



# APPENDIX R.

2014 Heritage Report

# South Rockhampton Flood Levee

## Cultural Heritage Desktop Review Report



## South Rockhampton Flood Levee

### Cultural Heritage Desktop Review Report

*The South Rockhampton Flood Levee Planning and Design project is a joint initiative of Rockhampton Regional Council, the Queensland Government and the Australian Government.*

Client: Rockhampton Regional Council

ABN: 59 923 523 766

#### Prepared by

**AECOM Australia Pty Ltd**

Level 1, 130 Victoria Parade, PO Box 1049, Rockhampton QLD 4700, Australia  
T +61 7 4927 5541 F +61 7 4927 1333 www.aecom.com  
ABN 20 093 846 925

23-Jul-2014

Job No.: 60313918

AECOM in Australia and New Zealand is certified to the latest version of ISO9001, ISO14001, AS/NZS4801 and OHSAS18001.

© AECOM Australia Pty Ltd (AECOM). All rights reserved.

AECOM has prepared this document for the sole use of the Client and for a specific purpose, each as expressly stated in the document. No other party should rely on this document without the prior written consent of AECOM. AECOM undertakes no duty, nor accepts any responsibility, to any third party who may rely upon or use this document. This document has been prepared based on the Client's description of its requirements and AECOM's experience, having regard to assumptions that AECOM can reasonably be expected to make in accordance with sound professional principles. AECOM may also have relied upon information provided by the Client and other third parties to prepare this document, some of which may not have been verified. Subject to the above conditions, this document may be transmitted, reproduced or disseminated only in its entirety. AECOM has prepared this document for the sole use of the Client and for a specific purpose, each as expressly stated in the document. No other party should rely on this document without the prior written consent of AECOM. AECOM undertakes no duty, nor accepts any responsibility, to any third party who may rely upon or use this document. This document has been prepared based on the Client's description of its requirements and AECOM's experience, having regard to assumptions that AECOM can reasonably be expected to make in accordance with sound professional principles. AECOM may also have relied upon information provided by the Client and other third parties to prepare this document, some of which may not have been verified. Subject to the above conditions, this document may be transmitted, reproduced or disseminated only in its entirety.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Project Methodology	2
2.1 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Methodology	2
2.2 Historical Cultural Heritage Methodology	2
2.3 Limitations	2
3.0 Legislative Overview	3
3.1 Burra Charter	3
3.2 Commonwealth Heritage Legislation	3
3.2.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999	3
3.3 State Legislation	3
3.3.1 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003	3
3.3.2 Queensland Heritage Act 1992	4
3.4 Local legislation	5
4.0 Historical Context	7
5.0 Aboriginal Heritage	10
5.1 Aboriginal Party and Cultural Heritage Body	10
5.2 Native Title Claimants	10
5.3 Registered Sites	10
5.4 Potential Impacts	10
5.5 Potential Mitigations	11
6.0 Historical Heritage	12
6.1 Registered Sites	12
6.2 Other Heritage Places	12
6.2.1 Non-statutory Registers	13
6.2.2 Local Heritage Places	13
6.3 Potential Impacts	13
6.3.1 Quay Street	13
6.3.2 Port Curtis and Depot Hill	14
6.4 Potential Mitigations	14
6.4.1 Quay Street	14
6.4.2 Port Curtis and Depot Hill	15
7.0 Summary	16
8.0 References	17
Appendix A	
Heritage Listings	A

## Executive Summary

The following Cultural Heritage Assessment Report outlines the findings of the cultural heritage due diligence assessment undertaken in relation to the proposed South Rockhampton Flood Levee project. The assessment identifies and assesses the potential impact of the project on Aboriginal (Indigenous) and historical (non-Indigenous) cultural heritage.

The methodology utilised was a desktop assessment which was informed by the project scope and broader policy setting provided by state legislation. The report details the methodologies for Aboriginal cultural heritage and Historical cultural heritage due diligence noting the limitations associated with the assessments.

The report provides an overview of the legislative context under which the heritage assessment for the project has been considered that includes the Burra Charter, Commonwealth heritage legislation, State legislation and Local legislation. A historical background is also included within the report to provide a contextual overview of the project area.

The assessment results of the project's potential impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage in accordance with the Duty of Care Guidelines are detailed. Recommendations for the management of this heritage include ongoing consultation with the Aboriginal Party for the project area, the Darumbal, and development of a Cultural Heritage Management (CHMP) or Cultural Heritage Management Agreement (CHMA) if appropriate.

The assessment of the project's potential impacts on Historical cultural heritage identifies places of national, state and possibly local heritage significance. The main area of project impact is identified as likely to be in the Quay Street Area with impacts potentially occurring during both the construction and operational phases of the project. The report provides recommendations for the management of these impacts in accordance with heritage policy and legislation framework.

The report summarises the potential impacts to historical heritage places along the river on Quay Street, as well as on remaining tangible or intangible Aboriginal cultural heritage values. While preliminary measures are outlined for the management of identified potential impacts, more detailed mitigation measures may be developed for the management of specific places.

## 1.0 Introduction

This cultural heritage due diligence assessment has been prepared for Rockhampton Regional Council (RRC) in relation to the proposed South Rockhampton Flood Levee project.

The proposed flood levee is to be constructed adjacent to Quay Street, along the banks of the Fitzroy River from the Fitzroy Bridge through to Depot Hill, and then inland to Port Curtis. The levee will protect communities situated in Port Curtis, Allenstown, Depot Hill and the CBD from Fitzroy River flood events up to the 1% Annual Exceedence Probability (AEP) level.

The proposed levee is approximately 8.6 km long generally consisting of earthfill embankment, with portions being crib wall, vertical flood walls and temporary flood barrier systems. The location of the SRFL is shown in Figure 1 (the Study Area).



**Figure 1** Location of the Proposed SRFL.

This assessment seeks to identify and assess the potential impact of the Rockhampton Flood Levee project on Aboriginal (Indigenous) and historical (non-Indigenous) cultural heritage, specifically to:

- identify the Aboriginal Party(s) and/or the Cultural Heritage Body(s) for the area
- conduct a brief historical review of the Study Area
- identify any known Aboriginal or historical cultural heritage in the Study Area
- assess the potential for undiscovered Aboriginal or historical sites to be present within the Study Area
- assess, and provide advice and recommendations for compliance with the relevant legislative requirements governing the management of Aboriginal and historical cultural heritage
- determine a strategy for future management of any cultural heritage issues identified during the assessment to ensure compliance under the relevant legislation.

## 2.0 Project Methodology

This desktop assessment of potential heritage impacts in the Study Area was informed by the proposed project scope, and the broader policy setting provided by state legislation.

### 2.1 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Methodology

In keeping with legislative and project requirements, the key elements of this Aboriginal cultural heritage due diligence assessment are:

- a search of the National Native Title Tribunal registers to identify any Native Title Claims and Claimants
- a search of the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs (DATSIMA) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Database and Register to identify:
  - Aboriginal Party(s) and/or Cultural Heritage Bodies for the Study Area
  - any known Aboriginal cultural heritage within the Study Area
- a review of historical and archaeological research in the area to identify:
  - any additional places of cultural heritage significance, and to inform
  - previous land use and levels of ground disturbance
- an assessment of potential project impacts based on the Duty of Care Guidelines outlined in the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003*.

### 2.2 Historical Cultural Heritage Methodology

The historical due diligence assessment is informed by *Using the Criteria: A Methodology* (Queensland Environmental Protection Agency 2006), which provides a framework for the identification and management of historical significance as required under the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992*. In keeping with this framework, the key elements of this assessment are:

- Heritage register searches that include:
  - Commonwealth and National Heritage Register
  - Australian National Shipwrecks Database
  - Queensland Heritage Register
  - Rockhampton Local Heritage Register.
- a review of historical studies, historical documents and previous historical cultural heritage assessments of the Study Area and the surrounding regions
- an assessment of potential project impacts and mitigation measures.

### 2.3 Limitations

This assessment is based on the information on the project scope provided in the Preliminary Design Phase by the wider project team. While it is our understanding that this information is correct, any changes to the development would potentially impact on the accuracy of this report.

Furthermore, because due diligence or 'desk top' studies are based on a review of pre-existing reports and data, they are necessarily limited to what information is 'already known' about an area. There is still the potential for currently unknown heritage sites to exist within the Study Area.

## 3.0 Legislative Overview

Cultural heritage, whether it be Indigenous or non-Indigenous, plays an important role in a community. This importance is reflected in legislation enacted at both a state and commonwealth level to recognise, protect and conserve cultural heritage. The following sections provide an overview of the legislative context under which the heritage assessment for this project has been considered.

### 3.1 Burra Charter

Originally created in 1979 by the Australian branch of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the Burra Charter provides the benchmark for cultural heritage management in Australia and is the basis for the majority of commonwealth, state and local heritage legislation and policy (Australia ICOMOS 2013).

The Burra Charter defines a place as being of cultural significance if it possesses aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value and provides guidance on managing and conserving places in order to preserve this significance.

### 3.2 Commonwealth Heritage Legislation

#### 3.2.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999

The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) is the key national heritage legislation and is administered by the Commonwealth Department of the Environment. The main aim of the EPBC Act is to provide protection for the environment, specifically Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES). Under Part 9 of the EPBC Act, any action that is likely to have a significant impact on a MNES (known as a controlled action under the Act), may only progress with approval of the Department of Environment. An action is defined as a project, development, undertaking, activity (or series of activities), or alteration. An action will also require approval if:

- It is undertaken on Commonwealth land and will have or is likely to have a significant impact on the environment on Commonwealth land
- It is undertaken by the Commonwealth and will have or is likely to have a significant impact.

The EPBC Act defines 'environment' as both natural and cultural environments and therefore includes Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal historical cultural heritage items. Under the Act, protected heritage items are listed on the National Heritage List (NHL) (items of significance to the nation) or the Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL) (items belonging to the Commonwealth or its agencies). These two lists replaced the Register of the National Estate (RNE). The RNE has been suspended and is no longer a statutory list, but it remains as an archive.

### 3.3 State Legislation

#### 3.3.1 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003

Section 4 of the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003* (ACH Act) defines the main purpose of the Act as providing effective recognition, protection and conservation of Aboriginal cultural heritage. This Act defines Aboriginal cultural heritage as anything that is either: a significant Aboriginal area in Queensland; a significant Aboriginal object, or; significant archaeological or historical evidence of Aboriginal occupation of an area of Queensland. A significant Aboriginal area or object under the ACH Act is considered to be any area or object that is of particular significance to Aboriginal people because of Aboriginal tradition and/or the history, including contemporary history, of any Aboriginal party(s) for the area.

Section 23 of the Act states that 'A person who carries out an activity must take all reasonable and practical measures to ensure the activity does not harm Aboriginal cultural heritage (the cultural heritage duty of care)' [emphasis in original]. These guidelines, gazetted under Section 28 of the ACH Act, identify reasonable and practicable measures for managing activities in order to avoid or minimise harm Aboriginal cultural heritage. The Act also makes provisions for the management of Aboriginal cultural heritage values through a formal Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP), or a less formal Cultural Heritage Management Agreement (CHMA).

### 3.3.1.1 Duty of Care Guidelines

The duty of care guidelines requires a land user to make an assessment of their particular land use activity and the likelihood that it will cause harm to Aboriginal cultural heritage. In summary, the 'Duty of Care' categories are:

**Category 1** activities involve **no** surface disturbance. Such activities are generally unlikely to harm Aboriginal cultural heritage meaning and may proceed without further cultural heritage assessment.

**Category 2** activities cause **no additional** surface disturbance and as such will not result in additional harm to Aboriginal cultural heritage and may proceed without further cultural heritage assessment.

**Category 3** activities are those that occur in **Developed Areas** (such as road and rail infrastructure). Activities that occur in these areas are generally unlikely to harm Aboriginal cultural heritage and may proceed without further cultural heritage assessment, provided they do not extend beyond current levels of ground disturbance.

**Category 4** activities are those that occur in an area that has already been subject to significant ground disturbance. In these circumstances, further activities are unlikely to harm Aboriginal cultural heritage and may proceed without further cultural heritage assessment. However, care should be taken lest residual Aboriginal cultural heritage values are impacted. The Aboriginal Party(s) should be contacted in the event that any feature of potential cultural significance is uncovered.

**Category 5** activities are those that will create **additional** surface disturbance, and so have a high risk of harming Aboriginal cultural heritage. These activities cannot proceed without cultural heritage assessment, and it is generally necessary to notify the appropriate Aboriginal Party(s) to seek advice in relation to cultural heritage values of the area.

### 3.3.1.2 Cultural Heritage Management Plans

The ACH Act provides for the management of Aboriginal cultural heritage under Part 7 of the Act. A CHMP is a state-approved agreement between a land user and the Cultural Heritage Body(s) and/or Aboriginal Party(s) of an area that outlines how project activities may be managed to avoid harm to Aboriginal cultural heritage, or to minimise harm where avoidance is not reasonably practicable. A formal CHMP establishes a statutory process for addressing Aboriginal cultural heritage with certainty. The CHMP process involves a statutory notification period during which the land user must notify the Cultural Heritage Body(s) and/or Aboriginal Party(s) of their intention to develop a CHMP. Notification recipients are given 30 days in which to respond to the notification, which is followed by an 84-day consultation and negotiation period.

A CHMP is compulsory where an EIS is required, or else may be entered into voluntarily by a land user regardless of the legal requirements. The advantage of a voluntary approved CHMP is that it provides the land user with complete certainty that they are acting lawfully under the legislation and that they are meeting their cultural heritage duty of care.

### 3.3.1.3 Cultural Heritage Management Agreements

A less formal alternative to the CHMP is the Cultural Heritage Management Agreement (CHMA). Under Section 23, a CHMA is an agreement between the land user and the Cultural Heritage Body(s) and/or Aboriginal Party(s) of the area outlining how project activities may be managed in order to avoid or minimise harm to Aboriginal cultural heritage. A CHMA under Section 23 involves some risks, however, in that there are no statutory guidelines or time limitations for notification or negotiation phases.

## 3.3.2 Queensland Heritage Act 1992

The *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* (QH Act) provides the framework for assessing the significance of items and places of historical cultural heritage value in Queensland and is administered by the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (EHP), with advice from the Queensland Heritage Council (QHC). It makes provision for the conservation of Queensland's cultural heritage by protecting all places and areas listed on the Queensland Heritage Register (QHR).

Broadly, a place is considered to be of state cultural heritage significance if:

*its heritage values contribute to our understanding of the wider pattern and evolution of Queensland's history and heritage. This includes places that contribute significantly to our understanding of the regional pattern and development of Queensland (Environmental Protection Agency 2006:5).*

Under section 35 (1) of the QH Act, a place may be entered on the QHR if it satisfies one or more of the following criteria:

- the place is important in demonstrating the evolution or pattern of Queensland's history
- the place demonstrates rare, uncommon or endangered aspects of Queensland's cultural heritage
- the place has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Queensland's history
- the place is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of cultural places
- the place is important because of its aesthetic significance
- the place is important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period
- the place has a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons
- the place has a special association with the life or work of a particular person, group or organisation of importance in Queensland's history.

Under section 68 of the QH Act (see also section 70), anyone wishing to develop a Queensland Heritage Place must make a development application. This application is assessed by the EHP chief executive (who may seek the advice of the QHC) and is granted only if the proposed development is not deemed to have a detrimental impact on the cultural heritage values of the site (see also section 68), or if there is no 'prudent or feasible alternative' to the development.

The QH Act (section 60) also provides protection for places that have potential archaeological significance. That is, a place that:

- is not a State heritage place
- has potential to contain an archaeological artefact that is an important source of information about Queensland's history.

Section 89 requires a person to notify EHP's chief executive of an archaeological artefact that is an important source of information about an aspect of Queensland's history. This notice must be given as soon as practicable after the person discovers the item. Section 90 stipulates that it is an offence to interfere with an archaeological artefact once notice has been given of the artefact to the chief executive.

Development applications for archaeological places are assessed against the potential harm the development poses to the archaeological resource and approval may be contingent on the applicant conducting archaeological investigations or making other provisions for the management of archaeological artefacts (section 69).

The QH Act also provides specific protections for shipwrecks, which are defined as the remains or any part of the remains of a ship that is in Queensland waters, and has been in the waters for more than 75 years. Any actions that may impact on a shipwreck are only permitted with the prior approval of the Chief Executive of EHP.

### 3.4 Local legislation

Local heritage places are managed under Part 11 of the QH Act, local planning schemes and the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*. The QH Act provides a process for establishing a Local Heritage Register and nominating places to be included on a local heritage register.

Broadly a place is considered to be of local (rather than state) significance if:

*its heritage values are of a purely localised nature and do not contribute significantly to our understanding of the wider pattern and evolution of Queensland's history and heritage (Environmental Protection Agency 2006:5).*

The Study Area falls within the RRC boundaries and is covered by the Rockhampton City Plan 2009 (RCP). The RCP Heritage Place Code (Section 5.1) seeks to ensure that 'that development on or adjoining a heritage place maintains the heritage significance of the place' by:

- ensuring that development does not detract from the cultural heritage significance of the heritage place
- ensuring that development respects and incorporates any relevant aspects of Indigenous cultural interests and values in the heritage place
- ensuring that the impacts of development on the heritage place are assessed and mitigated

- ensuring that development does not degrade, disturb or cause encroachment on the heritage place
- conserving the biodiversity and geodiversity of the heritage place
- protecting any ecological corridor linkages of the heritage place to other natural areas.

## 4.0 Historical Context

The following discussion is not intended to be an exhaustive archaeological or historical review, but rather aims to provide a contextual overview of the Study Area. Further research and analysis of specific areas and sites may be required to assist with the assessment of particular cultural heritage issues arising from project activities.

There has been no detailed exploration of pre-contact Aboriginal life in the Study Area, but research in surrounding regions provides some insights. The closest archaeological studies to the Study Area are those on the Keppel Islands (approximately 50km to the north east), which suggest that Aboriginal people have occupied the region since at least 4,200 Before Present (BP) (Ulm & Reid 2000). These dates, however, are more likely a reflection of the timing of sea level stabilisation and island formation than they are of Aboriginal settlement of the region.

A better indicator of Aboriginal prehistory in the area comes from Cania Gorge, approximately 150km to the south of the Study Area. Here, a series of excavations of rock shelters and other living sites suggest Aboriginal occupation by at least 18,000BP (Westcott et al. 1999). The excavations at Cania Gorge also point to an increase in occupation in the last few thousand years, with dates from nine rock shelter sites indicating that they were first used between 8,500 BP and 3,500BP (Westcott et al. 1999). Many of these extensive living sites feature rock art, suggesting a period of complex socio-cultural change over the last 10,000 years, perhaps coupled with a growth in population and a more intensive use of the types of food and other resources available in the gorge (Lilley et al. 1999; Westcott et al. 1999).

Such a trajectory fits in with the broader trends evident in the region, with a noticeable increase in occupation levels and site use in the last 10,000 years (Morwood 2002; Morwood 1989), emphasising the complex and dynamic Aboriginal history of the central Queensland area. It is argued that this evidence marks a significant change in Aboriginal social organisation, with groups becoming increasingly territorial, and perhaps indicating the formation of the social groupings and practices noted by explorers and settlers in the historical period (McNiven 1991).

The first settlers to enter the Rockhampton region were the Archer brothers, who travelled north from the Burnett in 1853 to establish the large pastoral run of 'Gracemere' (approximately 10km south west of the Study Area). By the time the Archers left the Burnett region, Aboriginal people were actively resisting colonial expansion, and the Archers came to Gracemere expecting similar conflict, bringing with them four Native Mounted Police (Bird 1904). Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Archer's expectations were fulfilled, and the following two decades were typified by intense conflict as more and more settlers moved into the region. Aboriginal groups attacked homesteads and isolated outstations, and settlers retaliated in far greater magnitude. The Archers reputedly mounted a swivel gun to protect their Gracemere homestead, while other colonists depended on the Native Mounted Police to 'disperse' (by killing or otherwise driving off) 'troublesome' Aborigines, and a Native Mounted Police Camp was established in Rockhampton in 1860 (Richards 2005; Bird 1904).

By 1870, violence coupled with introduced diseases had radically reduced the Aboriginal population and, by 1900, government policy towards Aboriginal people had shifted from one of dispersal to one of protection. Many Aboriginal people who had remained on their land thus far were forcibly removed to missions and government reserves. In the Rockhampton area, this removal was generally to the Taroom Reserve approximately 260km south west of the Study Area, and subsequently Woorabinda, approximately 150km south west of the Study Area (Barnard 2009; Donovan 2002).

As the settlers pushed further into the hinterland during the second part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, expanding the frontier to the west and north, the township of Rockhampton grew in relative peace. The settlement had originally been established as a port to serve the large pastoral runs of the inland. Located in the hinterland along 50km of navigable river, it was an ideal location to import supplies and export wool (Bird 1904). The purpose and extent of the settlement changed radically in 1858, however, when gold was discovered at Canoona to the north.

Rockhampton offered the closest port facilities to the field, and the then New South Wales colonial government gazetted it as a port of entry - a place where immigrants could legally enter the colonies, and duties could be collected (Figure 2). Rockhampton was soon swamped by an influx of more than 15,000 prospectors seeking their fortune. The Canoona field was exhausted in a matter of weeks, but the population of the district had been permanently increased (Allom Lovell 2000). The burgeoning township of Rockhampton was officially surveyed in 1858, with the main business area established one street back from the river, allowing Quay Street on the esplanade to be used solely for port business (Allom Lovell 2000).

In 1882, Rockhampton was once again transformed by the discovery of gold, this time at Mt Morgan. The Mt Morgan deposit proved far richer than previous fields, and Rockhampton grew in wealth and consequence, becoming the second largest port in the colony with annual exports of over £1,000,000 (Allom Lovell 2000). Locals began to agitate for secession from the colony of Queensland, and regarded Rockhampton as the obvious 'capital of the north'. As a reflection of this status, numerous grand public and private buildings were constructed in the town, principally along the river-side Quay Street, which was central to the port-town's identity (Figure 3, Figure 4). These included the heritage listed Custom's House, Rockhampton Club, Harbour Board and Criterion Hotel (Allom Lovell 2000).

The campaign for secession was ultimately unsuccessful, but Rockhampton remained an important mercantile and port centre until 1950, when the wharves were closed and their infrastructure dismantled and removed. Since that time, Rockhampton has once again become primarily a service centre for the surrounding pastoral district, although the emphasis is now on cattle rather than sheep, earning the town the appellation of the 'beef capital' of Australia (Allom Lovell 2000).



Figure 2 Quay Street and wharves in 1864 (SLQ 18000).



Figure 3 Quay Street c.1890, showing (from right to left) the Rockhampton Club, Trustee Chambers and Cattle House (SLQ 237138).



Figure 4 Rockhampton c. 1930, showing Quay Street in the background, and a series of boating sheds and wharves in the foreground (SLQ 256500).

## 5.0 Aboriginal Heritage

The following section details the results of register searches, assesses the project's potential impact on Aboriginal cultural heritage in accordance with the Duty of Care Guidelines, and make recommendations for the management of this heritage.

### 5.1 Aboriginal Party and Cultural Heritage Body

A search of the DATSIMA database indicates that the **Cultural Heritage body** for the Study Area is:

Darumbal Enterprises Pty Ltd

Mr Doug Hatfield

133 Dee Street, North Rockhampton QLD 4701

Phone: (07) 4926 0026 Fax: (07) 4926 7457

Email: Darumbal.enterprises@bigpond.com

The **Aboriginal party** for the Study Area is:

QC12/8 - QUD6131/98

Darumbal People

Queensland South Native Title Services Limited Level 10, 307 Queen St Brisbane QLD 4000

Phone: (07) 3224 1200 Fax: (07) 3229 9880

### 5.2 Native Title Claimants

The Study Area falls within the Native Title Claim of the Darumbal People (Table 1). The proposed works are planned for a series of reserve areas in Rockhampton that may be subject to this Native Title Claim. Consequently, these works may be classed as 'Future Acts' under the Native Title Act 1993, and subject to the associated controls.

Table 1 Active Native Title Claims in the Study Area (Native Title Tribunal)

Application Name	Date Filed	Federal Court file no	Tribunal file no	Description
Darumbal People	26/07/2012	QUD6131/98	QC12/8	Central Queensland

### 5.3 Registered Sites

A search of the DATSIMA database indicates that there are no registered Aboriginal places within the Study Area. It should be noted, however, that areas around waterways are generally of high significance to Aboriginal people, and it is very likely that Study Area contains previously unrecorded cultural heritage values, whether tangible or intangible.

### 5.4 Potential Impacts

Historical photographs of Quay Street (Figure 2, Figure 3) show that the area has undergone substantial changes since colonial settlement. Changes in more rural areas through Depot Hill and Port Curtis have probably been less dramatic, but clearing and other activities will have caused some level of ground disturbance.

Consequently, the planned works may be classified as **Category 4** activities under the Duty of Care Guidelines. Category 4 activities are those that occur in areas that have already been subject to significant ground disturbance. As such, they are unlikely to harm Aboriginal cultural heritage, but care should be taken in case residual Aboriginal cultural heritage values are disturbed. The possibility of residual Aboriginal cultural heritage values existing in the Study Area is high, given the proximity to the river and wetlands. Even if all tangible cultural heritage places (such as archaeological places and scarred trees) have been previously removed, there is strong potential that intangible Aboriginal cultural values will exist within the Study Area.

## 5.5 Potential Mitigations

In accordance with the ACH Act, AECOM and RRC has consulted with representatives of the Darumbal to discuss project background, the proposed levee footprint, potential construction works and potential future archaeological survey and mitigation of cultural heritage artefacts.

Should the project proceed to construction, consultation with the Darumbal should continue, and a CHMA/CHMP be negotiated if required.

## 6.0 Historical Heritage

The following section details the results of register searches, assesses the project's potential impact on historical cultural heritage, and make recommendations for the management of this heritage.

### 6.1 Registered Sites

There are more than 50 registered heritage sites in Rockhampton, 20 of which are located in the Study Area (Table 2). The majority of these are state heritage places, with one commonwealth place (see Appendix A for more detail). These places are listed predominately for their historical value and their aesthetic value both in their own right, and as a part of the Quay Street streetscape. In these listings, Quay Street is variously described as 'a premier Queensland streetscape' (QHR 601582), and as 'the symbol of Rockhampton' (QHR 600811).

Many of the heritage places are also listed for their rarity or representativeness, or their associations with a particular group or person. The Criterion Hotel is the only place to be listed as having research (specifically archaeological) value.

**Table 2 Registered Heritage Places in the Study Area**

Place	Location	Listing
Avonleigh	248 Quay Street	QHR
ABC Radio Studios	236 Quay Street	CHL
Bulletin Building	162-164 Quay Street	QHR
C J Edwards Chambers	174 Quay Street	QHR
Cahill's Stores (former)	232 - 234 Quay Street	QHR
Callianiotis Constructions	178 Quay Street	QHR
Cattle House	180 Quay Street	QHR
Clewett's Building (former)	250 Quay Street	QHR
Commercial Hotel and Chambers (former)	230 Quay Street	QHR
Criterion Hotel	150 Quay Street	QHR
Customs House Rockhampton	208 Quay Street	QHR
Evans & Hearn	206 Quay Street	QHR
Goldsborough Mort Building (Former)	238 Quay Street	QHR
Harbour Board (former)	288 Quay Street	QHR
Luck House	182 Quay Street	QHR
R Rees and Sydney Jones	186 Quay Street	QHR
Rockhampton Club	166 Quay Street	QHR
Royal Bank Building (former)	194 Quay Street	QHR
Trustee Chambers	170 Quay Street	QHR
Walter Reid Court	260 Quay Street	QHR

There are also a number of shipwrecks recorded in the Fitzroy River, however, none of these are located in the Study Area.

### 6.2 Other Heritage Places

In addition to the registered sites listed above, there are some heritage places in the Study Area that are either included on non-statutory registers, or have been proposed for heritage listing. These places currently have no

legal protection, but they are indicative of community heritage concerns, and should be considered as a part of the assessment process.

### 6.2.1 Non-statutory Registers

A number of buildings in Quay Street have individual heritage listings (see previous section), but the streetscape as a whole is also listed on the RNE (RNE 8855), the register superseded by the National and Commonwealth Heritage Lists. Quay Street is described as 'outstanding group of nineteenth century buildings: public buildings, hotels, commercial buildings and residences' and 'one of the best examples of townscape of the period' (RNE 8855).

### 6.2.2 Local Heritage Places

In 2000, Allom Lovell completed the *Urban Heritage and Character Study of Rockhampton*, making a series of recommendations that relate to the Study Area:

- the listing of the Quay Street streetscape on the local heritage register
- the listing of the views along Denham, William and Derby Streets on the local heritage register
- the listing of Quay Street as part of a character area (Precinct 1), conserving heritage buildings and significant views, and restoring heritage plantings where required
- the listing of Depot Hill as a character area (Precinct 2), conserving early residential areas and elevated timber housing in particular
- the listing of Port Curtis as a character area (Precinct 3), conserving its rural setting.

## 6.3 Potential Impacts

Impacts on historical heritage may be either direct or indirect in nature. Direct impacts are those that result from a physical connection between the development activities and the heritage place, such the full or partial demolition of a heritage building. Indirect impacts, on the other hand, are those that affect the heritage place via the surrounding environment, such as vibration from nearby construction works causing damage to a heritage building.

### 6.3.1 Quay Street

The main area of project impact is likely to be in the Quay Street area, where 20 heritage buildings will be within 50m of the proposed works. Impacts to these places may occur during both the construction and operational phases of the project.

#### 6.3.1.1 Construction Phase

There is potential for both direct and indirect impacts during the construction phase, including:

- physical interactions between built heritage and construction materials or machinery, resulting in structural damage
- vibration from construction activities in excess of 2mm/second, resulting in structural damage
- increased dust from surface construction or transport activities resulting in corrosion of fabric
- damage to mature plantings by disturbance of root systems
- disturbance or destruction of subsurface archaeological deposits.

The nature of the proposed works along Quay Street – the construction of concrete foundations for a removable flood barrier – suggests that the most likely impact will be to potential subsurface archaeological deposits along the river bank. Early maps and images of Quay Street show a number of buildings (Figure 4), wharves and other structures ranged along the river bank, traces of which may remain in situ. Given the importance of the Quay Street wharves to Rockhampton and to the development of Queensland as a whole, these deposits have the potential to be of state significance and, as such, would be protected under s. 60 of the QH Act.

### 6.3.1.2 Operational Phase

Operational phase impacts are anticipated to be largely positive. The proximity of the Quay Street heritage places to the Fitzroy River makes them extremely vulnerable to flooding, and this intermittent inundation has the potential to cause short and long term damage to building fabric, and to disturb any archaeological deposits. The installation of the proposed flood barrier would protect the heritage places from this impact, helping to conserve their fabric and significant values.

Any negative impacts during operational phase are likely to be minimal and indirect in nature, and relate to the disruption to the Quay Street streetscape and viewscape. As noted in the heritage listings for a number of Quay Street buildings, Quay Street is one of the most significant heritage streetscapes in Queensland. Key to its heritage value is its relationship with the now demolished wharves and the river, as the listing for Callianiotis Constructions (QHR 600804) states:

*the Quay Street precinct stands as a legacy to the Port of Rockhampton which served central Queensland from 1858. The port was influential in establishing Rockhampton as the premier commercial city of central Queensland and the river wharves fostered the substantial commercial development along Quay Street, enabling it to become the principal business district of the city.*

The importance of the relationship between Rockhampton and the river is also reflected in the proposed local heritage listing of the viewsapes along Denham, William and Derby Streets, which incorporate a number of heritage buildings and their river-side setting.

The flood barrier has the potential to obscure the heritage setting of Quay Street during times of flood, blocking views and disrupting the relationship between heritage listed buildings and the river. This impact would be temporary, however, and would be far outweighed by the positive benefits of flood control.

### 6.3.2 Port Curtis and Depot Hill

Given the generally undeveloped nature of much of Port Curtis and Depot Hill, and the absence of any listed heritage sites, it is unlikely that the project will have a significant impact on heritage values, provided that:

- early residential areas are avoided
- the rural setting is maintained.

## 6.4 Potential Mitigations

The proposed project has the potential to impact places of national, state and possibly local heritage significance. In general, these impacts should be managed in accordance with the heritage policy and legislation framework outlined in Section 3.0. That is:

- where ever possible, project works should avoid heritage places and avoid negatively impacting on heritage values
- cultural heritage awareness training should be included in site induction processes, alerting workers to any heritage places in the vicinity, and outlining appropriate management procedures
- appropriate monitoring and oversight should be in place to protect heritage places and values
- any development in or adjacent to state heritage places may only proceed with the approval of EHP
- any development in or adjacent to commonwealth heritage places may only proceed with the approval of the Department of Environment
- any works to heritage places should be conducted in accordance with the tenets of the Burra Charter
- any damage to heritage places caused by the project should be repaired by suitably qualified professionals and in accordance with the principles of the Burra Charter
- a 'Stop Work' procedure should be activated if any historical archaeological materials are uncovered.

### 6.4.1 Quay Street

The project has the potential to have impact on the heritage values of 20 registered heritage places on Quay Street, as well as on potential archaeological deposits along the riverbank. It is recommended that a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) be developed to manage these impacts. As noted, the Quay Street area

is of high heritage significance, and it is valued by both the local and the wider Queensland community for this reason (Allom Lovell 2000). This value stems not just from the significance of the individual buildings, but also from their relationship with one another and with the river. A CMP would identify the chief values of this precinct and provide guidance on retaining these values not only during the current project, but also during any future developments. The CMP should also give consideration to the management of historical archaeological deposits along the river bank which, as noted, have the potential to be of state significance.

Additionally, development adjacent to state and commonwealth heritage places requires the approval of EHP and the Department of Environment respectively. Appropriate submissions should be made to these bodies, and additional management measures may be required as a result. Such measures may include archaeological test excavation and/or monitoring along the river bank.

In general, the following mitigation measures might be proposed to manage impacts on Quay Street.

#### **6.4.1.1 Construction Phase**

- construction materials not to be stored on or adjacent to heritage places
- construction site traffic to be routed away from heritage places wherever possible
- appropriate traffic management to be employed around heritage places if required
- loose loads to be appropriately covered
- appropriate monitoring and dust management to be implemented at the construction site
- archaeological test pitting and/or monitoring to be employed at places of high archaeological sensitivity
- monitoring to be implemented at heritage places where vibration has the potential to reach or exceed 2mm/second
- structural audit and archival recording to be conducted where vibration has the potential to reach or exceed 2mm/second
- conservation works (e.g. reinforcement or stabilisation) to be conducted in accordance with Burra Charter principles where significant fabric or values are threatened
- any damage to significant fabric to be restored or reconstructed in accordance with Burra Charter principles.

#### **6.4.1.2 Operational Phase Impacts**

- design consideration should be given to any measures that can reduce the visual impact of the levee bank while maintaining its efficacy
- form of levee bank and any associated infrastructure to be sympathetic to surrounding heritage buildings
- relationship between the river and Quay Street to be maintained as much as possible
- interpretive signage to provide information on the heritage values of Quay Street and its relationship to the river.

#### **6.4.2 Port Curtis and Depot Hill**

As noted previously, it is unlikely that the project will have a significant impact on heritage values, provided that:

- early residential areas are avoided
- the rural setting is maintained.

## 7.0 Summary

The proposed Rockhampton levee extends from the Fitzroy Bridge to Port Curtis, and has the potential to impact on 20 historical heritage places along Quay Street, on historical archaeological deposits on the river bank, and on remaining tangible or intangible Aboriginal cultural heritage values.

The following preliminary measures are recommended for the management of these impacts should the project proceed to construction:

- works should avoid heritage places and harm to heritage values wherever possible
- the Aboriginal Party (the Darumbal) should continue to be consulted regarding the project, and a CHMA/CHMP be negotiated if required
- a CMP (prepared by a suitable qualified historical heritage specialist) should be considered for the Quay Street area
- EHP should be consulted regarding development adjacent to state heritage places, or in areas of archaeological sensitivity
- the Department of Environment should be consulted regarding development adjacent to commonwealth heritage places.

From these initial steps, more detailed mitigation measures may be developed for the management of specific places.

## 8.0 References

- Allom Lovell 2000 *Urban Heritage and Character Study: Rockhampton*. Report for Rockhampton City Council.
- Barnard, T., 2009. Missions and Reserves. *Queensland Historical Atlas*. Available at: <http://www.qhatlas.com.au/content/missions-and-reserves>.
- Bird, J.T.S., 1904. *The Early History of Rockhampton, Dealing Chiefly with Events Up Till 1870*, Rockhampton: The Morning Bulletin.
- Donovan, V., 2002. *The Reality of a Dark History: From Contact and Conflict to Cultural Recognition*, Brisbane: Arts Queensland.
- ICOMOS (Australia), 2013. *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*, Burwood, Victoria: Australia ICOMOS. Available at: [http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/BURRA\\_CHARTER.pdf](http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/BURRA_CHARTER.pdf).
- Lilley, I., Brian, D., Clarkson, C., Ulm S., 1999. Pleistocene aboriginal occupation at Cania Gorge, Central Queensland: Preliminary results of fieldwork. *Archaeology in Oceania*, 33, pp.28–31.
- McNiven, I., 1991. Teewah Beach: new evidence for Holocene coastal occupation in southeast Queensland. *Australian Archaeology*, 33, pp.14–27.
- Morwood, M.J., 1989. Caching and Native Well: A Reply to Hiscock. *Archaeology in Oceania*, 24(1), pp.37–88.
- Morwood, M.J., 2002. *Visions from the Past: The Archaeology of Australian Aboriginal Art*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Queensland Environmental Protection Agency, 2006. *Using the criteria: a methodology*, Brisbane: Queensland Government.
- Richards, J., 2005. “A Question of Necessity”: *The Native Police in Queensland*. Griffith University.
- Ulm, S. & Reid, J., 2000. Index of Dates from Archaeological Sites in Queensland. *Queensland Archaeological Research*, 12, pp.1–129.
- Westcott, C., Lilley, I.A.N. & Ulm, S., 1999. The archaeology of Cania Gorge: An overview. *Queensland Archaeological Research*, 11, pp.15–28.

## Appendix A

# Heritage Listings

## Appendix A Heritage Listings

**Place Name**

Avonleigh



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

248 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600813

**Construction**

1885-1906

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Bulletin Building



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

162-164 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

601582

**Construction**

1926

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☒ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

Also listed on the RNE (17547)

**Place Name**

C J Edwards Chambers



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

174 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600803

**Construction**

1914

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☒ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Cahill's Stores (former)



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

232 - 234 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600811

**Construction**

1889

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☐ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Callianiotis Constructions



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

178 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600804

**Construction**

c. 1886 – 1960s

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Cattle House



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

180 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600805

**Construction**

1903-1904

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☐ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Clewett's Building (former)



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

250 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600814

**Construction**

1887

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☒ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☐ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☐ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Commercial Hotel and Chambers (former)



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

230 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600810

**Construction**

1898

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☒ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☐ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Criterion Hotel



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

150 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**
☐ NHL   ☐ CHL   ☒ QHR   ☐ HSW
**ID**

600800

**Construction**

1889-1890

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☒ Research
- ☒ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Customs House Rockhampton



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

208 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600817

**Construction**

1863-1900

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☒ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☒ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

Also listed on the RNE (8857)

**Place Name**

Evans &amp; Hearn



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

206 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600809

**Construction**

1870s

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Goldsborough Mort Building (Former)



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

238 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**
☐ NHL   ☐ CHL   ☒ QHR   ☐ HSW
**ID**

601489

**Construction**

1899

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☐ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Harbour Board (former)



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

288 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**
☐ NHL   ☐ CHL   ☒ QHR   ☐ HSW
**ID**

600816

**Construction**

1898

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

Also listed on the RNE (8856)

**Place Name**

Luck House



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

182 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600806

**Construction**

1861-1884

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☐ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

R Rees and Sydney Jones



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

186 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**
☐ NHL   ☐ CHL   ☒ QHR   ☐ HSW
**ID**

600807

**Construction**

1880

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☒ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Rockhampton Club



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

166 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600801

**Construction**

1892-1893

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Royal Bank Building (former)



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

194 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**
☐ NHL    ☐ CHL    ☒ QHR    ☐ HSW
**ID**

600808

**Construction**

1888

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical  
☐ Rarity  
☐ Research  
☐ Representativeness  
☒ Aesthetic  
☐ Creative or technical  
☐ Social, cultural or spiritual association  
☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Trustee Chambers



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

170 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600802

**Construction**

1876-1877

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☐ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

Walter Reid Court



Image courtesy QHR

**Location**

260 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☐ CHL ☒ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

600815

**Construction**

1893-1918

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☒ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☒ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☒ Special association

**Notes**

**Place Name**

ABC Radio Studios



Image courtesy CHL

**Location**

236 Quay Street, ROCKHAMPTON

**Register**☐ NHL ☒ CHL ☐ QHR ☐ HSW**ID**

105420

**Construction**

1897

**Significance**

- ☒ Historical
- ☐ Rarity
- ☐ Research
- ☒ Representativeness
- ☒ Aesthetic
- ☐ Creative or technical
- ☐ Social, cultural or spiritual association
- ☐ Special association

**Notes**

Also included on the RNE (8853)