development in the Historic Conservation Zone states that new development should take place away from existing stands of trees and watercourses (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:233). Pine Park Reserve is indicated on Fig. HT/1 as part of an area of Significant Vegetation (City of Tea Tree Gully 2008:232).
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5 History of Pine Park Reserve, Tea Tree Gully

Kaurna History

Kaurna country covered all of what is now known as the Adelaide plains (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:5). It extended up to Crystal Brook in the north, down to Cape Jervis in the south, west to the ocean where Kaurna people stayed in winter, and east to the hills where they stayed in summer (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:5). Springs and waterholes would have provided water in the dry summers, but the creeks and rivers flowed down to the plains in winter (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:6).

The initial arrival of European settlers in the area that came to be known as Steventon, and then later Tea Tree Gully, quickly led to the displacement of the local Kaurna people, followed by the dispossession of their ancestral homelands (Auhl 1993:339). In the 20 years that followed the initial invasion, the number of Kaurna people declined rapidly as the area was occupied and settled by Europeans (Auhl 1993:339). The majority of the area was used as farmland by the Europeans; the trees were removed and the land tilled and cultivated, in the process removing many of the indicators of Kaurna inhabitation (Auhl 1993:339-340).

One of the most common Kaurna tools found in the early days of settlement were kidney-shaped scraper, generally made of slate, used for scraping the possum skins which were then made into cloaks. (Auhl 1993:340). The tribal life of the Kaurna was
permanently disrupted within a few years of the invasion of Europeans (Auhl 1993:340).

One of the earliest local records of contact with Kaurna people was made by Walter Cronk who lived in the Modbury area (Auhl 1993:120-121). Cronk described his first meeting with a group of 35 Kaurna “about 18 miles from town” (Auhl 1993:121), Cronk was living in Adelaide at the time (Auhl, 1993:124). As European settlement and land clearing drove the Kaurna food sources such as kangaroo and possum away, Kaurna people turned to European’s livestock for food, which quickly led to conflict (Auhl 1993:122). Auhl notes that Indigenous people frequently passed through the district, sometimes from districts as far away as the River Murray (Auhl 1993:123). He also mentions remembrances of a traditional ceremony held on a
reserve in Tea Tree Gully, thought to have been Haines Memorial Reserve, which is less than 500m away from Pine Park Reserve. Another common meeting and camping place in the district was by the Little Para near the Snake Gully Bridge, another permanent source of water (Auhl 1993:124).

**Pine Park Reserve and the North East Road**

Although Tea Tree Gully was not the first area of settlement in the north eastern district, it was amongst the earliest and has the best surviving village core (McDougall and Vines Heritage Consultants 1999:69). The area was originally referred to as Teatree Gully after the Tea Trees that grew along the banks of the creek (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:14). The mill, constructed in 1853 and the first building in the area, was also named after these trees (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:14). John Stevens laid out the town on part of his land in 1854 (McDougall and Vines Heritage Consultants 1999:69). It soon became known as Steventon Estate, which led to the township being called Steventon (McDougall and Vines Heritage Consultants 1999:69). The area continued to be referred to as Tea Tree Gully by locals however, and eventually the name became permanently associated with the township (McDougall and Vines Heritage Consultants 1999:69).
The village grew quickly, with six new buildings constructed that year, followed by the first local Council Chambers and a Wesleyan Chapel in 1855 (McDougall and Vines Heritage Consultants 1999:69). There were already 1,440 residents in the District Council at the time (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:6).

The road is a significant feature of the area and runs alongside the Reserve. The current road follows almost exactly the original route first cut privately in 1840-1 by Thomas Williams of Hermitage (Auhl 1980:36). The road was chosen and developed as one of the main thoroughfares through the ranges due to its proximity to water and its gentle gradient which made it possible for bullock and horse trains to carry supplies to and from Adelaide (Auhl 1980:31). The only other passage through the Mount Lofty Ranges at that time was via Glen Osmond (Auhl 1980:31). Transportation of various materials – particularly logs, fire wood for domestic usage,
wattle bark, building stone, fruit, road metal, timber, wool and food supplies – by bullock and horse trains begins and quickly became common in the 1840’s (Clifton 2005:3).

By the early 1850’s there was discussion in the state government regarding the construction of a road to replace the informal track (Butcher 1997:2) and in 1854 the Main North East Road was declared by the State Government (Auhl 1980:36). The road led from Adelaide via Walkerville, Klemzig, Hope Valley, Tea Tree Gully to Houghton (Auhl 1980:36). The presence of water and an existing road contributed to this decision (Auhl 1980:36). The combination of these factors contributed to John Stevens’ decision to subdivide the land at the entrance to the Gully into a township (Auhl 1980:36).
As bullock and horse trains were common along the road, the council arranged in 1860 for a tree on the reserve to be felled and a large trough to be hollowed out of it to water the animals (Auhl 1980:31). In 1910, all business and property owners had private transport, depending on their requirements (Clifton 2005:3). Bullock teams were very common, horse teams were less so (Clifton 2005:3). However by 1935 vehicle transport had largely replaced the bullock and horse teams, and there were only two horse teams remaining (Clifton 2005:8). The road was bituminised in 1926 (Auhl 1993:162). Today, Main North East Road is still a major thoroughfare providing access to the townships and country to the north east of Adelaide (Auhl 1980:34).

Auhl (1980:30) notes that the area close to the creek and bridge was once part of the Public Pound. The Reserve contains several small bridges, but it is likely that the bridge Auhl refers to is the Haines Road bridge and the grassed picnic area. The
Pound was established in 1855 and William Haines was the first keeper (Auhl 1980:152). The fines for straying animals impounded were 1/3d for horses and cattle, 2d for sheep and goats, 6d for pigs (Auhl 1980:152).

**The Highercombe Council Chambers**

The State government passed the *Act to appoint District Councils* in November 1852, which allowed districts to begin organising meetings to establish councils and begin raising taxes to make roads, public buildings and a public pound. (Auhl 1980:140). The District of Highercombe was established in the middle of 1853, one of the earliest councils in South Australia (Auhl 1980:145-6). The first councillors were all local landowners: George McEwin, Howard Blyth, Andrew Shillabeer, John Gollop and Joseph Ind (Auhl 1980:145-6). The councillors commissioned the Council Chambers in May 1855, and had their first meeting there in November that same year (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:48). The building was designed by William Weir, a significant colonial architect and the designer of several important buildings in the early colony including the Royal Exchange and many of the early church of England buildings (McDougall 2008). Weir was also the owner of Section 1559 (McDougall 2008) which was next to the section where the Chambers were built.
The district was subsequently split in 1858 and divided into the District of Highercombe to the north and the District of Tea Tree Gully to the south, but was reunited in 1935 as the District of Tea Tree Gully (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:49). The Chambers were used for a variety of purposes, including as a schoolroom, polling booth, court room and police lock up, in addition to serving the council as an Assembly Room for meetings (Auhl 1980:26). The Council Chambers were used by the council until a new civic centre was opened in Modbury in 1967, at which point the Chambers became the local Works Office (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:49).
The Pine Plantation

Pine trees were planted in 1937 behind the Council Chambers to commemorate a centenary of settlement in Tea Tree Gully district (Anon. n.d.). The two districts of Highercombe and Tea Tree Gully had been reunited just 2 years earlier (Anon. n.d.). Celebrations were low key as South Australia was only just beginning to recover from the Great Depression (Anon. n.d.). Around 2200 people lived in the district at the time (Anon. n.d.). The Districts of Highercombe and Tea Tree Gully had been reunited only two years previously (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:49). The 1980 (:27) Auhl study described an adventure playground in the reserve, but without specifying whether the playground was in the Pine plantation or further down the slope, nearer to the creek. The playground has since been removed.
Springs, Creek, Well and Water Tank

In 1860 the Mill ran out of water for steam to power itself due to an inadequate water supply and was forced to close (Auhl 1993:192). At that time George Dickerson owned part of the springs and it is unclear whether he dammed the spring or whether it was overdrawn (Auhl 1993:192). The springs were supposed to have been included as part of the road, but had been incorrectly surveyed (Auhl 1993:314). Dickerson started charging the local residents 1/- a year for water, and people travelled miles to collect it (Auhl 1993:314). The residents were unhappy with paying so much for the water, and petitioned the Government to purchase the springs for public use (Auhl 1993:314). In 1865 the Central Road Board declared the area around the springs an official water reserve, much to Dickerson’s disappointment (Auhl 1993:317). He continued to insist that the springs belonged to him, but allowed the public to draw water from one of the two spring-fed wells on the property (Auhl 1993:317). Plans to pipe the water to people’s homes were not revived until Dickerson left the district in 1876 (Auhl 1993:317).

In 1880 Parliament passed an Act to authorise the construction of a Tank, Wells and other Works for the purpose of supplying Teatree Gully and Modbury with water after William Haines made submissions on behalf of the local residents (Auhl 1980:31). The Act gave permission to the Commissioner of Waterworks to construct the tank, wells and other waterworks as required from public money. The Act created a number of Water Reserves in those districts, and included what is now Pine Park Reserve. A dry brick well was sunk to gather the water from the springs, and earthenware pipes laid to lead water away to a covered tank constructed at a
sufficient elevation to provide fair pressure in the township (Auhl 1980:31). By 1882 homes in Tea Tree Gully and Modbury had piped water (Auhl 1980:31). This was the first government waterworks scheme undertaken outside of Adelaide (Auhl 1993:321). This somewhat inadequate supply continued until 1926 when reticulated water from the Millbrook Reservoir via the Torrens Gorge pipeline was connected to the original supply (Auhl 1980:32, Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1999:7). 1880, the year the act was passed, is also the year in which the quarry ceased operations (Clifton 2005:3). The well and underground tanks are located close to the base of the quarry. The natural springs are still part of a Government Water Reserve, but the tanks are no longer functioning (Auhl 1980:33).
Fig. 5.8. Haines Road bridge, Pine Park circa 1929. Taken from outside the park; the mill building is on the right. Source: State Library of South Australia. Used with permission.

Fig. 5.9. View from Pine Park Reserve towards the drain running under Main North East Road. © Jo Thredgold 2009.
Gum Tree Section

Although there is no specific information about the gum tree section of Pine Park Reserve, this section of the Reserve contains a scarred tree, which is associated with Aboriginal heritage and is one of the few remaining indicators of the presence of Indigenous people in this area.
Quarry

Good quality freestone began to be quarried in the 1850’s on the northern side of the North East Road (Clifton 2005:3). This quarry forms part of Pine Park Reserve today. The original owners are not recorded, but the quarry was later owned by Brown and Thompson (Clifton 2005:3). Stone was transported via horse and bullock teams into the city (Clifton 2005:3). William Bundey opened a quarry in 1868 on the south side of the road, which was in operation until 1922 (Clifton 2005:3). The Anglican St. Peter’s College was built from this stone, as was the Cross of the Sacrifice in Pennington Gardens (Clifton 2005:3). Quarrying on the northern side ceased in 1880, but the quarrying on the southern side continued for many years after that. (Clifton 2005:3)
The two main quarries from which the major buildings in Adelaide city were constructed were at Tea Tree Gully and Glen Osmond (Butcher 1997:7). Butcher et al. (1997:7) report that the freestone sourced from Tea Tree Gully was considered superior to that of Glen Osmond, but it was also less abundant. Some of the buildings constructed from Tea Tree Gully stone include the Town Hall, General Post Office, Scots Church on North Terrace, St. Peter’s Cathedral, St. Francis Xavier’s
Cathedral, Flinders Street Baptist Church, Adelaide University’s Mitchell Building, and the Supreme Court (Butcher 1997:7-8). The main quarries in the Tea Tree Gully area were at Glen Ewin in Lower Hermitage on section 5640, which opened in 1856 (Auhl 1993:266), either side of the Main North East Road in what is now Pine Park and Anstey Hill Park, and at section 5626 of Anstey Hill Park near Lower Main North East Road (Auhl 1993:174).

Fig. 5.13. The Pine Park Reserve quarry today. The telegraph pole on the far right indicates the top of the tank. Taken from the path at the start of the western side of the quarry, looking northeast. © Jo Thredgold 2009.
Clay was mined from the area where the St. Agnes Shopping Centre now stands (Butcher 1997:8). The peak of the mining was in the 1870’s, and it was transported into factories in other parts of Adelaide to be used for sewerage and water pipes, ceramics, and later bricks (Butcher 1997:8).
6 Methodology

The request to survey Pine Park came from the Florey Reconciliation Task Force via the Member for Florey, Frances Bedford’s office. The survey team consisted of myself, Rani Attwood, Olly Spiers and Heidi Pittman. The four major components of the survey were historical research, fieldwork, significance assessments and recommendations.

6.1 Historical research aims and methodology

Historical research was carried out at the beginning of this study and was largely conducted at the Flinders University, Tea Tree Gully and State libraries. The goal of the historical research was to locate information about the history of the area and the park in order to discover what is or was in the park, what it was used for, what kinds of activity have occurred there. An analysis of the research results produced the summary history and contributed to recommendations.

The research process began prior to conducting fieldwork in order to gain an idea of what to look for when conducting fieldwork, and also to guide the selection of the most appropriate forms of fieldwork. Historical research conducted at the libraries was combined with a reconnaissance trip to the park to confirm the presence of expected items and to identify other aspects that required further research. Historical research was an ongoing process, continuing as required for the duration of the study.
6.2 Fieldwork aims and methodology

The goal of the fieldwork was to establish the presence and location of the features of Pine Park identified during the historical research, as well as any other features of interest. A systematic survey of the park would allow the significance of the park to be determined and assist with the development of interpretative signage and increased community understanding of local history. It would also allow community and local government organisations to better protect those features.

After first conducting background historical research, several members of the survey team visited Pine Park to determine what survey techniques might be appropriate. The survey team used a variety of measurement techniques to describe and locate the various features in Pine Park. The survey methods are listed below, including a description of how they were carried out, the order they were performed where relevant, and the equipment used.

The survey team decided to use a baseline offset survey to record the main features of the grassed area of the park. The baseline offset survey would allow for the current course of the creek line to be plotted in relation to some of the more permanent pieces of park furniture and trees. A transect survey of the entire Reserve was selected to ensure that the entire park would be surveyed. An environmental survey of the entire park followed the transect survey, and the scar tree recorded on a form copied from the Archaeologists Field Handbook. The environmental survey was recorded on forms provided by Dr. Alice Gorman, who
supervised this study. Items in the park were photographed and their location recorded by GPS. All of the contents are described in the results section. The methodology for each form of survey and recording is described in more specific detail below.

Other methods of survey were considered and rejected. Due to the steep gradient of many sections of the park, setting up a total station to survey the park was dismissed due to anticipated problems with lines of sight from the total station to the measuring stick around the bends of the creek, and the vegetation. The possibility of using a dumpy to measure the levels of the park was also considered and rejected for similar reasons. We expected to have enough time to survey the park by only one method, and so baseline-offset was chosen as the method likely to capture the majority of the park furniture contained in the largest section of the grassed area, the area that is most likely to be used by members of the public.

**Transect survey**

The first survey we conducted was a transect survey. The aim of the transect survey was to identify features of the park and record their location so that they could be revisited and photographed, and their location recorded by GPS. The features we were looking for included scarred trees, built heritage, the quarry and underground tank, groupings of plants and artefacts on the ground. We also wanted to get a sense of the entire park and the different ranges of plant zones within it. The survey team conducted nine transects with the team spaced approximately 3 metres apart, eight of which ran from north to south, with the last one along the creek line running
roughly west to east. As features were located they were marked with a pinflag and recorded on a map. One team member later returned to these pinflags and photographed the features and recorded the location with a GPS.

The survey team used a map of the park that had been enlarged several times by photocopier. The original map came from the City of Tea Tree Gully’s Pine Park Land Management Plan. The original photo had been taken during summer and showed a number of park features clearly. The original map was traced over the map and several orientating features added, but left largely blank for recording different aspects of the park. This map is subsequently referred to as a blank map.

Equipment used – two GPS units borrowed from Flinders University; one blank map of the park per person; pens.

Baseline offset mapping

After the transect survey, a baseline was established with string and pegs in a straight line along the grassed, garden section of the park, as close to the creek as possible. The length of this line was 60 metres. Due to the sharp inclination of the hillside, it was not possible to measure beyond the northern edge of grassed section. The alignment of the baseline was recorded and all measurements taken plotted on Mylar paper.
As the park is a public space, it was likely that members of the park would want to use it during the survey. The presence of bridges and paths in the park means that the string was laid out in a manner that avoided potentially tripping or obstructing members of the public. Additionally, the string was flagged with fluorescent tape to draw attention to it and prevent people accidentally tripping over it. Three members of the survey team worked on the baseline offset survey, running a 30 metre tape measure along the string line in two sections, taking measurements at 50cm intervals or where features were encountered. All of the trees, rocks and park furniture within 30 metres of the baseline on the southern side were included, as well as the creek edges.

Equipment used – four 30 metre tape measures; a pair of walkie talkies; flagging tape; drafting box with rulers, pencils and erasers; Mylar paper and graph paper;
string; pegs; scissors to cut the string. All items were borrowed from Flinders University.

![Fig. 6.2. View of the Reserve from the western end of the baseline, looking east. © Jo Thredgold 2009.](image)

**Photographic Recording**

After the transect survey Jo Thredgold returned to the areas of interest as marked by the pinflag, recorded the location by GPS, and photographed features of the areas of interest. The main features of the Reserve – the Council Chambers, scar tree, quarry, water tank, grassed area, well and stone retaining walls – were also photographed. The majority of these photographs are included in this report. The location from which the photographs were taken and direction of the view was recorded on a blank map as described above.

Equipment used – DSLR camera, photographic survey recording form, blank map, range pole borrowed from Flinders University.
**Scar Tree Recording**

After the transect survey, the scar tree was recorded by Rani Attwood. No other scar trees were identified during the transect survey. The recording form used was taken from the Archaeologist’s Field Handbook.

Equipment used – Recording form, callipers borrowed from Flinders University.

**Environmental survey**

The environmental survey was conducted by Heidi Pittman. After the baseline had been established, the entire park was surveyed to identify the approximate boundaries of any distinct areas of vegetation. The different areas were marked on a blank map and the features recorded on environmental background recording forms provided by Dr. Alice Gorman.

Equipment used – environmental background recording forms, blank map.
7 Results

7.1 Research Findings

The majority of the historical research findings are described in Section 5 – History of Pine Park Reserve, Tea Tree Gully. Any additional findings are described here.

Council Chambers

Mark Butcher Architects et al. (1997:47) provide the following description of the Tea Tree Gully Council Chambers:

Single storey early Victorian white-painted stone building with pitched corrugated-iron roof. Designed by colonial architect William Weir. Plan consists of rectangular section with hipped roof and a symmetrical gabled ‘porch’ projecting to south (front). Details include a rectangular central double doorway (rectangular) flanked by thin blocked slits and surmounted by a round ventilation opening beneath the shallow pitched gable. To the left of the projecting ‘porch’ is a similar tall slit, used as a window with fixed small-paned glazing. Other details include double hung sash windows, and a central red-bricked chimney. A modern porch and concrete steps have been added on to the west side and a modern extension is attached to the rear (north).
The Council Chambers were constructed in the year following the proclamation of the District Council of Highercombe, which was one of the earliest districts proclaimed in the colony of South Australia. The building is a simple but novel design, and despite the recent additions it retains many of its original features (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:48). The building was designed by William Weir, an important colonial architect who was responsible for the design of a number of important buildings in Adelaide, including the Exchange Hotel, the Bank of Australasia (McDougall 2008).
The original building appears to have been very simply finished – the roof was iron which was lifted off in a storm and had to be riveted down in 1860 (Auhl 1993:157). The floor was compacted earth until wooden floorboards were laid in the main meeting room in 1862 (Auhl 1993:157). Electricity was installed in 1926 (Auhl 1993:162).

Research has not established the construction dates of the additions, or when or why the doorway on the eastern side was cemented up. The source of the stone used for this building has not been identified. The majority of buildings in the area were constructed from local materials, and almost all the local permanent structures from the late 19th and early 20th century were made from local stone (Mark Burcher Architects et al. 1997:8). It is very likely that the Council Chambers were also constructed from local stone, however this is not explicitly mentioned in the
literature, and the largest and most famous local quarry at Glen Ewin did not open until the following year (Auhl 1993:265). As the photos indicate, the white paint described in the Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997 report has been removed to expose the stone.

Fig. 7.3: Tea Tree Gully Council Chambers. © Jo Thredgold 2009.

**Quarry**

The two main quarries from which the major buildings in Adelaide city were constructed were at Tea Tree Gully and Glen Osmond (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:7). Mark Butcher Architects et al. (1997:7) report that the freestone from Tea Tree Gully was considered superior to that of Glen Osmond, but it was also less abundant. Three important buildings constructed almost entirely from Tea Tree Gully stone are the Town Hall, General Post Office and the Supreme Court (Auhl 1993:265). Some of the other buildings that used Tea Tree Gully stone as facings
include the, Scots Church on North Terrace, St. Peter’s Cathedral, St. Francis Xavier’s Cathedral, Flinders Street Baptist Church, Stow Memorial, Adelaide University’s Mitchell Building, (Auhl 1993:265, Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:7-8). The main quarries in the Tea Tree Gully area were at Glen Ewin in Lower Hermitage on section 5640, either side of the Main North East Road in what is now Pine Park and Anstey Hill Park, and at section 5626 of Anstey Hill Park near Lower Main North East Road (Auhl 1993:174).

Tea Tree Gully

European settlers were attracted to the area by the abundance of water (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:6). It was quickly covered by a mix of farms, orchards and large pastoral estates (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:6). The earliest main product of the area was wheat, which was grown in the damp valleys and gullies, with the plains reserved for stock grazing (Auhl 1993:278). The abundance of water and the road brought people to the area initially, and one of the first businesses established was a Mill (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:6). The Mill employed water from the local creek, and the buildings still stands (Auhl 1980:192). This drew further development (Auhl 1980:36).

By 1855, the local industries included pastoralism, agriculture, viticulture, horticulture, milling, wine-making, quarrying and pipe-clay mining (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:6) as well as being a major thoroughfare for horse and bullock trains bringing supplies to and from Adelaide, via Tea Tree Gully through to Gumeracha and later Mt. Pleasant (Clifton 2005:3). The area was extensively cleared
to make way for agriculture – two aerial photographs, one from 1954 and the other from 1974 show significant differences in the region (Auhl 1993:342-343). The 1954 photo shows small patches of development on the Adelaide plains and few trees in the hills (Auhl 1993:342). Twenty years later, the majority of the plains are covered with housing development with scattered fields remaining, and the hillsides largely covered with trees (Auhl 1993:343).

7.2 Field Survey Outcomes and Findings

**Transect survey**

The survey began at 9.30am with the four team members walking along transects spaced between three metres apart. We began the first transect on the western edge of the park, alongside Haines Rd and next to the Council Chambers. Due to the Chambers currently being used by the CFS, the rear of the Chambers and the CFS sheds behind it are fenced off for security, so we were not able to survey this section, and that is indicated on the map. We continued to cover firstly the Pine tree area and the grassed area in north/south transects spaced between 2-3meters apart. The visibility of the ground was very low, ranging from 5 -15% visibility in the Pine Reserve and 0-5% in the grassed area. The area marked as ‘car park’ on the diagram is covered in bitumen and was entirely visible.

We were not able to identify any scarred trees in addition to the previously identified tree, nor were we able to identify any indigenous artefacts. We did note
several patches of rubbish in the transects of the Pine Reserve, but did not record their location. The rubbish patches were mostly concentrated along the northern boundary, near the houses.

The features identified in the transect survey are described below according to area.

**Pine Reserve**

*Fig. 7.4. The beginning of the Pine section from behind the Chambers, looking north. © Jo Thredgold 2009.*
Fig. 7.5. The Pine section, looking north. One of the drains, not visible in this picture, is in the corner of the park towards the right side of the picture. © Jo Thredgold 2009.

Fig. 7.6. Pine trees in the Reserve with Permapine posts still attached. The eastern boundary drain lies between these two pines and is indicated by the lush growth of weeds and grasses. © Jo Thredgold 2009.

The survey revealed two drains opening onto the Reserve, one in the middle of the northern boundary (see Fig. 7.5) and the other on the eastern boundary near the stairs in the north western corner (see Fig. 7.6). These drains open into the park,
adding contours to the slope. The water from the drains seems to come from stormwater runoff. The only pool of water we found came from the eastern drain in Fig 7.6, and was oily and dark.

Two trees in the park appear to have been connected by two horizontal Permapine logs which have since been partially removed (see Fig. 7.6). The section of tree near the logs shows evidence of disturbance and holes, and the logs appear to have been cut off with the stub and bolts remaining, or removed entirely. It is unclear what this was used for. The original Auhl (1980:27) study states that there was an adventure playground in the reserve, however there is no evidence of such a playground today. It is possible that these posts were part of the playground equipment.

Fig. 7.7. © Jo Thredgold 2009.

The survey also identified an artificial ridge (see Fig. 7.7) running diagonally from the north western corner to the centre of the pine section, and then curving towards the
south east towards the gum tree section. The ridge appears to have been constructed prior to the planting of at least some of the trees. This was evident by the proximity of the trees to the side of the ridge. The ridge appeared to be a long, shallow ditch with the excavated soil piled up next to it. Trees growing out of the ditch or very close to it would have made it difficult for a machine to have passed through there without deviating, suggesting that the ridge is earlier than the trees.

Several patches of rubbish were identified, including clean, unburied fragments of broken earthenware garden pots and old, partially covered, hand-size pieces of asbestos board. The majority of the rubbish was located near the northern boundary, close to houses, the remainder was slightly north west of the northern boundary of the CFS enclosure.

**Grassed area**

![Fig. 7.8. The grassed area, looking west. Taken from the eastern end. © Jo Thredgold 2009.](image)
This section of the survey covered the area below the Council Chambers. This area resembles a garden, with planned banks of a diverse range of popular and decorative plants such as hydrangeas and bottlebrush trees on the slope, grass on the flat area along the creek and then more plantings on the slope between the grass and the roadside, giving the area the appearance of a well maintained garden. We expected, but did not find any evidence of, woolly tea trees (Leptospermum pubescens, also known as Leptospermum lanigerum) planted in this area as records from the 1995 *City of Tea Tree Gully: Plants of Rare and Historic Significance* file indicated. The Auhl (1980:30) study also indicates that tea trees had recently been planted along the creek. The plants may have been removed or died. Instead, we found recent plantings of seedlings near the creek line, which the Tea Tree Gully Council identified as River Red Gums (pers. comms. City of Tea Tree Gully Council Staff).
A surprise discovery in the grassed section were 3 memorial plaques. Two of them are included here.

Fig. 7.10. Memorial Plaque. Inscription reads: Vicky. Forever in our hearts. © Jo Thredgold 2009.

Quarry and water tank

Fig. 7.12. The telegraph pole and cement block on top of the tank, looking south. The Main North East Road is visible on the left. © Jo Thredgold 2009.

The second stage of the transect survey was the area from the eastern boundary of the Pine Reserve, along the creek. Transects for this part of the survey ran from west to east. Initially we intended to survey the entire area, however on the northern side of the creek the majority of the area was too steep to walk, and on the southern side it was difficult to access due to water lying from recent rains, bushy plant growth such as blackberries and the lack of bridges across this wider and less clearly defined section of the creek. Consequently, we were only able to conduct a single row of four transects along this section, which quickly narrowed to the four participants walking along the track beside the creek.

We were able to locate the quarry face and the underwater tank. The quarry face became visible as we walked along, and it was possible to easily climb up to a flat
area to observe the quarry. Large rocks lay randomly on the slope up towards the quarry, and it quickly became clear that the flat area was the top of the underground tank. The quarry was covered with vegetation in all but the sheerest parts, and in some areas we observed dark patches where water was seeping out of the quarry face. There was no plaque marking the tank, as Auhl’s 1980 study had recommended, however once on top of it, it was clearly a round, man-made structure with small patches of concrete exposed, a section covered with metal plate and another covered with cement that might be controls or access to the tank. There was also an old telegraph pole on the edge of the tank. We were not able to see any other similar poles in the area or aligned with this one.

Fig. 7.13. The water tank and telegraph pole, looking north east. The quarry is to the left of the picture. Taken from the path. © Jo Thredgold 2009.
The final transect also revealed a metal plate set into the ground, surrounded by decaying planks of wood on three sides acting as retaining walls around the metal cover, about one metre square (see Fig. 7.15). We were not able to confirm that this was a well, however it is in the vicinity of where we expected to find the well.
Limitations of the survey

Transect survey was limited by poor ground visibility, both in the Pine Reserve and along the creek past the grassed area. It would be better to conduct this kind of survey during summer when the ground cover is thinner, however it is unlikely that we would have been able to locate any indigenous or historic artefacts due to the heavily disturbed nature of the ground. The survey was also limited by the steep
incline of the eastern section of the creek. It would be necessary to get permission from neighbouring property owners in order to get access to the top of the quarry.

**Baseline-offset mapping**

The survey team started to establish the baseline at 1pm. We chose to place the baseline along the longest straight line we could establish without crossing the creek, on the northern side of the flat, grassed area of the park. The start of the baseline was approximately 1.5 metres from the edge of the bridge that forms part of the road in the south western corner of the park. This measurement is not precise due to the steep incline from the grass up the side of the bridge to the road, however the start and end points of the baseline were recorded by GPS.

All of these areas were located on the landscape with the assistance of two handheld Garmin Etrex GPS (Global Positioning System) units utilising UTM coordinates (Australian Geocentric Datum 1994/GDA94) supplied by Flinders University. The data from the Garmin Etrex GPS units no. 21 and 27 was downloaded and processed in OxiExplorer. The following table contains the waypoints recorded for the baseline-offset survey of the grassed creek area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Reference</th>
<th>Waypoint Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Easting GDA94</th>
<th>Northing GDA94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5.10</td>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>Eastern point of baseline</td>
<td>292525</td>
<td>6144080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP 2</td>
<td>30m mark on baseline</td>
<td>292544</td>
<td>6144393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP 16</td>
<td>60 m mark/western end of baseline</td>
<td>292572</td>
<td>6144385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 7.15. GPS waypoints for the baseline offset 0m, 30m and 60m points.*
The table shows the GPS coordinates for the 0m, 30m and 60m points on the baseline from which offset measurements were taken of the main picnic area of the park. This area is covered with grass and contains the majority of the garden furniture within the park, and shows the location of the furniture in relation to the current course of the creek. The survey was conducted during early spring, and there was been unusually high rainfall in the weeks preceding the survey, so a small but steady stream of water was flowing. The survey team also experienced brief but heavy rainfall at lunchtime, shortly prior to the survey starting, as well as regular intervals of drizzle during the first two hours of the survey. The creek would be a different environment in summer, but the survey shows the current flow of the water produced by a wet season.

Offset measurements were taken at either intervals of 50cm or as significant objects were encountered. Objects were considered significant if they were fixed or large enough to be difficult to move, or mentioned in the council management plan. They included logs that delineated the boundary of the grassed area and vegetation beds at the start of the northern slope, large rocks similar to those from the quarry, trees, bridges, park tables and chairs, barbeque, water fountain and the stairs on the northern slope.
Fig. 7.16. Baseline Offset map 0-30m section.

Fig. 7.18. Baseline Offset map 30-60m. T&C in the upper right section of the map indicates table and chairs.
It seemed from aerial and Google maps that it would be possible to construct just two or three baselines to cover the 400m of creek. On site however, past the grassed area the park becomes little more than a track alongside the creek with steep hillside to the north and the road to the south and then the sides of the valley slope quite sharply up. In this context, a large number of baselines would be required, rendering the measurements prone to inaccuracies due to both frequently changing orientation of the baseline and the majority of significant items being on a slope.

Away from the grassed area, the edges of the creek become less defined, increasing the amount of error in the measurements. For these reasons, we decided to restrict the baseline-offset survey to the first 60 metres of the grassed area of the park.

**Photographic and GPS location recording**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Reference</th>
<th>Waypoint Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Easting GDA94</th>
<th>Northing GDA94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5.10</td>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Creek drain bridge</td>
<td>292520</td>
<td>6144407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5.9, 6.1</td>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>second creek drain</td>
<td>292515</td>
<td>6144404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Fig. 7.19. GPS waypoints for features of the Reserve. The GPS unit ran out of power, GPS #27 was used for the remainder of the Reserve._
### GPS #27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Reference</th>
<th>Waypoint Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Easting GDA94</th>
<th>Northing GDA94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 7.8</td>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>Approximate west end of the grassed area</td>
<td>292605</td>
<td>6144368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Scar tree opposite side of creek</td>
<td>292661</td>
<td>6144366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5.1, 7.21, 7.22</td>
<td>WP3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Scar tree</td>
<td>292661</td>
<td>6144363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Quarry and tank from top of tank, centre of clearing</td>
<td>292865</td>
<td>6144365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Telegraph pole from on top of tank</td>
<td>292864</td>
<td>6144361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>North East Road/west boundary corner of Pine Park Reserve</td>
<td>292872</td>
<td>6144325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 7.14</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>AWW (top of tank)</td>
<td>292856</td>
<td>6144360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 7.11</td>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>Memorial seat</td>
<td>292612</td>
<td>6144379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 7.12</td>
<td>WP12</td>
<td>Memorial Plaque</td>
<td>292588</td>
<td>6144387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP13</td>
<td>Memorial stone Peter Key</td>
<td>292574</td>
<td>6144386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 7.6</td>
<td>WP 20</td>
<td>Pine trees with Permapine attached</td>
<td>292609</td>
<td>6144516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 7.20. GPS waypoints for features of the Reserve.*
Scar Tree

Scar tree recording was conducted by Rani Attwood. The species was not identified as the tree was dead. The tree has two large scars, the first on the north east side of the trunk (Fig. 7.21) which measured approximately 140cm long and 53cm wide. The scar is 8cm deep, the trunk is 94cm in diameter at the widest point of the scar. No axe marks were visible. The shape of the scar was square at the top and indeterminate at the bottom due to fire and water damage to the tree.

![Fig. 7.21. Scar Tree, northern scar, looking southwest. © Jo Thredgold 2009.](image)
The scar on the southern side of the tree (Fig. 7.22) is approximately 240cm long, 55cm wide and 15cm deep. The diameter of the tree is approximately 90cm at the widest point of the scar. The scar is oval shaped at the top and extends to the bottom of the tree, however the earth at the base of the tree has been subject to earth moving related to the construction of the road. Again, axe marks were not visible but insect damage was present. The tree is suffering from termite damage, and is breaking down at the base. Crumbling is evident.

Fig. 7.22. Scar Tree southern scar, looking north west. © Jo Thredgold 2009.
Environmental recording

The environmental survey was conducted by Heidi Pitman, and revealed six distinct environmental areas within the reserve. Those six areas were labelled Pine Plantation, Eucalyptus, Eucalyptus mixed, Remnant vegetation, Garden bed and Creek line.

Plants found in the Pine Plantation included the pines as well as a thick ground cover of invasive bulbs and grass. Plants found in the Eucalyptus area included Eucalyptus species as well as Acacia paradoxa and pienatha, Alocasurina, Callitnis pressii, some remnant understory species including Lomandra, grasses, orchids, lilies Hirbertia, Gonocarpus, as well as the invasive bulbs found all over the park. Plants found in the Eucalyptus mixed section included the same eucalypts as well as invasive olive trees and bulbs. Plants found in the Remnant vegetation section included Eucalypts, Doolonea, Accacia, Xanthorea quadrangulata, Bulbine and Chocolate lily, Astraloma, Lomandra, Alocasurina, native cherry and Calithis pressi. There were also olives, roses, invasive bulbs and grasses in this section, however in fewer numbers than in other sections, possibly due to the steep slope of the section which discourages people moving through it and disturbing plants or transferring species. The plants in the Garden bed section were not recorded, however they did not included Tea Trees as expected. The Creek line included eucalypts as well as invasive species such as willows, grasses, bulbs, olives and lilies.

For the full recording form please see the Appendix Fig. 12.3-8
Fig. 7.23 Pine Park environmental areas. The map indicates the different environmental zones within Pine Park Reserve.
8 Assessment of the significance of the Pine

Park Reserve

8.1 Indigenous heritage in the reserve

It is difficult to assess the significance of the Scarred Tree due to the uncertain nature of the scarring. As discussed earlier, the tree shows evidence of ringbarking and fire damage, as well as large scars caused by the removal of bark sections. It is difficult to ascertain by visual inspection whether the removal of bark and subsequent scarring was due to cultural or natural processes, or some combination of the two. The local Kaurna people have asserted that the scars on the tree were caused by cultural processes (2009, pers. comm. Lea Crosby).

The social significance of the Scarred Tree is much clearer. The Tree has been celebrated over the years by local Kaurna people. The Florey Reconciliation Task Force has collected flyers from different events, such as the launch of a fund to preserve and recognise the site in July 1999. The tree provides a tangible link to Indigenous occupation of the area prior to settlement by Europeans in the 1830’s. Few other links survive in the area, and this increases the significance of the tree. Being close to the road and a part of the Reserve, the tree is accessible and visible to both pedestrians and traffic.
Local Kaurna people have indicated that they would like to use the tree to publicly celebrate Kaurna culture and history, and this has provided some of the impetus for this survey.

### 8.2 Built heritage in the reserve

The Council Chambers are a very significant aspect of Pine Park Reserve. In 1997 Mark Butcher Architects et al. assessed the significance of the Chambers as follows:

The building is significant both as the State’s first District Council Chamber and as a representative of the type of building constructed by District Councils. It has significant connections to the establishment of local government in both the area and the state.

- **a)** *it demonstrates important aspects of the evolution or pattern of the State’s history*, being the first local Council Chamber to be built in the State, and being associated with the early development of the hinterland around the City of Adelaide.

- **d)** *It is an outstanding representative of a particular class of place*, being a building of novel design which was the first of its kind in South Australia.

- **e)** *It has special historical importance with the life of a person or organisation or an event of historical importance*, being associated with one of the earliest local Councils to be established in the State, and being the first local Council Chamber
to be erected after the passing of the Act to Appoint District Councils in 1852. The building is also associated with William Weir, and important early architect in South Australia.

The significance of the Highercombe Council Chambers has been the subject of a number of studies (see Auhl 1980, McDougall and Vines 1994, Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997) and as a result the Council Chambers were placed on the South Australian Heritage Register on 16 March, 2000.

Other kinds of significant built heritage in the Reserve include the underground tanks and well. These are not listed on any register. They are significant as the first government waterworks scheme undertaken outside of Adelaide (Auhl 1993:321). These tanks supplied Tea Tree Gully and Modbury until 1926 (Auhl 1993:321). They are associated with economic themes of the development of Tea Tree Gully, and demonstrate important aspects of the evolution and pattern of development of the city of Tea Tree Gully.

On the boundary between built heritage and natural heritage is what remains of the quarry. The quarry is largely revegetated but still visible from the path. It was part of a network of quarries that provided the finest quality stone for some of the most important buildings of Adelaide, as well as providing stone for local buildings. The quarry is not necessarily significant on its own, but is significant as a part of the park and as a part of a network of quarries in the area that contributed to the construction of Adelaide and Tea Tree Gully.
8.3 Natural heritage in the reserve

The Pine Tree Reserve is a Local Heritage Places under Section 23 of the Development Act 1993 under the following categories:

a) it displays historical, economic or social themes that are of importance to the local place,

f) it is a notable landmark in the area.

The Pine Park Reserve was listed as a Local Heritage Place on 15 May, 2008.

8.4 Overall significance

The park contains a number of significant features in a small location, the majority of which date back either to Indigenous habitation of the area prior to the arrival of European settlers, or to the very early development of the colony of Adelaide. The only significant feature of the park not from the late 19th Century is the Pine Plantation, which commemorates the centenary of settlement of the area in 1937. Despite the very small area, the features provide a wide range of information about the development of the state relating to Indigenous land use, water management in the colonial era, stock management in the colonial era, the beginnings of local government and the construction of significant buildings from local stone. For these reasons, this study recommends extending Local Heritage Place status to the entire reserve. The Reserve is already well protected by the City of Tea Tree Gully Development Act 2008 development controls relating to the conservation of waterways and the restrictions placed on development in the Historic Conservation
Zone, however extending Local Heritage Place status would afford the Reserve more permanent protection, as well as acknowledgement of the variety of significant features in the park.
9 Recommendations

The recommendations contained in this report emerged from the combination of historical research and fieldwork. The recommendations comply with the criteria contained in the South Australian Heritage Places Act 1993 and Development Act 1993. The following recommendations are provided for the Pine Park Reserve. As with other sections of this report, they are listed under the specific section of the Park that they pertain to.

9.1 Pine Park Reserve

The Reserve is currently administered by the City of Tea Tree Gully Council. The preserve contains a number of Indigenous, natural and built features which provide information about the early development of Tea Tree Gully and Adelaide.

- Recommend that Local Heritage Place listing be extended to the entire Reserve, rather than just the Pine Plantation due to the presence of the quarry, scar tree, springs, creek, well and water tanks, all of which are significant features in the development of the area.

- Recommend assessing the safety of the park overall, and its accessibility for a wide variety of members of the public.

- Recommend interpretative signing be placed in the Reserve in order to assist members of the public to understand the Reserve in the context of the development of the Tea Tree Gully and the wider area.

- A permanent toilet block would be a great improvement to the site and would allow the Reserve to be better employed for community events. At
present there is only a very rudimentary temporary structure maintained by the council.

• Recommend extending the stone retaining walls presently erected in sections of the park along the path to the entire path.

9.2 Council Chambers

The Chambers are presently being used as a headquarters for the local CFS. The council’s management plan indicated that the CFS occupation of the Council Chambers is temporary (Tea Tree Gully Council 2003:1). The CFS have temporarily occupied these premises since at least 1980.

• Previous studies (Auhl 1980, Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997) have recommended that the CFS be relocated and the building be opened to the public as a recreational facility. That recommendation is repeated here. The CFS has a number of temporary structures around the Chambers which detract from the visual appearance of the Chambers, and which are not sympathetic to the heritage values that are identified above. Recommend removing the temporary structures.

• The ongoing use of the building is one of the factors that protect the Chambers from various kinds of damage such as vandalism and gradual structural problems such as salt damp and shifting foundations. For these reasons the adaptive reuse of the building is recommended.
• Recommend investigating whether there is sufficient demand to support reuse in a way that allows the public access to the building, whether as an extension of the local history museum and/or function space.

• Recommend that the doorway on the western side of the building that has been covered with cement be restored to its previous state – that is, for the cement to be removed and the doorway to be barred by some other means if necessary.

• Recommend that the Besser block addition to the rear (northern end) of the building be removed and replaced with something more in keeping with the front part of the building.

9.3 Pine Plantation

The Pine Plantation was planted to celebrate the centenary of settlement in Tea Tree Gully (Anon. n.d.). It is included in the Local Heritage Places register.

• The transect survey of this section of the park revealed patches of rubbish distributed throughout the Pine Reserve. Recommend that the rubbish in these patches be removed and appropriately disposed of, and further dumping be discouraged, for example by the use of signs placed near the northern boundary of the Reserve – where the majority of the rubbish was located – advising that dumping rubbish in the Reserve is illegal.
9.4 Springs, Creek, Well and Tank

The natural springs and the spring-fed creek two of the main reasons why settlement of this area commenced, and have sustained habitation in the area here most likely even before European settlement in the 1830’s. The well and tank were constructed in the early 1880’s and supplied the entire Tea Tree Gully and Modbury settlements until 1926. They were the first Government water works outside of Adelaide (Auhl 1993:321).

- Recommend that the stone retaining wall that runs along some sections of the creek be extended along the entire path.
- Recommend that the structural integrity of the tank be assessed for safety purposes. If the presence of tank is to be highlighted by interpretative materials, it should be checked to ensure that it is safe for people to climb on as it is accessible from the path.
- Recommend that the section of the path alongside the creek just west of the quarry be examined in light of the runoff from the quarry across the path and into the creek. The amount of water running across the path seems to vary with the amount of local rainfall. Recommend that the path be augmented in an appropriate way to prevent the path becoming slippery and muddy, and potentially washed away.
- Recommend that the old well be included in interpretative signage.
9.5 Gum Tree Section

The Gum Tree Section contains some remnant native vegetation, as well as some invasive weeds.

- Recommend that the Scarred Tree be protected by including it on the Indigenous Heritage Register.

- Recommend that signage be erected to inform the public about the Scarred Tree. To preserve a natural, undeveloped environment around the tree it would be better to place the signage away from the tree.

- Access to the scarred tree from the path is currently available via stepping-stones across the creek, however this could be improved with the placement of several more large stones, and by improving the placement of the stones so that larger areas of flat surface are available. There are already a number of small bridges across the creek nearby, but access to the tree along the southern side of the creek is limited, particularly in wet periods.

- Recommend that where possible and safe, the weeds be removed from this section of the park to prevent weeds increasing and displacing the native grasses and plants that still remain. The presence of olive trees in particular detracts from the otherwise well-preserved native bushland.

- Recommend that the path be resurfaced for accessibility and to prevent water damage. Recommend that the path be examined by suitably qualified people in order to determine the best kind of surfacing methods.
9.6 Quarry

The quarry was the source of building material for local buildings as well as for some of the most important buildings in Adelaide. Tea Tree Gully stone was considered to be the finest building stone.

- Recommend that signage be erected to inform the public of the presence of the quarry and the significant buildings that were constructed from Tea Tree Gully stone.

- Recommend that the quarry face be assessed for safety of Reserve visitors.
10 Directions for future research

Time constraints made it difficult to seek and include more consultation with the Indigenous community, with the local council, and with the local historical society, however future versions of this report would benefit from their input. The study is very focused on the local context; future studies might include a broader view. For example, the description of the quarry would benefit from being contextualised with the Dry Creek and Glen Osmond quarries, as well as the development of mining in the Mount Lofty Ranges colonisation through into the 20th Century.

Additionally, this study has not been able to investigate the date and origin of the stone retaining walls in the park, or renovations. Research is recommended to determine the age of the stonewalling along the path beside the river.

Additionally, it is possible that the CFS has had a long association with the Council Chambers and has been operating in one way or another from that location for a long time. Research is recommended to establish the association of the CFS with the Council Chambers and Pine Park Reserve, and to make recommendations about creative ways of sharing the Reserve between the CFS and the Council Chambers whilst respecting the heritage values of the Chambers.
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**Other Information Sources**

Resources provided by Aboriginal Affairs Victoria, both factsheets and information from the website was used to assess the Indigenous heritage of the Pine Park Reserve. The information and fact sheets are available at http://www.ccmaindig.info/heritage/Intro.html.
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Fig 12.1. Baseline offset mapping page 1, 0-30 metres.
Fig 12.2 Baseline offset mapping page 2, 30-60 metres.
Fig. 12.3. Environmental Background Recording form Creekline A.
Fig. 12.4. Environmental Background Recording form Creekline B.
Fig. 12.5. Environmental Background Recording form Remnant Vegetation A.
**Fig. 12.6. Environmental Background Recording form Remnant Vegetation B.**
**Fig. 12.7. Environmental Background Recording form Pine Plantation, Eucalyptus Section, and Eucalyptus Mixed Sections A.**
**Fig. 12.8. Environmental Background Recording form Pine Plantation, Eucalyptus Section, and Eucalypts Mixed Sections B.**
Fig. 12.8. Environmental Background sections on a blank map.
Fig. 12.9. Transect survey on a blank map.
Tea Tree Gully Timeline:

1839 – The area was surveyed and the land subdivided. The area around Tea Tree Gully was popular for its abundance of water and fertile land (Mark Architects et al. 1997: 6).

1840-1 – The route through the Gully was first cut privately by Thomas Williams of Hermitage (Auhl 1980:36).

1842 – The discovery of springs in the Gully led to the decision to make the road an official route (Auhl 1980:36).

1840’s – Transportation of various materials – particularly logs, fire wood for domestic usage, wattle bark, building stone, fruit, road metal, timber, wool and food supplies – by bullock and horse trains begins and quickly becomes common (Clifton 2005:3).

Early 1850’s – Discussion begins in the state government regarding the construction of a road to replace the informal track (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997:2)

1852 – In November of this year the colonial government passed an “Act to appoint district councils and to define the power thereof” (Auhl 1980:140). This act gave councils the power to tax themselves, to make roads, public buildings and a public pound. (Auhl 1980:140)

1853 – The local district council was established. The first councilors were all local landowners: George McEwin, Howard Blyth, Andrew Shillabeer, John Gollop and Joseph Ind (Auhl 1980:145-6).

1853 – A flour mill was constructed close to the Gully entrance, taking advantage of both the water to power the mill and the accessibility provided by the road (Auhl 1980:36).

1854 – The Main North East Road was declared by the state government, the road led from Adelaide via Walkerville, Klemzig, Hope Valley, Tea Tree Gully to Houghton (Auhl 1980:36). The presence of water and an existing road contributed to this decision (Auhl 1980:36). The combination of these factors contributed to John Stevens’ decision to subdivide the land at the entrance to the Gully into a township (Auhl 1980:36).

1855 – William Haines became first keeper of the Public Pound. The fines for straying animals impounded were 1/3d for horses and cattle, 2d for sheep and goats, 6d for pigs (Auhl 1980:152).

1855 – May: Mr. William Weir was asked by the council to provide a design for a council chamber. The main room was to be about 30ft long, with two or 3 smaller rooms attached. The completion date was not recorded, but in Nov. 1855 the council
held its first meeting in the newly completed chambers. The building was also used as a courthouse and as a public meeting space (Auhl 1980:152). 1,440 residents lived in the area (Mark Butcher Architects et al. 1997: 6).

1856 – The Council Chambers were plastered (Auhl 1980:153).

1850’s – Quarrying of good quality freestone begins on the Northern side of the road. The original owners are not known, but the quarry was later owned by Brown and Thompson. Stone was transported via horse and bullock teams into the city. (Clifton 2005:3)

1860 – The Mill ran out of water for steam to power it due to an inadequate water supply. At that time George Dickerson owned part of the spring and it is unclear whether he dammed the spring or whether it was overdrawn (Auhl 1980:192).

1868 – William Bundey opened a quarry on the south side of the road, which was in operation until 1922 (Clifton 2005:3). The Anglican St. Peter’s College was built from this stone, as was the Cross of the Sacrifice in Pennington Gardens (Clifton 2005:3).

1880 – Quarrying on the northern side of Main North East Road ceases. (Clifton 2005:3) The Act authorising the construction of Tanks and Wells and other Works to supply Tea Tree Gully and Modbury was passed. These waterworks are the first undertaken outside of Adelaide city (Auhl 1993:321).

1910 – All business and property owners have private transport, depending on their requirements. Bullock teams are very common, horse teams less so. (Clifton 2005:3)

1935 – Vehicle transport has largely replaced bullock and horse teams, there are only two horse teams remaining at this time (Clifton 2005:8).

1937 – Pine trees were planted behind the Council Chambers to commemorate the Centenary of settlement in Tea Tree Gully district. The two districts of Highercombe and Tea Tree Gully had been reunited just 2 years earlier. Celebrations were low key as South Australia was only just beginning to recover from the Great Depression. Around 2200 people lived in the district at the time. (ref – notes about photo 00286)

1967 – After nine years of using the Chambers in conjunction with other rooms, halls and offices nearby, the growing Council moved to new offices in the Modbury Civic Centre (Auhl 1980:152), and the Old Council Chambers became the Works Office.