Post-Contact Heritage Assessment

PAKENHAM EAST PRECINCT

FINAL REPORT
Revised October 2017

Prepared for
Cardinia Shire Council
Report Register

This report register documents the development and issue of the report entitled ‘Pakenham East Precinct Post-Contact Heritage Assessment’ undertaken by Context in accordance with our internal quality management system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Notes/description</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Issued to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>31/01/2013</td>
<td>Ben Weiner, Hilary Rutledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>07/03/2013</td>
<td>Ben Weiner, Hilary Rutledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final, revised</td>
<td>01/11/2013</td>
<td>Ben Weiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final, revised to integrate new findings from ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct – November 2013’ prepared by John Patrick Pty Ltd</td>
<td>13/10/17</td>
<td>Marcelle Ball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Team:
Natica Schmeder, Senior Consultant
Annabel Neylon, Senior Consultant
Louise Holt, Consultant
Jessie Briggs, Consultant

NB: This revised report also includes the work prepared by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. entitled ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ prepared for Cardinia Shire Council November 2013.

© GML Heritage (Victoria) trading as Context

Context
22 Merri Street, Brunswick VIC 3056
Phone 03 9380 6933
Facsimile 03 9380 4066
Email context@contextpl.com.au
Web www.contextpl.com.au
CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

Summary of key findings 2
Apply Heritage Overlay: 2
Add to Cardinia Significant Tree Register: 2
Undertake assessment of archaeological values: 2
Record prior to removal for historic interest (trees): 2
Retain for amenity value (trees): 2

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 3

Include on Schedule to the Cardinia Heritage Overlay 3
 Significant Trees 4
Places of archaeological interest 4
Plantings of historic interest only 5
Trees of amenity value 5
Summary of Trees to be retained 6

1 INTRODUCTION 7

1.1 Brief 7
1.2 Study Area 7
1.3 Approach & methodology 8
1.4 Study limitations 9

2 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS 10

2.1 Thematic history 10
2.2 Local history 11
2.3 Relevant Victorian Historic Themes 11
2.4 Previously identified heritage places 18
  2.4.1 Historical databases and inventories 18
  2.4.2 Stakeholder engagement 18
2.5 Fieldwork findings 19
  2.5.1 Places of potential local heritage significance 19
  2.5.2 Significant Trees 19
  2.5.3 Places of archaeological interest 20
  2.5.4 Plantings of historic interest 21
  2.5.5 Trees of amenity value 21
  2.5.6 Places of no post-contact heritage significance 22

3 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE 25

3.1 Basis of assessment 25
3.2 Establishing threshold for local significance 25
3.3 Establishing archaeological potential 26
3.4 Establishing other values 27
  3.4.1 Significant trees 27
  3.4.2 Historic interest 27
  3.4.3 Amenity value 27
3.5 Outcomes of assessment 28
  3.5.1 Places of local significance 28
  3.5.2 Places with archaeological interest 28
  3.5.3 Places with other values 29
4 DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE

4.1 Within and around places of heritage significance (HO recommended)
   4.1.1 Pear Tree, 40 Dore Road, Pakenham, PSP Property 8
   4.1.2 ‘Carinya’, 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon, PSP Property No. 38
   4.1.3 Bungalow, 140 Ryan Road, Pakenham, PSP Property No. 48

4.2 Tree Retention and Protection
   4.2.1 Urban Design and Subdivision
   4.2.2 Tree Management Plans for Development Phase

4.3 On sites of archaeological interest

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Statutory recommendations
   5.1.1 Inclusion on the Heritage Overlay
   5.1.2 Archaeology

5.2 Additional work

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources
Secondary sources

APPENDIX A - HERCON CRITERIA

APPENDIX B - PLACE CITATIONS

Citations for places recommended for Heritage Overlay
   Carinya, 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon
   Bungalow, 140 Ryan Road, Pakenham
   Pear Tree, 40 Dore Road, Pakenham PSP Property No. 8

Places NOT recommended for inclusion on the Heritage Overlay
   1550-1560 Princes Highway, Pakenham
   The Range, 40 Dore Road, Pakenham
   45-55 Dore Road, Pakenham
   15 Mount Ararat Road North, Pakenham
   180 Ryan Road, Pakenham

APPENDIX C MAPPING

APPENDIX D - SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

APPENDIX E - LOCATION OF PROPERTIES NOTING PSP NUMBER

APPENDIX F - JOHN PATRICK REPORT

‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ by John Patrick Pty. Ltd., 2013
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report has been prepared for the Strategic Planning Department of Cardinia Shire.

The Pakenham East Precinct was announced by the Victorian Planning Minister as an extension to the Urban Growth Boundary in June 2012. In response, Cardinia Shire has been preparing a Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) for the future development of this area as a residential precinct, with a Neighbourhood Activity Centre and associated community facilities.

The Pakenham East Precinct (henceforth known as the ‘Study Area’) is located in the western part of Cardinia Shire, approximately 60 kilometres southeast of Melbourne, and 20 kilometres east of Narre Warren-Fountain Gate principal activity centre. The Study Area is bound by Seymour Road (to the north), Ryan Road and Deep Creek Road (to the west), Mount Ararat Road (to the east), and the Princes Freeway Pakenham Bypass (to the south). Dore Road and Canty Lane, and part of the Princes Highway fall within the Study Area.

In order to inform its preparation of the PSP, Cardinia Shire has engaged a range of consultants to prepare background reports. Context were commissioned in 2013 to carry out a Post-Contact Heritage Assessment – encompassing both buildings and trees for the Precinct. This involved the identification, survey, and assessment of places of potential heritage significance, as well as providing statutory and management guidelines to minimise negative impacts from future development.

A report entitled ‘Pakenham East Precinct Post Contact Heritage Assessment’ was prepared by Context and a final revised version delivered to Council in March 2013 (referred to hereafter as the 2013 Context report). That report recommended that further assessment be undertaken by an arborist to determine the amenity value of a small number of trees within the PSP. Council commissioned John Patrick Pty Ltd to undertake this work in November 2013, resulting in a report entitled ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ (referred to hereafter as the John Patrick report).

The 2013 Context report was subsequently updated in October 2017 to incorporate the findings of the John Patrick report. This report supersedes all other earlier reports.

This revised report focusses on statutory heritage assessment for buildings, trees and landscapes and has assessed all sites based on the HERCON Criteria (Appendix A) and the Cardinia Significant Tree Register Criteria. The report does not make assessment or reference to pre-contact indigenous heritage places and sites.
Summary of key findings

A desktop review of secondary sources determined that there were no post-contact heritage places on any statutory or non-statutory registers, and that no places within the Study Area had previously been assessed for their heritage values.

The final recommendations are set out below:

**Apply Heritage Overlay:**
- ‘Carinya’, 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon
- 140 Ryan Rd, Pakenham
- *Pyrus communis* (Pear Tree), 40 Dore Road, Pakenham

**Add to Cardinia Significant Tree Register:**
- *Pyrus communis* (Pear Tree), 40 Dore Road, Pakenham

**Undertake assessment of archaeological values:**
- Early wattle and daub cottage site – 40 Dore Road, Pakenham
- Farmhouse, outbuildings, dam etc. (c.1905) – 45-55 Dore Road, Nar Nar Goon
- Farm, 1550-1560 Princes Highway, Pakenham

**Record prior to removal for historic interest (trees):**
- Garden (including trees and shrubs) but not *Araucaria cunninghamii* (Hoop Pine) which is to be retained (see below) – 45-55 Dore Road, Nar Nar Goon
- *Cupressus sempervirens* (Italian Cypress) (pair) – 40 Dore Road, Pakenham

**Retain for amenity value (trees):**
- *Quercus robur* (English Oak) – 15 Mount Ararat North Road, Nar Nar Goon North
- *Cedrus deodara* (Deodar Cedar) – 180 Ryan Road, Pakenham
- *Phoenix canariensis* (Canary Island Palm) – 40 Dore Road, Pakenham
- *Araucaria cunninghamii* (Hoop Pine) – 45-55 Dore Road, Nar Nar Goon

A full list of the findings is included in Appendix D
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Include on Schedule to the Cardinia Heritage Overlay

Three places within the study area are recommended for inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme as Individually Significant places. These are set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Local heritage significance (Pear Tree only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>32 Mount Ararat South Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Local heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>140 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Local heritage significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the properties in the above table, as well as all other tables in this report, are listed by their street address as well as their PSP Property Number, which is keyed to the plan found in Appendix E.

A draft schedule specifying any additional controls where required is set out below in Table 3, to be incorporated into the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme. Please note that the addresses for each heritage place may change during the process of development, and the Schedule may need to be amended in the future.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Carinya’, 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Dairy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungalow, 140 Ryan Road, Pakenham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrus communis (Pear Tree) 40 Dore Road, Pakenham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Pear Tree only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heritage place is the Pear Tree and land beneath the canopy edge of the tree for a distance of five metres from...
A proposed curtilage for the Heritage Overlay for each place is shown in Appendix C. The curtilage for each heritage place is smaller than the title boundary, and has been drawn provide adequate protection of all identified element of heritage significance, their setting and context.

**Significant Trees**

Cardinia Shire Council have prepared a Significant Tree Register, with a specific set of criteria, based on the recognised heritage (HERCON) criteria. Cardinia have adopted an approach whereby if a tree is assessed to warrant inclusion on the Cardinia Shire Significant Tree Register (CSSTR), then it should be added to the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, and protected through the mechanism of the Heritage Overlay (HO).

One tree, the Pear Tree at 40 Dore Road, Pakenham was assessed in the John Patrick report as having sufficient historical and representative significance for its outstanding size and age (the largest example of the taxon within the municipality) to warrant inclusion on the Significant Tree Register.

**Table 3: Add to the Cardinia Significant Tree Register and Heritage Overlay (see above)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Mature specimen of <em>Pyrus communis</em> (Pear) in the modern garden.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Places of archaeological interest**

Three places within the study area were identified as having historical archaeological potential. These are set out in Table 4. Each of these sites should be further investigated through a detailed archaeological site inspection and either recording or monitoring as required.

The *Heritage Act (1995)* states that it is an offence to knowingly disturb, damage or excavate an archaeology site without obtaining the appropriate consent from the Executive Director at Heritage Victoria. As such, in the event that artefacts, footings, foundations, sites, or any other archaeological remains or features be encountered within the three sites documented below, or within any part of the Study Area, work should cease immediately and the relevant authorities, namely Heritage Victoria, be notified (under the requirements of the *Heritage Act 1995*).

Early consideration of the issues relating to demonstrated or potential historical archaeological values is essential, as archaeological investigations and research can take time.

The proposed extents of areas of ‘archaeological interest’ are shown on the maps in Appendix C. These extents have been drawn to protect elements of potential archaeological significance.

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44-55 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1550-1560 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plantings of historic interest only

Plantings of historic interest identified in this report are considered to have some potential to provide information about the range of plantings associated with pastoralism and settlement of the area in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. These are set out below in Table 5. They are not considered to be of sufficient integrity, or long term value to retain within the urban context.

It is desirable that these plantings are recorded through photographic means prior to removal, and the recordings are placed with the local historical society and/or Cardinia Shire Council. The location of the plantings of historic interest are shown on the maps in Appendix C.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Pair of Cupressus sempervirens (Italian Cypress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trees of amenity value

The four trees included in Table 6 below are considered have been assessed as having high amenity value, and are considered to have the ability to positively contribute to the new urban landscape.\(^1\) It is recommended that these trees be retained and integrated into the new development of Pakenham East. Trees with high amenity value are those which

\[\ldots\text{make(s) a significant contribution to the amenity value of the site, or tree makes a moderate to significant contribution to the amenity value of the larger landscape.}\]

The location of trees with high amenity value are shown on the maps in Appendix C.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 Mount Ararat North Rd, NB: There are two homestead sites on this property: one at the south end and the other at the north.</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012 and 18 Jan. 2013</td>
<td>Quercus robur (English Oak) at north homestead site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Phoenix canariensis (Canary Island Palm) located in the modern garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45-55 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Araucaria cunninghamii (Hoop Pine) located to the west of the dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>180 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Cedrus deodar (Deodar Cedar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) A brief datasheet for each of the trees in Table 6 can be found in Appendix F - ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ (Section 4) prepared by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. for Cardinia Shire Council in November 2013.

Summary of Trees to be retained

There are only five (5) trees recommended for retention for their amenity and heritage value in this report. These are set out below in Table 7. All trees which are retained will require protection and management during development of the new urban landscape. Development guidance for all trees to be retained is set out in Section 4 of this report.

Table 7: Trees to be retained and protected during development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reason for Retention</th>
<th>Tree citation (page number in John Patrick Report, Appendix E)</th>
<th>Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) (m)</th>
<th>Recommended3</th>
<th>Apply Planning Scheme Overlay?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 Mount Ararat</td>
<td><em>Quercus robur</em></td>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>p. 5</td>
<td>7.8m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Road, Nar</td>
<td>(English Oak)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nar Goon North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Road,</td>
<td><em>Phoenix canariensis</em></td>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>p.7</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakenham</td>
<td>Canary Island Palm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Road,</td>
<td><em>Pyrus communis</em></td>
<td>Significant Tree</td>
<td>p.8</td>
<td>10.8m</td>
<td>Yes, Heritage Overlay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakenham</td>
<td>Pear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45-55 Dore Road,</td>
<td><em>Araucaria cunninghamii</em></td>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>p.9</td>
<td>8.2m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nar Nar Goon</td>
<td>Hoop Pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>180 Ryan Road,</td>
<td><em>Cedrus deodara</em></td>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>p.13</td>
<td>8.6m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakenham</td>
<td>Deodar Cedar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Op. cit., p.17
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief

This report has been prepared for the Strategic Planning Department of Cardinia Shire.

The Pakenham East Precinct was announced by the Victorian Planning Minister as an extension to the Urban Growth Boundary in June 2012. In response, Cardinia Shire has been preparing a Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) for the future development of this area as a residential precinct, with a Neighbourhood Activity Centre and associated community facilities.

In order to inform its preparation of the PSP, Cardinia Shire engaged a range of consultants to prepare background reports. Context were commissioned to carry out a Post-Contact Heritage Assessment – encompassing both buildings and trees – for the Precinct in late 2012. This involved the identification, survey, and assessment of places of potential heritage significance, as well as providing statutory and management guidelines to ensure that impacts from the future development are minimised. The brief did not require, nor does this report make any assessment of or reference to pre-contact indigenous heritage places and sites.

Context prepared a report on the findings of the Post Contact Heritage Assessment in March 2013.

In September 2017, Council requested that Context review and amend their 2013 report to incorporate the findings of a report by John Patrick Pty. Ltd entitled ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ prepared for Cardinia Shire Council in November 2013 (hereafter referred to as the John Patrick report). The amalgamation of the findings of both reports represents a thorough investigation into the post contact heritage of the Pakenham East PSP. This report, prepared in October 2017 supersedes all other reports.

This report has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines set out by the ICOMOS Burra Charter, and references the Victorian Historic Themes Framework. In accordance with Heritage Victoria guidelines, the Study was prepared using The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Heritage Significance (1999) and its guidelines.

Places of potential cultural heritage significance were assessed using the Heritage Council Criteria for the Assessment of Cultural Heritage Significance (HERCON). Significant trees have been assessed using the Cardinia Shire Council Significant Tree Study Assessment Criteria, which is based on the HERCON criteria.

1.2 Study Area

The Pakenham East Precinct (henceforth known as the ‘Study Area’) is located in the western part of Cardinia Shire, approximately 60 kilometres southeast of Melbourne, and 20 kilometres east of Narre Warren-Fountain Gate principal activity centre. The Study Area is bound by Seymour Road (to the north), Ryan Road and Deep Creek Roads (to the west), Mount Ararat Road (to the east), and the Princes Freeway Pakenham Bypass (to the south). Dore Road and Canty Lane, and part of the Princes Highway fall within the Study Area (see Figure 1 below).
1.3 Approach & methodology

The study methodology was based upon the series of tasks set out in the brief, and subsequent request to incorporate the findings from the John Patrick report. The tasks were broken down into three major stages:

- Identification and assessment of heritage places and the elements of significance that comprise them
- Statutory recommendations, appropriate curtilage and management recommendations to protect the identified places of heritage significance.
- Incorporate findings of John Patrick report on the significance and amenity value of trees within the study area.

Stage one

The first step was a desktop review of the Victorian Heritage Register, the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme, the Victorian Heritage Inventory, the Register of the National Estate, and the Register of the National Trust of Australia (Victoria). A number heritage studies and other secondary sources were also reviewed to determine a list of known heritage places and sites that fall within the Study Area. These are listed in Section 2.4 of this report.

Stakeholders with an interest and/or knowledge of historic sites in the Study Area were contacted. Furthermore, historic maps and plans were studied to determine the location of early homestead sites and identify places of potential significance.

Natica Schmeder and Annabel Neylon made site visits to all properties in the Study Area on 19 December 2012 and 18 January 2013. All properties were entered and the consultants were
able to confirm what built elements or trees were of interest (note that the homestead site, at 15 Mount Ararat North Road, was entered and inspected on 18 January 2013).

Sites that were identified as having heritage significance and archaeological interest were marked up on a map of the Study Area, indicating the extent of significant elements. Exotic trees of amenity value or historic interest which did not reach the threshold for Heritage Overlay protection were also noted.

A full heritage assessment was undertaken for two places that were identified as being of potential heritage significance, and place citations, in line with Heritage Victoria recommendations, were prepared for them.

For places with other (sometimes lesser) values, a brief citation and photograph has been prepared, and these places have been mapped.

All citations prepared by Context in Stage 1 are included in Appendix B to this report.

Stage two
The second stage was the provision of recommendations to appropriately protect the heritage significance of the two places assessed and found to be of local heritage significance. This includes statutory recommendations for protection under the Cardinia Heritage Overlay, as well as further non-statutory recommendations regarding places of archaeological potential, plantings of historic interest or amenity value.

For the two places which are recommended for inclusion under the Cardinia Heritage Overlay, the following guidance is provided:

- Appropriate curtilage and additional controls required to retain the significance, integrity and setting of both heritage places
- Suggested design guidelines regarding the bulk, form, scale and size of surrounding development to both heritage places
- Conservation policy regarding both heritage places.

Stages one and two resulted in March 2013 report ‘Post Contact Heritage Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ (hereafter referred to as the 2013 Context report).

Stage three
The third stage was undertaken in October 2017, and was to review and incorporate the findings of the John Patrick report into the 2013 Context report. A full copy of the John Patrick report is included in Appendix F.

1.4 Study limitations
The Study Area is primarily rural in nature, and most of the properties comprise a farmhouse, often set within a modest garden, surrounded by farmland. All properties were able to be accessed by the consultants, and all buildings and exotic trees visible on current aerial photographs and/or from public and private roads were externally inspected. The consultants did not walk the paddocks to identify additional potential archaeological sites (other than those included in this report). The archaeological site at 40 Dore Road was not able to be inspected at close range at the request of the property owner.
2 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

2.1 Thematic history

The Pakenham district is located in the traditional land of the Bunurong, which extends from Western Port Bay northward to the Dandenong Ranges. During the 1840s the area attracted a large number of pastoralists, and with Closer Settlement and Soldier Settlement Schemes further intensification through small scale farms further changed the landscape. With the development of transportation networks from the 1870s, namely the arrival of the railway and the improvement of the east-west route (now the Princes Highway), the Shire’s isolation ended.

First settlement

Unsuccessful attempts were made to establish permanent settlements in the Western Port area in the early years. These attempts, Butler notes, were mainly related to the defence needs of the colony (Butler 1996:4). Other early settlement in the region included sealers and those connected to the bark industry.

It wasn’t until the last 1830s that the first permanent settlers began to arrive into the district. Hick’s notes that it was only after McMillan and Strezlecki ‘began to sing the prises of the eastern area of Victoria … that the Squatters, their pastoral workings, timber getters, ticket-of-leave convicts and cattle thieves took up residence … and gradually [began] to transform it to their needs’ (Hicks 1989:7). Early survey maps show that the first settled areas within the Shire were near the Great Swamp, for it had a network of creeks (by way of the Cardinia, Toomuc and Ararat creeks) and a plentiful water supply which ensured that the area was well suited for an agricultural settlement.

Pastoralists and farmers

Squatters began flooding into the Western Port Phillip District (now the Cardinia Shire) after the 1840s (see Butler and Associates 1998:18). By 1836 squatting licences were legalised and official sanctioned pastoral leases were issued for any run at a cost of 10 pounds. Under this system, nearly the whole of Victoria was acquired and developed into large pastoral estates.

A 1847 map drawn by the surveyor Urquhart marked the study area, now known as Pakenham East (at the boundary between the localities of Pakenham and Nar Nar Goon), as containing ‘good agricultural soil … and an abundance of grass’ (Urquhart 1847). There were at least twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick, including John Dore’s station (Nar-Ri-Uk); Hennessy’s cattle station, which was located close to Dore’s station and Waton, Wight and Company’s station (Nar Nar Goon) to the south (Butler 1998:17,19).

In 1848 new regulations (pre-emptive rights) allowed squatters to purchase, and take up to 640 acres of their pastoral runs. Holders could purchase these rights before any land in the general vicinity was available to the general public, granted they carry out improvement such as construct homesteads and establish cultivation paddocks (Cabena et al. 1989: 2). Hicks notes that many of the early settlers also planted huge elms, oaks, pines and hawthorn hedgerows in a ‘desire to have familiar surroundings in this new strange land’ (see Hicks 1989:12). Seven of the twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick were secured with pre-emptive allotments (see figure 2).

Among the earliest prominent district settlers was John Dore. Early parish plans show that John Dore, with Michael Hennessy secured the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right (640 acres) in 1855. The Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A small part of the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right, and a house built ca1860, at 125 Mt Ararat Road North, Pakenham are protected under HO81 (see HERMES 6004 for further information).

The Selection era, which began with the passing of a series of Land Acts in the 1860s, further opened up Victoria for selection and sale. It also accelerated the process of subdivision, particularly when larger pastoral runs were subdivided and opened up for sale to the general public. With subdivision came a decline in pastoral runs, and in grazing, which were replaced
with a diverse range of agricultural activities, including dairying and orcharding (see figures 2 to 7).

In 1888 the area was described by Alexander Sutherland as:

> Although there are numerous towns and villages spread over nearly all parts of this district, none of them are either very large or possess any special importance, being for most parts small railway townships (or) agricultural centres … Their population consists mainly of the various hotel and storekeepers who supply the needs of the many small settlers and others, who are located broadcast over the district’ (as quoted in Hicks 1989: 22).

The development of the Gippsland Road, from the 1860s (now the Princes Highway), and the arrival of the railway, in the 1870s, increased settlement in the area and the development of Nar Nar Goon Township. The centre became the ‘dispatch centre for swan products … and became the third most important point of dispatch for West Gippsland timber’ (Butler 1998:70).

The Selection Acts were followed by the Village Settlement, the Closer Settlement and the Soldier Settlement Scheme, which followed both World Wars. These settlement programmes were designed to revive an agrarian ethic so men of small means should own quarter acre blocks (0.1ha). This change lead to the decline of grazing and the further development of a diverse farming community, in which dairying, agriculture and the breeding of cattle were major occupations until well into the twentieth century.

### 2.2 Local history

**East Pakenham**

Research indicates that Dr William Jamieson, who took up the IYU run of almost 13,000 aces in 1838, was the first settler in what is now Pakenham (Hicks 1988:26).

Pakenham East developed as a township with the opening up of the railway in the 1800s. Hicks notes that ‘when the line opened, businesses began to gather around the station to the south-west, and came to call themselves “East Pakenham”. At first there were great rivalry between the two villages, but gradually they emerged into a single unit’ (Hicks 1988:27).

The Shire of Berwick located its centre in Pakenham in 1902 and held council meetings in the Pakenham Shire Hall until 1922. From 1911 the town held an annual agricultural show and in 1928 electricity and water were supplied to the town.

**Nar Nar Goon**

The township of Nar Nar Goon grew in association with the development of the railway, travelling east from Melbourne, and it was formally part of the Mt. Ararat run, taken up by John Dore and Michael Hennessy. The railway station at Nar Nar Goon became the centre of the town, also operating at the town’s Post Office (Hicks 1988:31).

### 2.3 Relevant Victorian Historic Themes

1.5 Exploring, surveying and mapping
2.6 Promoting settlement
4.1 Living off the land
4.3 Grazing and raising livestock
4.4 Farming
Figure 2: Pastoral leaseholds and pre-emptive right properties (shaded) in the Western Port District. Study area forms part of Mt. Ararat 1. Source: Butler 1998b:19.
Figure 3: Country lots, parishes of Pakenham and Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington 1859. Victoria. Dept. of Crown Lands and Survey. Source: State Library of Victoria.
Figure 4: Country lots, Parish of Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington, surveyed by M. Callanan 1872. Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right is located at top of plan. Melbourne, Dept. of Lands and Survey. Source: State Library of Victoria
Figure 5: Cadastral map of the Parish of Nar Nar Goon, Victoria showing parish boundaries and land ownership- northern section of the Study Area, including Mt Ararat pre-emptive right (northern side of the Princess Highway). Victoria Department of Crown Lands and Survey 1896. Source: State Library of Victoria.
Figure 6: Cadastral map of the Parish of Nar Nar Goon, Victoria- showing parish boundaries and land ownership, showing the southern section of the Study Area (southern side of the Princess Highway). Victoria Department of Crown Lands and Survey 1896. Source: State Library of Victoria.
Figure 7: Nar Nar Goon Parish Plan 1895, showing the study area. Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne. Source State Library of Victoria
2.4 Previously identified heritage places

2.4.1 Historical databases and inventories
Desktop research was undertaken to determine if any known places had been recorded within the Study Area. This research component involved the examination of a number of primary and secondary sources, and included statutory and non-statutory registers.

Statutory registers
The Victorian Heritage Register (VHR) and the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme, which both provide statutory protection to the places included on them, were examined, as well as the Victorian Heritage Inventory (VHI) and Heritage Victoria’s Online Interactive Heritage Management Electronic System (HERMES) Map. The VHI lists all recorded archaeological sites in Victoria, and includes site information regarding the fabric and integrity of archaeological places. Places that are included on the VHI have protection under the Heritage Act 1995.

Heritage Victoria’s Online Interactive (HERMES) Map indicates and maps all known sites and places listed on the VHR, VHI, delisted VHI sites and the HO. Newly recorded post-contact and archaeological sites are updated onto this online resource regularly by Heritage Victoria.

A search of these sources found no known or previously recorded places of heritage significance within the Study Area.

However, care should be taken during the course of development, as previously unknown archaeological sites may be uncovered, in which case the appropriate procedures of notification and recording, as specified by the Heritage Act 1995 need to be taken.

Non-statutory registers & heritage studies
Non statutory registers and pertinent heritage studies were reviewed to determine a list of known heritage places and sites that fall within the Study Area. These included:

• Register of the National Estate (Australian Heritage Database)
• Register of the National Trust of Australia (Victoria)

A search of these sources found no known or previously recorded places of heritage significance or potential historical interest within the Study Area.

2.4.2 Stakeholder engagement
As part of this assessment Context approached:

• Berwick-Pakenham Historical Society, Audrey Dodson,
• Don Jackson and John Carney, private citizens recommended by Audrey Dodson for they are related to the founding families of the area and have associations with Pakenham East,
• Casey-Cardinia Library Corporation, Heather Arnold, Local History Librarian,
• Property owners also discussed individual properties and the locality history with consultants during the course of the site visits.
Heritage Victoria. The Study Area was discussed with Heritage Victoria staff members and a search of their databases did not indicate that anything of historical significance had been previously identified. Chris Benham of Heritage Victoria noted that all known VHR, VHI, delisted VHI sites and HO sites and place are recorded on Heritage Victoria’s Online Interactive (HERMES) Map. A search of this database was undertaken as part of 2.4.1, and no sites were identified within the Study Area.

2.5 Fieldwork findings

Context identified four site types during field work:

1. Sites (including trees) that appeared to meet the threshold for local significance (and qualify for the Heritage Overlay to be applied). These places were deemed at this point – prior to full assessment – to be ‘places of potential heritage significance’;

2. Early homestead sites noted by local residents without above-ground remains which have ‘archaeological interest’;

3. Sites with mature exotic trees of amenity value (but not considered to have specific heritage value), which should be considered for retention in the PSP planning and design process; and

4. Sites with mature exotic plantings which were remnants of residential planting, with limited amenity value, which do not have sufficient significance to warrant the application of the Heritage Overlay, but are of historic interest.

In the tables below, all places are identified by their street address as well as their PSP Property Number which is shown on the map in Appendix E.

2.5.1 Places of potential local heritage significance

Based on initial research, review of existing material and field investigation, it was clear at this point that two places with the Study Area were of potential heritage significance. These places were then fully assessed to confirm their significance.

Table 8: Places of potential local heritage significance identified in fieldwork (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>32 Mount Ararat South Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Local heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>140 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Local heritage significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2 Significant Trees

The 2013 Context report did not identify any Significant Trees (which met the threshold for local significance or the Cardinia Shire Significant Tree Register). The report recommended

---

4 The Pear Tree which has subsequently been recommended for inclusion in the Cardinia Shire Significant Tree Register and the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme was initially considered to have Amenity value, but a recommendation was made to further investigate and test this against the Cardinia Significant Tree Register Criteria (CSTR). The tree was re-assessed by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. in November 2013, and found to meet the test for inclusion on the CSTR.
that an arborist should undertake an assessment of all trees at PSP Property numbers 6, 8, 11, 48 and 50 to determine the value (amenity or other) of the trees on those sites.

Subsequent work undertaken by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. in November 2013 which assessed the Pear Tree at 40 Dore Road, Pakenham being worthy of inclusion on the Cardinia Significant Tree Register. The identified criteria and values are shown in Table 8 below, and the citation for this tree is included in Appendix B.

Cardinia has adopted an approach where trees which are deemed ‘Significant’ and worthy of inclusion on the Cardinia Significant Tree Register are added to the Heritage Overlay.

It is therefore recommended in this report that Pear Tree, located at 40 Dore Road, Pakenham be added as an individual place to the Schedule of the Heritage Overlay and to the Cardinia Significant Tree Register.

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Identified Criteria and values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>Pyrus communis (Pear Tree)</td>
<td>Criterion A (Historic) A1C – association with the early property, 'The Range' Criterion D (Representativeness) D1C – Outstanding example of the species</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.3 **Places of archaeological interest**

Based on research, review of existing material and field investigation, three sites of ‘archaeological interest’ were identified within the Study Area, shown in Table 9 below.

### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44-55 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1550-1560 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site of ‘archaeological interest’ at 40 Dore Road showed no evidence of the original four roomed wattle and daub house, which was reportedly located in a paddock 80 metres to the south of the current homestead. As the site has been heavily disturbed through activities relating to farming, and dairying, there is limited potential for subsurface material relating to the former house to remain in-situ. The site has limited potential to yield information about the establishment of small farm complexes and the development of agricultural activities in the area.

---

5 John Patrick Pty. Ltd, 2013, ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East prepared for Cardinia Shire Council November 2013, pp. 5-16

NB: These values and criteria were identified in Tree Assessments (Section 4) of the John Patrick report.
No evidence of the original homestead remains at the site of ‘archaeological interest’ at 45-55 Dore Road. As the site has been heavily disturbed through activities relating to farming, and dairying, there is limited potential for subsurface material relating to the former house to remain in-situ. The site has limited potential to yield information about the establishment of small farm complexes and the development of agricultural activities in the area.

The house at 1550-1560 Princes Highway, Pakenham, was reportedly constructed on the site of the former Carney family homestead, which was constructed in 1862. No evidence of the former house was visible. There is, however, limited potential for subsurface material relating to the former house to remain in-situ which may yield information about the establishment of small farm complexes and the development of agricultural activities in the area.

2.5.4 Plantings of historic interest

Plantings of historic interest are those which have the ability to provide information about the past, are clearly associated with an early or historic property, but do not meet the threshold for local significance (and therefore application of the Heritage Overlay).

There are many fine examples of historic plantings throughout the municipality of Cardinia. The Cardinia heritage studies (1996 and 1998) and the Cardinia Shire Significant Tree Study (2009) identified numerous trees, gardens and plantings. Some of these have been protected by the application of the Heritage Overlay, and others have not.

During fieldwork, two plantings which were clearly associated with historic sites were identified. The first, 40 Dore Road, Pakenham comprises a pair of overmature *Cupressus sempervirens* (Italian Cypress) (c. 1890) in poor condition which appear to be planted at the entry of a former garden, indicating the possible archaeological site of a residence, possibly ‘The Range’ a wattle and daub cottage. The trees are of interest for their age, and as a marker for the early farmhouse site, but are in poor condition and now lack a clear context. While the trees have the ability to provide some historical information, they do not meet the threshold for local significance, as outlined in Section 3.2 of this report.

The second site, at 45-55 Dore Road is a farmhouse garden (c.1905-1920) which survives in very poor condition around a new residence, built on the site of an earlier (c.1905) farmhouse. Many of the original plants have been lost from the garden, and many trees and shrubs have been significantly damaged (or removed) through animal or mechanical damage. The garden retains the skeleton of a large residential farmhouse garden, but lacks sufficient integrity or context to meet the threshold of local significance as outlined in Section 3.2 of this report.

In cases where there are plantings of historic interest only, it is desirable that where trees can safely be incorporated into the design of the new PSP, they be retained. Where this is not possible (due to tree health, safety or design priorities), it is recommended that the place, plant species and location be photographed and recorded prior to any tree removal.

2.5.5 Trees of amenity value

Trees of amenity value are those which have landscape and aesthetic interest and value, and make a contribution to the surrounding locality.

The 2013 Context report identified that there were four properties which may have exotic trees of amenity value within Pakenham East Precinct, these were PSP No. 6, 8, 11, 38 and 50. Initially, it was thought that the Pear Tree at 40 Dore Road, Pakenham (now recommended for inclusion in the HO and CSTR) was of amenity value only. It was recommended that further work be undertaken to assess these trees for their amenity or other value.

Subsequent work to assess the amenity value of trees on these properties. The four trees set out in Table 9 below are considered to have high amenity value, and should be retained in future development of the area.
Table 9: Amenity trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6                | 15 Mount Ararat North Rd, NB: There are two homestead sites on this property: one at the south end and the other at the north. | *Quercus robur* (English Oak) at north homestead site | High retention value  
High landscape contribution  
Wide spreading specimen, prominent location near crown of hill. |
| 8                | 40 Dore Rd                                 | *Phoenix canariensis* (Canary Island Palm) located in the modern garden. | High retention value  
High landscape contribution  
On raised mound and in prominent location when viewed from the south. |
| 11               | 45-55 Dore Rd                              | *Araucaria cunninghamii* (Hoop Pine) located to the west of the dwelling | High retention value  
High landscape contribution |
| 50               | 180 Ryan Rd                                | *Cedrus deodar* (Deodar Cedar) | High retention value  
High landscape contribution  
Good symmetrical form |

2.5.6 Places of no post-contact heritage significance
The following places have been inspected and no elements of potential heritage significance have been identified on them:

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>155 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>365 Seymour Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>325 Seymour Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mount Ararat North Rd, Lot 1 LP55512</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The attributes and values listed here are from the datasheets for each tree included in the John Patrick report in Appendix F of this report - John Patrick Pty. Ltd, 2013, ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East prepared for Cardinia Shire Council November 2013, pp.5-16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55 Mount Ararat North Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dore Rd, Lot 3 PS422931</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dore Rd, Lot 2 PS422931</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>95 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>35 Canty Lane</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>36 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>40 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>46 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>46 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>50 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>60 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>70 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ryan Rd, Lot RES1 PS402188</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>25 Canty Lane</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP Property Number</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td>Heritage assessment findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Allotment 23B1 Parish of Nar Nar Goon</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1530 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lot 2 PS547978</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1610 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1610 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>90 Mount Ararat South Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lot 3 PS607403</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lot 1 PS613913</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lot RES1 PS607403</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>10 Canty Lane</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>104 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>110 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>114 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>160 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Lot 2 PS547650</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Lot 2 PS547650</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

3.1 Basis of assessment

The Burra Charter defines ‘cultural significance’ as:

… aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations

The Burra Charter further clarifies that:

Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Places may have a range of values for different individual or groups

In accordance with the VPP Practice Note ‘Applying the Heritage Overlay’ (2015) guidelines, this report provides an assessment using the HERCON criteria and concludes with a statement of cultural heritage significance.

3.2 Establishing threshold for local significance

The Heritage Victoria standard brief for heritage studies notes that local significance can include places of significance to a town or locality. For the purposes of this review the following series of local ‘tests’ developed to determine whether a place met the threshold of local significance using the HERCON criteria:

- The place is associated with a key theme identified in the thematic environmental history. The place will have a strong association with the theme and this will be clearly illustrated by the fabric, when compared with other places (Criterion A).

- The place may be rare within the municipality or to a township or locality. It may be a very early place, or one that is under-represented (Criterion B).

- If it is a representative example of a place type it will usually have the typical range of features normally associated with that type – i.e. it will be a benchmark example. If a precinct, it will usually have a high degree of integrity (i.e. 70% or more of the places will be considered to be contributory) (Criterion D).

- The place is an exemplar of an architectural style or represents significant technical or artistic/architectural innovation or achievement when compared to other similar places in the municipality. The places will usually have a high degree of integrity when compared to other places (Criterion F).

- The place has strong social or historic associations to a township or locality (Criterion G) or to an individual or organization (Criterion H) and, in particular:

  - There is continuity of use or association, meanings, or symbolic importance over a period of 25 years or more (representing transition of values beyond one generation).

  - The association has resulted in a deeper attachment that goes beyond utility value.

  - The connection between a place and a person/s or organisations is not short or incidental and may have been documented – for example in local histories, other heritage studies or reports, local oral histories etc.

By comparison, places that do not meet the threshold of local significance will generally be those where:

- Historical associations are not well established or are not reflected in the fabric because of low integrity, or

- The place is common within the municipality or already well-represented in the Heritage Overlay, or
• If a precinct, it has a high proportion of non-contributory buildings, or
• It is a typical, rather than outstanding example of an architectural style or technical achievement and there are better representative examples in the municipality.
• The social or historical associations are not well established or demonstrated.

3.3 Establishing archaeological potential

Archaeology is the study of physical evidence from the past. An archaeological site can include below ground features such as building foundations, wells, weirs, fence posts, poles, machinery foundations and remains and artefacts. Archaeological sites provide solid evidence of important elements of human settlement and activity and can provide confirmation for the documentary record or new insights into existing perceptions and opinions.

Archaeological investigations can tell us about the way people lived, what techniques and processes were used in domestic, agricultural, industrial and commercial activities. It is important from a cultural viewpoint that sites of human activity deemed to be of archaeological value not be disturbed before an archaeological investigation is undertaken lest important evidence be destroyed, disturbed or displaced. The original context is very important to archaeology.

In Victoria, Heritage Victoria supports the work of the Heritage Council of Victoria, although the two are quite separate entities. Heritage Victoria is a Victorian State Government agency and is part of the Department of Planning and Community Development, whereas the Heritage Council is an independent statutory authority established under the Heritage Act. The Heritage Act 1995 is administered by Heritage Victoria and is the Victorian Government’s key piece of cultural heritage legislation. The Act identifies and protects heritage places and objects that are of significance to the State of Victoria including:

• Historic archaeological sites and artefacts
• Historic buildings, structures and precincts
• Gardens, trees and cemeteries
• Cultural landscapes
• Shipwrecks and relics
• Significant objects

The Heritage Act establishes the Victorian Heritage Register, the Heritage Inventory and the Heritage Council of Victoria.

Heritage Victoria notes that ‘archaeological sites and their associated artefacts do not exist in isolation from their broader cultural and natural environment. For this reason, historical archaeology also relies on other fields including history, anthropology, geography and geology, to help develop an understanding of a place’s history (see Department of Planning and Community Development/Historical Archaeology).
3.4 Establishing other values

3.4.1 Significant trees

Many municipalities across Victoria hold Significant Tree Registers, which hold information about the important trees of that municipality. The National Trust maintains a Significant Tree Register for each State and Territory, which records information about significant trees across Australia. A significant tree may be significant for reasons other than their post-contact cultural heritage value.

These registers are non-statutory and afford no formal protection to the trees or land on which they stand. They can however be used as the basis of a municipal Planning Scheme Amendment to apply various controls, such as the Heritage Overlay (HO), Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO) or Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO).

The Cardinia Shire Council prepared the Cardinia Shire Significant Tree Study in 2009. That study assessed a number of trees against a unique set of criteria, based on the HERCON criteria. The study lists trees across the municipality which address one or more of the identified criteria to an outstanding degree within the municipality. The assessment of significant trees in this report was informed by the John Patrick report (2013) which used the same criteria.

Cardinia Shire Council have adopted an approach which applies the Heritage Overlay (HO) to trees which are included on the Cardinia Significant Tree Register (CSTR). Therefore, places which are considered to meet the threshold for the CSTR are also recommended for inclusion on the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay (HO).

3.4.2 Historic interest

Trees or plantings of historic interest identified in this report are those which are clearly related to the history of the Study Area, and are associated with and early residence, or archaeological site, but do not meet the threshold for local significance in their own right as set out in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of this report.

3.4.3 Amenity value

Trees of amenity value identified in this report are considered to be worthy of retention as they have the ability to enhance or positively contribute to the future urban character of Pakenham East.

The amenity value assessment was undertaken by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. in November 2013. The amenity value is based on whether the physical characteristics of the tree have the potential to positively contribute to the new urban landscape. Trees with high amenity value are recommended for retention and integration into the new development of the urban landscape, and are those which

...make(s) a significant contribution to the amenity value of the site, or tree makes a moderate to significant contribution to the amenity value of the larger landscape.

A brief datasheet for each of the trees in Table 6 can be found in Appendix F - ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ (Section 4) prepared by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. for Cardinia Shire Council in November 2013.

3.5 Outcomes of assessment

3.5.1 Places of local significance

Three places are recommended for inclusion on the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme, listed in Table 11. Citations for places of local significance are included at Appendix B of this report.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Elements of heritage significance</th>
<th>Applicable HERCON criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>Pyrus communis (Pear Tree)</td>
<td>A, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>32 Mt Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon</td>
<td>Edwardian timber house, Dairy</td>
<td>A, D,E, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>140 Ryan Road, Pakenham</td>
<td>Interwar bungalow</td>
<td>D , E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two built places identified as being of potential heritage significance during the fieldwork were given a full assessment of their heritage significance, and place citations prepared by Context.

This included the preparation of a detailed place history, to establish when the property was established and the construction date of buildings, as well as the early owners of the place. Based on this history, and the architectural style and features of the buildings (as detailed in the description), the places were compared against others of a similar date and type in Cardinia Shire. Comparisons were particularly sought from among places already on the Cardinia Heritage Overlay and those recommended for the overlay as part of Amendment C161, as these places provided benchmarks in determining whether the places meet the threshold of local significance using the HERCON Criteria (see section 3.2).

In addition, the Significant Tree identified at 40 Dore Road was assessed by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. as being individually significant, and worthy of addition to the Significant Tree Register. Cardinia Shire Council have adopted an approach where trees included on the Cardinia Significant Tree Register are included in the Heritage Overlay. On this basis, all three (two built places and one tree) were found to meet the threshold for local significance and should be added to the Heritage Overlay.

As assessment of the Significant Tree (Pear) at 40 Dore Road, Pakenham was undertaken by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. and a citation prepared, consistent with the citations prepared for the CSTR.

3.5.2 Places with archaeological interest

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44-55 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1550-1560 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The brief for this post-contact heritage assessment did not require an archaeological investigation of the Study Area. However, during the course of field work, three sites were
identified and considered to have ‘archaeological interest’. ‘Archaeological interest’ denotes these places as having the potential to contain archaeological deposits.

Although there was no visible evidence of the former homesteads at these three locations, site boundaries (buffers) have been established around these sites to highlight their archaeological potential (archaeological interest). These site boundaries also work to identify these areas as ‘archaeological sensitive areas’ within the greater Pakenham East Precinct.

These three sites should be further investigated through a detailed archaeological site inspection (see requirements of *Heritage Act 1995* as set out in section 3.3, above).

### 3.5.3 Places with other values

**Table 12: Historic Interest Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Pair of <em>Cupressus sempervirens</em> Italian Cypress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13: Amenity value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 Mount Ararat North Rd, NB: There are two homestead sites on this property: one at the south end and the other at the north.</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012 and 18 Jan. 2013</td>
<td><em>Quercus robur</em> (English Oak) at north homestead site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td><em>Phoenix canariensis</em> (Canary Island Palm) located in the modern garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45-55 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td><em>Araucaria cunninghamii</em> (Hoop Pine) located to the west of the dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>180 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td><em>Cedrus deodara</em> (Deodar Cedar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE

This chapter suggests strategies for integrating identified heritage elements and places into the future Pakenham East Precinct environment. It also addresses exotic trees that have amenity value or are of heritage interest and sites of archaeological interest that have been identified.

4.1 Within and around places of heritage significance (HO recommended)

This section provides suggestions for ensuring that future development in the Pakenham East Precinct has a minimal negative impact on the heritage values of the two places recommended for protection under the Cardinia Heritage Overlay:

- Pear Tree, 40 Dore Road, Pakenham
- ‘Carinya’ (Edwardian timber house and dairy), 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon
- Bungalow, 140 Ryan Road, Nar Nar Goon

The suggested development guidelines are in keeping with Heritage Victoria’s Heritage Overlay Guidelines, 2007.

4.1.1 Pear Tree, 40 Dore Road, Pakenham, PSP Property 8

Matters for consideration

- It is a mature Pyrus communis (Pear Tree) of an outstanding size within the municipality
- It is estimated to have been planted c.1900-1930
- It is believed to have been part of the orchard or garden associated with the historic property known as ‘The Range’.
- The significant place is the Pear Tree and an associated area of land only. The significance does not extend to any other elements at 40 Dore Road, Pakenham.

Objectives

- To preserve and maintain the Pear tree in an appropriate setting and context so that its history and original farming associations can be understood.
- To preserve views to the Pear Tree from the public realm.
- To ensure that adjacent new development does not visually detract from the heritage significance of the place.
- To ensure that new infrastructure and development does not detrimentally effect the health and useful life expectancy of the tree.

Development guidelines

The following guidelines are suggested to minimise and/or mitigate the impact of new development in the PSP:

Planning and Subdivision:

- Proposals for development should demonstrate that sufficient space is provided for the successful retention of the Pear Tree in subdivision, including allowance for growth.
- No development should be allowed within the area specified by the Heritage Overlay curtilage.
- Ideally, the Pear tree would be located in an area of Public Open Space to allow sufficient room well beyond the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) to allow the tree to thrive in the new setting and maximise the potential for retention.
• The Pear tree should not be retained within a road reserve, where the potential for damage and decline is high, and the context for understanding the significance of the tree is limited.

**Use**

As a rule, the most appropriate use for a heritage place is the one it originally served. It would be desirable for the Pear Tree to form part of a new residential allotment or Public Open Space.

**Views**

Ideally, the Pear tree would be visible from the public realm, either as a feature tree in a residential garden, or area of Public Open Space.

**New development**

The Pear tree should be afforded minimum protection based on a Tree Management Plan (TMP) conforming to AS4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites, including establishment of a robust, fenced area that includes the calculated TPZ as well as additional canopy protection, if required. The TMP should be prepared by a suitably qualified arborist, and include at minimum:

- Specifications for fencing and mulching to the tree
- Provisions for limiting excavation for road and pavement construction, service installation and building construction. The TMP can specify sensitive methods for construction, such as horizontal boring, root sensitive footings etc., where these can be appropriately managed and not impact on the viability of the tree
- Exclusion of material storage, including fuels and other chemicals
- Exclusion of vehicles, including parking, where ever possible, and mechanisms for temporary access into a TPZ if required
- Appropriate pruning standards
- Inspections by the Responsible Authority

**Future Plantings**

- Consideration is required for new plantings adjacent to an established tree, especially if the tree is retained in a park setting
- New plantings proximal to the Pear Tree should be limited to small shrubs and herbaceous species to minimise direct competition, especially for solar access, and to allow the form of the tree to be best appreciated.
- The TPZ should remain mulched and free of substantial under plantings. Establishment of turf within the drip one of established trees should be avoided.

4.1.2 ‘Carinya’, 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon, PSP Property No. 38

**Matters for consideration**

There are a number of features of ‘Carinya’ that should be considered and/or protected in planning the Precinct Structure Plan:

- It is an Edwardian timber farmhouse that exhibits the influence of the architectural fashions of its time.
- It was constructed for Frank Dore, a member of the European family that first settled the Study Area, who resided in the farmhouse with his family and milked his cows in the dairy at the rear. Dairying has been one of the main industries in the Study Area.
- It has been separated from the farm by a subdivision to create a homestead block (Lot 1 PS425398, PSP Property No 38), but the homestead block encompasses the significant
elements of the site (farmhouse and dairy) within a generous garden setting similar in size to a farmhouse garden setting. The modern house, built on the west side of the site, is not of heritage significance.

- The farmhouse addresses Princes Highway to the north and is set back approximately 20 metres from the road. It is likely that the homestead site was originally entered off Princes Highway. Currently, the entrance is off Mount Ararat South Road, due to traffic considerations (i.e., the 100-kph speed limit on Princes Highway and lack of a service road). The farmhouse (and the modern house) is currently concealed from Princes Highway by vegetation, which provides both privacy and noise attenuation from this major road.

- There is a contributory element to the rear of the house, the former dairy.

**Objectives**

- To preserve and maintain the elements of heritage significance on the site.

- To ensure that all related elements of heritage significance remain visually linked and understood as interrelated.

- To retain the setting of the elements of heritage significance so that their history and original farm use can be understood.

- To preserve views to the front of the farmhouse (the north elevation) from Princes Highway.

- To encourage an appropriate use for the farmhouse in the future. An appropriate use is one which requires the least amount of change to significant fabric (that is, the buildings including the construction materials that comprise them, and the tree) while ensuring the long-term viability of the place.

- To ensure that adjacent new development does not visually detract from the heritage significance of the place.

- To conserve the rural character of the surrounding garden setting

**Development guidelines**

The following guidelines are suggested to minimise and/or mitigate the impact of new development in the PSP:

**Subdivision**

If Lot 1 PS425398 (PSP Property No 38) is subdivided in the future, then the farmhouse and former dairy should be retained on a single title which is no smaller than the recommended HO extent. No additional development should take place within the HO extent (apart from that subsidiary to its use, such as a garage, sheds or a new extension to the rear of the house).

**Use**

As a rule, the most appropriate use for a heritage place is the one it was purpose-built for. Development of the Pakenham East Precinct will prevent the former dairy from ever returning to its original use, but it would be desirable for the farmhouse to return to residential use in the future.

**Views**

The desirability of creating views to the front (north elevation) of the farmhouse from Princes Highway, which is currently concealed by vegetation, must be weighed against retaining its suitability as a residence on such a major road. If entry via Princes Highway (e.g., with a service road) is not feasible, then it would be desirable for the entry to the property to retain some relationship with the front of the house so it can be properly appreciated from the public domain.

**New development**
It would be desirable for:

- New built form immediately adjacent to the heritage place (as defined by the recommended HO extent) to have setbacks from the HO boundaries of at least 10 metres to provide a buffer zone.
- The location of new roads in the vicinity to enhance visibility to the front and/or side elevations of farmhouse and dairy from the public domain. It would NOT be desirable for a road to run directly south of the heritage place, as the house (in particular) was not designed to be seen from this vantage point and it will result in a lack of understanding of the place by the general public.
- New development immediately adjacent to the heritage place to have a similar scale and bulk to the farmhouse.
- New built form should have the same setback at minimum from Princes Highway as the front façade of the heritage house optimally for a distance of 250 metres on either side (east and west) of the proposed HO boundary.
- If any sound attenuating barriers are provided along Princes Highway (whether built or of vegetation), care to be taken when determining their location so that they do not conceal views of the farmhouse from the public domain.

4.1.3 Bungalow, 140 Ryan Road, Pakenham, PSP Property No. 48

**Matters for consideration**

There are a number of features of the Bungalow and its setting that should be considered and/or protected in planning the Precinct Structure Plan:

- It is an interwar timber bungalow that exhibits the influence of the architectural fashions of its time.
- While part of a large rural property, the homestead section, comprising house, front and rear yards, and outbuildings, are found in close proximity to each other and Ryan Road.
- The bungalow is set back behind a front garden about 30 metres from Ryan Road. Its main elevation (the façade) faces Ryan Road.

**Objectives**

- To preserve and maintain the elements of heritage significance on the site.
- To ensure that all related elements of heritage significance remain visually linked and understood as interrelated.
- To preserve views to the front of the bungalow (the west elevation) from Ryan Road.
- To encourage an appropriate use for the bungalow in the future. An appropriate use is one which requires the least amount of change to significant fabric while ensuring the long-term viability of the place.
- To ensure that adjacent new development does not visually detract from the heritage significance of the place.

**Development guidelines**

The following guidelines are suggested to minimise and/or mitigate the impact of new development in the PSP:

**Subdivision**

When 140 Ryan Road (PSP Property No. 48) is subdivided, then the bungalow and garden area should be retained on a single title which is no smaller than the recommended HO extent. No additional development should take place within the HO extent (apart from that subsidiary to its ongoing residential use, such as a garage, sheds or an extension to the rear of the house).
Use

As a rule, the most appropriate use for a heritage place is the one it was purpose-built for, i.e., as a single-family residence.

Views

The entry to the property should retain a relationship with the front of the house, facing Ryan Road, so it can be properly appreciated from the public domain. No development should take place between the bungalow and Ryan Road (including small structures or extensions related to its ongoing residential use).

New development

It would be desirable for:

- New built form immediately adjacent to the heritage place (as defined by the recommended HO extent) to have setbacks from the HO boundaries of at least 10 metres to provide a buffer zone.
- New development in the vicinity to have their frontage onto Ryan Road. It would not be desirable for adjacent development to back onto Ryan Road as the high rear fences would conceal oblique views to the bungalow, and isolate its occupants from their neighbours.
- New built form to have the same setback as the bungalow from Ryan Road (about 30 metres) within a buffer zone of 40 metres north of the north end of the house and 40 metres south of the south end of the house, in order to preserve oblique views to it from Ryan Road.
- New built form immediately adjacent to the heritage place to have a similar scale and bulk to the bungalow.
- New roads to be sited in the vicinity to avoid running directly behind (east) of the recommended HO extent, as the bungalow was not designed to be seen from this vantage point and it will result in a lack of understanding of the place by the general public.

4.2 Tree Retention and Protection

A number of trees assessed as part of this study have been identified as suitable for retention for either their heritage value or their high landscape/amenity value by the John Patrick report. These trees are listed at Table 14 below. (John Patrick Pty. Ltd., 2013:17-19). The information relating to tree retention and protection contained in that report has been used to inform the text in Section 4.2.

Established trees provide immediate amenity within the new urban landscape that can be immediately enjoyed, and can often be an excellent focal point for place making.

The potential for damage to trees to be retained as part of a subdivision is high and requires careful design and management. This includes not only consideration of physical works but also careful planning and urban design to ensure trees worthy of retention are afforded sufficient room for future growth and protection. It is recognised that to protect these values, the health and long term viability of these trees will need to be managed during the planning and design phase of any development project, including new buildings, works, roads or other infrastructure creation.

At the PSP design stage, the objective should be to conserve and protect all of the trees in Table 14 as a priority. This can be achieved through good planning which takes a sensitive approach to subdivision and urban design, as well as through the preparation of Tree Management Plan (TMP) for each tree to be retained.
**Table 14: Trees to be retained in the Pakenham East PSP for amenity and heritage value**

NB: Page numbering and Tree Protection Zone recommendations have been taken directly from the John Patrick report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reason for Retention</th>
<th>Tree citation</th>
<th>Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) (m) Recommended in</th>
<th>Apply Planning Scheme Overlay?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon North</td>
<td><em>Quercus robur</em> (English Oak)</td>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>p. 5</td>
<td>7.8m</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Road, Pakenham</td>
<td><em>Phoenix canariensis</em> Canary Island Palm</td>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>p.7</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Road, Pakenham</td>
<td><em>Pyrus communis</em> Pear</td>
<td>Significant Tree</td>
<td>p.8</td>
<td>10.8m</td>
<td>Yes, Heritage Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45-55 Dore Road, Nar Nar Goon</td>
<td><em>Araucaria cunninghamii</em> Hoop Pine</td>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>p.9</td>
<td>8.2m</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>180 Ryan Road, Pakenham</td>
<td><em>Cedrus deodara</em> Deodar Cedar</td>
<td>Amenity value</td>
<td>p.13</td>
<td>8.6m</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.1 Urban Design and Subdivision

In order to ensure the successful retention and integration of the trees in Table 14 into the future Pakenham East urban landscape, it is important to ensure that:

- Proposals for urban development should demonstrate the sufficient space is provided for the successful retention of, and future projected growth of trees during urban design and subdivision planning.

- Established trees should, where possible, be retained within areas of public open space where generous room well beyond the calculated TPZ can be accommodated around the tree, maximising the protection for successful retention. In this context, successful retention of these trees can be further enhanced by ensuring that Council takes an active role in managing these trees, through input from the in-house arborist and maintenance teams.

Where established trees are retained in areas of public open space, care should be taken to ensure that the area of the TPZ remains well mulches and free of turf and/or substantial under plantings. New plantings which are nearby should be limited to small shrubs and...
herbaceous species to limit competition, especially for solar access and allow the form of the
tree to develop and be best appreciated.

• Where trees cannot be retained within areas of public open space, they should be retained on
residential lots of sufficient size to allow for new residential development (including paths,
fencing and built structures) to be erected beyond the TPZ.

• None of these trees are retained within a proposed road reserve, with the exception of a
roundabout. There is high potential for damage and decline of trees retained within road
reserves. The proximity to construction vehicles for road making, as well as service
installation greatly increases the potential for damage.

4.2.2 Tree Management Plans for Development Phase
Regardless of the setting, trees to be retained within the new urban area should be afforded
minimum protection based on a Tree Management Plan (TMP), prepared by a suitably
qualified arborist. The TMP must conform to AS4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development
Sites, and provide, as a minimum:

• An identified Tree Protection Zone (TPZ)
• Factual data regarding the tree’s size, species, age, safe useful life expectancy and health,
supported by photographic evidence
• The location where appropriately robust fencing will be erected to protect the above and
below ground fabric of the trees during the development of the PSP. This will include an
area which includes the TPZ and additional canopy protection, if required.
• Guidance on the type and minimum standards of fencing required to be erected around the
tree for protection, and the duration for which this fencing must remain in place
• Specifications for hydration, fencing and mulching to the tree over the course of
development
• Stipulation of materials, chemicals and fuels which are excluded from storage within the
fenced Tree Protection Zone
• Stipulation of vehicle and machinery (including parking) within the fenced Tree Protection
Zone, and mechanism into a TPZ if required
• Appropriate pruning standards, or variations of these, to be applied, specific to the tree’s
requirements
• Inspections by the Responsible Authority

4.3 On sites of archaeological interest
Under the Victorian Heritage Act 1995 all archaeological sites older than 50 years are protected
and recorded on the Heritage Inventory (VHI), regardless if they are registered by Heritage
Victoria.

Under Section 121 of the Act, the VHI records all places or objects identified as historic
archaeological sites, areas or relics, all known areas where archaeological relics are located, all
known occurrences of archaeological relics and all persons known to be holding private
collections of artefacts. The Act further notes that it is an offence to damage or disturb an
archaeological site or relic, irrespective of whether it is listed on the VHI or Heritage Register.

This study did not engage an archaeological component; however, documentary evidence, oral
history and a field investigation indicated three sites of potential archaeological interest within
the Study Area. These sites relate to the former homesteads at:

○ 1550-1560 Princes Highway, Nar Nar Goon
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- 40 Dore Road, Pakenham
- 44-45 Dore Road, Nar Nar Goon

Although there was no visible evidence of the former homesteads at these locations, site boundaries (buffers) have been established around these sites to highlight their archaeological potential (archaeological interest). These site boundaries also work to identify archaeological sensitive areas within the greater Study Area.

It is recommended that all development within these three areas takes a ‘proceed with care’ approach. This ‘proceed with care’ approach should be agreed in advance of the commencement of construction works to prevent damage to cultural heritage, or delay the construction programme.

Furthermore, due to the long history of pastoral occupation within the Study Area, it is recommended that all development within the Study Area takes a ‘proceed with care’ approach. As noted above, this ‘proceed with care’ approach should be agreed in advance of the commencement of construction works to prevent damage to cultural heritage, or delay the construction programme.

Early consideration of the issues relating to demonstrated or potential historical archaeological values is essential, as archaeological investigations and research can take time.

If disturbance is proposed for any historical archaeological sites then archaeological excavation, investigation and either recording or monitoring is required, and that consent from the Executive Director at Heritage Victoria is required.

In the event that artefacts, footings, foundations, sites, or any other archaeological remains or features be encountered within the three sites documented above, or within any part of the Study Area, work should cease immediately and the relevant authorities, namely Heritage Victoria, be notified (under the requirements of the Heritage Act 1995).

It is important to note that under the Heritage Act 1995 it is an offence to knowingly disturb, damage or excavate an archaeology site without obtaining the appropriate Consent from the Executive Director at Heritage Victoria.

* A historical (post-contact) archaeological site can include below ground features such as building foundations, wells, weirs, as well as above ground features such as fence posts, poles, machinery, foundations and remains and artefacts. All archaeological sites older than 50 years are protected under the Heritage Act. 
5 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Statutory recommendations

5.1.1 Inclusion on the Heritage Overlay
Three places in the study area are recommended for inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme as Individually Significant places. These are:

- 40 Dore Road, Pakenham
- 32 Mt Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon
- 140 Ryan Road, Pakenham

A draft HO Schedule to demonstrate the appropriate controls is set out below:

Table 15: Draft HO Schedule for places of heritage significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Carinya’, 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – Dairy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungalow, 140 Ryan Road, Pakenham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pyrus communis</em> (Pear Tree) 40 Dore Road, Pakenham</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – Pear Tree only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed Heritage Overlay curtilage for each are shown in Appendix C. The curtilage has been drawn specifically to protect the elements of heritage significance (buildings, trees) within their setting.

5.1.2 Archaeology
The three sites identified to have ‘archaeological interest’ should be further investigated through a detailed archaeological site inspection (with the required Notice of Intent submitted to Heritage Victoria and Archaeology Site Cards completed and submitted to Heritage Victoria).
Furthermore, due to the long history of pastoral occupation within the Study Area, it is recommended that all development within the Study Area takes a ‘proceed with care’ approach. This ‘proceed with care’ approach should be agreed in advance of the commencement of construction works to prevent damage to cultural heritage. Archaeological excavation, investigation and either recording or monitoring is required.

The *Heritage Act (1995)* states that it is an offence to knowingly disturb, damage or excavate an archaeology site without obtaining the appropriate consent from the Executive Director at Heritage Victoria. As such, in the event that artefacts, footings, foundations, sites, or any other archaeological remains or features be encountered within the three sites documented above, or within any part of the Study Area, work should cease immediately and the relevant authorities, namely Heritage Victoria, be notified (under the requirements of the *Heritage Act 1995*).

As such, in the event that artefacts, footings, foundations, sites, or any other archaeological remains or features be encountered within the three sites documented above, or within any part of the Study Area, work should cease immediately and the relevant authorities, namely Heritage Victoria, be notified (under the requirements of the *Heritage Act 1995*).

Early consideration of the issues relating to demonstrated or potential historical archaeological values is essential, as archaeological investigations and research can take time.

*Note: a historical (post-contact) archaeological site can include below ground features such as building foundations, foundation, remains, wells, weirs, as well as above ground features such as fence posts, poles, machinery, and artefacts. All archaeological sites older than 50 years are protected under the Heritage Act.*

### 5.2 Additional work

Archaeological assessments should be undertaken for those areas identified in this study as having post-contact archaeological potential.
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APPENDIX A – HERCON CRITERIA

The HERCON criteria are used to assess heritage value and have been adopted by the Heritage Council in 2009 and revised in 2012 as a standard set of criteria for use in Victoria. They are recommended for use by the VPP Practice Note ‘Applying the Heritage Overlay’ (2015).

**Criterion A:**
Importance to the course, or pattern, of Victoria’s natural or cultural history.

**Criterion B:**
Possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Victoria’s natural or cultural history.

**Criterion C:**
Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Victoria’s natural or cultural history.

**Criterion D:**
Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of natural or cultural places and objects.

**Criterion E:**
Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics.

**Criterion F:**
Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.

**Criterion G:**
Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. This includes the significance of a place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions.

**Criterion H:**
Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Victoria’s history.
Citations for places recommended for Heritage Overlay

Carinya, 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon

Figure 8 - Carinya - front of residence

Figure 9 - Quince tree at rear of residence
**Description**

The early homestead of 1911-12 at 32 Mount Ararat South Road is located just west of where Mount Ararat Road crosses Princes Highway. The homestead faces Princes Highway, but the site is now entered via a rear drive off Mount Ararat South Road, and the homestead is largely hidden from Princes Highway by plantings.

Apart from the homestead, there is a fibro-cement clad former dairy behind the homestead which has been converted into a garage. There are also two recent large metal-clad sheds on the west and south sides of the homestead, and a large modern house on the west side of the site.

The homestead is a block-fronted timber Edwardian house with a gabled hip roof and two simple corbelled brick chimneys. The walls are clad in weatherboards with a chamfered bottom edge, and the roof retains early short-sheet corrugated iron (painted). The front verandah has a bullnose roof and turned timber posts and half-posts against the wall. The verandah frieze is gone. The façade is arranged symmetrically, with the doorway flanked by two paired sash windows. The door is panelled with segmentally arched glazing to the top, and two sidelights and a highlight.

There is a single double-hung sash window on each of the east and west side elevations, and a small fixed window at the rear of the east elevation, all with moulded timber architraves.

The house had an original lean-to at the rear, which was later extended to double its size. The later section of the lean-to, probably post-war in date, has bullnose-profile weatherboards, louvered windows, and a glazed back door.

A large opening has been made in the rear (south) elevation of the lean-to, and a garage created in the rear half of the house. A simple timber carport has been appended to the rear half of the west side elevation, and new cladding and an aluminium window installed beneath it.

The front verandah floor is a recent replacement. The verandah posts have minimal paint layers on them, suggesting they could be a restoration, though scarfed repairs at the base of some indicate that they were not installed recently.

The house is in fair condition, with most of the paint peeled from the west elevation, much of the verandah gutter missing, and rusted and lifting corrugated iron sheets to the verandah and roof.

Immediately to the rear of the residence is a mature Quince tree which dates from c. 1920. The tree is in good condition, but has been coppiced in the past, which has resulted in a reduced canopy size and spread and multi-trunked form. The quince is one of the few early plantings which survive from the farmhouse garden.

**History**

**Contextual history**

Early survey maps form the 1840s and 1850s show that the first settled areas within the Shire were near the Great Swamp, for it had a network of creeks (by way of the Cardinia, Toomuc and Ararat) and a plentiful water supply which ensured that the area was well suited for an agricultural settlement. There were at least twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick, including John Dore’s station (Nar-Ri-Uk); Hennessy’s cattle station, which was located close to Dore’s station and Waton, Wight and Company’s station (Nar Nar Goon) to the south (Butler 1998:17,19).

Among the earliest prominent district settlers was John Dore. Early parish plans show that John Dore, with Michael Hennessy secured the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right (640 acres) in 1855. The Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A small part of the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right, and a house built ca1860, at 125 Mt Ararat Road North, Pakenham are protected under HO81 (see HERMES 6004 for further information). Pre-emptive rights allowed squatters to purchase, and take up to 640 acres of their pastoral runs. Holders could purchase these rights before any land in the general vicinity was available.
to the general public, granted they carry out improvement such as construct homesteads and establish cultivation paddocks (Càbena et al. 1989: 2).

The Selection era, which began with the passing of a series of Land Acts in the 1860s accelerated the process of subdivision, particularly when larger pastoral runs were subdivided and opened up for sale to the general public. With subdivision came a decline in pastoral runs, and in grazing, which were replaced with a diverse range of agricultural activities, including dairying and orcharding.

The development of the Gippsland Road, from the 1860s (now the Princes Highway), and the arrival of the railway, in the 1870s, increased settlement in the area and the development of Nar Nar Goon Township. The centre became the ‘dispatch centre for swan products … and became the third most important point of dispatch for West Gippsland timber’. (Butler 1998:70), and the railway promoted the marketing of produce from dairy farms and orchards.

**Place history**

Crown Allotment 62 (173 acres, 0 roods, 18 perches or 70.06ha), bounded to the north by Princess Highway, and to the east by Mt Ararat Road, was held under crown lease by Franklin Jackson before being purchased by Jackson for £174.00 on 10 June 1874 (Nar-Nar-Goone County of Mornington Parish Plan 1967, and File Number 33/84.54. Titles V704/F799). On 20 October 1874 this land was transferred to Patrick Sullivan, a farmer from Nar Nar Goon (Titles V704/F799, V720/F843).

On 12 June 1877 the land was sold to John Dore. John Dore and Michael Hennessy were the first European settlers to hold lease over land in this area, with the Mount Ararat squatting run, established in 1842, where they ran cattle. Dore and Henessey purchased the Mount Ararat Pre-emptive right in 1855, which is just north of 32 Mt Ararat South Road. John Dore also proceeded to lease and then purchase numerous crown allotments to the south and east of the pre-emptive right. John’s son, Edward Dore, established a his own home called ‘The Range’ in 1862 at 40 Dore Road, but the original wattle-and-daub hut was demolished in the late 1930s (Cochrane and Sullivan, 1982: 12-13).

Ownership of the land at 32 Mt Ararat South Road was transferred to Edward Dore, farmer of Mt Ararat, on 19 September 1883 (Titles V720/F843). Edward Dore died on 14 February 1911. His youngest son, Frances ‘Frank’ Peter Dore (1883-1970) of ‘The Range’, Pakenham, farmer, inherited the property.

The 1911 Shire of Berwick Rate Books indicate that Frank Dore was the owner of Crown Allotment 62 and that its net annual value was £24 (Rate Book, 1911, R375). The net annual value (about 10% of the entire value of the property) then jumped to £50 in the 1912 Rate Book, though the acreage remained the same (Rate Book 1912 –R610).

This sudden rise corresponds to the stylistic indicators of the timber house that stands there today, indicating that Frank Dore had it built 1911-12, just after inheriting the property. This assumption is strengthened by Cochrane and Sullivan (1982:13), who note that Frank Dore married Annie Rose Kennedy on 10 November 1915 and ‘continued on his farm’, and named it ‘Carinya’.

Frances ‘Frank’ Peter Dore died on 9 September 1970, and in December 1971 his daughter Monica Cochrane (nee Dore), a married woman of Princess Highway, and his son-in-law Dominic (Nic) Cochrane inherited ‘Carinya’ (Cochrane and Sullivan 1982:13; Titles V957/F328). They continued to run it as a dairy farm until 1976, before selling it out of the family in 1982 (Titles V9452/F297).

**Sources**

Land Victoria (LV), Certificates of Title, as cited.

Shire of Berwick Rate Books, as cited.
Comparative analysis
‘Carinya’, the timber farmhouse of 1911-12, built for farmer Frank Dore, can be compared to other farm houses of the Edwardian era in Cardinia Shire. Examples already protected on the Heritage Overlay, or approved for inclusion by Panel as part of Planning Scheme Amendment C161 in 2012, include:

- Linehams Farm Complex, 65-75 Linehams Road, Catani (C161) – a block-fronted late Victorian farmhouse with an M-hip roof of c1890s.
- House, 683 Koo Wee Rup-Lang Lang Road, Bayles (C161) – a simple asymmetrical timber Edwardian town house with a gabled hip roof of 1906.
- House, 4 Hope Street, Bunyip (C161) – a block-fronted Edwardian timber town house with an M-hip roof, clad in ashlar boards, with a timber verandah valance.
- Smith Orchard House, 19 Martin Road, Garfield (HO70) – a simple gabled, timber farmhouse with bullnose verandah of 1910.
- Kaduna Park, 270 Cardinia Road, Officer (HO90) – a simple timber Federation Bungalow farmhouse with a pyramidal roof, of c1912-15.
- Wood Farm Complex, 575 McDonalds Drain Road, Pakenham South (HO74) – an asymmetrical timber Edwardian farmhouse of 1914.
- Glen-Keith Farm, 250 Peers Road, Dalmore (C161) – a simple asymmetrical timber Edwardian farmhouse of c1919.

‘Carinya’ compares well to the above examples in terms of its intactness and architectural detail. It shares features such as corbelled brick chimneys with most of them, the block-fronted form with Linehams farmhouse and the Hope Street house, and the decorative hipped gable roof (popularised by the Federation style) with the house in Bayles. Its condition, however, falls below that of all of the above houses apart from the Lineham farmhouse.
**Statement of significance**

**What is significant?**

‘Carinya’, at 32 Mount Ararat South Road, Nar Nar Goon. The Edwardian timber house was constructed c1911-12 for dairy farmer Frank Dore, and owned by his daughter until the 1980s. Contributory elements of the site include the former dairy behind the house.

The modern metal-clad garages and the recent brick house are not significant.

**How is it significant?**

‘Carinya’ is of local historical, architectural and aesthetic significance to the Shire of Cardinia.

**Why is it significant?**

‘Carinya’ is of historic significance for its connection with the locally significant Dore family for over 100 years. John Dore was one of the first European settlers in the Pakenham and Nar Nar Goon area, establishing the Mount Ararat squatting run with M Henessey in 1842. Even with the coming of selection, John Dore remained a major land owner in the area. His land holdings were passed to his son, Edward Dore, and then his grandson, Frank Dore, who both continued the family dairying business. Along with the Mount Ararat Pre-Emptive Right (HO81), ‘Carinya’ is the only surviving Dore-family homestead. The former Dairy building (now a garage) is also significant in illustrating the dairy farming that had been carried out in this area since the mid-19th century. (Criteria H & A)

The farmhouse is architecturally significant as a representative example of an Edwardian house with typical features of that era including the gabled hip roof, corbelled brick chimneys, bull nose verandah, turned timber verandah posts and a front door with a segmentally arched window and sidelights and highlights. (Criterion D)

**Statutory recommendations**

Recommended for inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme as an Individually Significant place.

Recommendations for the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay (Clause 43.01) in the Cardinia Planning Scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Paint Colours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Alteration Controls</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Controls</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Heritage Register</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuildings and fences exemptions</td>
<td>Yes – Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited uses may be permitted</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Place</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended extent of HO:**

Refer to the curtilage plan showing the curtilage around the farmhouse and the former dairy in Appendix C.

**Conservation management recommendations**

**CONSERVATION GUIDELINES - SPECIFIC**

The following specific conservation guidelines apply to this property:

- The house requires some deferred maintenance to ensure its long-term survival. This includes the replacement of defective gutters, painting timber elements, and the removal of
the bee’s nest above the front verandah. The floor of the verandah should also be monitored to ensure that the weight of the car parts stored on it is not causing structural damage.

**CONSERVATION GUIDELINES - GENERAL**

In order to conserve the heritage significance of this place, it is recommended that the following conservation guidelines, as appropriate, be given priority in the future maintenance, development or management of the place:

1. Conserve the fabric of the building/s or other built elements, which is identified as contributing to the significance of the place. This includes the original fabric as well as fabric that may demonstrate important successive stages in the historic development of the place and/or provide evidence of changing architectural styles or techniques.

For specific guidelines about how to conserve buildings, please refer to the Restoration Guidelines in the ‘Cardinia Shire (Pakenham) Heritage Study, Volume 1: Heritage Program, 1996’.

2. Discourage the demolition or removal of significant fabric unless the demolition or removal is only of part of the building and it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the responsible authority that, as appropriate:

   - The fabric to be removed is not significant, or
   - The fabric to be removed is not of primary significance and its removal will not adversely affect the significance of the place, or
   - It will assist in the long term conservation of the place, or
   - It will facilitate the historic use of the place and will not result in the loss of fabric considered to be primary significance.

Note: The poor condition or low integrity of a heritage place should not be used as justification for its demolition, particularly if it appears the condition of the heritage place has deliberately been allowed to deteriorate.

3. Where there is a complex of buildings and other elements the aim should be to conserve or reveal the historic visual relationship between the buildings and other elements in order to demonstrate the historical use and layout of the place.

4. Conserve significant plantings on the property (refer to specific conservation guidelines for trees), and maintain a visual relationship between the plantings and the significant buildings on the property.

5. Encourage the removal of non-significant or intrusive elements, particularly where this would assist in understanding or revealing the significance of the place.

6. Ensure that the siting and design of new development does not overwhelm the historic setting of the building and the site as a whole by becoming a dominant element or by interfering with key views to and from the site. For specific guidelines about new development or additions to buildings, please refer to the Restoration Guidelines in the ‘Cardinia Shire (Pakenham) Heritage Study, Volume 1: Heritage Program, 1996’.

7. Encourage any new development on the property to relate and be complementary in form, scale and materials to the significant buildings and other elements, but be clearly contemporary in design. For specific guidelines about new development or additions to buildings, please refer to the Restoration Guidelines in the ‘Cardinia Shire (Pakenham) Heritage Study, Volume 1: Heritage Program, 1996’.

8. Retain views of significant building(s) and plantings from the street.

9. In the case of subdivision of the property, encourage the retention of the significant buildings and related elements on one lot.
NOTE:
While every effort has been made to ensure that the information contained in this citation is accurate, it is possible that more detailed investigation may reveal further information about the significance of the place. For example, in most cases an internal inspection was not made of buildings at the time of initial assessment. In the time since the place was first assessed it is also possible that the condition of buildings or trees may have changed.

The information contained in this citation should therefore be reviewed at the time that it is proposed to make changes to the property. This would likely require a more detailed assessment of any significant or contributory element that is affected by any proposed buildings or works. Once this more detailed assessment has been made, a review of the significance of the place should be carried out by Council’s Heritage Adviser or an appropriately qualified professional.
Bungalow, 140 Ryan Road, Pakenham

Figure 10 - Front of residence (facing Ryan Road)

Figure 11 - south elevation
Figure 12 - Large Monterey Cypress at rear of residence

Description

The interwar bungalow at 140 Ryan Road is situated near the road on a homestead block well screened from the road by trees. The timber house faces the road and has a long, transverse gable roof with a minor gable at the centre of the façade. There are two short chimneys of red brick with a soldier course at the top, typical of the 1920s.

The house is clad in square-edged weatherboards with accent bands of weatherboards notched to look like singles. There is also a band of strapped fibro-cement in the gable ends, beneath a decorative louvered vent.

A the centre of the façade, beneath the minor gable (which is filled with notched weatherboards), is a four-sided canted window bay (half an octagon in plan). Below the windows are notched weatherboards. The windows are nine-over-one double-hung sashes with rippled ‘Arctic glass’ to the upper lights. There is a pair of such windows on the south side of the façade. The entrance is at the north side of the façade. It comprises a pair of panelled doors with Arctic glass multi-light glazing to the upper half, with a dramatic curve to the bottom. Beside it is an ornamental bull’s eye window, also with Arctic glass.

The south side elevation has a canted window bay near the front with four nine-over-one double-hung windows (all clear glass), with notched shingles below and a flat roof above. Windows to the rear of this elevation are paired and single one-over-one sashes, as are the windows on the north side elevation.

At the rear is a small skillion, which may be original. It comprises an enclosed room (probably the bathroom) and a porch (since enclosed with louvered windows).

The front slope of the roof is clad in pale green Colorbond, while the rear slope has long sheets of galvanised corrugated steel.

A simple timber verandah has been added to the façade of the building. It appears that the house did not have a verandah originally, as there are remains of a separate flat roof to the canted bay window at the centre of the façade.
The garden is separated from the side drive by a modern log and chain-link fence, but retains original chain-link gates – a pedestrian gate near the back corner of the house, and combined vehicular and pedestrian fences at the rear of the garden. There is a small fibro and weatherboard shed behind the south-east corner of the house, which has been partially reclad with corrugated iron.

The garden appears to have several layers, with the dominant phase being the post World War Two plantings to the front and sides of the residence. These are generally in fair to poor condition and do not provide great evidence as to what the garden design or layout was.

There is a single mature Monterey Cypress (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) tree to the east of the rear yard. The size and spread of the tree indicates that it dates from around 1920-1940. Monterey Cypress were typically planted on rural properties from the turn of the nineteenth century, as they were fast growing and provided stock and buildings protection from wind, rain and heat. There are other specimens of Monterey Cypress on the associated farmland of 140 Ryan Road, but the specimen adjacent to the farm outbuildings is the best example, is in good condition.

**History**

**Contextual history**

Early survey maps form the 1840s and 1850s show that the first settled areas within the Shire were near the Great Swamp, for it had a network of creeks (by way of the Cardinia, Toomuc and Ararat) and a plentiful water supply which ensured that the area was well suited for an agricultural settlement. There were at least twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick, including John Dore’s station (Nar-Ri-Uk); Hennessy’s cattle station, which was located close to Dore’s station and Waton, Wight and Company’s station (Nar Nar Goon) to the south (Butler 1998:17,19).

Among the earliest prominent district settlers was John Dore. Early parish plans show that John Dore, with Michael Hennessy secured the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right (640 acres) in 1855. The Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A and a part of the Mt. Ararat before the right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A and a house built ca1860, at 125 Mt Ararat Road North, Pakenham are protected under HO81 (see HERMES 6004 for further information). Pre-emptive rights allowed squatters to purchase, and take up to 640 acres of their pastoral runs. Holders could purchase these rights before any land in the general vicinity was available to the general public, granted they carry out improvement such as construct homesteads and establish cultivation paddocks (Cabena et al. 1989: 2).

The Selection era, which began with the passing of a series of Land Acts in the 1860s accelerated the process of subdivision, particularly when larger pastoral runs were subdivided and opened up for sale to the general public. With subdivision came a decline in pastoral runs, and in grazing, which were replaced with a diverse range of agricultural activities, including dairying and orcharding.

The development of the Gippsland Road, from the 1860s (now the Princes Highway), and the arrival of the railway, in the 1870s, increased settlement in the area and the development of Nar Nar Goon Township. The centre became the ‘dispatch centre for swan products ... and became the third most important point of dispatch for West Gippsland timber’. (Butler 1998:70), and the railway promoted the marketing of produce from diary farms and orchards.

**Place history**

Crown Allotment 25 (164 acres 1 rood, 31 perches or 66.55ha) was leased by Marion Ferguson under the Land Act of 1869, until he purchased it under a Crown Grant on 6 July 1887 for £164 (Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1967; LV: 1952/268, File number 4630/19.20).

Marion Ferguson died on 24 April 1898, and probate to his Will, Alexander Ferguson, farmer, and Alexander Ritchie, of Pakenham became owners. Alexander Ferguson died on 5 October 1914 and probate to his Will, his land was granted to Richard Lewis, accountant of Pakenham, on 11 December 1914 (LV: V1952/F268). In contradiction to this, the 1917 Rate Books
indicate that William Ritchie was the owner of Allotment 25. Its net annual value (about 10% of its total value) at the time was £40 (Shire of Berwick Rate Book 1917 – R302).

The titles indicate that Gerald Joseph Way, Pakenham East, clerk, became owner on 26 November 1926 (LV: V5232/F262). The 1928 Rate Books indicate that the net annual value has increased since 1917 to £87. The size of the allotment had also increased by 10 acres to 174 acres (Shire of Berwick Rate Book 1928-R4271). The more than doubling of the value of the land in this 10 year period appears to indicate that the present house was built during this time, probably after 1925 judging by stylistic indicators. (Note: Rate entries for Crown Allotment 25 could not be found for 1920, 1923, 1925 or 1927, so the built date of the house could not be further narrowed down.)

Clive William Tully, Pakenham East farmer, became the owner on 9 May 1944 (LV: V6695/F068). From this date forward, other owners have included Alan Marston Wood and Harriett Millicent Wood, both farmers of Pakenham, who purchased the property on 16 November 1950, which was then transferred to Frank Alexander Langsford on 28 July 1952 (Titles V7480/F116). By 1960, the property appears to be used as a holiday home for owners not involved in farming (LV: V8264/F377)

**Sources**

Land Victoria (LV), Certificates of Title, as cited.

Shire of Berwick Rate Books, as cited.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1859, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1872, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1896, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.


**Comparative analysis**

The 1920s timber house at 140 Ryan Road can be compared to other interwar houses in Cardinia Shire. Examples already protected on the Heritage Overlay, or approved for inclusion by Panel as part of Planning Scheme Amendment C161 in 2012, include:

- Highland Park, 2 McBride Road, Upper Beaconsfield (HO72) – a substantial brick California Bungalow with a slate roof of 1924-8.

- Tehennepe, 495 Little Road, Iona (C161) – a sprawling timber farmhouse which is primarily Federation in form (high hip roof with projecting gabled bays, diagonal axis) but with verandah supports influenced by the California Bungalow style, of c1924.

- House, 21 James Street, Pakenham (C161) – an unusual timber and fibro-sheet bungalow, with a gabled roof and verandah beneath the roof line of 1927-8. In an intact garden setting.

- Lamble Orchard House, 145 Sanders Road, Garfield North (HO113) - a timber California Bungalow with gabled corrugated iron roof and unusual flared window hood covered in timber shingles, of c1928.
• Grason, 6 Henty Street, Pakenham (C161) – a timber weatherboard bungalow with a hipped terracotta tiled roof and blade-profile verandah brackets of 1928-9. In an intact garden setting.

The house at 140 Ryan Road is far less grand than Highland Park, but compares well to fashionable interwar houses of the late 1920s, such as Grason, Lamble Orchard House and 21 James Street in its overall design and level of detail. It is slightly less intact than these three houses, due to the addition of the front verandah, but this is reversible. The house at 140 Ryan Road also demonstrates interwar design features not seen on any other interwar houses with heritage protection, including the semicircular windows to the double doors and the circular window.

**Statement of significance**

**What is significant?**

The interwar bungalow at 140 Ryan Road, Pakenham. It has a transverse gable roof, and a shingled minor gable at the centre of the façade. The walls are clad in weatherboards with bands of decorative notched weatherboards and strapped fibro-cement in the gable ends. Distinctive features include the front double doors with semi-circular windows filled with Arctic glass, and a bull’s eye window beside it. This and the six-pane supper sashes of the other windows are also filled with rippled Arctic glass. There are canted bay windows to the façade and south side elevation.

**How is it significant?**

The interwar bungalow in its setting is of local architectural and aesthetic significance to the Shire of Cardinia.

**Why is it significant?**

The bungalow is of architectural and aesthetic significance as a representative example of a fashionable interwar house with a high level of intactness. It demonstrates many features of interwar houses, most often seen in a town or urban setting, including the high transverse gable roof with a minor gable to the façade, the use of contrasting materials and textures (plain weatherboards, notched weatherboards, timber shingles, strapped fibro-concrete sheet, frosted Arctic glass), red brick chimney with a soldier course at the top), and Arts & Crafts inspired details such as the dramatic form of the front door glazing. (Criterion D)

**Statutory recommendations**

Recommended for inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Cardinia Planning Scheme as an Individually Significant place.
Recommendations for the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay (Clause 43.01) in the Cardinia Planning Scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Paint Colours</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Alteration Controls</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Controls</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Heritage Register</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuildings and fences exemptions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited uses may be permitted</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Place</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended extent of HO:**
Refer to the curtilage plan for the place in Appendix C showing the curtilage around the bungalow, front yard and rear yard.

**Conservation management guidelines**

**CONSERVATION GUIDELINES - SPECIFIC**
The following specific conservation guidelines apply to this property:

- Consider the removal of the front verandah and the replacement of the separate roof over the front bay window.

**CONSERVATION GUIDELINES - GENERAL**
In order to conserve the heritage significance of this place, it is recommended that the following conservation guidelines, as appropriate, be given priority in the future maintenance, development or management of the place:

1. Conserve the fabric of the building/s or other built elements, which is identified as contributing to the significance of the place. This includes the original fabric as well as fabric that may demonstrate important successive stages in the historic development of the place and/or provide evidence of changing architectural styles or techniques.

   For specific guidelines about how to conserve buildings, please refer to the Restoration Guidelines in the ‘Cardinia Shire (Pakenham) Heritage Study, Volume 1: Heritage Program, 1996’.

2. Discourage the demolition or removal of significant fabric unless the demolition or removal is only of part of the building and it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the responsible authority that, as appropriate:

   - The fabric to be removed is not significant, or
   - The fabric to be removed is not of primary significance and its removal will not adversely affect the significance of the place, or
   - It will assist in the long term conservation of the place, or
   - It will facilitate the historic use of the place and will not result in the loss of fabric considered to be primary significance.

Note: The poor condition or low integrity of a heritage place should not be used as justification for its demolition, particularly if it appears the condition of the heritage place has deliberately been allowed to deteriorate.
3. Where there is a complex of buildings and other elements the aim should be to conserve or reveal the historic visual relationship between the buildings and other elements in order to demonstrate the historical use and layout of the place.

4. Conserve significant plantings on the property (refer to specific conservation guidelines for trees), and maintain a visual relationship between the plantings and the significant buildings on the property.

5. Encourage the removal of non-significant or intrusive elements, particularly where this would assist in understanding or revealing the significance of the place.

6. Ensure that the siting and design of new development does not overwhelm the historic setting of the building and the site as a whole by becoming a dominant element or by interfering with key views to and from the site. For specific guidelines about new development or additions to buildings, please refer to the Restoration Guidelines in the ‘Cardinia Shire (Pakenham) Heritage Study, Volume 1: Heritage Program, 1996’.

7. Encourage any new development on the property to relate and be complementary in form, scale and materials to the significant buildings and other elements, but be clearly contemporary in design. For specific guidelines about new development or additions to buildings, please refer to the Restoration Guidelines in the ‘Cardinia Shire (Pakenham) Heritage Study, Volume 1: Heritage Program, 1996’.

8. Retain views of significant building(s) and plantings from the street.

9. In the case of subdivision of the property, encourage the retention of the significant buildings, trees and related elements on one lot.

NOTE:

While every effort has been made to ensure that the information contained in this citation is accurate, it is possible that more detailed investigation may reveal further information about the significance of the place. For example, in most cases an internal inspection was not made of buildings at the time of initial assessment. In the time since the place was first assessed it is also possible that the condition of buildings or trees may have changed.

The information contained in this citation should therefore be reviewed at the time that it is proposed to make changes to the property. This would likely require a more detailed assessment of any significant or contributory element that is affected by any proposed buildings or works. Once this more detailed assessment has been made, a review of the significance of the place should be carried out by Council’s Heritage Adviser or an appropriately qualified professional.
Pear Tree, 40 Dore Road, Pakenham PSP Property No. 8
This citation is different to the above citations prepared by Context, as it has been prepared by John Patrick Pty. Ltd. in their report entitled ‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ prepared for Cardinia Shire Council in November and 2013. A copy of the citation can be found in Appendix F, where the entire report is reproduced.

The citation aims to assess whether the tree meets the threshold of significance determined by the criteria and thresholds set out in the Cardinia Shire Council Significant Tree Study, which resulted in the preparation of the Cardinia Significant Tree Register.
**EUROPEAN PEAR, 40 DORE ROAD, NAR NAR GOON NORTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Botanical Name:</strong></th>
<th>Pyrus communis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Name:</strong></td>
<td>European Pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>40 Dore Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburb/Township:</strong></td>
<td>Nar Nar Goon North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting/Position:</strong></td>
<td>Single specimen tree on west side of garden setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Trees:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public/Private:</strong></td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GPS Location:</strong></td>
<td>37°09.060, 145°31.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height:</strong></td>
<td>11m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canopy</strong> N-S:</td>
<td>16m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>width</strong> E-W:</td>
<td>12m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trunk</strong> girth:</td>
<td>252cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DBH:</strong></td>
<td>90cm (at 600 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate Age:</strong></td>
<td>&gt; 70 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected amenity period:</strong></td>
<td>Medium1 long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPZ:</strong></td>
<td>10.8m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EUROPEAN PEAR
40 DORE ROAD, NAR NAR GOON
NORTH

Figure 1: View of tree from east

**History:**
Crown allotment 21 was purchased by John Dore in 1861 and shortly thereafter transferred to Edward Dore. The farm, known as The Range, was occupied from this time, and a wattle and clump dwelling occupied the site at least until the 1930s.

Fruiting Pears are potentially long-lived trees, and the age of this specimen suggests it dates from at least the early 20th century.

**Integrity:**
Good. The tree is reasonably well structured and although dormant at the time of assessment, was not showing indications of reduced health.

**Significant Features:**
The tree is notable for its outstanding size.

**Comparative Analysis:**
Orchards, especially cultivation of apples, were a major industry within the district from the 19th century onwards. This particular tree appears to have been started as a single specimen within a domestic garden, rather than for commercial purposes. The tree is the largest known specimen of this taxon within the Shire of Cundinup.
EUROPEAN PEAR,
40 DORE ROAD, NAR NAR GOON
NORTH

Statement of Significance:
What is significant?
A mature European Pear tree forming a specimen within a formal garden setting.

How is it significant?
The tree is of local significance to Cardinia Shire.

Why is it significant?
The European Pear is of local significance as an outstanding example of this species within Cardinia. The tree is associated with the early history of the site and the Dore family.

Level: Local

Categories of Significance:
A1C Association with the early property, The Range
D1N Outstanding example of the species

Tree Condition: The tree was assessed during the dormant winter season. Re-assessment during the active growing season is recommended.

Threats/Risks:
- Removal of the tree as part of subdivision
- Removal of the Monterey Cypress row to the west which affords protection from prevailing summer winds

Management Prescriptions:
- Regular assessment and if required, maintenance.

Extra Research: None noted.

Tree Rating: Four (4)

References: Post Contact Heritage Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct. Prepared for Shire of Cardinia by Context Pty Ltd. March 2013

Assessed By: SH-JFLA

Date: 28th May 2013
Places NOT recommended for inclusion on the Heritage Overlay

1550-1560 Princes Highway, Pakenham

Description
The site consists of some scattered fruit trees (mainly Plum and one Fig) and a Cypress located adjacent to the current house at 1550 Princes Highway. These may be associated with the earlier homestead that was reportedly constructed 1862 by the Carney family (P Carney, pers comm. 2012).

The existing residence was reportedly constructed on the site of the early house. There is no above ground evidence of the early house and the area is considered to have archaeological potential.

History
Contextual history
Early survey maps form the 1840s and 1850s show that the first settled areas within the Shire were near the Great Swamp, for it had a network of creeks (by way of the Cardinia, Toomuc and Ararat) and a plentiful water supply which ensured that the area was well suited for an agricultural settlement. There were at least twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick, including John Dore’s station (Nar-Ri-Uk); Hennessy’s cattle station, which was located close to Dore’s station and Waton, Wight and Company’s station (Nar Nar Goon) to the south (Butler 1998:17,19).

Among the earliest prominent district settlers was John Dore. Early parish plans show that John Dore, with Michael Hennessy secured the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right (640 acres) in 1855. The Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A small part of the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right, and a house built ca1860, at 125 Mt Ararat Road North, Pakenham are protected under HO81 (see HERMES 6004 for further information). Pre-emptive rights allowed squatters to purchase, and take up to 640 acres of their pastoral runs. Holders could purchase these rights before any land in the general vicinity was available to the general public, granted they carry out improvement such as construct homesteads and establish cultivation paddocks (Cabena et al. 1989: 2).

The Selection era, which began with the passing of a series of Land Acts in the 1860s accelerated the process of subdivision, particularly when larger pastoral runs were subdivided and opened up for sale to the general public. With subdivision came a decline in pastoral runs, and in grazing, which were replaced with a diverse range of agricultural activities, including dairying and orcharding.

The development of the Gippsland Road, from the 1860s (now the Princes Highway), and the arrival of the railway, in the 1870s, increased settlement in the area and the development of Nar Nar Goon Township. The centre became the ‘dispatch centre for swan products … and became the third most important point of dispatch for West Gippsland timber’. (Butler 1998:70), and the railway promoted the marketing of produce from diary farms and orchards.

Place history
H. Carney leased Crown Allotment 22 (170acres 3roods 4perches or 69.11ha) under the Land Act of 1869 until purchasing it on 22 April 1887 (Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan, File number 4296/19.20). The property has remained in the Carney family to the present day, and is run as a dairy farm (LV).

A local member of the Carney family (Paul Carney of 45 Dore Road) claims that the first Carney family house of 1862 survived on this site until recent decades. As H Carney leased the property under the Land Act of 1869, the date of this first dwelling may in fact be the end of the 1860s.
Sources
Land Victoria (LV), Certificates of Title, as cited.
Shire of Berwick Rate Books, as cited.
Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1859, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.
Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1872, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.
Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1896, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.

Potential values
Archaeological interest
The house at 1550 Princess Highway, Pakenham, was reportedly constructed on the site of the former Carney homestead, which was constructed in 1862 by the Carney family. No evidence of the former house was visible. There is, however, limited potential for subsurface material relating to the former house to remain in-situ which may yield information about the establishment of small farm complexes and the development of agricultural activities in the area.

Caution should be taken to follow the requirements of the Heritage Act 1995 in the unlikely event that an archaeological deposits or sites are uncovered during any stage of development. Heritage Victoria must be contacted should an archaeological site or deposit be uncovered.
The Range, 40 Dore Road, Pakenham

Figure 13: Pair of Cypress located south of modern residence (species unknown) and archaeological site

**Description**

The site consists of a modern brick house, surrounded by an attractive garden with a number of mature trees and later plantings. The mature trees surrounding the modern residence appear to date from the interwar and immediate post WW2 period, and include a very large Pear Tree (*Pyrus communis*) and a large Canary Island Palm (*Phoenix canariensis*) west of the modern house. In addition, the garden has a number of mature small trees and large shrub plantings which appear to date from the interwar period, including a Sweet Pittosporum, a Wielegia (shrub) and several Cumquats.

Approximately 80m south of the modern residence, a pair of over-mature Cypress (species is not known as viewed from a distance) are located marking the entrance to the early wattle and daub house site of ‘The Range’ (demolished c.1930).

**History**

**Contextual history**

Early survey maps form the 1840s and 1850s show that the first settled areas within the Shire were near the Great Swamp, for it had a network of creeks (by way of the Cardinia, Toomuc and Ararat) and a plentiful water supply which ensured that the area was well suited for an agricultural settlement. There were at least twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick, including John Dore’s station (Nar-Ri-Uk); Hennessy’s cattle station, which was located close to Dore’s station and Waton, Wight and Company’s station (Nar Nar Goon) to the south (Butler 1998:17,19).

Among the earliest prominent district settlers was John Dore. Early parish plans show that John Dore, with Michael Hennessy secured the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right (640 acres) in 1855. The Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A small part of the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right, and a house built ca1860, at 125 Mt Ararat Road North, Pakenham are protected under HO81 (see HERMES 6004 for further information).
Pre-emptive rights allowed squatters to purchase, and take up to 640 acres of their pastoral runs. Holders could purchase these rights before any land in the general vicinity was available to the general public, granted they carry out improvement such as construct homesteads and establish cultivation paddocks (Cabena et al. 1989: 2).

The Selection era, which began with the passing of a series of Land Acts in the 1860s accelerated the process of subdivision, particularly when larger pastoral runs were subdivided and opened up for sale to the general public. With subdivision came a decline in pastoral runs, and in grazing, which were replaced with a diverse range of agricultural activities, including dairying and orcharding.

The development of the Gippsland Road, from the 1860s (now the Princes Highway), and the arrival of the railway, in the 1870s, increased settlement in the area and the development of Nar Nar Goon Township. The centre became the 'dispatch centre for swan products … and became the third most important point of dispatch for West Gippsland timber’. (Butler 1998:70), and the railway promoted the marketing of produce from dairy farms and orchards.

**Place history**

The Nar-Nar-Goon County of Mornington Parish Plan indicates that John Dore purchased the Crown Allotment 21 (202 acres 3 roods 20 perches or 82.10ha) on 29 April 1861 for £233-6-3 (Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1967). Sometime soon after, the allotment was transferred to Edward ‘Ned’ Dore (as noted by Cochran & Sullivan 1982: 12). Shortly afterwards, in August 1861, Ned Dore married Mary Josephine Shields and brought her to the farm on Dore Road which they called ‘The Range’. The original house was wattle and daub, and had four rooms (Cochrane and Sullivan, 1982:12). Cochrane and Sullivan further note that ‘the present house was built some years later but the original house was in use well into the late 1930s’ (Cochrane and Sullivan 1982:12).

The 1931 Shire of Berwick Rate Books indicate that Mary Ellen, Anne Rose and Frank Dore were the owners of Crown Allotment 21 (Shire of Berwick Rate Book 1931-R00265). Cochran and Sullivan (1982: 13) note that Ned and Mary Dore’s granddaughter, Elizabeth Savage, lived at 'The Range' from 1935 until her death in 1981, and that her husband, Richard Savage, still resided there in 1982.

**Sources**

Land Victoria (LV), Certificates of Title, as cited.

Shire of Berwick Rate Books, as cited.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1859, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1872, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1896, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.


**Findings**

**Local Heritage Significance**

The substantial and mature *Pyrus communis* (Pear) is considered to be of outstanding size and an excellent representative example of its species within the municipality. It is considered to have historical significance as part of the early property, known as ‘The Range’. A separate citation for this tree, demonstrating its significance was prepare in the John Patrick report, and is included as a separate citation above.

**Plantings of historic interest only**

The two surviving Italian Cypress which survive at the early (archaeological) homestead site appear to be a pair of ‘sentinel’ cypress commonly planted in the Victorian period at either side of the entrance to either the residential garden or entrance to the residence itself. The trees are clearly early (pre 1900), and are in poor condition. One tree is almost dead, and the other is in significant decline. The trees do however have historical interest as and early planting from the early ‘The Range’ residence. The trees have some historic values, but do not have sufficient value to meet the threshold of local heritage significance as per the HERCON Criteria, nor do they meet the threshold for addition to the Cardinia Shire Council Significant Tree Register, which has similar criteria to HERCON. Their age and senescence preclude them from having sufficient amenity value to retain.

**Archaeological values**

No evidence of the original four roomed wattle and daub house, which was reportedly located in a paddock, 80 metres to the south of the current homestead, remains. As the site has been heavily disturbed through activities relating to farming, and dairying, there is limited potential for subsurface material relating to the former house to remain in-situ. The site has limited potential to yield information about the establishment of small farm complexes and the development of agricultural activities in the area.

**Recommendations**

Caution should be taken to follow the requirements of the *Heritage Act 1995* in the unlikely event that an archaeological deposits or sites are uncovered during any stage of development. Heritage Victoria must be contacted should an archaeological site or deposit be uncovered.

Tree species, location and size should be photographed, recorded and plotted on a site plan prior to any tree removal or development of the site. This information should be retained by Council and/or lodged with the Historical Society for future generations.
45-55 Dore Road, Pakenham

Figure 14 - Farmyard associated with garden - Cabbage Palm and Canary Island Palm visible

Figure 15 - remnants of garden planting - tapestry hedge in foreground, Hoop Pine and windrow at rear

Description
The site consists of a collection of mature exotic trees and shrubs which form the skeleton of what was once a typical large Edwardian style farmhouse garden. The mature trees which
survive include a windrow of Monterey Cypress (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) which form an L-shape to the south of the site, a Hoop Pine (*Araucaria cunninghamii*), Canary Island Palm (*Phoenix canariensis*), Cabbage Palm (*Cordyline australis*), the remnants of a tapestry hedge comprising Shiny Leaf (*Coprosma repens*), Cotoneaster (Cotoneaster sp.) and Common Privet (*Ligustrum vulgare*). Scattered throughout the site are a number of stunted fruit trees and mature shrubs including specimens of Fig, Nectarine, Buddlejia, Tecoma, Roses and various climbers. All of the plantings are in poor condition and have been subject to significant animal grazing. The best surviving specimen is the Canary Island Palm.

There is above ground evidence of various farming structures including outbuildings, cattle yards and a brick well which may have the potential to yield further information about the farming practices in the area in the early twentieth to mid twentieth century.

The original house (c.1905) has been replaced by a modern dwelling.

**History**

**Contextual history**

Early survey maps form the 1840s and 1850s show that the first settled areas within the Shire were near the Great Swamp, for it had a network of creeks (by way of the Cardinia, Toomuc and Ararat) and a plentiful water supply which ensured that the area was well suited for an agricultural settlement. There were at least twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick, including John Dore’s station (Nar-Ri-Uk); Hennessy’s cattle station, which was located close to Dore’s station and Waton, Wight and Company’s station (Nar Nar Goon) to the south (Butler 1998:17,19).

Among the earliest prominent district settlers was John Dore. Early parish plans show that John Dore, with Michael Hennessy secured the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right (640 acres) in 1855. The Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A small part of the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right, and a house built ca1860, at 125 Mt Ararat Road North, Pakenham are protected under HO81 (see HERMES 6004 for further information). Pre-emptive rights allowed squatters to purchase, and take up to 640 acres of their pastoral runs. Holders could purchase these rights before any land in the general vicinity was available to the general public, granted they carry out improvement such as construct homesteads and establish cultivation paddocks (Cabena et al. 1989: 2).

The Selection era, which began with the passing of a series of Land Acts in the 1860s accelerated the process of subdivision, particularly when larger pastoral runs were subdivided and opened up for sale to the general public. With subdivision came a decline in pastoral runs, and in grazing, which was replaced with a diverse range of agricultural activities, including dairying and orcharding.

The development of the Gippsland Road, from the 1860s (now the Princes Highway), and the arrival of the railway, in the 1870s, increased settlement in the area and the development of Nar Nar Goon Township. The centre became the ‘dispatch centre for swan products … and became the third most important point of dispatch for West Gippsland timber’. (Butler 1998:70), and the railway promoted the marketing of produce from diary farms and orchards.

**Place history**

Crown Allotment 20 (an area of 189 acres 0 roods 33 perches or 76.57ha) was granted to David Conner Junior, the ‘Younger’ of Bunyuip for £189, 4 shillings and 2 pence on 4 January 1878 (Titles V1040/F895, File number 4666/19).

The property was sold to Hanora Carney, Widow, Pakenham on 16 December 1902. A family photo owned by the current owner, Paul Carney, shows a house of c1905 on this site (since demolished), which it appears was constructed for Hanora Carney shortly after she purchased the property.

Hanora Carney died 17 November 1912, and the property was inherited by John Carney (probably her son), a Pakenham farmer (Titles V1040/F895). John transferred this land to Thomas Carney, a Pakenham farmer on 8 September 1914. Thomas Carney died 7 December
1964 and probate to his Will, the land was granted to Hannah Mary Carney, Widow, James Marmachute Carney and Michael John Carney, both farmers. The property remains in the Carney family.

**Sources**

Land Victoria (LV), Certificates of Title, as cited.

Shire of Berwick Rate Books, as cited.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1859, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1872, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1896, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.


**Potential values**

**Plantings of historic interest**

The plantings are in fair to poor condition, but have been heavily compromised by animal grazing. The complexity of this garden has also been lost, although the context is retained somewhat through the construction of the modern residence on the site of the original homestead.

**Archaeological values**

No evidence of the original homestead remains. As the site has been heavily disturbed through activities relating to farming, and dairying, there is limited potential for subsurface material relating to the former house to remain in-situ. The site has limited potential to yield information about the establishment of small farm complexes and the development of agricultural activities in the area.

**Recommendations**

Caution should be taken to follow the requirements of the *Heritage Act 1995* in the unlikely event that an archaeological deposits or sites are uncovered during any stage of development. Heritage Victoria must be contacted should an archaeological site or deposit be uncovered.

Tree species, location and size should be photographed, recorded and plotted on a site plan prior to any tree removal or development of the site. This information should be retained by Council and/or lodged with the Historical Society for future generations.
15 Mount Ararat Road North, Pakenham

Figure 16 - Driveway to 15 Mount Ararat Road North (with garden and Oak Tree visible)

Figure 17 - English Oak in the garden
Description
The homestead site at the north end of the property (just west of Property #5) is an interwar house reportedly moved here c1936 from Cardinia, where it had served as a rectory for Rev. Duff. It is surrounded by mature exotic trees.

History
Contextual history
Early survey maps form the 1840s and 1850s show that the first settled areas within the Shire were near the Great Swamp, for it had a network of creeks (by way of the Cardinia, Toomuc and Ararat) and a plentiful water supply which ensured that the area was well suited for an agricultural settlement. There were at least twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick, including John Dore’s station (Nar-Ri-Uk); Hennessy’s cattle station, which was located close to Dore’s station and Waton, Wight and Company’s station (Nar Nar Goon) to the south (Butler 1998:17,19).

Among the earliest prominent district settlers was John Dore. Early parish plans show that John Dore, with Michael Hennessy secured the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right (640 acres) in 1855. The Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A small part of the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right, and a house built ca1860, at 125 Mt Ararat Road North, Pakenham are protected under HO81 (see HERMES 6004 for further information). Pre-emptive rights allowed squatters to purchase, and take up to 640 acres of their pastoral runs. Holders could purchase these rights before any land in the general vicinity was available to the general public, granted they carry out improvement such as construct homesteads and establish cultivation paddocks (Cabena et al. 1989: 2).

The Selection era, which began with the passing of a series of Land Acts in the 1860s accelerated the process of subdivision, particularly when larger pastoral runs were subdivided and opened up for sale to the general public. With subdivision came a decline in pastoral runs, and in grazing, which were replaced with a diverse range of agricultural activities, including dairying and orcharding.

The development of the Gippsland Road, from the 1860s (now the Princes Highway), and the arrival of the railway, in the 1870s, increased settlement in the area and the development of Nar Nar Goon Township. The centre became the ‘dispatch centre for swan products … and became the third most important point of dispatch for West Gippsland timber’. (Butler 1998:70), and the railway promoted the marketing of produce from dairy farms and orchards.

Place history
The parcel of land on which the property at 15 Mount Ararat Road sits was initially part of the Mt. Ararat pastoral run. When John Dore and M. Hennessy secured the pre-emptive right to Allotment B, within the run, the parcel of land at 15 Mount Ararat Road fell within the allotments boundaries, at the south western corner.

John Dore (1805-1895) was born in County Limerick, Ireland. He sailed to Australia aboard the ‘Forth’ in 1841 with Elizabeth O’Connor, wife, and four children. After residing at Merri Creek for less than a year, John and family settled at the Mt. Ararat pastoral run in 1842 (Cochrane and Sullivan 1982:3). Butler et al. notes that his first house on the run was a ‘slab hut’ which was located just east of the study area (Butler et al 1996 Volume 2:276).

The Mr. Ararat No. 1 pastoral run was located six miles east of Pakenham. The 19,000 acre run was leased in 1847 to John Dore and Michael Hennessy, although it was only officially gazetted as a run in October 1848 (Butler et al. 1989:21).

On 17 December 1855 John Dore and M. Hennessy secured the pre-emptive right to Allotmen B (640 acres 0 roods 0 perches or 259.0ha) (Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1967, Old Law Note 42126, Plan number P.R. M50).

The entire pre-emptive right was soon solely owned by members of the Dore family (Old Law Search Notes 42126), and remained in the family until 1945. In the period from 1917 to 1933,
the Dores were noted as residing at 'The Range', Pakenham (40 Dore Road), indicating that no house had been built at 15 Mount Ararat Road North as yet (LV: V3988/F598).

On 4 May 1945 Mary Ellen Dore transferred to title to Frances ‘Frank’ Alexander Duff, Princes Highway, farmer (Titles V5852/F255; V5849/F714). Walter Stuart Duff, farmer of Mt. Ararat Road, is listed as owner in 1958 (Titles V8204/F778). The property remains in the Duff family (Titles V10036/F743).

Members of the Duff family believe that the current house (which appears to date from c1920) was moved here by Frank Duff in 1934 from his family’s property in Cardinia (Frank Duff - grandson of FA Duff, Pers. Comm., 2013). Considering that Frank only purchased the property in 1945, the relocation of the house may have been later.

**Sources**
Land Victoria (LV), Certificates of Title, as cited.
Shire of Berwick Rate Books, as cited.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1859, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.
Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1872, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.
Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1896, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.


**Potential values**

**Amenity value**
There is a large, mature English Oak in the residential garden with amenity value. The canopy is well shaped, and visually attractive. This tree should be retained and protected through the development of the urban landscape.
PAKENHAM EAST PRECINCT

180 Ryan Road, Pakenham

Figure 18 - Cherry Plum adjacent to machinery shed

Figure 19 – Deodar Cedar associated with post World War 2 garden
Description
A number of fine mature exotic trees at located at 180 Ryan Road. A Cherry Plum, which appears to date from about c1920, is located adjacent to a large machinery shed, whilst numerous other specimen trees form the skeleton of what was a fine post World War Two garden. Species include a large Fir tree, a Willow tree, several introduced Eucalypts and a number of Cypress, and a range of shrubs which are in fair to poor condition.

History
Contextual history
Early survey maps form the 1840s and 1850s show that the first settled areas within the Shire were near the Great Swamp, for it had a network of creeks (by way of the Cardinia, Toomuc and Ararat) and a plentiful water supply which ensured that the area was well suited for an agricultural settlement. There were at least twelve pastoral run properties within the former Shire of Berwick, including John Dore's station (Nar-Ri-Uk); Hennessy's cattle station, which was located close to Dore's station and Waton, Wight and Company's station (Nar Nar Goon) to the south (Butler 1998:17,19).

Among the earliest prominent district settlers was John Dore. Early parish plans show that John Dore, with Michael Hennessy secured the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right (640 acres) in 1855. The Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right extends into the north eastern corner of Study Area A small part of the Mt. Ararat pre-emptive right, and a house built ca1860, at 125 Mt Ararat Road North, Pakenham are protected under HO81 (see HERMES 6004 for further information). Pre-emptive rights allowed squatters to purchase, and take up to 640 acres of their pastoral runs. Holders could purchase these rights before any land in the general vicinity was available to the general public, granted they carry out improvement such as construct homesteads and establish cultivation paddocks (Cabena et al. 1989: 2).

The Selection era, which began with the passing of a series of Land Acts in the 1860s accelerated the process of subdivision, particularly when larger pastoral runs were subdivided and opened up for sale to the general public. With subdivision came a decline in pastoral runs, and in grazing, which were replaced with a diverse range of agricultural activities, including dairying and orcharding.

The development of the Gippsland Road, from the 1860s (now the Princes Highway), and the arrival of the railway, in the 1870s, increased settlement in the area and the development of Nar Nar Goon Township. The centre became the ‘dispatch centre for swan products … and became the third most important point of dispatch for West Gippsland timber’ (Butler 1998:70), and the railway promoted the marketing of produce from dairy farms and orchards.

Place history
Crown Allotment 26 (174 acres 1 rood 16 perches or 70.56ha) was sold to George Ritchie (File number 1859-593). From the County of Mornington Parish Plan it would appear that George Ritchie purchased Crown Allotment 26 in 1862, around the time that he purchased Crown Allotment 27 (12 May 1862) (see Schedule to Allotments, Parish of Nar Nar Goon Sheet 2).

The 1917 Shire of Berwick Rate Books indicate that Milo Bourke was the owner of Allotment 26 and 27 and that combined the net annual value was listed as £106 (Shire of Berwick Rate Book 1917-R2668). The 1920 Rate Books indicated that the two allotments were still under the ownership of Milo, Pakenham East farmer, and Eileen Bourke, home duties, and valued at £106 (Shire of Berwick Rate Book 1920-R564)

The 1922 and 1923 Berwick Rate Books indicate that allotments 26 and 27 were still owned by Milo and Eileen Bourke with a net annual value of £180 (Shire of Berwick Rate Book 1920-R3335). The 1930 Shire of Berwick Rate Books indicate the net annual value has increased to £220 and that a house is now located at the site (Shire of Berwick Rate Book 1900-R769).
**Sources**

Land Victoria (LV), Certificates of Title, as cited.
Shire of Berwick Rate Books, as cited.

Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1859, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.
Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1872, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.
Nar-Nar-Goon, County of Mornington Parish Plan 1896, Department of Lands and Survey, Melbourne.

**Potential values**

**Amenity value**

The *Cedrus deodara* (Deodar Cedar) is considered to have amenity value and should be retained in development of the urban landscape.
APPENDIX C MAPPING

Please note that trees are shown on these maps are shown for the purpose of indicating location. The area associated with each tree is not the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) or other indication of an area which is considered sufficient to be used for planning purposes. Tree Protection Zones should be used, or, where appropriate, the indicated curtilage.
POST CONTACT HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

80 Dore Road, Pakenham

- Area archaeological interest
- Amenity value tree (Canary Island Palm)
- Significant Tree (Pear) (The HO curtilage for the Pear is to be set 5m from the canopy edge)
- Plantings of historic interest **only** (2 x Italian Cypress). Record prior to removing for historic interest
Area of Heritage Overlay curtilage recommended
Amenity value tree (Deodar Cedar)
APPENDIX D – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Summary of findings from field work. Properties are referred to by their street address as well as their PSP Property Number as set out in the map found in Appendix E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Site Visit</th>
<th>Heritage assessment findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>155 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>365 Seymour Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>325 Seymour Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mount Ararat North Rd, Lot 1 LP55512</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55 Mount Ararat North Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 Mount Ararat North Rd, NB: There are two homestead sites on this property: one at the south end and the other at the north.</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012 and 18 Jan. 2013</td>
<td>Exotic tree of amenity value at north homestead site (specimen of Quercus robur (English Oak))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dore Rd, Lot 3 PS422931</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Site of archaeological interest (reputedly a wattle and daub cottage) indicated by two early specimens of Cupressus sempervirens (Italian Cypress) located to the south of the modern residence at 40 Dore Road. Both Italian Cypress trees are senescent but should be recorded prior to removal. The site of the former wattle and daub cottage may have some archaeological potential, and should be assessed and if appropriate, included on the relevant statutory register. The Phoenix canariensis (Canary Island Palm) located in the modern garden is of amenity value and should be retained. <strong>Local heritage significance</strong> The large mature specimen of Pyrus communis (Pear) in the modern garden is of outstanding size and age and should be added to the Cardinia Significant Tree Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dore Rd, Lot 2 PS422931</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP Property No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td>Heritage assessment findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>95 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45-55 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>The garden of historic interest only. This garden retains some remnant plantings from the early twentieth century, but has low integrity. Record prior to removal. A single specimen of <em>Araucaria cunninghamii</em> (Hoop Pine) located to the west of the dwelling is of high amenity value and should be retained. The site of the former c.1905 homestead and outbuildings may have some archaeological potential, and should be further assessed and if appropriate, included on the relevant statutory register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55 Dore Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>35 Canty Lane</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>36 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>40 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>46 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>46 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>50 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>60 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>70 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ryan Rd, Lot RES1 PS402188</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>25 Canty Lane</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Allotment 23B1 Parish of Nar Nar Goon</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1530 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1550-1560 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1560 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Archaeological interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lot 2 PS547978</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP Property No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td>Heritage assessment findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1610 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1610 Princes Hwy</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>32 Mount Ararat South Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>32 Mount Ararat South Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Local heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>90 Mount Ararat South Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lot 3 PS607403</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lot 1 PS613913</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lot RES1 PS607403</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>10 Canty Lane</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>104 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>110 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>114 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>140 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Local heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>160 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>180 Ryan Rd</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>Cedrus deodar (Deodar Cedar) of high amenity value should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Lot 3 PS547650</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Lot 2 PS547650</td>
<td>19 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>No post-contact heritage significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E – LOCATION OF PROPERTIES NOTING PSP NUMBER

Map supplied by Cardinia Shire Council.
APPENDIX F - JOHN PATRICK REPORT

‘Significant Tree Assessment, Pakenham East Precinct’ by John Patrick Pty. Ltd., 2013