LINDEMAN GREAT BARRIER REEF RESORT PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

APPENDIX V - NON-INDIGENOUS CULTURAL HERITAGE REPORT

Addendum: This EIS was initially prepared assuming that the safe harbour was to be part of the Lindeman Great Barrier Reef Resort Project. With the commencement of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority's (GBRMPA) Dredging Coral Reef Habitat Policy (2016), further impacts on Great Barrier Reef coral reef habitats from yet more bleaching, and the recent impacts from Tropical Cyclone Debbie, the proponent no longer seeks assessment and approval to construct a safe harbour at Lindeman Island. Instead the proponent seeks assessment and approval for upgrades to the existing jetty and additional moorings in sheltered locations around the island to enable the resort's marine craft to obtain safe shelter under a range of wind and wave conditions. Accordingly, remaining references to, and images of, a safe harbour on various figures and maps in the EIS are no longer current.

Lindeman Island Redevelopment

Non-Indigenous Cultural Heritage Report Cardno February 2016







Document Verification				
Project	Lindeman Island Redevelopment Project EIS			
Project Number	15069C			
Document Title	Lindeman Island Redevelopment NICH Technical Report			
File Location	SharePoint/Lindeman Island/Reporting			
Client	Cardno			

Version history				
Revision	Date	Nature of revision	Prepared by	Authorised by
0	15/12/2015	Draft report	SW; KT	РН
1	18/02/2016	Revised Report	SW	-
2				



Lindeman Island Redevelopment | i

Contents

1	Introduction1			
1.1	Project Area1			
1.2	Purpose of the Study2			
1.3	Methodology2			
1.4	Dates and Duration of the Work 2			
1.5	Personnel2			
2	Heritage Framework			
2.1	National Legislation			
	2.1.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999			
	2.1.2 Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976			
	2.1.3 Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975			
2.2	State Legislation			
2.3	Local Legislation 4			
2.4	Non-Statutory Framework			
	2.4.1 Register of the National Estate – Archive			
	2.4.2 Queensland National Trust 4			
	2.4.3 Historic Mines			
	2.4.4 State Wide Survey			
2.5	Guidelines and Charters5			
	2.5.1 Burra Charter			
	2.5.2 Queensland Heritage Council Guidelines			
	2.5.3 Archaeological Research Potential			
3	History and Context			
3.1	Results of Heritage Searches7			
	3.1.1 Summary of Register Searches			
3.2	Previous Studies			
3.3	Historic Summary			
	3.3.1 Exploring and Early Colonisation			
	3.3.2 Grazing			
	3.3.3 Tourism			
4	Cultural Heritage Survey			
4.1	Field Survey Methodology14			
	4.1.1 Field Sampling Strategy			
4.2	Consultation			
4.3	Constraints			
4.4	Main Features in the Project Area14			



4.5	5 Survey Outcomes	15
	4.5.1 Site One: Airstrips	
	4.5.2 Nicholson's Residence	
	4.5.3 The Resort Complex	
	4.5.4 Summary of Sites	
	4.5.5 Archaeological Potential	
5	Significance Assessment	24
5.1	1 Heritage Significance Criteria	
5.2	2 Significance Assessment	
	5.2.1 Significance of the Project Area	
	5.2.2 Significance of Individual Sites	
	5.2.3 Conclusion	
6	Proposed Development	27
6.1	1 Nature of the Proposed Development	
6.2	2 Impact Assessment	
	6.2.1 Impact Criteria	
	6.2.2 Project Impact on NICH	
7	Recommendations	
7.1	1 Recording of Impacted Sites	
7.2	2 NICH Management across the Project Area	
Refer	eferences Cited	
Appe	ppendix	
	Appendix A – Incidental Finds Procedure	



List of Figures

Figure 1: Location of Lindeman Island (Adapted from Google Earth Pro 2015) 1	L
Figure 2: Adderton 1898 home with residence on left and woolshed and yards on right. Photo taken ir 1923 (Source Blackwood 1997, p. 131)	
Figure 3: Tents at Home Beach 1928 (SLQ)10)
Figure 4: Female bathers on the beach at Lindeman Island, 1928 (SLQ) 10)
Figure 5: West side of Home Beach 1931 (QSA ID966)11	L
Figure 6: Home Beach 1941 (QGTB brochure 1941) 11	L
Figure 7: Dining room c. 1945 (JOL) 12	2
Figure 8: Bungalows c 1947 (JOL)12	2
Figure 9: Accommodation c. 1960 (JOL) 12	2
Figure 10: Lindeman Island Resort 1977 (NAA A6135,K20/7/77/53)	3
Figure 11: 1957 airstrip	5
Figure 12: Light aircraft on 1957 airstrip15	5
Figure 13: Airstrips at Lindeman Island (Google Earth Pro)	5
Figure 14: View to house from the north	5
Figure 15: Northern elevation	5
Figure 16: Kitchen	5
Figure 17: Kitchen	5
Figure 18: Entry room	5
Figure 19: Fireplace	7
Figure 20: Entry to sunroom17	7
Figure 21: French doors	7
Figure 22: Bedroom 1	7
Figure 23: West exterior	7
Figure 24: West exterior	7
Figure 25: Hall	7
Figure 26: Bedroom 2	7
Figure 27: Dilapidated exterior	7
Figure 28: Back door	3
Figure 29: East side of the house	3
Figure 30: Missing soffits	3
Figure 31: Front door	3
Figure 32: Garden and rock wall	3
Figure 33: Retaining wall	3
Figure 34: Nicholson's Residence (Google Earth Pro))



Figure 35: View of the former resort from the air	19
Figure 36: View from former resort manager's residence.	19
Figure 37: Caretaker's residence	20
Figure 38: Entry to former reception.	20
Figure 39: Accommodation blocks from the road	20
Figure 40: Accommodation blocks from the pool	20
Figure 41: Former beachside pool at resort	20
Figure 42: Boat ramp, entry to resort area	20
Figure 43: Jetty	20
Figure 44: Accommodation blocks near golf course	20
Figure 45: Tennis courts	21
Figure 46: Staff accommodation.	21
Figure 47: Dam at the golf course	21
Figure 48: Golf course	21
Figure 49: Retaining walls, gardens and paved road	21
Figure 50: Path by the beach	21
Figure 51: View from the golf course	21
Figure 52: Beach in front of main resort area.	21
Figure 53: Lindeman Island sites, the resort boundary is shaded in red (Google Earth Pro)	22
Figure 54: Proposed development (DBI 2016).	28

List of Tables

Table 1: Results of Heritage Searches	7
Table 2: Sites identified in project area (WGS84/UTM Zone 55 S).	22
Table 3: Relative Significance Criteria (Converge 2015)	24
Table 4: Significance of the project area	25
Table 5: Significance Assessment for Individual Sites.	26
Table 6: Likelihood of potential impact on NICH sites.	29
Table 7: Consequence of potential impact on NICH sites.	29
Table 8: Risk Assessment for NICH sites	30
Table 9: Impact assessment	30



Abbreviations

Term	Abbreviation
Australian Heritage Council	AHC
Australian Heritage Council Act 2003	AHC Act
Commonwealth Heritage List	CHL
Converge Heritage + Community	Converge
Department of Environment and Heritage Protection	EHP
Department of the Environment (Federal)	DE
Department of Environment and Resource Management (former)	DERM
Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999	EPBC Act
Ground Integrity	GI
Global Positioning System	GPS
Ground Surface Visibility	GSV
Initial Advice Statement	IAS
Integrated Development Assessment System	IDAS
John Oxley Library	JOL
Local Heritage Register	LHR
Non-Indigenous Cultural Heritage	NICH
Queensland Government Tourist Bureau	QGTB
Queensland Heritage Act 1992	QHA
Queensland Heritage Council	QHC
Queensland Heritage Register	QHR
Queensland State Archives	QSA
Register of the National Estate	RNE
Sustainable Planning Act 2009	SPA
Terms of Reference	ToR
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	UNESCO
World Heritage List	WHL



1 Introduction

White Horse Australia Lindeman Pty Ltd purchased the Lindeman Island resort in late 2011 and have been exploring a wide range of potential re-development scenarios for the island after the existing resort was closed after the devastation of cyclone Yasi in 2012. This Non-Indigenous Cultural Heritage (NICH) technical report has been prepared to meet the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed development.

1.1 Project Area

The project area is within the existing resort grounds located on the south side of Lindeman Island within the Whitsunday Island Group near Proserpine in North Queensland. The project area includes five key lots: Lot 2 on Crown Plan CP858366 (containing the existing resort, airstrip allotment and part of the existing golf course), Lots B, C and D on HR2029 (being the balance of the golf course and undeveloped land) and Lot 8 HR1954. The total proposed site area is approximately 145 hectares, including a proposed new sea bed for lease for the safe harbour and glamping facilities.



Figure 1: Location of Lindeman Island (Adapted from Google Earth Pro 2015).



1.2 Purpose of the Study

This report presents the results of the NICH survey and includes:

- A summary of the history and environment of the areas impacted by the proposed project.
- The results of the NICH field assessment.
- The nature of the NICH significance of places and areas affected by the proposed project and the potential impacts of the project in relation to this significance.
- Specific recommendations for the management and protection of potential NICH sites and areas.

This assessment and its recommendations address the project's Terms of Reference (ToR) and are intended to guide the management of NICH matters.

1.3 Methodology

The methodology employed for the project was developed to meet the project's ToR for NICH, as well as following best practice and legislative framework. A desktop assessment was undertaken to determine the existence, extent and probable levels of significance of any places of NICH significance likely to be located within the project area. This assessment comprised searches of statutory and non-statutory registers and databases, and a review of existing published and unpublished reports – refer Section 3, History and Context. The results of the desktop review informed the assessment provided in this report.

Details relating to field methodology are provided in Section 4. Criteria used for the significance assessment is provided in Section 5. The results from the significance assessment informed the impact assessment in Section 6, Proposed Development. Recommendations and management strategies for the management of identified and potential NICH in the project area are provided in Section 7, Recommendations.

1.4 Dates and Duration of the Work

Converge was engaged by Cardno to undertake the NICH assessment for the project in March 2015. Research for the desktop assessment commenced after commission and the field assessment was subsequently undertaken on 27 October 2015. The draft NICH technical report was completed in December 2015 and revised in February 2016.

1.5 Personnel

Karen Townrow (Senior Archaeologist) prepared the contextual background of the project area. Samantha Winnubst (Cultural Heritage Consultant) and Dr Jim Smith (Senior Archaeologist) undertook the field assessment and prepared this report.



2 Heritage Framework

A number of national, state and local Acts and regulations are relevant to this NICH assessment. Knowledge of heritage frameworks is essential when assessing sites, places or items of NICH significance. Searches of relevant statutory heritage registers associated with national, state and local legislation were undertaken for this study (refer to Section 3.1 for the results). Places included on these registers possess an established level of significance. However, the absence of a place on these registers does not demonstrate that it is not significant, as the registers are not comprehensive. Values can also change and evolve and places may become significant as a result.

2.1 National Legislation

2.1.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999

The *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC) is the key national heritage legislation and is administered by the Commonwealth Department of the Environment, (DE). This Act provides a number of statutory and legislative controls for heritage places. Places of world and national heritage value are located on the World Heritage List (WHL) and National Heritage List (NHL) respectively.

2.1.2 Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976

The *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976* is federal legislation that is jointly administered by the Commonwealth and the States. The legislation provides protection for all shipwrecks and associated artefacts that are more than 75 years old. Wreck sites can be used for recreational purposes such as diving, but no artefacts can be removed from a wreck and the wreck itself cannot be removed or destroyed unless a permit has been obtained.

2.1.3 Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975

The Great Barrier Reef Region Strategic Assessment and the *Whitsundays Plan of Management 1998* prepared in accordance with the *Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975*, identifies a range of cultural heritage values that have the potential to provide evidence of early European occupation of the islands. This includes evidence of early exploration and industry inclusive of grazing and timber getting activities as well as evidence of early tourism development. An assessment of these values has been included in this survey and related desktop research for the NICH technical report and, where relevant, the recommendations of the Whitsundays Plan of Management have been considered within the development of strategies for the management of NICH within the context of the project.

2.2 State Legislation

Places of State heritage significance in Queensland are managed under the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* (QHA). The Act provides for the establishment of the Queensland Heritage Council (QHC) and the Queensland Heritage Register (QHR), which lists places of cultural heritage significance to Queensland and regulates development of registered places. Under the provisions of the Act, any development of a place listed on the QHR must be carried out in accordance with the Act. A place may be entered in the register if it satisfies one or more of the assessment criteria under Section 35 (1) of this Act.

The Act also applies to potential archaeological places:

• Under section 60, a place may be considered to be an 'archaeological place' if not registered as a State heritage place and demonstrates 'potential to contain an archaeological artefact that is an



important source of information about Queensland's history' (s. 60 (b)). Archaeological places can be entered onto the QHR if they meet those criteria.

- Section 89 requires a person to advise the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Environment and Heritage Protection (EHP) of an archaeological artefact that is an important source of information about an aspect of Queensland's history. This advice must be given as soon as practicable after the person discovers the item.
- Section 90 stipulates that it is an offence to interfere with an archaeological artefact once notice has been given of the artefact to the Chief Executive Officer.

2.3 Local Legislation

Local heritage places are managed under Part 11 of the QHA, local planning schemes and the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* (SPA). It is mandatory for local government to have a Local Heritage Register (LHR). The QHA provides a process for establishing and nominating places to a LHR. Specific criteria must be met to nominate a place to the LHR and these include:

- Enough information to identify the location and boundaries of the place.
- A statement about the cultural heritage significance of the place.

Following nomination to the LHR the IDAS Code (contained in the *Queensland Heritage Regulation 2003*) and any relevant planning scheme provisions apply. The project area is located within the local government area of Mackay Regional Council, therefore the relevant planning scheme is the *Consolidated Mackay City Planning Scheme 2007*.

2.4 Non-Statutory Framework

There are other sources of heritage places or historic sites that are not listed on statutory registers. These places are not afforded legislative protection. Nonetheless, places identified during these searches contribute to a better understanding of the project area and often identify places that have been overlooked for entry on statutory heritage registers. This is particularly important when considering the regulations of the QHA with regard to archaeological places.

2.4.1 Register of the National Estate – Archive

The Australian Heritage Council Act 2003 manages the Register of the National Estate - Archive (RNE). The Register was frozen in 2007 and from February 2012 ceased to exist as a statutory register. The RNE remains an archive of information for more than 13,000 places across Australia, many of which are of local and state significance, and is therefore considered in this report.

2.4.2 Queensland National Trust

The register of the Queensland National Trust (QNT) was searched for the project. The QNT is the Queensland branch of the National Trust of Australia, which is a community based, non-government organisation that maintains a non-statutory register of heritage places. The listing of a place on the QNT register, known as 'classification', has no legal force; however it is widely recognised as an authoritative statement of the cultural significance of a place.

2.4.3 Historic Mines

The Queensland Department of (formerly Department of Mining and Safety) maintains the Interactive mapping dataset within the Queensland Globe dataset. This enables the user to search and display mining tenure and exploration information. In particular, it is possible to search and display historic mining leases. The information is generally limited to the last 100 years and therefore excludes mining



activity in the nineteenth century. However, it provides some ability to determine the location of historic mining leases and potential mines that are located in the project area.

2.4.4 State Wide Survey

In 2006, the former Department of Environment and Resource Management's (DERM, now EHP) Heritage Branch launched a state wide heritage survey of historic sites in Queensland. The pilot study was carried out in the former Mackay/Whitsunday region, and heritage officers located in the DERM Rockhampton office identified a range of heritage places in accordance with a thematic framework prepared by Queensland historian Thom Blake (Blake, 2005).

Although the main aim of the study was to identify places of potential state significance, DERM heritage officers conducted community consultation sessions to generate information about a range of heritage places across the region. Staff also undertook archival and historical research and entered information gathered about specific places into DERM's database. Places were categorised into levels of significance from potential state significance to not significant or nor located.

2.5 Guidelines and Charters

This section provides details of the relevant guidelines and charters that are applicable to heritage practice in Australia. These key documents include the Burra Charter and the Queensland Heritage Council Guidelines, and are often used to assist practitioners in determining the heritage value of a place.

2.5.1 Burra Charter

The Burra Charter of Australia ICOMOS is the leading guideline for heritage practitioners and provides guidance for the conservation and management of significant places. It defines cultural significance as "aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present and future generations" and goes onto state "cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects" (Australia ICOMOS. 1997). It outlines a specific methodology/ process for assessing sites.

2.5.2 Queensland Heritage Council Guidelines

The Queensland Heritage Council provides guidelines to assist in assessing which level of cultural heritage significance is applicable to a site. These guidelines provide the following definitions:

A place is of local cultural heritage significance if its heritage values are of a purely localised nature and do not contribute significantly to our understanding of the wider pattern and evolution of Queensland's history and heritage...A place is of state cultural heritage significance if its heritage values contribute to our understanding of the wider pattern and evolution of Queensland's history and heritage. This includes places that contribute significantly to our understanding of the regional pattern and development of Queensland (2006:5).

2.5.3 Archaeological Research Potential

The heritage significance of archaeological relics within the project area was considered according to their potential ability to contribute to our understanding of the culture and history of the nation, state and local area, and the site itself. On the whole, more intact deposits and archaeological resources that can be used to address important research questions, or which can reveal information about little known aspects of history, will have the highest heritage significance. This is a matter that has been considered in an influential paper by Bickford and Sullivan (1984). They note that archaeological



significance has long been accepted elsewhere in the world as being linked directly to scientific research value:

A site or resource is said to be scientifically significant when its further study may be expected to help answer questions. That is scientific significance is defined as research potential.

This is a concept that has been extended by Bickford and Sullivan in the context of Australian archaeology and refined to the following three questions which can be used as a guide for assessing the significance of an archaeological site or resource within a relative framework:

- Can the site contribute knowledge which no other resource can?
- Can the site contribute knowledge which no other site can?
- Is this knowledge relevant to general questions about human history or other substantive questions relating to Australian history, or does it contribute to other major research questions?



3 History and Context

This section provides the NICH search results and a brief history of the project area in the context of the broader development of Lindeman Island. This section is not intended to be a complete history of Lindeman Island. It is based on a review of available primary and secondary sources and is intended to provide context for the identification and assessment of NICH sites, places and features within or nearby the project area, in order to properly assess their significance and the impact of any works on them. It includes a review of the 'Great Barrier Reef Region Strategic Assessment Report' (GBRMPA 2014) to meet the TOR for NICH.

3.1 Results of Heritage Searches

Table 1 presents the results of the NICH searches undertaken for the project.

Heritage Register or	Search Results		
Database			
World Heritage List	No NICH sites on the WHL were identified in the project area. Lindeman Island is located within the Great Barrier Reef, which is listed on the WHL (ID# 105060), however the values in the project area are for natural heritage.		
National Heritage List	No NICH sites on the NHL were identified in the project area. Lindeman Island is located within the Great Barrier Reef, which is listed on the NHL (ID# 105709), however the values in the project area are for natural heritage.		
Commonwealth Heritage List	No NICH sites on the CHL were identified in the project area. Lindeman Island is located within the Great Barrier Reef, which is listed on the CHL (ID# 105573), however the values in the project area are for natural heritage.		
Register of the National Estate	No NICH sites on the (former) RNE were identified in the project area. Lindeman Island is located within the Great Barrier Reef, which is listed on the former RNE (ID# 8320 and ID# 103284), however the values in the project area are for natural heritage.		
Queensland Heritage Register	No NICH sites on the QHR were identified in the project area.		
Australian National Shipwreck Database	No shipwrecks, aircraft or other maritime cultural heritage was identified in the close vicinity of Lindeman Island.		
Local Heritage Register	No NICH local heritage sites were identified in the project area.		
Queensland National Trust Register	No NICH sites on the QNT register were identified in the project area.		
Queensland Globe	No NICH sites on the Queensland Globe dataset were identified in the project area.		
State Wide Survey	No NICH were identified within the project area however one site was located on Lindeman Island, identified as careening poles located within Boat Port on the north western side Lindeman Island. Assessed as not being of state significance but probably of local significance.		
Great Barrier Reef Region Strategic Assessment Report 2014	The report considers the types of historic heritage values in the Great Barrier Reef including WWII features, light stations, sites associated with early exploration and shipwrecks for instance. A review of the report and the above registers found that no historic sites are located in the project area.		

Table 1: Results of Heritage Searches



3.1.1 Summary of Register Searches

Lindeman Island is located within the Great Barrier Reef, which as noted above is listed on the WHL, NHL, former RNE and CHL for it natural heritage values. No places of NICH (historic) heritage value are listed in the project area. Further the 'Great Barrier Reef Region Strategic Assessment Report' does not list any features relevant to the project area on Lindeman Island.

3.2 Previous Studies

The following studies have provided some context for the development of the historic summary:

- Barker, B. (2004). The Sea People: Late Holocene Maritime Specialisation in the Whitsunday Islands, Central Queensland.
- Blackwood, R. (1997). The Whitsunday Islands; An Historical Dictionary.
- Converge Heritage + Community. (2010). 10091C WRC Heritage Study Review of Resources.
- Department of Environment and Heritage Management, (2006). The Mackay-Whitsunday Region.
- Rowland, M. J. (1986). The Whitsunday Islands: Initial historical and archaeological observations and implications for future work.

3.3 Historic Summary

Lindeman Island has been identified as part of the Ngaro People's traditional country (Barker, 2004, p. 29) and has been part of areas claimed by a number of native title groups, most recently the Yuibera People. There is currently no native title determination application over the island. This report does not include an assessment of the Indigenous Cultural Heritage of the project area (see EIS, 2016).

3.3.1 Exploring and Early Colonisation

Cook passed through the Whitsunday Islands on his voyage of discovery in 1770. He named the group of islands the Cumberland Island Group of which the Whitsunday islands were a part. Whilst in the Whitsunday Passage he noted two Aboriginal people with their canoe with outrigger.

Cook was followed by Brampton in 1793, Campbell in 1797 and Swan in 1798. Flinders spent time surveying the islands during his circumnavigation of Australia in the HMS Investigator in 1802. Lindeman Island was named in 1868 by Commander H.M. Bingham, RN, who was undertaking a survey of the surrounding waters. He named the island after Sub Lieutenant George Sidney Lindeman, nephew of the founder of the Lindeman Wine Company (Blackwood, 1997, p. 125).

Intermittent but increasing contact occurred between the local Aborigines and colonial explorers, surveyors, fishermen, settlers and passengers for the next 60 years and then intensified with the establishment of the port and administrative at Port Denison and the settlement of Bowen which was declared a town in 1861 (Barker, 2004, p. 26).

Pastoralists started moving north into the district in the late 1850s. In 1859, the government proclaimed the boundaries of the Kennedy pastoral district, which included the Whitsundays (DERM, 2006, p. 5).

Initial European occupation of the Whitsundays was by timber getters who established a camp at Fitzalan Point and then sawmills at Cid Harbour and Gulnare Inlet on Whitsunday Island, Hook Island and Long Island (DERM, 2006, p. 102).

Pastoral leases were granted on the Whitsunday Islands from 1883 (DERM, 2006, p. 102), but the first lease to be taken up on Lindeman Island was in 1886 by Blake. After some clarification as to the location of the island it was allocated as an occupation licence on 4 September 1886. It remains



unclear if Blake made use of the allocation. The island was regazetted on 11 November 1887 and 12 September 1890 but was not taken up on either occasion (Blackwood, 1997, p. 127).

3.3.2 Grazing

An occupation licence was granted to Abraham Adderton for the whole of Lindeman Island on 17 July 1897. He and his wife, Sarah, moved onto the island in c. 1898. They grazed sheep and goats on the island. The improvements they made to the island are described by Blackwood (1997, p. 129) as:

At Home Beach, the site of the present resort, the Adderton's built a weather-board and iron roofed dwelling towards the western end of the beach. This had living quarters on one side and dining quarters on the other, separated by a central boatshed from which a slipway ran to the water's edge...

Adjacent on the eastern side of the main building was a large woolshed and store-room with sheepyards adjoining. The Adderton's employed aboriginal labour to help them in their stock work and the construction of small dams and fences. Their main water-supply came from a permanent spring which is thought to still flow into the sea just to the east of Home Beach (note: not located during fieldwork).



Figure 2: Adderton 1898 home with residence on left and woolshed and yards on right. Photo taken in 1923 (Source Blackwood 1997, p. 131).

By 1913 the Adderton's had 800 goats and 1500 sheep with the wool clip being taken off the island either by supply ships or the Adderton's own boat Ayesha (Blackwood, 1997, p. 129). The Adderton's sold the occupational licence and their stock to Tom Matthews-Frederick in 1918 who moved to the island with his new wife Lydia Elphick Maciver. By 1918, the property was reported to be a little run down and stocked with 900 sheep, 1,000 goats and 13 cattle (Blackwood, 1997, p. 129).

The Matthews-Frederick's sold their interest in the island to W. R. M. Nicklin in 1922 who appears to have carried out no improvements to the property before selling it to Elizabeth Nicolson in 1923. Elizabeth's husband Argus moved to the island and was followed by the rest of the family in 1925. At this time Mrs Nicolson applied for and was granted a transfer of the Occupational Licence (OL92) to a Special Lease (SL4758) for pastoral purposes from 1 January 1926 for 14 years. The Nicolson's initially depended on wool production as their primary source of income. Vegetables were grown in the



gardens and an orchard on the hill top behind Home Beach supplied fresh fruit (Blackwood, 1997, p. 135).

3.3.3 Tourism



Figure 3: Tents at Home Beach 1928 (SLQ).



Figure 4: Female bathers on the beach at Lindeman Island, 1928 (SLQ).

At Christmas 1928, the Nicholson's hosted the first of the Embury expeditions where over 100 people camped along Home Beach in tents (see Figure 3). The old wool-shed had been dismantled by this time and replaced with a rough galvanised iron cookhouse, which was used by the expeditioners (Blackwood, 1997, p. 135). So began the development of tourism which grew to replace grazing as the primary activity on the island.

A tourism venture was also established on Brampton Island by the Bussutin family around this time. During 1929 Federic Truethardt proposed a resort development at Stonehaven on Hook Island (Blackwood, 1997, p. 135). Other Whitsunday Islands tourist ventures, such as those on Daydream, South Molle and Hayman Island were established during the 1930s (Barr, Nov 1990, pp. 29-30).

In 1929 the site of the old wool-shed and materials from it were used to construct a row of eight accommodation units under one roof with hessian or canvas partitions. This became known as the bungalow.

In 1930 Ian Wood (then Mayor of Mackay) formed a syndicate of Mackay business men to form Mackay Tours Ltd. This group obtained a sublease from the Nicolsons over part of Lindeman Island. Several trips were organised and it appears that the

facilities at Home Beach were used with the bungalow being reserved for ladies and tents being provided for men. A dancing hall / dining hall comprised an 'open-air affair' (Blackwood, 1997, p. 135).

By 1932 a number of detached cabins had been built from palm leaves and grass to the east of the bungalow. Walls and roofs were of thatched grass and the inside walls were lined with plaited coconut–leaf matting. It appears these may have been built by several Torres Strait islanders, former trochus fishermen, who became long term residents on the island. Most of promotion of the island was directed to the southern states (Blackwood, 1997, pp. 135-36).

An airstrip was cleared on the hill behind the resort with Avro Avian landing the first plane on the island in early June 1933. The airstrip had later been condemned by the Department of Civil Aviation, was re-built and extended during 1946 and Somerset Airways of Mackay ran a regular service in Auster aircraft (Blackwood 1997). The airstrip was again extended in 1956 to meet government standards,



however it was only suitable for light aircraft. In order to accommodate larger planes, a new northsouth airstrip was cut across the existing northwest-southeast airstrip in 1957 (Blackwood 1997).



Figure 5: West side of Home Beach 1931 (QSA ID966).

Mackay Tours sublease with the Nicolson's expired in 1934 and, as a result of some differences of opinion, was not renewed. A new syndicate was formed with shareholders comprising George Gordon-MacLeod of Sydney (an import/exporter and honorary consul to Siam), the Nicolsons and Mel Ward. The Queensland Government Tourist Bureau (QGTB) was appointed as their principal agents. By 1938 all shares were owned by the members of the Nicolson family. In 1942, 300 shares were bought by Tom Evetts who had married Betty Nicolson in 1941. The Evetts and their growing family then became an integral part of the resort (Blackwood, 1997, p. 136).

Upgrades during this time included:

- By 1934 electricity and running water to every room.
- In 1934 a museum was set up in the re-sited bungalow building (located further to east) by Mel Ward who studied marine zoology in the waters off Lindeman Island between 1933 and 1935. Living quarters were in one half and the museum in the other.
- By 1936 the resort comprised seven fibro tourist cabins towards the eastern end of the beach, eight grass cabins, dining hall, recreation lounge, an "Idlers Club', a dormitory (<u>the Nicolson</u> <u>residence</u>), amenities block, staff quarters in the old Adderton building. A tennis court and nine hole golf course were under construction. Water was supplied by well and windmill. Acetylene gas was piped to all buildings.
- In 1937 the museum was moved to a new building.
- During 1939, electric lights replaced the aceytylene gas lighting (Blackwood, 1997, p. 136).



Figure 6: Home Beach 1941 (QGTB brochure 1941).



Lindeman Island and Little Lindeman Island were declared a national park on 20 December 1941. Elizabeth Nicolson renegotiated the special lease over Lindeman Island over the whole 1920 acres from 1 January 1942 for 30 years (Blackwood, 1997, p. 137).



Figure 7: Dining room c. 1945 (JOL).



Figure 8: Bungalows c 1947 (JOL).



Figure 9: Accommodation c. 1960 (JOL).

The resort was closed in 1942 for the remainder of World War II and survived during this time on fishing and its small wool clip. The post war period saw a major accommodation upgrade of the resort. Karl Langer¹ drew up plans for cabins, a bush house and coral pool, stone bench and alteration to the hall in 1946. Buildings were mainly clad in asbestos sheeting with feature palm leaf plated walls (Karl Langer Architectural Plans. JOL, Record #371532).

The airstrip was re-built and extended and Somerset Airways of Mackay began a regular service which supplemented the regular ferry and steamer services. Barrier Reef Airways using Catalina flying-boats also began a service at this time (Blackwood, 1997, p. 139).

An offer for the resort by Ansett Transport Industries was declined by the family in 1947. Similarly, a proposal for the development of a second resort complex at East/Dalwood Point saw some clearing during the 1950s but no further development eventuated (Blackwood, 1997, p. 139).

The Nicolsons and Evetts formed a new company in 1955 to manage the tourist resort. This was called Lindeman Island Pty Ltd and saw Angus retiring as managing director in favour of Lachlan Nicolson. Ongoing upgrades during this period featured the extension of the air-strip and, in 1959, the establishment of the Lindeman Aerial Services Pty Ltd, the construction of new guest accommodation and swimming pool, new grass hut as an adjunct to the recreation hall and the demolition of the last of the 1930s grass huts. The resort could now cater for 80 guests (Blackwood, 1997, p. 139).



¹ Karl Langer (1903-1969) emigrated from Austria in 1939. He became the assistant town planner for Brisbane City Council in 1944 where he undertook a range of commissions including revising the town plan for the city of Mackay and advising on the site for a civic centre in Perth. In 1947 he undertook an examination of the development of Sydney for the Cumberland County Council. Other town planning projects were undertaken for Darwin, Ingham, Toowoomba, Yeppoon, Kingaroy and Mount Isa. He was also involved in the first Gold Coast canal developments and various coastal tourist projects. He was active in the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, first president (1952) of the Queensland Division of the Royal Australian Planning Institute, a founder and chairman (1966-68) of the Queensland Association of Landscape Architects and a member (1963–69) of the National Trust of Queensland (Sinnamon, 2015).

Further tenure changes were made on 1 October 1961 with the aim of obtaining more secure tenure over the land where improvements had been made resulting in a perpetual lease NCL1818 over 152 acres covering the resort area and airstrip with a special lease SL26379 covering the remainder of the island which remained national park. This lease was replaced by SL37519 in 1973 (Blackwood, 1997, p. 141).

In 1966 a swing basin off the eastern end of Home Beach was dredged. This was followed in 1968 by the construction of a jetty. In 1970 a six hole golf course was built to the west of the air-strip on the high ground. This became known as Piccaninny Golf Course and necessitated the construction of a dam across Boat Port Creek in order that sufficient water could be supplied to the golf course and for gardening and general use (Blackwood, 1997, p. 141).



Figure 10: Lindeman Island Resort 1977 (NAA A6135,K20/7/77/53).

On 9 May 1974 P&O bought the Evetts' 50 percent shares in the resort and Lindeman Aerial services Pty Ltd. Lachlan and Thora Nicolson held the other 50 percent and stayed on as managing director and secretary but retired in 1978 selling their shares to P&O. A major refurbishment of the resort was undertaken between 1974 and 1976 with the construction of accommodation for 204 guests in about 80 units, the enlargement of the main hotel and entertainment facilities. Their target market was families with dependants.

P&O sold the resort to the State Government Insurance Office in February 1983 but continued the management of the place until the resort was sold to Adelstein Investments Pty Ltd who partnered Australian Investment Corporation to form Lindeman Island Ltd. A \$20 million redevelopment was undertaken during 1987 which saw 104 new rooms constructed along the

foreshore, the refurbishment of 84 of the original rooms and the construction of a heated pool. The refurbished resort was put on the market in 1989 and bought by Club Med in late 1990 who operated the resort as Club Med Lindeman Island. They also undertook a major reconstruction from August 1991 to November 1992. Accommodation was increased to 225 rooms and most of the older resort buildings were demolished during this time (Blackwood, 1997, p. 142).

Club Med initially promoted the three star resort as a destination for singles until reverting to the family market in more recent years (News.com.au, 2011). It was described as '...a village of colonial colours, finished in terra cotta and natural timbers and built on terraced hill slopes leading down to the main beach and swimming pool' (Cairns Unlimited, n.d.). The resort closed on 31 January 2012 as a result of a downturn in the global tourism industry and severe weather events (News.com.au, 2011). It was purchased by White Horse Australia in 2012.



4 Cultural Heritage Survey

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology and overall results of the field survey. Fieldwork undertaken by Converge staff is based on widely understood and accepted forms of assessment that occur in a series of clearly defined steps including sampling, surveying, site evaluation, recording, impact assessment, and management recommendations.

4.1 Field Survey Methodology

The survey methodology adopted for this assessment incorporated a pedestrian survey undertaken by Converge consultants across the majority of the project area on 27 October 2015. The project area is the site of several phases of tourist resorts which have operated on the island since the 1920s. The survey area covered the resort and redevelopment areas.

4.1.1 Field Sampling Strategy

Historical and contextual research enabled an initial assessment of those areas known to be of historical interest within the development footprint. Noted sites and areas were recorded with reference to site title, location, site integrity, ground surface visibility, condition and relevant comments. All assessment data was recorded and captured via a hand help global positioning system (GPS) receiver, accurate to ±5 metres using datum GDA 94/degree decimal. This information was then used to create maps identifying the location of sites and features noted during the assessment. Areas of interest were photographed. Relevant data is included in this report.

4.2 Consultation

Consultation was undertaken with Darren Stuart, member of the Lindeman Island caretaking team. Darren provided information about known places of historical interest in the project area and on the island generally.

4.3 Constraints

Access to the resort buildings was restricted so photographs were taken externally only - the only building accessed was the former house of the Nicholson family.

4.4 Main Features in the Project Area

The main resort features date to the 1990s when the site was completely redeveloped as Club Med. Apart from the Nicholson house, no historic buildings are extant in the project area. Typical features within the resort include:

- Reception building.
- Restaurant and bar areas.
- Sporting facilities (i.e. tennis courts), pools and gyms.
- Golf course.
- Accommodation buildings.
- Staff quarters.
- The jetty.
- Airstrips.
- Roads and footpaths.
- Nicholson house.
- Landscape features including gardens/ plantings, rock retaining walls and concrete drains.





4.5 Survey Outcomes

Three sites of interest have been considered in this NICH assessment. These are the airstrips, Nicholson's house and resort area in general.

4.5.1 Site One: Airstrips

The northwest-southeast airstrip is considered to be in the same location as it was in 1933, being extended in 1946 and 1956 and a new north-south airstrip added in 1957 to accommodate larger planes. The airstrips are cleared, flat grassed areas which intersect each other and form an X pattern. There is fencing at the edge of the 1957 airstrip that is adjacent to the bitumen roadway.



Figure 11: 1957 airstrip.

Figure 12: Light aircraft on 1957 airstrip.



Figure 13: Airstrips at Lindeman Island (Google Earth Pro).



4.5.2 Nicholson's Residence

The exact date for the construction of the Nicholson residence is not known, however the history mentions that a new residence (also called the dormitory) had been built for the Nicholson's by 1936, along with seven fibro tourist cabins (since demolished). The Nicholson's residence is located in the centre of the main resort area, on a hillside surrounded by mature trees, former gardens, retaining walls and cliff to the rear.

The building has undergone various extensions and changes over the years and is currently in a poor condition. The building is clad with weatherboard and asbestos and has a Trimdek roof. It has multipaned sash windows and French doors. Internally the building is lined with asbestos and cover strips. The kitchen floor is covered with linoleum (possibly asbestos backed) and the rest of the house has bare timber floors. It has a fireplace in the main living area and a brick chimney at the rear. There are two main sections of the house, separated by a hallway. The sunroom is possibly an enclosed veranda.



Figure 14: View to house from the north.



Figure 15: Northern elevation.



Figure 16: Kitchen.



Figure 17: Kitchen.



Figure 18: Entry room.





Figure 19: Fireplace.



Figure 20: Entry to sunroom.





Figure 22: Bedroom 1.



Figure 23: West exterior.



Figure 24: West exterior.



Figure 25: Hall.



Figure 26: Bedroom 2.



Figure 27: Dilapidated exterior.





Figure 28: Back door.



Figure 29: East side of the house.



Figure 30: Missing soffits.



Figure 31: Front door.



Figure 32: Garden and rock wall.



Figure 33: Retaining wall.





Figure 34: Nicholson's Residence (Google Earth Pro).

4.5.3 The Resort Complex

The historic resort buildings and features have long since been demolished, however the current (1990s) resort is representative of the history and development of tourism on Lindeman Island and has therefore been considered for this NICH assessment. Aside from the airstrips and Nicholson's residence, an individual analysis of each building and feature within the resort has not been undertaken (too extensive for the scope of this study), rather the resort is considered in more general terms as a complex.

Indicative photographs of the resort complex are included below.



Figure 35: View of the former resort from the air.

Figure 36: View from former resort manager's residence.





Figure 37: Caretaker's residence.



Figure 39: Accommodation blocks from the road.



Figure 38: Entry to former reception.



Figure 40: Accommodation blocks from the pool.



Figure 41: Former beachside pool at resort.



Figure 42: Boat ramp, entry to resort area.



Figure 43: Jetty.



Figure 44: Accommodation blocks near golf course.





Figure 45: Tennis courts.



Figure 47: Dam at the golf course.



Figure 46: Staff accommodation.



Figure 48: Golf course.



Figure 49: Retaining walls, gardens and paved road.



Figure 50: Path by the beach.



Figure 51: View from the golf course.



Figure 52: Beach in front of main resort area.



4.5.4 Summary of Sites

Site #	Site Name	Easting	Northing	Brief Description
1	Airstrips	N/A	N/A	Two airstrips, one north-south and the other northwest-southeast, intersected to form an X shape.
2	Nicholson's Residence	712606	7736424	Weatherboard and asbestos house. Residence of former landholder.
3	Resort Complex	N/A	N/A	Club Med Resort featuring all buildings and elements within the entire resort complex.

Table 2: Sites identified in project area (WGS84/UTM Zone 55 S)	
---	--



Figure 53: Lindeman Island sites, the resort boundary is shaded in red (Google Earth Pro).

4.5.5 Archaeological Potential

Since the initial construction of the Adderton's homestead and associated structures at Home Beach in the late 1890s this section of the project area has been subjected to at least 11 phases of demolition and construction. These have ranged from relatively minor renovations to extensive reconstructions that included the addition of new accommodation buildings, entertainment areas and swimming pools. Indeed, the last major construction phase in 1991 saw much of the older resort demolished (Blackwood, 1997, p. 142).

It is possible that the early phases of development may have entailed demolition to the floor then subsequent building resulting in relatively minimal ground disturbance. However, the construction that occurred during the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s would have involved considerable ground disturbance for foundations and the installation of services, etc. Constructions of this type are likely to have severely disturbed or destroyed any non-indigenous archaeological deposits that may have been present. The possible exception to this is the area comprising the location of the Nicolson house. It is possible that remnants of earlier structures and/or other archaeological features are still present underneath this house. If there are any non-indigenous archaeological sites present in the project they



are most likely to be in the form of foundations including posts and post holes, remnants of earlier service installations such as earthern ware pipes and/or rubbish pits. Overall however, it is considered that the potential for locating non-indigenous archaeological deposits within the project area is low.



5 Significance Assessment

The section assesses the NICH significance for individual sites identified within the project area.

5.1 Heritage Significance Criteria

Determining the significance of a heritage place, item or site requires research to enable an understanding of its value or level of importance. Assessments of heritage significance for this assessment were based on an understanding of the place's history together with the physical analysis (field survey) and an appreciation of the comparative level of rarity or representativeness that the site possesses. In Queensland, heritage practitioners rely on two key documents to undertake significance assessments: The Burra Charter of Australia International Council on Monuments and Sites (Australia ICOMOS) and the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* (QHA).

The QHA outlines the following criteria for assessing cultural significance of heritage places. Under Section 35 (1) of the QHA, a place may be entered into the register if it satisfies one or more of the following criteria:

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

The criteria used for assessing places of local heritage significance under the Mackay City Planning Scheme mirrors the criteria developed under the QHA, except that a site's significance relates to the shire or locality rather than the state. Once a site has been assessed using the above-listed QHA criteria, the following thresholds (Table 3) of relative significance are applied to determine the level (i.e. local, state or national) at which the site or element is considered significant.

Table 3: Relative Significance Criteria (Converge 2015).

Definition	Ranking	Threshold
Element of outstanding/ exceptional significance or heritage value - embodies national or state heritage significance in its own right and makes an irreplaceable contribution the significance/heritage value of the place as a whole.	Exceptional	Likely to fulfil national heritage entry criteria.
Element of high significance or heritage value - embodies state heritage significance in its own right and makes an irreplaceable contribution to the significance/heritage value of the place as a whole.	High	Likely to fulfil state heritage entry criteria.
Element of moderate significance or heritage value - embodies state or local heritage values in its own right and makes an irreplaceable contribution to values of the place as a whole.	Moderate	Likely to fulfil state and/ or local heritage entry criteria



Definition	Ranking	Threshold
Element of some significance or heritage value - embodies local heritage values in its own right and makes a significant contribution to the significance/heritage value of the place as a whole.	Low	Likely to fulfil local heritage entry criteria
Element is neutral, with little or no heritage value.	None	Unlikely to fulfil local heritage entry criteria. May contribute to other elements of heritage value.
Intrusive element which detracts, or has the potential to detract, from the significance of the place.	Intrusive	Does not have heritage value. Does not contribute to other elements of heritage value.

5.2 Significance Assessment

The following significance assessment was undertaken to ascertain the significance of the project area to inform the impact assessment (Section 6) and recommendations (Section 7) within this report.

5.2.1 Significance of the Project Area

The project area has been assessed against the significance assessment criteria outlined above, taking into account the contextual historical information available for the project area.

Criteria	Significance Ranking	Statement
A	Low	The former resort on Lindeman Island provides evidence of the evolution of tourism on islands off the Queensland coast since the 1930s. Major redevelopments in the 1970s coincided with the boom in the industry at the time.
		Given that further developments in the 1990s for the establishment of Club Med saw most of the older buildings demolished with only the Nicholson's Residence (Site 2) and the airstrips (Site 1) remaining from previous developments, most of the values relating to this criterion are intangible by nature and relate to the historical development of tourism on the island.
		The project area is considered significant at a local level under this criterion.
В	None	This criterion has not been met.
C	None	With each development at the resort, much of the previous developments were demolished. The last development in the 1990s for the construction of Club Med saw almost all of the historical buildings removed and the new resort built in their place. It is unlikely that evidence of previous developments would be extant as archaeological remains under Club Med, however a process to manage potential archaeology is provided in Section 7 – Recommendations. This criterion has not been met.
D	None	The former resort on Lindeman Island represents the principal characteristics of an island resort. Elements of the landscape such as its mature palm, fig and pine tree plantings are evocative of tropical island

Table 4: Significance	of the r	nroiect area	
Table 4. Jightheance	or the p	project area.	



Criteria	Significance Ranking	Statement
		characteristics. However, the buildings of the resort are not significant for representativeness.
		This criterion has not been met.
E	None	Given its location on a tropical island in the Whitsundays, the former resort is set amongst a picturesque landscape, however, the buildings of the resort are not significant for aesthetic qualities.This criterion has not been met.
F	None	Detailed analysis regarding the degree of creative or technical achievement was not possible within the constraints of this assessment, however, there is no physical evidence readily identifiable which would suggest any outstanding creative or technical attributes exist. This criterion has not been met.
G	None	This criterion has not been met.
Н	None	This criterion has not been met.

5.2.2 Significance of Individual Sites

Within the project area, sites of interest were assessed for their inherent heritage value. These sites have been attributed an individual cultural heritage significance rating.

able 5: Significance Assessment for Individual Sites.

Site #	Site Name	Significance Ranking	Justification
1	Airstrips	Low	Dating to 1933 and 1957, the two runways are among the oldest infrastructure within the project area and were crucial to the development and success of the resort, since the 1930s until it was closed in 2012.
2	Nicholson's Residence	None	The Nicholson's Residence is the oldest building on the island, but it is not constructed in a remarkable or unique architectural style and it has been adapted over the years. Further, it is in a state of disrepair and includes damaged asbestos materials. Its condition and integrity has impacted on its significance ranking.
3	Resort Complex	None	The values of the resort are largely intangible and relate to the development of the place as a tourist destination. The physical components of the resort are not considered to have cultural heritage significance.

5.2.3 Conclusion

Of the three sites assessed, only one was found to have cultural heritage value - Site 1. The airstrips are significant for their role in the development of tourism on the island, as is the resort complex in general. However it should be noted that the individual buildings and elements within the resort are not considered significant, as this significance is of an intangible nature. The Nicholson's Residence is in a poor state which has affected it significance, as noted above.



6 Proposed Development

6.1 Nature of the Proposed Development

While the location of buildings, density of development, infrastructure and the Safe Harbour, are to be refined through the EIS process, key aspects of the proposal prepared by DBI Design Pty Ltd includes:

- Beach resort redevelopment of existing resort to achieve a new 5 star beach resort with 136 suites, conference centre, beach club and a new central facilities building which includes restaurants, bars and lounges.
- Spa resort on the headland adjacent to the existing resort a new 6 star Spa resort is proposed with 59 villas, central facilities, entry lounge, Spa, sea view restaurant, pool and signature rock bar. The signature rock bar is proposed to be located at the south-west corner of the headland and will provide spectacular alfresco dining close to the sea.
- Tourist villa precincts two tourist precinct villa precincts accommodating 89 tourist villas are proposed to the north-east and the north-west of the existing resort.
- Eco resort a new 5 Star Eco Resort is proposed at the northern end of the lake gently falling towards the western coastline and will consist of 41 villas, a central facility, a boathouse and a waterside restaurant.
- Village a central village precinct is proposed that will accommodate a bar, night club, restaurant, conference facility buildings, arrival centre, shops, restaurants, sport and recreation centre and a staff village.
- Services infrastructure precinct the existing services including power (solar arrays proposed), sewerage and water treatment plants will be replaced to increase capacity and reflect current best practice
- Airstrip the existing airstrip is proposed to be upgraded to provide for near all-weather status and capable of landing small jets and helicopters.
- Golf course a recreational golf course is proposed adjacent to the tourist villa precinct (a reduction in size from the existing layout).
- Safe harbour a new Safe Harbour is proposed to provide access for the transfer of guests via ferries, luxury vessels and private charters which offers greater protection from the prevailing wind directions.
- Ecotourism facilities including a National Park and Great Barrier Reef Educational Centre and 30 glamping facilities.
- Environmental enhancements. A vegetation replanting program is proposed over previously disturbed/cleared areas, along with improvements to storm water management and a shift towards renewable energy.

The scope of the project also includes the rearrangement of lease boundaries to allow for the creation of a more uniform boundary and provide for improved environmental management. White Horse Australia Lindeman Pty Ltd is currently in negotiations with the Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing and Department of Natural Resources and Mines and Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, to amend the existing lease boundaries and investigate opportunities for ecotourism facilities (30 glamping tents). See master plan concept overleaf.





Figure 54: Proposed development (DBI 2016).

6.2 Impact Assessment

The field survey undertaken for this report identified three sites, one of which was found to have low levels of cultural heritage value - Site 1, Airstrips. An impact assessment has not been undertaken for Site 2, Nicholson Residence or Site 3, Resort Complex as they are not considered to be NICH.

6.2.1 Impact Criteria

Impacts have been determined using frameworks specifically developed for projects of this nature. Refer Tables 6, 7 and 8.



Table 6: Likelihood of potential impact on NICH sites.

Descriptor	Description
Almost certain	Will occur, or is of a continuous nature, or the likelihood is unknown. There is likely to be an event at least once a year or greater (up to 10 times per year. It often occurs in similar environments). The event is expected to occur in most circumstances.
Likely	There is likely to be an event on average every one to five years. Likely to have been a similar incident occurring in similar environments. The event will probably occur in most circumstances.
Possible	The event could occur but is not expected. May have heard it discussed as a possibility but an extremely unusual one. A rare occurrence.
Remote	The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances. Very rare occurrence. Unlikely that it has occurred elsewhere; and, if it has occurred, it is regarded as extremely unique.

Table 7: Consequence of potential impact on NICH sites.

Consequence	Description
Critical	The impact is considered critical to the decision-making process.
	Impacts tend to be permanent or irreversible or otherwise long term.
	Very high sensitivity of cultural heritage receptors to impact (e.g. national heritage significance – loss or removal of significant historic place/item, with the potential to adversely impact on heritage status under the EPBC Act).
Major	The impact is considered likely to be important to decision-making process.
	Impacts tend to be permanent or irreversible or otherwise long to medium term.
	High to moderate sensitivity of cultural heritage receptors to impact (e.g. state heritage significance – partial loss of significant heritage place/item under the QHA).
Moderate	The effects of the impact are relevant to decision-making including the development of mitigation measures. Impacts range from long term to short term in duration and are significant at the local scale. Moderate sensitivity of cultural heritage receptors to impact (e.g. removal or significant reduction of the place's local heritage values under the relevant town/regional planning schemes).
Minor	Impacts are recognisable/detectable but acceptable.
	These impacts are unlikely to be of importance in the decision making process. Nevertheless, they are relevant in the consideration of standard mitigation measures.
	Impacts tend to be short term or temporary and/or occur at local scale (e.g. a minor reduction in the extent of site's local heritage values under the relevant town/regional planning schemes).
Negligible	Minimal change to the existing situation (e.g. short term changes to an historic place that does not meet the threshold for local heritage under the relevant town/regional planning schemes).

Table 8: Risk Assessment for NICH sites.

Consequence	Likelihood				
consequence	Almost certain	Likely	Possible	Unlikely	Remote
Critical	High	Medium	Low	Low	Very Low
Major	High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Moderate	Medium	Medium	Low	Very Low	Very Low
Minor	Medium	Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low
Negligible	Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low

6.2.2 Project Impact on NICH

The proposed development will directly impact Site 1. The impact on this site relates to the construction of the tourist villa precinct over most of the 1933 airstrip alignment. The 1957 airstrip will be extended and sealed, maintaining its use as an airstrip. The remaining part of the 1933 airstrip will be sealed and used as a taxiway to the hangars, which are to be constructed around it. However, it should be noted that currently, both airstrips are only cleared grass alignments with no historic buildings or features that will be affected. Use of the site as an airstrip and taxiway will be maintained in the future development. Refer to Table 9.

Table 9: Impact assessment.

Site	Significance	Impact Description	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk Rating
1	Low	Construction of villas over part of the 1933 grass airstrip.	Likely	Minor	Low



7 Recommendations

This assessment identified three sites, however only one was found to have cultural heritage value within the project area. This section provides site specific recommendations in relation to the identified NICH site, as well as general recommendations to manage potential impacts on unknown/unexpected NICH sites that may be extant within the project area. Assuming the management measures below are suitably implemented, this assessment concludes that the nature and level of impact on NICH by the project is manageable.

The Great Barrier Reef Strategic Assessment Report was reviewed as part of this NICH assessment, which found that no historic sites listed in the report are located in the project area (refer page 7).

7.1 Recording of Impacted Sites

Heritage recording, compliant with the Draft EPA Guidelines for Archival Recording (including historical research, consultation, photography, site plans and related drawings where relevant), should be undertaken for Site 1, Airstrips, prior to being developed. Given the nature of the site as a grass alignment, this recording need only be brief but should preferably include aerial photographs or up-to-date satellite imagery of the airstrips in their current format.

7.2 NICH Management across the Project Area

The NICH management recommendations should be implemented and incorporated into the project's Environmental Management Plan (EMP) to mitigate project impacts on both the identified NICH site and unidentified NICH material/sites found during the development of the project. This should be applied across the entire project area and should provide information and processes to enable identification and protection of NICH sites, both known and unknown. The policies and procedures for management of NICH sites or archaeological material uncovered during the project, as outlined in Appendix A (Incidental Finds Procedure), should be implemented.

Additionally, it is recommended that diligence be practiced during works conducted within the project area, particularly during any clearing or construction phases associated with initial preparation of the area. To facilitate this diligence, it is recommended that a NICH Induction Booklet be developed once all approvals for the project are in place but prior to ground disturbing activities, which can be incorporated into the General Site Induction. The NICH Induction Booklet should be prepared by a qualified heritage specialist and include the following:

- Specific instruction for crews regarding their obligations to look for and avoid impacting on NICH material until it has been properly assessed.
- Presentation of familiarisation material for work crews so that they are aware of what constitutes a NICH find.
- Provision of educational material to personnel informing them what archaeological material may look like, and provide clear instructions on what to do should any such material be found.
- A process for the collection, transport and storage of any NICH items.



References Cited

Bickford, A and Sullivan, S. 1984, Assessing the Research Significance of Historic Sites, in Sullivan, S and Bowdler, S. (eds) Site Surveys and Significance Assessment in Australian Archaeology (Proceedings of the 1981 Springwood Conference on Australian Prehistory), Department of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra, pp 19–26.

Blake, T. (2005) Queensland Cultural Heritage Places Context Study. Brisbane, Environmental Protection Agency.

Australia ICOMOS Inc. (2013). Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 2013. Retrieved November 28, 2013, from http://australia.icomos.org/publications/charters/

Australian Heritage Commission. (2001). Australian Historic Themes; A framework for use in heritage assessment and management. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Barker, B. (2004). The Sea People: Late Holocene Maritime Specialisation in the Whitsunday Islands, Central Queensland. Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Barr, T. (Nov 1990). From Quirky Islanders to Entrepreneurial Magnates: The Transition of the Whitsundays. The Journal of Toursim Studies Vol. 1 No. 2, 26-32.

Blackwood, R. (1997). The Whitsunday Islands; An Historical Dictionary. Rockhampton: Central Queensland University Press.

Cairns Unlimited. (n.d.). Lindeman Island. Retrieved from Cairns Unlimited: http://www.cairnsunlimited.com/whitsundays_lindeman.htm

Converge Heritage + Community. (2010). 10091C WRC Heritage Study Review of Resources. Cairns: Unpublished report to Whitsunday Regional Council.

Department of Environment and Heritage Management. (2006). Statewide Survey: the Mackay-Whitsunday Region. Brisbane: Unpublished report by DERM.

News.com.au. (2011, November 30). Travel. Retrieved from The holiday's over as Club Med shuts up shop in Australia : http://www.news.com.au/travel/travel-updates/the-holidays-over-as-club-med-shuts-up-shop-in-australia/story-e6frfq80-1226209951608

Rowland, M. J. (1986). The Whitsunday Islands: Initial historical and archaeological observations and implications for future work. Queensland Archaeological Research 3, 72-88.

Sinnamon, I. (2015, May 20). Langer, Karl (1903-1969) . Retrieved from Australian Dictionary of Biography, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University. Published first in hardcopy 2000: http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/langer-karl-10783/text19123



Appendix



Anager to contact the Project Archaeologi me site as soon as possible to assess significan may include: i) protect and avoid; ii) excava- or no action if the item is deemed to have uire preparation of a work method statement r to any action commencing. nificant?
Anager to contact the Project Archaeologi me site as soon as possible to assess significan may include: i) protect and avoid; ii) excavat or no action if the item is deemed to have uire preparation of a work method statement r to any action commencing. nificant?
nificant?
ne site as soon as possible to assess significan may include: i) protect and avoid; ii) excavat or no action if the item is deemed to have uire preparation of a work method statement r to any action commencing. nificant?
ne site as soon as possible to assess significan may include: i) protect and avoid; ii) excavat or no action if the item is deemed to have uire preparation of a work method statement r to any action commencing. nificant?
may include: i) protect and avoid; ii) excavate or no action if the item is deemed to have uire preparation of a work method statement of to any action commencing.
may include: i) protect and avoid; ii) excavate or no action if the item is deemed to have uire preparation of a work method statement of to any action commencing.
No 🗸
ecording: Items deemed to have no significan
ill require recording as evidence. A photograp f the item, including a description of why it is n f significance, should be completed by t roject Archaeologist and forwarded to t roject Manager.
1
dvice: Advise Site Manager when assessment omplete. Confirm advice with EHP Cultur eritage Branch if required.
en works can re-commence in the original evised to ensure suitable management is in pla
ng in accordance with the appropriate guidelin It Government Authorities and Project Manage

