Executive Summary

Thomas Ball’s Pottery

The pottery
The archaeological site at 710-722 George Street, Haymarket, contained remains associated with Australia’s oldest excavated pottery site and one of Australia’s earliest potteries – Thomas Ball’s Pottery (c.1801-1823). It was located in the Haymarket, initially part of the early Brickfields, because of good clay sources and closeness to water, natural creeklines which emptied into Cockle Bay (later Darling Harbour). A series of pits containing pottery wasters from Thomas Ball’s pottery were found and excavated. There was 650 kg of pottery, not including pottery saggers and kiln furniture. Among the 55,182 fragments of pottery, as well as 1220 fragments of pottery used as kiln furniture, were 2683 identified vessels. Most of the pottery was lead-glazed vessels (2625 Estimated Vessel Equivalent or 49,452 sherds) with some slipped (46 EVE or 567 sherds) and self-slipped (12 EVE or 60 sherds). The greater majority of the pottery was fine earthenware (95%) but also included coarse earthenware (4%) and most surprisingly stoneware (1%).

The majority of Ball’s pottery was utilitarian (72%) in quality and function but also identified were some medium (27%) and finer quality vessels (1%). While sherds and parts of utilitarian vessels had previously been found on sites in Sydney only some of the medium and finer vessels were known. The utilitarian shapes included: pans (309 EVE), bowls (156), crocks (140), chamber pots (25), jars (105) and variations of these shapes. The medium quality vessels included bowls (159 EVE), dishes (336), lids (19), pans (59), and plates (14). Many of these involved some type of decoration. The finer vessels, typically with a thin bodied fabric, included: bowls (46), dishes (10) as well as a few cups and saucers.

The range of decorated pottery was astonishing, with 59 different slip-painted decorations on 433 EVE vessels (1246 sherds). Many were decorated with green and brown patterns of lines and dots on a yellow background. Other decorative techniques were 12 incised decorations (12) and three different rouletted or coggled bands (24 EVE) impressed into the vessels. Other decorative techniques included 14 vessels in agate or ‘marbled’ ware, where two differently coloured clays were worked together, and 17 green speckled vessels, possibly imitating green porphyry. The most likely influences on the decorative techniques, notably for the hollow vessels, are the British factory-made slip wares more typically found on creamware and pearlware. These were the cheapest decorated pottery made in Britain that were contemporary with Ball’s period of manufacture in Sydney. Ball was a potter within the late eighteenth-century British traditions and was a better potter than a decorator and therefore probably worked within the more specialised workshops of Staffordshire, where he was born, where potters were trained in specific aspects of the potter’s skills rather than developing expertise in all areas of manufacture.

The Kiln and its Furniture
The redeposited debris from Thomas Ball’s Pottery shows that he fired his wares in a wood-fuelled updraught clamp or possibly Scotch-type kiln sunk into the ground surface. It had a (near) permanent lower sandstock brick wall bonded and lined with clay and at least one corbelled flue. The temporary domed or curved superstructure was made of hand-applied layers of clay containing fragments of previous walling, clay kiln furniture (bobs) and lined on the interior with pottery sherds to provide extra strength and better thermal retention.

Most of the bricks used by Ball to build the kiln were moulded and then fired in wood-fuelled clamp kilns by government gangs or small independent brick and tile manufacturers who operated at Brickfield Hill. The few denser bricks that had been shaped by Ball to create one or more corbelled flues as well as one of the specialised ‘kiln bricks’ were possibly imported from Britain. The
chamber floor was made using kiln bricks with cells and pierced holes to efficiently transfer heat up from the wood-fired flue(s). Ball would have reconstructed the upper part of the kiln after every firing and when the bricks had seriously deteriorated after a number of firings it would have been rebuilt from scratch, reusing whatever materials were viable.

To stack the pottery and other products in the firing chamber Ball used a wide range of kiln furniture. These fall into three categories: formal wheel, hand-shaped and pre-fired forms; informal clay forms, some of which were hand-shaped; and reused broken fired pottery and recycled sandstock clay roof tiles.

Results of the Archaeological Excavation
The site showed no evidence of Aboriginal occupation of the area. Pollen analysis of material from the site revealed that the 1788 landscape was characterised by open casuarina woodland with a grassy understorey. Erosion evidence suggested the land was cleared rapidly with subsequent water action carrying away much of the loosely compacted topsoil, and dynamic gullies were created on the slope of Brickfield Hill.

Thomas Ball’s pottery made use of the site in the early 1800s (c1801-1823), when brickmaking and pottery manufacturers were concentrated in the area. Evidence of Thomas Ball’s pottery was found in the form of large quantities of pottery wasters, small reservoirs and part of a large clay extraction pit.

By 1823 the haphazard and permissive property boundaries had been consolidated and three lots formed the study area. By the mid 1820s the Woolpack Inn was built in Lot 2 on the southern part of the site. Archaeological evidence of the Woolpack included foundations, underfloor deposits, a cesspit and drainage. The underfloor deposits yielded large quantities of alcohol bottles consistent with the use of the building as a public house. Some spatial interpretation was also possible from this material, with one room in particular being associated with food preparation. It was at the rear of the building and was probably the kitchen of the inn. Evidence of dining and drinking was apparent in all of the ground floor rooms. Also many clay pipes were found within the underfloor deposits. The hotel occupied the lot until 1881.

On Lot 3, in the centre of the site, a timber structure had been built by 1823, but no convincing archaeological evidence of this was found. The first evidence of structures in Lot 3 was from the early 1840s or very late 1830s. Remains of a timber structure and two brick structures were found from this period. Sandstone footings and a cesspit belonged to the brick structures but there was no evidence of occupation deposits. The timber building was represented by a fireplace and some occupation-related material that had been unfortunately contaminated by later historical events. The alignments of the buildings during this period suggested that some liberties had been taken with the street-front boundary, and the brick structures may have extended beyond it onto George Street.

In the northern part of the site (Lot 4) the earliest evidence came from the remains of a brick building constructed in the early 1840s or very late 1830s. This building was represented by sandstone foundations, an underfloor deposit, a well and two cesspits. The structure lasted until the early 1880s. The underfloor deposit was an accumulation covering 30 or 40 years in one ground-floor room. It largely represented domestic use, although the premises were used as a grocery store over much of this time.

In the early 1860s Lot 3 was redeveloped and three new two-storey structures were built on the lot. These buildings were represented in the archaeological record by sandstone footings and cesspits.
There was no occupation material associated with these buildings. The buildings were added to over their lifetimes so that by 1901 structures covered the whole lot. They were demolished in the early twentieth century.

Cesspits throughout the site reflected backfilling events only. Although littered with domestic artefacts, conjoins were found across lots and no deposit could be related directly to occupation of a single building. The cesspits were most likely backfilled in the 1870/80s with items of household rubbish such as broken crockery and bottles. Significantly there was very little organic material and faunal remains were rare in the fills.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background
Casey & Lowe were commissioned to undertake the archaeological excavation of the site at 710-722 George Street, Haymarket. The site is on the corner of Campbell Street and was therefore at the very edge of early British settlement and within the historic area called the Brickfields by late 1788. Casey & Lowe were commissioned by Parkview, the builders, on behalf of Inmark, the developers. We undertook an archaeological assessment of the site, as 710-718 George Street was identified in the City of Sydney Archaeological Zoning plan, while the whole of the development area covered 710-722 George Street. The eastern part of the site, 720-722, was identified in the zoning plan as having no archaeological potential. The assessment, therefore, did not cover the historical background for 720-722 George Street. It was only because we thought that that the eastern area of the site was possibly part of the property on which Thomas Ball operated his pottery that we discussed with Iain Stuart at the Heritage Branch the need to do testing there to confirm the identified model of it having no archaeological potential. Testing on this area, however, indicated that the eastern part of the site had considerable archaeological potential, including remains of the Woolpack Inn and a series of waster pits containing many thousands of pottery sherds from vessels manufactured by Thomas Ball between c1801 and 1823.

The archaeological program was undertaken under S140 approval 2008/S140/05, issued on 1 August 2008. Archaeological fieldwork commenced at 710-722 George Street on 18 August 2008 when monitoring works started and was finalised on 16 October 2008.

Cataloguing of the artefacts recovered from the site commenced in mid-2009. The sheer quantity of pottery and other artefacts recovered from the activities of Thomas Ball’s Pottery has necessitated an extensive and protracted cataloguing program. Its significance is unrivalled in Australian archaeology in terms of its date (c1801-1823) and the sheer quantity of the material. This is the earliest pottery site so far excavated in Australia, representing the beginnings of local manufacturing.

1.2 Excavation Methodology
The site was excavated from east to northwest following the street frontage and in line with the client’s needs to provide access to certain areas of the site. Open area excavation was undertaken using an excavator with a flat edged bucket to open up the site. The site was relatively small and because of the need to backfill for the piling machines, at the completion of the archaeological program, the central area of the site beneath the spoil heap could only be excavated once the street frontages were completed and backfilled. The central area was basically monitored and identified features were excavated and recorded. Also we were not able to excavate in part of the eastern area until the site sheds were placed on the hoarding which occurred towards the end of the excavation program. The main series of waster pits were found beneath the site sheds area which involved some additional week or so of excavation.

The areas were cleaned and recorded, using 1:50 scale drawings, context sheets, digital, colour side and black & white print photography, as well as video recording. Detailed excavation of underfloor deposits involved setting out a 500x500mm grid and excavation in 50mm spits. Cesspits contents

1 Casey & Lowe 2008 Archaeological Assessment, 710-722 George Street, Haymarket.
were excavated in 200mm spits. All artefacts were labelled with their context numbers, areas and dates.

1.3 Report Methodology
This report is intended to respond to the standard conditions set by the NSW Heritage Council to produce a report presenting the results of the archaeological program. The report includes:
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1.4 Research Questions
The archaeological research questions for the site were identified in: Excavation Permit Application, 710-722 George Street, Haymarket, Sydney, for Parkview, June 2008. They have been modified slightly where necessary to address issues arising out of the course of the excavation and from additional historical information that has become available regarding the study site. The relevant Research Questions addressed in this report relate to the changing use of the site over time:

1. Brickfields and Permissive Occupancy
This phase of occupation may contain archaeological evidence that will relate to the following questions:

i How the early Europeans set about clearing the land for extensive brickfield production.

ii What type of early clay products were being produced beside bricks? Did these include clay roofing tiles, general household ceramics and other items?
What is the evidence for how these clay products were moulded, fired, and dried?
General questions relating to the manufacturing process undertaken at the site.
An area of interest is the manufacture of early lead-glazed ceramics in the Brickfields.
Recent archaeological work and analysis at the Pitt & Campbell Streets site and in Parramatta has shown that this material was definitely being manufactured in the Brickfields. How does the archaeological information from this site expand on this new understanding?
It is likely that people were living in the Brickfields from the earliest days of the Colony. Is there evidence to support this assertion? If there is evidence of the conditions they were living under? How limited was their material culture? How does it relate to other evidence for early occupation of Sydney found in the Rocks and Parramatta? What are the differences?
Other questions will relate to the evidence for early trading with other countries including England and China.

Section 4 addresses the relevant sections of the Brickfield and pottery-related questions.

2. Residential Occupation, Part of Town, from c.1823
This covers the period of Thomas Buckton’s ownership and occupancy, the subsequent sale and sub-division of the estate into lots and early occupancy by George Richards, Michael Joyce and Thomas Ryan of the two properties on George Street. This phase of occupation coincides with the establishment of the Woolpack Inn and nearby buildings. Specific questions that address this phase of the site relate to:

i The type and nature of early private housing and commercial premises in Sydney. This site may contain some remains associated with businesses, houses, gardens and other structures. What type of houses did they build in this part of the colony? Are there differences in layout, size, and orientation which illustrate the various site activities and the transformation of early Sydney by the processes of urbanisation.

ii What can the artefacts, deposits and features associated with their houses tell us about the living standards of the residents of the early colony? What changes are happening by the mid-nineteenth century to domestic markets and their relationship to trade with overseas countries and how are they reflected by the occupants of this site?

iii Comparison of the archaeological remains from these houses and later commercial/residential housing may provide a valuable insight into the variation between different people living in the one location in early Sydney.

We note that due to budgetary and timing constraints there will be no specific response to these questions. A number of the issues raised in these questions are addressed in Sections 3 and 5.

3. Nature of Slums and areas of ‘Vice’

i Is there evidence for the presence of a slum area on the site in the 1850s? Does it support or disagree with those perceptions stated by William Jevons in 1858 as this block being the worst in Sydney through its association with the surrounding pubs and Durand’s Alley which connected to the site through a ‘right of way’? Was it a haunt of vice and disreputable persons?
What type of archaeological evidence might support the statements made by Jevons:
- The presence of large quantities of alcohol and drugs, such as opium.
- Evidence for prostitution: contraceptives, costume jewellery, evidence for numerous women living at a residence rather than a family.
- Poor living conditions: overcrowding, poor building standards, unsanitary conditions compared with other sites.

ii How does the evidence from this site compare with other ‘slum’ areas in Sydney, such as the Quadrant site, the adjacent Cunningham Lane site and the Rocks, Pyrmont and Surry Hills?
We note that due to budgetary and timing constraints there will be no specific response to these questions. A number of the issues raised in these questions issues are addressed in Sections 3 and 5.

4. General questions addressed to all phases of the site relating to processes of Immigration, Urbanisation, the Economy and Consumerism, Gender, Ethnicity, Personal Identity and Material Culture.

i What were the expectations of immigrants when they arrived in the early nineteenth century? Were the expectations of convicts and free settlers different? How do these aspirations represent themselves in the material culture of early nineteenth-century Sydney and late nineteenth-century Sydney? How were these artefacts used to construct and re-construct personal identity once people they arrived in the colony and experienced a different environment and social conditions?

ii An examination of the archaeological material from all phases of the site’s occupation should help us understand the process of urbanisation in this part of the city. The identified phases should relate to changes in the urbanisation of the city and the archaeological evidence of these phases should provide insight into how this process altered the material behaviour of the occupants of the site. This process includes changes in sanitary practices, access to markets, domestication of the topography and other areas of evidence.

iii The processes of urbanisation are also closely connected to questions relating to the economy and consumerism. How and when people bought ceramics and other artefacts can help us begin to understand the behaviour of these early European occupants.

iv A comparison of the remains from all phases of the occupation of the site should provide valuable information relating to questions of ethnicity and gender. How the material culture reflects changing occupation of the structures. Is the ethnicity of the occupants of the houses and shops, from all periods of occupation, identifiable in the archaeological record? What is the nature of the evidence: refuse patterns, type of objects used, type of food eaten, cooking methods and so on?

v How does the evidence from this part of the city relate to or differ from other sites in the Haymarket, the Rocks and the Pyrmont-Ultimo peninsula?

5. Local-pottery manufacturing

Questions relating to local manufacture of pottery in the Brickfields were briefly mentioned in Question 1 iv. Due to the extensive material found associated with local pottery-manufacturing this question needs to be considerably expanded to further our understanding of this early pottery.

- What is the nature and range of the pottery manufactured by Thomas Ball at his pottery at the base of Brickfield Hill? Is it a mixture of utilitarian and finer table and teaware as indicated from the wasters found at Pitt and Campbell Streets?
- What does the pottery tell us about Ball’s training, skills, materials, techniques and understanding of pottery manufacturing techniques and technology? In effect how did he manufacture pottery and other products in the Brickfields?
- Analysis of the pottery sherds was undertaken using the methodology established by Mary Casey in 1999 and further developed in subsequent years. This is based on a vessel shape type-series and typically quantified using minimum vessel counts but because of the sheer quantity of material we have adopted an Estimated Vessel Equivalent (EVE) based on rim counts with some specialised other sherds being counted.
- Analysis of evidence of manufacturing flaws, notably problems when firing the kiln, stacking, glazing and such.
1.5 Heritage Significance
The Statement of Heritage Significance from the Archaeological Assessment 710-722 George Street, Haymarket, Sydney, June 2008, is reproduced below.

1.5.1 Original Statement of Heritage Significance
This study area has the potential to contain archaeological remains that are historic, rare and representative of life in Sydney for more than two hundred years. These remains have the ability to address a range of research questions. The various phases of occupation the study area is associated with are:

- late eighteenth-century brick and pottery works and brickfield-period occupation.
- George Richards and Michael Joyce, both former convicts, and their occupation and ownership of these properties.
- mid-century commercial and residential housing and its association with the area’s description as a ‘slum’ and associated with ‘vice’ during the 1850s.
- the evolution and urbanisation of Sydney from the early colony through to the early twentieth-century urban city. The pattern of urbanisation of the area shows that it reflects its economic connection with the markets and wider economic shifts.

This site has the ability to provide access to knowledge about a part of Sydney’s history that is only beginning to be discovered.

The study area, through the excavation and analysis of its archaeological remains, has potential to illustrate the cultural differences, aspirations and values of an evolving European culture from the early 1800s as well as the social life and working and living conditions of colonial and convict society.

The deposits, relics, structures, features and artefacts associated with this site have the potential to reveal much about the urbanisation and industrialisation of Sydney, the evolving relationship between the living and working lives of the individuals and families who resided there, the transformation of the resources through dynamic changes in ethnicity of residents, the construction and reorganisation of gender relations and the interplay of cultural groups. The low to moderate archaeological potential of this site means that its ability to answer research questions is limited by what is likely to survive because of twentieth-century impacts and repeated nineteenth-century rebuilding. While there are clearly impacts on this site the nature of any surviving archaeological evidence is important and means that it has to be assessed as having State heritage significance.

1.5.2 Review of Statement of Significance
Other than the waster pits, the clay extraction pits and some general landscape changes to the site and its soil profile, little evidence of the Brickfield-period survived. In addition, the pre-1830s occupation did not survive to allow us to interpret it with any significant degree of confidence other than some post holes, mostly because the impacts from the post-1830s buildings. The remains of the Woolpack Inn were found in an area predicted by the Archaeological Zoning plan to have no archaeological potential. We tested in this area because of the likelihood that 720-722 George Street was associated with Thomas Ball through the later ownership by Thomas Buckton. This turned out to be a correct assumption, though the main site of the kilns was probably on the property immediately to the east and was excavated out for the existing basement carpark several years ago.

1.5.3 Revised Statement of Heritage Significance
This study area contained archaeological remains that are historic, rare and representative of life in Sydney for more than 200 years. These remains have the ability to address a range of research questions. The various phases of occupation the study area is associated with are:
Late eighteenth-century brick and pottery works and brickfield-period occupation, and the nature of Thomas Ball’s pottery dating from c1801-1823, Australia’s earliest discovered pottery. Thomas Ball was an emancipated convict who trained as a potter in Staffordshire. The excavation of these remains has found many previously unknown pottery types and decorations. The detailed analysis of the pottery and the kiln remains and kiln furniture can help us significantly expand our understanding of locally-manufactured pottery during the early years of the settlement and the way it was probably used by the residents of early Sydney.

The remains of the Woolpack Inn, including an underfloor deposit and cesspit deposit, help us to address questions relating to the nature of public houses and the people who used them.

Mid-century commercial and residential housing and its association with the area’s description as a ‘slum’ and associated with ‘vice’ during the 1850s.

The evolution and urbanisation of Sydney from the early colony through to the early twentieth-century urban city. The pattern of urbanisation of the area shows that it reflects its economic connection with the markets and wider economic shifts.

This archaeology of this site has the ability to provide access to knowledge about a part of Sydney’s history that is only beginning to be discovered.

The study area, through the excavation and analysis of its archaeological remains, has the ability to illustrate the cultural differences, aspirations and values of an evolving European culture from the early 1800s as well as the social life, and working and living conditions of colonial and convict society.

The deposits, relics, structures, features and artefacts associated with this site have the ability to reveal much about the urbanisation and industrialisation of Sydney, the evolving relationship between the living and working lives of the individuals and families who resided there, the transformation of the resources through dynamic changes in ethnicity of residents, the construction and reorganisation of gender relations and the interplay of cultural groups. While there were clearly impacts on this site the nature of the surviving archaeological evidence was important and means that the initial assessment of having State heritage significance is endorsed by the findings.

### 1.6 Artefacts and Samples

There are 260 boxes of artefacts and samples from this archaeological project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of boxes</th>
<th>Box numbers within each category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural/ Building materials</td>
<td>14 boxes in total, of those - 12, 1, 1</td>
<td>1 to 14, 1 to 12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar and plaster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate and tile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics (non-Thomas Ball)</td>
<td>16 boxes in total, of those - 4, 12</td>
<td>40 to 49, 51 to 55², and 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40 to 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine earthenware and Chinese ceramics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44 to 49, 51 to 55, 116³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Note that all ceramics, both those associated with Thomas Ball and those not attributed to him, are contained in boxes which form part of a single numbering system.

³ Note that box 116 is larger than other boxes and contains bulky, glued ceramics.
### Ceramics (Thomas Ball, including lead glaze, slipped and self-slipped)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Boxes</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type series examples</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130 and 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated vessels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7, 8, 108, 118 and 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of vessels showing re-use in stacking the kiln</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115 and 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned samples from scientific analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of knobs and handles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of faux stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of ‘dross’ found in waster pits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 131 boxes in total of those -

### Glass

- Special finds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boxes</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 to 38, 40 to 45, 48 to 50&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Metal

- 6 boxes

### Miscellaneous

- 7 boxes

### Organic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Boxes</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibre, matting and hair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 1, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Animal bone

- 6 boxes

### Shell

- 2 boxes

### Kiln building materials and Kiln Furniture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Boxes</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Building Materials</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 to 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Furniture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16 to 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Soil & Pollen samples

- 3 boxes

### Brick samples

- 12 boxes

### Mortar samples

- 1 box

### Building material samples (slate & tile)

- 1 box

#### 1.6.1 Stage 2 Re-cataloguing

The following boxes were reviewed as part of Stage 2 re-cataloguing:

1-5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 22, 24, 27, 29, 35, 36, 37, 56, 58, 60, 69, 71, 72, 75-78, 81, 83, 85, 86, 91, 92, 111, 114. These boxes, excepted for decorated ones, are being sent to the Inmark storage.

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that box 128 is currently empty after stage 2 re-cataloguing, but has been retained in the ceramics box number for use in the stage 3 review.

<sup>5</sup> Note that box numbers 39, 46 and 47 were not used in the glass box number sequence.
1.6.2 Stage 3 re-cataloguing
Boxes retained by Casey & Lowe for Stage 3 re-cataloguing:

Boxes to remain with Casey & Lowe for the time being:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of boxes</th>
<th>Number of Boxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulk boxes of lead glaze ceramics (yellow dots)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxes of lead glaze ceramics retained for stage 3 reviewing (blue dots)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Furniture (rings &amp; spurs)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of box number of lead-glazed ceramics boxes which have not been reviewed and which are being retained by Casey & Lowe for Stage 2 re-cataloguing (blue dots):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box number</th>
<th>Brief description of box contents (where applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Handpainted vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Handpainted vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Examples of ‘Faux Stoneware’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Incised vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Examples of vessels showing re-use in the kiln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Handpainted vessels (HP Unid)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
120
121
122
125
126
127
128 Currently empty – retained for use in stage 3 review
129 Examples of vessels showing re-use in the kiln
130 Type series examples
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141 Type series examples, knob & handle examples, SEM samples
143
147 Combined decoration vessels

A list of bulk boxes of lead glaze ceramics (yellow dots)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box Number</th>
<th>Context number</th>
<th>Catalogue numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7645</td>
<td>85558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7645</td>
<td>85804-85806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7645</td>
<td>85806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7645</td>
<td>85806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7645</td>
<td>85806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>7645</td>
<td>85806-85827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>86403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>86403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>86638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>86800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>86800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>86800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>86800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>7460</td>
<td>86800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87700-87708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>7662</td>
<td>87851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: this box was also reviewed, as it contained smaller catalogue items, but has been included in the count of bulk boxes given here.
Details of kiln furniture box retained by Casey & Lowe:
Box 16 of the Kiln furniture box sequence has been retained for the moment by Casey & Lowe. Its contents is comprised of placing rings and spurs.

1.6.3 Details of miscellaneous boxes retained by Casey & Lowe:
All seven boxes of miscellaneous artefacts have been retained for the moment by Casey & Lowe.

A key to coloured dots on lead-glaze pottery boxes:
- **Red** = reviewed boxes of lead glaze ceramics (to be taken to on-site storage).
- **Blue** = boxes of lead glaze ceramics to be retained for Stage 3 reviewing (to remain with Casey & Lowe for the moment).
- **Yellow** = bulk boxes of lead glaze ceramics (to be retained for Stage 3 cataloguing).

1.6.4 Boxes to be taken to on-site storage at the new Inmark building on the site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of boxes</th>
<th>Number of Boxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed boxes of lead glaze ceramics (red dots)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural/Building Materials</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics (non-Thomas Ball)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Bone</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Building Materials and Kiln Furniture</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil &amp; Pollen Samples</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead-glazed boxes to be stored at Inmark building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramics (Thomas Ball, including lead glaze, slipped and self-slipped)</th>
<th>35 boxes in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed boxes (red dots)</td>
<td>1-5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 24, 27, 29, 35, 36, 37, 56, 58, 60, 69, 71, 72, 75-78, 81, 83, 85, 86, 91, 92, 111, 114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7 Limitations
As with any project it is hard to produce the ideal final report. In the case of this report the sheer quantity of locally-made pottery from Thomas Ball's Pottery overwhelmed any reasonable or considered budget. We would ideally have wanted to spend another 2 to 4 months cataloguing the unrevised 75 per cent of this pottery as Stage 3. The fact that we proceeded to Stage 2 re-cataloguing (review of 25% of all locally-made pottery contexts, all decorated sherds and all kiln furniture etc) means that we did not have confidence in our data. We now have considerable more confidence in our data and feel that we can adequately address the nature of the resource for the purposes of saying something considered.

The focus of this report and the reporting and cataloguing program has been on the locally-made pottery which means that while there are other periods of the site that warrant further research we are unable to address this as well as we would like, notably the Woolpack Inn and other contexts at the site. This relates to the significance of the Ball Pottery, which is Australia’s earliest pottery site yet excavated and the only one for which a detailed excavation report has been produced.

We note that we hope to finalise the Stage 3 cataloguing and then proceed to publication of the results of this work.

1.8 Authorship
This report has been produced by the team of archaeologists at Casey & Lowe Pty Ltd. A number of people contributed to all phases of the project leading to its final production and are listed below. The archaeological program was co-directed by Abi Cryerhall and Dr Mary Casey. Abi was responsible for the day to day on site excavation and the management of the post-excitation work relating to the trench reports and plans. Dr Mary Casey, Director, Casey & Lowe, managed the excavation report. Members of the team contributed to various phases of the work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Casey</td>
<td>Overall carriage of this report. Wrote Sections 1, considerable portions of Section 2 and the first half of Section 4 on the Thomas Ball Pottery, Sections 4.1 to 4.7. Mary was responsible for the design of the report, the redesign of the lead-glaze pottery database and reviewed all trench reports as well as other sections of this report. Mary re-catalogued most of the decorated pottery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abi Cryerhall</td>
<td>Wrote Trench Report B with Beau Spry, supervised and reviewed Trench Reports A and C. Her interpretation of the site as Co-Director informed most of the interpretation in Section 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hincks</td>
<td>Was a senior archaeologist on the excavation project. He was responsible for writing the Synthesis of the Results (Section 3) and considerably added to our understanding of how the early landform was modified during this reporting. As part of this he reviewed and amended the trench reports and matrices for the three areas and resolved outstanding context issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Stocks</td>
<td>Cataloguing of pottery kiln flaws, kiln furniture and, saggars, and general kiln evidence as well as Miscellaneous and supervision of the cataloguing of the Seeds, Organics, Metals and Building Materials. Robyn participated in the redesign of the database interface for the lead-glaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Stocks</td>
<td>Managed production of photos for her sections of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Winnett</td>
<td>Managed a team of volunteers for part of the project. She did the first part of the decorative type series. Contributed text on pipes and small finds to Section 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadette McCall</td>
<td>Undertook the Stage 1 cataloguing of the majority of the Thomas Ball Pottery. As part of this she managed a team of volunteers for part of the project. She did the first part of the decorative type series. Contributed text on pipes and small finds to Section 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Winnett</td>
<td>Undertook the Stage 1 cataloguing of the majority of the Thomas Ball Pottery. As part of this she managed a team of volunteers for part of the project. She did the first part of the decorative type series. Jenny also wrote some preliminary text for this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadette McCall</td>
<td>Undertook most of the Stage 2 re-cataloguing of the 25 per cent sample of the lead-glazed pottery and compiled a glossary of manufacturing faults (Appendix 4.3). Bernadette also wrote and reviewed sections of the final report and undertook additional historical research which was incorporated into Sections 2 and 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Ward</td>
<td>Undertook the cataloguing of the ceramics and the last 25 per cent of the Thomas Ball Pottery Stage 1 cataloguing program. Rowan wrote the majority of Section 5 as well as the Ceramic Report (Section 9.1) and contributed to Section 2. Rowan also managed the production of photos for her sections of the report and the cataloguing program as well as some of the Ball pottery. In addition she reviewed and annotated the Type Series drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Miskella</td>
<td>Was the Supervisor of Areas A and C and wrote trench reports for Area A and C. Produced the computer plans for the site and reviewed aspects of all trench reports. Finalised and reviewed all lists in Appendix 5.1 and 5.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Harris</td>
<td>Catalogued the glass artefacts and wrote the specialist report, Section 9.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Pitt</td>
<td>Wrote his honours thesis on aspects of Thomas Ball’s pottery part of which are presented in Section 9.2. Nick assisted with many aspects to help us finalise the report acting as Research Assistant to Mary Casey and Robyn Stocks. He was also involved in early stages of sorting the pottery and produced a first go at the bobs types series. Produced the type series illustrations in Appendix 4. He was responsible for final report production for Vols 2-5. Nick also contributed research to parts of Chapter 4 and wrote some parts of Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Reidel</td>
<td>Undertook all site planning and inked the Site Plans and drew all type series drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Plim</td>
<td>Undertook historical research for the Archaeological Assessment and additional research for Lot 2 and the Woolpack Inn once we realised archaeology survived within this part of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Macphail</td>
<td>Mike Macphail Section 9.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Maxwell</td>
<td>Archive of site photos and photo lists. He also undertook additional historical research and transcribed a number of Thomas Ball-related documents as well as cataloguing seeds and organic artefacts under the supervision of Robyn Stocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau Spry</td>
<td>Assistant archaeologists on site, he co-wrote the Area B trench report and catalogued the building materials and pottery and kiln furniture. Robyn also managed the production of photos for her sections of the report. Robyn contributed text on pipes and small finds to Section 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figures
Figure 2.1: Lesueur’s 1802 plan of the satellite village at the head of Cockle Bay. The approximate location of the study area is shown with a red circle. North is at the top as is the main settlement of Sydney. We do not consider this plan to be an accurate survey but rather a sketch of the general locality. Detail from Charles Alexandre Lesueur’s Plan de la ville de Sydney: (Capitale des colonies Anglaises aux Terres Australes), NLA map raa2-s32.
Figure 2.2: Lesueur’s complete 1802 plan showing the relationship of the Brickfield village to the main settlement. North is to the right. Charles Alexandre Lesueur’s Plan de la ville de Sydney: (Capitale des colonies Anglaises aux Terres Australes), NLA map raa2-s32.
Figure 2.3: Detail of Meehan’s 1807 plan showing the approximate location of the study area (circled in red). The study area is in the vicinity of early buildings. North is to the top. Detail from Plan of the town of Sydney in New South Wales by Jas. Meehan, NLA map f105b.
Figure 2.4: Plan from 1831 showing buildings on the George Street frontage within the study area (arrowed). The Cattle Markets stretch between George and Elizabeth streets and between Campbell and Hay streets. Hoddle, Larmer and Mitchell, Map of the Town of Sydney, 1831. Kelly & Crocker 1978:15.
Figure 2.5: Brickfield Hill, George Street, near the corner of Liverpool and George Street, 1873, looking south. The study area is out of picture on the left. ML, SLNSW, SPF/535.
Figure 2.6: 1830-31 survey showing the lot divisions. These divisions remained constant throughout the nineteenth century. North is at the top of the image. Detail from City Section Survey Plans, 1833, Section 02, City of Sydney Archives: Historical Atlas of Sydney.
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<td>Worked as a volunteer for Jenny Winnett and once she started working as an intern at Casey &amp; Lowe was involved in many stages of the post-excavation stage of the project and was responsible for a lot of the data entry, production of tables etc. Wrote Section 4.8 to 4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Workman</td>
<td>Spent many hours taking photographs of artefacts from the site. All artefact photos in the report were taken by Russell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Robson</td>
<td>Redesigned our Access database to deal with the lead-glazed pottery component and set up the new type series forms with image attachments. Provided database advice generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Semper</td>
<td>Mary was responsible for a lot of the data entry of the miscellaneous, organics, building materials and metals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.7: Harper’s 1823 plan showing the two structures on the site. The site boundary is shown in red and the lines of the structures have been enhanced. The building that corresponds to the Woolpack Inn is in the lower left corner of the site. The red line indicates the present study area and the purple line is the likely footprint of Thomas Ball’s Pottery. A building possibly associated with Ball’s pottery is arrowed. Detail from Harper’s *Map of Sydney*, 1823, Cat. No. S.2.1264, roll, SRNSW.

Figure 2.8: Detail of Hallen’s field book sketch c. 1830-1831. This was probably a tracing of Harper’s plan as the noted angles do not correspond to the drawn lines. The angles were corrected by Hallen in the formal survey plan (Figure 2.6). Information about the owners of the lots was noted on this sketch. Purple outline indicates the land acquired by Thomas Buxton (Buckton) from John Johnston which was occupied by Thomas Ball from c. 1801 to 1823. Detail from *Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney*, A. Hallen, c. 1831, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5.

Figure 2.9: Detail of Dove’s 1880 plan showing Lot 2 (outlined in red) and the Woolpack Inn shortly before its demise. Detail from *A new and complete wharf, street and building plan directory of the city of Sydney 1880*, H. Percy Dove licensed Surveyor. City of Sydney Archives: Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 2.10: ‘Huge crowd in George Street at Mick Simmons’ Sports Store to see Don Bradman, 1930’. The large three-storey building is on the site of the Woolpack Inn and was once the Mercantile Bank. To the left is the redeveloped Lot 3, shown here as the two-storey part of Mick Simmons’ store. In the extreme left of the image, and barely visible, is the slightly taller building at No. 710. ML, SLNSW.

Figure 2.11: Woolcott and Clark’s 1854 map showing an unusual alignment of the boundaries in Lot 3. This may reflect inaccuracy in the survey rather than changing boundaries. Detail from Woolcott and Clark’s Map of the City of Sydney, City of Sydney’ Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 2.12: Plan showing some of the long standing shops that occupied the street-front of Lot 3 during the second half of the nineteenth century. Detail from the *Trigonometric Survey of Sydney, 1855-1865*, Section O2, City of Sydney Archives, Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 2.13: Hallen’s 1830 field sketch of Lot 4 showing the partitioned area that was within the site boundary (Area C). Detail from *Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney*, A. Hallen, c1831, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5.

Figure 2.14: 1865 *Trigonometric Survey of Sydney* showing the southern portion of Lot 4, by then heavily built upon. Thomas Grogan the grocer was in residence at the time. The additional buildings are likely to be stores. Detail from the *Trigonometric Survey of Sydney, 1855-1865*, Section O2, City of Sydney Archives, Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 2.15: The water closet at No. 710 George Street in 1900. From ‘Views taken during Cleansing Operations, Quarantine Area, Sydney, 1900, ‘Views taken during Cleansing Operations, Quarantine Area, Sydney, 1900, Vol. III’, 172. W.C., rear of 710 George-street. SLNSW computer catalogue.

Figure 2.16: This plan shows the extent of buildings by 1888 as well as 1895. The courtyard area to the north of 710 was the only part of the site not built on by the 1880s. *Sydney Metropolitan Detail Series*, 1895, on-line at ML, SLNSW.

Figure 2.17: A plan showing the large building occupying the Lot 4, No. 710 in 1901. It is the same building shown on the 1917-1939 Insurance plan. It may have stood until 1918 but was demolished soon afterwards. Fire Underwriters Association of NSW, c1901: City of Sydney detail survey maps ‘Ignis et Aqua’ Series, Sheet II Vol. 1, ML MAV/FM4/10537.

Figure 2.18: The buildings on this plan are the same ones shown in the Bradman photo (Figure 2.10). Detail from the *Fire Underwriters’ Plans, ca 1917-1939 - Block177_181*, on-line, City of Sydney, Historical Atlas of Sydney.
Section 3
Figures

Figure 3.1: Site survey plan showing the archaeological areas. These areas correspond to the original subdivision of the block. North is at the top of the image.

Figure 3.2: The site location is indicated by a red circle where the road to Parramatta forks on the north side of the creek. Detail from Plan of the town of Sydney in New South Wales by Jas. Meehan, NLA map f105b.

Figure 3.3: Lot boundaries c.1830 showing the variations in street alignment as George Street approaches the corner of Campbell Street. City Section Survey Plans, 1833, Section 02, City of Sydney Archives: Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 3.4: Hallen’s field sketch c.1830 showing a boundary fence extending into the street. This would later correspond to the location of No. 712. Detail from Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p.5.

Figure 3.5: Interpretive plan showing the changing street frontage at Lot 3. Original boundaries are taken from Hallen’s 1830 survey. 1840s/50s projections are based on archaeological evidence discussed in Section 3.7.1.2 of this report. City Section Survey Plans, 1833, Section 02, City of Sydney Archives: Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 3.6: B horizon clays (7668) exposed at the base of a large pit (7660) in Area A. The yellow-orange subsoil can be seen in section, here contaminated with darker material. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.7: The eroded A2 soils in Area B. The high iron content has resulted in red staining in the yellow soils (7456). The footing in the right of the image is the southern flank of No. 716 (7488). View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.8: Detail of an 1802 plan showing Brickfield village, George Street (Route de Parramatta), and the creek feeding Cockle Bay. The red circle shows the approximate location of the site. North is at the top of the image. Detail from Charles Alexandre Lesueur’s Plan de la ville de Sydney: Capitale des colonies Anglaises, aux terres Australes, NLA map f307.

Figure 3.9: Interpretive plan showing the remains of erosion features across the site (Plan 19, Section 10).

Figure 3.10: The exposed gully (7489) beneath the footings of No. 718 George Street (7341). The grey soil (7450) in the foreground has been introduced to replace the eroded ground but it also shows signs of erosion and waterlogged exposure. View to the northeast. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.11: The base of the gully (7481) beneath the footings of No. 716 (7488) and No. 718 (7468). The trajectory to the southwest (the lowest point of the site) can be seen clearly in this image, as can a divergent depression in the lower left of the photo. View to the southwest. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.12: Water-worn surfaces exposed at the southern perimeter of the site (Area A, context 7647). The subsoil is absent in the northeast, exposing the yellow B horizon clays. View to the northeast. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.13: Detail of a later version of Lesueur’s map shown in Fig. 3.8. Here the brick kilns are shown on the land closest to the creek. The approximate location of the site is marked with a red circle. North is to the right of the image. Detail from Charles Alexandre Lesueur’s Plan de la ville de Sydney: (Capitale des colonies Anglaises aux Terres Australes), NLA map ref. raa2-s32.

Figure 3.14: Detail of a c.1850 copy of an 1807 map showing scattered elements of the Brickfield Village. North is to the top of the image. Plan of the town of Sydney in New South Wales by Jas. Meehan, NLA map f105b.

Figure 3.15: Plan of the posthole cluster (circled in red), Area B showing repeated attempts to secure a post within the same general area. The limit of excavation is at the left of the image, close to the George Street frontage. North is at the top of the image. (Extract from Plan B, Section 10).
Figure 3.16: Detail (with additions) from an 1823 plan showing the approximate locations of the two large pits associated with the Brickfield period (indicated by black circles). The Woolpack Inn was built over the location of the deepest pit by this time. The site boundary is shown in red. The pits are 30.8m apart. Detail taken from Harpers Map of Sydney, 1823, S.2.1264.roll., SRNSW.

Figure 3.17: Test trench (TT10) through the large pit 7436 showing the grey clays at the base and the dark grey organic sediment in section. View to the northwest. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.18: Test trench (TT11) showing the vertical cut (left) and timber pieces amongst the yellow clays and grey silty soils used to backfill the pit. The exposed part of the cut is on the western (shallower) side of the pit (7436). View to the south. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.19: The shallower pit (7660) showing the eroded appearance of the cut. The straight sides at the left and right of the image are arbitrary creations to avoid contamination from modern disturbance - they do not reflect the original boundaries of the pit. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.20: An ambiguous water-worn feature (7647) associated with the Brickfield period. The straight sides in the lower right of the image are arbitrary creations for the purpose of recording during excavation and do not represent the original parameters of the feature. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.21: Section of Test Trench 17 showing the backfill of redeposited clays and subsoil. The amorphous cut of the gully can be seen at the base of the trench. View to the north. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.22: Interpretive plan showing the archaeological features and projected building configurations (grey) during Phase 4 in Area A and Phases 4 to 5 in Areas B and C. (Plan 20, Section 10).

Figure 3.23: Harper’s 1823 plan showing the two structures on the site. The site boundary is shown in red and the lines of the structures have been enhanced. Detail taken from Harpers Map of Sydney, 1823, Cat. No. S.2.1264.roll, SRNSW.

Figure 3.24: Fill 7648 within cavity 7647 mid-excavation, showing the dense concentration of pottery fragments within the fill. View to the north. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.25: Hand-painted pearlware plate from the fill 7648. This item was produced in the UK after 1780. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.26: Field drawing made by Hallen c.1831 show several fences within the study area and a gate on the southern George Street side of the Woolpack building. Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5.

Figure 3.27: A painting depicting the Brickfield Hill in 1796. The extensive land clearance shown in the area suggests it is unlikely that remnants of forest survived on the site until 1823. Source: McCormick 1987:Pl. 36; painting by Edward Dayes, c.1796, from the Petherick Collection, NLA, Accn No. R.282.

Figure 3.28: Archaeological plan of footings of the Woolpack Inn. The red lines show probable room divisions in locations where the foundation was disturbed by twentieth-century activity. Rooms 5 and 2 may be part of the same large space, as may be rooms 1 and 3. The corner of Campbell and George Streets is to the right. The remains are drawn to scale and the southern wall (at the right of the image) is 9m long. (Extract from Plan 4, Section 10).

Figure 3.29: Schematic diagram of the Woolpack Inn showing distribution of window glass fragments in the underfloor deposits of the lower-storey rooms. Thick black lines indicate room divisions and exterior walls. Each square represents 500mm x 500mm. The front of the building is at the bottom of the diagram (represented by Rooms 1, 3 and 4) and the rear is at the top (Rooms 2 and 5).

Figure 3.30: The remains of the footings of the Woolpack Inn, showing extensive twentieth-century disturbance in the centre. The sandstone rubble footing is here overshadowed by the
much larger concrete and sandstone footing of the later Mercantile Bank. View to the northeast.

Figure 3.31: Room 5 of the Woolpack Inn showing various postholes cutting the imported topsoil beneath. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.32: The fireplace (context 7325) in Room 2 at the rear of the building. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.33: The remains of the Woolpack Inn showing underfloor deposits (shaded) and grid excavation squares. (Plan 23, Section 10).

Figure 3.34: Room 1 of the Woolpack Inn showing the somewhat rubbly underfloor deposit. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.35: The underfloor deposit in Room 2 showing the remains of joists in the foreground. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.36: The underfloor deposits in Rooms 3 and 4, showing the rotten remains of joists (Room 3) and bearers (Room 4). View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.37: The cesspit at the rear of the Woolpack Inn (context 7658). View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.38: Remains of the brick drain (context 7636) that ran along the southern boundary of Lot 2. Scale 500mm.

Figure 3.39: Image showing the approximate location of yard features with reference to Hallen’s 1830 field sketch. Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5.

Figure 3.40: Ceramics recovered from the cesspit backfill at the Woolpack Inn. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.41: A detail of an 1888 plan showing the large buildings that replaced the Woolpack Inn on Lot 2 (here labelled 720 and 722). Detail from City of Sydney 1888 / W.F.P. & A.W.M. Sydney & Suburban Map Publishing Co., 1888 NLA ref: MAP RM 722. Tile b1.

Figure 3.42: The footings of the Mercantile Bank at the southwest corner of the lot. The rubble foundation of the Woolpack Inn can be seen within these footings. View to the southeast. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.43: Large and well-cut sandstone blocks used in the foundation for the Mercantile Bank. View to the northwest. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.44: Interpretive plan showing archaeological remains and projected relationships based on the 1888 Survey (City of Sydney 1888 / W.F.P. & A.W.M. Sydney & Suburban Map Publishing Co., 1888 NLA ref: MAP RM 722. Tile b1). The archaeological remains have a strong correlation with the 1888 plan. (Extract from Plan 22, Section 10).

Figure 3.45: The damaged drain in the yard at the rear of the bank building. View to the north. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.46: An image from the 1930s showing the large commercial structures adorning the lots of the study area. View to the northwest from the southwest corner of George and Campbell Streets.

Figure 3.47: Site survey showing the original boundaries of Lot 3 in red. The original boundaries were taken from the angles shown in Hallen’s 1830 survey, which appear accurate with reference to the modern boundaries of Area A and other known angles on the site. This image shows that the street-front during this phase was beyond the limits of excavation. North is at the top of the image. Original boundaries from City Section Survey Plans, 1833, Section 02, City of Sydney Archives: Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 3.48: Two plans by Hallen dated to 1830 showing Lot 3. The image on the left is a field sketch, while the formal plan is shown at the right. The angles of the property are considerably different in the two images, but the noted angles on the sketch correspond to that of the formal plan. It is likely that Hallen traced Harper’s plan for his notes and then corrected the angles in his formal survey. Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5 (left image); detail from
Figure 3.49: The sump at the northern end of the box drain (context 7339). Scale 500mm.

Figure 3.50: The drain mid-excavation showing the collapsed arched capping and the curve to the north. The grey-brown fill (7431, 7432) within the drain is visible where the brick capping is missing. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.51: The circular cut (7600) revealed against the yellow subsoil. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.52: Harper’s 1823 plan showing that Area C occupies a vacant part of Lot 4. The site boundary is indicated by a red line.

Figure 3.53: Hallen’s 1830 field sketch showing the structures on Lot 4 outside the excavation area. Area C occupied the vacant southern part of the lot. Although this sketch shows what appears to be the incorrect Lot 3/4 boundary for 1830 (see section 3.5.2 above), Hallen’s angle measurements do correspond to the later survey, and so we can confidently assume that the fenced portion of land corresponds to that of Area C. Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5.

Figure 3.54: General Post Office Plan of 1837. The site indicated by the curved corner of Campbell and George Streets can be seen near the centre-left of the image.

Figure 3.55: Plan of locations used in this phase in Area B (Plan 10, Section 10).

Figure 3.56: The lot boundary between Lots 3 and 4 where the alignment of George Street changes (indicated with a red circle). No. 712 was built against the southern side of this boundary, in the northwest corner of the lot. North is at the top of the image. City Section Survey Plans, 1833, Section 02, City of Sydney Archives: Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 3.57: Detail from 1865 Trigonometrical survey of Sydney plan showing the change in street frontage that is likely to have occurred before the structure at No. 712 was built. CSA-HAS Trigonometrical survey of Sydney, Sheet O2.

Figure 3.58: The rear room of the structure at No.712 George Street. Concrete has been added to the southern wall and the northern wall has been replaced by a later footing. The internal space showed no evidence of flooring or occupation debris. The partially exposed remains of the front room can be seen beyond. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.59: The cesspit (7625) at the rear of No. 712. The sandstone and machine-made brick wall at the left belongs to a later, unrelated structure. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.60: Woolcott and Clark’s 1854 plan showing the changed alignment. The 1830 Lot 3 boundary is shown in red. However, inconsistencies with the lot shapes and sizes across the block may indicate that this map contains some inaccuracies. City of Sydney Archives - Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 3.61: This image is a detail of Hallen’s field book sketch from 1830. His sketch shows a transgression of the lot boundaries, where a property fence has extended into the street at the point where the alignment changes. The figure 161 indicates that the alignment shifts by 19° at this point, but the fence is shown at odds with the change. Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5.

Figure 3.62: Detail of an archaeological plan of the northwest corner of Lot 3. The remains of the footings of the houses at location Nos. 712 and 714/716 can be seen with interpretive projections (pale grey lines) extending to the street-front. The structure at No. 714/716 is shown with a length of 9m including the attached skillion rooms (Extract from Plan 10, Section 10).

Figure 3.63: The southern wall footing of the structure at No. 714/716 (right of image). The fireplace support can be seen in the foreground and a dividing wall in the centre. Test trenches reveal that the structure was cut into imported topsoils. The naturally occurring subsoils can be seen at the base. View to the east. Scale 1m.
Figure 3.64: The northern wall of the structure at No. 714/716. The southern footing of No. 712 can be seen in the right of the image. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.65: The fireplace support within the timber structure at No. 718/720. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.66: The southern edge of the brick alignment (7467) and the posthole (7521) after excavation. North is to the left of the image. Scale 500mm.

Figure 3.67: The imported ceramics represented in the occupation deposit 7395. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.68: The large front room of the structure at No. 710 George Street. The remains of the footings have been outlined in red. The fireplace and the paving can be seen near the top of the image. View to the north. The dark remains of cuts containing timber planks and associated fill (7543, 7544) were visible following excavation of the underfloor deposit (7444) and construction fill (7519). Scale 1m

Figure 3.69: The sandstone fireplace support against the north wall of the front room. The sandstone paving can be seen beyond. A later footing has been built over the fireplace. View to the north. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.70: The underfloor deposit at No. 710 George Street. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.71: The paving on the northern side of the structure at No. 710. The paving continued beyond the limit of excavation. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.72: Detail of Woolcott and Clark’s 1854 survey showing the possible location of the alley on the northern side of No. 710 (circled). North is to the top of the image.

Figure 3.73: The well during excavation, showing later disturbance in the form of a concrete footing. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.74: The interior of the well after machine excavation removed the eastern side. The well was 4m deep. View to the west.

Figure 3.75: Interpretive plan showing the archaeological remains and projected configurations of buildings in Phase 6. (Plan 21, Section 10).

Figure 3.76: Overlay of the archaeological plan with the 1888 survey showing the correlation between the Phase 6 remains and the historical plan. This overlay gives some indication of the extent of the remains beyond the limit of excavation. Detail taken from City of Sydney 1888 / W.F.P. & A.W.M. Sydney & Suburban Map Publishing Co., 1888 NLA ref: MAP RM 722, Tile b1.

Figure 3.77: Plan showing some of the long-standing retailers that occupied the street-front of Lot 3 during the second half of the nineteenth century (Extract from Plan 11, Section 10).

Figure 3.78: The two items with conjoining sherds between cesspit fills 7627 and 7632 (cesspits 7625 and 7626 respectively). Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.79: The rear room at No. 714. The robbed-out dividing wall can be seen as a strip of darker soil in the centre, parallel to the back wall in the foreground. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.80: The footings at No. 716. The party wall with No. 714 can be seen at the right, while the rear wall is in the foreground. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.81: The cesspit at the rear of No. 714. The angled wall at the back reflects the line of the alley that ran along this side of the lot boundary. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.82: Items from the cesspit at No. 714 (fill 7632) including four willow pattern plates. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.83: The sprigged bone china ware recovered from the cesspit at No. 714 (context 7632). Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.84: The sandstone cesspit at No. 716. The longest side describes the boundary of the alley at the rear of the lot. View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.85: Archaeological plan showing the extensions to No. 718. The red line represents the 1865 survey and at this point would only indicate an upper storey bridging the lane between No. 718 and No. 716. By 1888 this would have included a lower storey as
well, as the laneway had been blocked and built on (represented by the green line). (Extract from Plan 11, Section 10).

Figure 3.86: The cesspit at No. 718. At the right of the image is the boundary with Lot 2 (Area A). View to the east. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.87: The 23 ceramics from the cesspit at No. 718 (7342, 7387, 7401). Two locally-made lead-glazed earthenware sherds are at the top right. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.88: An overlay of the archaeological plan and the 1865 Trigonometric Survey of Sydney (represented by red lines) showing the relationship between the archaeological remains and the historical plan. The cesspits are shown at the eastern end of the yard against two Phase 6 structures. (Extract from Plan 21, Section 10).

Figure 3.89: The northern cesspit at No. 710 (context 7418). View to the northeast. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.90: Ceramics within the northern cesspit backfill at No. 710 (7418). Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.91: Ceramics from the backfill of the southern cesspit (7419) at No. 710. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.92: An example of ceramic artefacts from the well backfill (7567) at No. 710. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.93: An example of ceramic artefacts from the well backfill (7569) at No. 710. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 3.94: Interpretive plan showing the remains of the 1880s footings in Area C. Projected connections have been suggested with shaded grey areas. (Extract from Plan 22, Section 10).

Figure 3.95: The footings of the 1880s building at 710 George Street. The large blocks of the central divider are flanked by the rougher-cut stones that formed the foundation of internal dividing walls. View to the west. Scale 1m.

Figure 3.96: 1888 survey showing the building of Fox, Bennett and O’Connor at No. 710. Detail taken from City of Sydney 1888 / W.F.P. & A.W.M. Sydney & Suburban Map Publishing Co., 1888 NLA ref: MAP RM 722. Tile b1.

Figure 3.97: Interpretive plan of the site showing remains and projected relationships relevant to this phase.

Figure 3.98: Image showing the correlation between the archaeological remains and the plan of 1901. The 1860s footings still describe the structures accurately at the start of the twentieth century. Detail from Fire Underwriters Association of NSW, c1901: City of Sydney detail survey maps ‘Ignis et Aqua’ Series, Sheet II Vol. 1, ML MAV/FM4/10537.

Figure 3.99: Detail from a 1901 plan showing the building at No 710. Detail from Fire Underwriters Association of NSW, c1901: City of Sydney detail survey maps ‘Ignis et Aqua’ Series, Sheet II Vol. 1, ML MAV/FM4/10537.

Tables
Table 3.1: Summary of all the test trenches excavated on site. Each of these test trenches was annotated on plan (see Volume 3, Section 10 of Excavation Report).

Table 3.2: Chronological phases developed for the archaeological remains from each site area. The development of Area A was different to the other areas of the site.

Table 3.3: Room dimensions on the ground floor of the Woolpack Inn.

Table 3.4: This interpretation of the continuity of structures in Lot 3 is based on the archaeological evidence and on information in the Assessment Rates Books for the period. Coloured shading may represent a single structure (as in the brick building at 712) or a location within the lot (right of way). The building at 718/720 may have originally been a four-roomed, single-storey wooden structure that was split several ways during this phase.

Table 3.5: Street numbers corresponding to No. 712, and their relevant years during Phase 5.

Table 3.6: Street numbers corresponding to the location No. 714 /716 during Phase 5.

Table 3.7: Street numbers corresponding to the location No. 718 /720 during Phase 5.
Section 4

Figures

Figure 4.1: Preliminary sorting according to glaze colour and rims, bases and body sherds. Jenny Winnett, 26 October 2009, scale 500mm

Figure 4.2: Further sorting of sherds into vessel groups. Sue Hearn is working with a student volunteer. Jenny Winnett, 2 November 2009.

Figure 4.3: Detailed sorting of decorated pottery into vessels and decorative types. Jenny Winnett, 3 December 2009.

Figure 4.4: Screen capture of the Stage 2 lead-glazed pottery database direct entry form.

Figure 4.5: Matrix of contexts and waster pits in Area A. The four main fills contain 77 per cent of locally-made pottery vessels (EVE) or 74 per cent of locally-made sherds recovered from the site. See Appendix 4.1: Table 1.

Figure 4.6: Matrix of main Area B contexts with locally-made pottery. Context 7460 has 12,505 sherds, 19.9 per cent of all locally-made pottery found at the site. Context 7460 has most of the locally-made pottery in Area B. See Appendix 4.1: Table 1.

Figure 4.7: Two pans which are finer than typically found, 7662/#87663 and 7646/#85031. Russell Workman, 15/4/2010, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.8: Bowls or basins as they are also termed are Type 17 in the Casey & Lowe type series. Front row: 17.2.7 7460/86310(2), 17.6.6 7662/87375(1), 17.2.6 7662/87346(1), 17.1.2 7645/85913(1); Mid row: 17.1.8 7662/87389(1), 17.6.7 7663/86905(1), 17.1.3 7460/86511; Back row: 17.6.8 7662/87878(1), 17.1.9 7646/85071(1), 17.2.6 7460/86415(2). Russell Workman, 3/3/2011, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.9: Green speckled dish, Type 4.1. 7460/#86011. Russell Workman, 6/10/2010, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.10: Handled crocks. These are Type 14 in the Type Series. Left: front row: 14.6, 7646/85069(1), 14.3.1, 7646/85011(1); middle row: 14.3.2, 7646/85068(3); back row: 14.5, 7645/#85572(3). On the right is the near complete profile of a handled crock 7646/85010. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.11: Yellow chamber pot (left), 7474/89613. This is now on display in the new development. It is a very typical shape which imitates that found in contemporary British creamware. On the right is a mulberry ware chamber pot (7662/88066) with incised decoration. The interior glaze on this chamber pot is a different colour (a greeny brown). Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.12: A range of different shapes were identified that had not been found previously: a black-glazed candlestick (7662/88501), a mug (7662/88083), a dish or saucer (7460/86643) used as a saggar with later glazes and breakage marks. Russell Workman, 8/3/2010, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.13: Three children’s tea dolls set toys, lid, bowl and other vessel, made by Thomas Ball. Front left: 17.9 7662/89903; front right: 17.9 7648/89251 and back: 11.14 7460/86770. Russell Workman, 8/3/2010, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.14: HP 1, handpainted decoration was frequently found on the base of dishes or saucers. The decoration is thought to indicate that these were tablewares or at the least serving vessels. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.15: Bichrome floral or insect motif consisting of a central irregularly ovoid shape with dashes or petals, of contrasting colour radiating out from it in a single direction. Petals are in groups of two, four or six. These shapes were mostly dishes with fragments of a bowl at the top. Decoration was on the rim as well as the base of the dish. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.16: HP20, a green wavy line with red brown dots, above and below, around the rim of pale yellow dishes. Row 1: 7460/#86118(3), #86103(3), #86111(2); Row 2: 7460/#86109(2), #86108(4), #86115(6); Row 3: 7460/#86120, #86107(3), #86113(7), #86114(5). Russell Workman, 25/11/2010, Scale 10cm.

Figure 4.17: Rouletting wheel used at the Lue Pottery, Lue, near Mudgee, NSW.
Figure 4.18: Sprigged decoration in fine white fabric with yellow and green slip, probably a tree on the larger sherd, found on a brown vessel (#89195). The drawing of the smaller sherd suggests a different type of plant or animal. There was probably a band of sprigs around the vessel. Evidence of where another sprig was attached is visible on the larger sherd. Photo: Russell Workman, 10cm scale; Drawing: Franz Reidel.

Figure 4.19: Moulded lids, mostly slipped with a couple of mulberry glaze. The smaller glazed lids were probably associated with teas wares or serving vessels. Left photo: Left row: 7662/#88405, #88403, #88406, #88402, #88407; Row 2: 7662/#88397; Row 3: 7662/#88398; Row 4: 7662/#88399, #88395, #88408, #88396. Right: mulberry-glazed knobs 7645/#85954, 7662/#88400. Russell Workman, 25/11/2010, Scale 10cm, 1cm divisions.

Figure 4.20: Marbled or agate bowls, showing the light and dark colours of the mixed fabric beneath a clear lead glaze. The photo shows the exterior of a number of larger vessels, mostly unglazed. Front 2 rows: 7646/#85024(7); middle left: 7460/#86483(3); middle right: 7460/#86529(2); back left: 7645/#85534(1); back right 7645/#85436(2). Russell Workman, 3/2/2011, Scale 10cm.

Figure 4.21: Green speckling which is probably intended to create a decoration that imitates green porphyry, as in the case of early variegated slips in factory-made slipware. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.22: Range of incised vessels, mostly with a mulberry-glazed vessels with ID1 decoration on the right of the photo. Front row: 7662/#88132(1), 7662/#88111(4), 7662/#88104(2); middle row: 7662/#88101(1), 7662/#88106(1); Back row: 7663/#87043, 7645/#85912(3), 7662/#88103(2). Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.23: Decorated lid fragment HP13 (7645/#85315), showing red brown dots, including one which appears to have fallen off before glazing. Russell Workman, 1cm scale division.

Figure 4.24: Decorated rim fragment (HP27 7460/#86181), showing red brown dots, and brown and green lines. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.25: Decorated rim fragment HP36 (7460/#86366), showing brown dots visibly raised from the general glaze surface, and exhibiting a metallic sheen. Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 4.26: Decorated rim fragments HP33.1 (7460/#86186), showing a motif based on green lines which demonstrates the tendency of green decorations to run in the glaze. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.27: Rim sherd with decoration type HP24 (7460/#86142, interior), showing pronounced dimple in the centre of dot decorations. Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 4.28: Example of vessel with ‘marbled’ fabric from 710-722 George Street (#85052, Context 7646): a. cross-sectional view showing fabric comprised of two different coloured clays; b. exterior view of base, showing same marbled fabric visible underneath a clear lead glaze. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.29: Range of mocha ware tree-like patterns, Stoke-on-Trent Museum. Mary Casey 2005.

Figure 4.30: Dish or plate with an orange fabric covered with a dark brown coloured slip. Simple trailed decoration of lines, zig-zags and dots. Design probably applied by a slip cup with three quills which allowed three lines to be trailed simultaneously. Probably Midlands or north of England, second half of 18th century. Diam. 305mm. Stoke on Trent Museums webpage, Slipware Collection, Accession number 1951 P3.

Figure 4.31: Late seventeenth to early eighteenth-century slipware excavated on the Sadler Pottery Site, Burslem. Probably manufactured by Richard Parrot. A combed marbled slip decorated vessel is on the lower right shelf. Stoke-on-Trent Museum, Mary Casey 2005.

Figure 4.32: Slipware probably from William Burns Pot Works, Burslem. Stoke-on-Trent Museum, Mary Casey.

Figure 4.33: Range of factory-made or industrial slipware, Stoke-on-Trent Museum. Most are late eighteenth and early and mid-nineteenth-century examples; all are probably British. Mary Casey.

Figure 4.34: Tankards and jugs with reeded decoration highlighted with green slip around the rim. Note the use of a marbled glaze and sprigged decoration, one of which is highlighted in green. Rickard 2006: 16.

Figure 4.35: Variety of reeded lines (ID2) highlighted with green slip (HP6) which is similar to factory-made slipware on creamware. Remains of four lids are in the left column (front to back): 7663/#86827(1), 7645/#85354(1), 7645/#85258(1). In the middle column: 7460/#86383(2), 7645/#85256(2) - frags of a cup, 7662/#88460 - partial lid; right column: 7663/#88255(1) - bowl, 7645/#85459 - base, 7650/#89274 – base. Russell Workman, 3/2/2011, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.36: Range of thicker vessels, all dishes. Bottom row (LtoR): 7663/#86824(5), 7646/#85221; 2nd row: 7662/#88464(5); 3rd row: 7662/#88463(5); Back row: 7645/#85266(3), 7646/#85267(3). Russell Workman, 3/2/2011, scale 10cm.
Figure 4.37: Rouletted decoration (ID3) highlighted with green slip. Narrow coggled band consisting of repeating tiny impressed triangles and rectangles. These dish sherds came from pit 2, 7645/#85343. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.38: Rouletted decoration (ID9) highlighted with green slip (HP6), narrow coggled band of rectangles with circles in the middle. These two sherds from a dish came from Pit 3, 7662/#88113. Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 4.39: HP24 with the simple flower motif made of dots is occasionally found on factory-slipware. Russell Workman, scale 10cm.

Figure 4.40: Earthenware slipware bowl decorated with cable motif, cats eyes and a simple flower motif. From Slesin 1997. Another example of this motif is in Rickard 2006: 94, Figs 131, 132.

Figure 4.41: Decorated stoneware, (HP57) 7645/#89815.

Figure 4.42: Lead-glazed ceramic bowl with incised lines below rim and green glaze highlighting found at 2008 Cunningham Lane excavations. Photo by Jenny Winnett.

Figure 4.43: Handpainted, lead-glazed ceramics from the Conservatorium site. Left: 1004/#2097, #2145, #2156, #2176, #2181, #2194, #2163 and right: 1004/#2116. Franz Reidel.

Figure 4.44: Fragments of a saucer (left: 1005/#2379, #2384, #2399, #2403) and a cup (right: 1005/#2378) from the Conservatorium site. These originally termed “annular creamware”, although it now seems possible that they were manufactured by Thomas Ball at 710-722 George Street. Mary Casey.

Figure 4.45: Handpainted saucer from Parramatta Justice Precinct, made by Thomas Ball, 6331/#55853. While this sherd is too small to be certain which decoration was used it has elements of HP20 except there is a use of a red brown and dark brown dots. Scanned, Scale divisions, 1cm.

Figure 4.46: Coffee Can (6336/#38966) and base of chamber pot (6336/#38977) of a storage vessel from Parramatta Justice Precinct with incised and handpainted decoration, (ID2 & HP6). Both these vessels were probably made by Thomas Ball. Mary Casey, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.47: Fragment of a bowl (left) from the Parramatta Justice Precinct (6529/#55888) found in association with the Wellington jug. Teapot knob (3958/#21613) (right) from the Parramatta Children’s Court site, George Street Parramatta. Mary Casey, scale divisions, 1cm.

Figure 4.48: Sorting of kiln structure and furniture artefacts from Area A, context 7460. Front: lead glaze and slag on various clay items and setter fragments. Middle: briquetage. Back: bricks. Russell Workman.

Figure 4.49: Flat sandstock bricks from kiln structure showing (from top to bottom) gradual to extreme heat changes and deterioration of clay, vitrification and build-up of slag and splashed lead glaze. Left-right, top row: 7663/95165, 7650/95080, 7460/95203, 7662/95086, 95167. Second row: 7460/95220, 95219. Third row left and bottom: views of 7460/95222; right: 7662/95094. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.50: Shaped and marked bricks from the kiln structure found in context 7460. Top row left: corbel or keystone brick (95298). Top right and Middle row left: bricks with bevelled side edges and partly darkened dense clay fabric (95208). Middle row right: brick fragment with incised ‘XX’ tally mark (95195). Bottom: dense brown clay bricks fragments (95122). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.51: Selection of heat-affected bricks with finger-smoothed clay mortar and render/lining provided information about kiln wall bonding and possible reuse. Top left: overhanging side hack or original brick kiln stacking mark, mortar above dark green glaze on face and side (7648/95067); right: mortar on blackened vitrified chipped end (95064). Bottom left: denser brown-grey brick fabric with darkened clay mortar (7460/95213); right: bright orange clay mortar on face and side of partly heat-affected brick (7663/95167). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.52: Range of broken kiln bricks with squarish cells and perforations from contexts 7460, 7645, 7648 7662 7663. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.53: Kiln brick types. Left: S type with plain cells (7648/95068). Right: SS type with 5 holes in cells made by a nail (7662/95097). Franz Reidel amended by Sandra Kuiters.

Figure 4.54: Large kiln walling or briquetage fragment (7460/95223). Left top-bottom: curved profiles of three sides showing construction layers, pot inclusions and gaps filled with glaze and slag. Right top: exterior with finger-smoothed layers; bottom: interior with pot body sherds used to line interior. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.55: Sub-rectangular base and flues of clamp or Scotch kiln at 20 Albion Street, Surry Hills, drawn by Franz Reidel 1996.

Figure 4.56: Clamp kiln with temporary walls from R. Ringer 2008: 18.

Figure 4.57: Scotch kiln with reusable walls from R. Varman 1993: Fig. 97, from “The Kiln”, Lionel Lindsay etching, Art in Australia, September 1925.
Figure 4.58: James King’s Irrawang Pottery, Hunter Valley. Advertisement showing layout in c.1836, with clay-pugging mill to left, bottle kiln centre right. From Birmingham 1983: 81.

Figure 4.59: Circular clamp pottery kiln with central plinth and opposed firemouths. Sixteenth century with early eighteenth-century reuse from Donyatt Site 13, Cutting N, Kiln 2, plan and conjectural perspective reconstruction, from Coleman-Smith 2002: 220, Fig. 9.

Figure 4.60: Comparative plans of various salt-glaze and other kilns excavated in Britain, Germany and USA. From Green 1999, Figure 23. Note: f = firebox, s = stokepit, sg = salt-glaze, tg = tin-glaze, and lg = lead-glaze kilns.

Figure 4.61: New England, USA late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century excavated brick and stone kiln bases. Note top left was a bottle oven. Drawn by Old Sturbridge Village (www.osv.org).

Figure 4.62: Cross-section of a typical bottle oven with central kiln inside hovel, from Francis 2000: Fig. 20.

Figure 4.63: Scotch kilns for brick and tiles with walls of same thickness top to bottom. Top left: Plan of walls and flues or firing chambers with dark shading being firebrick lining, unshaded are temporary piers. Top right: profile through structure. Middle: profiles showing structure and flue openings. Bottom: brickyard layout showing functional areas from rear to front. A: clay extraction cut; B: clay heaps; C: clay-puddling mill; D: working floors before firing; E: drying sheds; F: kiln; G: working floors after firing; Left: water pond. From Dobson 1850 Vol. 1, p.75, 76, 77 and 60.

Figure 4.64: Clay smoother/pounder with finger and thumb impressions on side, flat circular base with striations and scarring from wear (7648/89252). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.65: Knife or palette marks on base when lifted off wheel (7663/86915). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.66: Exterior base of Type 17.6.2 large bowl with spattered splitting yellow glaze and base marks string and wheel marks, and tripod marks from probable drying stand (7646/85022). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.67: Stacking of finer yellow-glazed saucers/plates with scarring on bases, rims missing (7645/85442 on 85441). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.68: (left): Two red-brown glazed rim sherds adhering with glaze scar (7646/85245); (right): circular glaze pooled from kiln furniture placing ring or narrow vessel rim (7645/85434). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.69: Double stacked pot body and base fragments (7664/87073). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.70: Views of Type 12.7.28 bobs on rim of pot Type 1.5 (7645/85664). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.71: Selection of pot and setter fragments with various bobs, encrusting and pooled glaze (7645/85879, 89853-89862). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.72: Pot base setter fragment adhering to Type 12.7.2 bob (7645/85879). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.73: Left: Fingerprints on coarse earthenware Type 12.7.7 bob (7645/95314); Right: on thin fine earthenware bob Type 12.8 1 (7662/95460). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.74: Fingerprints on flattened fine earthenware bob Type 12.8.9 (7662/95444). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.75: Upper and lower views of Spurs Type 12.3.2 showing clay colour and dripped/pooled glaze from upper vessel (left-right: 7645/88564). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.76: Kiln furniture from the mid-eighteenth-century pottery at Town Road Hanley, North Staffordshire. Left-right: clay bob, two different ‘ring stilts’, pierced saggar with salt-glazed bobs on flint chips or ground quartz, salt-glazed ‘crown stilts’. Mary Casey, Stoke-on-Trent Museum and Art Gallery 2005 exhibition.

Figure 4.77: Range of placing rings (upper) and rectangular spurs (lower two rows) from the site. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.78: Placing ring (7460/88367) on tile/setter (7645/95030) demonstrating how two impressions were probably made by a points from a similar ring during firing. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.79: Spurs Type 12.3.1 with dripped/pooled glaze and ridges broken off from adhering vessels (left-right: 7645/88575, 88576). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.80: Range of sizes and colours of Spur Type 12.3.1 (left-right: 7645/88574, 88573, 88572, 88578, 88579(2)). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.81: Upper and lower views of Spurs Type 12.3.2 showing clay colour and dripped/pooled glaze from upper vessel (left-right: 7645/88582, 88583, 88584). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.82: Views of high wheel-thrown placing ring type 12.4.2, both sides with position of broken spur indicated by added clay on interior and change in dripped glaze on rim (7645/88591). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.
Figure 4.83: Range of placing rings type 12.4.2 showing shape and manufacture and usage details. Top (left-right): Ring interiors irregular slumped (7460/88368); unused or unglazed after biscuit firing(?)(7662/88676); narrow angled (7662/88706); layered or marbled clay (7646/95495). Middle and bottom: exterior and horizontal interior views. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.84: Placing ring type 12.4.2 features, fabric and glazes. Top (left-right): Applied clay spur with red-brown 'glaze' from burning wood in kiln, dripped glaze and adhering fine earthenware fragment from vessel being fired above (7664/85248, 7662/88669). Middle and bottom: pooled glaze down exterior and on base (7645/88598) and (7662/88706, 7646/95495). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.85: Multiple bobs (left): angled stacking type 12.6.6M 7460/95242; (right): vertical stacking type 12.6.50M 7460/95264. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.86: Selection of 77 Type 12.7.23 bobs of fairly regular form used to separate two vessels, with impression across the centre of both sides, some with broken ends (7460/95288). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.87: Group of clay setter fragments on the sorting table (7460/95237-38). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.88: Clay-smeared rim setter fragment 7460/86475. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.89: Clay-smeared rim setter fragments 7460/86476. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.90: Clay-smeared triangular body setter now fragmented 7490/89625. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.91: Evenly encrusted base setter fragments, left 7646/85026 and right 7646/85006. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.92: Base setter fragments. Left: bob fragments on interior. Right: encrusted exterior 7663/86997. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.93: Base setters showing dripped glazed over breaks and adhering pot fragment. Left to right: 7460/86796, 86643. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.94: Lid setter fragment with encrusted underside and burnt upper 7663/87005. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.95: Tile setter fragments with stacking evidence on the surface; (left): reserve silhouette of vessel (7662/95098); (right): impression and remnants of placing ring or vessel rim (7662/95104). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.96: Selection of Peg 1 and Single Lug 1 type tile setter fragments or shelves showing burnt encrustation and pooled glaze (context 7662). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.97: Double-stacked tile setter fragments showing blistered and pooled glaze (7645/95031). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.98: Carved facetted pipes from Area A (context 7645) showing range of fired clay colours and surface glaze drops. Front row: 97728(1), 97729(2). Back row: 97732(1), 97731(1), 97730(2). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.99: Carved facetted pipes Area A (context 7645), reverse of above. Front row: 97729(2), 97728(1). Back row: 97730(2), 97731(1), 97732(1) interior possibly grey from firing rather than use. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.100: (left): carved facetted pipes detail of stem showing carving marks and darker red stem end from greater heat in kiln (7461/97843, 7648/97745); (right): Exterior of bowl fragment showing unmixed clays (7324/96444). Russell Workman, 10mm scale divisions.

Figure 4.101: Hand-rolled white, buff to red clay marbles from Area A, made by Thomas Ball. Front row: 7323/96047, 96058, 96067, 96214. Middle row: 7324: 96525, 96616, 96623. Back row: 7331/96782, 7330/96677, 7349/97670. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.102: Hand-rolled buff to orange clay marbles from Area A waster pit fill 7645 with splashed lead glaze and adhering clay fragments from kiln firing, made by Thomas Ball. Bottom row: 97737, 97736, 97738, 97739. Middle row: 97734, 97735, 97736, 97739. Back row: 97741, 97733, 97740. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.103: Hand-rolled white, buff to orange clay marbles from Area B with splashed lead glaze and adhering clay fragments from kiln firing, made by Thomas Ball. Front row: Area B House 716 cleaning 7457/97827, 97831, 97830, 97828, 97829, 97832. Middle row: 7457/97823, 97824, 97825, 97826. Back row: topsoil 7472/97844, fill east of House 718 7490/97853, 97854. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 4.104: Clay, stoneware (stw), porcelain and limestone marbles from Area A Woolpack Room 3 underfloor deposit (7335). Hand-rolled clay and stoneware types were made by Thomas Ball. Front row: 'Stw alley (glazed)' 96968, 'Clay m made paint' 96969, 'Clay m made' 97016, 'Clay m made paint' 97030, 'Clay h made' 97082; Middle row: 'Stw alley (glazed)' 96964, Limestone 'Stonie' 96966,
Porcelain ‘China alley linear’ 96967, ‘Clay m made paint’ 96965, ‘Stw alley (glazed)’ 96964; Back row: ‘Clay m made paint’ 96850, ‘Clay m made’ 96886, ‘Clay h made’ 96911. Russell Workman, 10cm scale. Key: h=hand; m=machine.

Figure 4.105: Views of moulded clay bird whistle (7657/97752). Russell Workman, 1cm scale.

Section 5
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Figure 5.1: Selection of roof tile fragments reused as kiln setters, Area A, with burnt material and glaze on the surfaces (7645/#95028). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.2: Example of briquetage fragments, Area B, showing finger smoothing and glaze patches (7460/#95224). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.3: Copper alloy household fittings, Area A. Front: handle 7323/#82010. Middle row: doorknobs 7335/#82064, 7335/#82065. Back row: roseplate 7337/#84911, hook 7324/#82053. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.4: Examples of iron strap hinges, Area C. Front: 7569/#82270. Middle: 7313/#82166. Back: 7569/#82267. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.5: Selection of English and Scottish ball clay tobacco pipe bowls from Area C. Front row (L-R): 7460/#98317, 7393/#97894, 7313/#97880. Middle row: 7313/#97877, 7444/#98309, 7444/#98309. Back row: 7581/#98434, 7465/#98356. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.6: Glass beads of various colours and sizes used as jewellery and clothing decoration from a single excavated spit within gridded square D1 in Room 5 of the Woolpack Inn, in Area A (7337/#97435-#97462). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.7: Types of sew-through and shanked metal buttons found in the Woolpack Inn, Area A (underfloor contexts 7323, 7324, 7335 and 7337). Front row: mother of pearl. Second row: bone. Third row: glass. Back row: porcelain and glass. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.8: Types of marbles found in Areas A & B. Front row (L-R): limestone 7417/#97810, 7638/#97868, 7335/#96932. Second row: limestone 7335/#96986, 7337/#97376, linear-painted porcelain 7335/#96985 and glass 7337/#97377. Thomas Ball hand-rolled clay third row: 7320/#96012, 7331/#96759, 7335/#96931, 7324/#96675; Back row: 7337/#97623, 7337/#97433, 7337/#97488. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.9: Selection of the jewellery from Area A. Front row (L-R): pierced farthing coin pendant 7335/#96096, cross 7337/#97255, and locket back 7337/#97425. Back row: mounted blue glass pendant 7337/#97509, gold oak leaf and acorn earrings (7337/#97427, 7337/#97427, 7337/#97426), and gilt copper alloy dagger-shaped pendant 7337/#97232. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.10: Finely decorated brass bodkin fragments from Area C. Front: 7444/#98085. Back: 7444/#98016. Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 5.11: Selection of machine-pressed brass thimbles from Area A. (L-R): 7324/#96636, 7333/#96803, 7335/#96841, 7337/#97208. The two central thimbles feature verses. Russell Workman, 1cm scale.

Figure 5.12: Items associated with weapons, munitions and the military, Area A. Front row (L-R): British pistol gunflint 7392/#97715, badge fragment 7337/#97429, gun eye bolt 7337/#97134, pistol percussion cap 7324/#96325. Back row: lead fineshot 7335/#96993, swanshot 7337/#97288, buckshot 7324/#96470, musket ball 7324/#96059, brass .32 calibre bullet cartridge 7337/#97132. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.13: Lead shot found in excavated 1m squares of underfloor deposit 7444, Area C. (L-R): A2 #97901, C3 #98123 and F5 #98300. Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 5.14: Items associated with personal grooming, health and hygiene found in Area C. Front: bone toothbrush 7389/#97888. Second row: bone toothbrush 7389/#97887. Back row
(L-R): glass spectacle lens 7444/#98149, bone stopper 7444/#97930, small brass pillbox lid with glass inset 7444/#98154, antler walking stick handle 7567/#98363. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.15: Selection of toy and game recreational items from Area A. Front row (L-R): toy cup 7632/#97862, Jews harp 7301/#96003, doll’s leg 7337/#97431. Middle row: toy tea cup 7337/#97527, toy saucer 7324/#96430. Back row: hand-cut and polished bone dominoes 7323/#96167, 7232/#96201; toy stemmed glass 7335/#97091. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.16: Clay bird whistle with broken tail, Area A 7657/#97752. Russell Workman, 5cm scale.

Figure 5.17: Examples of a lead token with rayed design 7323/#76117 and obverse of a copper British 1827 penny 7646/#97744 found in Area A. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.18: Examples of pipes commemorating the wedding of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert in 1840 made in Britain and sold by the Sydney tobacconist Hugh Dixson. Front: 7466/#98346. Back: 7567/#98384. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.19: A selection of clerical items from Area A. Left and right: slate board fragments with surface marks 7337/#97526, #97501. Front to back (L-R): slate pencil fragments (with initials ‘NM’) 7335/#96908; with sawmarks 7321/#96036, 7337/#97230, 7331/#96680, 7337/#97607, 7337/#97266; square lead pencil 7337/#97485(3). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.20: Selection of jewellery from Area A. Front row: glass beads 7337/#97312, 7337/#97579, 7331/#96696, 7335/#97090, 7645/#97725. Middle row: left glass beads 7337/#97384, 7335/#96877; right jet beads 7324/#96393, 7335/#97014. Back row: black glass inlay 7337/#97636, purple glass or amethyst inlay 7335/#96823, gilt copper alloy clasp 7337/#97636, black glass inlay 7324/#96607. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.21: Selection of personal grooming, health and hygiene items from Area A. Front: bone toothbrush 7321/#96029. Back row (L-R): spectacle lens and frame 7337/#97490; vulcanite comb and haircomb fragments 7337/#97229, 7337/#97411, 7337/#97412; pharmaceutical bottle lid 7335/#96907. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.


Figure 5.23: Selection of food-related ceramics from Area B (cesspit fill 7632). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.24: Selection of Sprigged teaware-related ceramics from Area B (cesspit fill 7632). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.25: Pipe with portraits commemorating the wedding of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert in 1840 7313/#97876. Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.


Figure 5.27: Selection of buttons from Area C. Front row: metal 7444/: #98087, #98250, #98116, #98088, #98071. Middle row: porcelain 7444/: #97940, #98271, #98243, #9815. Back row: bone 7568/#98393, 7444/#98059. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.28 Spatial distribution of general artefacts (MIC) in underfloor deposit from all spits in Room 1 (7323) excluding bone and shell. Each square represents a 500mm x 500mm
grid square. The grey area shows the position of modern disturbance through the centre of the Woolpack building.

Figure 5.29: Spatial distribution of general artefacts (MIC) in underfloor deposit from all spits in Room 2 (7324) excluding bone and shell. Each square represents a 500mm x 500mm grid square. The grey area shows the position of modern disturbance through the centre of the Woolpack building.

Figure 5.30: Spatial distribution of general artefacts (MIC) in underfloor deposit from all spits in Room 3 (7335) excluding bone and shell. Each square represents a 500mm x 500mm grid square. The grey area shows the position of modern disturbance through the centre of the Woolpack building.

Figure 5.31: Spatial distribution of general artefacts (MIC) in underfloor deposit from all spits in Room 4 (7331) excluding bone and shell. Each square represents a 500mm x 500mm grid square.

Figure 5.32: Spatial distribution of general artefacts (MIC) in underfloor deposit from all spits in Room 5 (7337) excluding bone and shell. Each square represents a 500mm x 500mm grid square. The grey area shows the position of modern disturbance through the centre of the Woolpack building.

Figure 5.33: Ivory brooch/pendant featuring a finely fret-sawed/pierced design of a rearing stag 7337/#97400, underfloor deposit, Wool Pack Inn. Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 5.34: Ceramics in cesspit 7658 (fills 7653, 7654, 7655). The “Albion” pattern platter with conjoining fragments is at the back left and the “Willow” pattern serving dish with conjoining fragments is at the front right. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.35: Children’s ceramics in cesspit 7658. The black transfer-printed alphabet plate is on the left #73601 and “The Ethiopians” pattern clobbered mug is on the right #73615. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.36: Ceramics in occupation deposit 7395. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.37: Copper alloy 12-point starburst brooch 7395/#97779, No. 718, and brass buckle 7401/#97801, cesspit fill, No. 718. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.38: Ceramics in cesspit 7625, No. 712. The “Venus” pattern soup plate is on the left (#73769). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.39: “Venus” pattern soup plate and transfer-printed poe. These two items feature conjoins between cesspits 7625 (fill 7627) and 7626 (fill 7632). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.40: The four “Willow” pattern plates and one tureen lid in cesspit 7626 (#73772-#73776). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.41: Porcelain head and shoulders of a soft-bodied ‘Mary’ or ‘Jenny Lind’ type doll from cesspit 7626 /#97867. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.42: Ceramics in cesspit 7635 (fill 7638). The child’s mug featuring the gilded script “A Present” / “for my” / “Dear Girl” is at the rear, second from left (#73797). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.43: Ceramics in cesspit 7347 (fills 7342, 7387, 7401). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.44: Female Negress pipe bowl 7387/#97772. Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 5.45: Selection of toys, mostly from underfloor deposit 7444. Front row: limestone, glass and stoneware marbles (L-R): 7444/#98269, 7444/#98266, 7444/#98267, 7444/#98268, 7444/#98265, 7444/#98150, 7444/#98172. Back row: porcelain dolls: 7393/#97893, 7444/#98226; lead soldier 7444/#98124; dolls 7444/#98270, 7396/#97900. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.46: Ceramics in cesspit 7418 (fill 7459). The six salt-glazed stoneware penny ink bottles are the most dominant item in the cesspits artefact assemblage (#73333-#73338). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.
Figure 5.47: Ceramics in cesspit 7419 (fill 7445). The sprigged bone china saucer is on the left (#73895) and the green flow semi-vitreous fine earthenware toiletry box is on the right (#73896). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.48: Ceramics in well fill 7465. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.49: Selection of ceramics in well fill 7466. Fragments from the blue-transfer-printed “Willow” pattern plate (#73928), at front left, joined with fragments in well fill 7567. Fragments from the blue transfer-printed pearlware “Two Temples II” pattern small plate (#73930), at front centre, joined with fragments in well fills 7465 and 7568. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.50: Selection of ceramics in well fill 7567. Fragments from the blue transfer-printed pearlware “Willow” pattern platter (#73989), at front centre, joined with fragments in well fill 7569. A fragment of the blue transfer-printed “Rousillon” pattern slop bowl (#73980), at centre left, joined with fragments in well fill 7568. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.51: Group of broken tobacco pipes from context 7567 in the well, Area C. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.52: Baltic Cutty tobacco pipe, right side with fouled anchor (7567/#98373). Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 5.53: Baltic Cutty tobacco pipe, left side with three-masted sailing ship (7567/#98373). Russell Workman, 1cm scale divisions.

Figure 5.54: Selection of ceramics from well fill 7568. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.55: Cut fragments of woollen coat found in well fills 7568/#95571 and 7569/#95570. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.56: Tobacco pipe manufactured for the Sydney tobacconist Hugh Dixson, steam engine on left side (7568/#98406). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.57: Tobacco pipe manufactured for the Sydney tobacconist Hugh Dixson, paddle steamer on right side (7568/#983406). Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.58: Selection of ceramics from well fill 7569. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.

Figure 5.59: Double-layered cut woollen coat fragments with hand-stitched buttonholes found in well fill 7569/#95570. Russell Workman, 10cm scale.
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<td>5.1</td>
<td>Location of all plain Churchwarden pipes c1830-80 on the site. Note UF are underfloor deposits; (Ball) indicates redeposited wasters and kiln debris from Thomas Ball’s pottery.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>5.3</td>
<td>Locations of Moreton and MPP marked pipes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.11 Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;LD</td>
<td>Casey &amp; Lowe database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>Department of Conservation and Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Conservation Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>Land Titles Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML, SLNSW</td>
<td>Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>Minimum Item Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>Minimum Number of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC</td>
<td>Minimum Vessel Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLA</td>
<td>National Library of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWSR</td>
<td>New South Wales State Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ</td>
<td>terminus ante quem (date before which)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPQ</td>
<td>terminus post quem (date after which)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Sydney Gazette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations used in Specialist Reports and Artefact Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alch</td>
<td>alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archi</td>
<td>architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bev</td>
<td>beverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cond</td>
<td>condiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont</td>
<td>container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fd</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g/s</td>
<td>gin/schnapps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h'hold</td>
<td>household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyg</td>
<td>hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indust</td>
<td>industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jew</td>
<td>jewellery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>Minimum Item Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-stru</td>
<td>non-structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers</td>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pharm</td>
<td>pharmaceutical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serv</td>
<td>serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spts</td>
<td>spirits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stemwr</td>
<td>stemware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stru</td>
<td>structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tblw</td>
<td>tableware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tumb</td>
<td>tumbler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unid</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ceramic wares/decorations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bl flow</td>
<td>blue flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blktp</td>
<td>black transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bltp</td>
<td>blue transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brntp</td>
<td>brown transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clobb</td>
<td>clobbered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few</td>
<td>fine earthenware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gild</td>
<td>gilded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl</td>
<td>glazed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grntp</td>
<td>green transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hp</td>
<td>hand painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>istic</td>
<td>ironstone china</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead gl</td>
<td>lead glaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mou</td>
<td>moulded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pearl</td>
<td>pearlware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porc</td>
<td>porcelain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppl tp</td>
<td>purple transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provin w</td>
<td>provincial ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redtp</td>
<td>red transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock gl</td>
<td>Rockingham glaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tp</td>
<td>transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wgl</td>
<td>white glaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ww</td>
<td>whiteware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations used in Miscellaneous and Metals cataloguing and tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2pcs</td>
<td>two-piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aes</td>
<td>copper alloy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Aluminium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bwtp</td>
<td>blue and white transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cu</td>
<td>copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>diameter: inner seam to seam (pipe bowl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dia</td>
<td>diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emb</td>
<td>embossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encr</td>
<td>encrusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>fabric decay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few</td>
<td>fine earthenware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>height of bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>incuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>left hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m/pce</td>
<td>mouth piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Mother of Pearl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>machine wrought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>Nickel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr comp</td>
<td>near complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o’cut</td>
<td>offcut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porc</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rect</td>
<td>rectangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>rose head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHS</td>
<td>right hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sect.</td>
<td>section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sep</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>Tin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq</td>
<td>square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>spiral wound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synth</td>
<td>synthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T’Brush</td>
<td>toothbrush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>terracotta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tp</td>
<td>transfer print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH</td>
<td>upset head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. fine</td>
<td>very fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w.</td>
<td>width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>wedge point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>Zinc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 Historical Background

2.1 The Brickfields

The study area was on the lower side of what became known as Brickfield Hill in the early years of British settlement. To the south a stream which rose in Surry Hills flowed west into the head of Cockle Bay. Its path was later mimicked by the alignment of Hay Street. In the early years of the settlement the area to the south of Campbell Street was low and swampy. Aboriginal people would have made use of this area for freshwater and food. They are known to have been utilising coastal resources in the harbour area for at least 3000 years.8

The early plans show that the site was somewhat outside the town of Sydney. Nevertheless, it was subject to clearance from an early stage. Exploitation of the alluvial clays swiftly transformed the area into a Brickfield village. The head of Cockle Bay was in use as early as March 1788 for brickmaking and additional land was set aside for agriculture.9 A plan of Sydney published in July 1788 confirmed this location. A description of the Brickfields at that time noted that:

At somewhat less than a league from the camp (Sydney Cove) there is plenty of good clay, and capital brick-kilns are here established and this, tho’ a scanty village, is, I assure you, a much frequented and pleasant walk.10

Another record on the same day in July remarked that:

His excellency the Governor has set on foot a brick manufactury, which succeeds to his wishes, having already burnt several thousands for his own house.11

In August 1799 a case of murder was recorded in the Brickfields. A body was dumped in a clay pit leaving a trail of blood that led to a nearby house.12 At this time the Brickfields was developing a reputation as the source of criminal elements in the colony.

The early Brickfields centred on the blocks between Campbell, Elizabeth, Goulburn and George Streets (incorporating the current study area). As the clay resources were used up, brickmaking activities spread out towards Darling Harbour and Surry Hills. In 1802 the study area was still well outside the town of Sydney (Figures 2.1, 2.2, 2.3). The built-up area had only stretched as far south as the burial ground (where the Sydney Town Hall now stands). Lesueur’s Plan of the Town of Sydney depicted allotments and houses on both sides of the stream, in a satellite settlement labelled “Brickfield Village, where there are manufacturies of tiles, pottery, crockery, etc”. The picturesque ideal of Lesueur’s orderly village was tempered somewhat by a different depiction in 1807. Meehan’s plan of that year showed the buildings in a much more haphazard layout, with the notation, “These Houses are irregularly Built - very few of them good” (Figure 2.3).

An early report on the work undertaken within the brickfields themselves, a decade after they were first begun, indicates that they were still a rather inefficient industry. Collins’ observations concerning the work that went into making a soldiers’ barracks:

7 The history in Section 2 of this report was developed from the history included in Casey & Lowe 2008 Archaeological Assessment, 710-722 George Street, Haymarket, Sydney, for Parkview, June 2008 which is based on other histories written by Mary Casey for nearby archaeological sites, i.e. cnr Pitt and Campbell Streets. Parts of this were used in Casey 1999. Site specific research and writing was also undertaken by Caroline Plim, specifically the land titles, publican licences and individual research. Additional work by Rowan Ward for Casey & Lowe 2009 has been incorporated, as well as additional historical research (notably digitised newspapers) and reporting by Bernadette McCall and Mick Hincks.

8 Attenbrow, V., T. Doelman, T. Corkhill 2008 ‘Organising the manufacture of Bondi points at Balmoral Beach, Middle Harbour, Sydney, NSW, Australia’ Archaeology in Oceania, 43: 104-119, 105.


10 HRNSW Series 1, Volume 2:691.

11 HRNSW Series 1, Volume 2:745.

12 HRNSW Series 1, Volume 3:711.
Another barrack for officers was got up this month at Sydney; but, for want of tiles, was only partly covered in...

The great want of tiles that was occasionally felt, proceeded from their being only one person in the place who was capable of moulding tiles, and he could never burn more than thirty thousand tiles in six weeks, being obliged to burn a large quantity of bricks in the same kilns. It required near sixty-nine thousand bricks to complete the building of one barrack, and twenty-one thousand tiles to cover it in. The number of tiles rendered useless by carriage, and destroyed in the kilns, was estimated at about three thousand in each kiln, and fifteen thousand were generally burnt off at a time.

To furnish bricks for these barracks, and other buildings, three gangs were constantly at work, finding employment for three overseers and about eight convicts.

To convey these materials from the brickfield to the barrack-ground, a distance of about three-quarters of a mile, three brick-carts were employed, each drawn by twelve men, under the direction of one overseer. Seven hundred tiles, or three hundred and fifty bricks, were brought by each cart, and every cart in the day brought either five loads of bricks, or four of tiles.13

The above description indicates that skilled workmen were still lacking within the industry, with high demand outstripping supply. Kilns had to be juggled between firing tiles and firing bricks, and stock wastage was high due to both losses in the kiln during firing and also during transportation. By the 1820s brickmaking had moved from the area as the available clay was used up or as the encroaching town made the process objectionable or uncommercial.14

13 Collins 1798:277-78.
14 Casey & Lowe in prep
Figure 2.2: Lesueur’s complete 1802 plan showing the relationship of the Brickfield village to the main settlement. North is to the right. Charles Alexandre Lesueur’s *Plan de la ville de Sydney: (Capitale des colonies Anglaises aux Terres Australes)*, NLA map raa2-s32.

Figure 2.3: Detail of Meehan’s 1807 plan showing the approximate location of the study area (circled in red). The study area is in the vicinity of early buildings. North is to the top. Detail from *Plan of the town of Sydney in New South Wales* by Jas. Meehan, NLA map f105b.
The Brickfields Potteries, c1801 to 1823

Although the area was called Brickfield Hill, after its main industry, the production of pottery also occurred from the earliest years of settlement, albeit in far lesser quantities than that of the brick production. Comparatively little is still known about Brickfield Hill and its inhabitants, with any rare early vignettes mainly concentrating on the brickmaking industry and its associated labour intensive activities. An 1822 “Constables’ Notebook” does include the names for inhabitants of the Brickfields and for Campbell Street, and in 1822 Thomas Ball, a potter, was identified as living with his wife and family in Campbell Street.15

Thomas Ball identified himself as the first to begin a pottery business in Sydney, apparently in the Brickfields and who, by 1823, had already been established for some 23 years when he requested the Colonial Secretary Goulburn to intercede in matters on his behalf.16 Ball had a kiln and was evidently using an adjacent garden to dry his pottery.17 Mention of Ball is also found in the account of an Obed West, born in Pitt Row in 1807, who described Sydney streets during the 1820s and 1830s, including the area of the Brickfields.18 Obed describes George Street as follows:

On the Haymarket corner was a potter named Ball who had a large block of ground, and there stood another wattle and daub house with a thatched roof. All around the Haymarket at that time were wattle and daub houses, thatched, with gardens about them, principally occupied by soldiers…On the square now known as the Haymarket Square, were the Government Brickyards where the bricks required for the various Government establishments were made….The first toll gate stood at the Haymarket, near the boundary of Jones’s property, and then came a large paddock up to Hay Street.19

Obed’s description places Ball on the corner of George and Campbell streets, and although Ball’s name is not found in the most recent lists of early Australian potters he was known about in the 1950s, when Brodsky suggested that he resided on the site of the ‘Woolpack Tavern’, on the corner of George and Campbell streets.20

Another early potter was Samuel Skinner, who by the early 1800s was making domestic pottery. Skinner was a free settler, accompanying his convicted wife to the colony. Mary Skinner was transported after being found guilty of shop lifting, and although Samuel was charged with receiving stolen goods, he was acquitted.21 Skinner established his pottery in Pitt Row (Pitt Street), and recent research has indicated that it was located in the area between Hunter Street and Martin Place, around Angel Place, at what is now 115 Pitt Street.22 This places Skinner’s pottery at some distance to the north of the study area and outside the Brickfields.

During the early years of settlement the production of pottery was intermittent and because there were no apprentices or a skilled base to rely on its very survival depended on skilled potters arriving from England.23 Governor Bligh evidently had little time for the potteries, calling them ‘trifling’, and in 1806 the only other known potter listed in the Sydney Gazette was the tobacco pipe maker William Cluer, and his wife Mary.24

17 Casey 1999:7.
18 West 1988.
22 Godden Mackay Pty Ltd 1997:Appendix E, Chain of Title.
23 Casey 1999:8.
24 Casey 1999:8.
The 1820s marks the move away from small pottery enterprises towards attempts to shift the production into more of an industrial-scaled trade, signified by the arrival in 1819 of two men, both skilled potters convicted of burglary and transported to the colony aboard the ship the *Recovery*, Jonathan Leak and John Moreton. Leak had worked with Enoch Wood in Burslem and Moreton had worked with Josiah Wedgwood, and it appears that both men were immediately put to work at Brickfield Hill, in the Government Pottery which was under the control of Major Druitt, the Colonial Engineer. \(^{25}\) Both men eventually began their own pottery businesses at Brickfield Hill, within relative proximity to the study area – Leak within the block bordered by Elizabeth, Goulburn and Wentworth Streets and Moreton at the bottom of Elizabeth Street. \(^{26}\)

The location of the Government Pottery does not appear on any early historical maps, with its general location generally noted in secondary sources as just being at Brickfield Hill or ‘near’ the Carters’ Barracks (vicinity of Belmore Park and Central Station). \(^{27}\) It is thought that the pottery was first established as early as 1819, by Governor Macquarie, and that once it was established its running was delegated to Major Druitt. \(^{28}\) The Major’s department was already responsible for the Government brickmakers and the establishment of a pottery may have been seen as an effective means of employing the trained potters whose skills were at that stage being under-utilised making bricks and tiles. \(^{29}\) However it was more likely the need for utilitarian pottery goods to supply the expanding colony, and especially the needs of government infrastructure, which led to its development. Jonathon Leak and John Moreton rented the pottery from the Government for an annual fee, payable in pottery, and in 1822 the pottery was home to both the Leak and Moreton families. Moreton had been put in charge of the pottery in 1820 and he continued as overseer until at least 1822, by which time he and Leak were renting it. \(^{30}\) In September of that same year both Moreton and Leak were granted tickets-of-leave. In late 1822 Leak left to set up his own business nearby and by 1823 Moreton had established his own pottery.

It is unclear when, or even if, Moreton left the Government Pottery at this time or if he instead simply took it over, but it does seem that he was running his own pottery, located in Elizabeth Street, at the bottom of Brickfield Hill. \(^{31}\) In 1826 John Moreton was arrested once again while attempting a burglary and subsequently had his ticket-of-leave cancelled and was sentenced to six years of hard labour, serving in a chain gang in Bathurst. \(^{32}\) It is at this stage that evidence appears to suggest not only that Moreton’s business was at the Government Pottery but also more of an indication of where the pottery was situated. It appears that very soon after Moreton was arrested and sent to Bathurst the Government Pottery was put up for lease, in March 1827. \(^{33}\) Two of Jonathon Leak’s sons, Lewis and Stephen, petitioned the Colonial Secretary to lease the pottery:

> That Memorialists having been informed that the Government Pottery adjoining the Carters Barracks is about to be leased by Government... Memorialists begs leave to offer Government, an annual Rent of Thirty Five Pounds.... \(^{34}\)

The two brothers were unsuccessful in their application, with the lease instead being granted to another potter, David Hayes, who had arrived aboard the ship *Asia* in 1820 to serve a seven year

\(^{25}\) Casey 1999:8.  
\(^{26}\) Ford 2001:8 & 15.  
\(^{28}\) Archaeological Heritage Management Solutions Pty Ltd 2007:11.  
\(^{29}\) Archaeological Heritage Management Solutions Pty Ltd 2007:11.  
\(^{30}\) Casey 1999:8.  
\(^{31}\) Ford 2001:15.  
\(^{32}\) Ford 2001:16.  
\(^{33}\) Ford 2001:10 & 17.  
\(^{34}\) Ford 2001:10.
sentence for stealing. The 1828 census has Hayes still leasing the Pottery. This suggests the attempts to sell the Pottery in December 1827 were not successful. The Government Pottery contained a ‘glaze mill, a LATHE, and other apparatus’ for manufacturing pottery, according to Ford, Moreton’s sons continued to work within the pottery industry, on land near the Government Pottery, and after Moreton had served his sentence he returned to Sydney and joined his sons. By 1829 Anson Moreton was listed as making tobacco pipes at a site located on Upper Pitt Street, near the Brickfields and in 1835 John Moreton and his sons set up a pottery in Surry Hills, on rented land east of Bourke Street, somewhere between Oxford and Fitzroy Streets.

If indeed the Government Pottery and Moreton’s 1823 business are one and the same, with the Government Pottery identified as ‘near’ the Carters Barracks and Moreton’s business being on Elizabeth Street, at the bottom of Brickfield Hill, then that would situate it in the vicinity of what is now Belmore Park, to the north of Central Railway Station.

2.2.1 Thomas Ball

We have not undertaken additional research for this report on the history of Thomas Ball as another archaeologist, Graham Wilson, generously provided his draft history of Ball. Graham has been researching early Sydney potters for more 20 years. While we have undertaken some basic research on Thomas Ball over the last few years (see above Section 2.2) the following section is based mostly on Graham Wilson’s (2009) research ‘Thomas Ball (1765-1827) draft’. It should be noted that since Graham did this research more material has been digitised and is more easily available.

Thomas Ball was born in Staffordshire sometime between 1765 and 1785. In his Certificate of Freedom his age is stated as 59 years which would suggest c.1765. He was convicted at the Warwick Assizes on 27 March 1797 for a term of 7 years. Unfortunately these records were destroyed at a later date. He was transported to New South Wales on the Hillsborough and arrived July 1799. Graham Wilson tends to see Ball’s statement, given above, that he established his pottery in 1801, as reliable. Ball’s self-employment is not certain until 1806 by which time he was free-by-servitude. Wilson suggests the lack of potters may have meant that Governor Bligh released Ball early so as to produce pottery for the colony.

Ball and Martha Wise began a de facto relationship in 1806 and they had three children: Anne (1809), Thomas jnr (1810) and Jacob (1812). Thomas and Martha appear to have separated by 1818 thought this contradicts the evidence of the Constable’s Notebooks indicated above which say that Ball was living with his wife and family on Campbell Street. By 1818 Ball was apparently living with Hannah Field, a currency lass. Two court cases indicate that Ball assaulted Hannah Field twice, quite badly, firstly in 1818 and then again in 1820. Ball received his pardon in 1810 and his Certificate of Freedom in 1824. He was described in 1824 as 5 feet 9 ¼ inches tall, with grey hair, sallow completion and blue eyes. He was admitted to the Benevolent Asylum (near the tollgates) in May 1825, again in February 1826. He discharged himself in May 1826 but was readmitted in June again discharging himself in November 1826. He died at the General Hospital on 26 February 1827.

Ball had taken out a loan on his land containing his pottery works in 1805 from Rosetta Marsh né Maddern and had failed to pay back these loans. Ball serviced this debt for 15 years but ran into trouble in 1822 when the Samuel Terry, who married Rosetta Marsh and administered her assets, sold Ball’s debt to John Johnston (aka John Johnson), also a potter. Under the conditions of the sale
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Ball was to retain the use of his kiln, workshop and the garden where he dried his pottery. Johnson was in financial straits and was forced to sell this land to Thomas Buxton in 1823. Buxton stopped Ball’s access to the site and built a house. By December 1823 Ball was no longer able to operate his pottery.

2.2.2 Location of Thomas Ball’s Pottery
The historical resources associating the study area with Thomas Ball are quite limited. The only reason we know that the eastern part of the study area was part of Thomas Ball’s pottery was the annotation of Thomas Buxton’s (Buckton) name on Hallen’s 1830-31 Field Book sketch (Figure 2.8). We also know from the 1822 Constable’s Notebooks that Ball lived on Campbell Street; in addition Obed West has said Ball’s Pottery was on the site of the Woolpack Inn which is the western part of the two properties annotated with Buxton’s name. These three sets of information provided the clues to locate Ball’s Pottery. It is difficult to determine if any of the structures shown on the 1830-31 sketch belonged to Ball’s Pottery or were constructed after the land was transferred. Comparison of the 1823 plans with Hallan’s 1830-31 sketch suggests that the eastern block of Ball’s land, outside the current study area, may have retained one of the buildings set back from George Street (Figures 2.7, 2.8). It is likely that the new building on the street frontage of the eastern block was the expensive new house supposedly built by Thomas Buxton (Buckton).

2.3 Redevelopment and Slums, 1820s to 1900

2.3.1 Sydney 1830–1851
The 1830s in Sydney saw the predominance of the wool industry over other primary industries and a burgeoning of secondary industries and of the professional and merchant classes. The population of Sydney in 1836 was 21,361. In 1842 the City of Sydney was incorporated. At this time the city’s population was about 30,000 but by 1851 it increased by nearly 50 per cent when it increased to 44,240. It was only by 1851 that the urban population reached a balance with adult males constituting 31.8 per cent rather than as much as 50 per cent of the population as they did in 1836. The city area contained the largest concentration of Sydney’s population.

The urbanisation processes were reinforced by the economic successes of the pastoral industry and were evidenced by a building boom in the late 1830s. In 1845 there were about 5,500 houses in the central area which increased to 8,500 by 1851. Many of these new buildings were workers’ cottages erected in close proximity to their workplace. The construction of small houses often ensured a return on the investment after three years. Therefore the boom in jerry-built tenant housing in the 1830s was partly responsible for the development of Sydney’s urban slums in the late 1800s.

There was an economic depression in the 1840s. The general picture was one of depressed trading conditions, high wages and a shortage of skilled labour, following the cessation of convict transportation in 1841 and drought. Yet business successes were still happening with the establishment and growth of the Australian Gas Light Company which supplied 49 customers when it began in May 1841.
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2.3.2 Haymarket in the 1830s

The modern street layout that defined the block containing the study area was settled in the 1820s. Castlereagh Street and Pitt Street were extended southwards of Goulburn, to Campbell Street which now formed as the southern limit of the town. By June 1829 a cattle market was opened in the area between Hay and Campbell Streets (Figure 2.4).\(^{49}\) The cattle market had previously been situated near Market Street and the relocation was a response to the inconvenience of herding large volumes of stock into what had become the centre of the town.\(^{50}\)

In 1833 hay and corn markets were also opened on the other side of Pitt Street.\(^{51}\) These markets remained an important part of the locality for the next 50 years and their commercial pull would have exerted a powerful influence on the use of the buildings in the area, particularly along Campbell Street and nearby George Street. From 1831 the plans of Sydney show how the study area had become part of the town proper (Figure 2.4). The frontages of the new streets were already dotted with buildings.

By the 1830s the southern part of Pitt Street had managed to charm at least one observer. It was noted that:

> although less occupied by expensive buildings, [it] is remarkable for the neatness and cheerful appearance displayed by most of the cottages with which it is lined on either side; the small
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garden plots before them, their shaded verandahs, and the regularity of design which many of them display, taken altogether, not only please the eye and gratify the taste, but also have a direct tendency to recall the rustic beauties of Old England to the memory of every one who can think of the land he has left, and rejoice in the land now his home.52

In 1838 a major piece of public works saw Brickfield Hill (George Street) reduced in height and made more gradual in gradient. The spoil was used to reclaim the southern end of Cockle Bay and to elevate the southern part of George Street.53 This bulk removal of soils is not likely to have affected the study area although it was known to have changed the landform to the south of Hay Street, in the area of Parker Street.54 Material from this cutting down was used to backfill the creek in Hay Street and raise it to current ground levels.

2.3.3 Sydney 1851–1870s

The period following 1851 saw the beginning of the gold rush and a long period of economic boom. It is during this period that urbanisation became more pronounced with the undertaking of various public maintenance programs by the new municipal council. Among the duties of the municipal government was the maintenance of roads. Most time and money was spent on looking after George Street and other major through roads. But general road conditions were poor, with Liverpool Street having only ‘rough guttering’ in 1855.55 The boom resulted in high rental prices due to the influx of gold seekers. From this period onwards city land became scarcer. The quality and type of speculative and rental houses being built was not constrained by any sort of legislative control.

...the Sydney Municipal Council was plagued by administrative inexperience, inefficiency and, most importantly, a chronic lack of finance. With inadequate powers granted to it by the colonial legislature, the Council was unable to force landlords and speculative builders to connect even new houses to the water supplies, and, given the limited funds available, the provision of formed roads, sewerage and drainage was exasperatingly slow.56

Another economic depression hit in 1859 and lead to mass unemployment. As conditions worsened, the Legislative Assembly established a select committee to investigate the conditions of working-class housing. The select committee noted that much of the housing stock around Goulburn Street, and particularly in the laneways, was poorly built. South of Goulburn Street, on George Street were:

Densely settled rows of buildings packed between narrow lanes...the dwellings were poky and deficient in ventilation, and many of them were already falling into ruins... In the absence of a full system of underground sewers and proper surface drains, sewage and house slops festered in street gutters, draining eventually into stagnant pools on low lying ground.57

Between 1851 and 1871 Sydney’s population more than doubled from 30,000 to c74,000 people.58 The burgeoning population placed more pressure on accommodation requirements. From 1861 to 1891 Phillip Ward (which includes the study area) grew by more than 109 per cent from 5,915 inhabitants to 12,347.59 This further doubling of the population increased the stress on the available accommodation resource. During this same period, the average amount of people per dwelling was between 5.44 and 5.99.60 This quite small change relative to population growth

52 Maclehose 1839 Picture of Sydney and Strangers’ Guide in New South Wales for 1839, pg. 72.
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59 Mayne 1982.
60 Mayne 1982 Appendix 1, Table 1.2.
suggests that as population more than doubled, an increasing number of dwellings were being squeezed into an already overcrowded setting.

### 2.3.4 Slum Development

When William Jevons visited the colony in 1858 and carried out his *Remarks upon the Social Map of Sydney*, his attention was often drawn to the more depressed parts of the places he visited. He mentions ‘Durands Alley’, which was at the rear of the properties in the study area, on Cunningham Street. He observed that:

> Third class residences collect about a few distinct centres, or form part of the town peculiar to themselves, generally in the lowest or least desirable localities. In general, third class residences appear of considerable age showing that the land has been long located. Durands Alley, the Rocks, the lower end of Sussex Street, the north part of Chippendale, & Market land are the chief and worst third class quarters.

He further stated:

> That part of Sydney where the lowest & vicious classes most predominate & where the abodes are of the worst possible description is the square block of land between George, Goulburn, Pitt, & Campbell Streets. Towards the first & last of these streets it is occupied by shops or business premises, and among which are no less than seven public houses or inns & two or three livery stables, a stable yard of large size. It is however within this block of land that the bad features appear. Several lanes of irregular angular shape proceed into it burdened by very closely packed & chiefly brick cottages, the dirty low appearance of which defies description. Such is Durands Alley, some female inmate inhabitant of which is punished almost every day at the Police Court for offences chiefly connected with prostitution. I walked through these miserable alleys which are quite shut out from common view & form almost blind alleys. No more secure & private retreat for vice is afforded in Sydney.

This block of land included the study area and one of the public houses referred to is the Woolpack Inn in the eastern part of the study area. At the time it featured hotels and inns on its northern and southern perimeters. The description of the housing within the block, specifically within Durands Alley, does situate the study area within a place renowned for its more dubious qualities in the middle of the nineteenth century. This suggests that the commercial enterprises in the area were directed towards a customer base of lower working-class people (Jevon’s ‘third class’). None of the properties within the study area were resumed by Council which suggests that the George Street frontage was not in such bad circumstances. They may have been spared by redevelopment. In the early 1860s the 1840s buildings at 712-718 were replaced by four two-storey shops with residences.

### 2.3.5 Markets

In the second half of the nineteenth century the markets on the southern side of Campbell Street continued selling fruit and vegetables. The cattle market was relocated to Glebe Island, and in 1869 the produce markets were housed in a new building called the Belmore Markets. By 1872 they were the main outlet in Sydney for fruit and vegetables. During this time George Street was considerably developed with many two-storey shops with verandahs and canvas awnings (Figure 2.5). The markets were replaced in 1893 by the New Belmore markets on the site of the old Haymarket. The Old Belmore Market was demolished in 1910 and replaced on the Castlereagh Street frontage by the Adelphi Theatre, later the Tivoli.
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2.3.6 Sydney 1870s to 1890

The period from 1870 to 1890 was one of economic growth. It has been suggested that this growth, both of population and economics, was not accompanied by the provision of public amenities. Rather, the privately-funded growth far outstripped the amenities such as sewerage, water, public housing and transport. It has been proposed that the lack of urban planning and legislation was responsible for many of the social problems that existed throughout the latter part of the nineteenth century. These social problems of sub-standard living conditions were visible through poor housing, poor health standards, high infant mortality rates, lack of public services and trade union upheavals.

There are numerous examples of the poor public amenity in the area of the site during this period. In 1875, in the central city blocks on either side of Goulburn Street (including that of the study area), committee members found a densely settled working-class population living along a maze of courts and alleys. Tenement blocks that were closely packed together were built without sanitary foresight, were poorly ventilated and still relied on stinking common cesspools. Sydney’s population, including municipalities, increased markedly with more than half the population residing within the city in 1871 and this population trebled by 1891.

Access to work was the factor that kept working-class people living in such squalor. Committee men observed in 1876 that:

Residents along one narrow passageway off Campbell Street, near the Haymarket, pointed to their sickly children, and then lamented that they must remain where they were since better accommodation could be had only at an impossibly long distance out in the suburbs.

This debate over access and amenity is a re-occurring theme in the urbanisation of Sydney. Inspections of working-class housing by health inspectors of the City Corporation continued from 1880 into the 1890s. Mayne noted that these inspections:

repeatedly demonstrated the emphasis placed by many working people upon domestic neatness and household ornamentation, which together served as the foundation of bourgeois respectability. The signs were there to be seen and their significance appreciated. That they
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generally were not appreciated underlined the distorting influence of the unconscious cultural arrogance with which middle-class visitors observed the unfamiliar environment of the City slums.  

And further that:

[committee members] Chapman and Read remarked that among districts of the lowest repute, in places like Robin Hood Lane and even in Durand’s Alley, there were respectable working people who complained at the coarse language and the drunken rowdyism of their neighbours, and who lamented at having to live alongside prostitutes and vagrants.  

2.3.7 1890 to 1920

During the early 1890s a major economic depression hit Australia, one of the three worst depressions in Australian history. ‘Between 1890 and 1895 a number of major banks crashed, national output fell by about 30 per cent, and employment and income dropped disastrously as a result’. By 1891 the population of Phillip Ward had increased to 12,347. During the depression, Sydney suffered high levels of unemployment, especially in the building trades. Following the First World War attention again turned to the identification of congested or slum areas. Much of this work was undertaken in 1919 and 1920 by the City Surveyor. He defined the context and use of the term slum:

Whilst recognising that the term slum area as generally understood in older countries and defined as “A foul back street of a City, especially one filled with a poor, dirty, degraded and often vicious population; any low neighbourhood or dark retreat” is practically non-existent as far as the City of Sydney is concerned, we yet are of the opinion that certain areas are so congested and so devoid of adequate means of ingress and egress, and the usual amenities of modernly planned areas, that it is advisable in the interests of public health and generally in the public interest that such areas be resumed or acquired with a view to improving or re-modelling.

It seems obvious that by the 1920s Council saw some of the city’s older and smaller housing as incompatible with the commercial centre that had emerged in the previous thirty years. Grand emporiums could stand only streets away from crowded residential precincts, with houses left dilapidated by constantly changing tenants and landlords not willing to provide regular maintenance.

Increasing road traffic saw the need to widen older narrow streets. The attribution of ‘slum’ had less to do with sub-standard living conditions than social engineering and the decision by Council to act as the arbiters of respectability. Regularity could be enforced by resuming whole blocks of housing, demolishing the lot, widening the roads and providing space for the new commercial buildings that inevitably filled the gap. The Council was not at any point concerned with retaining the inhabitants within the city area and did not attempt to provide alternate housing.

2.4 Post –Brickfield Occupation and Land Use of the Study Area

There are a number of sources that helped construct the history of the study area’s occupation and land-use. These included Sands Directory which was kept from 1858–1933 and which listed the names and sometimes the occupations of the principal residents; the Council Rate Assessment books from 1845 which gave the names of residents, owners, and descriptions of buildings; pictorial material including plans of the city and of the site and photographs showing buildings on the site;
and land title material which detailed the history of the subdivision and ownership of the site (Vol. 5, Appendix 5.2). Combined, these resources gave a good overall picture of the site's development during the late eighteenth century and the nineteenth century. These are discussed in more detail in Section 3, overview of results in relation to each of the houses.

Around 1823 the land within the study area was subdivided into part of three separate properties, Lots 2, 3, and 4. The lots corresponded to the archaeological Areas A, B, and C respectively (Figure 2.6).

![Figure 2.6: 1830-31 survey showing the lot divisions. These divisions remained constant throughout the nineteenth century. North is at the top of the image. Detail from City Section Survey Plans, 1833, Section 02, City of Sydney Archives: Historical Atlas of Sydney.](image)

2.4.1 Lot 2 – Area A
Lot 2 was the southeastern part of the study area. Its large, gently sloping and elongated yard was used for stabling throughout much of the nineteenth century, when the street frontage was occupied by the Woolpack Inn.

**Early Years**
In 1823, Thomas Buckton (Buxton) was the owner of the land, having acquired it from John Johnston who obtained it through Samuel Terry from Thomas Ball who had operated his pottery on
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the site. Thomas Buckton fenced off the area, effectively excluding Thomas Ball from access to any of his remaining holdings, and built on the property and then sold it to William Cuthbert with ‘buildings consisting of four dwellings’. One of these buildings was recorded on plan by William Harper in 1823 (Figure 2.7). Its pictorial representation was similar in dimensions and position to the Woolpack Inn and it may have been the same building.

Figure 2.7: Harper’s 1823 plan showing the two structures on the site. The site boundary is shown in red and the lines of the structures have been enhanced. The building that corresponds to the Woolpack Inn is in the lower left corner of the site. The red line indicates the present study area and the purple line is the likely footprint of Thomas Ball’s Pottery. A building possibly associated with Ball’s pottery is arrowed. Detail from Harper’s Map of Sydney, 1823, Cat. No. S.2.1264.roll, SRNSW.

This may have been purchased as part of a forced sale that was ordered by the Sheriff in 1829, as prior to 1830 Cuthbert had sold a subdivision (Lot 2) to G. Porter who sold it on to John Sharpe. Between the end of the Brickfield period and 1830, the history of the lot is vague apart from the references to several publicans and tenants that are listed on the property. Harper’s 1823 plan appears to show the same building that is depicted on Hallen’s 1830 plan, and so it is probable that this was the location of the Woolpack Inn that was known in 1824, and was possibly operating as

76 Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, c1831, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5. SRNSW. Hallen’s 1831 sketch plan of shows fencelines at the rear of Lot 2 which have been marked in and then crossed out which connected with George Street via a gate to the south of the Woolpack. These may correspond to Ball’s work areas but there is no indication as to where the kiln may have been located.
early as 1823, although a licensee was not recorded until 1830. By 1830, the value of the building was recorded in Hallen’s field book as £500, suggesting it was a substantial structure of relative high quality. In 1830 a ‘well built house’ is listed on Lot 2 leased to Alexander McCabe for fifteen shillings a week, but it is unclear whether this was in addition to the Woolpack Inn. A further advertisement of the houses that were let to tenants on the site describes:

...that substantial stone-built House, adjoining the Woolpack Inn, formerly the Property of Thomas Buckton, in George-street, containing eight rooms’. This house can be let to two tenants, having two kitchens, the back yard divided, and sufficient stabling for both, with an excellent well of water, and every convenience requisite for two respectable families. There is also a skilling attached to the house, which will be included along with the above.77

Figure 2.8: Detail of Hallen’s field book sketch c. 1830-1831. This was probably a tracing of Harper’s plan as the noted angles do not correspond to the drawn lines. The angles were corrected by Hallen in the formal survey plan (Figure 2.6). Information about the owners of the lots was noted on this sketch. Purple outline indicates the land acquired by Thomas Buxton (Buckton) from John Johnston which was occupied by Thomas Ball from c. 1801 to 1823. Detail from Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, c. 1831, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5.

77 Sydney Gazette 18 December 1830.
The uncertain history of early occupation and ownership coupled with the large extent of the block make it unsurprising that different parts of Lot 2 may have been used initially for a variety of purposes.

A licensee was not recorded for the Woolpack until 1830 although other sources indicate that a public house may have been operating as early as 1824.78 In the years between 1823 and 1830, Cuthbert had sold Lot 2 to G. Porter. An 1822 Muster Record lists a 17 year old George Porter who was born in the colony and he may have been the one-time owner of the lot. He was probably in his early twenties by the time he acquired the land at Lot 2. Porter sold it on to John Sharpe, about whom we know very little. Just two men of the name John Sharpe have survived in the records from this period. The paucity of the records meant that neither could be linked to the site. The first Sharpe arrived in 1819 on board the Baring. In 1822 he was on a list of prisoners sent to Port Macquarie where he was to serve 14 years. Muster records show him there in the mid-1820s. The second arrived in 1821 on board the Dick. In 1822 he was serving on an invalid gang. Between the end of the Brickfield period (c.1823) and 1830, the history of the lot is somewhat vague but several newspaper references allow some reconstruction of the early days of the Woolpack Inn and suggest that the sale of Buckton's property was forced upon him.

The Woolpack Inn

By 1824 a Woolpack ‘public-house’ is recorded ‘just at the entrance of Sydney’. It is mentioned in connection with a murder trial and presumably is the same establishment that was operated by one of the trial witnesses, ‘an innkeeper in George-street, Sydney, on the Brickfield-hill’.79 From 1827 to 1830 there are various references to a hotel known as the Sign of the Woolpack at the bottom of the Brickfield Hill with several early proprietors. One of the first publicans perhaps was a Mrs Nightingale whose name appears in connection with a sale of contents from the property in 1827.80 She was followed at some stage by Thomas Buckton who is listed as proprietor, in sale notices in 1829 and 1830.81 Buckton’s attempt to sell in July of 1829 was unsuccessful and may have arisen from financial problems. Another sale was advertised in December of the same year, ordered by the Sheriff, and by January 1830 there were three different tenants listed on Lots 1, 2 and 3 when it appears the entire holding was offered for sale.82 By February 1830 Buckton had died in police custody and the property was again advertised for sale in the following December (Appendix 5.2).83

Early records to confirm the identity of license holders are not readily available and are probably a consequence of continued debate and amendments to legislation between 1825 and 1830 regarding the types of premises that could be licensed to sell alcohol.84 The Legislative Council passed a law Feb 15 1825 prohibiting mixed businesses selling alcohol as it encouraged persons to visit such places on the pretext of buying other goods but this may have been amended/repealed on 20 February, 1826.85 Again this Act was amended/repealed in February 1827, indicating that some degree of uncertainty and instability existed regarding the granting of licenses to sell alcohol.86 A bill was re-introduced in 1830 to re-address the issues of licenses for public houses. After agreeing to a second reading, the matter was referred to a sub-committee for their recommendations.87 The report was tabled April 19, 1830 and the revised Bill printed for future
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discussion. Discussions ensued. After approval from the Governor the amended Bill was read a third time and passed unanimously. This situation may account for the lack of records relating to the issuing of licenses before 1830.

The first officially recognised licensee for the Woolpack Inn was Edward McCabe (Vol. 2, Appendix 5.2). The records of two convicts appearing in the musters of the mid-1820s share the name Edward McCabe, and either may be the man listed as the publican. Both arrived in 1816 and were likely free men by 1830 (one served a seven-year sentence beginning in 1816, the other received a conditional pardon in the mid-1820s), but neither could be linked directly to the site. It would appear that licensees may have changed several times during the 1830s. The Woolpack was offered for lease in 1832 by a Mr William Sharpe, a butcher, resident of Hunter Street. By 1833 James Bryan had taken up the mantle of licensee but his tenure was short-lived. He surrendered it to William Stevenson the following year. Stevenson was at the helm until 1840.

The 1840s saw just two licensees at the Woolpack. William Joshua Ballard took over from Stevenson but he did not last long and was gone by 1842. James Stewart had a longer residency. He was there throughout the rest of the decade and into the early 1850s. An early description of the premises comes from the period in which Stewart was licensee. The Woolpack was described in the Assessment books for 1845 as a two-storey, 12-roomed brick building with a shingled roof. The notes also record a detached wooden structure, stabling and sheds. In 1848, a separate kitchen and store was noted. Stewart ended his tenancy as licensee in 1854 and appears to have bought the lot from Sharpe, although 1855 and 1856 are the only years in which he is recorded as owner. This may be an error in the records as William Sharpe was once again the holder of that title in 1858. Charles Enderby was licensee for a year after Stewart, but was then replaced by John Boyd. In 1855, the building had 14 rooms and a rated value of £475. Boyd was absent for the next two years, when Michael Leacey was licensee and large sheds and stables were recorded in the assessment of the Woolpack’s value. Boyd returned to the role in 1860 (Vol. 2, Appendix 5.2).

Boyd was still operating at the hotel in 1861 but by 1863 both he and owner Sharpe had surrendered their roles to new faces. In that year, William Douglas was listed as owner and John Hall as licensee. By 1866, William Blunt was running the Woolpack and he saw out the decade there, as did owner Douglas. By 1871 the property had changed hands again, and a new licensee in the shape of Morgan Darcy graced the Woolpack. Ownership was now in the hands of George Moore.

The Ryan family that had owned Lot 3 since 1830 had extended their acquisitions to include the Woolpack property by 1877. At that time John Pries had been the licensee for five years and he remained in that position until the early 1880s when the Woolpack ceased trading and was demolished. By that time J. Barrett owned Lot 2, and the Ryan estate had retreated to its former borders.
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94 Stewart’s wife is recorded as giving birth to a son in 1848 at the Woolpack Inn indicating he resided there with his family, Sydney Morning Herald, 14 March 1848. A death notice in 1851 for James Stewart, aged 17, son of Mr James Stewart of the Woolpack, suggests they may have had more children in the years between. SMH 18 November 1851.
The Mercantile Bank
The Mercantile Bank was constructed between 1881 and 1883 (Figure 2.10). It owned the land for the remainder of the century, when it passed to the Commonwealth Bank of Australia and then onto Mick Simmons who remained there until 2000 (Figure 2.10).
Figure 2.10: ‘Huge crowd in George Street at Mick Simmons’s Sports Store to see Don Bradman, 1930’. The large three-storey building is on the site of the Woolpack Inn and was once the Mercantile Bank. To the left is the redeveloped Lot 3, shown here as the two-storey part of Mick Simmons’ store. In the extreme left of the image, and barely visible, is the slightly taller building at No. 710. ML, SLNSW.

2.4.2 Lot 3
Lot 3 occupied the central portion of the site. It was a triangular-shaped lot that witnessed creative building throughout the nineteenth century (Figure 2.6).

Early Years
In 1823 Michael Joyce owned Lot 3. Michael Joyce appeared in several records pertaining to the early years of the colony. He was referred to as residing on George Street, although there was nothing more to connect him with the site. This man was a baker who arrived on board the *Providence* in 1811 as a convict and received a conditional pardon in 1816 or 1818 (records differ). He received three convict labourers in 1823. In the 1840s several petitions were made by him regarding the confirmation of the granting of 40 acres of land, promised him some ten or 20 years previous. The land at Lot 3 consisted of 20 perches only, which complicates this man’s already loose connection with the site.

Joyce sold Lot 3 to James Ryan sometime before 1830. Ryan was already renting the land from Joyce at the time, and he continued living there after the sale. The building Ryan lived in was recorded on a plan by William Harper in 1823 (Figure 2.7), and the building was still standing in 1830 when Hallen completed his survey of the block (Figure 2.8). It was large and rectangular and was located in the eastern part of the lot with open ground on all sides. Hoddle, Larmer and Mitchell’s plan of the same period shows a similar building on Lot 3 but the plan appears more stylised and less accurate (Figure 2.4).
Between 1830 and 1835 there was a dispute over ownership of the land. Mr Sydney Stephen claimed that he bought the land from Joyce on 16 January, 1830 and was guaranteed title by the Under Sheriff at the time. At the time of the sale there had been some confusion over whether the sheriff had the authority to sell the property on behalf of Joyce. It was later settled that he did not, and in fact Joyce had already sold the property to Ryan by the time the transaction took place. In 1835, Thomas Ryan was recognised as the rightful owner of the land.95

Thomas Ryan was born in County Tipperary in c.1795. He was sentenced to 14 years in 1816 for the possession of forged notes and arrived on board the *Pilot* in 1817. In 1823 he was working at the Colonial Secretary’s office as a clerk on a conditional pardon. He was granted the land at Lot 3 in 1831. By 1838, he had achieved the position of chief clerk and received an absolute pardon. He remained owner of lot 3 until his death in 1866. The lot remained in the family until the mid-1880s.

**Subdivision and construction**

In the late 1830s or early 1840s the lot was subdivided and several structures were built on the property. By 1845 two brick buildings stood in the north of the lot and three wooden premises in the south (Vol. 2, Appendix 5.2). All were listed as shops. Andrew Miller occupied the most northern building. It had two storeys, four rooms and there was a bakehouse at the rear. John Morris was his southern neighbour in a two-roomed, one-storey building and the three wooden premises were occupied by Solomon Davis, Francis Timmings and Joseph Wade. Davis had a one-roomed shop in the middle of the row. His two southern neighbours had two rooms each, and probably shared the same building.96

---


96 The street numbers on George Street altered considerably over the years, with the assigning of particular numbers changing on individual lots. The current 710 George Street was listed in *Sands* as being number 722 for the years 1858/1859 to 1880. Within this same time frame number 712 was 724, 714 was 726, 716 was 728, 718 was 730, 720 was 732, and 722 was 734. By 1883 the street numbering was as it is today, with 710 at the northern end of the study area and 720 at the southern end. In the 1840s and early 1850s the numbers were even more confusing, ranging from 164-176, then changing direction to 649-653a. A separate table of previous street numbering for each property is provided in Section 3.
Three years later, Miller was still in the northern building, now numbered as 653a George Street, and Wade still occupied the southernmost at No. 649, where he would remain until 1858. Francis Timmins had moved next door into the other brick structure at No. 652/653 which now boasted five rooms in total. Samuel Phillips and Noble Irwin had a two-roomed wooden structure each at Nos. 651 and 650 respectively.

By 1856, Humphrey Richardson had moved into the bakehouse and Nathaniel Douglas occupied a three-roomed place that appeared to be an amalgamation of Phillips’ and Irwin’s old residences. Otherwise the lot remained the same.

The northernmost building (now numbered 724 George Street) had become a well-established bakery by this time, and between 1858 and 1865 James Byrnes, Henry Hough and Edward Fitzgerald (a pastry cook and confectioner) continued that tradition. During Hough’s residency, tenders were advertised for additions and alterations to the premises. This coincided with redevelopment on the rest of the lot in 1861-63.

The buildings to the south were pulled down in 1861, after advertising for tenders for the construction of four houses between May and December. The last shopkeepers to trade from them were a fruiterer (Thomas O’Connell), a carrier’s agent (Robert Allen), a saddler (Lewis Smith) and a plate worker (Edward Voss).

Redevelopment
By 1863, three new two-storey brick shops and residences had been built to the south of the 1840s bakehouse. The Sands lists indicate that the tenants within the study area were all operating commercial businesses, enterprises wholly suited to the general mercantile nature of the Haymarket area as a whole. The range of business conducted within the study area between 1858/59 to 1933 reflected the general commercial tone of the neighbourhood and includes such things as grocers, bakers, tobacconists, jewellers, hairdressing, millinery, confectioners, saddlers, boot making, boot importing, a music seller, and a refreshment room. Tailors and a draper occupied the middle of the row in 1863 (Willis & Baynes at No. 714 and George Jones at No. 716) and the saddlers Smith and Johnson were next door to the Woolpack Inn at No. 718.

No. 718 remained a saddlers until 1883, with Smith and Johnson in residence until the mid-1870s and William Adams (also a harness-maker) in the intervening years. Arthur Lestone, a hairdresser, shared the building with them from 1873 until 1883. After that the New York Novelty Company took over from the saddlers and stayed until the turn of the century.

97 These new buildings occupied the locations that would be numbered 710-718 from 1880 onwards. They were originally numbered 724-730. The twentieth-century street numbers have been used here to avoid confusion.
Figure 2.12: Plan showing some of the long standing shops that occupied the street-front of Lot 3 during the second half of the nineteenth century. Detail from the *Trigonometric Survey of Sydney, 1855-1865*, Section O2, City of Sydney Archives, Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Mrs L. Kennedy, a milliner, had a brief residence at No. 716 in the late 1860s, and after a short period of vacancy, Samuel Kerr’s boot warehouse was established at the location in the following decade. The provisions dealer Lewis Halvorsen saw the 1880s go by there, and Webb’s tailoring stitched their way through the last ten years of the century at No. 716.

In the mid-1860s, the Ryalls (a draper and a professor of music) occupied the store at No. 714, and Samuel Phillips, an auctioneer, was also to have a short stay there before the 1870s arrived. In 1873 John Fitzjohn Hall (a writing master) and George Stone (a saddler) were sharing No. 714 but by 1879 the tobacconist Cornelius Loughlan had become comfortable there. He would remain there until the 1890s.

At No. 712 in 1868, Aaron Bauman, a hatter, broke the long line of bakers at the residence. By 1873 he had been replaced by a confectioner, Jeremiah Callaghan. The Cahill Brothers and George Adams continued the confectionery trade there until the late 1890s.

**The twentieth century**

At the turn of the twentieth century the 1860s buildings were described as ‘very dilapidated’. It is possible that they survived until c.1930 when the lot was amalgamated into Mick Simmons property to the south. At No. 718, Pattinson’s chemist saw in the early part of the century. At No. 716, a bootmaker and importer shared the first three decades. No. 714 was occupied by Fred Salier, a
music seller, and No. 712 saw a variety of shops including a fruiterer, jewellers, a bag store, a tailor and a milliner.

2.4.3 Lot 4
Only the southern part of lot 4 was within the study area. This part of the lot had become a semi-autonomous entity by the early 1840s when subdivision occurred in many lots on this city block.

![Figure 2.13: Hallen's 1830 field sketch of Lot 4 showing the partitioned area that was within the site boundary (Area C). Detail from Field Books, Survey of the City of Sydney, A. Hallen, c1831, SR Reel 2628 (2/5195), Item 347, p5.](image)

Early Years
The lot was granted on 8 March 1831 to George Richards, who was by then a shopkeeper. This was a confirmation of title as Richards had already sold it to Thomas Etchells, a hatter, of Sydney in May 1828. Richards was originally a labourer from Derbyshire with a ‘dark and sallow’ complexion, black hair and hazel eyes. He was sentenced to life in Southampton in 1795 and arrived on board the Glatton in 1803. He was pardoned in 1818, granted land in 1821 and by 1823 was resident at the Brickfields and had received an assigned convict. He was still there when the 1828 Census was taken, with his two sons, George (junior) and William. Also residing there were Charlotte Lamb who came free and Mary Perry who may have been an assigned convict working for George Richards. He was 50 in 1828. When Richards sold the land there were five structures on the lot (Figure 2.12; Appendix 5.2).

---

Subdivision and development

By 1845 the portion of land described as Area C had been sold to Samuel Powers and a two-storey brick structure had been built at the street-front. More than one Samuel Powers appeared in the records of the time and none could be conclusively linked to the site. The most likely candidate was a convict pardoned in 1821. He was a 5ft 9¾in (175cm) groom from Birmingham with a ‘ruddy pock-marked complexion’, brown hair and grey eyes. He had been sentenced to life in Warwick in 1817. Little more could be found concerning his life in the colony.

Powers was residing on a separate portion of land at the ‘rear’ in 1845 in a two-storey, four-roomed brick house, but no evidence of this structure could be found on plans or in the archaeological record. It may have been located north of the site. Thomas Dally was in residence at the street-front shop. By 1848, Terrance Daly was the owner of the land and was also in residence. Thomas and Terrance almost certainly represent the same family if not the same person. Three other structures were listed at the address at this date: a store, stable and ‘co-house kitchen’. Each was listed with five rooms on a single level, with Daly as owner and occupant. There was no archaeological evidence for these additional buildings.

By 1855 the grocers Harris and Grogan were in residence. Within three years, Thomas Grogan was the sole operator of the business, and he remained there until 1867. The Lenehan brothers continued the grocery trade at the address until the early 1870s by which time ownership of the land had passed to T. J. McDonagh, and then onto Mrs Fraser. By this time stores covered much of the property at the rear (Figure 2.14).

In 1873 Edward Lidbury set up his Berlin wool and fancy warehouse and was still there in 1877 when the land had been bought by the Ryan family of Lot 3. John Henry Mulholland had taken up residence by 1879. His ‘fancy toy bazaar’ was however gone by 1882. The land was now the property of the Linden estate. Henry Linden (also referred to as Lindon) arrived in the colony from Madras in 1814. In 1824 he had been free for five years and had a wife and family, all born in the colony. He died in Burwood in 1866. He had four children (John, James, Ann and Sarah) by his wife Ann who died in 1869. In 1883 Grigor & Hutchinson’s fancy depot occupied the premises. They were the last company to operate out of the 1840s building.
Figure 2.14: 1865 *Trigonometric Survey of Sydney* showing the southern portion of Lot 4, by then heavily built upon. Thomas Grogan the grocer was in residence at the time. The additional buildings are likely to be stores. Detail from the *Trigonometric Survey of Sydney, 1855-1865*, Section O2, City of Sydney Archives, Historical Atlas of Sydney.

Figure 2.15: The water closet at No. 710 George Street in 1900. From ‘Views taken during Cleansing Operations, Quarantine Area, Sydney, 1900, ‘Views taken during Cleansing Operations, Quarantine Area, Sydney, 1900, Vol. III’, 172. W.C., rear of 710 George-street. SLNSW computer catalogue.
Twentieth-century Redevelopment
By 1888 the 1840s structure and its 1860s add-ons had been demolished and a large structure occupied over two thirds of the lot. It housed The New York & American Novelty Co. The following decade would see them share the premises with an oyster saloon, a clothier, a restaurant and a fancy goods store, and the building would expand further to the back of the property. In 1903 it was noted that the building was dilapidated and the stock that it housed hazardous (Figure 2.17). However, the New York Novelty Company continued to occupy the premises until 1918 (Figure 2.18). The building may not have survived much longer. Subsequent construction on the lot was not the focus of the excavation.

Figure 2.16: This plan shows the extent of buildings by 1888 as well as 1895. The courtyard area to the north of 710 was the only part of the site not built on by the 1880s. Sydney Metropolitan Detail Series, 1895, on-line at ML, SLNSW.
Figure 2.17: A plan showing the large building occupying the Lot 4, No. 710 in 1901. It is the same building shown on the 1917-1939 Insurance plan. It may have stood until 1918 but was demolished soon afterwards. Fire Underwriters Association of NSW, c1901: City of Sydney detail survey maps ‘Ignis et Aqua’ Series, Sheet II Vol. 1, ML MAV/FM4/10537.

Figure 2.18: The buildings on this plan are the same ones shown in the Bradman photo (Figure 2.10). Detail from the Fire Underwriters’ Plans, ca 1917-1939 - Block177_181, online, City of Sydney, Historical Atlas of Sydney.