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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Conservation Management Plan (CMP) addresses the whole of Churchill Island as included in the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR). Preparation of the CMP has had regard for the objectives, recommendations and actions arising out of the Churchill Island Key Area Plan (April 2014) and Churchill Island Key Area Plan – Technical Report (November 2013).

The CMP:

- Assesses and documents the cultural heritage values of Churchill Island, and clarifies what is significant about the island (buildings, structures, select objects and landscape elements).
- Provides a heritage policy framework to inform and guide management of the island, including conservation works to significant elements and potential future development and change.

The CMP includes a summary history which focuses on documenting the historical uses and physical evolution of the island; a physical survey and analysis which addresses buildings, structures, landscape areas and elements, archaeology and objects; a comprehensive and up to date assessment of the heritage significance of the island, including a revised statement of significance; opportunities and constraints; and a conservation policy, with recommended actions and implementation, for Churchill Island.

Regarding significance, the CMP concludes that Churchill Island is of historical significance to the state, but is significant at the local level for other values. The state historical significance derives from the association with early European exploration of Victoria, including the first documented planting of European crops in Victoria, and the first documented European structure or building in the state. Individual items of significance are identified: Rogers’ kitchen cottage and dormitory cottage; Amess house, half-cellar, wash house and stable; Grant cairn; select moveable objects; and several sites of archaeological potential. Landscape elements of significance include indigenous Moonah trees in the north of the island; and the Norfolk Island Pine, Mulberries and olive trees associated with the homestead. A range of significant aesthetic attributes and qualities, including views and vistas, are also described and analysed in the CMP.

The CMP recommends that items of significance should be retained and conserved, although alterations or changes can be considered where these support the ongoing viability and operation of the island. Conversely, non-significant buildings and elements (such as the buildings introduced to the ‘heritage’ farm precinct in the late twentieth century, visitor centre and 1999 bridge) can be removed or replaced, although the latter works should still be sympathetic to, and avoid impacts on, the heritage values of Churchill Island.

There is scope for new buildings albeit the ‘heritage’ farm precinct generally offers limited opportunity for new development. The visitor centre and function and events area provide greater opportunity, including for a new or expanded visitor centre and function/events centre. New buildings and structures should adopt a materials palette and architectural language which distinguishes them as contemporary, and avoids the proliferation of different building styles and materials across the island.

The CMP includes policies relating to the landscape, including managing the significant elements, with a recommendation to prepare a master plan to guide future landscape works and plantings on the island.
The CMP identifies a suite of permit exemptions which can be declared under Section 66 (3) of the *Heritage Act* 1995, to enable a range of works to be undertaken which would not require a permit from Heritage Victoria. These typically relate to building and landscape maintenance and upkeep, as well as temporary structures associated with temporary events. It recommends the exemptions be requested of Heritage Victoria.

‘Authenticity’ in relation to the ‘heritage’ farm experience at Churchill Island, is another focus of the conservation policy. Enhancing awareness and understanding of the history of the island can be assisted by emphasising what is authentic about the island, and adding clarity to the historic experience. Ironically, the more distinguished history of Churchill Island as a private island ‘retreat’ for wealthy owners over nearly 100 years does not come through strongly in the ‘heritage’ farm experience. Retaining and conserving the significant buildings is consistent with reinforcing the ‘authentic’, as is distinguishing them from the buildings and elements which are later introductions. Interpretation is another means of adding clarity, and giving weight to the historical experience.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

This Conservation Management Plan (CMP) has been prepared for Nature Parks in response to a Project Brief dated 19 August 2014. The CMP addresses Churchill Island, located off the north coast of Phillip Island, Western Port. The whole of the c.50 ha island is included in the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR, see Section 1.7 below).

The need for a CMP is identified in the Churchill Island Key Area Plan (KAP), prepared by Tract Consultants, in association with Urban Enterprise and Sanmor & Associates, for Nature Parks (April 2014). The KAP is a strategic planning document which sets out a vision and objectives for the island, and addresses a range of issues including design, uses, interpretation and implementation. The plan also proposes a precinct planning model for the island, whereby discreet heritage, visitor arrival and activities, major events, grazing and ecological conservation precincts are identified.

Another document of relevance is the Churchill Island Key Area Plan – Technical Report, prepared for Nature Parks by Tract Consultants et al (November 2013). Both these reports have been referred to in the preparation of this CMP, as the recommendations and actions arising out of the reports have potential implications for the cultural heritage values of Churchill Island.

1.2 Churchill Island

Churchill Island is a significant place in the context of Victorian history. Prior to the arrival of Europeans, it was home to the Boon Wurrung (an alternative spelling is Bunurong) people who attributed special significance to the Moonah tree vegetation. The island is also associated with European exploration of the Victorian coastline, having been sighted by George Bass in 1798 (after whom Bass Strait is named). In 1801, navigator James Grant who was surveying Western Port for the British Government, cleared a small area of land on the island and planted various edible crops. His crew also constructed two small timber buildings from felled island trees. Both the crops and the building are the first recorded in Victoria. From the 1850s, the island operated as a private farm, and from the 1870s until the 1970s it was a privately-owned retreat. Since 1981, following the acquisition of the island by the Victorian Conservation Trust (in 1976), it has been opened to the public as a visitor attraction.

The island is managed by Nature Parks, and is a publicly accessible attraction showcasing the heritage buildings, including Amess homestead (c. 1872) and associated gardens, together with the natural landscape. A visitor centre and cafe are also provided, in combination with an historic agricultural experience at the Churchill Island Heritage Farm. The latter features a collection of historic farm machinery.

Churchill Island is a ‘layered’ place in terms of its history and heritage significance. It is prized for its indigenous values, European exploration history, heritage buildings and structures, the natural landscape and the visual qualities inherent in its location. As noted, the entirety of the island is included in the VHR (H0027). More localised sites are included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory (inventory of historical archaeological sites). The waters and mudflats surrounding the island are also listed under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (the RAMSAR Convention).
1.3 **Purpose of CMP**

The chief purpose of the CMP is to:

- Assess and document the cultural heritage values of Churchill Island, and clarify what is significant about the island (buildings, structures, select objects and landscape elements).
- Provide a heritage policy framework to inform and guide management of the island, including conservation works to significant elements and potential future development and change.

1.4 **Sub-consultants**

This report was prepared by Lovell Chen Architects & Heritage Consultants, with inputs from the following sub-consultants:

- ArchLink Archaeologists and Heritage Advisors prepared the archaeological content (see Archaeological Survey and Assessment at Appendix B).
- Rohan Lamb, mechanical engineer, undertook an investigation and inspection of the collection of historic farm machinery at Churchill Island, and items associated with dairy farming, food processing and food storage, as well as items in the outbuildings, including the blacksmiths’ shed (see Inventory of Moveable Objects at Appendix C). For comment on other collections at Churchill Island, see Section 1.6.1 ‘Moveable objects and artefacts’.
- John Patrick Pty Ltd, landscape architects prepared content relating to the assessment and management of the landscape.
- David Huxtable, Lookear, heritage interpretation.

1.5 **Previous work**

Aspects of Churchill Island have been subject to extensive research and analysis over the past 30 years. The CMP has referred to this work, which is listed and identified in the ‘Bibliography’ attached to this report. Of particular note and assistance was the PhD thesis prepared by E Rebecca Sanders, *Applying the public history method: creating a history of Churchill Island* (the University of Melbourne, 2014). We wish to acknowledge her generosity in making a draft of this work available.

1.6 **Content and scope of CMP**


The CMP contains the following components:

*History*

A summary history of Churchill Island is included at Chapter 2. This largely utilises the existing histories of the place, supplemented with additional research including historic images, aerial photographs, maps and plans (most of which are reproduced in the chapter).
The focus of the history is on documenting Churchill Island uses and physical evolution over time. It is not intended to be a comprehensive history of the place, and nor does it address in detail the various owners and individuals who have been associated with the place.

**Physical survey and analysis**

A physical survey and analysis of the property is included (Chapter 3). This addresses buildings, structures, landscape areas and elements, geomorphology and objects. The survey and analysis has assisted in establishing the relative physical significance of the various components of the island and identifying issues to be addressed in the conservation policy. The survey also involved an historical archaeological component.

For comment on the extent of the collections inspected for this CMP see Sections 1.4 ‘Rohan Lamb’ and 1.6.1 ‘Moveable objects and artefacts’.

**Assessment of significance**

The assessment of heritage significance (Chapter 4) includes some comparative analysis (comparisons with similar places) so as to better understand the relative importance of the place in the context of related sites. Understanding the relative importance of the farm buildings and use of the place as a ‘heritage farm’ has also benefitted from some comparative investigation. The assessment also addresses the Victorian Heritage Register (Heritage Council) criteria, to provide a more comprehensive and up to date assessment of the island, which is recommended to Heritage Victoria. This is based on the understanding that the current VHR assessment is limited and inaccurate. The revised statement of significance addresses the historical, social, aesthetic/architectural and scientific heritage values; it also follows a recommended format and structure.

**Opportunities and constraints**

Chapter 5 establishes a framework for the conservation policy in Chapter 6, addressing the implications arising from the cultural heritage significance of Churchill Island; Nature Parks’ aspirations for the site, including the Key Area Plan; statutory requirements and obligations; environmental, natural and Indigenous values; and the condition of buildings and elements, including landscape areas and elements.

**Conservation policy**

Informed by the above process, Chapter 6 includes the conservation policy, with recommended actions and implementation, for Churchill Island. The policies have regard for the existing statutory heritage controls and context, and the tourism related focus of island management.

1.6.1  **Limitations and exclusions**

**Historical research**

The aim of the historical research undertaken for this report was to gather information about the place sufficient to understand significance. It was beyond the scope of the report to access all of the historical documentation that relates to Churchill Island.

**Social values**

While consideration has been given to Churchill Island’s social values, this has been done on the basis of a survey of members of FOCIS (Friends of Churchill Island Society), as opposed to a more comprehensive survey.¹
Aboriginal heritage

The CMP does not address or include Aboriginal heritage, and nor does it examine Indigenous cultural history. The natural values of the island are also not covered in detail, whereby the focus of this report is on cultural heritage values and management.

Moveable objects and artefacts

As noted above (Section 1.4, ‘Rohan Lamb’), investigation and inspection of objects/collections at Churchill Island was limited to farm machinery, items associated with dairy farming, food processing and food storage, as well as items in the outbuildings, including the blacksmiths’ shed.

During research for the CMP, it was brought to the consultants’ attention that FOCIS also maintains a collection of artefacts found on site (including archaeological finds), as well as documents, photographs and objects/artefacts from former owners and residents of Churchill Island. The collection is owned by Nature Parks. At the time of writing, this collection – which includes a considerable number of items with Churchill Island provenance – was in the process of being catalogued.2

A detailed inspection and assessment of the collection of artefacts found on site, documents, photographs and objects was beyond the scope of this CMP. However, it is noted that analysis of items within the collection has the potential to enhance an understanding of the historic use and operation of the Island. At a future date it would be desirable for a detailed investigation of this collection to be undertaken.

1.7 Heritage controls

Churchill Island is included in the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR), maintained by the Victorian Heritage Council (VHR number H1614). It is categorised as a ‘heritage place’, and includes ‘heritage objects’. The extent of registration includes the island and the access bridge at the south. The citation does not include a permit policy or permit exemptions.

The island was included in the VHR in 1998. The source for the brief Statement of Significance was the entry in the (then) Register of the National Estate. A copy of the VHR citation is included at Appendix A.

The whole of the island (H7921-002) and one individual site on the island (H7921-0014) are included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory, which is a list of historical archaeological sites. These are addressed in the archaeological assessment and survey at Appendix B.

Churchill Island is also included in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay of the Bass Coast Planning Scheme (HO27). The extent of the overlay is consistent with the VHR entry (Figure 1). Abutting HO27 to the south – i.e. on Phillip Island – is the ‘Newhaven entrance to Churchill Island, Samuel Amess Drive, Newhaven’, an area designated at HO123 in the Heritage Overlay. This site is not addressed in the CMP.

1.7.1 Non-statutory listings and classifications

Churchill Island is classified as a place of state significance in the National Trust of Australia (Victoria) register (file number L10088). Trees on the island are also listed in the Trust’s Significant Tree Register. Churchill Island was also included in the (now defunct) Register of the National Estate. The RNE and National Trust citations are at Appendix A.
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Figure 1  Left: Bass Coast Planning Scheme detail: Churchill Island is designated HO27; Right: Aerial view of Churchill Island, November 2014
2.0 HISTORY

2.1 Introduction

Churchill Island has had three main phases of occupation and land use since its sighting in 1801 by Lieutenant James Grant: a working farm, a private island retreat and a public recreation and conservation reserve. Each of these phases has impacted the island and introduced new built form. The following history is presented chronologically with a focus on the most enduring periods of ownership and occupation. A series of annotated historic plans and aerial photographs dating from the 1880s is included at Section 2.7, showing the sequential development of the island.

The history has been informed by both primary and secondary sources, including books, archival websites, reports, a thesis and visual material. This has included the work of E Rebecca Sanders in her 2014 draft PhD thesis: Applying the public history method: creating a history of Churchill Island. A history is also included in the Churchill Island (H1614) Archaeological Assessment by ArchLink (Appendix B).

2.2 Indigenous contact

The Western Port district is the country of the Boon Wurrung people, who are part of the Kulin nation, and who prior to European contact were semi-nomadic. Boon Wurrung country includes land to the Werribee River to the west and to Wilson’s Promontory at the east. Within the Boon Wurrung are six clans, with the Yallock-balluk and Mayonebulluk associated with Western Port. Early visitors to the area found marks of fire and an abandoned canoe, and evidence that the local wildlife had been hunted. Given the accessibility of Churchill Island, it is likely that the Boon Wurrung visited it prior to the arrival of Europeans, although the exact nature of their use or occupation of the island is unknown.

2.3 Exploration (early 1800s)

2.3.1 Early exploration and settlement of Western Port

The south-east coast of Australia had been sighted by explorers from France, Portugal and Britain as early as the seventeenth century. Western Port itself was identified by European explorers in the late eighteenth century, and by the early nineteenth century was ‘the scene of fairly constant activity’. The tidal bay was the focus of initial European exploration of the south-east of Australia, before interest in Port Phillip Bay to the west.

In December 1797, naval surgeon and explorer George Bass departed Sydney to explore the southern coast of Australia, and located the strait separating Van Diemen’s Land (Tasmania) and the mainland. On this voyage Bass also discovered Wilson’s Promontory and Western Port, so named as it was the most westerly harbour reached on the journey. James Grant’s 1801 expedition further explored Western Port and gave Churchill Island its name (see Section 2.3.2). A French expedition of 1803 charted Western Port, identifying and naming French Island (Ile des Francais), with Phillip Island named Ile des Anglais (Figure 2). In 1803 a short-lived British settlement, which intended to secure this area against French intrusion, was established by Lieutenant-Governor David Collins in Port Phillip Bay at present day Sorrento. The party, which comprised 300 convicts, marines and a number of free settlers, was hampered by the lack of suitable water, soil and timber. The settlement was officially abandoned in October 1804. In this period, gangs of sealers from England, France and America began to exploit the fur seal colonies of Bass Strait. Sealing in the Strait had declined by the 1830s with the
depletion of seal and sea elephant numbers. Sealers, or Straitsmen, would be left with supplies at remote locations including Sealers’ Cove at Wilsons Promontory and the Bass Strait islands for months at a time.\textsuperscript{12} Little physical or archival evidence remains of the communities. It does not appear that a sealing base was established on Churchill Island. In the 1980s a possible site was identified, but the likelihood of it being used by sealers has been disputed in recent years. However, at least one sealing ship reportedly anchored there.\textsuperscript{13} Sealing continued into the 1820s, with an encampment near Rhyll depicted by Louis Saison, the artist with the French expedition of the Astrolabe in 1826 (Figure 3).\textsuperscript{14}

The first official attempt to settle Western Port came in 1826 with the establishment of a British outpost at what is now Corinella, on the eastern shore of Western Port. Governor Darling sent 20 soldiers, some of whom brought their wives, and 20 convicts to Western Port with the aim of both preventing uncontrolled settlement in the southern part of the New South Wales colony and to emphasise British control of the area to the French, who had recently explored the area.\textsuperscript{15} Again poor water supply and the cost of settlement resulted in the withdrawal of the military and subsequently the free settlers by March 1828. However, within the two years some 50 structures had been constructed at the settlement, including houses and stores, and although many were evident in 1835, all buildings had been demolished by 1842. A fort and gun emplacement at Fort Dumaresq near present day Rhyll on the north-east of Phillip Island was also established in December 1826 (Figure 4).\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{‘Port Western’ as shown on the chart of the French expeditions of 1800-1804}
\label{fig:chart}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Source: State Library of Victoria}
Figure 3  Sealers’ settlement, Western Port, as depicted by artist Louis Saison in c. 1826
Source: State Library of Victoria

Figure 4  Map of Western Port by surveyor Wetherall, c. 1827. Note flags showing location of British settlements at Rhyll and near Corinella (indicated).
Source: State Library of Victoria
2.3.2 **Lieutenant James Grant**

In 1800, naval officer Lieutenant James Grant departed England in command of the Lady Nelson, which was to undertake survey work of the Australian coastline. Grant’s first assignment was to survey the south-west of Australia, assisted by Francis Barrallier, who would later prepare the maps charting the ship’s voyage. The expedition, however, did not reach the west of the continent, and was instead confined to Bass Strait.\(^{17}\)

The expedition arrived at Western Port on 20 March 1801, naming Lady Nelson Point near present day Rhyll on Phillip Island. The following day Grant set out to find fresh water, and upon encountering a series of mud flats, he saw what he identified as a separate island – Churchill Island.\(^{18}\) Grant recalled his impressions of Churchill Island in his published account of the voyage:

> I fell in with an island, pleasantly situated, and separated from the Main island [Phillip Island] by a very narrow channel at low water ... It is of gradual ascent, well covered with trees of a considerable height, and underwood. The situation of it was so pleasant, and the prospects round it so agreeable, that this, together with the richness of the soil, and the sheltered position of the spot, made me conceive the idea that it was excellently adapted for a garden. Having determined upon establishing a garden in this place, I thought it incumbent upon me to give the island the name of Churchill [after John Churchill, Esq. who] ... supplied me with a variety of seeds of useful vegetables, together with the stones of the peaches, nectarines, and the pepins or kernels of several sorts of apples, with an injunction to plant them for the future benefit of our fellow-men.\(^{19}\)

John Churchill was a ‘generous and public spirited’ gentleman of Dawlish in Devon, who was clearly of sufficient social standing for Grant to honour him with the name of an island.\(^{20}\) The exact nature of his support of Grant and the Lady Nelson expedition is unknown. Grant had also been provided with seeds by his friend, Captain John Schanck, a commissioner of the Transport Board who had assisted Grant in gaining the command of the Lady Nelson.\(^{21}\) Both men were recognised by Grant in the naming of Churchill Island and Cape Schanck.

After further surveying the coast and the hinterland around Western Port, Grant and members of his crew returned to Churchill Island, having not found ‘any other place fitter for the purpose ... of clearing ground for a garden.’\(^{22}\) Grant recalled that his men cleared a space of ‘about 20 rods’ by burning the ground and felling the trees.\(^{23}\) Grant may have meant the size of the cleared land was 20 square rods, approximately 1 hectare, or 20 roods, approximately 2 hectares.\(^{24}\) Grant departed the island with Barrallier, leaving behind a party of men. Upon his return, he found that they had:

> cleared the spot I had laid out for a garden, and that there was nothing wanting but to prepare the ground to receive such seeds as I should chuse [sic] to plant. [My men] slept on the ground which they had cleared for a garden, in a hut which they had built for the occasion ... The ground was now prepared and I sowed my several sorts of seeds, together with wheat, Indian corn and peas, some grains of rice, and some coffee berries; and I did not forget to plant potatoes. With the trunk of the trees I felled I raised a block-house of 24 feet by 12, which will probably remain for some years ... I made this plantation rather late in the season, but I am in hope that some of the crops will flourish.\(^{25}\)
As has been widely noted in previous histories of the island, Grant expressed an attachment for Churchill Island, saying:

I scarcely know a place I should sooner call my own than this little island.\textsuperscript{26}

The likely site of the garden is depicted in Barrallier’s chart of Western Port completed upon the return of the voyage to Sydney. Two versions of the chart show a dotted outline on the western side of the island, believed to show the indicative location of the planted area. The second version (Figure 5) includes further detail showing two markings which appear to indicate structures, possibly the hut and the block house.

The relative size of the cleared area compared with the island appears somewhat of an exaggeration, and was perhaps enlarged to ensure the visibility of the site on the published plan. Grant and his crew departed Western Port on 29 April 1801, having spent five weeks surveying the area.

The following December, Grant’s first mate James Murray returned to Western Point, making the point to return to Churchill Island. He found that the huts and garden remained as they had left them.\textsuperscript{27} The wheat and corn were reported to be in ‘full vigour’ at six feet high, although other crops appeared to have been eaten by animals. As noted by Rebecca Sanders, the lack of change to the Grant garden indicates that this part of the island had not been accessed by sealers.\textsuperscript{28}

Figure 5  Barrallier chart of James Grant’s 1801 voyage showing Churchill Island. Note dotted line and markings which likely indicate the site of the garden, block house and hut
Source: State Library of Victoria
2.3.3 Later exploration

Despite the attachment Grant, and apparently Murray, felt for Churchill Island, it appears to have disappeared into obscurity for the next five decades. The voyage by Grant did not result in any attempts to settle Western Port, although Grant’s naming of the island was retained. Indeed the name Churchill Island is the only legacy of the 1801 expedition. Furthermore, subsequent exploration of the bay did not appear to reference Grant’s published account and the voyage received little attention in newspapers until the late nineteenth century.29

The resurgence of British interest in Western Port in the 1820s, a result of French exploration of the area, also appeared largely ignorant of Grant’s work.30 Indeed the Governor of New South Wales, Thomas Brisbane, noted his intention to send a ship to ‘Western Port, to have that explored, as it seems to have escaped Flinders as well as others’, despite it having been officially explored four times by the British.31 Survey work of Western Port was undertaken in conjunction with the establishment of the settlement at Corinella in 1826. The resultant plan prepared by naval cartographer F A Wetherall of the HMS Fly defines Churchill Island as an isle off Phillip Island (Figure 4).32

With the abandonment of the Western Port settlement, no further official exploration of Western Port occurred until the late 1830s and early 1840s, after the establishment of Melbourne in 1835. The plans produced as part of these surveys show Churchill Island as a distinct island, and depicted its topography and vegetation.

The c. 1842 plan by surveyor G D Smythe (Figure 6) notes the island to be of ‘dense scrub with tea tree’, and the 1843 plan by J L Stokes (Figure 7) also shows the island as heavily vegetated. Sanders asserts that given the dismantling of the 1825 settlement at Corinella and the ongoing sealing in the area, it is unlikely that the timber block house and hut from Grant expedition would have survived to this period.33

2.3.4 Bunguyun Pastoral Run

By the late 1840s, much of the coastline of Western Port, including French Island, had been taken up as pastoral leases. The Bunguyun pastoral run was taken up by Martha Jane King in 1845, and divided into two separate runs in January 1854, known as Bunguyan and Sandstone Island. The Sandstone Island run included Sandstone, Elizabeth and Churchill islands.34

2.4 Working farm (c. 1854-1872)

It was not until the 1850s that further official settlement of Western Port took place, following the settling of San Remo in the 1840s, Crown Land sales in the area and the establishment of township reserves at the former British settlement sites in Western Port at Corinella and Rhyll. Churchill Island was first occupied by farmer John Rogers, a former employee of Martha King, who leased and later owned the island between 1854 and 1872. Rogers also occupied two other Western Port islands, Sandstone Island and Elizabeth Island, with the three islands originally having formed the Sandstone Island pastoral run. During the period of Rogers’ lease, the Pickersgill family spent a number of years on the island, and there have been different views as to the exact nature of their occupation. The Rogers’ occupation was the longest period in which the island was a working farm.
Figure 6  Detail of survey of islands of Western Port, by surveyor G D Smythe, c. 1842
Source: ROLL 85, Historic Plans Collection, Public Record Office Victoria

Figure 7  Detail of plan of ‘Port Western’ by J L Stokes, 1843
Source: National Library of Australia
2.4.1  John Rogers

Cornishman John Rogers had arrived in Western Port by the mid-1840s, having been appointed to manage the heifer breeding program on Sandstone Island, part of Martha King’s Bunguyan pastoral run. After leaving this position for the goldfields in the early 1850s, Rogers returned in 1853 and was granted the lease to Elizabeth Island, south of French Island. In 1854, an agreement with King saw the transfer of the Sandstone Island lease, to Rogers. Rogers applied to purchase Sandstone Island in March 1854 through pre-emptive right provisions, but this application was unsuccessful.

In April 1854 Rogers made an application to the Chief Commissioner of Crown Lands to lease Churchill Island. Although he stated he was ‘willing to pay the sum of one pound per annum’, it was noted that Martha King paid ten pounds per annum for Sandstone Island under an occupation licence, and ‘Mr Rogers should be charged the same fee.’ It appears that there may have been some delay in the administration of the Sandstone Island lease, as Rogers was in occupation of the island by this date.

Although it has been suggested that the comment regarding fees resulted in the application being refused, it is likely Rogers was in occupation of the island by 1856. A Titles Office indenture of 23 May 1856 refers to a Captain Edward Lintott reported paying John Rogers £140 for stores, implements, chattels, effects and interest on Sandstone, Elizabeth and Churchill islands. It is probable, therefore, that Rogers had an established interest in the island by this date. Furthermore, the Squatters Directory for the Colony of Victoria of 1857 states that Rogers’ lease commenced in 1853, confirming his interest in the island by the mid to late 1850s.

Rogers appears to have run sheep and cattle on Sandstone and Elizabeth islands, with Churchill remaining purely agricultural. He constructed a residence on Sandstone Island in the 1850s, and it may have been his main residence in this period. However, by 1858 Rogers had reported that the only stock remaining on Sandstone and Elizabeth islands was rabbits.

Rogers also introduced European species of birds to the island in the late 1850s through a connection with the Acclimatisation Society. In 1859 he reported to the Society on sightings of introduced birds and in February 1861, he ‘liberated’ a number of English pheasants at Sandstone and ‘Church Hill’ Island. He later complained of ‘sportsmen’ shooting the relatively tame partridges he hand-fed on the island. It appears his association with the Society lasted into the 1860s.

In October 1861 the Member for South Bourke in the Legislative Assembly, L L Smith questioned the Commissioner of Crown Lands and Survey as to whether Rogers was ‘cultivating extensively’ on the island, and if he had:

exported therefrom a large quantity of produce and sent it into the Melbourne market to compete with the farmers.

The Commissioner of Crown Lands and Survey assured the Parliament that Rogers ‘had made repeated applications for leave to cultivate [Churchill Island] which had been refused.’ He had two ‘small gardens in cultivation, from which he supplied vegetables to fisherman who were short of provisions. He did not, however, compete with any farmers.’ While it appears that Rogers had been granted a licence to occupy the island, he did not have permission to cultivate the land commercially.
In the mid-1860s, through the sale of Crown Land at Phillip Island, Rogers was able to cease leasing Churchill Island and purchase it outright. In December 1865 the island was sold as a special lot for an upset price of £1 10s per acre, and Rogers purchased the 140 acres, along with improvements valued at £730, for £210. The value of the ‘improvements’ suggests that buildings or fencing had been constructed on the island. That same year, Rogers’ first son, Churchill was born on the island. Also indicative that Churchill Island was now his primary place of residence, in 1866 Rogers transferred the lease of Sandstone Island to a John Skinner.

In 1861, a survey map was prepared of the eastern entrance to Western Port by Charles Ferguson, the Chief Harbour Master of Victoria, which detailed the narrows between Phillip Island and the mainland. Churchill Island itself was not mapped as part of this plan, being too far north of the survey area. However, the island is referenced, with a line of what appears to be coastline and a segmented rectangle annotated as ‘White House Churchill Island’ (Figure 8). Although the exact location of the building is not clear, it appears likely it was situated on the eastern edge of the island. A subsequent survey plan of Western Port, prepared by Henry Cox in 1865, includes two depictions of Churchill Island. A detail of the eastern coastline (Figure 9) shows what appears to be a building, enclosed in fencing, close to what is now Point Pickersgill. A second image (Figure 10) shows the whole of the island, with fencing and two additional buildings shown in the centre of the island. The survey had been completed by Cox by September 1865, and it seems that the value of the improvements noted in Rogers’ purchase may have taken into account the two small cottages which remain at the island in the heritage farm complex.

Figure 8  Detail of map of eastern entrance to Western Port, 1861, with ‘White House Churchill Island’ annotated off the coast of Phillip Island. Note: map does not show Churchill Island itself
Source: State Library of Victoria
Figure 9  Detail of Henry Cox plan of Westernport, surveyed in 1865, with building shown on eastern side of Churchill Island (indicated), and fence lines
Source: State Library of Victoria

Figure 10  Detail of Henry Cox plan of Westernport, surveyed in 1865, showing buildings in centre of Churchill Island (indicated) and fence lines
Source: State Library of Victoria
In 1867 Rogers took out a mortgage on the island from John McHaffie, a major landowner of Phillip Island. The funds from this mortgage likely enabled the construction of buildings or other improvements to the island. This may have included the construction of the second of the two cottages. Miles Lewis suggests that the rear or ‘bakehouse’ cottage was constructed earlier than the front cottage.

Rogers used the island for mixed farming, and introduced a large number of sheep to the island. Sanders estimates that from sale of wool by Rogers at the Melbourne markets in the late 1860s, he ran approximately 190 sheep in 1867 and 630 in 1868.

Despite this, Rogers put Churchill Island up for sale in 1869. It was advertised in the Argus as a ‘delightful retreat’, with fertile land, house and fruit trees. It does not appear that this advertisement attracted a purchaser as the island was subsequently put up for auction in March 1872. The Argus auction notice for the ‘splendid estate’ stated that the island was:

One of the most compact and productive islands in the world for its size;

in fact, second only to Norfolk Island.

The advertisement appealed to ‘gentlemen of independence’, indicating estate agents Stubbs & Co. did not anticipate interest from small scale farmers, but rather prospective buyers with wealth looking for an island property. It was announced the following May that Samuel Amess, a former mayor of Melbourne, had purchased the ‘beautiful little island’ for £1,450.

2.4.2 Pickersgill family

During Rogers’ occupation of Churchill Island in the 1850s, members of the Pickersgill family were located at the island. It is unclear how Samuel and Winifred Pickersgill and their children came to occupy the island, as the exact nature of their tenancy has not been established through documentary sources. It has been suggested that the family may have been labourers employed by Rogers or had an arrangement with him to sublet the island while he remained at Elizabeth Island or Sandstone Island. Conversely, Pickersgill family oral and written history contends that they arrived as squatters on the island in the late 1850s, only leaving when Rogers purchased the property in 1865. Samuel Jabez Pickersgill, son of Samuel Pickersgill, later wrote his parents had:

failed to acquire the right of occupying [the island and] had lost their home to a Mr. Rodgers (sic). My father was advised several times to select but he would not bother about it. Mother had made a comfortable home on the little island. It is I think about 160 acres or so.

From evidence of 1854 and 1861, it is unlikely the Pickersgills squatted on the island; rather it appears that there was an arrangement with Rogers to occupy the island until Rogers took up some form of residency in the early 1860s. The ‘White House’ of 1861 at what is now Pickersgill Point may have been the family’s residence. According to the family’s descendants, Winifred Pickersgill produced butter for sale, and stock reports of the early 1860s record two cows at the island. It is also believed that Winifred Pickersgill maintained a substantial kitchen garden, which likely would have been situated near the house.

2.5 Private retreat (1872-1970s)

2.5.1 Amess ownership (1872-1928)

The Amess family owned Churchill Island between 1872 and 1928, using it primarily as a holiday retreat from Melbourne. During the Amess ownership the current weatherboard
homestead was constructed, in the 1870s, along with the half-cellar and the planting of the 'homestead' pine at the front of the house.\textsuperscript{65} The health benefits of seaside air had been accepted since the mid-nineteenth century and Churchill Island offered Amess both a private sanctuary and a place of recreation away from the city. Others of Amess’ standing in the late nineteenth century were acquiring retreats in the increasingly popular Macedon Ranges and coastal towns such as Lorne, Queenscliff and along the Mornington Peninsula.

2.5.2 \quad \textit{Samuel Amess}

Samuel Amess (Figure 11) arrived in Victoria from Scotland in 1852, aged 26. Having trained as a stonemason, Amess started work as a building contractor in Melbourne soon after his arrival, and was awarded the contract for a number of prominent buildings including the Treasury building (1858-1862), Customs House (1856-58) and the Government Printing Office (1856-58). He was also the first president of the Builders and Contractors Association which was established in 1873. Amess was elected to the Melbourne City Council in 1864 and was mayor in 1869-70.\textsuperscript{66} After his time as mayor, Amess was selected as the alderman for the Bourke Ward of the City of Melbourne, and represented the Council on the Melbourne Harbor Trust.\textsuperscript{67}

Amess and his family, which included his wife Janet, six sons and two daughters, resided in William Street, Melbourne.\textsuperscript{68} In July 1898 Amess died, following a short illness which was apparently aggravated by continuing his public duties.\textsuperscript{69}

Figure 11  \quad \textit{Samuel Amess, photographed as Mayor of Melbourne, 1870}

Source: State Library of Victoria
2.5.3 Island retreat

While Samuel Amess maintained his William Street property in Melbourne as his primary place of residence, his ownership of Churchill Island provided him a private retreat from his public life. It does not appear Amess took part in local or municipal affairs in the Phillip Island district, and that his time spent on Churchill Island was purely recreational. He constructed a timber house with verandah (Figure 12), and maintained a garden, some stock and cultivated crops. In 1871 the Phillip Island Road District was proclaimed, taking in properties in both Phillip and Churchill islands. The first rate book assessment for the island was undertaken at the time of the transfer of ownership. The island was valued at a Net Annual Value (NAV) of £30/10/0. Ten years later, as a result of improvements undertaken by Amess, the island was valued at a NAV of £56.

Amess’ prominence in Melbourne, and his apparent generosity and hospitality saw a number of journalists visit and write favourable reports of Churchill Island. The first in 1876 noted the ‘pretty little place’ was ‘alive with pheasants, hares and preserved game of all sorts’.

A writer with the Australasian provided a more expansive description in 1880, remarking that Amess:

- took us to his house and showed us over his homestead, his garden, his rich and heavily-laden orchard, showed us his admirably appointed surroundings, introduced us to his pigs, and his black Highland cattle, and strolled with us round his compact and most enviable domain. He has on his island an area of 150 acres, all of fine rich volcanic soil. On this area he has plantations, grass paddocks, fields of root crops, game of various kinds, and a small menagerie of native animals. We coursed some lively hares.

A return visit by the newspaper in 1888 noted the ‘comfortable rural villa’ which offered ‘ample accommodation for any number of visitors, and that accommodation is often severely tested, for Mr Amess loves to have his friends with him’. Other writers of the 1880s described it as a ‘sea-girt retreat’ and that Amess had ‘as pleasant and healthful a situation as could be found in the world’. The writer also speculated that although ‘it is difficult to guess where Captain Grant formed his little plantation on the island ... Mr Amess found, when he bought the property, the remains of a very old garden not far from the eastern shore’. This is likely to have been the site of the ‘White House’ and possibly Winifred Pickersgill’s kitchen garden, rather than Grant’s garden.

The recreational character of Churchill Island is illustrated in the sketch of a party picnicking near the water in a series of sketches of Western Port of 1880 (Figure 13). A c. 1880 photograph shows a group of Amess family children and adults playing with a maypole at the front of the house (Figure 14), while an undated photograph shows three men relaxing on the slope of the hill (Figure 15). Two paintings were also completed by a member of the Amess family, possibly Margaret Amess or Minnie Laurence, which appear to show the approach to the island from the west (Figure 16, Figure 17).

The main access to Churchill Island in these years was from the end of Churchill Road on Phillip Island, then across to Churchill Island’s jetty by boat. However, it is understood that depending on tides and conditions some access to the southern tip of the island was also available over the mud flats, by way of a corduroy road or similar. This was used to drive livestock across, and occasionally by visitors to the island.
Figure 12  Undated photograph of Amess family in front of the 1870s house, with garden and pathways visible
Source: Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, reproduced from E Rebecca Sanders, Applying the public history method, draft, 2014, p. 259

Figure 13  View of Churchill Island (main image), 1880, David Syme & Co.
Source: State Library of Victoria
Figure 14  Amess family with maypole in front of house, c. 1880
Source: Churchill Island Visitors Centre interpretation

Figure 15  Three men relaxing on Churchill Island, undated
Source: Held by Churchill Island archive, reproduced from E Rebecca Sanders,
*Applying the public history method*, draft, 2014, p. 252
Figure 16  Detail of undated painting of Churchill Island, likely by a member of the Amess family
Source: Churchill Island collection

Figure 17  Detail of undated painting of Churchill Island, possibly showing approach from the west, and likely painted by a member of Amess family
Source: Churchill Island collection
Following Samuel Amess’ death in 1898, his family retained the island, spending three months there over Christmas each year. Ownership of the island itself had already been passed to Samuel Amess’ son, Samuel, in 1879, although it appears it was still understood as Samuel senior’s property. In 1907, Amess’ granddaughter, Marjorie Amess, described the island in a letter to the Australasian:

> We are the only people living here, except the manager, who has rooms not far from the house. The house and orchard are surrounded by large pine trees, some of which are as high as 80 ft [24.4 metres]. There are 150 acres, these being divided into nine paddocks. We go in for grazing in a small way. Each of the paddocks contains at least two or more waterholes. We have four landing-stages and three boats. We always spend three months down here at Christmas time, when we have a number of friends staying with us. We have a jolly time going for picnics and having impromptu dances, which are very amusing, especially for the onlookers ... There is also a large flagpole in the front paddock, which is about 50 ft. [15.2 metres] high, and on special occasions we hoist the flags. The house contains seven rooms and there are two bedrooms away from the house, called the ‘barracks’ which are the bachelors’ quarters. We have a large bell, which belonged to the Kerangie, and on New Year’s Eve we ring it to bring in the new year.

It does not appear any major changes were undertaken to the island in the early decades of the twentieth century, as the rate book assessment of the value of the property remained consistent between 1900 and 1920 with a NAV of £60.

### 2.5.4 Cannon

The origin of the cannon situated at the front of the house has been subject to much debate. The popular belief, initiated by the Amess family, that it was a gift from the American Civil War ship, the Shenandoah, has been disputed in recent years. The Shenandoah, a Confederate ship, visited Melbourne in 1865, when Amess was a member of the Melbourne City Council.

The cannon was noted in the newspaper article on the island of April 1880, with the description: ‘in front of his house, and near the foot of his flagstaff, Mr Amess has a small cannon planted, and a pile of veritable round shot stands in handy proximity’. The earliest public claim of the Shenandoah connection appears to be in 1907, when Amess’ granddaughter, Marjorie, stated in the Australasian that ‘we have a large cannon in the orchard, which belonged to the American war-ship Shenandoah, and was given to my grandfather by a friend.’ This claim was repeated in 1921 in the Frankston and Somerville Standard:

> On Churchill Island ... is an old muzzle-loading cannon, which belonged to the Confederate privateer, ‘Shenandoah’, which visited Australia in 1865, during the American Civil War ... The gun in question was presented by the officers of the vessel to the late Councillor Amess for hospitality.

More recent research, however, has questioned the likelihood of this. The American Civil War Round Table of Australia was approached by the Victorian Conservation Trust in the early 1980s to assist in establishing the history of the cannon. The Society concluded that there was no connection between the cannon and the Shenandoah, as ‘every cannon ever carried on the Shenandoah is currently in the United States Naval Academy’ in Maryland. As a six-pounder naval gun, the Churchill Island cannon was smaller than all the guns carried...
on the ship. The society raised the possibility that the cannon may have been brought to Western Port during the establishment of British settlement in 1826, which was later rejected by Ray Fielding of the Melbourne Science Museum. However, a report prepared by Tony Dunlap in 1982 concluded that ‘without proof to the contrary, the Cannon ... is for all intents and purposes is considered to be of Confederate origin.’ Historical archaeologist, William C Wright of the Victorian Conservation Trust, suggested that the cannon was of European origin. Further analysis of the cannon’s origins has not been undertaken as part of this report.

2.5.5 Buckley ownership (1928-c. 1936)

In 1919, Amess’ son Samuel died. The property was transferred in 1921 to his son, also named Samuel Amess, and in 1928 Churchill Island was put up for sale. An advertisement in the Daily News of Perth noted that the island had:

... been in the possession of the Amess family for over 60 years [sic.] continuously ... The soil is of volcanic origin and highly productive. As well as ordinary crops and oats, wheat, maize and barley, success has been attended the cultivation of chicory, millet, rape, tobacco, potatoes, tomatoes and onions. There is an eleven-roomed weatherboard house on the island, besides servants’ quarters and barns, a wool-shed, and a double-walled brick dairy, which is semi-underground. It is most attractively timbered. Churchill Island is estimated to be worth £10,000.

The island was purchased by Gerald Buckley, the son of Mars Buckley who founded the department store Buckley & Nunn. Buckley, who lived at Narrapumelap, a large Western District pastoral station, was a well-known pastoralist and horse breeder. He purchased the island for use as a small dairy farm with the aim of making it financially viable. Brothers A R (Bob) and E E (Ted) Jeffery, employees of Buckley’s at the Warrnambool property Airlie, were given the task of restoring and managing the property. Although the Jefferys were permanent residents of the island, the main bedroom of the house, which opened off the verandah, was reserved for Buckley’s ‘occasional’ visits. As recalled by Bob Jeffery’s widow, Edith:

The Jeffrey brothers worked long and hard to improve Mr Buckley’s farm, and in the early 1930s won a ‘Better Farming’ competition conducted by the Phillip Island Council. The property gradually prospered under their guidance and hard work.

The Jeffreys constructed a dam on the eastern side of the island (Figure 18) and erected a windmill and milking shed. Inexperienced in dairy farming, they were assisted by Mr and Mrs Burton, who had been employed by Buckley. The Jeffery occupation was the second period of the island’s history during which farming was the primary use, following Rogers in the mid-nineteenth century. Gerald Buckley died in February 1935, aged 78. He left an estate valued at £140,000, including a number of properties in Victoria which combined were valued at £104,676. Following Buckley’s death, the Jeffreys remained at the island in a caretaker role.
Figure 18  Construction of the dam in the 1930s  
Source: Churchill Island onsite interpretation

Figure 19  Churchill Island viewed from end of access road on Phillip Island, c. 1945-1954  
Source: State Library of Victoria
Figure 20  Map showing access to Churchill Island via Churchill Road on Phillip Island and a jetty on the west side of the island, 1940
Source: State Library of Victoria

Figure 21  Sketch map showing paddocks during Jenkins ownership, c. 1940s
Source: Churchill Island collection
Figure 22  View of the jetty on west side of island (no longer extant), c. 1980s
Source: VPRS 11544/P1/496, Public Record Office Victoria

Figure 23  Unknown group in front of memorial cairn commemorating James Grant’s planting of wheat in 1801, 1968
Source: Phillip Island Historical Society, via Victorian Collections
2.5.6 Jenkins family

In the mid-1930s, Churchill Island was acquired by Melbourne dentist, Edward Henry ‘Harry’ Jenkins. It is unclear exactly when Jenkins purchased the island. Although some sources suggest 1936-38, one newspaper reports noted the sale of the island for £2,000 in 1939.\textsuperscript{102}

It appears that the Jenkins had taken up occupancy of the island prior to the sale being finalised, as transfer was not recorded on the title until 1944.\textsuperscript{103} Harry Jenkins appears to have established a dental practice in the early 1900s, and served with the Dental Corps in Britain and France during World War I. In 1929 he competed in the Australian Motor Racing Grand Prix on Phillip Island, coming fourth overall and first in Class D.\textsuperscript{104}

Jenkins apparently purchased the island for his teenage son, Edward (‘Ted’), who was paralysed in an accident aged 16.\textsuperscript{105} It is understood that, Ted and his carer, Sister Margaret Campbell, lived on the island during World War II and ran it as a dairy farm, but otherwise lived primarily in their Melbourne house in St Kilda St Elwood, and spent the summer holidays on the island.\textsuperscript{106} Ted’s Melbourne-based friends visited the island regularly. As one of these friends recalled, access to the island was from the end of Churchill Road, where cars could be parked and visitors transferred to the island by dinghy (Figure 19).\textsuperscript{107} A jetty was located on the south of the island (Figure 20, Figure 22). During the Jenkins tenure work was undertaken to modernise facilities at the island, including the installation of a septic tank; the island was also connected to the Yallourn electricity supply in the late 1950s.\textsuperscript{108} Landscaping was also undertaken around the homestead, with the rows of passionfruit vines established to the north and south.

In 1953, after family friend Ken Stott had purchased land on Phillip Island opposite the south-east point of Churchill Island, plans were developed to construct road access. The first bridge connecting Churchill Island with Phillip Island was constructed between 1956 and 1959. A contractor drowned during the construction, and an inquest and subsequent lack of labour had delayed its completion.\textsuperscript{109} The Jenkins family, like the Amess family in the nineteenth century, hosted large parties of visitors during the Christmas and New Year period.\textsuperscript{110}

In the early 1960s both Ted, then Harry Jenkins died. Ted’s nurse, Margaret Campbell became the proprietor of the island in 1965, who owned it until 1973 when she put it up for sale. In 1968, during Campbell’s ownership, a cairn was erected by the Victorian Farmers’ Union to commemorate ‘the first cultivation of wheat in Victoria’ by James Grant (Figure 23) on the south-west side of the island.

2.6 Public recreation and conservation reserve (1976-present)

In 1976, after more than 120 years in private hands, Churchill Island passed into public ownership. This was in a period when both public and private land was increasingly being recognised for conservation.

2.6.1 Sir Rupert Hamer

Sir Rupert Hamer, appointed the Premier of Victoria in 1970, is recognised for the emphasis placed on environmental values, conservation and public ownership of land during his tenure. Hamer established the Land Conservation Council, to research and advise on the future use of Crown lands; the Environmental Protection Authority, to address pollution; and a new Ministry for Conservation which was established in 1972-1973.\textsuperscript{111}
2.6.2 *Victoria Conservation Trust*

Churchill Island was purchased by the Victoria Conservation Trust (VCT). The VCT was established in 1972 by the Hamer Government to:

...acquire, preserve and maintain areas within the State which are ecologically significant or of natural interest or beauty or scientific interest and to encourage and assist in the preservation of wildlife and native plants for public scientific and public educational purposes.¹¹²

The VCT had attempted to purchase the island when it was auctioned in June 1973 (Figure 27). The island’s natural and historic advantages were noted in the auction advertisement which stated that, ‘words do not adequately describe this superb and restful haven ... teeming with fish and birdlife and steeped in history as the first wheat planted in Victoria was grown by Capt. Grant, 1801’.¹¹³ In March 1973 the Shire of Phillip Island wrote to Premier Hamer, noting that Council had been advised that the island was to be sold at auction and requesting the Government join the Council in acquiring the land for ‘the people of Victoria for conservation purposes’.¹¹⁴ The Victorian Government was interested in the acquisition of the property, and local interest in the matter was high. A memorandum from the Fisheries and Wildlife Department of May 1973 noted that although the island contained ‘no significant wildlife habitat nor wildlife species’, its ‘historical associations are of prime consideration’.¹¹⁵ The VCT disagreed, however, arguing the island was actually of ‘considerable importance ... from both a historic and conservationist point of view.’¹¹⁶

---

Figure 24  Oblique aerial view of the island from the north, 1957. Note the extent of vegetation clearance; the main house and group of buildings in the centre of the island set within a strongly defined area bounded by windrows; and the bridge under construction at top centre of image

Source: State Library of Victoria
Figure 25  Aerial view, 1960, north is at top. Note the track leading up to the main house from the south; the same track is not evident in the preceding (1957) image
Source: Land Victoria Aerial Photograph Library, Laverton
Figure 26 Aerial view (detail), 1960, north is at top. Regular row plantings near the house may be passionfruit plantings, grown on the island around this time
Source: Land Victoria Aerial Photograph Library, Laverton

Figure 27 Advertisement for auction of Churchill Island in the Age, 12 May 1973
Source: VPRS 11544/P1/496, Public Record Office Victoria
Premier Hamer wrote to Prime Minister Gough Whitlam to request a contribution from the Commonwealth, which appears to have been agreed to in principle. Correspondence between government departments records an awareness of the high level of interest surrounding the sale, including the rumour that one individual was prepared to go ‘as high as $750,000’, well above the accepted value of $250,000.

The government was outbid at the auction held at the San Remo public hall, with Churchill Island purchased by Alex Classou, a businessman who apparently wished to use the island as a horse stud. Classou had established the Patra Juice brand, and kept horses on Churchill Island. The Victorian government continued to push for public ownership of the island, however, with Classou invited to visit projects being undertaken by the Fisheries and Wildlife Department at Phillip Island and Tower Hill, apparently to convince him of the value of public ownership of land. The Shire of Phillip Island, for its part, zoned the island to Rural A within its planning scheme, thus ensuring that ‘no undesirable development’ was to take place.

By June 1975, following meetings by government representatives, Classou had advised that the Victorian Government would have first option on purchasing the island. Negotiations with the VCT followed, both with Premier and Treasurer Hamer in ensuring the funding for the purchase, and with Classou in establishing a mutually acceptable price. A purchase price of $400,000 was agreed upon in October 1975, and the VCT took possession of the island in February 1976.

The VCT proposed to restore the island to ‘something like its original condition’, and to establish an ‘historic centre, a historic farm complex and minor tourist facilities on the island. It aimed to make its restoration ‘an outstanding success’ and was to begin fundraising efforts within the community by the end of 1976. In one fundraising campaign, illustrator Robert Ingpen produced a series of paintings of the island, which were sold through the Age newspaper (Figure 29).

In 1976, a report to the Churchill Island sub-committee of the VCT made a number of recommendations on the future direction of the island. Along with ‘goals’ relating to the natural environment, the report outlined aims for the historic buildings, including to ‘establish an identity for Churchill Island as an historical feature of the National Estate.’ This would involve the rehabilitation of the homestead and associated buildings to ‘conform with the nineteenth century style ... in character, but not in detail.’ Meanwhile the rehabilitation of the farm could involve the construction of ‘other farm buildings typical of the era.’

The sub-committee also recommended that a block house ‘as described by Grant’ be built to the north of the farm precinct, indicating how important the Grant connection was considered during this time.

The conservation work undertaken by the VCT caused some concern, with the National Trust writing in 1979 that, ‘the Conservation Trust appears to be headed in the opposite direction [as] much of the island has now been ploughed, and for some reason stands of blue gums have been planted [which] have nothing whatever to do with the original vegetation’. See also Figure 30. The VCT responded, noting instead ‘some rotary hoeing’ had been undertaken to eradicate box thorn and that the planting of blue gums was based on historic photographs. As can be seen in aerial photographs of 1979 and 1985, much replanting work was undertaken on the north-west of the island during this period. A visitor map produced in 1988 described the revegetation as ‘making amends’, while highlighting the remaining moonah trees on the north of the island. From 1978, students at the Burnley
College of Horticulture undertook much of the work associated with the restoration of the garden and revegetation of the island.\textsuperscript{133}

The purchase of 75 acres (30 hectares) of land at the Phillip Island end of the access bridge was finalised in 1981, enabling the establishment of car parking.\textsuperscript{134} At the end of that year the island was officially opened to the public by Sir Rupert Hamer, former premier of Victoria.\textsuperscript{135} In 1982, the whole of Churchill Island was included in the Register of Government Buildings, and was transferred to the Victorian Heritage Register in 1998, following proclamation of the \textit{Heritage Act 1995}. The statement of significance for the registration has largely been drawn from its inclusion in the Register of the National Estate in 1978.

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Aerial view, 1974, north is at top}
\label{fig:aerial_view}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Source: Land Victoria Aerial Photograph Library, Laverton}
2.6.3 **Friends of Churchill Island Society**

In 1980, the VCT initiated the establishment of a subscription membership society, aimed at community members who wanted to assist in the works being undertaken at the island. The first newsletter by the Friends of Churchill Island Society (FOCIS) in spring 1980 noted:

...the restoration and development of Churchill Island is no mean task. The Island offers unique opportunities for maintaining a balance of history, recreation, education and conservation in one challenging but fascinating project.

As well as calling for volunteers for ‘work days’, and advising of tour days of the island for members, FOCIS requested ‘cottage and homestead furniture’ and historic farm implements for the house museum. During the 1980s and 1990s, the society organised commemorative ceremonies, social events and gardening days at the island, and produced regular newsletters for its members. On 28 March 1985, a ‘historic wheat planting’ day was held, organised by FOCIS and supported by the National Parks Service, the VCT, the Department of Agriculture and the Australian Wheat Board. The island being the location of the first planting of wheat in Victoria has long been a source of pride for FOCIS members.

The volunteers also worked on a number of larger restoration and maintenance projects at the island including the removal of sheds, construction of new toilet block, rebuilding of stockyards, repairing of buildings and the restoration of the Amess barn. With funding for the management of the island reaching a critically low level in the early and mid-1990s, FOCIS provided much needed labour and materials to keep the island open to the public. By this period, the society had over 350 members. FOCIS continues to play an integral role in the operation of the island, offering services as tour guides, research assistance and maintenance of the buildings and garden.

![Illustration of one of the Rogers' cottages by Robert Ingpen, 1976](image)

Figure 30 Aerial view, 1979, north is at top. Note significant landscaping works since 1974, including grading/ploughing in preparation for blue gum plantings
Source: Land Victoria Aerial Photograph Library, Laverton
Figure 31  Amess house after completion of restoration work, 1984
Source: John Collins collection, State Library of Victoria

Figure 32  Crowds visit Churchill Island in 1985
Source: Friends of Churchill Island Society
Figure 33 Aerial view, 1989, north is at top. The plantings of 1979 are clearly evident
Source: Land Victoria Aerial Photograph Library, Laverton
2.6.4 Departmental ownership

In August 1983, the management of Churchill Island was transferred from the Victoria Conservation Trust to the National Parks Service for the island’s ‘future retention as an area of natural beauty and historical interest for use by the public for the purposes of enjoyment, recreation and education’. The National Parks Service was subsumed under the Department of Natural Resources in c. 1984.

2.6.5 Nature Parks

Nature Parks was created by the Victorian State Government in 1996 as an independent statutory authority with a board of management, reporting to the Minister for the Department of the Environment. It incorporated several conservation areas on Phillip Island, including the Penguin Parade, Seal Rocks, Cape Woolamai, Koala Conservation Reserve, Rhyll Inlet and Churchill Island. Nature Parks manages over 1,805 hectares of Crown land reserved for conservation.

The introduction of Nature Parks to Churchill Island saw a change in focus from volunteers and fund raising to the use of paid staff and the pursuit of the commercial tourist market. As noted by Sanders, Nature Parks was able to access sufficient funds to undertake comprehensive restoration work to the island’s buildings and structures. Within two years of assuming management of the island, a draft management plan had been prepared for the Nature Parks sites. The organisation saw the assets of the island being its ‘peaceful atmosphere, outstanding views, historic buildings and interesting history’ in an island setting. The Churchill Island Development Plan of 2001 put forward the proposal of Churchill Island becoming a commercial heritage site, with a focus on the tourist market.

This proposal has been developed, and improvements undertaken including providing parking access for tourist coaches, the construction of a new bridge in 1999 and a purpose-built visitor centre with cafe, gift shop and function space, and restoration work on the Amess house. There was a subsequent drive to increase visitor numbers in order to pay for the island’s upkeep, with major works having been largely funded by revenue from the Penguin Parade. Between 1996 and 1998 visitor numbers at Churchill Island doubled from 12,397 to 25,573. The organisation also undertook a large-scale planting program on the island, including habitat restoration on the west of the island.

In recent years, Nature Parks has sought to approach the use and management of Churchill Island more strategically and to diversify the types of experiences available to the public on the island. This has included the introduction of events including a folk music festival ‘Chill Island’ in 2010, and a concert by the Melbourne Symphony Orchestra held in 2013. There has also been a significant increase in the number of international visitors to the island, many of whom come by way of the Phillip Island three-park pass, which also includes stops at the Koala Conservation Centre and the Penguin Parade.
2.7 Sequential plans and aerial photographs

By 1880, Churchill Island had been occupied permanently for approximately 25 years. Development at the island reflected its operation as a farm (c. 1854 – c. 1870) and as a private retreat.

- Area (indicated) cultivated by lieutenant (name not given) in 1821, including hut and lighthouse (demolished)
- Location of the Water House, built by 1846 (demolished)
- Roger's Huts, kitchen (34) and 'Wombat's' (35) built by the mid-1880s
- Ames homestead, built c. 1872 with later additions
- Ames hall (rear, c. 1870s
- Ames stables, c. 1888
- Cannery, in use by the early 1880s
- Norfolk Island pine, Araucaria heterophylla, planted 1872
- Homestead garden (indicated extent), including orchard, vegetable and kitchen garden
- Jetty (built, undated but assumed to date from the 1880s
- Pathways to homestead, likely to have existed by 1880
- Approximate location of stock route over must fall

Note: Alignments of historic fences and locations of dams and shelterbelts are indicated where they are known to have existed, based on documentary evidence.
The island was operated as a dairy farm from 1928 to 1936. By 1939 it had been acquired by dentists Harry Jenkins, who used it as a private retreat.

- Area (indicated) cultivated by Lieutenant James Grant in 1883, including hut and blockhouse (demolished)
- Location of the White House, built by 1881 (demolished)
- Sheep's Hut (indicated), built by the mid-1880s
- Amos' homestead, built c. 1872, with later additions
- Amos' cottage, c. 1870
- Across station, c. 1880
- Cannons, in situ by the early 1880s
- Norfolk Island pine, Araucaria heterophylla, planted 1871
- Homestead garden (indicated on label), including orchard, Meninas and kitchen garden
- Homestead outbuildings, including wool shed, buggy shed, blacksmith, and carpenter's shops and yard
- Jetty (four), unlined but assumed to cease from the 1880s
- Pathways to homestead (indicated)
- Coastal walkway (indicated)
- Dams
- Shelter belts
- Approximate location of stock route over clay flat

Note: Alignments of historic fences and locations of dams and shelter belts are indicated where they are known to have existed, based on documentary evidence.
1900
During the Jenkins period of ownership the property was improved and modernised

1. Area (indicated) cultivated by Lieutenant James Grant in 1801, including hut and blockhouse (demolished)
2. Location of the White-House, built by 1886 (demolished)
3. Rogers’s Hut, kitchen (3a) and ‘Blindman’ (3b), both by mid-1860s
4. Amies Homestead, built c. 1872, with later additions
5. Amies calf-east, c. 1870s
6. Amies stables, c. 1886
7. Cannery, in situ by early 1880s
8. Norfolk Island pine, Araucaria heterophylla, planted 1877
9. Homestead garden: note clear definition of the orchard, re-established and intensified since 1979, and an enclosed position to the south
10. Homestead outbuildings
11. Jetty (short), situated but assumed to date from the 1850s — the dates of their removal/demolition have not been established
12. Timber bridge (built by 1865) and replaced in 1981
13. Unsealed track providing access from the bridge to the homestead (now disused)
14. Amies (riparian)
15. Coastal walkway
16. Dams
17. Shelter belts, generally re-established since 1959

Note: Alignments of historic fences and locations of dams and shelter belts are indicated where they are known to have existed, based on documentary evidence.
The aerial view of 1974 shows the island as it was acquired by the Victoria Conservation Trust.

1. Area (indicated) cultivated by Lieutenant James Grant in 1861, including hut and blockhouse (demolished)
2. Location of the White House, built by 1861 (demolished)
3. Roger's Hut Kitchen (No 1) and "Stormy" (No 3), built by the mid 1860s
4. Amica homestead, built c. 1872, with later additions
5. Amica Hall cellar, c. 1870s
6. Amica stables, c. 1885
7. Cannery, in situ by the early 1880s
8. Norfolk Island Pine, Araucaria heterophylla, planted 1877
9. Homestead garden, note clear definition of the orchard, re-established and intensified since 1939, and an enclosed position to the south
10. Homestead outbuildings
11. Jetty (1849), installed but assumed to date from the 1850s — the dates of their removal/demolition have not been established
12. Timber bridge (built by 1865, and replaced in 1911)
13. Unsealed track providing access from the bridge to the homestead (now former Amica Griev)
14. Coastal walkway
15. Dams
16. Shelter belts
17. Cairn, commemorating the first cultivation of wheat in Victoria (1856)
Significant works were undertaken at the island from the late 1970s, particularly in relation to the tree removal and revegetation.

HISTORY

1. Area (orchard) cultivated by Lieutenant James Grant in 1851, including hut and boathouse (demolished)
2. Location of the White House, built by 1861 (demolished)
3. Regent's Hut kitchen (3a) and "Stormy" (3b), built by the mid-1860s
4. Amos' homestead, built in 1872, with later additions
5. Amos' barn, c. 1876
6. Amos' stables, c. 1886
7. Cameron, in situ by the early 1880s
8. Hermitage, built c. 1869
9. Homestead gardens; note clear definition of the orchard, re-established and remodeled since 1919, and an enclosed paddock to the south
10. Homestead outbuildings
11. Jetty (broken) but assumed to date from the 1930s – the dates of their removal/demolition have not been established
12. Timber bridge (built by 1903, and replaced in 1981)
13. Unsealed track providing access from the bridge to the Homestead (now Samuel Amos Drive)
14. Coastal walkway
15. Dunes
16. Shelter belts
17. Cairn, commemorating the first cultivation of wheat in Victoria (1850s)
18. Significant landscape works were undertaken at the mouth of the island, including tree removal, ploughing, ground preparation and revegetation
3.0 PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

Churchill Island is located in Westernport Bay, a short distance from Phillip Island (c.150m at its closest point). It has an area of approximately 50.7ha. Development is generally consolidated on the high ground in the approximate centre of the island (generally referred to here as the homestead precinct). This has been the case since the mid nineteenth century.

Other areas where development is known to have occurred include a cove on the east coast, where the 'White House' was erected in the 1850s, and an area to the west of the island where a block house and hut were erected by Lt Grant in 1801. These buildings have been demolished. There are areas of vegetation at the island, both indigenous and introduced. There are also large areas of open pasture.

The homestead precinct operates as a Heritage Farm, a tourist attraction with an agricultural theme.

The following description of Churchill Island addresses:

- Geomorphology of the island
- Access and circulation
- Built elements, including elements dating to the nineteenth century and the Grant cairn (1968)
- Landscape elements and areas

Unless otherwise specified, all pictures in this chapter are by Lovell Chen and were taken between October and November 2014.

An aerial photograph showing the existing conditions is at Section 2.7.

Archaeology

An archaeological survey and assessment of Churchill Island is included at Appendix B. The detail of this assessment is not reproduced in this chapter. Zones and areas of archaeological sensitivity are identified as: the land area associated with Lt Grant in 1801; the site of the White House on the east coast; and former jetties. The homestead precinct is also an area of archaeological sensitivity, relating to its occupation since at least the mid nineteenth century and its demonstrated ability to yield artefacts with the potential to enhance an understanding of the island’s uses and occupation over the past 150 plus years.

The whole of the island (H7921-002) and one individual site on the island (H7921-0014) are included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory. Regarding H7921-0014, the so called ‘sealers site’, this refers to the two lines of stones in the ‘heritage’ farm precinct to the north-west of Amess house. This was previously thought to be the footings of a sealer’s hut. However, this interpretation of the remains is no longer accepted. Various aerial photos show outbuildings near the location of the stones, and it is possible that the feature is related to an outbuilding or animal pen associated with the homestead.

Moveable objects

An inventory of the historic farm machinery at Churchill Island, and items associated with dairy farming, food processing and food storage, as well as items in the outbuildings, including the blacksmiths’ shed was prepared in December 2014 (Appendix C). The vast
majority of these objects do not have a demonstrated provenance with the island. Exceptions are: the cannon (introduced to the island by the 1880s); the foot-operated grinding wheel mounted in a timber frame (located in the Amess Barn); a cheese press in the half cellar; and a timber garden barrow.

As noted in Chapter 1 (Section 1.6.1), FOCUS also maintains collections of objects, artefacts, documents and photographs. These collections include a considerable number of items with Churchill Island provenance. Detailed inspection and assessment of these collections (partly catalogued) was beyond the scope of this CMP.

The Amess house and Rogers cottages are presented as house museums, and include items on loan from the National Trust. These items do not have an historic association with Churchill Island.

3.1 Geomorphology

Westernport Bay is located within a tectonic depression between the Mornington Peninsula and the South Gippsland Highlands. As noted in the Encyclopaedia of the World's Coastal Landforms:

In Eocene times the Older Volcanics were deposited across the southern part of what is now Westernport Bay, and when the volcanic activity came to an end in the Oligocene a wide basalt plateau extended from the Mornington Peninsula across to Phillip Island and the southern parts of French Island. Broad valleys were then cut down into this plateau by rivers draining.\(^{154}\)

Churchill Island was attached to Phillip Island until a sea level rise c. 10,000-15,000 years ago. The island’s basalt bedrock is susceptible to erosion. The basalt is exposed at the north of the island (Figure 69).

3.2 Access and circulation

Historically, access to the island was principally by boat. There are remains of jetties around the island (see also Appendix B). Today, Churchill Island is accessed by a bridge from the south (the bridge was built in 1999, replacing an earlier bridge dating to c. 1981, which itself had replaced the original 1959 bridge). An unmade road (Samuel Amess Drive) leads from the bridge to the homestead precinct in the centre of the island, a distance of approximately 1km. This road may follow an earlier stock route; it is understood that stock were driven over the mud flats between the island and Phillip Island at low tide, in proximity to the present bridge.

A pathway extending from a jetty at the south-east of the island may have provided the most direct means of access to the homestead from Phillip Island prior to the construction of the first bridge. The approximate alignment of the pathway is indicated in the sequential development plans/aerials at Section 2.7.
3.3 Buildings and built fabric

The homestead precinct (Churchill Island Heritage Farm) includes a number of buildings (see Figure 34). The majority are of recent origin, and relate to the operation of the place as a tourist attraction. The service area, to the north-west of the homestead precinct, also includes a number of buildings of recent origin.

The emphasis of the following analysis is upon the six extant buildings dating to the nineteenth century. These are:

- Two Rogers cottages: kitchen (1862-63) and dormitory (mid 1860s)
- Amess house (c. 1872, with later additions and alterations)
- Amess cellar (1870s/80s)
- Amess stable (c. 1886)
- Wash house (1870s/80s)

This section also includes reference to the Grant cairn of 1968.

The following physical analysis is based on site visits to Churchill Island in October and November 2014. Roof spaces and sub floor spaces at these buildings were not accessed as part of the site visits.

Figure 34  Sign at the entrance to Churchill Island Heritage Farm
3.3.1 Rogers’ cottage (kitchen)

History

The cottage was constructed in c.1862-63 by farmer John Rogers, who occupied Churchill Island from the mid 1850s.\textsuperscript{155} It is believed to be the earliest surviving building on the island, being marginally older than the ‘dormitory’ directly to the south. The original use, or uses, of the cottage have not been established. However, from the early 1870s – following the purchase of Churchill Island by Samuel Amess – it was used as a kitchen,\textsuperscript{156} and later as servant’s quarters.\textsuperscript{157}

The building has been subject to significant alterations over time, the majority of these dating from the major works program undertaken at Churchill Island in 1981/1982 by the Victorian Conservation Trust.\textsuperscript{158} Works included re-roofing of the cottage, in conjunction with the neighbouring dormitory (Roger’s) cottage, with metal sheeting from the Amess stable; concrete underpinning and the re-pointing and whitewashing of the brickwork chimney and the removal of modern linings including Caneite board ceilings that were installed in the 1940s.\textsuperscript{159} Further works were carried out based on advice from conservation architect Phyllis Murphy in 2000, including the removal of a lean-to addition to the south of the west elevation and the removal of an internal partition wall.\textsuperscript{160}

Description

The small, single storey cottage is a simple timber structure with a shallow gable roof and an external brick chimney (Figure 35, Figure 36 and Figure 37). It consists of circular sawn timber framing clad with wide sawn softwood weatherboards painted white.\textsuperscript{161} The cottage is oriented toward the east (or north-east) in a splayed arrangement with the neighbouring cottage to the south, also built by John Rogers. Skillion roofed verandahs supported on timber posts extend along the east and west elevations. The east verandah is connected with the verandah of the adjacent cottage to the south to form a covered walkway that extends to the rear verandah of the later Amess house. The roofs of the cottage and verandahs are clad with corrugated galvanised steel sheet with ogee profile galvanised steel guttering. The guttering feeds into cast iron rain heads with galvanised steel downpipes. The floors of the verandahs are generally paved with terracotta tiles. Some sections have been infilled with concrete and brickwork. The cottage retains early fenestration to the east, west and south elevations. The windows consist of segmented arch openings with multi paned, single sash windows with simple timber sills and thin rounded reveals (Figure 38). The windows were originally operable and pivoted at their mid-point; they have since been fixed shut. There are doorways to the east and west elevations. The ledge and braced timber doors retain early hinges and rim locks with brass door knobs.

The interior of the cottage is a single volume, and is lined throughout with batten softwood lining boards (Figure 39). The surrounds of the windows are finished with turned timber sills and beaded architraves. The floor surface consists of a later concrete slab which has evidence of having been previously lined with floor tiles that have since been removed. The chimney retains its open fire place, brick bread oven with cast iron door and pine mantle with large supporting pine brackets (Figure 40). There is evidence that the bread oven has been retrofitted to the fire place at a later date.
Figure 35  View of the Rogers cottages from the north: the kitchen is at right and the dormitory at left

Figure 36  Kitchen cottage: west elevation
Figure 37  Kitchen cottage: south elevation

Figure 38  Kitchen cottage interior: note multi paned single sash segmented arch window and associated timber sill and beaded architrave details
Figure 39  Kitchen cottage interior: detail of the battened softwood lining

Figure 40  Kitchen cottage interior: fireplace and retrofitted bread oven
3.3.2 Rogers’ cottage (dormitory)

History

The building now known as the dormitory was erected by John Rogers in the mid 1860s. Its name derives from its use as accommodation for servants following the purchase of Churchill Island by Samuel Amess in 1872. Alterations to the cottage have been extensive as part of its conversion to a house museum and coincide with those works undertaken to the neighbouring kitchen (Roger’s) cottage. Many of these works have related to the introduction and subsequent removal of inappropriate features and the rectification works associated with this removal; one such feature was a modern leadlight window installed in 1981-1982 that was subsequently removed following the interpretation advice for the Roger’s cottages prepared by Phyllis Murphy in 2000.

Description

The dormitory cottage is similar in its external presentation to the kitchen cottage, in that it is a simple timber structure with a shallow gable roof and an external brick chimney. There is a later rear timber skillion addition to the south of the west elevation. The structure of the cottage consists of a timber frame, on log stumps, clad with wide sawn softwood weatherboards. The cottage is oriented toward the north-east in a splayed arrangement with the kitchen cottage. Skillion roofed verandahs supported on timber posts extend along the north-east and south-east elevations. The verandah is contiguous with the verandah at the front of the kitchen cottage, the whole forming an undercover walkway that connects with the rear verandah of the later Amess house. The roofs of the verandah and cottage are clad with corrugated galvanised steel sheet with ogee profile galvanised steel guttering. A section of the guttering along the north-west section of the verandah feeds into a cast iron rain head with a galvanised steel downpipe. Like the kitchen cottage, the floors of the verandah are paved with terracotta pavers with some sections infilled with concrete and brickwork. A wall mounted pump on the north-west elevation of the building is a later addition.

The cottage retains its early fenestration to the north-east elevation which consist of two multi paned single sash windows located either side of a central front door. The windows consist of a standard single sash with a simple timber sill and a proprietary timber architrave. The windows were originally operable and pivoted to open; the windows have since been fixed shut. The main entrance to the cottage on the north-east elevation has an early ledge and braced door. The later rear skillion is accessed from the south and has a ledge and braced timber door. Both doors retain their respective period hinges and rim locks with brass door knobs.

The interior of the cottage is divided into two spaces: a small bedroom to the south and a living room to the north. A batten and board lined dado constructed from circular sawn timber, while replicating an earlier design, was replaced in 1980 in conjunction with the reconstruction of the internal partition wall. Above the dado, the walls and ceilings are lined with reproduction wall and ceiling papers. The surrounds of the windows are finished with proprietary timber architraves similar to those on the exterior of the cottage. The floors are pine boards which have been sanded and finished with a clear sealant and appear early. The chimney retains its early fireplace, pine mantelpiece and brickwork hearth. The rear skillion is lined with overpainted beaded timber lining boards which in turn support painted open timber shelving. The Baltic Pine flooring of the skillion remains in its original unfinished condition.
Figure 41  Dormitory cottage: south elevation

Figure 42  Dormitory cottage: north-east elevation
Figure 43  Dormitory cottage interior: view of the fireplace and mantelpiece

Figure 44  Dormitory cottage interior: view of the refurbished interior details
3.3.3 Amess house

History

The house was constructed for Samuel Amess following his purchase of Churchill Island as a rural retreat in 1872. Substantially complete by the 1880s, the house initially consisted of a sitting room, a large dining room, four bedrooms, a pantry and gunroom. Service and back-of-house functions were accommodated in the Rogers’ cottages, which were used as servant’s quarters by the Amess family.

Extensive alterations and additions have occurred to the Amess house over the course of its history. Works include the removal of an original window and the installation of French doors with sidelights to the front verandah between 1965 and 1973, when Margaret Campbell was the resident—these works have since been reversed—and the demolition of the shaft of the kitchen chimney due to storm damage, prior to 1976. Further works were undertaken in 1977 relating to the use of the house as a film set for the motion picture Summerfield. These works included the installation of stained glass windows to the dining room and additional decorative features to the interior. Some of these works were reversed as part of the adaptation of the residence to a house museum, including the replacement of wallpapers with period reproductions from original samples.

Description

The Amess house is a single storey weatherboard villa with a U shaped plan. It is oriented to the east (or north-east). The house has a hipped roof, with canted bays projecting from the north and south ends of the east elevation, either side of the front verandah. The roof and verandahs are clad with galvanised corrugated steel sheet. The ogee profile eaves guttering to the perimeter of the house are painted and feed into early cast iron rain-heads with painted downpipes. There are brick chimneys to the side elevations of the canted bays. The shaft of one of the chimneys to the north-west elevation has been removed.

The front verandah incorporates cast iron columns, balustrade supports, frieze panels and brackets, timber balustrades and modern timber decking. A short flight of white marble steps provides access from the garden. A cast iron bracket for an oil lamp is extant to the east elevation of the house. The rear verandah is constructed from timber and is paved with unglazed terracotta pavers that extend throughout the covered walkway that links the house with Rogers’ cottages.

The house retains its early double hung sash windows with timber sills and architraves. There are three, four-paned sash windows to each of the canted bays, two windows centred upon the front verandah and a single window on both the north-west and south-east elevations, towards the rear of the house. A smaller single casement, dual paned window is also located on the south-east elevation, and a simple timber vent on the north-west elevation. On the south-west elevation, to the rear of the house, are four windows consisting of a combination of timber double-hung, multiple-pane sash windows and timber casement windows. The double hung sash windows are centred upon the elevation and have the same architraves as the windows to the remainder of the house. The casement windows are located at either end of the elevation and have different architrave details to those of the later double hung sash windows. Aligned with the casement windows are timber vents that are located above the roof line of the verandah. The timber vent to the north-west end extends the full height of the wall, incorporating the casement window, providing...
ventilation to the interior. The detailing of the casement windows suggests a period of construction somewhat earlier than the late Victorian period (possibly 1860s). It is also possible that the windows were recycled from another (earlier) building.

The house is accessed from the front verandah and rear porches. Doorways with four panelled timber doors, and matching architraves to those of the timber sash windows, open on to the verandah at either end of the main hipped roof section of the house and from each of the projecting bays. Each door has an external fly-screen door. At the rear, two doorways with four panelled doors and architraves open onto the recessed porches.

The house comprises of ten rooms and associated service areas with an off-centre hall way. There is a combination of internal and external circulation provided by the hallway and front and rear skillion-roofed verandahs. Two recessed porches at either end of the south-west elevation provide access to the house from the rear verandah. Later additions to the rear elevation include a laundry in the north-west end of the verandah.

The interior decoration of the house consists of beaded Baltic pine lining boards to dado level with the remainder of the wall surfaces and butt jointed ceilings lined with reproduction period wall papers. The service areas are lined throughout with overpainted beaded lining boards. Additional extant joinery includes skirting boards, architraves and mantle pieces, the majority of which are exposed timber finished with a clear sealant. The windows have been overpainted. The details of these joinery elements are representative of the late Victorian period. An exception is the mantelpiece in the sitting room which incorporates an early Victorian design executed in a darker timber variety, potentially New South Wales Cedar (Figure 51). It is understood that this mantelpiece came from a guest house in Cowes.
Figure 46  South-west elevation to the rear of the Amess house

Figure 47  Ship’s tank, located to the north-east elevation of the Amess house. The rain-head to the right of the tank is cast iron
Figure 48  North-west elevation of the Amess house. The chimney (base only) to the right has had the shaft demolished

Figure 49  Early casement windows on the south-west elevation of the house: the window at the north-west end of the elevation (left), is an early form of ventilation
Figure 50  Interior view of the dining room and its restored interior

Figure 51  Amess house sitting room mantelpiece and fire surround detail
The interior of the house incorporates many period fittings and fixtures, including rim locks with brass door knobs, light fittings, a cast iron oven and cast iron coal grates. While the rim lock and brass knob door sets are early fittings, the majority of the period fittings and fixtures most likely date from the development of the house museum and therefore are not original to the building. The use of the house as a film set for the film *Summerfield* also resulted in the introduction of non-original period features including stained glass windows in the dining room.\(^{176}\)

The house has been extensively renovated and restored as a house museum and as a result it is unclear what fabric is original and/or authentic. This is evident in the late Victorian wall papered decorative scheme of the house interior. While the wall and ceiling papers in the dining room; and the wallpapers and frieze in the drawing room and hallway are reproductions of original samples found within the house during restoration works,\(^ {177}\) the decorative schemes in the remaining rooms and service areas appear to be interpretations rather than reproductions of previous colour schemes. The non-original reproduction wall papers are understood to date to the restoration works carried out in 2000/01.\(^ {178}\)

To the rear of the house is a square, riveted iron plate 'ships tank' water tank on a modern timber tank stand (Figure 47). Several were originally located on the island;\(^ {179}\) however this tank is the only surviving example. The ships tank retains its maker's mark; it was manufactured by John Bellamy of Bying Street, Millwall, London for the importation of Murrays Caramels.\(^ {180}\)

### 3.3.4 Amess cellar

**History**

The cellar was constructed for Samuel Amess as one of his improvements to the homestead complex following his purchase of Churchill Island in 1872.\(^ {181}\) It has variously been described as having been constructed for the storage of dairy products\(^ {182}\) and as a meat house.\(^ {183}\)

A record of works carried out at Churchill Island between 1976 and 1996, prepared by Carroll Schulz, notes that the building (Amess half cellar) underwent a series of repairs between 1980 and 1989. These were largely repair works that conserved original materials where possible, including 'the original Ridge Cap of lead' of the roof following its re-cladding with 'new iron' and the canopy to the front door of the cellar (entrance 'Verandah') which was 'rebuilt, retaining the original roof structure materials and spouting'.\(^ {184}\)

**Description**

The cellar is located to the rear (west) of the Amess house and Roger's cottages, and forms part of the back of house functions associated with the operations of the homestead.

It is constructed of face brick (overpainted) with a gabled roof clad with galvanised corrugated steel sheet. It has a rectangular floor plan. The construction of the building is double brick with an internal cavity; the cavity is evident in the iron wall vents at floor level internally and at the top of the walls externally. The double brick thickness of its walls, coupled with the submerged nature of the building, assisted in the natural cooling of the interior. Early sea grass matting to the underside of the roof assisted in providing insulation qualities from above.\(^ {185}\) The roof structure is timber and has been re-clad with galvanised
corrugated steel sheet, retaining the original lead ridge capping of the building, albeit with replacement lead recycled from the roof of the main house.\textsuperscript{186}

On the north-east elevation, a ledge and braced timber door with a viewing pane provides access to the building. The door is accessed from ground level by a flight of steps with brick risers and timber treads. Immediately above the door, a ledge and braced timber casement shutter, covering a steel mesh lined opening, provides ventilation to the interior. This opening and detail is replicated on the south-west elevation of the building. The age and association of a poetry verse on the north-west external wall has not been established.

Internally, the building has overpainted face brick walls and a concrete slab floor. Slate benches on overpainted brick walls are located to the north, east and west walls of the building. To the north of the building, a shallow brick lined pit acts as a sump for the removal of water from the floor of the building. Near to the sump, a cast iron pedestal set into the concrete slab floor indicates the former location of machinery that formed part of the building’s previous operations (Figure 55). Four cross beams that intersect the roof void of the interior are later; having been installed as additional structural support in 1985.\textsuperscript{187}

The cellar contains a number of historic house-hold items, including a floor-mounted cheese press – believed to contemporary with the building. Metal milk churns and meat safes form part of its interpretation as a place of food storage for the homestead complex (Figure 54 and Figure 55).
Figure 52   Amess cellar as viewed from the east

Figure 53   Amess cellar: north and east elevations
Figure 54  Amess cellar interior

Figure 55  Interior of the Amess cellar: the slate benches with brick supports are early features: note cheese press to the left of the picture
3.3.5 Amess stable

History
It has been suggested that the stable was relocated to Churchill Island for Samuel Amess from Hastings c.1886. Prior to its relocation, the stable is understood to have formed part of a larger barn constructed for Cobb and Co. The exterior of the stable underwent significant repair and reconstruction work in 1980 – compare the historic and current photographs (Figure 56 and Figure 57 respectively).

Description
The Amess barn is located to the north-west of the Amess house. It forms part of the complex of sheds and agricultural buildings in this area – with few exceptions these are of recent construction and support the operation of Churchill Island as a farm themed tourist attraction.

The double height barn comprises an open plan working area below with a loft above. The painted weatherboard building, with corrugated galvanised steel sheet roof, has a rectangular floor plan and gable form.

The front (east) elevation has a pair of ledge and braced timber doors, at ground level, and a single ledge and braced door, to the loft, which provide access to the building. Additional access is provided through a non-original timber door on the south elevation. Windows on the south-west elevation provide light to the interior of the ground floor and loft.

Internally, the timber framing of the building is largely expressed with an earthen floor at ground level and timber floorboards at loft level. The framing, and its partial sections of timber wall linings, have been over painted; the interior of the loft remains unpainted. Portions of brickwork and bituminous surfaces to the earthen floor are later additions. The loft is accessed at ground level by an open riser timber stair.

Figure 56 Amess stable looking south-west (undated, pre-1980)
Source: FOCIS collection
Figure 57  Amess stables looking north-west

Figure 58  Interior of the Amess stables
3.3.6 Wash house

History

A freestanding wash house (also referred to as a bath house) was located at the rear of the Amess house by the 1870s. The 1976-1996 record of works carried out at Churchill Island (prepared by Carroll Schulz) notes that the building was relocated to the service area by the Victoria Conservation Trust in 1981. Schulz also noted that the building, ‘has several “updates” of lining and interior fittings’, and was ‘in poor condition’. It is understood that the wash house was relocated to its present site, in the garden to the rear of the Amess house by 2001.

Description

The wash house is a small weatherboard structure with a gabled roof clad with corrugated galvanised steel sheet (Figure 59). Extensive works have been carried out to the building over time and it includes little, if any, original fabric. The building is entered by a door to the east-facing elevation, and there is a multi-paned sash window to the south-facing elevation. The interior is lined with timber boards. An interpretive display inside the building includes information about nineteenth century bathroom and laundry equipment. Historic items are also on display.
3.3.7 **The Grant cairn**

A stone cairn commemorating the fleeting association of Churchill Island with Lt Grant in 1801 was erected in 1968 by the Victorian Farmers Union and unveiled by Gilbert Chandler, then the Minister for Agriculture (on 4 November 1968). At the time the island was still in private ownership. Its location on the west of the island is believed to be close to the area that was cultivated by members of Grant’s crew.

**Description**

The cairn is composed of rough hewn stone (possibly rocks from the shoreline of Churchill Island), and is approximately 1.5m high. It is set on a square, concrete plinth (Figure 61). Plaques are fixed to the south face. The main plaque reads:

> This cairn was erected by the Victorian Farmers Union to commemorate the first cultivation of wheat in Victoria by Mr James Grant in 1801 on this land known as Churchill Island.

![The Grant cairn](image)

*Figure 61  The Grant cairn*
3.4 Landscape elements and areas

The following overview of the qualities and characteristics of the Churchill Island landscape is a summary of the full description included in the *Landscape Heritage Assessment* prepared by John Patrick Pty Ltd.

A zoned approach has been adopted in the description of the Churchill Island landscape. Each zone reads as a discrete area, based on either historic use, such as the agricultural lands and domestic house and garden areas, or recent changes to the site. The identified zones, as shown at Figure 62, are as follows:

1. House and domestic garden, including outbuildings zone
2. Visitor centre and car park
3. Moonah zone
4. Farmland

Figure 62 Landscape zones: 1-4
Source: John Patrick Pty Ltd
House and domestic garden (Landscape zone 1)

The precinct around the Amess house is defined by c.1940s Monterey Cypress windrows to the south and west, and includes an orchard to the north and an open, treed lawn between the house and visitor centre to the east. The gardens immediately surrounding the house are planted in a domestic, cottage style and are, with a few exceptions, of recent origin (Figure 63). A mature Norfolk Island Pine, located to the north-east of the house was planted in 1872, and is believed to have been donated by Ferdinand von Mueller. The tree is the most prominent vegetative feature within the study area and a landmark specimen in the centre of the island. Other trees of note include two pairs each of Mulberry and Olives, believed to be remnant plantings from Amess’ nineteenth century orchard, and a few remaining Moonah to the south of the main house. These were damaged in a storm in 1987, with one tree now reduced to shooting sprouts from an ancient, fallen trunk.

The landscape areas in the south and west of the zone are more utilitarian in character, associated with the farm service buildings and shedding. The defining belts of Monterey Cypress are entirely typical, mid-twentieth century agricultural plantings (Figure 64).

Visitor centre and car park (Landscape zone 2)

The landscape associated with the visitor centre and car park was developed in response to the change in use of the site from private farm and retreat to a tourist attraction.

The trees in the lawn to the west of the visitor centre are among the earliest plantings established within the site following public acquisition in the 1970s. These, as for most of the tree plantings through the zone, are Australian natives, reflecting contemporary planting styles and ideology, rather than an attempt to follow historic planting precedents within the site. Plantings through the car park and service drive are selected from locally indigenous species (Figure 65).

None of the plantings within this zone are considered to be of significance within Churchill Island.

Figure 63 Cottage style plantings predominate in the gardens around the 1870s house
Figure 64  Monterey Cypress windrows on the perimeter of the zone were planted c. 1940

Figure 65  Trees located to the west of the visitor centre are early introductions following public acquisition of Churchill Island
Moonah zone (Landscape Zone 3)

The zone in the west of the study area is dominated by a scattered over storey of Moonah trees, many of which are estimated to pre-date European settlement (Figure 66). It is notable that although most of the island was cleared for agricultural use, Moonahs in the west of the site were retained, and comprise one of the oldest populations of this species in Victoria. The reasons for the preservation of these trees is not clear, but late nineteenth century accounts describe hunting (rabbits and wild fowl) as a leisure pursuit on Churchill Island, and this area may have been set aside for this purpose.

It is also notable that although the Moonah trees were retained, the balance of the vegetation that would have formed a scrubby understorey was cleared leaving the trees as an ornamental feature in the broader pastoral landscape (Figure 67).

The landscape character of this area was fundamentally changed in the late 1970s, when the ground was ripped and much of this portion of the island was planted with indigenous (and native) trees (Figure 68). These trees have matured, and additional revegetation activities have been undertaken so that the western portion of the island now reads as a distinctively different landscape to the cultivated and agricultural areas to the east.

Views

As well as containing the ancient Moonah trees, this zone affords broad views to Phillip Island to the south and west, French Island to the north, as well as more immediate view lines to the waters of Westernport and its underlying geology, especially to the south (Figure 69). This is assisted somewhat by the natural topography of this part of the island, which consists of a rocky escarpment which falls steeply down to the surrounding tidal zone.

At various locations some of these historic views, created by the nineteenth century clearing and cultivation of the site, are partly obscured by recent revegetation activities (Figure 70). Retention of these view lines where possible is desirable, as they allow for the site to be appreciated as an island, reinforcing the important characteristic of separation and the sense of isolation that made Churchill Island a desirable retreat for its nineteenth and twentieth century owners.
Figure 66  Moonahs retained in pasture: detail of 1957 oblique aerial photograph
Source: State Library of Victoria

Figure 67  Moonahs on the east side of the zone, adjoining the agricultural precinct
Figure 68  Revegetation areas, such as these Swamp Gums in the south-east of the zone, are developing into a mature over-storey.

Figure 69  Views within this zone are afforded to Phillip Island, as well as of the underlying Westernport geology.
Churchill Island has been used as agricultural land from the mid nineteenth century. Most of the island was cleared for grazing, except for the aforementioned Moonahs in the western area, which were retained as a tree group within the pastoral landscape. Except for these trees and a limited number of exotic trees planted outside the house and domestic garden zone, Churchill Island remained open pastoral land until the late 1970s, when much of the western part of the site was revegetated.

Revegetation has also occurred elsewhere at the island, however this is generally limited to peripheral areas along the coastal pathway, or in association with the development of the visitor centre and car park (Figure 71).

The few mature scattered trees throughout this zone are of likely mid-twentieth century origin, with the possible exception of a pair of Stone Pines in the paddock north of the visitor centre that appear to have blown over but continue to grow. These are likely to be early twentieth century plantings.

None of the fencing or other built fabric within the agricultural zone has been identified as being of significance, and appears to be of relatively recent origin. The western dam was constructed during the Buckley period of ownership in the 1930s. Two additional dams, in paddocks to the north and east of the visitor centre, are recent origin.
Figure 71  Limited revegetation has occurred along the coastal path around the periphery of the farm lands

Figure 72  Two Stone Pines (indicated) have failed in the central paddock area but continue to grow
4.0 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

This chapter provides an assessment of the cultural heritage significance and values of Churchill Island. It draws on the information and analysis of the preceding chapters. Comparative analysis with similar places is also included.

The assessment has regard for the definitions of historic, scientific, aesthetic, social and spiritual values included in the 'Understanding and assessing cultural significance' Practice Note to the *Burra Charter* 2013. It also has regard for *The Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines*, endorsed by the Heritage Council 6 December 2012, and updated on 5 June 2014. This chapter concludes with an updated statement of significance, which is recommended to Heritage Victoria.

4.1 Previous assessments/statements of significance

Churchill Island has not previously been the subject of a comprehensive assessment of its cultural heritage values, although there are previous statements of significance, as follows:

The National Trust statement of significance (1973) reads:

The special historical, ecological and visual qualities of Churchill Island and the surrounding bay combine to make this area highly significant, both within the Western Port Region and within the State.

The history of settlement and the important early sites are not always well documented and rarely does such an important site come into public ownership. Victorians now have an outstanding opportunity to gain a greater understanding of the settlement process.

The subtle beauty of the area also challenges us to explore and extend our perceptions of the Australian environment by reflecting on the vision of the early settlers.

The Register of the National Estate statement of significance (1978) reads (note the statement is poorly expressed):

Churchill Island site of first European settlement in Victoria. Lieutenant James Grant, of the Lady Nelson, having built a cottage, planted wheat, corn and a garden in 1801. The Island is unique in history of Victoria and, until recently, only privately owned island in Victoria. Churchill Island is most important landscape element in Western Port Bay. Present homestead is representative of homestead building and is unusual for its planning.

The Victorian Heritage Register statement (1998) reads:

Churchill Island, Westernport Bay off Phillip Island, includes the entire island and linking timber bridge, with all buildings and objects located on it. The island was first 'settled' by Lieutenant James Grant in 1801, when a cottage was erected and garden planted, no evidence of which remains. The present, symmetrical weatherboard homestead dates possibly from the 1860s, parts may be older. There is a cannon from the warship Shenandoah (1865).

Churchill Island, Westernport bay off Phillip Island, is the site of the first European settlement in Victoria, James Grant of the Lady Nelson having built a cottage and planted wheat, corn and a garden in 1801. The island
is unique in the history of Victoria and was until recently the only privately-owned island in Victoria. Churchill Island is a most important landscape element in Westernport bay. The present homestead is representative of homestead building and is unusual for its planning. The island has been acquired by the government of Victoria for public uses. Future plans are unclear. Current landscape is pastoral.

4.1.1 Comment on existing statements of significance

These statements of significance give rise to a number of observations:

- James Grant did not ‘settle’ the island per se. He oversaw cultivation of a small area (no larger than two hectares) for edible crops during a brief stay in March/April 1801. This is understood to be more in the way of a temporary activity, albeit with a deliberate intent to experiment with crops. However, on the basis of available evidence, no permanent or officially sanctioned settlement was intended. It was undertaken in the context of very early nineteenth century British exploration of Western Port, and as part of Grant’s funded expedition in the Lady Nelson. A settlement is defined as, 'A place, typically one which has previously been uninhabited, where people establish a community'.

- The cultivated area was not technically a ‘garden’, although referred to as such by Grant. A ‘garden’ implies a modification to a landscape for amenity purposes, and again with more permanent intent. Rather, this was a small clearing used to trial edible crops.

- A hut and blockhouse were constructed from cleared timber to provide accommodation for Grant’s working party. It is inaccurate to describe either of these structures as a ‘cottage’, a term that again suggests a place of more permanent or ongoing accommodation.

4.2 Historic value

The Burra Charter Practice Note provides the following description of historic value:

Historic value is intended to encompass all aspects of history—for example, the history of aesthetics, art and architecture, science, spirituality and society. It therefore often underlies other values. A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, an historic event, phase, movement or activity, person or group of people. It may be the site of an important event. For any place the significance will be greater where the evidence of the association or event survives at the place, or where the setting is substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of such change or absence of evidence.

The following historical themes of Churchill Island are explored:

- Lieutenant James Grant and early British exploration of the south-east coast of Australia including Western Port
- patterns of land use and occupation since the mid nineteenth century
- associations with various owners of the island
• use as a managed ‘heritage’ property and conservation reserve since the formative years of the conservation movement in Victoria

4.2.1 Lieutenant James Grant

The visit by Lieutenant James Grant and the planting of crops on the western part of Churchill Island was undertaken in the context of growing European interest in the south coastline of Australia in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The south-east of Australia had been sighted by European explorers as early as the seventeenth century, with Western Port identified by George Bass in the late eighteenth century. Grant’s voyage of 1801 was preceded by Bass in 1797 and 1798, who located the strait confirming Tasmania was a separate island, and was followed by a French expedition of 1803. Although Grant originally intended to survey the south-west of Australia, he instead explored the east and south-east coasts, and spent five weeks in Western Port.

Grant was dispatched from Sydney by Governor King, and the object of his voyage was exploration of the south of the continent. In late March 1801 he oversaw the cultivation of an area on the west coast of what is now known as Churchill Island for crops, including wheat, corn, onions and potatoes. The seeds had been supplied by John Churchill of Dawlish, Devon, England, of whom little is known, and after whom Grant named the island. A blockhouse and hut were constructed using timber from trees cleared for cultivation, and provided accommodation for the small party of men sent ashore. They stayed in Western Port for a number of weeks, leaving at the end of April. A visit to the island approximately eight months later (by Lieutenant Commander John Murray) confirmed that the crops prospered. The blockhouse and hut were demolished by the 1860s.

Grant’s choice of Churchill Island as a location to plant the seeds may have been based on the island’s proximity to the eastern entrance of Western Port. He certainly found the island to be ‘pleasantly situated’, with rich soil and a ‘sheltered position’.

The planting of wheat, corn, onion and potatoes, among other crops, are the first recorded European plantings in what is now Victoria. Likewise, the block house built by Grant’s men is the first documented European structure in the state, although other crude or rudimentary structures were likely built around this time by sealers who worked the Victorian coast. There is no physical evidence of either the plantings or the block house, although a commemorative cairn (Figure 73) is located close to where the planting is believed to have taken place. Cairns have also been erected in Rhyll, to commemorate the ‘Flagstaff Settlement’ (1973) and to the Lady Nelson (1988), and at Corinella to commemorate the 1826 settlement (1972). Such memorials provide an indication of growing interest during the twentieth century of the early European history of Victoria. This was also in the lead up to the Australian Bicentennial celebrations of the late 1980s.

Grant’s arrival at Churchill Island preceded official attempts to settle Western Port at Corinella and Rhyll in the 1820s, but it did not directly result in settlement of the area. The earliest settlement of the southern part of mainland Australia was instead in Port Phillip Bay. In 1803, Colonel David Collins commanded an expedition of 300 male convicts, a guard of marines, a small number of free settlers, as well as 40 women and 38 children to Sullivan’s Bay near Sorrento. The settlement was intended to secure the bay against the French, but was officially abandoned in October 1804.
In 1826, Governor Darling sent a party of convicts, soldiers and their wives to Western Port to establish a settlement in order to prevent uncontrolled settlement in the southern part of New South Wales and to emphasise British control of the area to the French. The settlement at Corinella was abandoned within two years. However, some 50 structures were built including a Government House, store house, military and prisoner barracks, and a blacksmith’s shop. There was a corresponding fort and gun emplacement established at Fort Dumaresq near present day Rhyll. Although the lack of fresh water resulted in both these sites being abandoned, the intention by authorities in New South Wales was that a permanent British presence be established in Western Port. That intent was not behind Grant’s expedition.

**Comment**

The arrival of Lieutenant James Grant at Churchill Island in 1801, and the subsequent clearing and planting of an area, was not an attempt at permanent official settlement of the south of (then) New South Wales. Rather, it took place within the context of European exploration of the southern part of the continent, and the British Navy’s ongoing interest in surveying the area. It was partly a precursor to settlement, but it was also an event which effectively lapsed into obscurity in the following decades. While the longer lived and more extensive settlements at Sorrento and Corinella, and the gun emplacement at Rhyll, are significant for their association with official attempts at early settlement, the Churchill Island association with Grant and the site of his plantings is more peripheral to this story.
Nevertheless, Grant’s Churchill Island site is historically significant at a state level. It is associated with a very early documented European ‘event’ in the history of Victoria. It was also the site of the first documented deliberate planting of edible European crops in Victoria, and the site of the first documented construction of a building or structure by Europeans in the state. The placement of a memorial to mark the site is indicative of the growing twentieth century interest in the early European history of Victoria.

4.2.2 Patterns of land use

Western Port islands

Churchill Island is one of three small islands (excluding Phillip Island) in Western Port, all of which were part of Martha King’s Bunguyan pastoral run from 1845 and leased by John Rogers during the 1850s. Sandstone Island, located south-east of Hastings in Western Port, has a comparable pattern of occupation to Churchill Island. It appears to have been Rogers’ main place of residence in the 1850s; Rogers having constructed a house there in c. 1854. The island was purchased by John Skinner in 1867, before passing to Melbourne fishmongers Robert and William Heard. Sandstone Island became the summer home of Robert Heard’s family from 1891. A ‘French-style’ residence was constructed on the island by this date.199 The island was leased for grazing from 1912, following the purchase by the Commonwealth government, who had apparently intended to store explosives there. In 1967 it was purchased by BHP, but reverted to private ownership in 1987 after a ‘conservation backlash’.200 It does not appear any nineteenth century structures remain on the island, and it is listed as a Heritage Inventory (HI) site (historical archaeological) as H7921-0097.

Rogers also ran sheep and cattle on Elizabeth Island, to the south of French Island, in the mid 1850s, but by 1858 only rabbits remained.201 A subsequent lease holder ran a small number of cattle, and the island was purchased in 1872 by John Cleeland, a major landholder on Phillip Island.202 The island has remained in private ownership. It is unknown what buildings were constructed on the site; presently there is only a modern residence.

Farming

Churchill Island was used for farming between c. 1854 and 1872 by John Rogers, and between 1928 and c. 1936 by the Jeffreys brothers, when the island was owned by Gerald Buckley. The farming operations were relatively small scale, given the limited size of the property. For a short period in the late 1860s, Rogers ran up to 630 sheep and constructed fencing which presumably divided the island into paddocks for grazing. The two cottages, known as the Rogers cottages, date from this period, however, little else remains which provides an understanding of this occupation of the island by Rogers. It is also noted that the two cottages (the ‘kitchen’ and ‘dormitory’ cottages) have been subject to significant alterations and upgrades over time. However, their locations, proportions and spatial relationship with each other are largely authentic. As noted in Chapter 3, the majority of the farm buildings at the site are of twentieth century origin. The one exception is the Amess stables, which is believed to date from the 1880s.

Historically, farming has not been a major activity on Churchill Island. There are numerous examples in Victoria of historic farm properties, including nineteenth century properties, which retain collections of long-standing and significant buildings and structures, in original farm layouts. They typically include the main house and outbuildings such as sheds, barns, stables, blacksmith’s, shearing sheds and yards, all of which contribute to a comprehensive
understanding of the operation of nineteenth century farms. That is not the case at Churchill Island.

Island ‘retreat’

The most enduring use of Churchill Island was as a private recreation retreat for affluent and sometimes influential owners based in Melbourne. Under the ownership of the Amess family (1872-1928) and the Jenkins family (1936-1972), Churchill Island was a holiday destination for nearly 100 years. Although some farming occurred on the island during this period – generally under the care of resident farm managers – the focus was on recreation. The perceived health benefits of fresh sea and mountain air had been accepted by the mid-nineteenth century, and the purchase of the island by Amess followed a well established pattern of the acquisition of properties in coastal locations by affluent city dwellers. Such properties were usually within a day’s travel of Melbourne, enabling regular visits by their owners to locations including the Mornington Peninsula. Churchill Island was perhaps a less fashionable choice than the coastal towns on the Peninsula, but it did provide the characteristic qualities of a seaside retreat, and had the added benefit of being an island property.

Soon after Amess’ purchase of Churchill Island the existing weatherboard villa was constructed. He also oversaw the construction of a brick in-ground cellar, timber wash house, cottage garden and windbreak trees, providing a secluded retreat for the family. The homestead (believed to have been constructed in 1872) has been extended and modified over time; the most recent works were carried out in the late 1990s/early 2000s (see Chapter 3). The brick cellar also survives, and is the least modified of all the nineteenth century buildings at the site. The wash house has been relocated, and retains little (if any) original fabric.

Until the late-1950s, access to the island was mainly via boat from the end of Churchill Road to a jetty on the south coast of the island. Amess hosted numerous visitors, holding parties and picnics, and the flagpole, ship’s bell and cannon were used on special occasions.

The ownership of the island by Harry Jenkins continued this use as a retreat, albeit one that was for the health and welfare of his injured son rather than purely for recreation, and the family also hosted parties of visitors. During this period landscaping work around the house and other improvements were undertaken.

Comment

The various land uses to which Churchill Island has been subject are of historical interest or local significance, but not state significance. The private ownership of the island, while of interest, is not unusual in the Western Port context; both Sandstone and Elizabeth islands have been under single ownership at various times.

Similarly the farming land use is not distinctive in a broader context, and is of historical interest only. While Rogers, as the first owner of the island, and the Jefferys, under the ownership of Buckley, engaged in mixed farming on the island, this was of a relatively small scale, and limited by the size of the island. Rogers’ farming activity also appears to be typical of the area during the mid-nineteenth century. Moreover, there are numerous historic farm properties in Victoria which retain more and varied original farm buildings, and historic farm layouts.
Although modified, the homestead presents as a mid-Victorian weatherboard villa, and retains its relationship with its garden setting, and its outbuildings – including the two Rogers’ cottages (1860s) – to the rear (west). Collectively, these elements provide some understanding of the character of Churchill Island as occupied during the late nineteenth century.

The island ‘retreat’ history is of greater interest, albeit still of local significance. This derives from the various affluent owners, resident elsewhere, who visited the secluded island in the company of friends and family for mostly recreational purposes. This was also the most enduring land use on Churchill Island, comprising nearly 100 years of the island’s history since its first European occupation in the mid-nineteenth century – as noted, farming was still ‘dabbled in’ during these periods. As a land use it does compare with the history of large holiday estates in areas such as the Mornington Peninsula. But the island ‘factor’ in this case enhances this aspect of history, deriving from the romance of owning and enjoying a private island. The homestead and immediate garden surroundings provide evidence of the use of the island as a private leisure retreat.

4.2.3 Associations with individual owners

Samuel Amess was a prominent nineteenth century Melbourne identity, successful member of the Melbourne building profession, and mayor of the City of Melbourne in 1869-70. Buildings of note which his company constructed include Customs House (1856-58) and the Government Printing Office (1856-58). He was also the Alderman for the Bourke Ward of the City of Melbourne, and represented the Council on the Melbourne Harbor Trust. Amess’ association with Churchill Island was long-lived (from 1872 until his death in 1898, with his family staying until 1928); and he and his family left their mark on the place, not least of all through the construction of the main house.

Gerald Buckley owned the island for a brief period (1928-36), and was noteworthy for being the son of Mars Buckley who founded the famous Melbourne department store Buckley & Nunn. He was also a successful pastoralist and horse breeder. Harry Jenkins was the next owner, from the 1930s to the 1960s. He was a dentist, but with some claim to fame through competing in 1929 in the Australian Motor Racing Grand Prix on Phillip Island. Another later owner of some note was Alex Classou, who established the Patra Juice brand, but was associated with the island for a very short period.

Comment

Churchill Island is of local significance for its association with a number of important owners. Of these Samuel Amess stands out, for his prominence in nineteenth century Melbourne, including his association with significant public buildings and his civic roles. While he is a comparatively important nineteenth century figure with a long association with Churchill Island, this aspect of significance is not at state level.

4.2.4 The conservation movement

The 40 year operation of Churchill Island as a public recreation reserve now forms a major part of the island’s history. The island was purchased by the State Government in 1976, within the context of a growing public and official interest in the conservation of places. The focus of this conservation movement was initially on natural places, and in 1972 the Victoria Conservation Trust (VCT) was formed to ‘acquire, preserve and maintain areas within the State which are ecologically significant or of natural interest or beauty or scientific interest’. The VCT became interested in purchasing the island when it came up for sale in
1973, due to its abundant fish and birdlife, and the association with Grant. After being outbid at the auction, the VCT later purchased the island through negotiations with the owner in 1976.

Between 1973 and 1976 (the year of their purchase of Churchill Island), the VCT bought or acquired 12 privately owned properties including land adjacent to national or state parks such as the Brisbane Ranges, Mallacoota Inlet and Howe Flat; a four hectare she-oak forest in Teesdale; and Haining Farm, a dairy farm and educational centre in Launching Place. After five years of operation, the VCT felt confident it had ‘become an active participator in the conservation and protection of land of ecological, scientific and historic significance for the people of Victoria’. By 1982, the number of properties acquired by the VCT had grown to 35. Of the VCT ‘portfolio’, Churchill Island is understood to have been one of the more well known of the properties purchased and for a time managed by the Trust. Its combination of historic and natural values also distinguished it in this context.

The ‘rehabilitation’ of Churchill Island also demonstrates conservation practices of the early or formative years of the conservation movement. In preparing the island to be opened to the public, the VCT aimed to present the place as a ‘typical’ nineteenth century farming complex, with a focus on a perceived period character rather than authenticity. Major landscaping work was also undertaken at the northern end of the island, which has resulted in dense vegetation on what was previously cleared land. A similar approach appears to have been taken at another VCT acquisition, Sage’s Cottage in Baxter, where the garden was ‘re-established’ in an Old English style.

The public use and conservation focus of the island as initiated by the VCT in the late 1970s, was enthusiastically taken up and assisted by the Friends of Churchill Island Society (FOCIS), which formed in 1980. This focus has moreover continued through to the present, under different management regimes, albeit in a context of the island’s increasing popularity and rising tourism involvement.

**Comment**

Churchill Island is of local significance for its historical association with the VCT, and its subsequent history as a publicly owned and accessible conservation-oriented island and ‘heritage’ farm. Many of the buildings, and the island as a whole, demonstrate early conservation approaches of the 1970s and 1980s, albeit these practices may be at odds with current best practice. The ongoing use of the island in this way, initiated by the VCT in the late 1970s, assisted by FOCIS from 1980, and continued under different management regimes through to the present, is an important aspect of the island’s history.

**4.3 Aesthetic value**

Aesthetic value is described in the *Burra Charter* Practice Note as follows:

Aesthetic value refers to the sensory and perceptual experience of a place – that is, how we respond to visual and non-visual aspects such as sounds, smells and other factors having a strong impact on human thoughts, feelings and attitudes. Aesthetic qualities may include the concept of beauty and formal aesthetic ideals. Expressions of aesthetics are culturally influenced.

In the context of Churchill Island this value relates primarily to the scenic and landscape values of the island, rather than the architectural value of the buildings – the early buildings at the island are discussed under historic value ‘patterns of land use’ (Section 4.2.2).
The 'pleasant' and 'beautiful situation' of the island was noted by James Grant in 1801. The low-lying island has views across the bay to Phillip Island, French Island and the eastern shore of Western Port. Churchill Island is also clearly visible from the road to San Remo, and from Newhaven on Phillip Island. Furthermore, Churchill Island is small enough to be experienced as an 'island' surrounded by water, with a strong sense of being 'separate' to the mainland or Phillip Island. This contributes to the aesthetic values of the place.

The island has been identified for its 'special ... visual qualities' by the National Trust of Australia (Victoria). The entry in the National Trust Register, dated 1973, notes the 'subtle beauty of the area ... challenges us to explore and extend our perceptions of the Australian environment by reflecting on the vision of the early settlers'. However, this statement was written in the context of efforts to have the island purchased by the government, and the island's landscape has undergone significant changes since this was written.

In regard to the scenic values, there are a number of places on the VHR for which scenic value is accorded aesthetic significance at state level. The Great Ocean Road, along with its historical, archaeological and social significance, is considered to be aesthetically significant 'as a sinuous road winding through dramatic topography'. The Point Nepean Defence and Quarantine Station Precinct on the Mornington Peninsula is of aesthetic significance for its dramatic landscape, dotted with significant historic buildings. This significance includes formalised internal views within the historic Quarantine Station, and views to and from Port Phillip Bay and the Heads. By comparison, the scenic values of Churchill Island are more understated and less widely appreciated than those of the Great Ocean Road and Point Nepean.

With regard to landscape, the mature indigenous Moonah (Melaleuca lanceolata) trees at the north end of the island contribute to the island's aesthetic values. As shown in several historic images in Chapter 2, the trees with their twisted trunks and sculptural forms have been featured in sketches and paintings of the island. A distinguishing feature of the Churchill Island Moonahs is the absence of under-storey; the trees have been integrated into the formal landscape character of the place. In this regard, the Moonah population is both of cultural and natural significance. This is in contrast to the Mangrove at the south of the island, which is solely of natural significance.

Other specimens of note are remnants of the Amess-era cottage garden: the mature Norfolk Island Pine (Araucaria heterophylla), two Mulberries (Morus alba) and two Olives (Olea europaea).

Comment

Churchill Island is of aesthetic value at a local level. While the island is noted for its visual qualities, the experience of the place as an 'island' and the sense of being 'separate' to the mainland, these values are not at a state level. Places on the Victorian Heritage Register with state level scenic value are, by comparison, more widely recognised for these values.

The Churchill Island Moonah population is of local cultural heritage significance. The Moonah vegetation has been retained and managed by successive occupants over the past 150 years, emphasising the value placed on these indigenous trees. The mature remnants of the Amess-era garden are also of local significance.

4.4 Scientific value

Scientific value is described in the Burra Charter Practice Note as follows:
Scientific value refers to the information content of a place and its ability to reveal more about an aspect of the past through examination or investigation of the place, including the use of archaeological techniques. The relative scientific value of a place is likely to depend on the importance of the information or data involved, on its rarity, quality or representativeness, and its potential to contribute further important information about the place itself or a type or class of place or to address important research questions. To establish potential, it may be necessary to carry out some form of testing or sampling. For example in the case of an archaeological site, this could be established by a test excavation.

In the context of Churchill Island this value has the following applications:

- Archaeological potential
- Potential for analysis of collections to yield further information

**Archaeological Potential**

Although the main location for buildings and activity has been in the centre of Churchill Island, documentary and some physical evidence indicates that other structures which are no longer extant were built elsewhere on the island. These include the site of Grant’s planting and block house of 1801 on the western side of the island, for which documentary evidence only exists. As outlined above, the sites of Grant’s 1801 plantings and block house are of historical significance at a state level. Another important site related to the early (c.1800-1820s) exploration and settlement of Victoria is the Collins Settlement site in Sorrento, which is also of state significance, and is included in the VHR as both a heritage place and an archaeological place. Any archaeology relating to the Grant voyage would be of generally comparable significance.

Another site of archaeological potential is the location of the White House on the east of the island – artefact scatters, a jetty and a fence post are tangible remnants of occupation in this area. There is also potential archaeology in and around the homestead precinct, associated with its occupation since the mid-1850s. Further areas of archaeological sensitivity are in proximity to the former jetties on the north, west and south-west coasts (see sequential development plans and aerials at Section 2.7). These known and potential sites are identified and analysed in the historical archaeological survey report attached to this CMP (Appendix B). The archaeological survey report also includes an ‘Assessment of Archaeological Significance’ (see Appendix B, pp. 46-47).

Two lines of stones in the ‘heritage’ farm precinct to the north-west of Amess house were identified in 1983 as the foundations of a sealer’s hut. This site is included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory (VHI 7921-0014). In 1991 this conclusion was dismissed as ‘extremely unlikely’.

**Comment**

Any archaeological deposits or artefacts associated with the site of Grant’s planting and block house of 1801, should they survive, would be of significance to Victoria. They have the potential to provide evidence of a very early European ‘event’ in the state, including the site of the first documented planting of European crops and the first documented structure or building in the state. There is also the possibility (albeit slim) that soil analysis could reveal plant material (seeds) from the Grant era plantings.
The 'White House' site also has the potential to yield information about early occupation of the island, albeit this is associated with a later phase of activity and one which was more widespread across Victoria. This archaeology would be of scientific interest, but not state significance. Similarly, any archaeology associated with the heritage farm precinct, and the jetties, would be in this category.

**Collections**

Churchill Island maintains a large collection of historic farm machinery and other items. The vast majority of these items have been donated to the island, and have no historic connection with it. Exceptions are the cannon, which was introduced by Samuel Amess in c.1880; the foot operated grinding wheel mounted in a timber frame; a cheese press in the half cellar; and a timber garden barrow. These items have a long standing association with the island. Other items may be of interest in their own right, although this has not been established for the purposes of this CMP.

It is also noted that the collections of memorabilia, artefacts and objects held by FOCIS also have the potential to enhance an understanding of the use and occupation of Churchill Island. These collections were not assessed during the preparation of this CMP.

**Comment**

The objects at Churchill Island with a confirmed connection to the island are of local significance.

### 4.5 Social value

Social value is described in the *Burra Charter* Practice Note as follows:

> **Social value** refers to the associations that a place has for a particular community or cultural group and the social or cultural meanings that it holds for them.

Social value is a current value, a contemporary heritage value which is associated with a defined group or community of people. The Friends of Churchill Island Society (FOCIS), formed in 1980, fits the latter category and has maintained an ongoing attachment to Churchill Island. FOCIS has undertaken research, managed events, performed maintenance and other works on the island, and has been a strong lobby group for the island. A number of the group’s members have familial links to previous owners of the island, and after 40 years in existence have approximately 250 members. Such numbers and the now long-term involvement in the island is an indication that there is social value in the associations FOCIS has with the island.

To provide a quantifiable basis for consideration of social value for the purposes of this CMP, Christine Grayden, Secretary of the Friends of Churchill Island Society (FOCIS) and Churchill Island curator, invited members to respond to the question, ‘Why do you value Churchill Island?’ Of the 20 respondents, a majority referenced the natural beauty and amenity of the island, and the tranquillity of the setting. While there were some references to the nineteenth century buildings and historic aspects of the island, these were generally secondary considerations.

There will be other members of the community with an attachment to the island, but this has not been demonstrated in any formal way, or by other means of recognition.
Comment

The attachment to Churchill Island on the part of FOCIS members is of social value at a local level.

4.6 Spiritual value

Spiritual value is described in the *Burra Charter* Practice Note as follows:

> Spiritual value refers to the intangible values and meanings embodied in or evoked by a place which give it importance in the spiritual identity, or the traditional knowledge, art and practices of a cultural group. Spiritual value may also be reflected in the intensity of aesthetic and emotional responses or community associations, and be expressed through cultural practices and related places.

The qualities of the place may inspire a strong and/or spontaneous emotional or metaphysical response in people, expanding their understanding of their place, purpose and obligations in the world, particularly in relation to the spiritual realm.

There exists potential for Churchill Island to be of spiritual value to the Aboriginal community. However, indigenous values have not been addressed or assessed in this CMP.

4.7 Assessment against Heritage Council criteria

The following provides an assessment of Churchill Island against the Heritage Council criteria. These criteria were adopted by the Heritage Council on 7 August 2008 pursuant to Sections 8(1)(c) and 8(2) of the *Heritage Act* 1995. Reference is also made to the thresholds relating to each criterion, as per *The Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines* (5 June 2014).

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

Churchill Island is of historical significance to Victoria for its association with a very early European ‘event’ in the history of Victoria; as the site of the first documented deliberate planting of edible European crops; and as the first documented construction of a building or structure by Europeans in the state. The ‘event’ was the visit by Lieutenant James Grant in the Lady Nelson in 1801, when his party cleared an area on the west side of the island; planted crops including wheat, corn, onions and potatoes; and constructed a blockhouse and hut which provided accommodation for the small group of men sent ashore. Grant’s party stayed on the island and in Western Port for a number of weeks, leaving at the end of April 1801. There are no known remains or evidence of the clearing, plantings, blockhouse or hut. Grant’s visit is significant for its association with European exploration of the southern part of the continent, and the British Navy’s ongoing interest in the area, having been sent south from Sydney by Governor King with the objective of exploring the south of the continent. The visit was partly a precursor to settlement, but the Churchill Island association with Grant and the site of his plantings is more peripheral to the story of settlement. The episode is distinct from other longer lived and more extensive attempts to settle this area of the Victorian coast in the early nineteenth century, such as the settlements at Sorrento (1803-04) and Corinella (1826). Grant’s episode was an agricultural experiment, not a permanent base and no attempts were made to settle Western Port as a result of the voyage. The event is recalled in a memorial close to the presumed location of the planting and block house; this much later placement of a memorial to mark the site is in itself indicative of the growing
twentieth century interest in the early European history of Victoria, coming many decades after Grant’s touching down on the island.

The island ‘retreat’ history of Churchill Island is of local significance. This derives from the various affluent owners, resident elsewhere, who visited the secluded island in the company of friends and family for mostly recreational purposes. The island’s use as a privately owned leisure retreat dates from 1872, and has been the most enduring land use over nearly 100 years of the island’s history. As a land use it compares with the large holiday estates in areas such as the Mornington Peninsula, but the island ‘factor’ in this instance enhances this aspect of significance, deriving from the ‘romance’ of owning and enjoying a private island. The homestead and immediate garden surroundings provide evidence of the use of the island as a private leisure retreat.

Churchill Island is also of local significance for its historical association with the Victoria Conservation Trust, and its subsequent history as a publicly owned and accessible conservation-oriented island and ‘heritage’ farm. Many of the buildings, and the island as a whole, demonstrate early conservation approaches of the 1970s and 1980s, albeit these practices may be at odds with current best practice. The ongoing use of the island in this way, initiated by the VCT in the late 1970s, assisted by the Friends of Churchill Island Society (FOCIS) from 1980, and continued under different management regimes through to the present, is an important aspect of the island’s history. This is reinforced by its ongoing popularity and increasing tourism focus.

The other land uses to which Churchill Island has been subject are of historical interest only. These include the island’s pastoral use in the mid-nineteenth century, and later use for farming and agricultural purposes.

**Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines**: The island’s association with an early episode in British colonisation of Australia satisfies the threshold for state significance. The other land uses of the island do not reach the threshold for state significance, but are of local significance or local interest.

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

The use of Churchill Island and the nineteenth century buildings are not uncommon and do not satisfy this criteria.

The survival of the indigenous Moonah trees, and their integration into the formal landscape within the defined ‘homestead precinct’ is unusual. A more typical response by settlers to native vegetation was the trees to be felled, and for the land to be given over to pasture. The extant Moonahs in proximity to the homestead are believed to predate European settlement.

The longevity of the private ownership of the island is somewhat unusual, but not rare in the context of Western Port. Aside from Churchill Island, there are two other small islands in the tidal bay, being Sandstone and Elizabeth islands, both of which have had periods of private ownership. Churchill Island was in private ownership from the mid 1850s to the early 1970s, and has never been subdivided. While this private ownership is of historical interest, it is not of significance, as the two other small islands in Western Port (Sandstone and Elizabeth islands) have also been held under single, private ownership at different times.
Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines: Churchill Island does not satisfy this criterion at a state level. While the Moonah trees are an unusual landscape feature in the local context, they similarly do not satisfy this criterion for rarity at a state level.

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

There is potential for archaeological evidence at the island:

- The Grant association (low potential)
- The White House, 1850s/60s occupation (good potential)
- Archaeological evidence within the ‘homestead precinct’ (good potential)
- Jetties/bathing boxes (moderate to good potential)

Although there have been archaeological investigations undertaken at what is believed to be the site of the Grant plantings on the west of the island, there has been no deposits found. However, although unlikely, given the relatively low level of disturbance to this part of the island, there remains the potential for archaeology to be located at the site. Any physical evidence associated with Grant is potentially of state historical significance, and would relate to the buildings not the plantings. Such evidence would likely have state level significance as remnants of a very early period of European history in Victoria.

There is also potential for archaeological evidence associated with post-1850s land use and occupation. This is likely to be of local level of significance given they would relate to more typical farming and residential uses in the district, which is already well documented.

The ‘sealer’s site’ (VHI H7921-0014, Hermes 10249) was identified in 1983 and has more recently been assessed as being extremely unlikely to have an association with sealing.

Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines: Any archaeological evidence of the Grant visit would likely satisfy this criterion for significance at a state level, with the potential to inform our understanding of early European exploration of what was to become Victoria. Archaeological deposits on other parts of the islands would likely have local significance for demonstrating the pattern of land use on the island, but would not reach the threshold for state significance.

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

The built fabric at Churchill Island comprises a number of residential and farming buildings dating from the nineteenth century. The buildings dating from Rogers’ occupation are typical of this early era of settlement in Western Port being modest, unadorned kit-built dwellings and with tanks for water collection. The built fabric dating from the Amess period of ownership also exhibits the characteristics of a private leisure retreat for a wealthier owner with the Italianate-style weatherboard villa, development of garden plantings, the cannon, cellar and other outbuildings. The Amess house has also been modified.

Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines: Although the buildings exhibit characteristics of the two uses of the island, they are not ‘notable’ examples of a class of buildings and therefore do not reach the threshold for state level significance.
**Criterion E: Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics.**

The aesthetic attributes of Churchill Island relate to its setting, views and the characteristics of the place being an island. The individual built elements are not of aesthetic significance for their design.

The island was noted for its scenic qualities by James Grant in 1801, and the views to French and Phillip Islands and the eastern shore of Western Port contribute to a strong sense of the place being an island. The area of Moonah trees at the north end of the island and the plantings around the residence, including remnant fruit trees and Araucaria, contribute to the scenic values of the island. The aesthetic values of Churchill Island are understated and are a result of a combination of setting and outward views, rather than the landscape of the island itself having particular aesthetic qualities. The island has been identified for its 'special ... visual qualities' by the National Trust of Australia (Victoria), although these qualities were not explicitly defined.

**Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines:** The aesthetic qualities of island (scenic, setting etc) are appreciated by the community but the island has not been the subject of critical recognition or otherwise acknowledged as having 'exceptional merit' [see social value, H]. Therefore, this criterion is not met at state level, but the island has aesthetic value at a local level.

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

This criterion is not considered to apply.

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

Indigenous values have not been addressed in this CMP.

The volunteer group, Friends of Churchill Island Society (FOCIS) was formed in 1980, and has since maintained an active association with the island in terms of maintenance, events and research. Many of these volunteers are likely to have been involved in the lobbying for government acquisition of the island by the local community in the 1970s. A number of FOCIS’s approximately 250 volunteers have familial connections with the island. The group has also taken an interest in the production of reports on the island’s future use and the PhD thesis being prepared by E Rebecca Sanders on the island’s history.

**Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines:** The guidelines note that in determining state level significance for this criterion, the place must represent a ‘particularly strong example of the association between it and the community of cultural group by reason of its relationship to important historical events and/or its ability to interpret experiences to the broader Victorian Community’.

While Churchill Island has a demonstrated level of social significance for the local community and the volunteer group FOCIS, this association, however, does not meet the threshold for state level significance.
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Criterion H: Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Victoria’s history.

The association of Churchill Island with its various owners contributes to an understanding of the use of the place. Samuel Amess is the most prominent of these, having been a mayor of the City of Melbourne, and a city councillor. However, as a relatively wealthy and successful man in nineteenth century Victoria, Amess’ public roles were typical commitments by someone of his class and standing. Amess does not appear to have had any involvement in the affairs of the local area. The association with Amess contributes to an understanding of the use of Churchill Island as private holiday retreat of a relatively wealthy owner, and is of local historical interest.

The association of the island with Amess and other owners John Rogers, Gerald Buckley and Harry Jenkins is not historically significant in its own right, but contributes to an understanding of the use of Churchill Island as a private island owned by well-off individuals.

Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines: While Amess made a contribution to Victorian society, this contribution was not ‘strong or influential’ and the association with Churchill Island does not directly relate to his achievements. Therefore, this criterion is not satisfied at a state level.

4.8 Statement of significance

What is significant?

Churchill Island is a 50.7 hectare island on the north coast of Phillip Island, Western Port. There was growing European interest in the exploration of the south coast of Australia in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and Churchill Island was visited by naval officer Lieutenant James Grant on the Lady Nelson in 1801. Grant and his men cleared an area believed to be on the west of the island, constructed a timber hut and block house and planted seeds of wheat, coffee and vegetables. A number of these seeds had been donated by an English gentleman, John Churchill, after whom Grant named the island. The island was not settled at this time, and no physical evidence of this brief episode survives.

Churchill Island was in private ownership from the mid 1850s to the 1970s. It was purchased from the Crown in 1865 by John Rogers, who had leased the island from as early as the mid-1850s, and who undertook small scale farming. Two small cottages remain from the period of Rogers’ ownership. In 1872, Rogers sold Churchill Island to Samuel Amess, City of Melbourne councillor and mayor in 1869-1870. The Amess family used the island as a private seaside retreat into the 1920s. A single-storey villa was constructed soon after Amess purchased the island.

The private ownership of the island continued into the 1970s under various owners. In 1976, it was purchased by Victoria Conservation Trust, which had been formed by the state government, under Premier Richard Hamer, to acquire and preserve areas of natural or historic significance. Under the VCT’s management the island was adapted for use as a public reserve, with a focus on the nineteenth century farming history. Landscaping and building works were undertaken at this time. A volunteer organisation, Friends of Churchill Island, was formed in 1980 and maintains a strong association with the island.
The island comprises two c. 1860s cottages, a c. 1872 weatherboard villa, and c. 1880s cellar and stables buildings dating from the Rogers and Amess periods, as well as more recent buildings including a visitor centre. At the northern end of the island is an area of Moonahs, which is believed to predate European settlement, and windrows have been planted around the buildings.

**How is it significant?**

Churchill Island is of historical significance to the state. The island is also of local historical, social and aesthetic significance.

**Why is it significant?**

Churchill Island is of historical significance to the state for its association with the very early European exploration of Victoria and the planting of crops in a small (c. 2ha) area to the west of the island in 1801. This event is recalled in a commemorative cairn on the island’s south-west coast. The event included the first documented deliberate planting of edible European crops in Victoria, with Churchill Island also being the site of the first documented construction of a building or structure by Europeans in the state.

Churchill Island is of local historical significance. The island’s built elements, moveable objects and landscape features variously demonstrate patterns of tenure and land use, including farming (the Rogers cottages) and the use of the island as a private retreat (homestead, barn, cellar, cannon, Araucaria and windrows). This latter use of the island extended for nearly 100 years. These elements are generally contained within the ‘homestead precinct’ on the high ground close to the centre of the island, as defined (historically) by dense windrow plantings to all sides. The history of the island as an early example of a publicly owned and accessible conservation-oriented property and ‘heritage’ farm, associated with the Victoria Conservation Trust, is also significant. The acquisition of the island by the VCT was a demonstration of the appreciation of its natural and historic values for the public, during a period of growing interest in the conservation of places.

Archaeological deposits have the potential to enhance an understanding of the use and operation of the site. Zones of archaeological sensitivity relate to the ‘White House’ site to the east of the island and former jetties/bathing boxes to the north-east, west and south coasts. These sites of archaeological sensitivity are significant at a local level. While extremely unlikely, there exists potential for archaeological deposits relating to the Grant blockhouse and hut to survive. In the event that evidence was to be revealed, it would be of significance to the state as tangible remnants of the earliest building(s) in Victoria.

The island is of local aesthetic significance for its scenic and visual qualities, including its setting and views of Western Port and surrounds, which enhance the experience of the place as an ‘island’, separate to and isolated from the mainland.

Churchill Island is of local social significance for the long-running and strong association with the volunteer group, FOCIS.
4.9 Schedule of significant elements

The following schedule provides a summary of the elements, areas and attributes that contribute to the significance of the place. These include: buildings and built elements; landscape areas, attributes and specimens; objects; and zones of archaeological sensitivity (Table 1 and Figure 74). Conservation policies relating to these elements, areas and attributes are provided at Chapter 6.

The significant elements, areas and attributes are varied, and relate, to differing degrees, to an understanding of the activities, associations and land uses that contribute to the significance of the place.

Elements not identified as being significant are generally later, and unrelated to the island’s operation as a farm and/or island retreat. From a cultural heritage perspective, buildings, objects and landscape elements introduced at the site since the 1970s are generally of little or no significance.
Table 1 Schedule of significant elements, areas and attributes

**Buildings/built elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rogers’ kitchen cottage</td>
<td>c. 1862-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers’ dormitory cottage</td>
<td>c. mid-1860s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amess house</td>
<td>c. 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amess half-cellar</td>
<td>c. 1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amess stable</td>
<td>c. 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amess wash house</td>
<td>c. 1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant cairn</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landscape elements and areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mature indigenous Moonah (<em>Melaleuca lanceolata</em>) trees</td>
<td>at the north end of the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Island Pine (<em>Araucaria heterophylla</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry (<em>Morus alba</em>) x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive (<em>Olea europaea</em>) x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moveable objects** *(specifically: the collection of historic farm machinery; items associated with dairy farming, food processing and food storage; and items in the outbuildings, including the blacksmiths’ shed)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>Foot operated grinding wheel mounted in a timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese press</td>
<td>in the half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber garden barrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sites of archaeological potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area to the west of the island</td>
<td>associated with the Grant cultivation experiment and blockhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location of the White House</td>
<td>on the east of the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The homestead precinct</td>
<td>associated with its occupation since the mid-1850s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations of former jetties</td>
<td>on the north, west and south-west coasts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Significant elements, areas and attributes

Buildings/site elements

1. Rogers kitchen cottage, c. 1842-43
2. Rogers cottage, c. mid-1860s
3. Amex homestead, c. 1877
4. Amex half-cellar, c. 1870s
5. Amex stables, c. 1886
6. Amex wash house, c. 1870s
7. Grant clem, 1968

Landscape elements and areas

1. Native indigenous forest (Melaleuca amendment) trees at the north end of the island
2. Norfolk Island Pine (Araucaria heterophylla)
3. Mulberry (Morus alba)
4. Olive (Olea europaea)

Sites of archaeological potential

1. Area to the west of the island associated with the Grant cultivation experiment and blackhouse
2. The location of the White House on the east of the island
3. The homestead precinct, associated with its occupation since the mid-1860s
4. Locations of former jetty on the north and southwest coasts

Moveable objects:

1. Cannon
2. Foot operated grinding wheel mounted in a timber frame (not mapped)
3. Cheese press in the half cellar (not mapped)
4. Timber garden barrier (not mapped)
5.0 OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

The following discussion establishes a framework for the conservation policy at Chapter 6. Issues addressed include implications arising from:

- cultural heritage significance of the place
- Nature Parks’ management and operations, including aspirations for the site
- statutory requirements and obligations, with a focus on the statutory heritage context
- environmental, natural and Indigenous values

5.1 Significance

The statement of significance at Chapter 4 identifies that Churchill Island is of historical significance to Victoria for its association with European exploration of south-eastern Australia in the early nineteenth century. It is also of historical, social, aesthetic and scientific significance at a local level.

Implications arising from the assessment of significance are as follows:

- Enhance awareness and understanding of the historical association with the European exploration of south-eastern Australia during the early nineteenth century, as per the activities of Lt Grant of the Lady Nelson in 1801. This includes acknowledgement that the island is the site of the first documented planting of European crops in Victoria, and the site of the first documented structure or building in the state.
- Enhance awareness and understanding of the history of the place as a private island ‘retreat’ for wealthy owners for nearly 100 years.
- Enhance awareness and understanding of the island as an early example of a publicly owned and accessible conservation-oriented property and ‘heritage’ farm, associated with the Victoria Conservation Trust.
- Retain and conserve the historical and architectural values of the buildings of nineteenth century origin (the Rogers cottages, Amess house, Amess cellar, Amess wash house and stable).
- Retain and conserve the aesthetic values of Churchill Island, including its scenic and visual qualities, and the experience and sense of the place as an ‘island’ which is separate to and isolated from the mainland.
- Retain and conserve views out from the island, including views to Phillip Island to the south and west, French Island to the north, the mainland to the east, as well as more immediate views to the waters of Westernport and its underlying geology, especially to the south.
- Retain and conserve the identified vegetation of significance, being:
  - Norfolk Island Pine, Mulberry trees (2) and Olive trees (2) located in the garden associated with Amess house
  - Remnant Moonahs from pre-European settlement period, in the west of the island
• Retain and conserve identified archaeological deposits and artefacts associated with historical land uses and activities.
• Retain and conserve the Grant memorial cairn.
• Retain and conserve the moveable objects with a demonstrated provenance to Churchill Island, specifically: the cannon; foot-operated grinding wheel mounted in a timber frame, cheese press and timber garden barrow.
• Maintain public access and continuation of programs and events which attract visitors and tourists to the island.
• Although not of heritage value for their historical association with the island, maintain the artefacts and collections which have been introduced to the island during its period as a ‘heritage’ farm, for their potential to educate and enhance the visitor experience.

5.2 Operation and management of Churchill Island

Churchill Island is managed by Nature Parks. The Nature Parks Board is appointed under section 14(2) of the Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978, and is responsible for the strategic direction and governance of the Parks as outlined in the Act.

The island is one of many properties within Nature Parks’ reserves system. It operates as a tourist attraction with a focus on the ‘heritage farm’ experience. It is also a venue for a calendar of public events, as well as one-off private functions. The events and functions will continue, and likely expand, into the future.

Visitation is high and increasing. A significant percentage of visitors are from overseas, and typically visit Churchill Island briefly as part of a three ticket pass to two other Nature Parks attractions at Phillip Island, being the Penguin Parade and Koala Conservation Centre.

As noted in Chapter 1, Nature Parks commissioned the Churchill Island Key Area Plan (Tract Consultants in association with Urban Enterprise and Sanmor & Associates, April 2014). The KAP is a strategic planning document which guides approaches to intensifying the commercial operation of the place, sets out a vision and objectives for the island, and addresses a range of issues including design, uses, interpretation and implementation. The plan also proposes a precinct planning model for the island, whereby heritage, visitor arrival and activities, major events, grazing and ecological conservation precincts are identified.

Preceding this, a Key Area Plan Technical Report was also prepared (Tract Consultants in association with Urban Enterprise and Sanmor & Associates, November 2013). The latter report is, as its title indicates, a technical report which provides additional background information for use by Nature Parks staff. Schematic plans for a new and expanded Visitor Centre are included in the report, and other plans relating to site planning and design principles only.

Both the KAP and the Technical Report have been reviewed in preparation of this CMP, with the policies and recommendations included in Chapter 6 in particular, informed by the review of these documents. By way of a summary comment, the majority of works and proposals anticipated in the KAP, including the definition of management ‘precincts’ are acceptable in heritage terms, with minimal if any heritage impacts arising.
However, in terms of the ongoing operation of Churchill Island, the key issues and recommendations coming out of this CMP are as follows:

- While the ‘heritage farm’ experience is a draw card, the cultural heritage significance of the island is not well understood or appreciated.
- The historic buildings within the homestead precinct are not clearly presented, and there are opportunities to improve the presentation and emphasise their authenticity.

### 5.3 Statutory considerations

Churchill Island is subject to a range of legislation:

- **Victorian Heritage Act 1995**
- **Planning and Environment Act 1987**
- **Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006**
- **Crown Land and Reserves Act 1978**
- **Disability Discrimination Act 1992**
- **Building Code of Australia**

Of the relevant acts, the *Heritage Act 1995* has the most relevance in terms of the management of the cultural heritage significance of the island, which is the focus of this CMP.

The *Crown Land and Reserves Act 1978* also governs management of the island. Nature Parks reports to the Nature Parks Board, as appointed under the Act.

#### 5.3.1 Victorian Heritage Act 1995

As noted in Chapter 1, the whole of Churchill Island is included in the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR), maintained by the Victorian Heritage Council (VHR number H1614). It is categorised as a ‘heritage place’, and includes ‘heritage objects’. The extent of registration also includes the access bridge at the south of the island. The *Heritage Act 1995* therefore applies to the island. Several sites on the island are also included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory, the list of historical archaeological sites. These sites are also subject to the *Heritage Act 1995*.

The *Heritage Act* is the Victorian Government’s key piece of (non-Indigenous) cultural heritage legislation. It provides a legislative framework for the protection of a wide range of heritage places and objects, including: historic archaeological sites and artefacts; historic buildings, structures and precincts; gardens, trees and cemeteries; cultural landscapes; shipwrecks and relics; and significant objects. The *Act* is administered by Heritage Victoria and enables the identification and protection of heritage places and objects that are of significance to the State of Victoria. The *Act* also establishes the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR), the Heritage Inventory and the Heritage Council of Victoria.

The VHR provides the highest level of protection for heritage places and objects in Victoria. Permits are required from Heritage Victoria for works to registered places other than regular maintenance and repairs.

Many properties included in the VHR have a ‘permit policy’ and suite of ‘permit exemptions’, typically relating to maintenance and minor works, including landscape works, attached to
the VHR citation and documentation. There is no permit policy or exemptions for the existing entry for Churchill Island. This is commented on and addressed in Chapter 6.

The whole of the island, plus one individual site, are also included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory, an inventory of known and recorded historic archaeological places. However, in Victoria, all archaeological elements and remains which are older than 50 years, including those not yet identified or included in the Heritage Inventory, are also protected by the Heritage Act, and no person can knowingly excavate or disturb an archaeological site without obtaining a consent from the Executive Director of Heritage Victoria.

5.3.2 Heritage approvals

The following is an overview of the requirements and protocols that apply to Churchill Island under the Heritage Act 1995.

5.3.3 Where permits are required

A permit is normally required from Heritage Victoria for any physical change, intervention, or works which impact on the current appearance of the island and its buildings and landscape.

This also applies to the later and contemporary buildings and structures on the island, as well as the car parking areas, fences, and plantings.

Accepting this current situation, and as noted above, Chapter 6 addresses this in that it identifies a suite of permit exemptions which can be recommended to Heritage Victoria.

However, permits are currently required for the following:

- Introducing new permanent elements such as pathways, roadways, gates, fencing, seating, signage, hard surface car parking, play equipment, buildings, shelters, etc;
- Demolition or relocation of existing buildings, structures and elements including those which are not identified as being of heritage significance;
- Altering or extending the existing buildings;
- Modifying existing elements through painting or changing materials;
- Introducing plantings in new locations;
- Temporary structures such as marquees and amenity vans.

Considerations

Under the provisions of the Heritage Act, the Executive Director, in determining a permit to undertake works to a registered place, must consider the extent to which the proposal, if approved, would affect the cultural heritage significance of the registered place. In cases where the proposal would have a major adverse affect on the heritage significance of the place, the Executive Director of Heritage Victoria must also, under Section 73(1) (b) of the Heritage Act, consider the extent to which the application, if refused, would affect the ‘reasonable or economic use’ of the registered place, or cause undue financial hardship to the owner in relation to the place.

Heritage Victoria generally acknowledges that many heritage registered places can absorb change without an adverse impact on their heritage significance.

5.3.4 Permit exemptions and minor works

Permit exemptions are declared under Section 66 (3) of the Heritage Act, on the basis that some categories of works proposed will not have an impact on the stated significance of the heritage place.
Exempt works typically cover all normal maintenance and upkeep issues faced by owners of heritage places. Exempt works can also cover changes to the interiors of buildings which are not of heritage value, but not normally changes to the exterior.

A VHR permit is also not normally required when the works involve replacing new for old material on the basis of ‘like with like’. For instance, replacing hard surfaces with the same materials; and replacing the components of seating, lighting, signage etc with the same materials or elements.

Where there is uncertainty or doubt as to whether works constitute minor repairs or maintenance, which would normally be permit exempt, the advice of a qualified heritage practitioner should be sought. Approval for minor works can also often be obtained from Heritage Victoria via correspondence.

5.3.5 Heritage Victoria permit process and requirements

For most permit applications, documents to be lodged/submitted to Heritage Victoria include a completed permit application form signed by the applicant and owner, application fee, three copies of any plans, and reports or other documentation associated with the application such as:

- Photographs which help to illustrate the existing conditions and reason for the alterations or works
- Existing conditions/survey drawings
- Plans and other drawings, such as elevations or sections (where relevant) which provide detail on the proposed works
- Photomontages if available and of assisting in determining an application
- Heritage Impacts Statement report (prepared by a qualified heritage practitioner, see below)

These documents should also be lodged electronically with Heritage Victoria.

After permit applications are lodged, permits are normally processed within 60 days unless an extension is granted by the Heritage Council. Minor matters can be dealt with in less than 30 days, while more major proposals, or those which the Executive Director of Heritage Victoria believes may have a detrimental effect on the place, require advertising for 14 days to enable interested parties to make submissions. Typically, the advertisements are placed in the public notices section of The Age on Wednesdays; a sign (or signs) advertising the application at the site is also usually required. The application documentation is additionally uploaded onto the Heritage Victoria website during the advertising period, for anyone with an interest in the proposal to download and review, and make a submission. Submissions and representations are accepted from interested parties up to 14 days from the date of advertising.

If the Executive Director can determine the matter on the information supplied, a permit is likely to be issued. If the application is contentious and submissions have been received from other parties, the Executive Director may stop the ‘permit clock’ to ask for additional information and clarification of the issues raised in submissions.

Heritage impacts

A Heritage Impact Statement (HIS), commissioned by the applicant/proponent of the works, prepared by a heritage practitioner, and lodged with the permit application, assists Heritage Victoria in making an assessment and reaching a decision.
In the case of relatively minor works a brief assessment of the heritage impacts on the registered place should be sufficient. For more major proposals, such as the construction of a new and expanded Visitor Centre at Churchill Island, a more detailed and comprehensive HIS report may be needed, together with (in some instances) other reports which support particular aspects of the proposal, such as planning or economic feasibility reports.

5.3.6 Project planning and timing

Where statutory approvals are required for heritage reasons, provision needs to be made in the initial project planning stages for the time involved in the approvals process.

Prior to lodging the permit application, it is recommended that the advice of a heritage practitioner be sought. This step can assist in determining an appropriate path to lodgement, including advice on consulting all relevant sources and preparing all necessary documentation. The heritage practitioner can also advise on, and participate in, pre-application discussions with Heritage Victoria, which are typically encouraged in the lead up to lodging a permit for works of any substantial nature. Depending on what is proposed, such a meeting could be held on site or in the offices of Heritage Victoria.

The timing for obtaining a permit from Heritage Victoria can vary. While Heritage Victoria has a 60 day statutory timeframe in which to determine an application, this can blow out to 90 days or more, depending on the nature of the proposed works, the requirement to advertise, submissions from interested parties, and any stopping of the ‘permit clock’ for additional information to be provided to Heritage Victoria.

5.3.7 What happens when the permit is obtained?

Once the permit is obtained, i.e. issued by the Executive Director, Heritage Victoria, the first step is to review the conditions attached to the permit, which can include multiple conditions, and where feasible initiate action to meet the conditions. Conditions are also often tied to timeframes which may prove difficult to meet. In many instances, minor aspects of the conditions can be modified through correspondence with Heritage Victoria (such as having a timeframe for completion of work extended from two to three years). In other instances, where the conditions are considered unacceptable, the proponent has up to 60 days (after issue of the permit) to lodge an appeal to the Heritage Council.

5.3.8 Appeals

In the event the permit application is refused, the applicant can appeal against the refusal and the appeal request must be lodged within 60 days of the refusal of the permit. The appeal is made to the Heritage Council. Note there are no appeal rights (third party or otherwise) against a decision by the Executive Director to grant a permit.

The Heritage Council must determine an appeal within 60 days. Other parties (submitters) to the permit application including the National Trust do not have the power to trigger a hearing but could request to be heard in the event a hearing was conducted.
The Heritage Council has the power to:

- Grant the permit with or without conditions; or
- Confirm the decision of the Executive Director of Heritage Victoria; or
- Vary the conditions on the permit.

Once an appeal has been lodged but before it has been determined by the Heritage Council, the Minister for Planning has the power to call in the appeal and determine it himself. Alternatively, subject to certain requirements, he also has the power to refer the appeal to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal for determination. However, the latter situations are unusual and rarely occur.

The argument put before the Heritage Council for a hearing must focus on the impacts of the proposal on the heritage significance of the place and the extent to which the refusal would affect the 'reasonable or economic' use of the place, or cause undue hardship to the owner.

5.3.9 Other legislation

Planning and Environment Act 1987

Churchill Island (HO27) is included in Heritage Overlay Schedule to the Bass Coast Planning Scheme. The extent of the overlay reflects the VHR entry. Consistent with the provisions of Clause 43.01-2 of the Planning Scheme no permits are required from Bass Coast Shire to develop Churchill Island because of its inclusion in the VHR.

Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006

There are known Aboriginal sites on Phillip Island, and Churchill Island is a designated area of cultural sensitivity as per the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006. It is understood that the island has not been fully surveyed for Aboriginal sites. Any new development on the island is likely to trigger the need for a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP), as per the requirements of the Act.

Disability Discrimination Act 1992

The Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (DDA) makes it illegal to discriminate against a person on the basis of their disability. It is not specifically about buildings, however it has an effect on buildings in which the design and construction prevents access by people with a disability, as the owners of those buildings are deemed to be discriminating against people on the basis of a disability. The DDA is philosophical in approach and:

- is complaints based
- has no construction standards
- applies to actions of discrimination wherever they occur
- can apply retrospectively to both new and existing buildings, wherever the discrimination occurs

The 'access to buildings component' of the DDA is applied only to buildings that are available for the general public to enter and use, as employees, patrons, customers or the general public. Accordingly, land owners/managers of buildings with a level of public access are bound to meet these objectives as far as possible. At Churchill Island, this applies to all the publicly accessible buildings within the 'heritage' farm complex.
Building Code of Australia

The Building Code of Australia (BCA) is produced and maintained by the Australian Building Codes Board (ABCB) on behalf of the Australian Government and state and territory governments. The BCA is the definitive regulatory resource for building construction, providing a nationally accepted and uniform approach to technical requirements for the building industry. It contains technical provisions for the design and construction of buildings and other structures, covering such matters as structure, fire resistance, access and egress, environmental sustainability, services and equipment, and certain aspects of health and amenity.

In addition to the requirement for new work to comply with the BCA, in cases of existing buildings (including heritage buildings) undergoing alterations and/or additions, some discretion may be available with regard to upgrading the existing part of the building to meet the BCA, based on either fire safety or volume of work. This means that for an existing building where no work is being proposed, the building is not subject to the BCA and therefore, is not required by legislation to be upgraded whenever the BCA is amended. For an existing building undergoing alterations and/or additions, including buildings with heritage controls, the new work must comply with the BCA although the existing part of the building may be subject to discretion on the basis of a fire safety matter or where the development involves less than 50 per cent of the building.

A BCA assessment is also required for all new building work proposed for construction on the island, to assess individual proposals against the technical provisions.

At Churchill Island, equitable access is reasonably available.

5.4 Environmental, natural and Indigenous values

In addition to the cultural heritage values, Church Island has environmental, natural and Indigenous values.

Nature Parks has an Environment Plan\textsuperscript{213} (2012-2017) which defines environmental objectives and outcomes for the whole Nature Parks portfolio of reserves. The Plan includes a comprehensive evaluation of the current status, priority needs and potential threats to natural assets. The Nature Parks is part of the United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Western Port Biosphere Reserve. For Churchill Island, the north and west coastline forms part of the Churchill Island Marine National Park and the whole of the island falls within the Western Port Ramsar site.

The Environment Plan identifies specific goals and actions for Nature Parks to undertake, and environmental management issues which need addressing. These include a range of matters of relevance to Churchill Island, including conservation of heritage sites, management of visitor carrying capacities for key areas to preserve the quality of visitor experience, and location of key visitor infrastructure.

In terms of Indigenous values, as noted there are known Aboriginal sites on Phillip Island, and Churchill Island is a designated area of cultural sensitivity. Western Port is also known as the country of the Boon Wurrung people. Given the accessibility of Churchill Island, it is likely that the Boon Wurrung occupied and visited the island.

The environmental, natural and Indigenous values of Churchill Island are not addressed in any detail in this report. However, it would be desirable in future for these values to be managed holistically, in tandem with the identified heritage values, to avoid unintended impacts.
6.0 CONSERVATION POLICY

This chapter contains the conservation policy for Churchill Island. It is based on the assessment of cultural significance at Chapter 4, and informed by the opportunities and constraints identified at Chapter 5.

The objective of the conservation policy is to provide direction and guidance on the conservation and management of the heritage values and heritage significance of Churchill Island, and to inform consideration of future physical change and development.

The approach used below identifies general and specific policies (policy statements), as well as management policies, and follows with a discussion of the intent of the policy and, where relevant, policy objectives and recommendations on implementation.

In preparing the policies, reference was also made to the implications arising from the assessment of significance, as identified at Section 5.1 of Chapter 5.

6.1 Site layout and planning

The conservation policy has also been informed by the following:

- Western half of the island has historically been the focus of development and activity.
- Eastern half of the island was used mainly for grazing purposes.
- Focus of development was on the high point in the centre of the island.
- Island was historically accessed by water, with jetties providing a landing, and accordingly vehicle access to the island is comparatively recent, following the construction of the first road bridge in 1959.

6.2 Definitions

The terminology used in this chapter is of a specific nature. The following definitions are from the Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013 (Article 1), as endorsed by all statutory and national heritage bodies.

Place means a geographically defined area. It may include elements, objects, spaces and views. Place may have tangible and intangible dimensions.

Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations.

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

Fabric means all the physical material of the place including elements, fixtures, contents and objects.

Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.

Maintenance means the continuous protective care of a place, and its setting.
Maintenance is to be distinguished from repair which involves restoration or reconstruction.

Preservation means maintaining a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

Restoration means returning a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing elements without the introduction of new material.

Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material.

Adaptation means modifying a place to suit the existing use or a proposed use.

Use means the functions of a place, including the activities and traditional and customary practices that may occur at the place or are dependent on the place.

Compatible use means a use which respects the cultural significance of a place. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.

Setting means the immediate and extended environment of a place that is part of or contributes to its cultural significance and distinctive character.

Related place means a place that contributes to the cultural significance of another place.

Related object means an object that contributes to the cultural significance of a place but is not at the place.

Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a place.

Meanings denote what a place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses to people.

Interpretation means all the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place.

6.3 General policies

6.3.1 Significance as the basis for conservation and management

The heritage significance of Churchill Island, as identified in this CMP, should guide and inform conservation and management of the heritage place.

Policy objectives:

- Retain and conserve the significant buildings and elements identified in this CMP.
- Manage the significant elements in accordance with the policies and recommendations of this CMP.
- Undertake a sensitive and respectful approach to any adaptation of significant buildings and elements, and to new works and future development where significant elements and areas may be affected.
• Alterations or changes to significant buildings and elements generally should only be considered where such works support the ongoing viability of Churchill Island as a publicly accessible conservation-oriented property and ‘heritage’ farm.

6.3.2 **Burra Charter**

_The conservation and management of Churchill Island should be carried out in accordance with the principles of the Burra Charter._

The conservation principles, processes and practices of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (2013), should guide all future development at Churchill Island which involves significant buildings and elements.

The Burra Charter should be referred to in the planning stages, when assessing the suitability of proposed works. The Charter has been widely adopted across Australia by state heritage agencies and local government; it has also been translated for use internationally.

The Burra Charter:

...sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians.214

The Burra Charter principles, which have been referred to in the preparation of this Conservation Policy, variously relate to conservation and management; a cautious approach; knowledge, skills and techniques; co-existence of heritage values; use; setting; location; contents; related places and objects; participation; and the Burra Charter process.

6.3.3 **Adoption and implementation of the conservation policy**

_The policies included in this CMP should be adopted and implemented by Nature Parks._

This conservation policy should be adopted and implemented by Nature Parks in their planning and management of Churchill Island. Implementation of the policy will ensure that future works and development, including that anticipated by the Churchill Island Key Area Plan in regard to intensifying the commercial operation of the place, will not undermine the conservation of the heritage values, or have unacceptable impacts on the significant buildings and elements.

6.3.4 **Specialist advice and skills**

_All work on buildings and elements of significance, save for routine maintenance, should be undertaken by suitably qualified or skilled practitioners, and where necessary under appropriate supervision. This includes works to significant landscape elements._

Utilising the input and expertise of suitably experienced and specialised practitioners, where works are proposed (other than routine maintenance) will assist in proper conservation and management of significant fabric, and compliance with statutory heritage requirements. The involvement of unskilled persons or volunteers in the conservation of significant fabric generally is not encouraged.

6.3.5 **Review of the conservation policy**

_Constant with best practice, this conservation policy should be reviewed and updated every five years (by 2020)._
This conservation policy should be subject to review and updating, including where the circumstances affecting the heritage place alter in any significant way. It is recommended that this occur every five years, taking into account the implementation of the KAP, and other outcomes of these policies and recommendations.

Churchill Island is a place where uses of buildings/areas have changed over time and where future change – including new development – is anticipated. Major physical change to the place should also trigger a review of the conservation policy.

6.4 **Specific policies: buildings, structures, objects, archaeology**

6.4.1 **Significant buildings and elements**

*Retain and conserve the significant buildings and elements at Churchill Island, and ensure future management is based on an understanding of their heritage values and significant characteristics.*

The significant buildings at Churchill Island include the two Rogers’ cottages, Amess house, Amess cellar, Amess wash house and the stable. Other significant (non-landscape) elements include the Grant memorial cairn; moveable objects with a demonstrated provenance to Churchill Island; and archaeological deposits and artefacts associated with historical land uses and activities.

Retaining and conserving these significant buildings and elements will ensure the elements of heritage significance are protected, and the heritage values maintained. Demolition or removal of these elements is not consistent with the retention of significance. Alterations or changes can be considered to support the ongoing viability of the island as a publicly accessible conservation-oriented property and ‘heritage’ farm, but such changes should be undertaken in a manner which limits or avoids heritage impacts. The buildings have also already been subject to change, and as a general comment are not intact to their original form.

6.4.2 **Changes to significant buildings**

*Adaptation of, and alterations to, significant buildings and elements should involve the minimum amount of change necessary to achieve the requirements of the proposed use.*

Adaptation of or alterations to significant buildings is sometimes required to accommodate changing needs or a new use. Such works should, in the first instance, follow Burra Charter principles including the ‘cautious’ approach recommended by the Charter, where as little as possible of the significant fabric is changed and works do not ‘distort’ the physical or other evidence provided by the place.

If an extension or addition is proposed for one of the significant buildings at Churchill Island, it should be recessive to the original building so as to limit any visual impacts. This can be achieved through the sensitive placement of an addition (such as to the rear of the subject building), adopting a respectful scale in relation to the original building, and/or separating the addition by a link element. An addition should also be distinguished from the original building in terms of architectural treatment, the objective being to ensure that the original building remains legible, and the addition readily understood.
Another principle to follow is that of ‘reversibility’, whereby (where possible and practicable) the design of an extension, or adaptation works, is able to be reversed in the future, and the original building form and fabric reinstated.

Establishing a palette of new materials for adaptation and alteration works is also recommended. These can be used to ensure consistency across works, and avoid the proliferation of different materials.

*Interiors*

The five timber historic buildings at Churchill Island have already been subject to significant change, including the interiors. This CMP has also concluded that the buildings are not of state level significance.

On this basis, the existing buildings provide opportunities for future internal change, should that be desired. For Amess house, the original internal layout and planning has not been established. The interior decoration to the house, and the internal presentation of Rogers’ cottages, is also derived from their use and interpretation as an historic house museum complex. While the presentation of the buildings in this manner suits the current use and operation of the ‘heritage’ farm, a future approach might seek to return to a more authentic presentation. This should however be based on research and investigation, as per Burra Charter principles.

6.4.3 *Remedial work and cyclical maintenance*

* A cyclical maintenance program should be prepared and implemented as the basis for ongoing care of the significant buildings and elements at Churchill Island.

For the most part, the significant buildings at Churchill Island are in good to reasonable condition. The Amess cellar is commented on below.

However, to ensure they remain that way, a consistent and regular approach to the maintenance of physical fabric, such as an ongoing cyclical inspection and maintenance program, is recommended. The approach should firstly be to maintain and ensure that significant fabric does not deteriorate and secondly to conserve significant existing fabric.

Where existing fabric needs to be renewed, the replacement generally should match the original in design, materials and construction unless there are strong overriding functional reasons for altering the original design or materials. The advice of a qualified heritage practitioner can assist with this.

However, generally day-to-day maintenance work can be carried out in accordance with the conservation policies and without reference to a conservation specialist. The primary aim of repair work should be to retain as much of the original fabric as possible.

*Maintenance of buildings and built elements*

Maintenance addresses all existing components of the place, including fabric and setting.

Typical maintenance works include:

- Cleaning out gutters and drainage systems;
- securing and replacing roof and external wall fabric, glazing and joinery in an appropriate and sympathetic manner;
- servicing existing equipment and services;
maintaining existing services where this involves no alteration to the fabric of the place; and

- replacing or upgrading services (may require specialist input for substantial works).

**Repairs**

From a heritage perspective it is generally recommended that repairs of significant buildings and objects should involve replacing 'like with like,' i.e. the replacement of material (missing, deteriorated or broken) with fabric to match the existing. The advice of a qualified heritage practitioner should be sought on this. Wherever possible, only actual decayed fabric of a heritage structure should be replaced, instead of the whole host element.

Repairs to significant structures should also, in preference, be carried out by appropriately skilled staff or contractors, and may require in some cases prior analysis of the composition of the fabric to be repaired/replaced.

Specialist input may also be required for the identification and eradication of any damage caused by pest infestations. Rectification may involve repair to, or replacement of, damaged fabric.

**Amess cellar**

The cellar, as a sub-basement or partly in-ground building, displays evidence of poor drainage and moisture retention. A number of options or remedies for addressing this are recommended:

- Install an ‘agi’ drain, or land drain, around the exterior of the building at the base of the wall. The aim is to take water away from building. The effectiveness of this should be monitored.
- Investigate removal of paint from the exterior brick walls. This may be contributing to the retention of moisture in the walls. Sand-blasting is not recommended, with the preferred method being a chemical and pressure water system, as used by a qualified contractor.
- Depending on the outcome of the external ‘agi’ drain, there may be a necessity to investigate the underfloor area for the potential to install or improve drainage.
- Investigate the current ventilation of the building, and improve if necessary.
- Replace the rotting timber treads to the brick steps down into the building; ironbark is a suggested replacement material.

6.4.4 **Non-significant buildings and elements**

Elements of no significance can be retained, removed, altered or replaced, although future works to these elements should be sympathetic to, and avoid impacts on, the heritage values of Churchill Island.

There are a range of buildings and elements of no significance at Churchill Island, including:

- buildings introduced to the ‘heritage’ farm precinct in the latter decades of the twentieth century
- buildings associated with the works area
- visitor centre
- 1999 bridge
Accepting this, works to these elements, including external change, replacement or relocation have the potential to impact on the significance of the island, and accordingly should have regard for the policies and recommendations included elsewhere in this conservation policy which address site presentation, new development, etc.

Works to these elements, in the absence of permit exemptions (see Section 6.6.3) currently require the approval of Heritage Victoria.

6.4.5 **New development**

*The siting, scale and placement of new development should have regard for the character and scale of significant buildings and elements, and the relationships between them.*

There is scope for new buildings and development at Churchill Island. In considering the location, scale, form and design of any new development and landscaping treatments, important considerations include the following:

- ‘Heritage’ farm precinct: this generally offers limited opportunity for new development. In preference existing non-significant buildings could be removed from this area, particularly if they have no current function. This would assist in simplifying the presentation of the area, and giving more prominence to the significant buildings. However, if new buildings are required here for operational purposes, or to replace existing redundant buildings, they should be of contemporary design, modest size and sensitively placed so as not to compete with the heritage buildings. They could also follow the existing pattern of being placed in the linear arrangement to the north and south boundaries of the ‘heritage’ farm. No new buildings should be placed to the front of Amess House, the Rogers’ cottages or the stables. The existing spatial and visual relationships between Amess house, Rogers’ cottages and Amess cellar should also be retained, with no new elements placed in this area. The stables being further away provide evidence of such buildings being at distance from the residential buildings.

- Visitor Centre and function and events area: This area is at a distance from the concentration of heritage buildings in the ‘heritage’ farm precinct, and accordingly provides significant opportunity for new development. A new or expanded visitor centre, and a new function and events centre could be constructed here. Contemporary design is encouraged. However, an analysis of views from Westernport and from the east should be undertaken, to ensure that any new development in this area does not compete with views of the high point of the island, where the ‘heritage’ farm precinct is located. New development should also not stand out as jarring or dominant in these views. Highly reflective materials, for instance, would be problematic and should be avoided.

- In addition to the ‘heritage’ farm precinct, there are other areas associated with archaeological sites, or those with potential. Any works in these areas of the island should proceed with caution and care so as to avoid impacts on the archaeology. This is further discussed at Section 6.4.7.

- All new buildings and structures should adopt an appropriate materials palette and architectural language which distinguishes them as contemporary, and avoids the proliferation of different building styles and materials across the island.

- Car parking can be maintained in the current parking area, or if required can be extended, but not in the direction of the ‘heritage’ farm precinct. Desirably, any
extension of the parking areas would also involve landscaping and other treatments to ‘soften’ the appearance of the parking areas.

6.4.6 Significant moveable objects

The significant moveable objects with a demonstrated provenance to Churchill Island should be retained and conserved, specifically: the cannon; foot-operated grinding wheel mounted in a timber frame, cheese press and timber garden barrow. Some interpretation of these items, as original to the island, is also recommended.

Regarding the cannon, the report prepared in 2001 remains valid in terms of its recommendations for the treatment of corrosion, and other repairs.\(^{215}\)

6.4.7 Archaeological sites

Sites assessed as having archaeological potential should be treated appropriately as per the requirements of the Heritage Act 1995.

As noted, the entire island is included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory. Research undertaken for this CMP (see Archaeological Survey and Assessment report at Appendix B), has also identified areas of archaeological potential (non Indigenous), specifically: the site of the former White House, including a jetty, artefact scatter and fence post, to the east coast of the island; a former jetty on the north coast; a former jetty on the south-west coast; the area cultivated under direction of Lt Grant in 1801; and the homestead precinct.

The sites/areas are shown at Figure 74.

The archaeological report includes the following recommendations regarding the protection, conservation and management of the archaeological resource of the island, and to ensure consistency with the requirements of the Heritage Act:

- **Recommendation 1** – Avoid ground disturbance
  - If possible, avoid disturbing or developing the areas of Churchill Island highlighted as areas of archaeological potential.

- **Recommendation 2** – Obtain a permit from Heritage Victoria
  - If disturbance and development works are unavoidable, then a permit for the works must be obtained from Heritage Victoria.

- **Recommendation 3** – Seek advice from the senior archaeologist at Heritage Victoria
  - For works that fall partly or fully within any of the areas of archaeological potential, advice must be sought from the senior archaeologist at Heritage Victoria on the appropriate level of archaeological investigation required. This may involve archaeological testing to be undertaken well in advance of any disturbance or construction works, or archaeological monitoring to be undertaken during the works.

- **4 - Protect site H7921-0014** (so called ‘sealers site’) from harm
  - The individual site that is registered on the Heritage Inventory (H7921-0014) should be protected from disturbance and harm. It would be advisable to move the activity that is currently being performed in that area to another location.

- **Recommendation 5 - Protect Area A from harm**
  - The area of potential for Grant’s blockhouse and cultivation area (Area A) should be protected from disturbance and harm. It would be advisable not to
use heavy machinery in this area and not to undertake any ground disturbing works.

- Recommendation 6 – Education
  - It may be prudent to provide information to the visiting public regarding the potential for archaeology on Churchill Island and the need to protect and conserve any physical expressions of that potential including artefacts laying on the ground or the shore. Artefact fragments found on the beach or elsewhere, for instance, should be left for others to see and enjoy.

6.5 Specific policies: landscape

6.5.1 Prepare a Master Plan

Prepare a landscape master plan to guide future landscape works within the site, as informed by the assessed significance.

Since the acquisition of the island in the 1970s various landscape works have been undertaken including removal of over-mature windrows, revegetation in the north of the site, and development of a domestic garden within the homestead precinct. The development of the visitor centre and associated native tree plantings have further altered the landscape characteristics of the island. These activities have generally been undertaken in the context of improving the environmental qualities of the island, and implementing contemporary environmental objectives.

Given the assessment of the landscape undertaken for this report, and the findings regarding heritage significance, desirably from a heritage perspective, an island-wide master plan should be prepared. This should guide future landscape works and plantings on the island, as informed by the assessed significance and the conservation policies and recommendations included here. The intention is to ensure that future landscaping is undertaken with a view to either reinforcing the significant landscape characteristics identified in this report, where this is practicable and feasible; or undertaken in sympathy with the characteristics. Importantly, the master plan should also seek to balance the heritage-related objectives with contemporary environmental management practices.

Issues and matters which could be addressed in the master plan generally fall under the following headings.

6.5.2 Homestead plantings: trees

Retain and protect the vegetation within the homestead precinct that has been identified of significance, namely the Norfolk Island pine, Mulberry and Olive trees and remnant Moonahs. Implement a replacement strategy for over-mature specimens.

Few nineteenth century plantings survive within the Churchill Island landscape. The Norfolk Island Pine and remnant fruit trees provide the last remaining links to trees planted during the Amess period of ownership and are contemporary to the nineteenth century house complex. The Norfolk Island Pine, a towering, mature specimen is a local landmark specimen, and visible from significant distances away from the island, to the east and south.

The remnant Moonahs in the homestead area are notable as remnant natural vegetation that has been deliberately retained and integrated into a nineteenth century utilitarian landscape. These trees especially are in over-maturity and of limited long-term viability. Replacement specimens should be propagated from existing island stock and planted within this area to ensure this characteristic is maintained into the future.
6.5.3 Homestead plantings: garden beds

*Retain the presentation of garden beds within the homestead precinct as low scale, exotic plantings.*

The presentation of the ornamental gardens associated with the homestead is a hypothetical reconstruction of a nineteenth century ornamental garden. Site interpretation should acknowledge the contemporary origin of the layout and planting design here. While accurate reconstruction of the original or early garden layout is desirable, this is unlikely in the absence of original garden plans or planting lists. If the latter were to come to light, then reconstruction or reinstatement would be encouraged.

There is also the matter of plant material which is appropriate to the late nineteenth century setting and presentation of the house, such as those listed in *Plants Listed in Nursery Catalogues in Victoria 1855 to 1889* (Garden Plant Conservation Association of Australia). These could be considered for the house garden.

Plantings should generally be of modest scale so as not to obscure the form of the significant buildings, and also the identified significant trees. The overall aim should be to provide a setting sympathetic to the period of the house, recognising that in the absence of original planting lists or plans, an accurate reconstruction is not possible.

Plant selections should also be appropriate to local growing conditions, such as solar access, limited irrigation, competition from established trees etc, recognising also the markedly different growing conditions from the nineteenth century due to the development of existing site trees and shrubs. The implication of this is that cultivation of recorded early plantings may in fact no longer be possible due to changed growing conditions.

6.5.4 Windrow plantings

*Retain and protect the Monterey Cypress windrows to the north, west and south of the homestead precinct. Consider reinstating the historical windrow, at least in part.*

*Remove intrusive late twentieth century tree plantations.*

The coniferous windrow plantations which historically enclosed the homestead garden precinct were a defining feature of the Churchill Island landscape through much of the twentieth century. Historic aerial photographs reveal that the homestead site was enclosed and protected against the surrounding landscape and coast by these plantations. Removal of the plantation to the north-east of the homestead in the late twentieth century therefore modified the landscape character of the place.

Sufficient documentary evidence exists, especially aerial photography, to allow for the accurate reconstruction of these early vegetative features. However, it is also recognised that Monterey Cypress are now regarded as environmental weeds. Reconstruction of the windrow could be pursued, as an action which is countenanced in heritage terms, but it is also recognised that the planting approach is not one which is preferred for environmental reasons. If pursued, it would also require the removal of trees established in the late-twentieth century to the north-east of the homestead, such as the row of Norfolk Island Pines which have no historic precedent planted in this context within the site.
Figure 75  The enclosed nature of the homestead precinct is apparent in various twentieth century aerial views

Figure 76  Consider re-establishing the pine windrow (dashed line) to the north-east of house
An alternative but complementary species could be considered for planting, if a windrow was reconstructed, in part or more extensively. Another approach could include plantings of a lower form and scale, which could be used to ‘mark’ or emphasise the location of the windrow in the landscape. Another possibility is a form of ‘hard’ landscape interpretation, including fencing to mark the original homestead paddock.

6.5.5  Agricultural land use

*Retain the open, grassed paddocks in the south and east of the island as managed, grazed agricultural land.*

Churchill Island has, since the 1850s, been used as farmland, a use which underpins much of the interpretation and appeal of the site as a tourist destination today. Historic aerial imagery shows the setting of the homestead complex on high ground surrounded by cleared and fenced agricultural land. Whilst the island was used at various times as a retreat for wealthy Melbourne families, the majority of the site remained agricultural, albeit at varying levels of intensity and productivity under different owners.

6.5.6  Moonahs

*Retain the remnant Moonah trees in the north-west of the Island.*

As well as being of environmental value, the ancient Moonahs are of particular note for their deliberate retention and integration within a nineteenth century pastoral landscape. Recent revegetation activities have seen the planting of new specimens within this part of the site which will ensure a new generation of Moonahs will establish.
As well as providing mature over-canopy to revegetation zones, some Moonahs should be retained as specimen trees on the periphery of paddocks, illustrating their previous cultural landscape setting within an agricultural landscape. New trees should be planted in adjacent paddock areas to develop as specimen trees.

6.5.7 Revegetation

Manage revegetation activities to the north and west of the island to ensure some retention of views and scenic qualities.

Since the acquisition of Churchill Island by the Victorian Government in the 1970s, the north of the island has been the focus of revegetation activities, consistent with environmental objectives. These activities have transformed the character of this area from scattered Moonah trees set in an open, agricultural landscape, to densely vegetated, semi-natural woodland. The scenic qualities of this area, including distant views to Phillip Island and French Island, as well as more immediate views of the tidal zone and its underlying geology are a characteristic of the historic Churchill Island landscape.

In seeking a balance between environmental objectives, and retaining existing views including from the coastal walking path, new revegetation plantings in these view-lines should preferably be small in scale so that in time the views are not totally obscured by the maturing plantings.

A more detailed analysis of these views, and recommendations for appropriate plantings in these areas, should be included in the recommended landscape master plan.

6.5.8 Roads, paths and access

Historic paths and access ways should be retained and interpreted

As noted, the island was historically accessed by water, with jetties providing a landing. The main historic access to Churchill Island was from the end of Churchill Road on Phillip Island, then across to Churchill Island’s jetty (on the south side of the island) by boat. Vehicle access to the island is for the most part comparatively recent, following construction of the first road bridge in the 1950s. However, it is also understood that depending on tides and conditions some access to the southern tip of the island was available over the mud flats. This was also used to drive livestock across to the island.

The pedestrian path from the location of the jetty on the south of the island, leading up to the house on the high point, is therefore of long standing. The coastal path around the western half of the island is also of long standing. Both these paths should be maintained, and interpreted in terms of their historical use.

In terms of vehicle access and roadways:

- The principal access road is not of heritage value; changes to this are generally supportable, including changes to its surface and alignment.
- The maintenance vehicle access to the works area is also not of heritage value, however due to its proximity to the significant buildings future change should be treated with sensitivity.
- The 1999 bridge is not of heritage value; it can be modified, upgraded or replaced without heritage impacts.
- Vehicle access infrastructure should be concentrated in eastern half of island.
In terms of pedestrian access:

- Aside from the two historic pathways referred to above, pedestrian access in the eastern half of the island, and surrounding the visitor centre, is not of heritage concern.
- The approach to the significant buildings from the visitor centre is not historic; changes can be made to this.

6.5.9 Views

As is consistent with the aesthetic values of Churchill Island, its views and visual qualities should be retained and conserved.

A range of significant aesthetic attributes and qualities, including views and vistas, have been described and analysed in this CMP. In summary, these are as follows:

- The experience of the place as an island is part of its significance. This ‘experience’ is enhanced by the ability to see the waters of Westernport and the coasts of Phillip Island and the mainland. Therefore, in a general sense, views out from Churchill Island should be maintained where practicable and feasible.
- The Moonah Zone in the north-west area of the island offers views to Phillip Island to the south and west, French Island to the north, as well as more immediate view lines to the waters of Westernport and its underlying geology, especially to the south. This was also historically the case, as it is understood that the underlying shrub layer was kept clear by successive owners. Retention of these views, at least in part through the Moonah vegetation, is therefore important in heritage terms.
- Due to the historical presence of windrows and (apparently) screening vegetation, it has been assumed that views out to Westernport from the north side of Amess house were historically not available, or at least were restricted. However, there is evidence, at least from the Jenkins period of ownership that views to the sea were to be had from the house, ‘through the trees’.
- Views of the house from main entry drive are not historic.
- Views of Churchill Island, as per the visual sequence on approach to the island which starts after the San Remo/Bass Highway turnoff, are important.

6.6 Management policies

6.6.1 Temporary events

Churchill island currently hosts a range of temporary events. These are generally acceptable in heritage terms, subject to the following:

- The hosting of temporary functions and events should avoid pressure on the heritage elements of the island, i.e. not be located in proximity to the significant buildings and elements.
- Any permanent infrastructure associated with events should be physically and visually separated from the ‘heritage’ farm precinct.
- Temporary items, such as marquees and portable amenities or vans, are less problematic in the ‘heritage’ farm precinct.

See also recommended permit exemptions at Section 6.6.3.
6.6.2 Victorian Heritage Register extent and statement of significance

The Victorian Heritage Register entry for Churchill Island should be reviewed to reflect the outcomes of this CMP.

This CMP has concluded that the existing assessment of significance as included in the VHR includes factual inaccuracies and is inadequate. Critically, research for this CMP has led to different conclusions about the cultural heritage significance of the place. The VHR entry should therefore be reviewed and updated, including the statement of significance.

Given this outcome, and the conclusions reached about the relative importance of the buildings and elements of the island, including the landscape elements, the VHR entry should also be reviewed to include permit exemptions (see below).

6.6.3 Permit exemptions

Permit exemptions, declared under Section 66 (3) of the Heritage Act 1995, would enable a range of works to be undertaken at Churchill Island which will not have an impact on the identified significance.

For Churchill Island, a range of exemptions could be considered and requested of Heritage Victoria, which typically relate to building and landscape maintenance and upkeep, as well as temporary structures associated with temporary events. Permit exemptions are also normally preceded by a permit policy.

The following are recommended to be considered by Heritage Victoria:

PERMIT POLICY

Preamble

The purpose of the Permit Policy is to assist when considering or making decisions regarding works to a registered place. It is recommended that any proposed works be discussed with an officer of Heritage Victoria prior to making a permit application. Discussing proposed works will assist in answering questions the owner may have and aid any decisions regarding works to the place.

The extent of registration of Churchill Island on the Victorian Heritage Register affects the whole place, including the land, all buildings, roads, trees, landscape elements and other features. Under the Heritage Act 1995 a person must not remove or demolish, damage or despoil, develop or alter or excavate, relocate or disturb the position of any part of a registered place or object without approval. It is acknowledged, however, that alterations and other works may be required to keep places and objects in good repair and adapt them for use into the future.

If a person wishes to undertake works or activities in relation to a registered place or registered object, they must apply to the Executive Director, Heritage Victoria for a permit. The purpose of a permit is to enable appropriate change to a place and to effectively manage adverse impacts on the cultural heritage significance of a place as a consequence of change. If an owner is uncertain whether a heritage permit is required, it is recommended that Heritage Victoria be contacted.

Permits are required for anything which alters the place or object, unless a permit exemption is granted. Permit exemptions usually cover routine maintenance and upkeep issues faced by owners as well as minor works. They may include appropriate works that...
are specified in a conservation management plan. Permit exemptions can be granted at the time of registration (under s.42 of the Heritage Act) or after registration (under s.66 of the Heritage Act).

It should be noted that the addition of new buildings to the registered place, as well as alterations to the interior and exterior of existing buildings requires a permit, unless a specific permit exemption is granted.

**PERMIT EXEMPTIONS (under section 42 of the Heritage Act)**

**Buildings of no heritage significance**

Buildings of no heritage significance are:

- buildings introduced to the ‘heritage’ farm precinct in the latter decades of the twentieth century
- buildings associated with the works area
- visitor centre

*Internal works to these buildings, which have no visible impact on the external presentation.

*Maintenance and repair.

**Archaeological**

*If during any exempted works archaeological deposits are discovered, all works in the vicinity should stop and heritage Victoria is notified of the discovery.

**Landscape**

*The process of gardening, including mowing, hedge clipping, bedding displays, removal of dead shrubs, disease and weed control, and maintenance to care for existing plants.

*The removal of dead or dangerous trees and emergency tree works to maintain safety.

*Management of trees in accordance with Australian Standard; Pruning of Amenity Trees AS 4373-1996.

*Management of trees in accordance with Australian Standard; Protection of Trees on Development Sites AS 4970-2009.

*Subsurface works involving the installation, removal or replacement of watering and drainage systems or services outside the canopy edge of significant trees in accordance with AS4970 provided that works do not impact on archaeological features or deposits.

*Removal of plants listed as noxious weeds in the Catchment and Land Protection Act 1994.

*Vegetation protection and management of possums and vermin.

*All works associated with water harvesting and storage outside the canopy edge provided that archaeological features and deposits are not impacted.

*Repairs and maintenance to all hard landscape elements, including fences, gates, paths, roads and lighting.

*Removal and replacement of rubbish and recycling bins, seats, picnic tables, lights and fencing.
Buildings of heritage significance

Buildings of heritage significance are:

- two Rogers’ cottages
- Amess house
- Amess cellar
- Amess wash house
- stable

*External repairs and maintenance that replaces like with like.

Temporary events

*Any event under 5 days in duration which has received an event permit from the relevant event approvals body.

*Introduction of temporary structures associated with temporary events including marquees, tents, catering vans, vendor vans, stages, truck-mounted broadcasting facilities, portable toilets and fencing, provided the temporary structures:

- where required are weighted down with sand bags or water tanks, and avoid the requirement for driven metal stakes that could impact on tree roots
- are located no closer than three metres to the base of a tree
- are placed on a protective surface (board or track mats)
- fencing, furniture and other small scale items are placed on turf or hard stand areas which require no fixing to the ground

*Temporary events which make good the affected areas, to match the condition of the areas prior to the installation of the temporary elements.

6.6.4 Authenticity

The ‘heritage’ farm experience at Churchill Island should give emphasis to authenticity.

The implications arising from the assessment of significance, as identified at Section 5.1 in Chapter 5, make reference to enhancing awareness and understanding of the history of Churchill Island. This can be assisted by emphasising what is authentic about the island, and adding clarity to the historic experience.

Retaining and conserving the significant buildings is consistent with this approach, as is distinguishing them from the buildings and elements which are later introductions. Where the age or authenticity of a building is not obvious, this can be achieved by a simple mechanism such as a plaque or unobtrusive sign. In the future, any new buildings added to the ‘heritage’ farm precinct should also not adopt a faux historic form. This is further commented on at Section 6.4.5.

Interpretation which explains the changes to landscape over time is another means of adding clarity. The landscape changes which have occurred to the island have been comprehensive, as documented in this CMP. Explaining what has occurred, and where it occurred would again enhance both the experience and understanding of the history of the island.

In addition to the buildings, the proliferation of farm machinery across the ‘heritage’ farm precinct may give rise to confusion about the original or authentic farming practices. This would be in tandem with the farm demonstrations, which also do not necessarily reflect the historic farming activities on the island. However, it is accepted that the demonstrations are
popular with tourists and visitors, as is the farm machinery. They provide a kind of ‘generic’
historic farm attraction. Again, interpretation is a means of adding some clarity to this.
Ironically, the more distinguished history of Churchill Island as a private island ‘retreat’ for
wealthy owners for nearly 100 years, does not come through at all strongly in the ‘heritage’
farm experience.

6.6.5 Site recording

A recording program should be undertaken where major change is proposed within the
homestead precinct.

In the event that significant physical change is proposed within the homestead precinct, it is
recommended that a recording program be undertaken. For historic buildings, this might
include, but would not necessarily be restricted to, undertaking an archival quality
photographic record – the object being to record the form/presentation at that time, and
avoid further confusion about authenticity. A digital or video record may also be undertaken.
The records should be lodged with an appropriate repository, for future research purposes.
A copy should also be retained and used, where appropriate, in any future site interpretation.

6.6.6 Interpretation

An interpretation plan should be developed based on the identified values of the place

Future interpretation should relate to the identified cultural heritage values of Churchill
Island. With regard to design, the interpretation should present the various eras and
relevant themes in a way that engages people’s interest and avoids confusion. A critical
issue is that the various forms of interpretation, both personal and non-personal, should
work as a unified whole, each complimenting the other to create a high quality visitor
experience that satisfies the interpretive and conservation objectives.

It is recommended that the interpretation of Churchill Island should be structured in a way
that allows visitors to appreciate the different eras, uses and associated values of the place.
It is important that one story and era does not get confused with another, by the inadvertent
presentation of material without sufficient context or clarity.

A list of the recommended themes is below:

- Aboriginal Culture and Connection
- Exploration and Experiments
- Farming Attempts
- Island Retreat
- Coastal Environment

Recommended locations for interpretive elements include the visitor centre, Amess house,
Rogers’ cottages and the coastal walk.

The development of themed displays at relevant locations may facilitate the development of
a series of self-selecting themed visitor experiences. These tours could be in the form of
downloadable apps and/or self guided audio and video tours. For instance, visitors can
select a themed tour dealing with early European explorers, and be led on a tour around the
circuit walk to Grant’s experimental crop site. Alternatively, visitors who want to find out
more about the Amess family retreat can be led on a self guided tour of the Amess house,
the surrounding grounds, and the old jetty sites where visitors arrived and departed. This
tour also has the potential to present significant conservation messages where the impacts of
the actions of, for instance, acclimatisation societies and the introduction of exotic plants and animals had on the Australian environment, and actions that are required now to minimise these impacts.

6.6.7 **Training**

* A staff training program should be established, to develop an understanding of the island’s cultural heritage significance, and raise awareness of heritage sensitivities related to managing the island.

Ensuring that the cultural heritage values of Churchill Island are maintained while managing a large and varied site can be difficult. Whether addressing day to day operational issues or considering long-term projects for the place, it is important that staff have an understanding of the cultural heritage values and significance of the island as a whole and of its individual elements.

It is recommended that a staff training program be developed to identify the implications of managing a heritage place and raise awareness of heritage issues and requirements covering:

- the cultural heritage significance of Churchill Island, and its individual areas and elements, including archaeological sites;
- management implications including statutory approvals requirements and the related process for approvals and;
- key relevant policies and guidelines in this CMP.

6.6.8 **Risk management**

* Potential risks should be identified, and an appropriate response strategy prepared.*

Risk management and preparedness is an important means of protecting and conserving the heritage values of a heritage place. While a detailed assessment of risk is beyond the scope of this report, the following brief analysis outlines the potential primary threats and hazards posed to the landscape and physical fabric at Churchill Island.

### Table 2 Risk analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Preparation/response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Always present</td>
<td>Fully compliant fire services must be provided for buildings and elements at the subject site. Ensure there is an evacuation plan in place for all buildings, and conduct regular training and rehearsals. Maintain electrical systems in good order. Maintain liaison with fire brigade to regularly test and monitor systems. Vegetation on the site should be controlled, and grass managed, to minimise the fire threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism and graffiti</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Maintain secure arrangements for protection of the homestead precinct, including on site surveillance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm damage</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Maintain roof areas in good order; inspect fixings; inspect and maintain windows and doors in good order; regularly inspect and clean the gutters and downpipes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6.9 Visitor/tourism pressures

Monitor visitor impacts on heritage buildings and fabric.

Visitor access and increased tourism can put pressure on heritage places, and significant buildings and structures subject to visitor use should be monitored for heritage impacts, including documenting and measuring physical impacts, desirably as part of an ongoing maintenance and inspection program. New visitor facilities should also seek to use and adapt, where appropriate, existing structures or locate new structures and amenities discreetly.

6.6.10 Maintaining records

Maintain records of all works undertaken to the dock and significant heritage buildings, including maintenance, conservation, adaptation and relocation.

All works to significant buildings at Churchill Island should be documented and recorded, with records maintained by Nature Parks. This should include measured drawings and photographs. If a significant structure or element is required to be relocated or removed, an archival record should also be made prior to works commencing, and the record maintained in an appropriate and accessible place for future reference. A copy should also be retained by site management and used, where appropriate, in any future site interpretation.
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**EXTENT:**
 Amendment of Register of Government Buildings
 Westernport Bay
 Churchill Island.

Transferred to the Victorian Heritage Register 23 May 1998 (2 years after the proclamation of the Heritage Act 1995 pursuant to the transitional provisions of the Act)
STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE:

Churchill Island, Westernport Bay off Phillip Island, includes the entire island and linking timber bridge, with all buildings and objects located on it. The island was first 'settled' by Lieutenant James Grant in 1801, when a cottage was erected and garden planted, no evidence of which remains. The present, symmetrical weatherboard homestead dates possibly from the 1860s, parts may be older. There is a cannon from the warship Shenandoah (1865).

Churchill Island, Westernport bay off Phillip Island, is the site of the first European settlement in Victoria, James Grant of the Lady Nelson having built a cottage and planted wheat, corn and a garden in 1801. The island is unique in the history of Victoria and was until recently the only privately-owned island in Victoria. Churchill Island is a most important landscape element in Westernport bay. The present homestead is representative of homestead building and is unusual for its planning. The island has been acquired by the government of Victoria for public uses. Future plans are unclear. Current landscape is pastoral.

[Source: Register of the National Estate]
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Statement of Significance

Churchill Island site of first European settlement in Victoria. Lieutenant James Grant, of the Lady Nelson, having built a cottage, planted wheat, corn and a garden in 1801. The Island is unique in history of Victoria and, until recently, only privately owned island in Victoria. Churchill Island is most important landscape element in Western Port Bay. Present homestead is representative of homestead building and is unusual for its planning.

(The Commission is in the process of developing and/or upgrading official statements for places listed prior to 1991. The above data was mainly provided by the nominator and has not yet been revised by the Commission.)

Official Values Not Available

Description

Churchill Island, includes the entire island and linking timber bridge, all buildings and objects located on it. The Island was settled by Lieutenant James Grant in 1801, a cottage erected and garden planted; no evidence remains. The present, symmetrical weatherboard homestead dates, possibly, from 1860s, parts may be older. There is a cannon from the warship Shenandoah (1865).

History Not Available

Condition and Integrity

Churchill Island has been acquired by the Government of Victoria for public uses. Future plans are unclear. Current landscape is pastoral.

Location

Western Port Bay off Phillip Island 2km north-west of Newhaven. Listing includes entire Island with linking timber bridge and all buildings and objects located on it.
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Executive Summary

Lovell Chen Architects and Heritage Consultants P/L were commissioned to prepare a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for Churchill Island by Phillip Island Nature Parks. Lovell Chen commissioned ArchLink Archaeologists and Heritage Advisors P/L to complete an historical archaeological survey and assessment of the Island, the results of which would be incorporated in the CMP while the report would be appended.

Initially, a desktop assessment was undertaken in order to develop a predictive model for potential archaeological sites. This included; reviews of the environmental, historical and archaeological background of the Island and surrounds. Five broad historical phases of European use were identified from Grant’s cleared cultivation area (1801) through the Rogers and Pickersgill early farming eras and the Amess homestead period. Five areas of archaeological potential were predicted and mapped:

- Area A - Grant’s Blockhouse and ‘Garden’ (1801)
- Area B - The White House (1861)
- Area C - Rogers’ two Huts (1860s) and Amess House and Outbuildings (1882-1929)
- Area D - Bathing Huts (1907), Piers and Jetties
- Area E – Boat house and jetty (uncited)

Archaeological survey was undertaken on the 1st, 15th and 18th December 2014 to test the findings of the desktop assessment. The survey crew comprised Sarah Myers, Dr Sarah Mirams, Fiona Shanahan and Tom Mallett. Additional site visits were made in January and February 2015.

The results of the survey generally confirmed and refined the findings of the desktop assessment. Some physical features such as fence posts, lines of mounded rocks and artefact scatters were found within the areas determined to have archaeological potential. No evidence was found that could be associated with Grant’s blockhouse and cleared area (in Area A) – which was not unexpected. However, landforms and landmarks hinted at the likely location and helped to confirm the initial desktop analysis. The area of potential could not be further narrowed due to a lack of clear evidence. In Area B an intact timber fence post and line of stumps was found that corresponded exactly with the fence line indicated on the 1865 Cox plan for the ‘White House’. Together with the presence of a scatter of 19th century
artefacts, the location for the site and likely potential for archaeological features here was confirmed.

As indicated by the desktop study, the survey findings also showed, that there had been considerable disturbance to the subject area from the 1950s to the present day which is likely to have reduced the potential for intact, significant archaeology across much of the Island.

The archaeological significance of Churchill Island was assessed in light of the findings of this study and found to be significant at a local level. The Island has the potential to contain archaeological remains associated with historical developments from Grant’s cultivation event through to the farming settlements of the 18th century for which little physical evidence is visible on the island.

Management recommendations were provided that will ensure the appropriate level of protection, conservation and management of the archaeological resource on Churchill Island under the requirements of the Heritage Act, 1995 and to the satisfaction of the Executive Director, Heritage Victoria.

**Recommendation 1 – Avoid ground disturbance**

If possible, avoid disturbing or developing the areas of Churchill Island highlighted as areas of archaeological potential.

**Recommendation 2 – Obtain a Permit from Heritage Victoria**

If disturbance and development works are unavoidable, then a Permit for the works must be obtained from Heritage Victoria. (A Permit is required for major works across any part of the Island).

**Recommendation 3 – Seek advice from the Senior Archaeologist at Heritage Victoria**

For works that fall partly or fully within any of the areas of archaeological potential (see Figure 12), advice must be sought from the senior archaeologist at Heritage Victoria on the appropriate level of archaeological investigation required. This may involve archaeological testing to be undertaken well in advance of the construction works or archaeological monitoring to be undertaken during the works.
**Recommendation 4 - Protect site H7921-0014 from harm**

The individual site that is registered on the Heritage Inventory (H7921-0014) should be protected from disturbance and harm. It would be advisable to move the activity that is currently being performed in that area to another location.

**Recommendation 5 - Protect Area A from harm**

The area of potential for Grant’s Blockhouse and cultivation area (Area A) should also be protected from disturbance and harm. It would be advisable not to use heavy machinery in this area and not to undertake any ground disturbing works.

**Recommendation 6 – Education**

It may be prudent to provide information to the visiting public regarding the potential for archaeology on Churchill Island and the need to protect and conserve any physical expressions of that potential including artefacts laying on the ground or the shore. Artefact fragments found on the beach or elsewhere, for instance, should be left for others to see and enjoy.
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Introduction

Lovell Chen Architects and Heritage Consultants P/L were commissioned to prepare a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for Churchill Island by Phillip Island Nature Parks. ArchLink Archaeologists and Heritage Advisors P/L were commissioned by Lovell Chen to complete an historical archaeological assessment of the island, the results of which would be incorporated in the CMP while the report would be appended.

Churchill Island is listed on the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR 1614) and Heritage Inventory (H7921-0002). These listings include the whole island and all objects. The island covers an area of 57 hectares, is located on the northeast side of Phillip Island and is accessed by Samuel Amess Drive (see Figure 1). It is Crown land and is managed by Phillip Island Natures Parks with assistance from the Friends of Churchill Island (FOCIS) group. It is currently open to the public as a mixed attraction including an historic working farm, wetlands, stands of Moonah, heritage gardens and historic buildings.

The archaeological survey was undertaken on the 1st, 15th and 18th December 2014. The survey crew comprised Sarah Myers, Dr Sarah Mirams, Fiona Shanahan and Tom Mallett. Additional site visits were made in January and February 2015.

Aims and Methodology

The aim of the project, as specified in the brief and further clarified by the client, was to undertake a detailed archaeological survey of Churchill Island focusing on post contact, historical archaeology and to provide a separate desktop assessment for the island’s potential Aboriginal archaeology.

The methodology for the historical archaeology survey was guided by the requirements published by Heritage Victoria (HV);

- Guidelines for Conducting Historical Archaeological Surveys (2008); and
- Guidelines for Investigating Historical Archaeological Artefacts and Sites (V2 May 2014).

As such, the methodology was as follows;

- Consultation – Heritage Victoria was consulted regarding the conduct of the survey and database listings. Discussions were held with the Friends of Churchill Island.
• **Desktop review** – existing reports and documentation (supplied by the client) were carefully scrutinised; all known historical archaeological sites in the area were identified through investigating the various registers of cultural heritage places in Victoria; previous archaeological studies and reports were downloaded from these databases and analysed; historical maps, primary and secondary source material available online, at the State Library of Victoria (SLV), at the Public Record Office (PROV), and from Lovell Chen were also reviewed and analysed.

• **Survey** – a three day ground survey on foot, focusing on known archaeological sites, areas of historical activity and areas predicted to be sensitive for archaeological sites was undertaken with a team of three. Two additional site visits were also made.

• **Written report** – a plain English report was completed presenting the results of the historical archaeology desktop review and field survey. Management recommendations were provided in the report specific to the requirements for historical archaeology places in accordance with the Heritage Act, 1995.

### Consultation

As per Section 131(1) of the Heritage Act, 1995 a Notice of Intention to carry out an Archaeological Survey form was lodged with Heritage Victoria on 20 November 2014 prior to the survey taking place. Heritage Victoria project number 4552 was provided to be used to identify the report and any further correspondence (see Appendix A & B).

Sarah Myers (Director, ArchLink) spoke with Jeremy Smith, senior archaeologist at Heritage Victoria in order to clarify the multiple database listings for the island and previous survey work that had been undertaken. She found that the photos appended to one of the listings were incorrect and are actually of excavations undertaken at Corinella to the northeast of the island, on the coast of Westernport Bay (see discussion on page 17).

Sarah also spoke with Christine Grayden, Churchill Island Curator and secretary of FOCIS on several occasions both in person and by telephone, regarding the location of potential footings on the island and also the artefact collection held there.
Figure 1: Map showing the location of Churchill Island, the subject area.
Part 1: Desktop Assessment

The desktop study involved a review of the environmental, historical and archaeological background of the study area, following the above described methodology, in order to establish the potential for archaeology in the study area and its significance.

Fiona Shanahan conducted the review of environmental and archaeological information while Dr Sarah Mirams conducted the review of historical background information.

Environmental Background

Low rises formed by lava flows have formed the geomorphological unit defined as 'basaltic residuals' on Churchill Island (see Figure 2).

The island contains vegetation, both Indigenous and introduced. Originally woodlands may potentially have included Manna Gum (Eucalyptus viminalis), however today the majority of the island has been cleared for stock use. Dyke and Spencer (1982, p. 2) identified four major Indigenous forms of vegetation on Churchill Island;

- Moonah woodland (Melaleuca lanceolata)
- Sheoak woodland (Casuarina stricta)
- Banksia integrifolia
- Salt marsh and mangrove swamp (Avicennia marina)

The Moonah trees as well as an olive tree, walnut tree, Norfolk pine and a white mulberry are listed on the National Trust of Australia (Victoria) Register for significant trees. The listing includes 254 trees, of which there are 250 Moonah trees (Taylor 1997, p.3).

Grant cultivated areas of Churchill Island as early as 1801 for wheat and corn crops, thus forming the first known European 'garden' or cultivation area in Victoria (O'Neill 1999, p. 3). Rogers in the 1860s constructed a kitchen garden and Amess (1872) developed a larger garden and orchard. The Norfolk pine and camellias of Amess remain today. See historical background following for further information on the periods of use, ownership and occupation referred to here.

Ground disturbance across the island will mainly have been caused by this cultivation, but also by dam construction, borrow pits and rubbish pits. Tree planting and removal has also occurred and erosion. See the aerial photos presented in Figures 3, 4 and 5 below which highlight some of these disturbances and environmental change over time.
Figure 2: Geomorphology of the Subject Area.
**Figure 3:** 1939 aerial photograph. Note the remnant woodland on the western side of the island, but otherwise the almost total clearance of the remainder. The homestead and other buildings are located in a central rectangular area. Other features that can be made out include dams, burrow pits, fence lines, jetties and plough or vehicle marks (Provided by Lovell Chen).

**Figure 4:** 1979 aerial photograph. Note the additional disturbance that has occurred, including the construction of dams, planting of trees in what appear to be ploughed strips, removal of the windbreak on the east side and addition of windbreaks on the west side.
Figure 5: Google Earth image showing current aerial view of Churchill Island (Google Earth 2014). Note the regeneration of trees across the northern and western part of the island and along the coastline.
**Historical Background**

Churchill Island was once part of the country of the *Yallock bullunck* clan of the *Boon wurrung* people, who may have visited the island in the summer months. The first recorded European visit to the island was in 1801. Farming commenced on the island in the 1850s and it became one of the few privately owned islands in Victoria until the Victorian Conservation Trust (VCT) bought it in 1976. It was opened to tourists in 1981. Today it is under the management of the Phillip Island Nature Parks and is a popular tourist destination.

**James Grant (1801)**

British Royal Navy navigator James Grant was sent from Sydney by Governor King in the *Lady Nelson* in 1801 to survey Western Port Bay. As was the tradition he kept a detailed log book and journal, which recorded his landing on Churchill Island. Extracts from the logbook with commentary were published in 1915 and are available online at the State Library of Victoria and at Project Gutenberg (Lee 1915).

Grant travelled with a crew that included Ensign Barrallier, Mr Carey (a botanist), Eunuabie and his wife Worragan, two ‘natives’ and four soldiers of the New South Wales Corp. Grant explored Western Port Bay and on 27th March landed on what was to become Churchill Island to ‘plant a garden’. His logbook records that he felled large trees and then burnt 20 rods (a rod is linear measure: 20 rods equals 1 ha. Alternatively Grant may have meant 20 roods, or 2 ha.). The soil on the island was easy to dig and looked rich. Grant left a party on Churchill Island and continued his survey with Barrallier. He returned to Churchill Island on the 29th, where his men in the meantime had cleared the land for a garden. He commented that they had slept on the ground ‘in a hut built for the occasion’. Grant then planted corn, potatoes, coffee, rice and wheat. They then built a more permanent structure, described thus;

*With the trunk of the trees I felled I raised a block house of 24 feet by 12 which would probably remain some years, the supports being well in the earth.*

Grant planted stone fruits and apple seeds around the hut and named the island Churchill after John Churchill of Dawlish, Devon, who had provided him the seeds and stones of fruit to plant. The *Lady Nelson* then returned to Sydney. Grant took with him a canoe he had found abandoned in a creek as a gift for Governor King.
Figure 6: Part of the Chart by Barrallier, 1801. Note the location for the cleared land being in the middle of the western side of the island (SLV).

Ensign Barrallier, the ships surveyor, recorded the location of the blockhouse and garden on a chart of Western Port Bay (see Figure 6). It shows a dotted rectangle and two small dots within, on the western side of the island, suggesting the location of Grants cleared area, or area of cultivation and a building or possibly two. This is the only map of Grant’s ‘garden’ and Blockhouse that has been located to date.

Six months after returning to Sydney, Lieutenant Commander John Murray returned to Western Port in command of the Lady Nelson to survey the whole of Bass Strait. His logbook records in some detail what he found when he revisited Churchill Island.

*Tuesday, 8th December. ... A.M. I went in the gig to Churchill’s Island and there found everything as we left it--I mean the remains of our fires and huts; the wheat and corn that Lieutenant Grant had sown in April last was in full vigour, 6 ft. high and almost ripe--the onions also were grown into seed; the potatoes have disappeared--I fancy that the different animals that inhabit the island must have eaten or otherwise destroyed them. I regret not having time or men to spare to clear a large spot and sow the wheat already grown, as the next crop would be large. I never saw finer wheat or corn in my life, the straw being very near as large as young sugar-cane.*

The next day’s entry suggests that the Boon wurrung were living in the vicinity of Churchill and Phillip Islands. Grant does not identify the river he was taking water from.
"Wednesday, 9th December. At 1 P.M. the first officer in the launch returned on board with a load of water; on his examining the river he reported that everything seemed the same as when we left it a strong presumption that no vessel had been there, as naturally they would have replaced their water. The river has been flooded since last April, as a temporary hut we built was found with part of the bank washed away; the banks of the river were found all in a high state of verdure and in many places the view is truly romantic and wild. No signs of native canoes or huts have been discovered, indeed, there is less appearance of natives now than when we were here last; for then many remains of huts, part of a canoe and their beaten tracks were to be found on all parts of the banks of this little river, all of which have vanished... At 3 P.M. sent the second mate to Churchill's Island to cut down the wheat on purpose to feed the young swans with it, at sundown they returned on board with it in the whole perhaps a bushel in quantity with a good deal mixed with oats and barley all fine of their kind--some potatoes were also found and 2 onions. (Lee 1915, chpt. 5)

Sealing was a rich and profitable industry in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century in Bass Strait. William Campbell, owner of the Harrington, harvested 3000 seal-skins and 9500 barrels of seal oil from Bass Strait in 1801 and Murray mentions the Harrington in his log. Murray noted several thousand seals basking on Seal Island along with rich animal and bird life. No precise archival or archeological evidence has been located that places sealers on Churchill Island (one site listed on the Victorian Heritage Inventory has been discounted), but it is possible that they visited. Usually sealers were in search of fresh water and neither Grant or Murray record creeks on Churchill Island.

A map of Phillip Island surveyed by a Captain Wetherall in c.1828 has no buildings or structures identified on Churchill Island (Shaw 1992, p. 15). If the blockhouse was still in existence it is possible that it was not visible from the shoreline and therefore not recorded.

**Port Phillip District 1830-1850**

The news of vast, fertile, ‘empty’ swathes of grasslands drew land hungry entrepreneurs to the Port Phillip District from the 1830s, despite the Colonial Office forbidding such settlement. The Henty family transported their flocks to Portland. John Batman, representing the Port Phillip Association, took possession of 600,000 acres of land from the Woi-Wurrung in May 1835 in return for an annual tribute. Three months later John Pascoe Fawkner’s party travelled in the
Enterprise across Bass Strait. Soon a motley collection of tents and huts sprung up along the banks of the Yarra River.

Forced to act, Governor Sir Richard Bourke, the Crown’s representative in Sydney, declared Batman’s treaty with the Woi wurrung void in September 1837. Captain William Lonsdale arrived in Port Phillip to take over as commandant of the 224 Europeans living in Melbourne.

Robert Hoddle was appointed Chief Surveyor in 1837 and began transforming the country of the Woi-Wurrung and other nations into surveys and maps. He visited Churchill Island in 1840 and in a letter published in the Sydney Monitor and Commercial Advertiser on January 25th he describes Churchill Island ‘thickly timbered’ but with some pasture for cattle. He also notes that ‘opposite the east end of Churchill Island’ there was a ‘fresh water creek at the head of which is fresh water, distant about four miles from the entrance’. Squatters established themselves there as it is well situated for a Village Reserve, due to the good quality of land which was well adapted for cultivation, and some land adjacent was fit for pasturage (The Sydney Monitor and Commercial Advertiser 1840, p. 2). Hoddle may be describing the squatting run taken up by John David and William MacHaffie officially in 1841. A coastal survey of the islands of Westernport (not reproduced here only available on microfiche) in 1842 by Smythe shows Churchill Island with no structures but marked with ‘Dense Scrub of Silver Tea Tree’ a little towards the northwest (Smythe 1842).

**John Rogers and Samuel Pickersgill (1850s–1860s)**

The historic record suggests that commercial and domestic farming began sometime in the 1850s with John Rogers. Rogers was occupying Churchill Island from 1854 possibly as part of a pastoral lease. He grew vegetables on the island (Miles Lewis 1999). There is some debate over the time and process by which he acquired Churchill Island, however it is recorded in The Age 1865 that Mr John Rogers purchased the Crown Land as a Special Lot. The report reads;

*SPECIAL LOT. Churchill Island, county unnamed, parish unnamed, situated in Western Port Bay, near Phillip Island, Upset price, £1 10s per acre. - ‘Lot 21, 110 acres, improvements valued at £7c0, £2 1 0 the lot, John Rogers. Total, £210.*

(The Age 1865)

The mention of ‘improvements’ could suggest structures dams or fences had been built. As the land was acquired under freehold and not as a selection block there would be no land files describing the block and any structures on it. The Parish Plan for Phillip Island (PROV, VPRS 16171) records Rogers ownership, but does not provide a file reference number, or indicate any features on the property.
The earliest map located from the 1860s is the 1861 Charles Ferguson, Department of Lands and Survey ‘Eastern Entrance to Westernport’. On the top left corner of the chart a small sketch entitled ‘White House; Churchill Island’ can be seen (Ferguson 1861, see Figure 7 below). Miles Lewis (1999, pp. 6-8) in his Churchill Island Homestead Report discusses this feature, in some detail. He argues the ‘White House’ drawn on the map must have been a prominent feature of the landscape which could be seen from the sea and may have been built by John Rogers possibly close to or at the present homestead site. Possibly it was a wattle and daub house built as early as 1854 for when Rogers stayed on the island (family history suggests the family did not move permanently to Churchill Island until 1864). Lewis suggests its orientation does not match any of the present buildings, and therefore may have been demolished (Lewis 1999).

Figure 7: Part of the Chart by Fergusson, 1861 (SLV).

An 1865 coastal survey map shows two buildings in the area of the present day homestead known as 'Rogers' Huts'. Originally calico lined, they have been significantly altered over time and adapted for use on the homestead site where they still stand (Cox 1865, see Figure 8 below).
The Pickersgill family also occupied Churchill Island from 1861-1866. Farm laborer Samuel Pickersgill, his wife Winifred and their three children squatted on the land and grew vegetables. Winifred went on to have five more children. According to family legend the family lived in Grant’s Blockhouse during their stay on the island. If this is true the blockhouse may have been standing till the 1860s when perhaps Rogers demolished it (Baird 2012; Pizzey 1982).

**Amess Family (1872-1929)**

Successful Melbourne businessman Samuel Amess bought Churchill Island from John Rogers in 1872 and built the homestead which forms the heart of the present complex in 1873. Amess used Churchill Island as a holiday retreat, however it still continued to operate as a farm hiring a manager and staff to work the property. Rogers’ huts became staff accommodation.

The Amess family occupied Churchill Island for 60 years and during that time substantial additions were made to the farm. These are mapped in the 1980 Conservation Master Plan and described in Taylor’s 1997 Conservation Analysis. They include an underground dairy cellar, a piggery and dairy (since demolished), workshop, grain store and harness room (Taylor 1997). A barn was relocated from Hastings. The island had been cleared by this time, paddocks fenced,
dams built and orchards and gardens planted. It’s features were described in some detail in the press when it would put up for sale;

**ISLAND FOR SALE**

**Historic Associations**

Churchill Island, just off Phillip Island, is for sale. In 1801 the first cultivation of Victorian soil took place at Churchill Island, when Lieutenant Grant, of His Majesty’s Navy, planted the precious seeds which he brought from overseas and in due season reaped a bounteous harvest. Lacking fitter tools, the garden was dug with a coal shovel which had worn thin.

**60 YEARS IN FAMILY** Churchill Island has been in the possession of the Amess family for over 60 years continuously. It came into the possession of the present owner’s grandfather when he was Lord Mayor of Melbourne. It is situated at the south-east end of Westernport Bay, and has an area of 140 acres divided at present into nine paddocks, in the main of which is a dam for stock purposes. The soil is of volcanic origin, and highly productive. As well as ordinary crops and oats, wheat, maize, and barley, success has attended the cultivation of chicory, millet, rape, tobacco, potatoes, tomatoes, and onions. There is an eleven-roomed weather board house on the island, besides servants’ quarters and barns, a wool-shed, buggy-sheds, fowl-houses, blacksmiths’ and carpenters’ shops, men’s huts, hay-shed, and a double-walled brick dairy, which is semi-underground. It is most attractively timbered. Churchill Island is estimated to be worth £10,000.

(The Daily News Perth 25 Nov 1928)

Further information about the activities that took place on the island in addition to the farming and industry were described by Majorie Amess in 1907.

**CHURCHILL ISLAND - By MARJORIE AMESS.**

Dear Patience, I am choosing Churchill Island for the subject on which I am going to write. Grandfather bought Churchill Island in 1872. Now it belongs to my father, and is situated in Westernport Bay, near Phillip Island. It is one mile in breadth across the widest part, four miles in circumference, and two miles in length. We are the only people living here, except the manager, who has rooms not far from the house. The house and orchard are surrounded by large pine trees, some of which are as high as 80ft. There are 150 acres, these being divided into nine paddocks. We go in for
grazing in a small way. Each of the paddocks contains at least two or more waterholes. We **have four landing-stages and three boats**. We always spend three months down here at Christmas time, when we have a number of friends staying with us...We have a large cannon in the orchard, which belonged to the American war-ship Shenandoah, and was given to my grandfather by a friend. There is also a large flag pole in the front paddock, which is about 50ft. high, and on special occasions we hoist the flags. The house contains seven rooms, and there are two bedrooms away from the house, called the "barracks," which are the bachelors' quarters. We have a large bell, which belonged to the Kerangie, and on New Year's Eve we ring it, to bring in the new year... The only misfortune is that the beach is not sandy. Right round there is nothing but large rocks, except in some places where there are small pebbles and broken shells. **Sea-bathing is one of our favourite pastimes,** We **have four bathing-boxes,** but unfortunately we can only bathe at certain times, as the water goes out for about a mile and leaves nothing but mud flats... Your sincere friend,-Marjorie.

(The Australasian 9th March 1907)

1929 to Present

Churchill Island passed out of the Amess hands in 1929 and went through a series of owners, who continued farming but did not initiate substantial building programs. The farm and homestead was run down by the time it was sold to the Victorian Conservation Trust in 1972. Substantial alterations were made to the buildings, which were ‘restored’ prior to it being opened for tourist use in 1981. These alterations and restorations are described in Taylor (1997).

Visitors and workers relied on row boats to get from Phillip Island until 1959 when the first bridge was built. Building materials were most likely transported by sea and perhaps offloaded at the Jetty marked on a tourist map from 1940 (Figure 9).
Figure 9: Tourist Map, 1940 (SLV – provided by Lovell Chen).

Conclusion

The historical background review indicates there have been four broad phases of European use and occupation on Churchill Island;

- Phase 1 (1801): Exploration and Experimentation; Grant's cleared cultivation area
- Phase 2 (c. 1850s - 1860s): Early farming and settlement; Rogers and Pickersgill
- Phase 3 (1872 - 1929): Amess Family farm and homestead
- Phase 4 (1929 - 1972): Private farming in the twentieth century
- Phase 5 (1972 - present): Victorian Conservation Trust and heritage farm

The potential archaeological remains that may be present on the island and which may relate to these periods of use will be discussed in the Predictive Model following that concludes the desktop assessment.
Archaeological Background

The Victorian Heritage Register (VHR), Heritage Inventory (HI), Heritage Overlay (HO), National Trust of Victoria (NT) and the Register of the National Estate (RNE) were consulted during December 2014 to establish the presence of listed and registered sites near to or encompassing the current study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Listing Authority</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>Newhaven</td>
<td>RNE</td>
<td>5875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>Newhaven</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>HO27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>VHR</td>
<td>H1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H7921-0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Island “Sealers Site”</td>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H7921-0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Island and Swan Bay</td>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>L10088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins Settlement Site</td>
<td>Sorrento</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H7821-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins Settlement Site</td>
<td>Sorrento</td>
<td>VHR</td>
<td>H1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinella Penal Settlement</td>
<td>Corinella</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H7921-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Point</td>
<td>Corinella</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>L10083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Highway House Site</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>D7921-0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Port Tramway</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>D7920-0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Road H1 Brick Structure</td>
<td>Woolamai</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>D7920-0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowes East Historical Site 1 (CE HS 1)</td>
<td>Cowes</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H7921-0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowes East Chicory Kiln (CE Kiln)</td>
<td>Cowes</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H7921-0079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chicory Kiln</td>
<td>Cowes</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H7921-0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollamai House</td>
<td>Cape Woolamai</td>
<td>VHR</td>
<td>H0666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollamai House</td>
<td>Cape Woolamai</td>
<td>HI &amp; HO</td>
<td>H7920-0015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Showing the historical and archaeological sites registered within and around Churchill Island.

As indicated in the table above, there are multiple listings (6) for Churchill Island on the various heritage and archaeological registers for Victoria and nationally. Several of these are duplications of the same site listing. The Heritage Register listing (H1614) for the whole island and the Heritage Inventory (HI) listing (H7921-0002) are essentially the same. The second HI listing (H7921-0014) refers to the line of stones thought to be the footings of a ‘Sealers Hut’. This interpretation has since been dismissed as unlikely.

There are a set of photos allocated to the listing H7921-0002 which are titled, Churchill Island Excavation. These have been incorrectly assigned to this record as they are actually from the excavations undertaken at Corinella as mentioned above in the consultation section. The photos are interesting though, as they could be very similar to how potential archaeological deposits at Churchill Island could look. The photos show the remains of stone footings and a stone hearth present below the ground surface, with furrow marks evident of cuttings made into the surrounding sediments.
The RNE listing is for the whole for the island and the linking timber bridge, all buildings and objects. However, the timber bridge has since been removed and replaced.

There are a further 9 previously recorded sites in the vicinity of Churchill Island which include early settlement sites (Corinella and Collins Settlement) and early industrial sites. Several of these sites also have multiple listings on the various databases.

The following section reviews relevant historical and archaeological studies that have been carried out in the area nearby to Churchill Island or on similar site types. Findings from these studies may provide valuable comparative data on possible site formation processes and preservation conditions at Churchill Island.

To date, at least one historical archaeological investigation has been carried out on Churchill Island, with the majority of reports for the island relating to conservation and management plans for the homestead and landscape. The management and conservation reports have been included in this investigation as they are relevant to the documentation of change and the locations of certain areas of interest for this study. Further archaeological investigations have occurred in regards to early settlement and farming in the wider area and these previous archaeological surveys, assessments and excavations allow for a comparative study with the current investigation.

**Churchill Island**

In 1980 a Master Plan was prepared for Churchill Island by the Centre for Environmental Studies, University of Melbourne. The plan presents a map showing the area where Grant’s Blockhouse and ‘garden’ is likely to have been, along the mid-north section of the western coast. They also indicated that there were two sets of substantial footings near to the homestead, at that time, possibly associated with sealers and squatters, one being to the northwest and one to the southeast, marked only by arrows pointing to the general location. They recommended that the likely area for Grant’s Blockhouse and clearing should not be disturbed until detailed investigations (possibly by the Victoria Archaeological Survey) had been undertaken.

Personal communication with Jeremy Smith from Heritage Victoria (January 2015), indicates that the Maritime Unit of Heritage Victoria may have conducted a survey there several years ago with a magnetometer, the results of which were inconclusive and therefore not published.
The Victorian Conservation League commissioned Dyke and Spencer (1982) to produce conservation strategies for the gardens on Churchill Island. The report concluded, 'in broad terms it is suggested that there can be little restoration work done and that the approach be more one of preservation' (Dyke and Spencer, 1982;1).

Karen Townrow (1993) studied sealing and whaling sites in Victoria, including the report of a 'Sealers Hut' on Churchill Island. It is not known who or how the Sealers Hut (H7921/014) was listed, however Townrow's survey in August and September 1991 relocated the reported Sealers Hut remains. She concluded that the footings were not likely to relate to structures associated with sealing, and rather, the site resembled the 'footings of a more substantial structure' (Townrow 1993, p. 20). Perhaps the site was first reported following the preparation of the abovementioned Management Plan in 1980. The site card prepared by Townrow is included in Appendix C.

In 1997 Taylor, an architect and conservation consultant, produced a report on the Churchill Island Homestead for the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. Taylor examined five of the nineteen buildings on Churchill Island and proposed the island’s homestead underwent four major stages of development. The first three stages clearly illustrate the works of Rogers and Amess; the Rogers’ huts (c. 1863), Amess House (1872) and ancillary buildings (wash house, Amess cellar and Amess stables) between 1870 and 1890. The last stage of development (1950s - present day) involved the demolition of the ancillary buildings and minor changes to interior fabrics (Taylor 1997; 61). Whilst surveying the island, Taylor identified the effects of the last stage of development, including alterations and the replacement of historic materials on all five buildings; two Rogers' huts, Amess House, Amess cellar and Amess stables.

A Conservation Management Report was commissioned in 1999. Miles Lewis produced a summary of alterations to the homestead for Mr. Leivers, the General Manager of the Phillip Island Nature Parks. Lewis referred extensively to Taylor’s 1997 report, criticising the report and survey methodology (e.g. the use of a metal detector to locate Grant's Hut). Lewis (1999, p. 15) does however highlight the same alterations evident in all five buildings examined by Taylor, including 'the most confusing work ... done in 1977 for the filming of Summerfield'. Lewis' report concludes by recommending 'a definitive search of the remains of Grant's Blockhouse and garden' to be undertaken.

O'Neill also published a garden conservation plan for Churchill Island in 1999, which detailed the garden history of the island. The importance of the ‘famous Moonah trees (Melaleuca lanceolata)’ was stated, and the introduction of a new garden north of the Rogers' Hut was
deemed inappropriate. O’Neill did conclude, however, that despite the significant changes evident in the Churchill Island gardens, the evidence of the 'original features and layout' remain, thus aiding the heritage values of the island (O'Neill 1999, p. 3).

**Early Settlement Sites**

In May 2006, Parks Victoria and Heritage Insight (Natalie Payner 2006) undertook stabilisation works at the State-level of significance ‘Collins Settlement Site’ (October 1803 - May 1804). No historical materials were located, however the listed shell midden was located and recorded. In order to address the potential for Aboriginal and historic materials on site, Parks Victoria prepared a Management Plan for the area in December 2002. Further investigations were undertaken by Archaeology at Tardis (Andrea Murphy and Dale Owen 2011a; 2011b). The study involved monitoring the installation of a tennis court and vehicle access (Lot 3) and it was concluded that no visible impact had occurred during the monitoring of the site. In 2012, Archaeology at Tardis (Andrea Murphy and Barry Green 2012) established three mechanical trenches to assess the impact of proposed building plans in Lot 2. Forty two historical artefacts of high to moderate significance were located, however no structural remains were found. Monitoring continued while the building works were completed.

Corinella, another settlement site in the Western Port, was established in December 1826 and abandoned in March 1828. Despite the short period of British settlement 50 buildings were constructed and a thriving timber and farming industry was recognised (Coutts 1985, p. 1). A review of the site in 1926 by the Royal Historical Society of Victoria stated that there was 'no visible evidence of the original buildings' (Coutts 1985, p. 9). In 1980 the Victorian Archaeological Survey report (P. J. F. Coutts) supported the 1926 observations, concluding that 'there was no obvious archaeological manifestations of the 1826 - 1828 settlement' (Coutts 1985, p. 9). Archaeological excavations were undertaken and some stone footings and plough marks were identified.

In 1999 Biosis (Helen Cekalovic 1999) surveyed the site to allow the rezoning of land from Intensive Farming to Extracting Industry. The survey did not locate any materials or structures from the original settlement and instead it cautioned that Aboriginal burials may potentially be present.

**Phillip Island**

Biosis (Jenny Fiddian 2006) completed an archaeological survey of the Bass Highway in March 2006 as a result of proposed highway duplication plans. Due to the identification of five Aboriginal sites (two located in her subject area) and three historical sites; circular brick
structure, Western Port Tramway, and Bass Highway H1 House, it was recommended that the option to widen rather than split the road for duplication be implemented. Additional recommendations for the duplication were presented by Tardis Enterprise (Andrea Murphy and Dr. Tom Rymer) in April 2008 when footprints for the development were altered.

Cowes East (Phillip Island) underwent an historical investigation in 2007 due to catchment and development proposals. Biosis (Bloink et. al. 2007) recommended the three previously identified historic and three listed Aboriginal sites be avoided and not disturbed if possible.

In 2008 Cowes East was further investigated by Alpha Archaeology (Joanna Richmond and Jodie Mitchell 2008) through the study of the ‘Cowes East Historic Site 1’, due to proposed housing developments. The site was originally used for crops and sheep grazing, until the early 20th century when the land was used for dairy farming. Thus the site illustrated one of the most prominent industries on Phillip Island in the 20th century; dairy farming. The 2008 study concluded that the site was of low scientific significance and only provided some local historic interest. The recommendation therefore allowed for a class 3 application, allowing damage to more than 50% of the site and no further monitoring was required.

Wollamai House was assessed and surveyed by CHM Archaeologists and Heritage Advisors (Sarah Myers and Matt Chamberlain 2008) due to housing subdivisions and residential developments in the area. The desktop assessment advised features associated with Wollamai House would be evident on site. This was verified by survey. Recommendations suggested a consent to damage be obtained and should further features become evident, works cease and further archaeological works be undertaken.

**Conclusion**

This survey of heritage archaeological investigations has revealed the extent of works undertaken on the Churchill Island Homestead and gardens. It has also revealed there are several other examples of early settlement sites in the region where potential remains have been difficult to locate. Little archaeological evidence has been uncovered at the Collins Settlement Site despite several studies being undertaken. By comparison, fifteen features were exposed during excavations at the Corinella settlement site in the 1980s; at least one relating to the 1826 settlement and the remainder from subsequent settlements. It is possible that the age and nature of the early settlement sites did not allow for good preservation conditions. Subsequent land use practices, construction of buildings and ploughing is likely to have removed the remains of these sites.
Predictive Model

The background review has examined the environmental, historical and archaeological information available and found that there has been considerable European use of the land for agriculture and farming. This use has resulted in Churchill Island becoming a cultural landscape with fence lines, roads and tracks, wind breaks, farm and homestead buildings, garden layouts and environmental features expressing the changes in use and priorities over time. Five historical phases were identified.

There is one known archaeological site on the island which comprises a stone footing to the northwest of the homestead (H7921-0014).

There are no other known archaeological remains associated with Grant’s use of the island in 1801, or with the later Rogers, Pickersgill and Amess periods of occupation.

The agricultural use of the land and more recent conservation works, in addition to creating the cultural landscape, have also caused considerable disturbance that will have removed some cultural heritage and archaeological remains. These disturbances include in particular, the demolition of older structures, ploughing for tree planting, dam construction, pit excavation, construction of work buildings, introduction of new materials, repairs and alterations and also coastal and land erosion. This disturbance is likely to have reduced the potential for any further intact, significant archaeology to be found across the island.

Some archaeological potential may however exist in areas where historical activity took place and where there has been minimal ground disturbance.

This desktop assessment has resulted in the identification of five areas of archaeological potential (see Figure 10). These will be examined closely during the archaeological field survey to verify that potential and so determine whether the potential is likely or not (i.e. high or low). The potential sites relate to the first four historical phases identified through the historical background study and are discussed below;

**Area A - Grant’s Blockhouse and ‘Garden’ (1801)**

The Chart by Barrallier (1801) (see Figure 6), the journal entries by Grant and later analysis by Taylor and Lewis (1997 and 1999 respectively) indicate that the area cleared by Grant in 1801, where he constructed a blockhouse and garden, was located on the central, western part of Churchill Island. Barrallier indicates that the cleared area extended back from a small point on the central Western coast of the island. Grant described the area as being 20 rod
which would be equivalent to 1 hectare. Although it is possible he meant 20 rood, which would be 2 hectares.

However, as mentioned in the 1980 Master plan, the shape of the coastline indicated on the Barralier chart does not reflect its current shape so it is difficult to determine the exact location of the cleared area. As such, the area of archaeological potential is necessarily twice as large as it would have been and takes in the small point and the more rounded promontory (see Figure 10 – Area A). Certainly Grant’s cleared area would have been located within this broad area of potential, but the exact extent of the clearing or the location of the blockhouse is not determined.

This area is likely to have been disturbed to some extent by agricultural activity, ploughing and dam construction, but the posts of Grant's Hut were apparently deeply embedded into the ground so it is possible that evidence for the post holes and perhaps remnants of the posts may survive subsurface. There may have been a simple hearth and chimney built for which some evidence may also remain subsurface.

**Area B - The White House (1861)**

The Charts by Fergusson (1861) (see Figure 7) and by Cox (1865) (see Figure 8), and later analysis by Lewis indicates that the White House was located on the eastern coastline of the island (see Figure 10 - Area B).

The Fergusson chart indicates the layout of the building and that it is close to the shoreline. The Cox chart indicates the exact location of the White House on one of the points jutting out from the southeast side of the island and also a fence line wrapping around the house that extends onto the shoreline. As such, the exact location of the area of archaeological potential is clear.

This area is also likely to have been disturbed by ploughing, but again it is possible that remnant posts and perhaps accumulated under floor deposits and rubbish pits survive subsurface.

**Area C - Rogers’ two Huts (1860s) and Amess House and Outbuildings (1882-1929)**

The 1865 Cox coastal survey map and Taylor's later analysis indicate the two Rogers' Huts were and remain located at the present day site of the homestead (See Figure 10 - Area C).
The two huts have been significantly altered, repaired and adapted since their construction. These alterations were noted in Taylor’s report (1997). There is some potential however that accumulated under floor deposits may be present if no major fit outs have occurred.

Amess House and outbuildings have been studied in detail during several earlier conservation studies and found to be significantly altered and/or demolished. Taylor’s (1997) report details the demolition of the Amess outbuildings from the 1950s - 1997. Furthermore, the house was completely re-stumped prior to restoration due to major subsidence from rabbit disturbance (client edits). Therefore the potential for under floor archaeological deposits to have accumulated under the main house is very limited. There is, however, some potential perhaps for original garden layout features to be preserved as well as rubbish pits, filled in long drops, wells, and footings of demolished outbuildings.

The 'Sealers Hut' site (H7921-0014) is located to the northwest of the homestead and apparently comprises two lines of stone footings. Although possible, it seems unlikely that these footings relate to a sealers hut due to their position so far to the east of the coastline, and their proximity to the homestead and other outbuildings. Various aerial photos (including Figure 3) show outbuildings of the homestead near to the location where this line of stones is located. The feature is therefore quite possibly related to an outbuilding or animal pen associated with the homestead.

Nonetheless, the feature indicates that subsurface remains of structures are preserved in this area, meaning that there may be potential for other archaeological remains as suggested above.

A corroded gun in the possession of FOCIS was apparently found in the gardens surrounding the Rogers' Huts and Amess Homestead building. The presence of the gun in the gardens verifies the potential for additional artefacts to become uncovered.

**Areas D&E - Bathing Huts (1907), Piers and Jetties**

*Bathing Huts*

Four bathing huts were mentioned by Marjorie Amess in 1907, however their location was not specified and they do not appear on any of the maps or aerials analysed during this assessment. Other investigations do not mention the bath houses, but it seems most likely that they would have been located on the more sheltered western side of the island.
**Piers and Jetties**

Several aerial photos and historic plans reveal there were a number of jetties around the coastline at various times; one was on the western shoreline and was associated with the Rogers and Amess period of occupation; one was located with a boat house in the northeast (Area E); and another was located near the White House.

According to the Masterplan (1980, p. 33) there are remains of a jetty, near the memorial cairn. The 1980 Master Plan also suggests there was jetty and boat house located at the North East Cove where the channel was at its deepest (this is not cited) (Area E). Most research into Churchill Island has concentrated on the homestead complex and Grant’s Blockhouse. One neglected area of potential interest is its coastal history. For this reason, the field survey will focus on this area.

With this in mind, the coastline may have been impacted by coastal erosion, which may have disturbed or removed archaeological features.

**Conclusion**

The discussion above indicates there is some archaeological potential within the above mentioned areas. It is also apparent, however, that there has been considerable disturbance to the subject area from the 1950s to the present day. This disturbance is likely to have reduced the potential for intact, significant archaeology.
Figure 10: Predictive model showing areas of archaeological potential determined as a result of the desktop assessment.
Part 2: Archaeological Assessment

In order to test and verify the predictive model and to assess the existing condition of the study area, a field survey was conducted.

The ArchLink team including Sarah Myers, Dr Sarah Mirams, Fiona Shanahan and Tom Mallett completed the field survey of the island on the 1st, 15th and 18th December 2014. Sarah Myers made additional site visits in January and February 2015.

Survey Method and Coverage

The first day involved surveying of the homestead and surrounds; both inside and outside the buildings then circumnavigating the island along the coastline via the installed walking paths. This enabled ArchLink staff to understand what remained of the original buildings and confirm any alternations noted in previous reports, particularly to the floors and ground. The remains of the 'Sealers Hut' site (H7921-0014) located to the north of the homestead buildings were also inspected closely and also the potential location for a forge (as reported by Christine Grayden). The survey along the coast via the walking paths allowed staff to note changes in the landscape, for example the replanting of trees, the cutting and filling of dams and drains.

The second day of the survey was conducted on the shoreline or rocky shore platform and intertidal zone. This allowed a connection to be established between the sites located inland and their access areas from the coast. It also allowed for the team to assess the extent of coastal erosion. The final day of survey involved the southwestern coastline including the location of the first bridge from Phillip Island.

During the two additional site visits the Sealers Hut site (H7921-0014) was again inspected, Area A: the potential Grant cultivation area, was walked over in its entirety and the ground closely inspected, and the location where the second set of footings mentioned in the 1980 Master Plan report was also closely inspected.

GPS points were taken where features were identified and many photos and field notes.

Limits to the survey coverage were experienced when some paddocks could not be accessed due to the presence of livestock, but also long grasses and overgrown areas were not surveyed as the ground visibility there was 0%. The weather was warm to hot most days so
long grass was also avoided due to the risk of snake bite. Overall approximately 50% of the island was covered by the survey focusing on areas identified as having potential in the predictive model and the majority of the coast line.

The following map indicates the areas surveyed;
Figure 11: Showing areas surveyed
Results

Area A

The area here was divided into two paddocks. A fenced walking path divides the two. The northern paddock was gently sloping and wooded by planted trees, but there was no understory so visibility of the ground surface was good. There was a mound of soil at the base of the slope in the northwestern corner where a dam was probably decommissioned and backfilled. There was also a pit at the base of the slope in the central part where rubbish was dumped that may also have been a decommissioned dam or borrow pit.

The southern paddock was clear of trees except towards the coastline where a small copse had been planted. A drainage line was noted running north-south across the middle of the paddock. There was also a mound that perhaps also represented a decommissioned and refilled dam. No other features were noted. This area lay directly behind the small point that may have been the point around which Grant's cleared area was located as indicated on the Barrallier chart. If this was indeed the location of Grant's cultivation area, then it may have been spared significant ground disturbance unlike the northern paddock where the planting program in the 70s may have seen deep ripping to prepare the soil (see Figure 4).

A memorial cairn commemorating the first cultivation of wheat in Victoria by Mr James Grant in 1801 has been erected alongside the coastal walking path here.

No physical evidence was found for Grant's blockhouse or cleared area, though the position of the fence line to the north where the Moonah stand begins may indicate its northernmost extent, alternatively the position of the small point or promontory and the southern paddock may also point to its location.

Although rather remote, there is some small possibility that evidence for Grant's Blockhouse could be preserved subsurface. The potential archaeological remains may comprise post holes, remnant timber posts, a stone arrangement for the chimney, furrow marks and perhaps some seeds. Perhaps careful archaeological test excavations or a ground penetrating radar survey could clarify the location more precisely.

The mapped area of potential, marked on the map showing the results of the survey (Figure 12) extends from the remnant Moonah trees to the southern side of the small point. This area is some 4 hectares in size, a considerably larger area than it would have been, but without further evidence, narrowing down the location was not possible.
Area B

One relatively intact timber fencepost (with cut out sections for railings) was noted while surveying the shoreline in Area B. The post is likely to be the remains of the fence marked on the Cox plan 1865 (Figure 8) to the north of the ‘White House’ and extending into the water. A number of additional timber stumps were noted extending across the shoreline to the water’s edge in alignment with the first. A scatter of artefacts was also noted in this area, including old glass bottle fragments, ceramic fragments, animal bones and teeth, shells, brick and iron scatters. These appeared in concentrations; one of which was associated with the above mentioned fencepost.

A second concentration of artefacts was noted to the south of the small promontory here where a line of mounded stones was also noted extending across the shoreline toward the water, perhaps representing another fence or the remains of a jetty.

The land extending back from the shoreline has been cut by a footpath and fence, but rises gently toward the north and west and appears otherwise undisturbed. This is the location where the White House was marked on the Cox plan. There were cows and bulls in the paddock here at the time of survey, so a full survey could not be completed. Long grass throughout, however, meant that the ground visibility was very low anyway.

Following the survey, Christine Grayden from FOCIS contacted a past farm manager who told her that there was a large rubbish dump near ‘Bass Rock’ (the name given to the point or promontory in Area B) on a bank which in the 1970s they were instructed to level off, not disturb and cover up. He said it was quite large in a depression and there were even bits of farm machinery within it. He also said its location was where the present track runs today. When VCT took over Churchill Island the whole place was apparently quite a mess so to make it presentable to the public, there was a lot of ‘cleaning up’ undertaken.

Despite the above mentioned disturbance in this area, given the presence of some intact features, the potential for archaeological deposits associated with the White House to be preserved subsurface seems quite good. According to the Cox plan, the White House was set back from the point some way, so may not have been impacted by the rubbish pit that was reportedly located there. According to Miles Lewis analysis (1999), the White House may have been a wattle and daub construction and therefore the potential archaeological features may comprise post holes, accumulated under floor deposits, in-filled long drops and rubbish pits. The mapped area of potential for Area B has been extended to include the fence post and artefact scatters along the coastline (see Figure 12).
**Area C**

In Area C it was noted that there may be some potential for under floor deposits beneath Rogers' two huts and Amess House; the floor boards appear original in some areas. There appears to be a gap under the Rogers' Huts between the base of the external wall and the ground level, patched from the outside, where an archaeological deposit could have accumulated. The surrounding gardens appear to have been extensively reworked.

The lines of natural stones which are identified as a 'Sealers Site' (H7921/014) and recorded as footings on the Heritage Inventory were relocated to the northwest of the homestead; the stones have been exposed further since originally being recorded due to use of the area for a dog show. A fence has been built near to the southern ‘footing’. There is a scatter of natural stones from which the ‘footing’ is formed extending back further to the east creating a flat bench. One small fragment of brick was noted wedged between the stones.

Certainly the straight edge along the western side does seem to indicate these stones were placed here. The southern line of stones ends in a wider collection of stones which was interpreted by the original recorder and in the 1980 Master Plan as a hearth, but during this inspection it appeared more like a natural outcrop. Similar stones to these were noted below the walls of the Rogers' Huts and were clearly used there to form a floor or fill in a gap between the bottom of the wall and the ground. Also the arrangement of the two lines of stones would suggest they could not have been part of the same structure, but perhaps represent different phases of a structure. One of the FOCIS volunteers thought they may relate to Grant's Blockhouse, although the farm manager suggested that they probably relate to a piggery that once stood in the area. As mentioned in the predictive model, the feature is too far to the east of the coastline to have been associated with Grant’s cleared area. It does seem more likely that they formed a platform, or were the base/foundation for an earthen floor of an outbuilding or animal pen.

The second set of footings mentioned in the 1980 Master Plan was not located during the survey. The paddocks to the southeast of the homestead were walked over, however nothing was noted. Christine Grayden from FOCIS contacted a past farm manager to ask about this second set of footings. He did remember something in that location (east of the current Visitor Centre) that comprised hand-made brick, some whole, some half, and some bits of what he called ‘cobbled stone’ similar to elsewhere on the island. He said there was ‘no formation to it’ and that they may have been the remains of a pen.
Christine met with the ArchLink team during the survey and mentioned a concrete and brick feature she had noted previously under the pines at the rear of Amess House near to ‘VICS Gate’. She thought that the feature might be the remains of a forge used during the Rogers/Pickersgill or Amess periods. The potential site had been covered with mulch since and although some was scraped away, the feature was not relocated.

Some other features noted around the house included; concrete stumps for a tank stand in the garden and a concrete marker with an inscription.

The mapped area of potential for Area C has been widened to take in the potential location of the second footing and the line of stones previously recorded (H7921-0014) (see Figure 12).

**Area D**

While surveying the shoreline in Area D remnants of a small jetty were noted at the location of a small promontory. The jetty remains do not appear very old as the joins were not well made and the posts appear to be pine. Although the historical evidence suggests there was a jetty on the south side of the small promontory in the Amess period, no evidence for a jetty in this location was found.

Some bricks set in concrete were located on the south side of the promontory in the cove there, however no substantial evidence was observed that might be associated with the remains of a jetty or bathing huts.

**Area E**

While surveying the northernmost part of the island a line of mounded stones was noted extending from the shore out into to the water which may represent the remains of a jetty. The mounded line was more substantial than the one found in the south which was associated with a fence.

A flat area on the land beyond the shore opposite the stone mound was observed as the potential location for the boat house. No physical remains of the boat house were identified, however. The area does not appear disturbed and therefore there may be some archaeological potential there.
Other Areas

While surveying the southernmost part of the island where it meets Phillip Island, the timber footings of the original 1961 bridge from Churchill Island to Phillip Island were noted on shoreline near to the western side of the newer bridge. The original wooden piles for the bridge have been reused as visitor seating along the walking path and as part of the recently constructed visitor centre.

Another line of mounded stones was noted on the shore in one of the northeast cove. There were post remains at regular intervals along the line, clearly this is the remains of another fence line.

Artefacts, previously collected and carefully stored by FOCIS, were observed and noted in the FOCIS offices; these comprised some objects that were similar to those noted on the shore during the survey, especially one piece of corroded iron. Most of the ceramic and glass appears to be 19th century. One object was clearly a gun, but very corroded. It appears to have the shape of a flintlock pistol.

Flintlock pistols were produced from the 17th century until the mid 1800s, ranged from 15cm in length till approximately 50cm and were used extensively in the British Army and Navy. Due to the corrosion and absent handle the exact model or period of manufacture cannot be defined. The pistol therefore could date from Grant's to Rogers. Amess, may have had possession of the gun from an earlier period, however this is only speculation.
Photos – Area A

Plate 1: gentle slope and planted trees in northern paddock of Area A.

Plate 2: cleared paddock with the drainage line and small mound visible in the centre and centre right of the photo.
Photos – Area B

Plate 3: Fence post associated with the White House. fence line on northern side of the bluff.

Plate 4: Ceramic and glass artefacts found on the rocky shore within Area B.

Plate 5: Dark green 19th century beer or wine bottle also found on the shore in Area B.
Photos – Area B cont.

Plate 6: Line of mounded stones indicating the White House fence line on the southern side of the bluff looking east.

Plate 7: Clear glass lemonade bottle in mud found on the shore within Area B.

Plate 8: Brown glass beer bottle in same area.
Photos – Area B cont.

Plate 9: Modern fence line and path in Area B, this may have been the location of a large pit that was filled.

Plate 10: Gentle sloping paddock in Area B occupied by stock looking west – the remains of the White House may be located here.
Photos – Area C

Plate 11: Line of natural stones which is identified as a ‘Sealers Site’ H7921-0014 on the Heritage Inventory.

Plate 12: Concrete stumps for a tank stand in the garden.

Plate 13: Gun found in the garden and kept in the FOCIS artefact collection, may be a Flintlock pistol.
Photos – Area C cont.

Plate 14: Space beneath the floor of one of Rogers Huts where an archaeological deposit could have accumulated. Note the row of stones under the weather boards and a stump.

Plate 15: Old floor boards and worn step may be original, underfloor space is closed with corrugated board.
Photos – Area D

Plate 16: Remnants of a small timber jetty near the small promontory.

Plate 17: Closer view of the jetty remains shown above, note the line of roughly mounded stones and scatter of brick in association with the jetty.
Photos – Area E

Plate 18: Line of mounded stones; possibly associated with a jetty that may have been located at the northeast point of the island opposite a deep channel.
Photos – Other Areas

Plate 19: Remains of the timber bridge that once provided the link between Phillip Island and Churchill Island.

Plate 20: Timber from the demolished timber bridge used for seating along the walking track.
Conclusion

The results of the survey have verified the findings of the desktop assessment for some areas and helped to refine the assessment in others. Some physical features such as fence posts, lines of mounded rocks and artefact scatters were found within the areas determined to have potential that indicate and confirm the location where historical activities took place.

This was particularly evident in Area B where an intact timber fence post and line of stumps was found that corresponded exactly with the fence line indicated on the 1865 Cox plan. Together with the presence of a scatter of 19th century artefacts, this confirmed the location and likely potential for archaeological features associated with the White House to be preserved.

No evidence was found within Area A that could be associated with Grant’s blockhouse and cleared area. The landforms hint at the likely location for the area though and have helped to confirm the initial desktop analysis. The area of potential could not be further narrowed due to a lack of clear evidence.

The following map shows the physical features found during the survey and the areas of potential as they have been confirmed.
Figure 12: Results of the survey showing physical features recorded and areas of potential confirmed.
Assessment of Archaeological Significance

Cultural heritage significance is defined in the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter as:
(A)esthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future
generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use,
associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. The cultural
heritage significance of a place is what makes it important to a community for historic,
social, spiritual scientific or aesthetic reasons; that is, the heritage values of a place.
The ‘community’ may be a particular social or ethnic group, the local community, the
state or the nation.

Churchill Island is presently listed on both the Victorian Heritage Register (VHR 1614) and
Heritage Inventory (H7921-0002). It is also listed on the Heritage Overlay, National Trust
database and the Register of the National Estate. Being listed on the VHR means it was
assessed to be of State significance when it was registered. The VHR listing does not,
however, consider the archaeological values or significance of the place.

Previous conservation and management reports regarding Churchill Island have mentioned
the location of footings and analysed the location for Grant’s Blockhouse, but they have not
considered archaeological potential or values as such. This significance assessment is a
preliminary, predictive, assessment of the archaeological significance of the subject area.

What is Significant?

Churchill Island has been subject to five broad historical phases of development and although
considerable disturbance and change has occurred, remains of these historical phases are
evident across the island.

The first phase has perhaps driven the intense interest in the history of the island. Lieutenant
James Grant landed on Churchill Island in 1801, prior to the settlement of Melbourne or
Victoria. He left men there to build a blockhouse and clear land to plant crops, fruit trees and
vegetables, but then left. Though this was a singular, short term event, it was the first of any
formal and recorded European attempt to build a house and plant crops in what is now
Victoria. As such the location on Churchill Island where this took place has become of great
historical interest and study. There is no known archaeological site associated with this
event, nor is there any physical evidence, however an area in which it is most likely to have
been located has been determined through close analysis of the available evidence. And although rather remote, this area has some potential to contain archaeological remains associated with this event.

The second and third historical phases at Churchill Island involved 19th and 20th century farming and settlement. Unlike the first phase these phases would have affected the whole island, but there were particular areas where activity was focused. The location of Rogers’ Huts and Amess House in the centre of the island and the ‘White House’ on the southeast coast both have the potential to contain archaeological remains associated with these farm settlements. Furthermore, coastal infrastructure was located at the northeast point, and on the western and eastern shores of the island where there is also some potential for archaeological remains.

The areas determined to have archaeological potential on Churchill Island have been mapped and presented in Figure 12.

**How is it Significant?**

Churchill Island and the areas of archaeological potential mapped in Figure 12 are of historical and archaeological significance to the people of Victoria at a local level.

If archaeological remains of Grant’s Blockhouse and cultivation area were found to be intact, however, the remains would have greater significance.

**Why is it Significant?**

Churchill Island is significant for its potential to contain archaeological remains associated with the historical events and phases that have occurred from Grant’s cultivation event through to the farming settlements of the 18th century for which little physical (visible) evidence now remains on the island. Potential archaeological remains may yield information about these events and historical phases, and about the individuals associated with them. The extant huts, house, sheds, fence lines, and European trees that do remain on Churchill Island serve as a visual record and reminder of the function of the island as an early farm settlement. The extant Moonah woodland juxtaposed to the cleared paddocks is also a reminder of the event that took place in 1801.
Part 3 Management

Legislation

Under the *Heritage Act*, 1995 in Victoria it is an offence to damage or disturb relics and archaeological sites without appropriate permits.

Section 127 of the *Heritage Act*, 1995 states;

(1) A person must not knowingly or negligently deface or damage or otherwise interfere with an archaeological relic or carry out an act likely to endanger an archaeological relic in accordance with a consent issued under section 129.

S.127(1)amended by No. 74/2003 s. 5(5)(a)(b).

(2) A person must not knowingly uncover or expose an archaeological relic or disturb or excavate any land for the purpose of uncovering or discovering an archaeological relic except in accordance with a consent issued under section 129.

S.127(2)amended by No. 74/2003 s. 5(5)(a)(b).

Section 64 of the *Heritage Act*, 1995 specifies that it is necessary to obtain a permit from the Executive Director of Heritage Victoria, which authorises works on a place that is included on the Victorian Heritage Register. A Permit is likely to include a series of conditions including one to undertake an historical archaeological assessment of any area where significant ground disturbance is proposed. An example of a common permit condition is stated below:

"Prior to the commencement of any sub-surface works an historical archaeological assessment report which identifies whether the works may impact any potentially significant historical archaeological remains must be prepared and submitted for endorsement by the Executive Director Heritage Victoria. If the report identifies the potential for impact on significant historical archaeological remains, a program of archaeological investigation and/or monitoring will be required, to the satisfaction of the Executive Director.”

In light of this, and given that the whole of Churchill Island is listed on the Victorian Heritage Register (H1614) it is important that a Permit is obtained from Heritage Victoria prior to conducting any major ground disturbing works (over and above ordinary farming activity) on the island especially in relation to construction activities.
Specific Recommendations

This assessment found that Churchill Island has the potential to contain archaeological remains associated with the use, development and ownership of Churchill Island from 1801.

The following recommendations and management policy will ensure the appropriate level of protection, conservation and management of the archaeological resource on Churchill Island according to the requirements of the Heritage Act, 1995 and to the satisfaction of the Executive Director, Heritage Victoria.

Recommendation 1 – Avoid ground disturbance

If possible, avoid disturbing or developing the areas of Churchill Island highlighted as areas of archaeological potential.

Recommendation 2 – Obtain a Permit from Heritage Victoria

If disturbance and development works are unavoidable, then a Permit for the works must be obtained from Heritage Victoria. (A Permit is required for major works across any part of the Island).

Recommendation 3 – Seek advice from the Senior Archaeologist at Heritage Victoria

For works that fall partly or fully within any of the areas of archaeological potential (see Figure 12), advice must be sought from the senior archaeologist at Heritage Victoria on the appropriate level of archaeological investigation required. This may involve archaeological testing to be undertaken well in advance of the construction works or archaeological monitoring to be undertaken during the works.

Recommendation 4 - Protect site H7921-0014 from harm

The individual site that is registered on the Heritage Inventory (H7921-0014) should be protected from disturbance and harm. It would be advisable to move the activity that is currently being performed in that area to another location.

Recommendation 5 - Protect Area A from harm

The area of potential for Grant’s Blockhouse and cultivation area (Area A) should also be protected from disturbance and harm. It would be advisable not to use heavy machinery in this area and not to undertake any ground disturbing works.
Recommendation 6 – Education

It may be prudent to provide information to the visiting public regarding the potential for archaeology on Churchill Island and the need to protect and conserve any physical expressions of that potential including artefacts laying on the ground or the shore. Artefact fragments found on the beach or elsewhere, for instance, should be left for others to see and enjoy.
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Appendices

Appendix A – Survey Notice

Archaeological Survey Notification

Pursuant to Section 13(1) of the Heritage Act 1995, this form must be completed in full and submitted to Heritage Victoria prior to conducting an archaeological survey. Please note that approval to access the survey area must be arranged by the applicant.

1. Applicant details
Name: .................. Sarah Myers
Email address: .......... info@archlink.com.au
Company: ................. Archlink Archaeologists and Heritage Advisors P/L
Postal address: .......... 59c Main Rd, Monbulk
Telephone (business hours): 0397521075
Commissioning agent: .......... Lovell Chen
Reason for survey: ........ To assist with the preparation of a conservation management plan

2. Survey location
A map clearly identifying the survey area must be attached to this form. For larger, or linear, surveys more than one map may be required. If surveying the seabed, attach a chart clearly identifying the survey area and location.
Location name: ........ Churchill Island
Address: ........ Churchill Island, Bass Shire
Mapsheet number (1:100,000): 7921
Mapsheet name (1:100,000): Western Port

3. Survey dates
It is intended that the survey will be conducted between the following dates:
From: ........ 25th November To: ........ 18th December 2014
Applicant’s signature: ........ Date: ........ 20 Nov 2014

This form must be lodged with Heritage Victoria’s Archaeology Team at:
Archaeology.admin@dpti.vic.gov.au
Heritage Victoria
GPO Box 2392
Melbourne Vic 3000
Appendix B – Survey Notice Response from HV

info@archlink.com.au

From: tim.scott@dpil.vic.gov.au on behalf of Archaeology Admin@dpil.vic.gov.au
Sent: Thursday, 11 December 2014 2:44 PM
To: info@archlink.com.au
Subject: Archaeological Survey Notification # 4552 (Churchill Island project) Received with Thanks
Attachments: pic29301.jpg; pic22363.jpg

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for forwarding the completed Archaeological Survey Notification Form regarding the above location. This email may be used as confirmation of the receipt of the above Archaeological Survey Notification Form, as letters are no longer provided.

Archaeology Report number 4552 has been allocated for this project. An electronic copy of this report is required to be lodged at this office within 1 year of the date of completion of the survey. Please ensure that the Archaeology Report number is referenced on the cover of the report.

In accordance with Section 131(1)(b) of the Heritage Act 1995, all records resulting from an archaeological survey, including those commissioned for Aboriginal cultural heritage investigations, must be provided to this office. Where historical archaeology exists (or is likely to exist), documentation must be submitted in the form of a Heritage Inventory Site Card and an Archaeology Report.

Documentation must be submitted even in cases where no historical archaeological evidence has been located during the course of the survey. This can be provided in the form of a short report. This report must include the project details, survey area and methodology, findings, and management recommendations.

Heritage Victoria’s Guidelines for Conducting Historical Archaeological Surveys provides details on what is required in surveying an area and documenting the findings. Any incomplete or inaccurate documentation will be returned for appropriate completion.

It should be noted that any disturbance to a historical archaeological site or artefact requires prior approval from the Executive Director of Heritage Victoria.

Kind regards,

Tim

Tim Scott | Heritage Officer (Archaeology) Heritage Victoria Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure
1 Spring Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000

T: 03 9288 3409 | Email: tim.scott@dpil.vic.gov.au

(Embedded image moved to file: pic29301.jpg) This office is located on the land of the Kulin Nations
(Embedded image moved to file: pic22363.jpg)
Appendix C – Site Card for Site H7921-0014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SITE NAME</strong></th>
<th>Churchill Island, ‘Sealer’s Site’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE NUMBER</strong></td>
<td>H7921-0014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE**
Stone foundations with possible hearth.

**SITE LOCATION (FULL A.M.G. COORDINATES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E (UTM EASTING)</th>
<th>N (UTM Northing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>547453</td>
<td>5739230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE TYPE**

- [ ] BUILDING
- [ ] STRUCTURE
- [ ] MACHINERY
- [ ] VEGETATION
- [ ] OTHER

**A.H.C. TYPE**

- [ ] 4-1-1

**CADAstral LOCATION**

- COUNTY: Moreton Bay
- PARISH: Phillip Island
- ALLOTMENT: 14
- BLOCK: 1168

**OWNERSHIP**

- [ ] CROWN
- [ ] PRIVATE

**OWNER OCCUPIER**

- D.E., Churchill Island

**ADDRESS**

- Newman

**POSTCODE**

- 3925

**PHONE NO.**

- 07/567214

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA**

- Westerway Bay

**ACCESS**

- UNRESTRICTED

**PRESENT USE**

- PARK, RESERVE

**CONDITION**

- RUINS

**INTEGRITY**

- DISTURBED

**PRESENT THREATS**

- STOCK, WEATHER EROSION, CONSERVATION & MAINTENANCE

**INFORMANTS**

- Carroll Smith, D.E. Head Range

**RECORDED BY**

- V. H. Tonna

**DATE**

- 29/9/91
SITE LOCATION SKETCH

SCALE 1:20

DIRECTIONS FOR RELOCATION

Follow through farmhouse area, first west of back boundary fence. Adjacent to south gate.

SITE SIGNIFICANCE

Originally described (1985) as a 'sealer's site'. Current survey (1991) suggests this is extremely unlikely.

RELEVANT SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS

Phillip Island Historical Society

LAND USE POLICIES

Rangers have policy of non-disturbance.
### HISTORIC SITE RECORDING SYSTEM

**SITE RECORD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE NAME</th>
<th>CHURCHILL 156 &quot;SEALERS SITE&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE NUMBER</td>
<td>7921 - 00X4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE DESCRIPTION**

Site consists of a line of foundation stones partly covered with grass. Area c. 21m x 9m. Heart (possible) on more 2 foundations in NW corner. Foundations form 'corners' in 2 areas in a 'line' in another. No associated artefacts located in back paddock area is covered with grass. Trees in area include Eucalyptus, Snagall & Pines. Apparently site was 'clear' when property was acquired c. 12 yrs ago.

**SITE FEATURES**

*Nil*

**RECORDED BY**

Karen Towrnov

**DATE**

29/3/91
Inventory of moveable objects

Prepared by Rohan Lamb
The primary focus of the following inventory of moveable objects at Churchill Island is the farm machinery collection. Also addressed are the collections of items associated with dairy farming, food processing and food storage, as well as items in the outbuildings, including the blacksmiths’ shed.

The inventory was prepared following a site visit in December 2014. Objects were inspected visually for key features to prepare a description of the item, along with recording any maker’s details and markings, and were photographed.

Where items had been catalogued by FOCIS, these have been referenced. FOCIS catalogue records were also consulted for details of provenance where known, along with assistance provided by Curator Christine Graydon, and volunteer Jeff Cole. For some items such as the oil engines it was possible to draw on manufacturer’s records to provide additional details which established approximate dates of manufacture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Two furrow plough</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Two furrow walking plough</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Under tree at front of Amess house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Manure spreader</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Manure or fertiliser spreader, missing wooden hopper</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Under tree at front of Amess house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Horse drawn walking cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Under tree at front of Amess house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Horse drawn walking cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Under tree at front of Amess house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>International Harvester Company, USA</td>
<td>After 1923</td>
<td>Mower, McCormick-Deering brand cast into body</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Garden bed to front of Amess house near cannon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of mower frame</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Garden bed front left of Amess house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Churchill Island Farm – Inventory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dray</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>c.1920s</td>
<td>Dray</td>
<td>Donated to FOCUS by F. Cameron, Ex Lukey property</td>
<td>Garden near half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Axle &amp; Wheels</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Axle and wheels</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Garden near half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hitch adaptor</td>
<td>Massey Harris Co. Ltd., Canada</td>
<td>c.1920s</td>
<td>Hitch adaptor for horse drawn implements to be used with a tractor</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Garden at rear of Amess house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Plough, stump jump</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 furrow stump jump plough, tractor or horse drawn</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Area behind shearing display building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Heavy Wagon</td>
<td>J. H. Bolden, Donald, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1920s</td>
<td>Heavy wagon suitable for wheat or wool. Hauled by Horses, bullocks or traction engine. See also item no.209 bag lifter which attaches to the side of the wagon. Maker's details from catalogue.</td>
<td>Donated by Morrish family, used at Minyip</td>
<td>Near Shearing display building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Plough, double farrow</td>
<td>Mr White, Lilydale</td>
<td>1880-1897</td>
<td>Double farrow plough, walking. White, Lilydale stamped into frame. White commenced business c.1880 and was declared insolvent in 1897.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Outside toilet block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultivator, 5 row, double tool bar, horse drawn</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Near driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Harrow" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Segment of diamond harrows</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Baler</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Baler" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker (possibly H. V. McKay Massey Harris Pty Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ram-type hay baler, belt driven</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Drag Scoop</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Drag Scoop" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drag scoop, metal bowl with wooden handles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Scoop, Silt</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Scoop" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaston Bros. Pty. Ltd., Kensington, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1920-30s</td>
<td>Horse or tractor drawn silt scoop. No makers identification found on scoop. Details from FOCIS catalogue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recovered from San Remo property, used locally for dam sinking and maintenance. From same place as item 153.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garden area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Wagon</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Wagon" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.1920s</td>
<td>Horse drawn wagon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donated by F. Cameron, ex Lukey property. Originally purchased by Lukey for working museum. Used at entrance to Lukey museum during 1980s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Near machinery sheds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Grader</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Grader" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.1920s-40s</td>
<td>Small horse or tractor drawn grader. Mouldboard has detached from grader. No markings to indicate maker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under trees south of Amess house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Windmill</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Windmill" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidney Williams &amp; Co. (Pty) Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>Comet brand windmill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used by Jeffery Bros. and later owners. Refurbished by BP Social club, 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paddock near dam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Potato digger</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Potato digger" /></td>
<td>Ransomes, Ipswich, England</td>
<td>c.1920s</td>
<td>Potato raising walking plough. Makers name cast into frame. Painted blue.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Plough, single furrow</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Plough, single furrow" /></td>
<td>Cockshutt Plough Co. Limited, Brantford, Canada</td>
<td>c.1920s</td>
<td>Single furrow metal beam walking plough. Scotch Dux model. Makers name and model cast into frame. Scotch Dux model was classed as a hillside plough recommended as a sod plough. Painted red.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Single furrow plough</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Single furrow plough" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single furrow metal beam walking plough. Painted green with silver mouldboard</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Hand tiller</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Hand tiller" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand tiller</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Hand hoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Hand hoe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Hand cultivator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Hand cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Segment of diamond pattern harrow</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Milk cart</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Milk cart" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulky used for milk delivery made up from components including Essex car wheels and axle.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No number</td>
<td>Milk/Cream Cans</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Milk/Cream Cans" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Various milk &amp; cream cans on milk cart. One can by Joyce, 4 gallons</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No number</td>
<td>Carriage Jack</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Carriage Jack" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage jack</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Seed drill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitchell &amp; Co., West Footscray, Victoria</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Seed drill. Maker’s details not sighted, details from sign on object</td>
<td>Used on McKindlay estate and various farms 1922 - 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Wagon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>On loan from Phillip Island Historical Society. <em>Not part of the Churchill collection</em></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Bag Lifter</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. H. Bolden, Donald, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bag lifter. Frame attaches to pivot point on side of wagon. Associated with wheat wagon (item no.159)</td>
<td>See item 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified item</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified item</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Manure Spreader</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manure spreader (missing hopper)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Roller mill</td>
<td><img src="145_Roller_mill" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>J. Buncle, Parkside Ironworks, North Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roller mill, belt driven. Cast nameplate on hopper, timber frame &amp; hopper.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Engine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-cylinder vertical spark-ignition stationary engine. Missing magneto, no makers markings</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Post drill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buffalo Forge Co., Buffalo, New York, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post drill, model no.612. Makers name cast into body of drill.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Grinder</td>
<td><img src="grinder.jpg" alt="Grinder" /></td>
<td>Wagner Bros., Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestal grinder, belt driven. Makers name cast into pedestal.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Blower</td>
<td><img src="blower.jpg" alt="Blower" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forge blower</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue no.</td>
<td>Blower</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forge blower, v-belt driven. Marked: “Australian Pressure Blower”</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Amess Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Grinding wheel</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grinding wheel in wooden frame, foot operated. Timber frame rebuilt.</td>
<td>Associated with Amess period on Churchill Island</td>
<td>Amess Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Corn Huller</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn huller. Legs have evidence of active woodborers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Amess Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Jack" /></td>
<td>Trewhella Bros., Trentham, Victoria</td>
<td>10 ton Monkey Jack. Typical used to remove stumps etc</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Amess Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orchard Fogger</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Orchard Fogger" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Orchard fogger, acetylene</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Amess Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various tools</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Various tools" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>The rear bench area in the Amess Barn contains numerous small hand tools. Items include drills, axes, blow lamps, a set of scales, a Babcock milk test (see item 169), a screw jack etc. Catalogue numbers on some items appear to duplicate other numbers.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Amess Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Shaft</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Shaft Image" /></td>
<td>Unknown make</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section of line shaft from a 3 stand shearing machine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Shearing stand</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Shearing Stand Image" /></td>
<td>Cooper Engineering Co., Mascot, NSW</td>
<td>After 1942</td>
<td>Portable sheep shearing stand. Powered by a single-cylinder spark ignition air-cooled engine. Cooper, type JM, 5/8 horsepower, serial no. JM6441, 1800 rpm. The type JM engine was introduced in 1942, and was copied from an American Johnson Iron Horse engine.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Wool Press</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Wool Press Image" /></td>
<td>Hugh Lennon, Spotswood, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1880-90s</td>
<td>Wool press, wood frame. Makers name on cast nameplate. Location on nameplate shown as Spottiswoode</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Winnowing equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand operated winnower. Item has evidence of active woodborers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Sulky</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulky. Seat in poor condition</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Wagonette</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wagonette</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Water Cart</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Furphy &amp; Sons, Shepparton, Victoria</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Water cart, horse drawn. 4 ft long barrel equivalent to 180 gallon capacity</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Super Spreader</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Super Spreader" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fertiliser spreader, horse drawn, wooden hopper with spreader at rear</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Butter worker</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Butter worker" /></td>
<td>T. Robinson &amp; Co. Ltd., Spotswood, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Butter worker, belt driven. Makers name painted on frame. “The Alexandra” model. Location marked as Spottiswoode</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Single furrow plough</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Single furrow plough" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-furrow walking plough</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Double furrow plough</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Double furrow plough" /></td>
<td>Cockshutt Plough Co. Limited, Brantford, Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double-furrow walking plough</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Reaper binder</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Reaper binder" /></td>
<td>H. V. McKay Massey Harris Pty Ltd., Sunshine, Victoria</td>
<td>Reaper-binder</td>
<td>Reaper binder</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Sled</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Sled" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Horse drawn sled</td>
<td>Horse drawn sled</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking cultivator</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Walking cultivator" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Horse drawn</td>
<td>Horse drawn walking cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Pole &amp; Swingle tree</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Pole &amp; Swingle tree" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Pole &amp; swingle tree</td>
<td>Pole &amp; swingle tree</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Swingle tree</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Swingle tree" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Swingle tree</td>
<td>Swingle tree</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Shave plough</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Shave plough" /></td>
<td>D. &amp; W. Chandler, Fitzroy, Victoria</td>
<td>1930-40s</td>
<td>Shave single furrow disc plough</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Plough, single furrow</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Plough, single furrow" /></td>
<td>Makers details obscured by beam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wooden beam, single furrow walking plough. Maker’s name obscured by wood beam</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cultivator" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring tine riding cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Hay rake</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Hay rake" /></td>
<td>Bamfords Ltd., Uttoxeter, England</td>
<td>c.1940s-50s</td>
<td>Side delivery hay rake</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Dump Hay Rake</td>
<td>Unknown Maker</td>
<td>Unknown Maker</td>
<td>Dump hay rake</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Bag hanger</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Bag hanger. Appear to be a home made item using an old wheel for the stand base.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Potato digger</td>
<td>Martin’s Cultivator Co. Ltd., Stamford, England</td>
<td>After 1911</td>
<td>Potato digger, horse or tractor drawn.</td>
<td>Koo Wee Rup &amp; Phillip Island, c.1915-1930s</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>International Harvester Co., USA</td>
<td>Mower, towed. McCormick-Deering, no.7 size</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Buck rake</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Buck rake</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Pole &amp; swingle tree</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Pole &amp; Swingle tree</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Seed drill</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Seed Drill" /></td>
<td>Unidentified maker (possibly Mitchell &amp; Co., West Footscray, Victoria, H. V. McKay, or Massey-Harris)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seed drill</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Baler</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Baler" /></td>
<td>H. V. McKay Massey Harris Pty. Ltd., Sunshine, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1940s</td>
<td>Ram type hay baler, oil engine driven. Fitted with H. V. McKay Massey Harris Pty. Ltd., Sundial single-cylinder horizontal spark-ignition engine, 4 hp, Type A. Engine nameplate missing.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Water Pump</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Water Pump" /></td>
<td>Forrers Pty. Ltd., Ipswich, Queensland</td>
<td>c.1950-60s</td>
<td>Geared, self-oiling enclosed reciprocating power pump. 2&quot; bore x 3½&quot; stroke, Name &amp; size cast into pump body. Associated with horseworks (item 190)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Horseworks</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Horseworks" /></td>
<td>T. Robinson &amp; Co., Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1880s</td>
<td>One horse horseworks. No.1 size. Name cast into frame. Associated with Forrers water pump (item 278) for display purposes</td>
<td>Purchased from M. Weatherhead, Tynong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Post Drill</td>
<td>Champion Blower &amp; Forge Company, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post drill (currently on a bench). Makers name cast into body of drill.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Workshop Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Engine</td>
<td>![Engine photo](249x364 to 444x363)</td>
<td>Underwood Motor Manufacturing Co., Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1950</td>
<td>Single-cylinder vertical spark-ignition internal combustion stationary engine, hopper cooled. The Underwood company were only in business between c.1946 and the mid 1950s.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Roller Mill</td>
<td>![Roller Mill photo](249x364 to 444x363)</td>
<td>Jas. Smith Pty. Ltd., Ballarat, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roller mill, belt driven. Hopper not shown in photo. Smith, Ballarat cast into body.</td>
<td>Recent donation used on Phillip Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>Massey Harris Co. Ltd., Canada</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mower, towed. Massey Harris brand. Further research required to confirm made in Canada.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Workshop Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Grinding Stone</td>
<td>Unknown make</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grinding stone, foot operated</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Workshop Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Grinding Stone</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grinding stone mounted on steel frame. Markings on sides of wheel suggest potential alternative use. Frame most likely for display purposes only.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Outside Workshop building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Header- Harvester</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Header Harvester" /></td>
<td>Massey Harris Co. Ltd., Canada</td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Header harvester, powered by tractor PTO. Massey-Harris brand. Header section not attached, and is located nearby at side of driveway. Further research required to confirm made in Canada.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two furrow plough</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Two Furrow Plough" /></td>
<td>D. Harvey, Box Hill, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two furrow walking plough (mould boards missing)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shave disc plough</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Shave Disc Plough" /></td>
<td>D. &amp; W. Chandler, Fitzroy, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shave disc plough, two disc (discs missing)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shave disc plough</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Shave Disc Plough" /></td>
<td>D. &amp; W. Chandler, Fitzroy, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shave disc plough, single disc</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaff cutter</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Chaff cutter" /></td>
<td>J. Buncle, Parkside Ironworks, North Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>17 December 2014</td>
<td>Chaff cutter, belt driven. Remains only – main shaft &amp; cutter wheel</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dray</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Dray" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dray</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Mower" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of a mower</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaper-binder</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Reaper-binder" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of reaper-binder</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Garden barrow</td>
<td>![Image](249x598 to 451x749)</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flat tray garden barrow</td>
<td>Thought to relate to Amess period, found in Amess barn 1980.</td>
<td>Outside Roger’s cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Milk tester</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Milk tester" /></td>
<td>Unknown, possibly Cornish, Curtis &amp; Green Manufacturing Co., Wisconsin, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Babcock milk tester. Marked: &quot;Babcock Official Milk Tester&quot;. Missing 4 x metal cups &amp; glass inserts</td>
<td>May be McKinley estate. Possibly used by Harry Jenkins when Churchill Island operating as a dairy</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Cream separator" /></td>
<td>Alfa Laval, Sweden</td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated, Viola IV model.</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Cream separator" /></td>
<td>International Harvester Company, USA</td>
<td>c.1940s</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated, pedestal mounted. McCormick-Deering brand. Bowl missing</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baltic Separator Co., Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>c.1930</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated. Baltic NW 22 on cover</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minion</td>
<td>c.1930-50s</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated. Base only</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Butter churn</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>E. Cherry &amp; Sons, Gisborne, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1935</td>
<td>Butter churn</td>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Butter worker</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>E. Cherry &amp; Sons, Gisborne, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Butter worker, hand operated. E. Cherry &amp; Sons, size no.2, stencilled on side. Cherry’s patent. 30 lb capacity</td>
<td>Used Churchill Island, from Patton’s woolshed, 1980.</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Cheese press</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>J. &amp; T. Young, Ayr, Scotland</td>
<td>1870-80s</td>
<td>Cheese press. Name cast into base. J. &amp; T. Young. J &amp; T. Young appear to have been in business between the 1860s until 1880s.</td>
<td>Early item apparently associated with Churchill Island, Amess period, Used 1880s to 1930s.</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue</td>
<td>Meat safes</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Three examples of meat safes, no makers known.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue</td>
<td>Ice chest</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Ice chest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue</td>
<td>Milk Cans</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Milk can, F. H. Jenkins, Churchill Island on attached pate. Also unmarked black milk can</td>
<td>Associated with Jenkins period from 1936 until 1960s</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anvil</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Anvil" /></td>
<td>Soderfors, Sweden</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
<td>Blacksmith's anvil</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Bellows" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td>Bellows for forge, hand operated</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Bellows" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Drill</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Post Drill" /></td>
<td>Buffalo Forge Co., Buffalo, New York, USA</td>
<td>Post drill, model no.615</td>
<td>Post drill, model no.615</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Forge – fixed</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Forge fixed" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker (likely to have been fabricated on site – modern addition)</td>
<td>Fixed forge, air supplied by hand operated bellows</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Forge - portable</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Forge portable" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker, most likely USA origin</td>
<td>Portable forge, hand operated. Hood later addition</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Vice</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Vice" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Blacksmith's leg vice</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Various hand tools</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Various tools" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Various tongs, dies, hammers, cropping shears, etc</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Horse Shoes</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Horse shoes" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Display of various horse shoes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Winnower</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand operated winnower. Item has evidence of active woodborers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Sulky</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulky. Seat in poor condition</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Wagonette</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wagonette</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Water Cart</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Furphy &amp; Sons, Shepparton, Victoria</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Water cart, horse drawn. 4 ft long barrel equivalent to 180 gallon capacity</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Super Spreader</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fertiliser spreader, horse drawn, wooden hopper with spreader at rear</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Single furrow plough</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-furrow walking plough</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Double furrow plough</td>
<td>Cockshutt Plough Co. Limited, Brantford, Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double-furrow walking plough</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Reaper binder</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>H. V. McKay Massey Harris Pty Ltd., Sunshine, Victoria</td>
<td>Reaper-binder</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Sled</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Horse drawn sled</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking cultivator</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horse drawn walking cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Pole &amp; Swingle tree</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Pole &amp; swingle tree</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Swingle tree</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Swingle tree</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Shave plough</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Shave plough" /></td>
<td>D. &amp; W. Chandler, Fitzroy, Victoria</td>
<td>1930-40s</td>
<td>Shave single furrow disc plough</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Plough, single furrow</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Plough, single furrow" /></td>
<td>Makers details obscured by beam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wooden beam, single furrow walking plough. Maker’s name obscured by wood beam</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cultivator" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring tine riding cultivator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Hay rake</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Hay rake" /></td>
<td>Bamfords Ltd., Uttoxeter, England</td>
<td>c.1940s-50s</td>
<td>Side delivery hay rake</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Dump Hay Rake</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown Maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dump hay rake</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Bag hanger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bag hanger. Appear to be a home made item using an old wheel for the stand base.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Potato digger</td>
<td>Martin's Cultivator Co. Ltd., Stamford, England</td>
<td>After 1911</td>
<td>Potato digger, horse or tractor drawn.</td>
<td>Koo Wee Rup &amp; Phillip Island, c.1915-1930</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>International Harvester Co., USA</td>
<td>Mower, towed. McCormick-Deering, no.7 size</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Buck rake</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buck rake</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Pole &amp; swingle tree</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pole &amp; Swingle tree</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Machinery Shed 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Seed drill</td>
<td>Unidentified maker (possibly Mitchell &amp; Co., West Footscray, Victoria, H. V. McKay, or Massey-Harris)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seed drill</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Horse Stables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Baler</td>
<td>H. V. McKay Massey Harris Pty. Ltd., Sunshine, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1940s</td>
<td>Ram type hay baler, oil engine driven. Fitted with H. V. McKay Massey Harris Pty. Ltd., Sunshine, Victoria</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Horse Stables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Water Pump</td>
<td>Forrers Pty. Ltd., Ipswich, Queensland</td>
<td>c.1950-60s</td>
<td>Geared, self-oiling enclosed reciprocating power pump. 2” bore x 3½” stroke, Name &amp; size cast into pump body, Associated with horseworks (item 190)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Horseworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Horseworks</td>
<td>T. Robinson &amp; Co., Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1880s</td>
<td>One horse horseworks. No.1 size. Name cast into frame. Associated with Forrers water pump (item 278) for display purposes</td>
<td>Purchased from M. Weatherhead, Tynong.</td>
<td>Horseworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Post Drill</td>
<td>Champion Blower &amp; Forge Company, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post drill (currently on a bench). Makers name cast into body of drill.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Workshop Shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Engine</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Underwood Motor Manufacturing Co., Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1950</td>
<td>Single-cylinder vertical spark-ignition internal combustion stationary engine, hopper cooled. The Underwood company were only in business between c.1946 and the mid 1950s.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Workshop Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Roller Mill</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Jas. Smith Pty. Ltd., Ballarat, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roller mill, belt driven. Hopper not shown in photo. Smith, Ballarat cast into body.</td>
<td>Recent donation used on Phillip Island</td>
<td>Workshop Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Mower Photo" /></td>
<td>Massey Harris Co. Ltd., Canada</td>
<td>Mower, towed. Massey Harris brand. Further research required to confirm made in Canada.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Workshop Shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Grinding Stone</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Grinding Stone Photo" /></td>
<td>Unknown make</td>
<td>Grinding stone, foot operated</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Workshop Shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Grinding Stone</td>
<td><img src="" alt="Grinding Stone Photo" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Grinding stone mounted on steel frame. Markings on sides of wheel suggest potential alternative use. Frame most likely for display purposes only.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Outside Workshop building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Header-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Harvester</strong></td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Header harvester, powered by tractor PTO. Massey-Harris brand. Header section not attached, and is located nearby at side of driveway. Further research required to confirm made in Canada.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Near visitor centre entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car Park &amp; Driveway Area (all items uncatalogued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Two furrow</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>plough</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two furrow walking plough (mould boards missing)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Next to driveway to visitors car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Shave disc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>plough</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shave disc plough, two disc (discs missing)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Near visitors car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Shave disc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>plough</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shave disc plough, single disc</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Near visitors car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaff cutter</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Chaff cutter" /></td>
<td>J. Buncle, Parkside Ironworks, North Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>Chaff cutter, belt driven. Remains only – main shaft &amp; cutter wheel</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Garden bed near visitors centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dray</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Dray" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Dray</td>
<td>Dray</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Garden bed near visitors centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mower</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Mower" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Remains of a mower</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Garden bed near visitors centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaper-binder</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Reaper-binder" /></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Remains of reaper-binder</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Next to visitors car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Garden barrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Flat tray garden barrow</td>
<td>Thought to relate to Amess period, found in Amess barn 1980.</td>
<td>Outside Roger's cottage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Milk tester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown, possibly Cornish, Curtis &amp; Green Manufacturing Co., Wisconsin, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Babcock milk tester. Marked: Babcock Official Milk Tester. Missing 4 x metal cups &amp; glass inserts</td>
<td>May be McKinley estate. Possibly used by Harry Jenkins when Churchill Island operating as a dairy</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfa Laval, Sweden</td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated, Viola IV model.</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Harvester Company, USA</td>
<td>c.1940s</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated, pedestal mounted. McCormick-Deering brand. Bowl missing</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baltic Separator Co., Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>c.1930</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated. Baltic NW 22 on cover</td>
<td>Gippsland area</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Cream separator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minion</td>
<td>c.1930-50s</td>
<td>Cream separator, hand operated. Base only</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Butter churn</td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Cherry &amp; Sons, Gisborne, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1935</td>
<td>Butter churn</td>
<td>Churchill Island</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Butter worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Cherry &amp; Sons, Gisborne, Victoria</td>
<td>c.1930s</td>
<td>Butter worker, hand operated. E. Cherry &amp; Sons, size no.2, stencilled on side. Cherry’s patent. 30 lb capacity</td>
<td>Used Churchill Island, from Patton’s woolshed, 1980.</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Cheese press</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. &amp; T. Young, Ayr, Scotland</td>
<td>1870-80s</td>
<td>Cheese press. Name cast into base. J. &amp; T. Young appear to have been in business between the 1860s until 1880s.</td>
<td>Early item apparently associated with Churchill Island, Amess period, Used 1880s to 1930s.</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Meat safes</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Three examples of meat safes, no makers known.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Ice chest</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Ice chest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No catalogue number</td>
<td>Milk Cans</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>C.1930s</td>
<td>Milk can, F. H. Jenkins, Churchill Island on attached pate. Also unmarked black milk can</td>
<td>Associated with Jenkins period from 1936 until 1960s</td>
<td>Half cellar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anvil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soderfors, Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blacksmith's anvil</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bellows for forge, hand operated</td>
<td>This item is on loan from the Coal Creek Community Park and Museum</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Drill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buffalo Forge Co., Buffalo, New York, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post drill, model no.615</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith's Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Forge – fixed</td>
<td>Unknown maker (likely to have been fabricated on site – modern addition))</td>
<td>Fixed forge. This item is for show only. The forge when operated uses a reverse vacuum cleaner.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Forge - portable</td>
<td>Unknown maker, most likely USA origin</td>
<td>Portable forge, hand operated. Hood later addition</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Vice</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s leg vice</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Various hand tools</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Various tongs, dies, hammers, cropping shears, etc</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncatalogued</td>
<td>Horse Shoes</td>
<td>Unknown maker</td>
<td>Display of various horse shoes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Blacksmith’s Shed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>