




Level 4, 182 Victoria Parade
East Melbourne, Victoria 3002

enquiries@gjmheritage.com
+61 (03) 9115 6566
gjmheritage.com

ABN: 62 348 237 636
ARBV: 51910

POST-CONTACT HISTORIC HERITAGE REVIEW

DERRIMUT FIELDS PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN (PSP)



PREPARED FOR: Department of Transport and Planning
DATE: 13 May 2026
FILE: 2026-008

PROJECT TEAM

Renae Jarman | Director

Jessi Briggs | Associate

The subject site forms part of the traditional lands of the Bunurong People, who are represented by the Bunurong Land Council Aboriginal Corporation. This report is limited in its scope to consideration of post-contact cultural heritage and does not provide advice on any Aboriginal cultural heritage significance. Nonetheless, we acknowledge the Bunurong People as the Traditional Owners of the land at this place and pay our respects to their Elders past and present. For more information on the Bunurong People, please visit <https://www.bunuronglc.org/>.

Cover page image: Historical aerial photograph dated January 1951 via Landata Victoria, Historic aerial photography.

DOCUMENT VERSIONS

Project No.	Version	Issued To	Date Issued
2026-008	Draft	Cindy Tran, New Communities Housing, Building and Land Delivery, Department of Transport and Planning	10 April 2026
	Final	Cindy Tran, New Communities Housing, Building and Land Delivery, Department of Transport and Planning	13 May 2026

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1 INTRODUCTION	8
2 METHODOLOGY	11
3 REVIEW FINDINGS	12
3.1 Places/sites subject to statutory controls	12
3.1.1 Heritage Overlay controls triggered	12
3.1.2 De-listed Victorian Heritage Inventory sites	13
3.2 Analysis of Heritage Overlay place	16
3.2.1 Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct (HO203, Melton).....	16
3.3 Significant trees	19
3.4 Places/sites proposed for statutory controls	19
3.5 Places/sites with non-statutory designations	20
3.5.1 National Trust of Australia (Victoria) Register	20
3.5.2 Register of the National Estate	20
3.6 Places/sites for further investigation	20
3.6.1 Potential historic heritage places	20
3.6.2 Potential historical archaeological sites	20
4 PLANNING REQUIREMENTS	26
4.1 Melton Planning Scheme	26
4.1.1 Clause 43.01 - Heritage Overlay	26
4.1.2 Clause 15.03-1L-02 - Dry Stone Walls.....	27
4.2 Potential archaeological sites	28
5 RECOMMENDED MANAGEMENT & MITIGATION STRATEGIES	29
5.1 Principles for historic heritage management	29
5.1.1 Precinct Structure Plans	30
5.2 Recommendations for the PSP area	31
5.3 Recommendations for potential historical archaeological sites	32
REFERENCE LIST	34

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX 1 - STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR PLACE SUBJECT TO STATUTORY CONTROLS**
- APPENDIX 2 - SITE CARD FOR DE-LISTED VICTORIAN HERITAGE INVENTORY SITE**
- APPENDIX 3 - LOCAL HERITAGE POLICY**



Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
CHL	Commonwealth Heritage List
CMP	Conservation Management Plan
HO	Heritage Overlay
NHL	National Heritage List
RNE	Register of the National Estate
VHI	Victorian Heritage Inventory
VHR	Victorian Heritage Register

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GJM Heritage has been engaged to undertake a historic heritage review of the Derrimut Fields Precinct Structure Plan area ('PSP area') in Truganina. The PSP area (Figure 1) is located approximately 20km to the west of Melbourne's CBD, within the City of Melton.

The PSP area previously formed part of a site considered for the Western Intermodal Freight Terminal (WIFT). As part of the WIFT investigations, two heritage reports were prepared: Lovell Chen's 2020 report *Department of Transport – Transport Infrastructure Program WIFP site, Final Historical Heritage Assessment Report* ('2020 Report'); and GJM Heritage's 2023 report *Post-Contact Historic Heritage Review, Western Intermodal Freight Terminal (WIFT), Truganina* ('2023 Report'). This historic heritage review has had regard to the above reports.

Places/sites with statutory historic heritage controls

This review has confirmed that one (1) place of recognised historic heritage value (and which is subject to a statutory controls) falls within the PSP area. Any works impacting this heritage place will require approval under relevant legislation (as outlined in Section 4 of this report).

Further detail on this heritage place is provided at Section 3 and initial management and mitigation recommendations are summarised below and are discussed at Section 5.

Statutory instrument	Historic heritage places/sites identified within the PSP area
<i>Commonwealth</i>	
National Heritage List (NHL)	No places
Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL)	No places
<i>State</i>	
Victorian Heritage Register (VHR)	No places
Victorian Heritage Inventory (VHI)	No sites
<i>Local</i>	
Melton Heritage Overlay (HO)	One (1) place

Places/sites proposed for statutory controls

This review has determined that no (0) places are currently being considered for heritage controls or have been recommended for inclusion in the Victorian Heritage Register or Heritage Overlay of the Melton Planning Scheme and

have not proceeded to Planning Scheme Amendment or Heritage Victoria consideration.

Places/sites with potential historic heritage and historical archaeological value

This review has determined that no (0) places of potential local-level historic heritage significance (i.e. would potentially warrant inclusion in the Heritage Overlay) exist within the PSP area. This is discussed at Sections 3.5 and 3.6 of this report.

Based on an analysis of historic plans and photography, it has been determined that six (6) sites of potential historical archaeological interest may exist within the PSP area. It is recommended that landowners be made aware of the potential for historical archaeology to remain within the PSP and the obligations under the *Heritage Act 2017* in respect of archaeological sites and artefacts over 75 years of age, regardless of whether they are included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory or not. Detail on these sites is provided at Section 3.6 of this report.

Historic heritage recommendations for the project

This report makes the following recommendations in respect of historic heritage places and sites within the PSP area:

Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct (HO203)

Recommendation 1.

It is recommended that the dry stone walls within the Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct be retained to the greatest extent possible. Dry stone walls should be retained along existing roadways and should define internal roadway networks where possible. Wall B40 (see Figure 4) is noted in the Statement of Significance as being of particularly high integrity. A 2023 site inspection identified wall B40 as being reasonably intact and having a higher visual quality than others in the precinct visible from the public realm. A buffer of 5m (with the wall at the centre-point) should be provided to the wall, with appropriate landscaping to either side (e.g. gravel, mulch or turf) which allows for maintenance access. New buildings and structures should be sited a sufficient distance from the wall to ensure it is not undermined or structurally compromised.

Recommendation 2.

A Dry Stone Wall Management Plan should be prepared by a professional dry stone waller or appropriately qualified heritage practitioner. The Dry Stone Wall Management Plan should include a construction and condition analysis of the walls within the PSP area, provide an understanding of the extent of the foundation for each wall, include a schedule of repair and conservation works, and set out strategies for future management.

Recommendation 3.

If retention of all walls is not possible, the following cascading approach is recommended:

- a. If walls are required for removal to facilitate the routing of services (and boring is not feasible) or construction access, reconstruct walls (using an experienced dry stone waller) after completion of service installation and construction work.
- b. If walls are required for removal and cannot be reinstated, utilise the removed stone to repair retained walls or reconstruct previously demolished walls where possible and appropriate (Figure 3 may provide some guidance for potential reconstruction). Repairs and reconstruction works should be undertaken by an experienced dry stone waller. If excess stone remains, this should be incorporated into landscaping or interpretation treatments within the site or, as a last resort, be provided to Council for facilitating dry stone wall repairs elsewhere in the municipality.
- c. Where walls are required for removal and cannot be reinstated, the walls should be photographically recorded to the standard required by Heritage Victoria, as set out in the 'Specification for submission of archival recording' (see: <https://www.heritage.vic.gov.au/resource-library>). Heritage interpretation should be implemented in an appropriate form on-site to provide information on the nature of the historic landscape of the area.

Potential Historic Archaeology

Recommendation 4.

Ensure landowners are aware of the potential need to engage an historical archaeologist to undertake investigations to determine whether any historical archaeological sites or artefacts are present within the PSP area that should be managed through the *Heritage Act 2017*, ahead of development occurring.

Recommendation 5.

Ensure landowners are aware of the need to develop an archaeological management protocol which establishes a procedure for responding to any unexpected archaeological finds during site development.

1 INTRODUCTION

GJM Heritage has been engaged to undertake a historic heritage review of the Derrimut Fields Precinct Structure Plan area ('PSP area'), Truganina. The PSP area (Figure 1) is located approximately 20km to the west of Melbourne's CBD, within the City of Melton, and totals approximately 519ha.

The PSP area previously formed part of a site considered for the Western Intermodal Freight Terminal (WIFT). As part of the WIFT investigations, two heritage reports were prepared: Lovell Chen's 2020 report *Department of Transport – Transport Infrastructure Program WIFP site, Final Historical Heritage Assessment Report* ('2020 Report'); and GJM Heritage's 2023 report *Post-Contact Historic Heritage Review, Western Intermodal Freight Terminal (WIFT), Truganina* ('2023 Report'). This historic heritage review has had regard to the above reports.




Figure 1. Derrimut Fields PSP area indicated with the black dotted line (Source: GJM Heritage, 2026)

This review has involved the following tasks:

- Technical review of the 2020 Report and 2023 Report, noting any subsequent historic heritage changes within the PSP area.
- Investigations to confirm and map places of historic heritage significance that are subject to statutory controls under the relevant legislation.
- Review of Heritage Victoria's HERMES data to determine any previous Victorian Heritage Register (VHR) nominations and to map these places (if relevant).
- Review of historical aerial imagery and plans to identify sites where historical archaeological fabric may continue to be present.

- Review of City of Melton heritage study documentation and any current or planned future heritage assessment work.
- Development of high-level management and mitigation recommendations, taking into consideration the relative intactness and values of different parts of the site.

It is noted that as part of the 2023 Report investigations, site inspections were conducted to those parts of the Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct (HO203) within the PSP area that are visible from the public realm (see section 3.2).

Historic Heritage

Historic heritage is a term that is generally used to describe places of built or created heritage significance and which are not places *solely* of natural, geological or Aboriginal significance. Historic heritage places can include buildings, parks, gardens, memorials, infrastructure (such as bridges, roads, railway stations), items associated with land use activities (such as farming or mining), and archaeological remnants of these places and activities. *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (2013) identifies these types of places as:

...historical records, that are important expressions of Australian identity and experience. Places of cultural significance reflect the diversity of our communities, telling us about who we are and the past that has formed us and the Australian landscape.

Places of historic heritage significance can be included in the following statutory lists and registers:

Historic Heritage Control	Managing Legislation
Commonwealth	
National Heritage List (NHL)	<i>Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (Cwth)
Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL)	<i>Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (Cwth)
State	
Victorian Heritage Register (VHR)	<i>Heritage Act 2017</i> (Vic)
Victorian Heritage Inventory (VHI)	<i>Heritage Act 2017</i> (Vic)
Local	
Heritage Overlay (HO)	Victorian Planning Provision established under the <i>Planning & Environment Act 1987</i> (Vic)

It is noted that this report specifically excludes a consideration of places relating solely to Aboriginal cultural heritage significance or natural or geological values.



2 METHODOLOGY

A review of the following statutory registers and lists was completed:

- National Heritage List (NHL)
- Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL)
- Victorian Heritage Register (VHR)
- Victorian Heritage inventory (VHI)
- Heritage Overlay (HO) for Melton.

The review of statutory registers and lists was conducted utilising spatial data sourced from the Australian Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (<<https://fed.dcceew.gov.au/>>) and DataShare Victoria (<<https://datashare.maps.vic.gov.au/>>). The findings are listed below and are represented on the corresponding maps in Section 3.1. We note that this review has relied upon the accuracy of the addresses and localities as recorded in the various registers and lists.

In addition, current Planning Scheme Amendments and the HERMES heritage database were reviewed to determine if heritage controls have been or are being proposed for any places or sites which fall within the PSP area. These findings are included at Section 3.4.

Places with non-statutory designations, due to inclusion on the National Trust of Australia (Victoria) Register, National Trust Significant Tree Register or the Register of the National Estate, were also investigated utilising the Victorian Heritage Database (<https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/>) and Australian Heritage Database (<https://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl>). These findings are included at Section 3.5.

The 2020 Report and 2023 Report identified places of potential historic heritage significance within the PSP area. These findings have been reviewed and are discussed in Section 3.6.1. It is noted that the City of Melton is not known to have completed any heritage studies that affect the PSP area since the completion of the 2020 Report and 2023 Report.

A review of historical aerial imagery and plans was conducted to determine the existence of early buildings or structures within the PSP area. If these buildings or structures have been removed, footings or other remnants may remain in these locations and future archaeological investigation may be required. These findings are discussed and represented on the maps in Section 3.6.2.

It is noted that as part of the investigations to inform the 2023 Report, consultation was undertaken with officers from the City of Melton. The session confirmed the existing heritage regime, advised on any planned heritage works or studies and provided information on expectations for heritage management when contemplating change.

3 REVIEW FINDINGS

3.1 Places/sites subject to statutory controls

There is one (1) place within the PSP area that is subject to one or more statutory historic heritage controls, as listed in the table below.

The place included in the Heritage Overlay within the PSP area is shown on the mapping following the table of results. The Statement of Significance and full citation for the place is included at Appendix 1.

Approvals will be required for works that impact this place. The current planning approval requirements are outlined at Section 4.

Table 1. Places/sites subject to statutory controls


PLACES/SITES WITHIN THE PSP AREA	STATUTORY CONTROL:					AVAILABLE DOCUMENTATION	MAP
	NHL	CHL	VHR	VHI	HO (LGA)		
CITY OF MELTON							
Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct	-	-	-	-	HO203 [four polygons] (Melton)	Statement of Significance (Incorporated Document: <i>Melton Dry Stone Wall Study Volume 3 – Statements of Significance</i> , Feb 2016). Citation (Peters 2011).	1, 2

3.1.1 Heritage Overlay controls triggered

The Heritage Overlay controls triggered for the place are listed below in the extract from the Schedule to Clause 43.01 Heritage Overlay of the Melton Planning Scheme.

PS Map Ref	Heritage Place	External Paint Controls Apply?	Internal Alteration Controls Apply?	Tree Controls Apply?	Solar energy system controls apply?	Outbuildings or fences not exempt under Clause 43.01-4	Included on the Victorian Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 2017?	Prohibited uses permitted?	Aboriginal heritage place?
HO203	Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

Figure 2. Extract from the Schedule to Clause 43.01 Heritage Overlay of the Melton Planning Scheme (Planning Victoria, accessed April 2026).




3.1.2 De-listed Victorian Heritage Inventory sites

It is noted that there is one site within the PSP area that was previously included in the Victorian Heritage Inventory. This site has since been de-listed on the basis that it was not considered to be archaeological in nature and is no longer subject to statutory controls. The de-listed VHI site is:

- GBL Dry Stone Wall I (D 7822-0877)

The site card is included at Appendix 2.



KEY


Heritage Controls:

 Heritage Overlay

 PSP Area

MAP 1
EXISTING CONTROLS






KEY

Heritage Controls:

 Heritage Overlay

 PSP Area



**MAP 2
EXISTING CONTROLS**

3.2 Analysis of Heritage Overlay place

3.2.1 Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct (HO203, Melton)

The Statement of Significance for HO203 Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct¹ identifies the precinct as being of local historical, aesthetic, scientific and social significance, for the following reasons (in summary):

- As a distinctive and characteristic group of dry stone walls from the late c. late 1850s to the 1870s, displaying high levels of craftsmanship.
- As the densest concentration of dry stone walls in the municipality, and as an expression of the historical diversity of dry stone wall construction in Victoria.
- For its demonstration of early pastoral and farming settlement in South Derrimut (Truganina/Tarneit) and its association with gold-rush land speculators and the issue of closed roads on pastoral estates.
- For its association with the Clarke and Hopkins families and the geological feature, Mount Atkinson (“Lava Hill”).

The walls within the precinct were first comprehensively recorded in 1917 as part of the Military Survey of Australia (see Figure 3). While many of the walls within property boundaries have now been removed or are highly degraded, a number of walls along roadways remain.





Figure 3. Detail of a 1917 plan showing the locations of dry stone walls (black lines) and structures (black solid squares). The PSP area is indicated by the red dotted line (Source: Military Survey of Australia, 1917)

¹ Sera Jane Peters, *Melton Planning Scheme C100, Dry Stone Wall Study Volume 3 – Statements of Significance*, Incorporated Document, February 2016, pp 12-13.

The 2011 *Shire of Melton Dry Stone Walls Study*² identified and numbered each section of dry stone wall within the Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall precinct. Those sections of wall located within the PSP area are shown on the plan at Figure 4.



KEY

Level of Intactness

- Very high/Higher visual quality than others in precinct
- Generally intact
- Variable intactness
- Unknown/Not accessed

 PSP Area

Level of intactness of walls within
HO203 Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct




Figure 4. Detail plan showing numbered walls within the HO203 Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct that fall within the PSP area – their levels of intactness indicated (correlating with Table 2).



The elements that contribute to the significance of HO203, and that are located within the PSP area, are also identified on the mapping in Section 3.1 and are listed at Table 2.

² Sera Jane Peters (2011), Jim Holdsworth et al (2007), *Shire of Melton Dry Stone Walls Study Volume 2 – Citations*, p78.



Table 2. Dry Stone walls that contribute to HO203, within the PSP area

Wall ID number	Description Source: HO203 citation, 2011; VHD.	Level of Intactness Bold: noted in HO203 citation, 2011; <i>Italics:</i> noted on site 27 February 2023	Image
B38	Internal property boundary wall.		 <p>(Source: Victorian Heritage Database, dated 2015)</p>
B39	Hopkins Road boundary	<i>Generally intact</i>	 <p>(Source: Melton City Council, dated 2015)</p>
B40	Middle Road boundary	Very high <i>Intact walls with higher visual quality than others in precinct</i>	 <p>(Source: Victorian Heritage Database, dated 2015)</p>

Wall ID number	Description Source: HO203 citation, 2011; VHD.	Level of Intactness Bold: noted in HO203 citation, 2011; <i>Italics:</i> noted on site 27 February 2023	Image
			 <p>(Source: GJM Heritage, 27 February 2023)</p>
B43	Middle Road boundary wall		 <p>(Source: Victorian Heritage Database, dated 2015)</p>

3.3 Significant trees

To determine if any trees or plantings of potential historic heritage significance are located within the PSP area, the National Trust Significant Tree Register, Avenues of Honour website (<<https://avenuesofhonour.org>>), Significant Landscape Overlay (SLO), Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO) and Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO) within the PSP area were reviewed to identify vegetation of historic heritage value.

No trees of cultural heritage significance have been identified through this review.

3.4 Places/sites proposed for statutory controls

HERMES heritage database records managed by Heritage Victoria and information on City of Melton Planning Scheme Amendments were investigated to determine if heritage controls were currently being pursued or have recently been recommended for any places or sites that fall within the PSP area, and which have not proceeded to Planning Scheme Amendment or Heritage Victoria consideration.

No places/sites were identified through this review.

3.5 Places/sites with non-statutory designations

3.5.1 National Trust of Australia (Victoria) Register

Places/sites included on the National Trust of Australia (Victoria) Register were investigated to determine if any fall within the PSP area.

No places/sites not already subject to statutory listings were identified through this review.

3.5.2 Register of the National Estate

The Register of the National Estate (RNE) is a non-statutory archived list that is searchable via the Australian Heritage Database. This list was investigated to determine if any places/sites fall within the PSP area.

No places/sites not already subject to statutory listings were identified through this review.

3.6 Places/sites for further investigation

3.6.1 Potential historic heritage places

The 2020 Report and 2023 Report considered places of potential heritage significance, via a historical analysis and desktop review of the study area, and a review of existing heritage studies, the National Trust of Australia (Victoria) database and the Hermes Database. These sources were reconsidered as part of this review.

No places/sites were identified through this review.

3.6.2 Potential historical archaeological sites

In undertaking our investigations, heritage studies, historical aerial imagery and plans were reviewed to identify sites of potential historic archaeological interest within the PSP area.

Where structures identified through this review have been removed, footings or other remnants may remain below-ground in these locations and it is therefore recommended that landowners be aware of the potential need to engage an historical archaeologist to determine whether the places are, or are likely to be, an archaeological site under the Heritage Act. Such places may then be considered for inclusion in the Victorian Heritage Inventory (VHI) and consents to disturb / destroy / excavate can then be obtained in advance of development commencing.

Six (6) sites within the PSP area were identified as potentially warranting further historic archaeological investigation, as follows and discussed below:

- A. Windmill
- B. Undetermined structure
- C. Windmill
- D. House

E. 'Archaeological site of goldrush hotel/shanty (and 2 reputed graves)' addressed to 622-688 Hopkins Road, Truganina (paddock on south east corner of Middle Road) – identified in Peters (2007:10)

F. Possible structures.

The PSP area comprises two historical square allotments (not necessarily historical cadastral boundaries but a pattern in the subdivision). The 1951 aerial photographs (Figure 6 - Figure 7) are divided into these two blocks.

The approximate locations of the six items identified on the historical map and aerial photographs are identified on the current aerial photograph at Figure 8.





Figure 5. Detail of a 1917 plan overlaid with the boundary of the PSP area (indicated by the red dotted line). The key to the 1917 plan identifies the feature names as listed below (except for the term 'structure' which was applied in this analysis) (Source: 'Military Survey of Australia, 1917 via SLV, Filename vc001517-001)

- A. Windmill
- B. Undetermined structure
- C. Windmill
- D. House



Red line Contours
 Green dots Timber





Figure 6. 1951 aerial photograph of Block 1 (western half of the PSP area) (Source: Landata Vic). Indicated are:

A. Windmill (possibly remained in 1951)

B. Undetermined structure (no fabric evident in 1951)

E. 'Archaeological site of goldrush hotel/shanty (and 2 reputed graves)' addressed to 622-688 Hopkins Road, Truganina. (paddock on south east corner of Middle Road) – identified in Peters (2007:10).



Figure 7. 1951 aerial of Block 2 (eastern half of the PSP area) (Source: Landata Vic).

Indicated are:

C. Windmill (possibly remained in 1951)

D. House

F. Possible structures – newly identified on this 1951 aerial photograph.






Figure 8. Current aerial photograph of the PSP area showing the approximate location of structures identified on the above historical sources:

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| A. Windmill | D. House |
| B. Undetermined structure | E. 'Archaeological site of goldrush hotel/shanty (and 2 reputed graves)' |
| C. Windmill | F. Possible structures. |



4 PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

If works or development is proposed to occur in the Heritage Overlay of the Melton Planning Scheme within the Derrimut Fields PSP area, planning approval will generally be required. The current planning triggers for places in the Heritage Overlay are as follows:

4.1 Melton Planning Scheme

4.1.1 Clause 43.01 – Heritage Overlay

Development and works within the Heritage Overlay are likely to trigger a permit under Clause 43.01 of the Melton Planning Scheme. The application requirements set out in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay are as follows:

Application requirements

The following application requirements apply to an application under Clause 43.01, in addition to those specified elsewhere in the planning scheme and must accompany an application, as appropriate, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority:

- *A Conservation Management Plan for heritage buildings and places where adaptation or change of use are proposed.*
- *A written justification as to why demolition or any proposed additions to a dry stone wall is required.*
- *Where any demolition of a dry stone wall is proposed (partial or full):*
 - *An assessment of the condition of the dry stone wall by a suitably qualified professional.*
 - *A plan for the proposed re-use or storage of any removed stone.*
 - *Photographs or other suitable records of the dry stone wall.*
- *Where partial demolition of a dry stone wall is proposed:*
 - *The extent of removal required, including the percentage of the demolished area in relation to the whole structure.*
 - *Details of how the section of dry stone wall will be reconstructed (where applicable).*
- *Where demolition of a dry stone wall section to create an opening is proposed, detail on the new wall end construction.*
- *Where any alterations to a dry stone wall are proposed (added to, reconstructed or conserved):*
 - *Sections of the dry stone wall where it is proposed to be altered.*
 - *Details of who will be carrying out the proposed works.*
- *Where conservation or reconstruction is proposed for a dry stone wall, details of how the style of works is in keeping with the structure and form of the original or adjoining lengths of wall.*
- *Where additions to a dry stone wall are proposed, detail on the proposed additions to demonstrate that they will not disturb its structure.*
- *Where subdivision or development is proposed:*



- A feature survey of any dry stone wall within the proposed development.
- A Dry Stone Wall Management Plan that includes the following:
 - Photographs (or suitable records) of the dry stone wall.
 - Recommendations for repair and / or reconstruction.
 - Conservation works which will retain the cultural significance of the dry stone wall.
- A plan showing the proposed location of any landscaping, footpaths, and structures which may impact the dry stone wall.

The decision guidelines at Clause 43.01 will be applied when determining a permit application.

4.1.2 Clause 15.03-1L-02 – Dry Stone Walls

In exercising discretion when determining a permit application under the Heritage Overlay, the local Dry Stone Walls Heritage Policy will also be considered.

The policy (provided at Appendix 3) generally encourages the retention, conservation and repair of dry stone walls and seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to dry stone walls.

The following strategies are provided:

Support the retention of roadside dry stone walls as part of transport networks, road design, subdivision and utility installation.

Discourage the demolition of parts of a dry stone wall unless one of the following applies:

- *The section of wall needs to be removed to undertake repairs to damage caused by earth movement.*
- *The section of dry stone wall needs to be removed to create a break for new openings such as farm openings, road widening or road breaks.*
- *The section of dry stone wall needs to be removed so utility services can be installed and no viable alternative exists. The dry stone wall must be reconstructed afterwards.*
- *It can be demonstrated that the removal of the part of the dry stone wall does not negatively affect the significance of the wall.*

Encourage the retention of dry stone walls in favour of contemporary walls or gateway treatments in development.

Encourage the retention of original openings, posts and wires in repair or maintenance programs.

Encourage the removal of alterations that detract from the cultural significance of the dry stone wall.

Encourage the reconstruction of features where they have been removed or lost.

Avoid the use of reproduction dry stone walls and faux-style buildings in public spaces and heritage areas.

Construct wall ends where new openings have been created in a dry stone wall.



Support the construction of additional stone courses to increase the height of an existing dry stone wall only where it is consistent with the type of dry stone wall.

Discourage the use of concrete mortar within a dry stone wall.

Allow additional wires above a dry stone wall, if required for farming purposes, provided the new posts do not disturb the structure of the dry stone wall.

Encourage the reuse and recycling of stone and dry stone walls for other dry stone walls.

Allow subdivision that does not detract from the heritage value of the dry stone wall provided it:

- *Minimises the number of new openings in a dry stone wall.*
- *Applies a landscape buffer on either side of a dry stone wall.*

The Policy guidelines include:

Consider as relevant:

- *Establishing a five metre wide landscape buffer on either side of the dry stone wall.*
- *Use a professional dry stone waller when either:*
 - *Reconstructing a section of dry stone wall.*
 - *Creating new openings.*
 - *Constructing new wall ends.*

4.2 Potential archaeological sites

Section 123 of the *Heritage Act 2017* provides protection for all historical archaeological sites (i.e. sites containing an artefact deposit or feature that is 75 or more years old), irrespective of listing or known status. Any works which disturb an archaeological site without prior approval must immediately cease and Heritage Victoria must be notified.

5 RECOMMENDED MANAGEMENT & MITIGATION STRATEGIES

5.1 Principles for historic heritage management

Consistent with *The Burra Charter: the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*, 2013 and local heritage policy, the starting point for the management of historic heritage places is to understand the values and fabric of the place and to retain and conserve them to the greatest extent possible.

It is recognised that change is occurring at a significant rate in and around the PSP area, and the local heritage policies and existing PSPs establish principles for managing change to historic heritage places within the PSP area. These can be summarised as follows:

- Understand the values, fabric and condition of relevant heritage places through the preparation of Conservation Management Plans by appropriately qualified professionals.
- Retain and conserve heritage places (dry stone walls) to the greatest extent possible.
- Where change is unavoidable, minimise interventions and mitigate impacts through reinstatement/conservation of retained elements and photographic recording/interpretation of lost elements.
- Where dry stone walls are potentially impacted, the following cascading approach is recommended:
 - Repair dry stone walls and retain them within road reserves or public open space;
 - Provide a 5-10m buffer (with dry stone wall at centre point) around retained and repaired dry stone walls, with an appropriate landscaped buffer;
 - Set-back new fences and buildings from dry stone walls at a sufficient distance to ensure wall foundation stones are not compromised;
 - Use and modify historic openings where appropriate in preference to creating new openings;
 - Bore services under walls where possible. If boring is not viable, use localised removal and reinstatement of walls to route services;
 - If demolition is required: (i) re-use removed stone to repair or reconstruct retained walls in the vicinity of the removed wall; (ii) re-use stone within landscaping treatments in the vicinity of the removed wall or as part of an interpretation device; (iii) provide stone to Council for repair of walls in other parts of the municipality.

5.1.1 Precinct Structure Plans

The expectations for the management of heritage places have been clearly established in other PSPs for the municipality in areas where it is anticipated that extensive redevelopment of former agricultural land will occur.

As a guide, the *Mt Atkinson & Tarneit Plains Precinct Structure Plan* (June 2017, Amended January 2020) contains the following provisions relating the historic heritage (and relevant to the Derrimut Fields PSP):

Objectives

03. *Encourage a strong sense of place through the protection, enhancement and interpretation of places of post-contact cultural heritage significance, including Mt Atkinson Homestead (HO112), the Greigs Road former goldfields route and dry stone walls of significance.*

Requirements

R6 *Any subdivision and/or development of land adjoining a heritage site identified under the Heritage Overlay in the Melton Planning Scheme and/or of post-contact cultural heritage significance must have regard to the heritage significance of the site and provide a sensitive interface.*

R9 *Dry stone walls ... must be retained unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority. Dry stone walls to be retained must:*

- *Be situated within public open space or road reserve to the satisfaction of the responsible authority;*
- *Have a suitable landscape interface;*
- *Be checked by a suitably qualified dry stone waller for any loose stones. Any loose stones are to be reinstated in the wall in secure positions;*
- *Retain post and wire and rail fences within the walls, with any wire protruding beyond the vertical face of the wall reinstated to its original position or removed;*
- *Be incorporated into subdivision design to minimise disturbance to the walls (e.g. utilisation of existing openings for vehicle and pedestrian access); and*
- *Be in a suitable, safe condition that ensures the safety of the public and preserves the significance of the walls.*

R11 *Installation of services across the alignment of retained dry stone walls must be undertaken by boring rather than open trenching. If open trenching or disturbance to the wall is unavoidable, a minimum section of wall may be temporarily removed and then reinstated to original condition under the supervision of a suitable qualified dry stone waller to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.*

R12 *Reinstatement of walls must use stone from (in order of priority):*

- *The original wall in that location (including fallen stone adjacent to the wall);*
- *A nearby section of the wall approved to be removed;*
- *Any adjacent paddock containing wall parts which can be recovered; or*
- *Walls approved to be removed in the nearby area (including any stone which has been stockpiled by Council).*

Guidelines

- G14 Land uses abutting retained dry stone walls should enhance public visibility of the walls. Relevant uses include open space, conservation reserve, road verge or property boundary.*
- G16 Integrate signage and interpretation opportunities for HO112 to contribute to the knowledge and understanding of the local area's history.*
- G18 Where it has been agreed with the responsible authority that an existing dry stone wall is to be removed, land owners should consult with Council to determine whether the material can be retained for use in repairing other walls within the PSP or landscape designs.*
- G19 Adaptive reuse of the Mt Atkinson Homestead (HO112) may be appropriate if it is demonstrated that it will contribute to the long-term conservation of the heritage place.*

5.2 Recommendations for the PSP area

This review has confirmed that the PSP area contains one (1) place of local-level heritage significance, which is included in the Heritage Overlay of the Melton Planning Scheme: Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct (HO203) (see Section 3.1 and 3.2).

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct represents the densest collection of dry stone walls in the municipality. The dry stone walls date from c.late 1850s to the 1870s, creating a historic landscape that reflects the early phases of European settlement in the area.

In respect of this place, the following high-level management and mitigation strategies are recommended:

Recommendation 1.

It is recommended that the dry stone walls within the Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct be retained to the greatest extent possible. Dry stone walls should be retained along existing roadways and should define internal roadway networks where possible. Wall B40 (see Figure 4) is noted in the Statement of Significance as being of particularly high integrity. A 2023 site inspection identified wall B40 as being reasonably intact and having a higher visual quality than others in the precinct visible from the public realm. A buffer of 5m (with the wall at the centre-point) should be provided to the wall, with appropriate landscaping to either side (e.g. gravel, mulch or turf) which allows for maintenance access. New buildings and structures should

be sited a sufficient distance from the wall to ensure it is not undermined or structurally compromised.

Recommendation 2.

A Dry Stone Wall Management Plan should be prepared by a professional dry stone waller or appropriately qualified heritage practitioner. The Dry Stone Wall Management Plan will include a construction and condition analysis of the walls within the PSP area, provide an understanding of the extent of the foundation for each wall, include a schedule of repair and conservation works, and set out strategies for future management.

Recommendation 3.

If retention of all walls is not possible, the following cascading approach is recommended:

- a. If walls are required for removal to facilitate the routing of services (and boring is not feasible) or construction access, reconstruct walls (using an experienced dry stone waller) after completion of service installation and construction work.
- b. If walls are required for removal and cannot be reinstated, utilise the removed stone to repair retained walls or reconstruct previously demolished walls where possible and appropriate (Figure 3 may provide some guidance for potential reconstruction). Repairs and reconstruction works should be undertaken by an experienced dry stone waller. If excess stone remains, this should be incorporated into landscaping or interpretation treatments within the site or, as a last resort, be provided to Council for facilitating dry stone wall repairs elsewhere in the municipality.
- c. Where walls are required for removal and cannot be reinstated, the walls should be photographically recorded to the standard required by Heritage Victoria, as set out in the 'Specification for submission of archival recording' (see: <https://www.heritage.vic.gov.au/resource-library>). Heritage interpretation should be implemented in an appropriate form on-site to provide information on the nature of the historic landscape of the area.

5.3 Recommendations for potential historical archaeological sites

It is recommended that landowners be aware of the potential need for further historical archaeological assessment to occur prior to the commencement of any works or development, to understand if historical archaeological sites remain within the PSP area, particularly within the areas identified in Section 3.6.2 above. This assessment would normally comprise a Predictive Archaeological Assessment comprising:

- historical research to establish physical changes within the project area over time;
- an analysis of current site conditions; and
- a review of previously prepared archaeological surveys.

This will determine the likelihood of historical archaeological sites or material being present within the PSP area.

On-ground site surveys may then be required, with survey reports and any site cards prepared being submitted to Heritage Victoria in accordance with the *Heritage Regulations 2017*. Heritage Victoria will then review the findings to determine whether a site warrants inclusion in the VHI. Consents to disturb/destroy/excavate will be required for Victorian Heritage Inventory sites in advance of works commencing.

This further archaeological assessment work should provide detailed advice to landowners on the approvals processes and pathways for sites identified as warranting management under the Heritage Act.

Recommendation 4.

Ensure landowners are aware of the potential need to engage an historical archaeologist to undertake investigations to determine whether any historical archaeological sites or artefacts are present within the PSP area that should be managed through the *Heritage Act 2017*, ahead of development occurring.

Recommendation 5.

Ensure landowners are aware of the need to develop an archaeological management protocol which establishes a procedure for responding to any unexpected archaeological finds during site development.



REFERENCE LIST

Heritage databases

Australian Heritage Database, <<https://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl>>.

HERMES heritage database, <<https://hermesorion.heritage.vic.gov.au/>>. Not publicly accessible.

Victorian Heritage Database (VHD), <<https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/>>

Heritage Studies

City of Melton

Peters, Sera Jane (2007, 2008); David Moloney, David Rowe, Pamela Jellie (2006), *Shire of Melton Heritage Study Stage Two*, 2006, updated 2007 & 2008.

Peters, Sera Jane (2011); Jim Holdsworth, Raelene Marshall & David Moloney (2007), *Shire of Melton Dry Stone Walls Study*, 2007, updated 2011.

RBA Architects & Conservation Consultants, *City of Melton Assessments Project*, 2018.

Other

Lovell Chen, *Department of Transport - Transport Infrastructure Program WIFP site, Final Historical Heritage Assessment Report*, November 2020.

Incorporated Documents

City of Melton

Sera Jane Peters, *Melton Planning Scheme C100, Dry Stone Wall Study Volume 3 – Statements of Significance, Incorporated Document, February 2016* [also titled *Melton Dry Stone Wall Study Volume 3 – Statements of Significance, February 2016*], published February 2016, via Planning Victoria <www.planning.vic.gov.au/>, accessed April 2026.

Spatial data

Australian Department of the Environment and Energy, <<http://www.environment.gov.au/>>. Source for GIS spatial data.

DataShare Victoria <<https://datashare.maps.vic.gov.au/>>. Source for GIS spatial data.

Image sources

Landata Victoria, historical aerial photos.

Nearmap.

Military Survey of Australia [cartographic Material] : Ballan, Sunbury, Meredith & Melbourne (Victoria) / Prepared by Commonwealth Section, Imperial General Staff. A.J. Mullett, Govt. Printer, 1917. Via State Library of Victoria, Filename vc001517-001.



APPENDIX 1 - STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR PLACE SUBJECT TO STATUTORY CONTROLS



HO203 – Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct

Melton Dry Stone Walls Survey Nos:	(See description)
Location:	Hopkins Road, Boundary Road, Middle Road, Truganina
Critical Dates:	Original construction of most c.late 1850s – 1870s; extensive reconstruction of most Rocklands walls c.1930s
Existing Heritage Listings:	HO114
Recommended Level of Significance:	LOCAL



Statement of Significance:

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is a group of characteristic and distinctive Shire of Melton walls built c.late 1850s to 1870s. It is significant at the LOCAL level as the densest concentration of dry stone walls in the Shire, for its demonstration of rural settlement patterns; for its demonstration of the early farming settlement of South Derrimut (Truganina / Tarneit), which was particularly dry, and partly isolated by the surrounding huge *Rockbank* pastoral estate; for its associations with gold-rush land speculators and the issue of closed roads on pastoral estates; for its demonstration of skilled craftsmanship; for the evocative names of two of its major properties – *Rocklands* and *Rockbank*; and for its potential to provide both research and educative information regarding nineteenth century farming and pastoral practices on Melbourne’s western plains.

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is historically significant at the LOCAL level (AHC A3, A4, B2, D2). The precinct demonstrates the early pastoral and farming settlement patterns of Melbourne’s western plains. It is significant as the densest group of dry stone walls in the Shire of Melton. The walls express nineteenth century small farming practices, and the particular difficulties of water supply and transport that hindered farming in this region. The precinct is framed by two original *Rockbank* boundary walls, associated with WJT Clarke and his son Sir WJ

Clarke. Some of the dry stone walls in the precinct are the best evidence of the widespread activity of land speculators along gold-rush routes in Melton Shire, and more widely across Melbourne’s western plains, that is known to survive. The walls along Mt Atkinson Road and Hopkins Road are almost certainly associated with the controversial issue of ‘closed roads’ on pastoral estates.

The precinct includes some excellent high and long all-stone walls (eg Wall B118), and composite stone and post & wire, with characteristic broad-based and pyramidal (rather than vertical) section. They are expressive of the historical diversity of dry stone wall construction in Victoria and are representative of the dominant type of wall in Melton Shire, and Melbourne’s west. The shape of the walls is largely a function of the high proportion of round and smooth stones, which are characteristic of Melbourne’s western plains. The precinct also contains excellent examples of original composite low stone and post and wire walls, including what is probably the best preserved example of this significant type of wall in the Shire (Wall B46 on Middle Road). An immensely significant stone structure in the precinct is the small dam on *Rocklands* (Wall B44). The precinct is also significant for its ongoing association with the Hopkins family, three of whom were Braybrook Shire Councillors (and one a President) in the nineteenth century, and after whom Hopkins Road is named; the family still occupies the late 1850s *Rocklands* homestead and farms the property.

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is aesthetically significant at the LOCAL level (AHC E1). Some of the individual walls have good sculptural qualities, and are expressive of the craftsmanship of their builders. Although the landscape is flat and the walls generally follow the grid pattern of roads and subdivisions, the relative concentration of walls enables some landscape views of multiple walls. The views to and from the homestead and gardens of *Rocklands*, to the open

farmland to the north, west and east are highly evocative of its C19th pastoral origins. The garden setting of the homestead, with high walls to enclose stock, C19th garden plants and mature plantation trees, is rare for its intactness and visual cohesion as a C19th farm landscape, in an area undergoing rapid urbanization.

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is scientifically significant at the LOCAL level (A1, C2). The precinct demonstrates the volcanic origin of the landscape, and is associated with the Mount Atkinson ‘Lava Hill’. The walls have the potential to yield research information regarding wall construction techniques, nineteenth century rural settlement patterns and farm management, and ways of life on Melbourne’s western plains.

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is socially significant at the LOCAL level (AHC G1). The precinct has the potential to educate the community in regard to wall construction techniques, and also nineteenth century farm management, settlement patterns, and ways of life on Melbourne’s western plains.

Overall, the Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is of LOCAL significance.

The following extract from Council’s GIS records all the walls in the Mount Atkinson Precinct (Hopkins Road District):

HO203	
Wall No.	Nearest Road
B115	Mt Atkinson Road
B116	Mt Atkinson Road
B118	Boundary Road
B120	Boundary Road
B121	Hopkins Road
B123	Hopkins Road
B124	Hopkins Road
B125	Hopkins Road
B126	Hopkins Road
B127	Hopkins Road
B130	Hopkins Road

HO203	
Wall No.	Nearest Road
B169	Hopkins Road
B170	Hopkins Road
B38	Hopkins Road
B39	Hopkins Road
B40	Middle Road
B43	Middle Road
B45	Middle Road
B46	Middle Road
B47	Hopkins Road
G84	Mt Atkinson Road
G85	Boundary Road

Citation No. 4 - Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct

Melton Dry Stone Walls Survey Nos:	(See description)
Location:	Hopkins Road, Boundary Road, Middle Road, Truganina
Critical Dates:	Original construction of most c.late 1850s – 1870s; extensive reconstruction of most Rocklands walls c.1930s
Existing Heritage Listings:	HO 114
Recommended Level of Significance:	LOCAL



Statement of Significance:

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is a group of characteristic and distinctive Shire of Melton walls built c.late 1850s to 1870s. It is significant at the LOCAL level as the densest concentration of dry stone walls in the Shire, for its demonstration of rural settlement patterns; for its demonstration of the early farming settlement of South Derrimut (Truganina / Tarneit), which was particularly dry, and partly isolated by the surrounding huge *Rockbank* pastoral estate; for its associations with gold-rush land speculators and the issue of closed roads on pastoral estates; for its demonstration of skilled craftsmanship; for the evocative names of two of its major properties – *Rocklands* and *Rockbank*; and for its potential to provide both research and educative information regarding nineteenth century farming and pastoral practices on Melbourne’s western plains.

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is historically significant at the LOCAL level (AHC A3, A4, B2, D2). The precinct demonstrates the early pastoral and farming settlement patterns of Melbourne’s western plains. It is significant as the densest group of

dry stone walls in the Shire of Melton. The walls express nineteenth century small farming practices, and the particular difficulties of water supply and transport that hindered farming in this region. The precinct is framed by two original *Rockbank* boundary walls, associated with WJT Clarke and his son Sir WJ Clarke. Some of the dry stone walls in the precinct are the best evidence of the widespread activity of land speculators along gold-rush routes in Melton Shire, and more widely across Melbourne’s western plains, that is known to survive. The walls along Mt Atkinson Road and Hopkins Road are almost certainly associated with the controversial issue of ‘closed roads’ on pastoral estates.

The precinct includes some excellent high and long all-stone walls (eg Wall B118), and composite stone and post & wire, with characteristic broad-based and pyramidal (rather than vertical) section. They are expressive of the historical diversity of dry stone wall construction in Victoria and are representative of the dominant type of wall in Melton Shire, and Melbourne’s west. The shape of the walls is largely a function of the high proportion of round and smooth stones, which are characteristic of Melbourne’s western plains. The precinct also contains excellent examples of original composite low stone and post and wire walls, including what is probably the best preserved example of this significant type of wall in the Shire (Wall B46 on Middle Road). An immensely significant stone structure in the precinct is the small dam on *Rocklands* (Wall B44). The precinct is also significant for its ongoing association with the Hopkins family, three of whom were Braybrook Shire Councillors (and one a President) in the nineteenth century, and after whom Hopkins Road is named; the family still occupies the late 1850s *Rocklands* homestead and farms the property.

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is aesthetically significant at the LOCAL level (AHC E1). Some of the individual walls have good sculptural qualities, and are expressive of the craftsmanship of their builders. Although the landscape is flat and the walls generally follow the grid pattern of roads and subdivisions, the relative concentration of walls enables some landscape views of multiple walls. The views to and from the homestead and gardens of *Rocklands*, to the open farmland to the north, west and east are highly evocative of its C19th pastoral origins. The garden setting of the homestead, with high walls to enclose stock, C19th garden plants and mature plantation trees, is rare for its intactness and visual cohesion as a C19th farm landscape, in an area undergoing rapid urbanization.

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is scientifically significant at the LOCAL level (A1, C2). The precinct demonstrates the volcanic origin of the landscape, and is associated with the Mount Atkinson 'Lava Hill'. The walls have the potential to yield research information regarding wall construction techniques, nineteenth century rural settlement patterns and farm management, and ways of life on Melbourne's western plains.

The Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is socially significant at the LOCAL level (AHC G1). The precinct has the potential to educate the community in regard to wall construction techniques, and also nineteenth century farm management, settlement patterns, and ways of life on Melbourne's western plains.

Overall, the Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Wall Precinct is of LOCAL significance.

The following extract from Council's GIS records all the walls in the Mount Atkinson Precinct (Hopkins Road District):

WALL NO	NEAREST ROAD
B115	Mt Atkinson Road
B116	Mt Atkinson Road
B117	Mt Atkinson Road
B118	Boundary Road

B119	Boundary Road
B120	Boundary Road
B121	Hopkins Road
B122	Hopkins Road
B123	Hopkins Road
B124	Hopkins Road
B125	Hopkins Road
B126	Hopkins Road
B127	Hopkins Road
B130	Hopkins Road
B169	Hopkins Road
B170	Hopkins Road
B38	Hopkins Road
B39	Hopkins Road
B40	Middle Road
B41	Middle Road
B42	Middle Road
B43	Middle Road
B45	Middle Road
B46	Middle Road
B47	Hopkins Road
G84	Mt Atkinson Road
G85	Boundary Road

Description:

The source of the fieldstone used in the construction of the walls in the precinct is Mount Atkinson, one of about 400 inactive eruption points that have been identified on Victoria's western volcanic plains, which stretch from the Darebin Creek to near the South Australian border. Mt Atkinson is described by geologists as a 'Lava Hill', a source of extended flows of lava whose crater is now 'absent or ambiguous'.¹

Unlike many of the volcanoes on Victoria's western plains, Mt Atkinson, a low hill south of Rockbank, does not lend a dramatic and distinctive character to its flat landscape. Its normally fluid lava flow became more viscous towards the end of the vent's eruptive phase, and built up a ridge that extends two kilometres east of the vent. The lava from the volcano extended mainly to the north, east and south in broad, thin flows, influencing the present course of Kororoit Creek. The western extent of its lava flows is an unnamed gully which marks the boundary between the Mt Cottrell and the Mt Atkinson flows. (Mt Atkinson is the younger of the two volcanoes).²

The longest of the Mt Atkinson lava flows extended to the south-east, that is, to the location of the present Mount Atkinson Dry Stone Walls Precinct. The tongues of lava it extruded were effusive, and slowly cooling, producing a denser basalt, in contrast to more explosive eruptions, or quickly cooling flows, which produced a more vesicular scoria or tuff. The basalt it produced has a slightly finer grain than the Mt Cottrell basalt.³ Although, as in the Mt Cottrell Dry Stone Walls Precinct, the vesicularity of the stone varies, a higher percentage of the stone in the Mt Atkinson dry stone walls are smooth, round and dense, providing less friction for good wall building.

Surveyors divided the extensive plains into square mile allotments, and created roads on a massive grid. This grid dominates the form of the Mt Atkinson dry stone wall landscape today, with the majority of

walls built along the roads or perpendicular to them, forming property boundaries or internal paddocks. The landscape is completely flat, diminishing the ability to view a pattern of walls, but the open character of most of the area does enable some views of multiple walls.

This is the most concentrated collection of walls in the Shire. Most were built by neighbouring early farming families: the Hopkins' (descendants of who still own, occupy and work *Rockbank*) and Faragher families. Like nearly all farms in the Shire, they were almost surrounded by the Clarke pastoral estate, and these Clarke boundary walls define the western and northern boundaries of the precinct. The Hopkins' (now Bitans') family's *Rocklands* homestead (HO 114) is a painted bluestone Victorian styled house, built around the late 1850s (and extended later) on a site settled a few years earlier. It is particularly distinguished by an exceptional complex of substantial and extensive all-stone dry stone wall cattle and sheep yards (c.1.5 metres high), with associated milking shed & farm outbuildings. Although of these walls were apparently rebuilt, with lesser skill, after the 1930s depression, they are solidly constructed on original foundations, and some have neat copings. There are some huge stones at the bases of some of the walls. One wall of a shed is a dry stone wall. There is a very old peppercorn tree beside a rear wall. Lower dry stone paddock walls beyond the homestead precinct also contribute to an understanding of the nineteenth century farming history of the place.

In front of the house is an apparently very early, well built and remarkably intact stock dam, c.3 metres deep and c.25 metres long. It has cobbled or pitched stone paving on an inclined ramp at the south end. Its embankment includes double tiers of dry stone walling, quite steeply set, on the west and east sides, with lower courses roughly 'squared'. The paved stock entrance ramp is at the south end of the horseshoe shaped structure.

The rather spare ornamental garden of *Rocklands* is typical of this particularly dry district, in which peppercorns, eucalypts and other native species (including the very old saltbush) are the most successful species; the stunted specimens of old pine trees sometimes encountered along the north side of Boundary Road (presumably planted by the former Braybrook Shire), also underline the dry and gaunt nature of the district.

1 Rosengren, N, 'Eruption Points of the Newer Volcanics Province of Victoria: An Inventory and Evaluation of Scientific Significance', a report prepared for the National Trust of Australia (Victoria) and the Geological Society of Australia (Victorian Division), 1994, pp.20, 349, 373

2 Stewart, G, 'The Newer Volcanics lava field between Deer Park and the Werribee River', *Geological Survey of Victoria, Unpublished Report 1977/26, 1977*, pp.4, 7

3 *ibid*

To the south of *Rocklands* is *Tibbermore*, which was established at the same time by the Faragher family, although the present weatherboard house dates substantially from 1903. (Its front verandah was burnt in the 1969 fire that devastated the area.) Adjacent to the house are old cow yards, constructed of dry stone walls, associated with a former milking shed. The numerous stone walls on the property are generally as they are shown in the 1916 map. They include a substantially intact all-stone driveway wall, and the substantial 'one mile' dry stone wall (most of this one mile north-south wall survives) situated to the west of house, sections of which are very intact (Wall B118).


On the neighbouring property some 500 metres to the west of *Tibbermore* is a bluestone ruin (originally the Killeen's house) burnt out in the 1969 fire. About 150 metres east of this ruin is an empty but quite intact small-medium sized old shallow-styled farm dam with walls built of fieldstone: c.15m long, c.2.5 m deep (including earth embankments).

The field-stone from which the walls in the precinct have been constructed are predominantly round, heavy, and medium to large in size. Accordingly, most walls lack coursing. The walls in this precinct are thus the typical style of wall in Melton Shire. Round stones are not the ideal material for construction of high (low batter) walls, and most of the walls are more pyramidal than vertical in cross-section. Some walls (eg Wall B42) retain clear evidence of original composite stone ('half-walls') and post-and-wire construction. These include very low stone walls with post-and-wire fences; this type of wall, clearly purpose-built although their purpose is unknown, is quite widespread throughout the Shire. Wall B46 on Middle Road is probably the best stone wall of this type, in terms of condition and length, in the whole of Melton Shire.

However many, perhaps most, walls in the precinct appear to have originally been all-stone constructions into which posts and steel droppers with between 1 and 4 wires have since been worked. These post-and-wire "top-ups" appear to have occurred in order to supplement the maintenance and height of the walls. In common with most old dry stone walls on Victoria's western volcanic plains, while often retaining sections in near original condition, most of the walls are generally in a state of declining condition. Inevitably, over the years many have lost copings, sagged and spread, and some have tumbled down in parts. It is noticeable

that in general walls on the major thoroughfares are in considerably worse condition than internal paddock walls. Many have sizeable gaps, which have been created by theft of stones, presumably for suburban gardens.

Mt Atkinson (Hopkins Road) dry stone wall precinct



History:

CONTEXTUAL HISTORY

Fencing in Nineteenth Century Rural Victoria

- **Fencing the Wilderness, 1850s-1870s**

The majority of dry stone walls in Victoria appear to have been built in the 30 year period from the 1850s to the 1880s.

In 1826 rural affairs commentator James Atkinson reported that he knew of no example of dry stone walling having been erected in the colony of New South Wales.¹ Initially pastoralists employed shepherds to look after sheep. They guided the sheep to pasture during the day, and in the evening returned them to folds, constructed of wooden hurdles or brush fences, near their huts (or outstations). There are several dry stone walls on Melton's Kororoit Creek that are thought to have been associated with early pastoralists: an

1 Kerr, JS, 'Fencing, a brief account of the development of fencing in Australia', *Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology Newsletter*, Vol. 14.No.1, March 1984, pp.9-16.

outstation associated with Yuille at Caroline Springs, and the remnants of a wall that are thought to have been associated with a shepherd's enclosure.² Other fencing was used on the squatters' homestations:- the 'home paddock' (likely for the squatters' precious horses) and the 'cultivation [or kitchen] garden'. Early fences were also required to separate stock for breeding purposes. These fences were usually of post & rail, vertical timber slabs or other primitive paling material.³ (However at *Greenhills* in Toolern Vale there are some remains of a dry stone wall that would appear to be the remnants of an original homestation garden.⁴)

Two major and related events in the early 1850s radically changed this situation. Firstly, the exodus to the gold-rushes made it difficult and expensive for squatters to retain labour for shepherding. And secondly, the extensive survey, subdivision and sale of Crown land in the early 1850s provided security of tenure to pastoralists, and incentive for them to invest in major improvements, including permanent fences, on their stations. Pastoralists were also encouraged to fence their land to ensure that neighbouring farmers didn't allow their stock to stray upon the open expanses of their stations.

Nevertheless, until the 1860s, extensive fencing of properties remained the exception rather than the rule. The first boundary fences in the Barrabool Hills of Victoria were only erected in 1854, and boundary and paddock fencing 'only gathered momentum after the mid 1850s'.⁵ This was no doubt due to the extensive sale of Crown Land as freehold in the 1850s, as well as the increasing availability of capital due to the gold boom, and the increasing availability of labour including professional stone wallers as alluvial gold declined in the late 1850s.

Slowly, fences began to replace shepherds on the pastoral estates. Early maps of Melton Shire show that pastoralists built walls and fences relatively sparsely – only on property boundaries and to enclose huge paddocks (about 5-10 square kilometres in the south part of Clarke's Rockbank estate).⁶ In dramatic contrast

the same historical maps (and the mapping survey undertaken as part of this Study) show concentrated patterns of walled paddocks established on farms in the same areas at the same time. The creation of small paddocks enabled mixed farming, by securing crops and gardens from stock, and managing stock for breeding. This Study shows that, in the south of the Shire, virtually all of these fences were dry stone walls. Dry stone walls were also used to protect the homestead from stock, to construct stockyards, fowl houses and pigpens, and possibly, on a few of the larger farms, to provide aesthetic effect.⁷

Given the expense of establishing a farm from nothing in a wilderness, and the experience of many small farmers as agricultural labourers before coming to Australia, it is almost certain that the walls on all but the largest farms would have been constructed by farmers themselves rather than by professional wallers. For example, general hand William Ison and his wife arrived on a Werribee farm in the mid 1850s, and found there a small wooden cottage and a young German in charge, 'who had already done some clearing of the stones which covered the land ... We set to, and cleared about 10 acres, and had it fenced in with stones by the next sowing time'.⁸ The quality of wall construction would have depended on the experience of the farmers and their seasonal hands at the craft. William Robinson who settled in the Tarneit area in 1872, was a stonemason who turned his skills to fieldstone, building a house (which does not survive) of the material and numerous fences (some of which do survive along Robinsons Road).

The outbreak of the highly contagious sheep disease, 'scab', which reached epidemic proportions in the 1850s, hastened enclosure of the pastoral estates.⁹ Western District squatter Neil Black quickly enclosed his Glenormiston run, and in 1854 George Russell

2 Melton Heritage Study Place Nos. 467 and 81.

3 Kerr, *loc cit*; Allan Willingham, 'The Dry Stone Walls in the Corangamite Region: A Brief History', in Corangamite Arts Council Inc, *If These Walls Could Talk, Report of the Corangamite Dry Stone Walls Conservation Project*, Terang, 1995, p.44

4 Melton Heritage Study, Place No.055

5 Kerr, *loc cit*

6 Shire Map Series (1892); Army Ordnance Map, 1916: 'Sunbury'.

7 Alan Marshall, asking an old waller why the walls on a particular property were so high, was told that ostensibly the reason was to keep steers in (they jumped fences), but the real reason was 'just so that he could say he had the best walls in the Western District, the biggest and the best, and bugga you.' (cited in Corangamite Arts Council, 1995, p.114). On Melbourne's western plains district however, such finely constructed walls were generally associated with formal gardens on only the largest properties, such as the Ha Ha walls on the Eynesbury (Melton Shire) and Werribee Park (Wyndham Shire) pastoral estates, or Greystones (Moorabool Shire).

8 Murray, E, *The Plains of Iramoo*, Henwood & Dancy, Geelong, 1974, p.111. (Murray notes that in 1974 these walls were still standing.)

9 Kerr, *loc cit*

ordered five miles of wire: ‘...the importance of fencing is becoming every year more apparent.’¹⁰ Likewise, the appearance of pluro-pneumonia in Australian cattle in the early 1860s impressed cattle-men of the need to isolate their properties from travelling or straying stock.¹¹ That ‘dreadful disease’ also encouraged the erection of property fences by Melton dairy farmers (and was responsible for less use of local Commons by Melton farmers).¹²

By 1876 the presence of ‘substantial stone walls’ appears to have been hallmark of a good farm in the Melton district, the *Australasian’s* ‘Travelling Reporter’ making sure to note these on the farms of Ralph Parkinson, George Missen and Isaac Gidney.¹³

However little is known of dry stone wallers who worked in the Shire at the time: Irish brothers John and George Funston worked in the Toolern Vale area from the 1850s; Patrick Connor worked on Mount Aitken in the 1860s; and Dick (the mason) Mitchell, and Arcoll (Arkell) worked in the Mount Cottrell area before 1872.¹⁴

The construction of fencing that was encouraged by sheep scab and cattle pleuro pneumonia was also fostered by legislation. At the beginning of the pastoral period in Victoria, common law held that, generally, a landowner was under no obligation to construct or maintain boundary fences, or fences adjoining a public road. However, as a result of Australia’s rapidly expanding pastoral industry, trespass of stock, and the need for security, Victoria’s *Fences Statute 1865* gave landowners the right to claim equal contribution towards the construction or repair of boundary fences from the owners of adjoining lands.¹⁵

• Types of fencing in the nineteenth century

The great variety and combination of nineteenth century fencing arose ‘as much from material shortages and the need to use what was procurable as from a

desire to improve the utility and durability of fencing.’¹⁶ As is the case with the rest of the Shire, most of the walls in the Mount Atkinson precinct are ‘composite’ stone and post & wire, rather than all-stone.

The *Fences Statute 1874* lists numerous types of fences, including ‘walls’ (stone walls) and ‘combination’ type fences. Walls that divided properties had to be a minimum of 4 feet high (1.22 metres), with a base of ‘not less than 2 feet wide at the bottom’, and ‘9 inches at the top.’¹⁷ Although the specifications for road boundary fences were not given (the Crown being exempt from the legislation) it could be expected that the walls on these public boundaries would be at least as high as those that divided neighbouring properties.

Post and rail fences were the most common early fence type in Australia, no doubt due to the prevalence of forests and woodlands, in comparison with stony land, across Victoria. They appeared early and were prominent in the study area. In 1854 William Westgarth, on his way to the goldfields Royal Commission in Ballarat, recorded that he ‘struck west through post and rail fences onto the Keilor Plains.’¹⁸ By the 1860s timber fencing, probably from the Grey Box forest in the west and south-west of the Shire, was common in the vicinity of Melton. But as local farmer John Chandler recorded, such fencing was prone to loss in the bushfires that swept south from the ranges over the plains.¹⁹ Even in the volcanic area near Aitkens Hill to the north of the Shire, nearly 80% of squatter John Aitken’s fencing was either ‘post & rail’ (either 2 rail, the most common, or 3 rail), or ‘post & 2 rails with (2 or 3) wires’, or ‘post & rail with 5 foot palings’. The balance was ‘stone walls.’²⁰ These figures might reflect squatters’ early preference for timber fencing, and an early dearth of professional dry stone walling skills, not remedied until after the gold rushes. In 1868 on the same property Henry Beattie erected much more stone walling, but also built nearly twice as much ‘3-rail

10 Willingham, *op cit*, p.45

11 Kerr, *loc cit*

12 Victorian Parliamentary Papers, 1864, p.94 ; John Chandler, Michael Canon, *Forty Years in the Wilderness* (Loch Haven, Main Ridge, 1990), p.175

13 The *Australasian*, October 1876.

14 Bilszta, JA, ‘Dry Stone Wall: Faulknors Road, Mt Cottrell, Shire of Melton’, 9/9/1990, unpublished paper

15 Lawlink: New South Wales Law Reform Commission website: ‘Report 59 (1988) – Community Law Reform Program: Dividing Fences’; Parliament of Victoria website: Law Reform Committee, ‘Review of the Fences Act 1968’

16 Kerr, *loc cit*

17 The Fences Statute 1874 (Fences Amendment Act, November 1873), Clause 4 (i-xi). Other types of early fencing are described in Michael Cannon’s *Life in the Country: Australia in the Victorian Age: 2*, Nelson, West Melbourne, 1978, pp.89-90; and Graham Condah’s *Of the Hut I Buildded*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1988, p.89.

18 Lack, J, Ford, O, ‘Melbourne’s Western Region: An Introductory History’ (Melbourne’s Living Museum of the West Inc, Melbourne Western Region Commission, 1986), p.27

19 Chandler, J, *Forty Years in the Wilderness*, Loch Haven, 1990, p.174

20 Map, ‘Index of Fences’ on John Aitken’s Mount Aitken property (after Crown Land sales). PROV 460/P0/39365. (The stone walls would appear not to survive.)

fence' in the same year.²¹

Post and wire fences were first introduced into Victoria in the 1850s, but the price of the metal posts (which could often not go down into the dry hard ground in Victoria) made them 'exceedingly expensive'.²² The very thick and soft 'black bull wire' was soon superseded by galvanised steel wires which, with droppers to keep the wire stable, allowing greater distance between fence posts, reducing the costs.²³ With progressive improvements, including local production of wire, use of timber posts, and winding and straining devices, by at least the early 1870s wire was the cheapest type of fence.²⁴ The invention of barbed wire in the 1870s, and its widespread use in Victoria in the 1880s meant that it could secure cattle as well as sheep, and it became the standard fence type from this time.²⁵

• Dry Stone Walls

In 1856 a government agricultural reporter travelling through the eastern part of Melton Shire (the Parish of Maribyrnong) commented that: 'A few good stone fences the only improvement worth noting.'²⁶

A dry stone wall was the best solution:- 'Where stone was abundant, timber scarce, transport of fencing material expensive, skilled labour available, and where cheaper alternatives were unavailable.'²⁷ From about the mid-late 1850s, when freehold ownership exploded and the price of labour declined, and through the early 1860s when the price of labour remained cheap, the labour-intensive construction of stone walls remained very competitive.

Stone walls were built wherever stony ground made them possible, or necessary. While most farmers built their own walls to clear stony ground and manage stock and crops, pastoralists could afford professional wallers.²⁸ In the mid 1850s brothers John and George

Funston, stone wallers and farm labourers from Ireland, are known to have been erecting walls on the Mount Aitken and Gisborne Park estates.²⁹ The Mount Aitken station accounts in 1868 showing the employment of a John Starkie for four weeks to help Henry gather and cart stones, and the engagement of 'Paterick [sic] Connor, Stone Wall Fencer' to erect 34 chains of stone walling at the very low rate of only 8 shillings per chain.

The popularity of stone walls with farmers is evident in the Lands Department files relating to the 1860s Selection Acts, which record the type, length and price of fencing 'improvements' made by each selector. A detailed examination of 21 selections in the Mount Cottrell, Rockbank, Mount Kororoit and Diggers Rest- Holden areas reveals that stone walling constituted by far the largest proportion (60%) of the 32.3 kilometres of fencing built on those properties by c.1875, despite the fact that it was the most expensive. Post & wire fences, one of the cheapest types of fencing then available, comprised only 6% of all fences erected. Post & rail fences, a little cheaper than the best stone walls, and a little dearer than the cheapest, constituted 9% of the fences. (Note that many other 'composite' varieties of fences were constructed from these three primary materials. There were also a small number of 'stub' or picket, and 'log' fences.³⁰)

Stone walling resolved two problems: the need to clear the land of rocks, and the need for fencing. Unquestionably, as was the case elsewhere, the key reason for the preference for dry stone walls on Melbourne's western plains by selectors was the need to clear stony land to enable cropping and grazing (dairying).³¹

21 Beattie, Steward K, *The Odd Good Year: Early Scots to Port Phillip, Northern Australia, Gap, Gisborne and Beyond*, Southwood Press, Marrickville, 1999, p.63

22 Willingham, *op cit*, pp.45-6

23 Cannon, 1978, *op cit*, pp.89-91

24 Survey of 21 Selectors in the Holden – Mount Cottrell districts.

25 Willingham, *op cit*, p.46; Kerr, *loc cit*; Cannon, 1978, *loc cit*

26 Victorian Parliamentary Papers, 'Statistics of Victoria for 1856', Appendix No.1, p.46

27 Vines, G, 'Comparative Analysis of Dry Stone Walls in Victoria, Australia and Overseas', in Corangamite Arts Council, 1995, *op cit*, p.56

28 Ann Beggs-Sunter, 'Buninyong and District Community News', Issue 211, August 1996

29 Judith Bilszta, Melton Heritage Study Research, Place No.029 (3/8/2005)

30 Research of PROV VPRS 625 (Selection Act files) for the Keneally, Slattery, Reddan J, Reddan M, Tate, Rhodes C, Rhodes, McKenzie, O'Brien P, McLeod, O'Brien J, Moloney, White, Mangovin, Carrige, Moylan Mary, Moylan Margaret, Parry, Moylan, MP, Moylan T, and Watts selections. This sample is primarily of selectors on stony country, Hannah Watts, in the forest off Chapmans Road Toolern Vale being the only exception; interestingly, the cost of her post & rail fences were half the price of the others, no doubt reflecting the relative proximity of materials, with none of the other properties having ready access to local timber. Another possible bias of the sample is the over-representation of Moylan properties. But it remains a good sample of fences built in stony country in the period late 1860s to mid 1870s.

31 Selectors were in fact obliged under the Selection Acts to cultivate 10% of their land area.

Apart from the relatively small areas of Melton Shire that were sold under the Selection Acts, there were many other areas of dry stone walling in the Shire. It is estimated that there were 23 miles of fencing on the Moylan brothers' Mt Kororoit property by 1876, and from the extensive walling that survives today it is evident that much of this was dry stone wall construction.³² Property sale advertisements in the local paper suggest that the properties on the Keilor Plain east of Toolern Creek were almost entirely walled.³³ Advertisements for stone wallers in the Buttlejorrk, Diggers Rest and Rockbank Estate areas appeared regularly until 1890. Between Toolern Vale and Diggers Rest the Beaty family built many kilometres of medium sized stone walls along boundaries, and a few larger walls inside their properties for stock. Other walls, including one of substantial composition (on the former Campbells' Toolern Park property), are scattered lightly around Toolern Vale. The highest concentration of walls is situated in the southern plains of the Shire: the 1850s small farming communities of Mt Cottrell and Truganina (this Mount Atkinson Precinct), and the paddock and boundary fences of WJT Clarke's Rockbank station.

According to Vines the dry stone walls of the Keilor-Werribee Plains 'form a reasonably distinct regional style quite different from either the interstate examples or the Western District walls'. This regional style is characterised by:-

*'... walls constructed using the local rounded, smoothly weathered, basalt field-stone of variable size. They are generally fairly low walls, averaging 1.2 metres with a width at the base of an average of 0.83 metres and battered sides on a slope of about 5-10 degrees off the vertical. Coursing is uncommon although coping is almost always found on intact walls and through stones can usually be identified at regular intervals of about one metre. The coping stones are often quite large, rounded boulders of a maximum dimension of 400-500 millimetres. Because of their rounded shape the stones are rarely suited to the close-fitting construction seen on the Western district walls, either for the main part of the wall or the coping. As a result, the rabbit proofing techniques involving close plugging, overhanging coping, or other methods are never found in this region.'*³⁴

32 The Australasian, 28th October 1876

33 Bilszta, 1990, *op cit*.

34 Corangamite Arts Council, *op cit*, p.58

These regular round stones lack interlocking, and often surface friction, and were never the ideal building material. The author of the 1848 'Rural Cyclopaedia' considered round stones objectionable 'as they are ever rolling off'. The small wedge stones which held these round stones in position were easily dislodged.³⁵ Similarly, the 'round stone fence' surmounted by turf was described in Loudon's 1857 guide to British agriculture as a 'very indifferent fence', whose only apparent benefit was that it cleared the land of stone and could be built by labourers. It was found to be unstable when built to a standard wall height. Stock could easily dislodge its copings, and 'great trouble and expense are annually required to keep it in repair.'³⁶ Despite this, as can be seen in an apparently scarce example of this type in Corangamite (the Foxhow Road Wall), a sturdy wall of very respectable height could be built by careful selection and coursing of stones, and the use of copestones and extensive plugging.³⁷

The Fences Statute's specification of walls to be a minimum 4 feet (1220 mm) high seems to have been the 'average paddock height' for which tenders were called in sheep country.³⁸ Walls in cattle country were built higher 'to discourage the cattle from leaning over to reach greener pastures and dislodging coping stones'. While numerous Western District dairying walls are higher, 'walls enclosing cattle were generally at least 1.4 metres (4 feet 7 inches) high'.³⁹ This standard also seems to have been applied in Melton, where the Moylan's high walls on Mount Kororoit Farm measure 1400 mm.

Although there is no conclusive evidence of it in Melton Shire, elsewhere boundary walls were built higher than internal walls. Vines states that: 'In almost all the dry stone wall regions in Victoria, the ... most substantial walls are located along the boundaries of properties. Subdivision of properties into fields was evidently a secondary consideration once the property had been fenced. Additional stone walls would be constructed to

35 Willingham, *op cit*, p.41

36 Loudon, JC, *Encyclopaedia of Agriculture*, 5th Edition (Longman Brown Green Longmans and Roberts, London, 1857), p.496

37 Corangamite Arts Council, *op cit*, p.28

38 Willingham, *op cit*, p.41. (The 1300 mm height was chosen as one of the categories for Study field survey. Almost all of the walls in the Shire had a base width of 700-800 mm.); Corangamite Arts Council, *op cit*, pp.49, 113

39 *ibid*, pp.17, 21, 130; Rod McLellan, 'The Dry Stone Walls of Victoria's Western District', *Historic Environment* Vol 7 No 2, 1989, pp.28-32

subdivide the property into paddocks if the field stone was so abundant as to allow these.⁴⁰ Perkins (whose stone wall education was in Britain) states similarly that: 'Inner boundaries however were not built as high as the boundary fences, which are also known as March Dykes.'⁴¹

- **Composite Walls**

In the study area, and Melbourne's western plains area, most of the remnant early fences are a combination of low stone walls with spit timber post with wire above (or, more rarely, timber rail). Many, perhaps the majority, of 'half walls' in Victoria were constructed because of limited availability of fieldstone.⁴² Peel states what is likely to be the primary reason for their construction:-

*'With increasing distance from a timber supply, less timber was used in fence construction and wire fences, or stone walls in the stony country, became more common. Again, where less stone was available, stone walls and wire fences were combined, with the stone wall portion consisting of anything from a single row of stones to a substantial wall three or more feet high with only one or two wires on top.'*⁴³

For example, says Peel, timber for the Sunbury vicinity was sourced from the Mount Macedon area, but as Sunbury was also at the edge of stony country, split timber, stone and wire were all used, commonly in the same fence.⁴⁴ And, as Vines has shown, the 'combination' fencing is also common on the Keilor and Werribee plains.⁴⁵ The reason for part stone wall - part wire fences of the Melton Shire study area relates to the quantity of stone in the area. And so the most typical stone fence of the study area reflects the particular geography and history of the Melton Shire, and is important for this reason.

Many other of Victoria's composite stone walls would appear to be the remnants of original all-stone walls that were later repaired by part-demolition and incorporation of post & wire fencing, or else just built up to a 'workable height' by the addition of post & wire

fencing (perhaps to accommodate a transition from sheep to cattle).⁴⁶ Mitchell states that 'Stone walls ... have since been electrified or had post and wire worked into their construction.'⁴⁷ Other examples of such walls have been recorded.⁴⁸

Some 'composite' stone walls were definitely not built as such. Farmers sometimes gathered 'floaters' as they appeared, stacking them under fences, making a rubble stone fence, rather than a professionally built 'dry stone wall'. Melton farmer Mary Tolhurst had stone walls on her childhood property, but also tells how, prior to sowing a crop, the men would take the horse and dray and pick up stones and place them along and under the property's post & wire and post and rail fences.⁴⁹

However the construction of half stone walls was not always simply an accidental by-product of the amount of fieldstone available, or deterioration of original walls, or need to increase wall height, or the need to progressively clear land. An 1861 treatise on fencing by a Scottish manufacturer includes a diagram showing wire fencing on top of stone walls.⁵⁰ And experiments with combining fencing materials to most economic effect were undertaken early in Australia. In 1851 John Learmonth in the Western District erected a boundary fence in which the lowest rail was replaced by a stone dyke (or wall).⁵¹ It appeared to Learmonth: 'that in some part this would add little to the expense, and at the same time would add to the durability and safety from fires.' Contracts for the same fences were being deliberately let in 1927, when a 'two foot walls with cope stone on a 2'6" base, with barb wire' was built at Turkeith near Birregurra.⁵²

In the Shire of Melton 'half-stone walls' – with the stone less than 18 inches high – were also built deliberately. The exact reasons are probably lost to time, but present farmers know that they had benefits in terms of preventing sheep crawling under the lower wire, and in preventing draught horses from scratching itch mites in the hairs of their legs.⁵³

40 Corangamite Arts Council, *op cit*, p.60

41 *ibid*, p.130

42 Corangamite Arts Council, *op cit*, p.80

43 Peel, LJ, *Rural Industry in the Port Phillip Region 1835-1880*, MUP, 1974, p.108

44 Peel, *op cit*, p 108.

45 Vines, G, *Built To Last; An Historical and Archaeological Survey of Dry Stone Walls in Melbourne's Western Region* (Living Museum of the West Inc, 1990).

46 Vines, 1995, *op cit*, p.60

47 Mitchell, H, 'Building Dry Stone Walls', *Grass Roots*, No.48, April 1985

48 Richard Peterson, Daniel Catrice, 'Bacchus Marsh Heritage Study', 1994

49 Mary Tolhurst, February 2002.

50 Willingham, *op cit*, p.46

51 Kerr, *op cit*. (Dyke was the Scottish word for stone wall.)

52 Mary Sheehan (author of Colac Otway Heritage Study), 11/8/2005

53 Personal conversations, John Morton, and Charlie Finch.

Many of the Melton composite stone and wire walls have neat coping stones intact. These all appear to have been built in the traditional manner in relation to base width and double wall construction (perhaps to comply with the Fences Act definition of a 'sufficient' wall). Other composite walls are less neatly constructed. These generally have a higher percentage of round-shaped stones, and consequently a higher wall batter and a more pyramidal, less vertical, shape. While some of these have obviously had posts inserted into them, it is also possible that some might have always been composite walls. The relative instability of stone walls built with the 'round stone' that predominates in Melton Shire may also have encouraged the original wall constructions to have been kept low, and topped up with wire.¹

Our natural association of 'the richest areas for dry stone walls'² with areas where fieldstone is most abundant is not the complete explanation for the different extent and quality of stone wall construction in different areas. While the availability of stone is the 'supply' side of the equation, there is also a 'demand' side: the need for fencing; and the economic feasibility of clearing land and building walls.

As mentioned previously, both historical and present maps of dry stone walls in Melton Shire show strikingly greater densities of walls in farming areas than on large pastoral properties. This is despite the fact that in this Mount Atkinson Precinct (in the Parish of Derrimut) and also in the adjacent Parish of Pywheitjorrk, both the pastoral and farming land-uses are situated in exactly the same volcanic landscape. So, while the greatest numbers of extant walls in the Shire were built as part of the Clarkes' vast Rockbank pastoral estate, the greatest concentrations are situated on medium and small sized farms. Another contrast between pastoral and farming properties evident in the fieldwork undertaken for this Study is that in all but one case (Clarke's boundary wall No.F96 on Faulkners Road) the most substantial stone walls – the most 'all-stone' and the highest walls – are also to be found on farms and small grazing properties rather than on the large pastoral estates.

Farms had a greater need for fencing, in order to separate stock from crops, and for construction of dairy yards, small dams, pigsties and cowsheds, than did large

sheep-runs, which only required fencing of boundaries and large paddocks. This more intensive use of the land would also have meant that it was worth investing more in the land, including clearing the property of fieldstone. Whereas land needed to be cleared for crops, and to maximise grass for cattle on small farms, less complete (if any) clearing of land was required to make huge flocks of sheep economical. For example, in the 1890s parts of the Chirnsides Brothers great Werribee Park pastoral estate were let to tenant farmers: 'The Chirnsides retained the "rocky" country, which was not fit for cultivation, but which was quite good grazing country, growing a nice quality of wool.'³ And there was comparatively little demand for fencing on the vast paddocks in the southern part of the Clarkes' Rockbank estate. While the evidence of the nearby small farms indicates that there was sufficient stone to build at least some substantial all-stone walls, it was not economical (or perhaps necessary) to build such walls for sheep paddocks.

The situation was different for farmers. At least three of the 21 selectors examined in the district (the Holden area) had stone coverage that was too expensive to clear. The Land Department inspector reported on Ellen Slattery's selection, which appears to have been the worst: 'I consider the land to be unfit for cultivation; it would cost from £20 to £30 per acre to clear some part of it, as it is a mass of rock.'⁴ While most of the volcanic plains would have cost much less than this to clear, even with a very conservative estimate of only £1 or £2 per acre, stone clearing would still have been a substantial cost likely to have been economical only for the more intensive land uses; that is, for farming rather than pastoralism.⁵ Being unskilled work, farmers (and their sons and itinerant labourers) would also be in a position to do it themselves cheaply.

So, even if there was sufficient fieldstone to build substantial stone walls, it was not always economical to clear it. In Australia the comparatively large size of landholdings, the high cost of fencing from scratch, and the predominantly pastoral land use, is likely to have had a significant influence on the form of stone wall

1 Loudon, *loc cit*

2 Eg, Vines, 1995, *op cit*, p.58

3 Morris, G, 'Centennial History, Werribee', extract obtained from *Werribee Banner*, 5th April 1962.

4 PROV VPRS 625 Unit 304 (20712), Inspector Yeoman, 10/9/1875

5 Figures provided by selector Alexander McLeod, whose density of rocks appears to have been unremarkable and may have been light, suggest that he spent approximately £1-2 per acre on 'clearing stone and sundries' (PROV VPRS 625, Unit 273 (18276)).

built. Whereas in Europe there is a high proportion of high all-stone walls, in Australia paddocks with enough stone to build high all-stone walls may not have been economical to clear.⁶ In the Melton Shire exceptions to this occurred in the larger and more successful mid-nineteenth century farms and small grazing properties (such as the Moylan, Beaty and Hopkins properties), on which some substantial stone walls (generally near the homestead) were constructed. The other major exceptions in Melton are the large and finely built Clarke dry stone wall dams. These, together with the magnificent boundary walls built by the Manifolds in the Western District to protect against rabbits, also support a conclusion that the use of stone was related not just to its quantity (the supply), but also to the special needs of the owners (the demand): for farming; or to countervail the peculiarly dry climate on Melton plains; or to combat the devastating rabbit plague on the Stony Rises. Cultural circumstances, for example, the local pool of skills in the Western District, and local traditions (such as belief in stone walls as a fire retardant), no doubt also played a part.⁷

Analysis of the 21 Selection Act files provides some grounds for arguing that the composite walls, such as 'post & wire and stone', may in fact have been particularly associated with the Melton district. The printed forms upon which selectors were asked to mark the improvements to their properties included 11 types of fences. However, these 11 options did not include categories for the most common type of fence in the district:- the composite 'post & wire & stone' (or 'post & rail & wire & stone') fence. Yet at least 5 of the 21 selectors in the district describe these types of fences on their selections, marking additions such as 'stone bottom' to the 'post and wire' category (Patrick O'Brien). It is likely that the lack of category meant that others again (in addition to these five) simply selected one of

the given types to describe their composite walls; some probably called their 'half stone' fences either 'stone walling' or 'post & wire' or 'post & rail' fences. (As such, it is likely that much of the fencing described as 'stone' and other categories was actually composite post & wire and stone. The price of the different type of walls would support the possibility that some 30% of the fencing built by these selectors was in fact post & wire and stone.)

One conclusion that could be drawn from the Selection Act pro-formas is that composite 'post & wire and stone' and 'post & wire & rail and stone' walls/fences were variants that were particularly associated with Melbourne's western plains. Alternatively, they may have been variants that became more common throughout the whole of Victoria around the time of the Selection Acts.

Composite stone and post & wire walls appear to characterise Melton Shire in a way that they do not elsewhere. But they are not confined to Melton Shire or Melbourne's western and northern plains. Examples are to be found in virtually all of the stone wall districts of Victoria, although they would appear to be small minority in some districts. There are also known to be many in New Zealand's Otago area, at least some in North America, but virtually none in Europe. The questions that remain, and can only ultimately be answered by further studies in other regions, is whether they are in fact the most common type of fence in Victoria as some claim, and whether they are more concentrated and numerous in Melton Shire and the Melbourne fringe than elsewhere.

History of the Place

All of the land in the precinct is situated in the Parish of Derrimut. It was subdivided by the Crown into allotments of c.100 acres, and sold in either May or November 1854. There were nine different purchasers of the ten Crown Allotments in the Mount Atkinson Precinct.

All of the land to the north of the Precinct – most of the Parish of Derrimut – had been purchased by WJT ('Big') Clarke at the same Crown Land sales.⁸ South of the precinct, in the Parish of Tarneit (in the Shire of Wyndham), c.160 acre allotments along Boundary

6 Gary Vines, posting in Heritage Chat, 11/8/2005

7 While it has not been analysed, it would seem that many of the large stone walls in the Western District (eg, the Kolora, Derrinallum and Purrumbete areas) were built by farmers c.1900 (Corangamite Arts Council, 1995, pp.76-142 and *passim*). The primary reason for the farmers' high walls, no doubt, was the amount of stone on the properties. But the 'demand' side may also have contributed. This was a period when dairying was transforming from a cottage to an export industry: the quality of the soil, or the rainfall, might have made this investment in the land worthwhile at this time, whereas it did not in Melton Shire. This is clearly very speculative, but perhaps demonstrates a need for more general research on the relationship between economics of farming and fence construction.

8 Parish Plan, Parish of Derrimut

Road were purchased by individuals, a few (eg William Doherty) of whom were *bona fide* farmers, while others (eg James Watson and William Craig) purchased multiple allotments, numerous of which appear to have been subject to speculative subdivision. South of these precincts the northern pattern was repeated, with WJT Clarke purchasing many allotments (although not as many as he did to the north); their price was probably lower than those on Boundary Road where speculators were operating.

• The Establishment of a Farming Community

The 1854 sales of Crown Lands in relatively small 100 acre parcels enabled the establishment of small farms. On allotments along Boundary Road, between Middle Road (originally in the Shire of Braybrook but in Melton Shire since the early twentieth century) and Doherty's Road (in the Shire of Wyndham), and significantly isolated by large pastoral estates, communities of *bona fide* farmers established small hamlets such as Mount Cottrell and South Derrimut (later known as Tarneit, and Truganina).

Melton Shire is a very dry place. The 'Melton Mallee' woodland near the Djerrivarrh Creek is the only place where mallee vegetation is found south of the Dividing Range.⁹ The area from about Bacchus Marsh - Diggers Rest to the Bay and towards Geelong has the lowest average rainfall in the Port Phillip district, about 22 inches (56 cm). The area between Melton and Werribee – which includes the Mount Atkinson Precinct – has the lowest rainfall of all, less than 18 inches (46 cm).¹⁰ Places associated with the provision of domestic and stock water supply are therefore of particular significance.

In the early 1930s, octogenarian Robert D Hopkins, born in 1854, related the two fundamental problems of early farmers. 'Two of the original difficulties' he said 'were in connection with water supply and transport.' For a time the necessary water was carried from Werribee River 'but only until such time as wells could be sunk, and dams used for water conservation'. As with the rest of the Shire however, it is likely that recourse would have had to have been made to the river in times of water shortage. 'Of course years passed before there were any metal roads', continued Hopkins, 'and horses ranged in

price from £120 to £140 per head. Consequently the bullock occupied pride of place for purposes of traction on the road or in the field.¹¹

In nearby Truganina (a little to the west) a bluestone Methodist church was built on the left bank of Skeleton Creek, on the south side of Boundary Road, in the 1850s. Then Sam Evans gave a quarter of an acre of land on the north-east corner of the intersection of Doherty's and Skeleton Creek Roads, for a corrugated iron Baptist church, built 1862. Members of the Baptist community included the locally prominent Cropley brothers. John Cropley often travelled across the country from Rockbank to take services as a lay preacher. Once a month Rev William Wade drove from Footscray on Saturday, preached at the church on Sunday, and returned to Footscray on Monday. An 1871 Sunday School roll names 37 children from 13 families.¹²

In the 1860s the Education Department inspector described the Mt Cottrell farmers as 'well-to-do', and the Rockbank families as being 'in fair circumstances'. The 'farmers and dairy keepers' of Mt Atkinson however were described as being 'in very moderate circumstances'.¹³ With the wretched seasons, droughts and pests of the early 1860s, many farmers left the area. By 1871 a 'group of twelve farmers and one labourer were the only landholders in south Derrimut'. The departure of the Cropley brothers and others from the district meant dwindling support for Baptist church, which was purchased in 1907 by the Werribee Presbyterian church, and used by a number of other Protestant churches.¹⁴

The farmers of the area 'were separated by their neighbours to the north by thousands of acres of the Clarke *Rockbank* Estate, but linked to their western neighbours by Boundary Road'.¹⁵ During the 1860s many of the surveyed roads on the square-mile grid on the southern plains had been closed, incorporated into the immense *Rockbank* estate. In 1871 the only open roads in the district are said to have been Boundary Road, Greigs Road, Mt Cottrell Road, and Mt Atkinson

9 National Trust of Australia (Victoria) Landscape Classification Report. Also *Ballarat Courier*, 11/6/1983

10 Peel, L, *Rural Industry in the Port Phillip Region, 1835-1880* (MUP, Melbourne, 1974), p.9

11 George F Green, 'A History of Truganina', unpublished typescript, 1935, pp.2-3

12 Starr, J, *Melton: Plains of Promise*, Shire of Melton, nd, pp.171-172

13 Ford, Olwen, 'Voices From Below: Family, School and Community in the Braybrook Plains 1854-1892' (M.Ed Thesis, University of Melbourne, 1993), pp.215, 235

14 Green, *op cit*, p.4. Pages 177-200 of the 'Rural Heritage Study: Western Region of Melbourne' (Melbourne Western Region Inc) by Chris Johnston / Context provides an overview of heritage places of this district.

15 Ford, *op cit*, p.234

Road (perhaps included at the urging of speculator TH Jones, who had subdivided a village half-way along this road).¹⁶ Notably, Hopkins Road is not included in this list; named after the Hopkins family several generations of whom were represented on the Braybrook Shire Council, it may have been opened after the 1878 Royal Commission into Closed Roads, which recommended the cessation of the practice of closing roads. The opening of Hopkins Road would have made Mt Atkinson Road, on which no small farm had been established, superfluous, and in c.1887 Patrick Killeen blocked it off with a stone wall across Boundary Road, effectively incorporating the road reservation into his own farm.¹⁷

In contrast to the Clarke estate which formed a barrier to the north, the east-west links were open for the farmers. In his evidence to the 1878 Royal Commission, Wyndham Shire Secretary and Engineer Patrick Nolan identified the 'three or four leading thoroughfares in the Shire of Wyndham' as Doherty's Road (parallel to and south of Boundary Road), Sayers Road (near Werribee), and Boundary Road, which he described as 'pretty well made'.¹⁸

• The Gold Era Subdivisions

An interesting historical sub-theme of the precinct was the small-allotment re-subdivision of land along prospective routes to the Ballarat gold-fields by gold-rush era speculators. Although the main route between Melbourne and Ballarat was the present Melton Highway through Keilor, the Western Highway and Greigs Road were lesser routes and Boundary Road, Middle Road and Doherty's Road apparently also carried some traffic.

When prices of land soared during the early 1850s, speculators snapped up Crown Lands on the flat, treeless, dry, isolated and shallow-soiled Melton-Werribee plains. They were particularly busy in the parishes of Pywheitjorrk and Derrimut. Travelling on the badly marked road from Geelong to Melbourne in 1854, William Westgarth encountered only 7 people (most near Melbourne), but was glad to see the plains in the process of survey. While hoping that men of modest financial means would be able to acquire it,

he remained sceptical:- 'Already the speculators are pouncing upon it – buying it all up as fast as it is sold, and letting it lie in hope of an augmented price.'¹⁹

But many of the speculators were not content to let their blocks lie, instead conjuring up audacious schemes to expedite and inflate their returns. The present day Boundary and Greigs Roads, and the Western Highway, as minor alternative routes between Melbourne and Ballarat, inspired the boosters to subdivide villages along them, creating so-called townships such as 'Middleton', 'Staughtonville', and 'North Uxbridge'. One township of about 120 suburban-sized allotments was even created half-way along Mount Atkinson Road.²⁰ Scores of allotments, of size ranging from less than half an acre to five acres (2 hectares), were created in these subdivisions.

If, as some proposed, the intention of the subdivisions was to facilitate the establishment of small yeoman farmers, they proved utter failures. No evidence of actual development, and only the barest fragments of their histories, remain today. It is highly likely in fact that many purchasers of the small rural and township blocks so created were themselves aspiring speculators. Most probably bought their properties on the strength of the representation of the 'developer', without having bothered to actually visit the properties. The boom appears to have amplified each whisper from every plausible source into an urgent din that many urban professionals and small businessmen found difficult to resist.

Crown Allotment 2 of Section One (the Hopkins homestead allotment) and CA 6 of Section One, and CAs 3 and 4 of Section Two, Parish of Derrimut, appear to have been subdivided by 1850s speculators. A later surveyors plan showed a patchwork of allotments, some with roads, on these allotments that are clearly the remnant of an earlier subdivision.²¹ There is also evidence that CA 3 of Section 2 (at least) was associated with the serial speculator/subdivider Joseph Charles Clinchy, of 'Melbourne Gentleman'. This allotment was one of at least three c.100 acre allotments which had

16 Ford, *op cit*, p.236, 239

17 PROV VPRS 460/P36721, statutory declaration by Samuel Smith, March 1907; and Lands Victoria, Torrens Application 36721, 'Plan of Crown Portions 1 & 3, Parish of Derrimut, 28/9/1905'.

18 Royal Commission into Closed Roads, Progress Report (containing minutes of evidence etc), Victorian Parliamentary Papers 1878 (No.72), p.13

19 Cited in John Lack & Olwen Ford, 'Melbourne's Western Region: An Introductory History' (Melbourne's Living Museum of the West, Melbourne Western Region Commission, 1986), p.30

20 Lands Victoria, Torrens Application 15850 (Crown Allotment 6, Section 15, Parish of Pywheitjorrk).

21 Lands Victoria, Torrens Application 31642, Claude Purchas 28/5/1898; a version of this plan is also attached to the title created by the application.

been purchased from the Crown by William Byrne, 'Melbourne Civil Engineer' and sold to Clinchy. While two of these Byrne allotments were on or near Boundary Road, a larger subdivision, 'better known as the Village of Surrey', was 'on the road to Buninyong', on the south side of the Western Highway, opposite Clarkes Road. As was typical, it was soon subsumed into the Rockbank estate.²²

At least 17 small allotments and two roads are known to have been created by Clinchy in the Mt Atkinson Precinct, on land newly purchased from the Crown by W Byrne and J Fox. As these allotments were approximately 4 acres each, and the original allotments some 200 acres, it is likely that many more were created. Having already purchased numerous of these small allotments, in 1898 Robert Faragher claimed much of the balance of CA3 and CA4 of Section 2 by adverse possession; some 12 names were identified as having a potential interest in the land.²³

Another major partnership in gold-rush speculation in Melton Shire comprised Algernon Lindsay, 'victualler', and James Moxham, 'auctioneer', both of Williamstown. They had jointly subdivided part of Section 24 Parish of Derrimut (the land immediately to the east of the present Hopkins Road overpass, on the south side of the Western Highway) into at least 58 allotments of 5 acres, selling them for up to £26 each.²⁴ Most purchasers (fellow Williamstown-ites) purchased multiple blocks, probably site unseen, and virtually all had on-sold to WJT Clarke within 3 or 4 years, usually at about half the price they had paid, although some received even less. The Lindsay/Moxham team also subdivided an allotment in the Mt Atkinson Precinct:- CA3, Section 1, Parish of Derrimut, on the east side of Mt Atkinson Road. The allotment had been purchased from the Crown by J Moxham in 1854, and in 1864 Algernon Lindsay conveyed some 46 allotments, on 'Lindsay', 'Mason' and 'Southgate' streets, to Patrick Killeen. These were likely the unwanted allotments from the goldrush subdivision. In 1904 Patrick Killeen's son Thomas, seeking creation of a title for his farm, claimed other parts of this property by adverse possession. His solicitors had identified 11 persons who might have had an interest in parts of the land.²⁵

There is also evidence that CA1 Section 1, the 100 acre allotment immediately north purchased from the Crown by WS Durie (who had also purchased the Rocklands homestead allotment for which there is also evidence of speculative subdivision), had also been subdivided into small allotments. In the period 1860s – 1880s Patrick Killeen had purchased portions of this Allotment from different owners.

Such speculative subdivisions in the Mt Atkinson Precinct would have been abandoned by the late 1850s, as soon as the major gold-rushes ended. Many of the unwanted small blocks appear to have been incorporated into the adjacent dairy farms, at a low price, or for no price where owners had simply walked away from their purchases. Some small farmers (such as the Killeens) may even have been initially attracted to the district because of the possibility of establishing very small farms on subdivided portions of the original 100 acre Crown Allotments. During the nineteenth century most of land in the Mt Atkinson Precinct was in the ownership of the Hopkins and Faragher families. In addition, another 270 acres were owned by the Killeens, and a 100 acre block was owned by the Clarkes.²⁶ The Woods family lived on a small property in the precinct on land rented from Clarke and Hopkins.

• **The Hopkins Property, Rocklands**

William Hopkins married Catherine Currie in Kilmarnock, Scotland on 2nd June 1851, after which the couple sailed for Australia, arriving at Gawler (South Australia) later in the year.²⁷ The extended family then moved around different parts of Victoria and Tasmania. One cousin settled in Sale, a second (after whom the Hopkins River is thought to have been named) went to Warrnambool, while cousin Robert moved to Boundary Road. In 1856 William and Catherine brought their young family to the property on which the homestead is built (part of of Crown Allotment 2, Section 1, Parish of Derrimut, which had been purchased from the Crown in May 1854 by WS Durie.²⁸) William conducted a dairy farm.²⁹ The Hopkins' were the only Presbyterian family in the locality then known as 'Derrimut' – later Truganina – in which Wesleyans, Episcopaleans, and Baptists predominated.

22 PROV VPRS 460/P/35850 (Torrens Application 35850), conveyance, 17/8/1863.

23 PROV VPRS 460/P/31642 (Torrens Application 31642), various conveyances.

24 VPRS 460/P/35850 (Torrens Application 35850), various indentures.

25 PROV VPRS 460/P/36721 (Torrens Application 36721), various indentures.

26 Shire Map Series (1892): Parish of Derrimut

27 Unless otherwise stated, Hopkins family history is derived from personal conversations with Mrs Wendy Bitans, 13/2/2002, 14/3/2002.

28 Parish Plan, Parish of Derrimut

29 Sutherland, A. *Victoria and Its Metropolis*, (McKarron Bird, Melbourne, 1888), p.427

It was a pocket of smaller holdings isolated from Rockbank in the north by WJT Clarke's vast *Rockbank* estate, further to the north-east lay Morton and Leech's *Mount Derrimut* station. It was connected to the west and east by Boundary Road.³⁰

School records show that in 1866 the Hopkins' had five children enrolled in the local school: William, aged 13 (born in Adelaide); Robert, aged 11 (born in South Melbourne's 'Canvass Town'); Margaret, aged 8, Elizabeth, aged 6, and Catherine, aged 3. As with many local communities in the early days, the Derrimut community was in dispute about the best location for the local school, with the different camps lodging hand-drawn maps of the location of dwellings of children who attended the school. The school committee was split, with four members representing the southern interests, and five representing families in the Parish of Derrimut. William Hopkins was in the camp of the latter. The dispute escalated dramatically when the Hopkins camp moved the school to their preferred site (rather than the site selected in Truganina by the southern interests) in the middle of the night. The southern camp was furious, describing the the settled Wesleyan and Episcopalian families of Derrimut as ruffians. A correspondent complained particularly of the behaviour of William Hopkins at a meeting. He had 'interrupted the proceedings in a most violent manner, using towards your correspondent the most vile and filthy language as could not be repeated'. Receiving no support from the chairman, the complainant left the meeting. By 1871 the vocal Hopkins was a Councillor of the Shire of Braybrook.³¹

The 1860s marked a turning point for farming in the Melton district, with many small farmers failing and leaving from this time. The boom prices of the gold-rush had collapsed, the good early yields had quickly exhausted the poor soils, and the crops were infested with rust and caterpillars, and decimated by drought. The advent of pleuro-pneumonia in cattle was devastating for those who relied on dairy produce. And wheat was now imported into Melbourne, both from overseas and from the new lands being opened in northern Victoria. The peak acreage under crop in the district from Bacchus Marsh to Craigieburn (including Melton), occurred in 1859. This figure was halved by

1864, and a further slight decline occurred during the next two decades.³²

The report of the West Bourke agricultural inspector in 1862-63 noted the continued drought, and the advent of 'that dreadful disease, pleuro-pneumonia.' This had ruined some industrious families, and was causing many dairymen to turn their attention to sheep dealing.³³ Memories of Melton Shire farmers John Chandler and Anders Hjorth both record the loss of heifers on local farmers commons (usually just unalienated crown land) to pleuro-pneumonia.³⁴ While in 1863-64 pleuro-pneumonia was no so virulent according to the inspector, he noted that he had recently 'met a gentleman from Derrimut who informed me that he had lost 27 of his best milkers' to the disease.³⁵ The disease was a major incentive to farmers to build good walls. Grain cropping farmers were devastated by 'rust and the caterpillar' in the 1863-64 season.³⁶

The exceptional drought continued through the 1865-66 season: '... most disastrously felt over the whole line of the plain country, extending from Essendon to the Djerrivarrh Creek.' There was still the occasional loss of cattle in the district to pleuro-pneumonia. The hoped-for advantages of the 'commonages' to dairy farmers had been disappointed, as they were always overstocked during the growing months, and in drought the 'wretched cattle' must die of starvation, said the agricultural inspector.³⁷ In the Truganina - Derrimut area, which has the lowest average annual rainfall in the Port Phillip district (18 inches), only 11 inches of rain fell in each of the years 1867 and 1868.³⁸

The drought of the 1860s caused the failure of many small settlers, and the merging of their quarter square mile properties into larger holdings.³⁹ Olwen Ford's detailed study of the South Derrimut district shows that

30 Ford, Olwen, 'Voices From Below: Family, School and Community in the Braybrook Plains 1854-1892' (M.Ed Thesis, University of Melbourne, 1993), pp.222, 234

31 Ford, *op cit*, pp.222, 230

32 Peel, L, *Rural Industry in the Port Phillip Region, 1835-1880*, (MUP, 1974), p.90.

33 Victorian Parliamentary Papers, 1864, p.94

34 Chandler, J (M Cannon), *Forty Years in the Wilderness* (Loch Haven, Arthurs Seat, 1990), p.175; 'Recollections of Melton 1861-67', by Anders Hjorth, reproduced in the MDHS News Sheet, April 2001

35 Victorian Parliamentary Papers, 1864-65, Vol.3, p.93.

36 *ibid* The dry lands that were soon to be opened for selection on the lower Goulburn and the Wimmera were not affected by rust, and consequently wheat growing soon moved north from the 1850s farming areas such as Port Phillip and Kyneton.

37 Victorian Parliamentary Papers, 1867, Vol.3, 1st Session, pp.83-84.

38 Green, *op cit*, pp.3-4, 7

39 *ibid*

in 1866 there had been 40 families with schoolchildren in the district. Six families were lost to the district in 1868-69, and by 1871 there were only twelve farming families, and one labourer, with children in the school.⁴⁰

William Hopkins continued to add acreage to his farm. By the early 1870s he had increased his holding to 387 acres of land, described as being situated in a 'peculiar manner, that is to say, in various blocks and not those adjoining each other.' Three of the blocks were situated amongst WJT Clarke's holdings.⁴¹ By the 1880s, under the management of William Hopkins junior and his brother Robert, dairying had been replaced by hay growing and grazing.⁴² The combination of hay and sheep was one of the movements in local farming in the late nineteenth century.⁴³ Although dairying would also make a general revival at a later stage, the pleuro-pneumonia outbreak of the late 1860s could be expected to have contributed to the shift at the Hopkins' farm. Indian horse-dealers were also good buyers of the district's hay at that time.⁴⁴ In the early twentieth 'general farming and grazing' were being conducted on the property.⁴⁵

The family was immersed in the 'South Derrimut' - 'Truganina' community. William junior married a Missen (the large pioneering Rockbank family who had also come over from South Australia), as did several of his sisters. His brother Robert Duncan Hopkins married a Miller (of Millers Road Altona); it was Robert who inherited the homestead property. In the early 1880s elder brother William, a justice of the peace, followed his father's footsteps in being elected a member of the Braybrook Shire Council in 1882, and President in 1887.⁴⁶ Robert Duncan Hopkins, who obtained possession of the Rocklands property, also followed his father in being both a member of the school Board of Advice, and a Councillor of the Shire of Braybrook; he was President of the Shire at the time of Federation.⁴⁷

The family is well represented in historical photographs of Truganina annual picnics. Local records show Robert Hopkins as runner-up in both the 'Slow Bicycle Race', and Obstacle Race held at the Truganina Debating

Society's 1904 picnic. R Hopkins, with JP Robinson, was elected first President of the Truganina Progress Association in 1924. In 1926 he was appointed a Trustee of the new Truganina recreation ground. In 1933, at a ball held to mark the Silver Anniversary of the opening of the Truganina Hall (Mechanics Hall), Robert Hopkins was presented with an illuminated address as a token of appreciation of his 25 years as Secretary to the Hall committee. With Henry Robinson, Robert Hopkins also initiated the Truganina tradition of the 'Ladies Night', in which men provided entertainment and catering as a gesture of thanks for the work of the local women at all public functions in the area.⁴⁸ Robert had the first tractor in the district.

In January 1969, on the same day the (separate) Lara fire killed five people, a fire started on Boundary Road and quickly burnt east and south. Many of the local fire brigade out fighting the Lara fire returned to find their own houses burnt. Forty five houses were destroyed by the 'Truganina' fire that day, as well as the Truganina school and hall.⁴⁹ While the stone house of their neighbour to the west was lost to the fire, and Tibbermore, the nearby house on their south side, was charred, Rocklands survived.⁵⁰

The exact date of the present bluestone house is unknown to the family, but is thought to be early. Family history is that the first house was of wattle and daub. William brought a stonemason from Scotland to build the house (his second job was a house on nearby Doherty's Road). In 1881 the house was described as a bluestone house of four rooms with wooden stables.⁵¹ In the 1930s Robert D Hopkins, who was born in 1854, remembered a hotel (or shanty) that had been built opposite the Hopkins' farm to cater for goldfields traffic along Middle Road.⁵² Hopkins family lore is that

40 Ford, *op cit*, pp.223, 225, 234

41 Ford, *op cit*, p.222, citing William Hopkins' 1881 probate papers. He had also acquired 114 acres in the Parish of Truganina.

42 Sutherland, *loc cit*

43 Sutherland, *op cit*, p.419-439

44 Green, GF, 'A History of Truganina' (1935), p.4

45 Albert Evans, 'From the Early Settlers to the 1969 Fires' (unpublished manuscript), p.5

46 Sutherland, *op cit*, p.427

47 Evans, *loc cit*; Bitans, *op cit*, 13/2/2002; Green, *op cit*, p.7

48 Green, *op cit*, pp.10-14

49 Bitans, *op cit*

50 Evans, *op cit*, p.5; The overgrown ruins of the stone house to the west survive. It was owned by Patrick and Mary Anne Killen and family from at least c.1870 to 1890s, and then Bob Patterson; there are memories of the Hopkins' family visiting the Pattersons to play cards (Shire Map Series, 1892, Parish of Derrimut; Ford, *op cit*, p.233

51 Ford, *op cit*, p.222, citing probate papers.

52 Green, *op cit*, p.2. It is possible that Middle Road was one of the many informal routes taken in the early goldrush days before official roads (tracks) were properly formed. It would have provided a route from the west of Melbourne (including the Footscray and Williamstown areas) away from the swampy Western Highway route which was not in common use until several decades later. Wendy Bitans recounts local lore that there are two graves dating to the goldrush days beside the

stone for the Rocklands house was taken from this shanty. If this is so, better quality quarried stone was probably also obtained from elsewhere for dressing by the stonemason. The archaeological remains of the hotel (several depressions, with evidence of stone foundations and stairs, in which crockery and other artefacts have been found, and cobble paving) are situated in a paddock on the opposite side of Hopkins Road, on a property which is thought to have been owned by the Hopkins family since the early 1850s.

The Derrimut-Truganina plain is the driest place in the Port Phillip region. Until such time as underground tanks and dams could be sunk, the residents of the Truganina area had to carry water from the Werribee River.⁵³ It could reasonably be assumed that it was very early in his occupation that Hopkins built the small dam near the homestead, located to take advantage of a shallow drainage line which crosses in front of the property (Wall B44). It is an extremely good expression of the necessity for farmers to harvest water in the plains area. It is also an excellent example of the shallow dams built in the plains areas, where the shallow soil (high bedrock) generally prevented deep excavation for paddock tanks, and so fieldstone was used to build up walls on shallow drainage lines. It is c.3 metres deep, which would appear to be deeper than the typical early small dry-stone wall dams in the district. Its quality of construction, and depth, may have played a part in the success of the Hopkins farm at times when many neighbours were failing.

This dam appears very similar to the description and plan of a 'pond' provided in an 1857 edition of a British encyclopaedia, a variant of the conventional English paved stock pond:-

*'It consists in employing the horse-shoe form as the ground plan of the excavation, and cutting all the sides steep, or at an angle of 45 or 50 degrees, except the part answering to the heel of the shoe, which is well gravelled or paved, as the only entrance for the cattle. The excavated earth serves to raise the high side of the pond, which is generally guarded by a fence, or a few trees.'*⁵⁴

road, one near Hopkins Road, the other (a 12 year old girl) some 1.5 kilometres east. Their exact locations were known to the previous generation of locals. Ruts were once visible in the road.

53 Green, *op cit*, p3.

54 Loudon, JC, *Encyclopaedia of Agriculture* (London, Brown Green Longman's & Roberts, 1857), p.735.

The Hopkins dam varies only in the addition of dry stone walling for the steep sides of the construction.

The farm is also notable for its complex of dry stone walls, as stockyards and paddock walls. The present owner is Wendys Bitans, a direct descendant of the original owner, William Hopkins. She advises that the walls were substantially altered in the 1930s Depression, when her father allowed many to be taken apart by rabbiters facing starvation. They were afterwards rebuilt, but not with the professional skills of the originals.

• The Faragher Property

To the south of and adjoining the Hopkins' property were the homes of the two Faragher families. Daniel and Robert H Faragher had purchased the site of the present Tibbermore homestead from J Begg in 1855, just one year after Begg had purchased it from the Crown. In 1859 they purchased C Smith's 100 acre Crown purchase on Middle Road. Additional allotments were purchased over the following decades.⁵⁵

In the 1860s Robert and Elizabeth Faragher had four children of school age, as did Daniel and his wife Christina. Daniel Faragher, the eldest brother, was a member of the Braybrook Road District Board. The Faraghers were Weslyans; Robert was Chapel Steward of the Wesleyan chapel at Skeleton Creek and the donor of half an acre of land proposed for a new school site.⁵⁶

The brothers ran the farm as a partnership. Daniel died in 1868, and his wife Christina died in 1869, leaving five children (one had died in 1866). Daniel Faragher had been 'one of the of the more comfortably off families in the district', yet the list of his assets in his probate papers include what we would regard today as very small items, such as 30 milch dishes, two cream crocks, two buckets, a can and scales and weights.

It appears that after Daniel's death Robert took over the running of the whole farm, and possibly the guardianship of the children. The Daniel Faragher children attended Mount Cottrell school to the west, possibly with a 'certificate of destitution.'

By 1871 Rober Faragher was one of the larger landholders of the Braybrook Shire, his farm was being over 500 acres in extent (half held in trust for his brother's children). He was involved in Mount Cottrell school, and

55 PROV VPRS 460/P/31642.

56 Ford, *op cit*, p.222

was one of the organisers of an annual picnic held for the people of Mt Cottrell and the plains. His son William was a school prize winner in 1874. The Faragher family were buried at Truganina Cemetery.⁵⁷

In 1900 Robert Faragher (farmer 'of Tower Hill, Koroit') held title to 584 acres 3 roods and 1 perch of land in Sections 1 and 2 of the Parish of Derrimut. In 1902 this land was transferred to Moonee Ponds 'gentleman' Finlay McPhail, who sold it in 1906 to 'Derrimut Grazier' John Walter Leigh.⁵⁸ The information of the current owner is that Faragher 'went back' to Kororoit around 1900. Like all local farmers, he made money at the time by growing oats for Boer War horses. The Leighs built the 'extension' to the house. This was probably the current weatherboard house (with pressed metal ceilings), behind which is a bluestone addition which is believed to have been constructed with stone from the original Faragher house (the large underground tank being the only part of the original house which now survives).⁵⁹

By 1934 that part of the property to the east of Hopkins Road (202 acres, 2 roods, 31 perches) was on a separate title, in the ownership of Harold Knowles. In 1941 William Athol Boyd was the owner. In 1950 and 1951 the property changed hands several times, but in 1952 was purchased by Alexander Graham McNaughton, whose descendents still own this and adjacent properties.⁶⁰ The McNaughtons have thus owned the property and maintained its dry stone walls longer than any other owner.


Old local resident Albert Evans' late twentieth century notes on the district have it that the Faragher family 'all died at an early age', that Bill Hannan and then Bill Boyd farmed the property for a number of years before it was sold to McNaughton.⁶¹

In about 1960 a major theft occurred of stone from one of the walls of the Tibbermore property. The house had a close escape from the devastating 1969 fire, its bullnoze verandah being lost.

It is evident from the sketch plan attached to the original

title that the property had originally been subdivided into small allotments by early speculators. It was no doubt one of these sites that is today known as the 'shanty site'.⁶²

A surveyors plan of Robert Faragher's land in 1900 shows a roughly 'H' shaped property with Hopkins Road crossing vertically through the centre. It is evident that Crown Allotments 2, 4 and 6 of Section One, and CAs 3 and 4 of Section Two have been previously subdivided into many smaller parcels, some of which have been amalgamated. Section Two shows two of the roads created in the early subdivision, but apparently never actually used. (Courtesy of Mrs Bonnie McNaughton.)



• **The Killeen Property**

To the west of McNaughtons' Tibbermore, to the east of Mt Atkinson Road, is a low ruin of a stone cottage that was built by the Killeens, and nearby an associated dam and windmill. The house was destroyed in the 1969 fire.⁶³

In 1864 Patrick Killeen, of Kildare, Ireland, purchased 46 of the unwanted small lots created by speculators A Lindsay and J Moxham in the mid 1850s. Patrick and Mary Ann Killeens' daughter Catherine was born on the property in 1868. They progressively added to their landholding, purchasing additional allotments over ensuing decades.⁶⁴

57 Ford, *op cit*, pp.230-232
 58 Certificate of Title, Vol.2770 Fol.553853. (Thanks to Bonnie McNaughton for copy of this title).
 59 Bonnie McNaughton, personal conversation, 26/2/2002
 60 Certificate of Title, Vol.5896 Fol.1179073
 61 Albert Evans, notes ('From the Early Settlers to the 1969 Fires'), Site 45.

62 Personal conversation, Bonnie and Robert McNaughton, 26/2/2002
 63 Evans, *op cit*, Site No.44.
 64 PROV VPRS 460/P/36721, conveyances and statutory declarations.

In 1870 the Killeens' farm was 170 acres. They were still a young couple when their three week old daughter Mary Jane died in 1870. Mary Anne told the coroner she took her down to their 'next neighbour' Mrs Woods 'who is of more experience about children than I am'.⁶⁵ (Two of the Woods children were later to die of the diphtheria that scourged the district in the 1870s. The Woods also lived within the precinct.⁶⁶) Four Killeen children died under the age of 6 years.⁶⁷

In 1872 Patrick Killeen and neighbouring farmers John Scott, his nephew William, and William Palmer, were driving drays home from a bone mill at Melton with 1.5 tons of bone dust. They stopped for a drink at the Rose and Crown Hotel in Rockbank, after which Scott stumbled and fell under the wheel of his dray, which killed him. While denying that Scott was drunk, Killeen conceded to the coroner that 'I believe the deceased was in the custom of taking a good deal of liquor. We used to have a drop together sometimes'.⁶⁸

Mary Anne Killeen died in 1884 and her daughter Rachel died in 1889. Patrick died from an accident in 1898, and in the early years of the next century his son Thomas succeeded to the family farm. The property was leased to the Patterson family, who milked cows up until 1939; after the war Colin Morton's brother purchased it.⁶⁹

• The Rockbank Estate

Like most farming precincts in Melton Shire situated east of Toolern Creek, the Hopkins, Faragher and Killeen farms were almost surrounded by the Clarke family's immense Rockbank pastoral estate. Clarke owned the abutting land to the west, north, and east of the Mt Atkinson Precinct.⁷⁰ The western and northern perimeter walls of the precinct are Rockbank boundary walls.

WJT 'Big' Clarke, whose early 1850s Sunbury Special Survey coup saw him gain control of most of the stations of earlier squatters in the whole region from Diggers Rest to Konagaderra, set about adding to this estate at the 1850s Crown land sales in the Shires of Melton and Wyndham. He was later described as the

largest landholder in Australia. Clarke apportioned this vast estate into different stations including *Bollinda Vale*, *Red Rock* (both north of Sunbury, and including Rupertswood) and *Rockbank* (which extended south of Sunbury to near Werribee, mostly from Diggers Rest to Tarneit). The *Rockbank* station had originally been established in the early 1840s; the headstation of its previous owner, WC Yuille, had been at the Beatty's Road crossing of Kororoit Creek, the location of the former Rockbank Inn.

Over the next 30-40 years Clarke and his son WJ Clarke (later to become Australia's first baronet) added greatly to their estate by buying adjacent properties, many of which had been abandoned by impoverished farmers during times of droughts or agricultural disease. Upon Big Clarke's death in 1874 WJ Clarke inherited his Victorian estate, including 136,310 acres in the Melbourne vicinity, stretching in an arc from about Sunshine, Tarneit, Balliang, Rockbank, Diggers Rest, Sunbury, Bolinda Vale and across to the Hume Highway.⁷¹ By 1892 Sir WJ Clarke owned the vast majority of the Parish of Pywheitjorrk, which together with his similarly extensive Parish of Derrimut landholdings, comprised most of the southern part of his immense *Rockbank* estate.⁷²

71 Peel, *op.cit.*, pp.130-1; Michael Clarke, *'Big' Clarke* (Queensberry Hill Press, Melbourne, 1980) Clarke (1980), opposite p.247

72 SLV Map 821.1A (1892), Parish of Pywheitjorrk; also PROV VPRS 460/P0 (35850).

65 Ford, *op cit*, pp.233-234

66 Ford, *op cit*, p.241


67 PROV VPRS 460/P/36721, conveyances and statutory declarations.

68 Ford, *op cit*, pp.224-225

69 Evans, *loc cit*

70 Shire Map Series (1892), Parishes of Derrimut and Pywheitjorrk.

Part of Parish of Derrimut, 1892, showing the boundary of the Clarke Rockbank estate (hatched in original and highlighted here in yellow) surrounding the farming district on three sides. The western and most of the northern parts of this boundary wall survive. The farming area of Truganina/Tarneit continues on into the Parish of Tarneit (in the Shire of Wyndham). The centre of the image is junction of Hopkins Road (north south) and Middle Road (east west), the west part of which is closed.



However, by the end of the nineteenth century historical changes were afoot. In addition to new taxes and the inherent difficulties of the pastoral industry, a new generation of farmers was restlessly surveying the vast pastoral estates about them. In the 1860s local Melton farmer Anders Hjorth had observed that 'the village was surrounded by large pastoral estates on three sides.'⁷³ There had long been a belief in Melton that these estates were thwarting the development of the town. As early as 1883 the situation enraged radical liberal politician John Quick:

*'What a monstrous and barbaric law that must be, under which the splendid land between Melbourne and Sunbury, and between Melbourne and Geelong, capable of giving homes and existence to a teeming population, is locked up in pastoral solitudes ...'*⁷⁴

As the the 1890s depression deepened popular discontent intensified, with calls for the repurchase of

73 Hjorth, *op cit*. Also, MDHS (1905 Melton Express), *op cit*, which refers to these three stations, plus Taylor's Overnewton Estate.

74 Cited in Lack, Ford, *op cit*, p.32

good pastoral lands for subdivision into small farms. The language was as it had always been: 'the plough' versus 'the sheepwalks'. The 'yeoman ideal', and the associated wrestle for the land between the rich and the poor had been a long-running and major theme in Australian history, evident in the diggers' movements to 'unlock the land' in the 1850s and 60s, the 'Closer Settlement' Acts at the turn of the century, and the early-mid twentieth century 'Soldier Settlement' Acts.

This early twentieth century 'break-up' of the large estates was a milestone in Australia's history. It coincided with major developments in farming in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, as new science, technologies, fertilisers, transport and markets enabled huge productivity increases. With inventions such as the Babcock separator, the development of local co-operative creameries and butter factories, and advances in refrigeration creating new export markets, dairying in particular boomed. In 1901 there were 42,000 rural properties in Victoria. By 1914 this number had jumped to 70,500, and by 1923 to a peak of 80,500.⁷⁵

And so the beginning of the twentieth century marked a watershed in the history of Melton Shire. In 1898 surveyors on behalf of Sir RTH Clarke began their calculations of the bearings and lengths and fences of the estate, in preparation for its sale.⁷⁶

The Dry Stone Walls

• Dry Stone Walls on the Hopkins & former Faragher Properties

Most of the walls in the precinct appear to have been built by the Hopkins family, whose Rocklands homestead is the centrepiece of the precinct, and the adjacent Faragher family. As a consequence of the goldrush subdivisions, some of the Hopkins and Faragher lands were in small parcels, and there was some swapping of these between the two neighbours, adding to the uncertainty about who built some of the walls.⁷⁷

75 Dingle, *op cit*, p 193.

76 Clarke (1980), *passim*; Lands Victoria Torrens Application 32123. Sir RTH Clarke Bart. sold the vast section of the Rockbank Estate that lay south of the Western Highway in November 1906; it appears that he sold the northern portion about a year earlier. (PROV VPRS 560/P0, 35850); also CT Vol.3211 Fol.642206, pertaining to an 8000 acre portion south part of this estate; and also Shire of Melton Ratebooks from 1905-06 which record local farmers as owners of parts of the Rockbank estate.)

77 Wendy Bitans, personal conversations, 13/2/2002, 14/3/2002;

In the early 1930s Robert D Hopkins recalled a 'hotel or "sly grog shop" opposite his residence, the ruined cellar of which could still be seen. The stone foundations and remains of this shanty or hotel cellar are still visible, set amongst dry stone walls.⁷⁸


The map below shows the walls that were situated in the precinct in 1916, with walls extant in 2006 marked in yellow. The walls would have been built by the original Hopkins and Faragher families, and are likely to date from the late 1850s to the 1870s.

also PROV VPRS 460/P/31642, Deed of Agreement 'to exchange lands Robert D Hopkins to Applicant' (1898).

78 Green, *op cit*, p.2; Bitans, *op cit*.

Part of 1916 Ordnance Map, showing the location of walls, which mark:- road boundaries; the internal boundaries of the c.100 acre allotments into which the land was surveyed and sold by the government; and also numerous smaller parcels some of which were the product of the even smaller allotments that were created by speculators in the mid -1850s gold-inspired property boom.

The Mt Atkinson Dry Stone Walls Precinct situated in the Shire of Melton, north of Boundary Road. The walls to the south of Boundary Road, in the former small farming district of Truganina/Tarneit in the adjacent Shire of Wyndham, are an integral part of the precinct. This small farming district was wedged between huge pastoral estates. The walls to the west and north of the precinct are the boundary walls of the Clarkes' Rockbank estate. The Mt Atkinson Precinct walls identified in this Study (the extant walls) are highlighted in yellow; it can be seen that these comprise the majority of the original walls (the walls south of Boundary Road were not included in this study).



Of the many walls in the precinct which are likely to have been associated with Hopkins and Faragher (the present Rocklands and Tibbermore properties), evidence from c.1900 surveyors plans associated with Torrens Applications by the parties suggests that:-

- Hopkins Road boundary Walls B127 and B139 and Middle Road boundary Wall B140 were almost certainly built by Hopkins; although Hopkins Road may not have been opened until the 1870s or later, it is likely that the southern portion, which provided access to Hopkins and other farms, was opened early, and that these walls also date from the period late 1850s – 1860s.
- The complex of stockyards and walls on the Rocklands homestead site was obviously built by Hopkins; while some probably date to an early era, it is known that they were added to and rebuilt over time.
- The fine long north-south Wall B118 formed a property boundary between Faragher and Killeen and also Faragher and Hopkins, so is likely to have been built by Faragher, likely by the 1860s. This wall, known as the 'mile wall', was originally an all-stone wall which has been topped up with a few strands of wire; it is one of the most vertical and intact walls in the precinct.
- Walls B125/126 to the west of Hopkins Road, and Walls B38 and B42 on the east side of Hopkins Road were also Hopkins – Faragher boundary walls, the cost of which was likely shared, and which could have been built by either party. They were probably built in the late 1850s – early 1860s.
- Road boundary walls on the Faragher property – Walls B124 (Hopkins Road) and B119 (Boundary Road) – would have been erected by Faragher; they are likely to have been amongst the first walls they erected.
- One wall on Tibbermore that does not appear on surveyors Jenkins' 1898 plan is Wall B120. It was either built later or, being an internal wall, was simply not recorded in 1898.

No early surveyors' plans or descriptions of Wall B46 on Middle Road have been found. However it was the boundary to an allotment owned by RD Hopkins in the late nineteenth century, and may have been built

by him.¹ It is of a style that is important in the Shire of Melton:- the composite 'half-walls' (apparently originally built in that form), some of which comprise a low stone wall, with just a few well-laid courses of stone and post & wire above. Wall B46 on Middle Road is probably the best stone wall of this type (in terms of condition and length) in Melton Shire.

As previously noted, Wall B44 (the dam in front of Rocklands) is a classic example of nineteenth century small farm dams adapted to the Melbourne's western plains. It is likely to have been one of the very early structures built by William Hopkins.

Many of the Hopkins walls were rebuilt in the 1930s as a consequence of the activities of rabbiters in the Depression.

The continuous occupation of Rocklands by the Hopkins family may have contributed to the preservation of the walls; similarly the Faragher property has been owned by the McNaughton family for a lengthy period.

• **Dry Stone Walls on the former Clarke Rockbank Estate**

The estates of the pastoralists – particularly the Clarkes, Staughtons, and Taylor – dominated Melton Shire in the nineteenth century. Of the 165 kilometres of dry stone walls identified in the Shire in this study, 73.7 kilometres, some 45%, appear to have been erected by the Clarkes' (WJT Clarke, Sir WJ Clarke, and Sir RTH Clarke) on the Rockbank estate. There are almost no drystone walls remaining that were associated with the Staughtons or William Taylor.

Little is known of when most of the Clarke walls were constructed.² Most of the information presently available constitutes the documents associated with RTH Clarke's applications for Torrens titles in preparation for selling the land in the early years of the twentieth century. In particular, statutory declarations attached to these applications (held at the PROV) sometimes describe the age and position of existing fences, and field notes for survey plans (held at Lands Victoria) often mark the walls and fences. Also, from the first edition of the Bacchus Marsh Express newspaper in 1866 until

1 Shire Map Series (1892): Parish of Derrimut

2 Any Clarke family papers relating to the period might include such information in the form of account records, correspondence between managers and owners, maps, photographs etc. Such papers have not been located at this stage.

about 1890, there were periodic advertisements seeking stone wallers for specified lengths (miles) of walling. For example, in 1880 Clarke advertised for ‘Stonewallers on Rockbank Station’; applicants were advised to apply at either the Raglan or Monmouthshire Hotels.³ These advertisements – ‘apply Monmouthshire Hotel Diggers Rest’ or ‘Rockbank Inn’, or ‘Rockbank Estate’ – appear at regular intervals, together with warnings that trespassers pulling down walls would receive summary justice.⁴ Although some walls are known to have been built later, it is likely that most stone walls on the Rockbank estate were built between the late 1850s and the early 1880s, after which period post and wire fencing would have been the major type of fencing built throughout area, as it was throughout the State.

Unlike farming properties, the vast majority of Rockbank pastoral estate walls erected were boundary walls. There were relatively few internal paddock walls. It could be conjectured that Rockbank estate boundary walls were more substantial due to their purpose in providing security. However a more detailed study would be required to confirm this; the style and quality of dry stone walls on the Clarke estate varies considerably. This would relate at least in part to the range of wallers used over the long period of their construction, and to the availability and quality of stone on different parts of the estate.

The precinct contains a number of Rockbank boundary walls. Clarke probably arranged their construction.

Walls B115, B130 and B47 are portions of the same original east-west wall, c.2.3 kilometres in length, which comprised a southern boundary of the Clarke Rockbank estate. Wall B45 is a portion of a north-south wall near these walls.⁵

Wall G84 marks an eastern boundary of the Clarke Rockbank estate. Situated along the western side of the Mt Atkinson Road reservation, and stretching for 2.2 kilometres, it is the remnant of an original c.6.5 kilometre stone wall that stretched from Boundary Road to Greigs Road.⁶ The fact that Mt Atkinson Road is

thought to have been one of only two (with Mt Cottrell Road) north-south roads in this southern portion of the Shire by 1871⁷ suggests that Wall G84 is likely to have been one of the first walls constructed by Clarke. It would certainly pre-date 1871 and is likely to date to the late 1850s or early 1860s.

• Dry Stone Walls on the former Killeen Property

The fieldnotes and final plan of surveyor John S Jenkins made as part of Thomas Killeen’s Torrens Title application show the fences on Crown Allotments 1, 3 and 5 of Section 1 Parish of Derrimut as they were in 1905.⁸ They show these allotments, and the Mt Atkinson Road reserve to the west, entirely enclosed by ‘stone walls’. On the west Mt Atkinson Road was walled along the whole length of its west side (Wall G84, a Rockbank boundary wall), and along the southern part of its east side (not extant). The northern wall (Wall B116) survives; it bordered a property owned by Faragher, and the cost was likely shared between the two parties. The long (c.1.9 kilometre) eastern wall, the boundary of the Hopkins and Faragher properties (Wall B118), also survives, substantial portions of it in excellent condition. The only external boundary wall that does not survive is the southern boundary, along Boundary Road.

Three east-west walls ran part-way into the allotments. These may have been built to accommodate small parcels created in the 1850s Lindsay/Moxham speculative subdivision. One is known to have been removed by Thomas Killeen in 1905.⁹ A stone wall dam (Wall B117) survives in the locality of one of these walls. Another short north-south wall within the allotment has also been demolished.

It is certain then that these walls are over one hundred years old. It is likely that they were built sometime between the late 1850s and the 1870s, and that they are 130-150 years old.

It is interesting that, by 1905, Mt Atkinson Road, which had earlier been open, was now closed by stone walls (without gates) across it at both Boundary and Middle Roads.

3 The Bacchus Marsh *Express*, 6/3/1880

4 Bilszta, 1990, *op cit*.

5 Lands Victoria, Torrens Application 35850 (p.18) ‘Plan of Resurvey of Part of Parish of Derrimut’, Claude Purchas, 23/2/1905

6 Lands Victoria, Torrens Application 35850 (p.3) ‘Fieldnotes of survey of Part of Parish of Pywheitjorrk’, Claude Purchas, Dec 1904

7 Ford, *op cit*, p.236, 239

8 Lands Victoria, Torrens Application 36721

9 PROV VPRS 460/P/36721, statutory declaration by Samuel Smith, March 1907.

- **Dry Stone Walls Associated with the Gold Rush Subdivisions**

Some of the walls which survive (B121, B123, B170) would appear to correlate with the property boundaries established by the goldrush property speculators. The small size, and isolated location (even today), of these allotments provides telling evidence of the fantastic impact of 'gold fever' on society in the early to mid 1850s. Although they were almost certainly not built by the original purchasers of these allotments, but by later owners such as the Hopkins and Faragher families, they are now the only material evidence of the subdivision pattern established by speculators during the goldrush boom. They are the most graphic known evidence of the work of the speculators along gold-rush routes.

Thematic Context / Comparative Analysis:

Shire of Melton Historical Themes: 'Pastoral', 'Farming', 'Transport', 'Water'.

Comparable Places in Shire of Melton:

The comparable precincts of walls in the Shire of Melton are those situated around eruption points:- the Mount Cottrell Precinct; the Mount Kororoit Precinct; and the She-Oak Hill Precinct. It is also comparable, to a lesser extent, to the 'gateway' precincts, in particular the Greigs Road Precinct, the Western Highway Precinct, the Melton Highway Precinct, and the Robinsons Road Precinct.

Condition:

Overall, the walls in the precinct are in good condition.

Integrity:

The integrity of the walls in the precinct varies, from low, moderate to high. Some of the walls in the worst condition are located along the roads, where they are prey to thieves who help themselves to stones for private gardens.

While the extent to which many dry stone walls have been altered over their long life may never be known, it is known that many of the walls on Hopkins' Rocklands

were reconstructed, in an inferior way to the originals, in the 1930s.

Recommendations:

Individual walls not already included in HO 114, are recommended for inclusion in the Melton Planning Scheme Heritage Overlay.

Other Recommendations:

- The walls in the precinct, especially the most significant examples, should be listed by the Shire of Melton as a high priority for future conservation works.
- An education campaign regarding the significance of the walls, and penalties for theft of stone, should be initiated by the Shire of Melton. This might include interpretation and other signage within the Precinct.

The integrity of the walls is likely to be affected by any future change in land-use (including rural residential development). If this is envisaged, guidelines for appropriate development of the walls (new gates etc) should be prepared; compliance with these would need to be mandatory.

Wall B28.

Hopkins' Rocklands homestead garden wall.



Rocklands homestead landscape of stock-yard walls.
(The shed at rear also has a stone wall.)



Wall 44.

Hopkins' stone-lined dam on Rocklands, showing paved stock access. Another wall in background. This dam is a textbook nineteenth century small farming dam.



Another small dam (dry), on former Killeen's property, south-west of Rocklands. Less elaborately constructed, without a cobbled ramp, this is a typical small farm dam in Melton Shire, on a small gully, dug about a metre or two to near the high bedrock, and walls constructed of fieldstone.



Walls B75.

At Rocklands homestead. A high and well constructed wall, with coping, is constructed using characteristic local round stones and the occasional boulder.



Walls B46.

Middle Road. This composite low stone post and wire fence with netting is the best preserved stone wall in the key 301 – 750 mm height range in the whole of Melton Shire. It is an excellent example of the major type of fence in the Shire that was constructed with a stone base. Although only a few stones high, its base is traditional double wall construction.



Wall B18.

The same style of wall, here more intact and vertical.



Walls B170. (Interior Rocklands paddock wall).

This style – with a broad-base and pyramidal rather than vertical shape – is the characteristic Melton wall. Steel droppers and barbed wire added later.



Walls B40.

(Both of the photos below). Middle Road. This is an excellent portion of a wall most of which is tumbling down (or having its stones stolen). Although doubtless repaired over its life, it demonstrates the original state of many local walls. The preservation of such remnants is important.



Walls B41.

Off Middle Road. Showing reasonably intact portion of original wall which has been topped up by single strand of barbed wire strung between later steel droppers.



Walls B42. (Off Middle Road).

Would appear to be an original composite 'half-wall', with early two-wire posts (with what may be remnants of thick 'black wire', now bypassed with barbed wire attached to post side).



Walls B48.

A similar wall/fence, with old four wire fence. Internal farm paddock wall, typically in better condition than roadside walls.



Walls B47. (Off Hopkins Road.

Clarke Rockbank Estate boundary wall.



Walls B39.

Wall on Hopkins Road, the major thoroughfare in the precinct.



Walls B122. Hopkins Road.

A portion of a major roadside wall that has not yet had stones pilfered.



Walls B118.

A more intact portion of the 'Mile Wall', an internal paddock wall behind Tibbermore. The wall runs north from Boundary to Middle Road.



Walls B43.

Looking west along Middle Road: a landscape of walls in the Mt Atkinson Precinct.



APPENDIX 2 - SITE CARD FOR DE-LISTED VICTORIAN HERITAGE INVENTORY SITE



D 7822-0877



Heritage
VICTORIA

Heritage Inventory: Archaeology Site Record

Site name: GBL Dry Stone Wall 1

Site type Civic Commercial Industrial Domestic
 Rural Religious Military Maritime
 Other (specify)

Listings National Estate Heritage Register
 AAV Record Planning Scheme
 National Trust Other (specify)

Location

Full AMG co-ordinates (Scale 1:25,000) 297630 5814606 AGD 66
E N
Map name and number 7822 Melbourne

Cadastral location

County Allotment Block
Parish Parcel P
Local Government Area Melton

Description of site

Brief description of site Site comprises a complex of dry stone walls including an east-west length of drystone wall along the south side of middle road, extending to the corner of middle + Hopkins Roads. The wall is continued by a north-south length extending along eastern side of Hopkins Rd. One internal wall was

Key components of site also recorded on a north-south alignment.
↳ Drystone walls - technically competent construction, 0-8m high with additional timber posts + wire fencing materials

Condition Fair

Present use Threats

Already impacted by existing pipeline - proposed route will utilise existing easement

Statement of significance Local

A. Long & Ass.

Plan of site

Scale 1:



List all features noted on plan of site

(Indicate site boundary, relative location of important features, prominent landmarks, etc.)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Interpretation of site

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Photograph of site

History of site.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Informants, other information and references

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....


.....

.....

.....

Map showing location of site

Scale 1:20,000



Directions for relocation and access From Western Ring Rd, Laverton North, turn left into Boundary Rd, turn right into Robinsons Rd, then left into middle Road. Site is located on ^{SE} corner of middle rd + Hopkins Rd.

Owner/occupier details

Private	Crown
Owner's name	Agency
Postal address	Contact name
.....	Postal address
.....
Telephone	Facsimile
.....

Occupier (if applicable)

Occupier's name
EASNET - Colin Mason
 Postal address

..... Postcode

.....

Telephone (Business hours) Facsimile

Report No	File
No.....	
Consent No	Artefacts Location

Plan No	Inception dates
.....
Photo No
.....
AHC Site Type
.....
.....	Date

APPENDIX 3 – LOCAL HERITAGE POLICY



15.03
31/07/2018
VC148

HERITAGE

15.03-1S

02/09/2025
VC283

Heritage conservation

Objective

To ensure the conservation of places of heritage significance.

Strategies

Identify, assess and document places of natural and cultural heritage significance as a basis for their inclusion in the planning scheme.

Provide for the protection of natural heritage sites and man-made resources.

Provide for the conservation and enhancement of those places that are of aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, cultural, scientific or social significance.

Encourage appropriate development that respects places with identified heritage values.

Retain those elements that contribute to the importance of the heritage place.

Encourage the conservation and restoration of contributory elements of a heritage place.

Ensure an appropriate setting and context for heritage places is maintained or enhanced.

Support adaptive reuse of heritage buildings where their use has become redundant.

Consider whether it is appropriate to require the restoration or reconstruction of a heritage building in a Heritage Overlay that has been unlawfully or unintentionally demolished in order to retain or interpret the cultural heritage significance of the building, streetscape or area.

Policy guidelines

Consider as relevant:

- The findings and recommendations of the Victorian Heritage Council.

Policy documents

- The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Australia ICOMOS Incorporated, 2013).

15.03-1L-01 Heritage conservation

13/07/2023
C219melt

Strategies

Support creative adaptive reuse of heritage places in precinct structure plan areas with sympathetic and imaginative designs compatible with the significance, scale, form and materials of the heritage place.

Support the retention of places listed in the ‘Conservation Desirable’ schedule of the *Melton Heritage Study: Environmental History* (David Maloney et al., 2007).

Policy documents

Consider as relevant:

- *Shire of Melton Heritage Study: Environmental History* (David Maloney et al., 2007)
- *Shire of Melton Dry Stone Walls Study* (Planning Collaborative (Vic) Pty Ltd, 2011)

15.03-1L-02 Dry stone walls

13/07/2023
C219melt

Policy application

This policy applies to all dry stone walls subject to the Heritage Overlay.

Objectives

To encourage the retention, conservation and repair of dry stone walls.

To ensure development is sympathetic to dry stone walls.

Strategies

Support the retention of roadside dry stone walls as part of transport networks, road design, subdivision and utility installation.

Discourage the demolition of parts of a dry stone wall unless one of the following applies:

- The section of wall needs to be removed to undertake repairs to damage caused by earth movement.
- The section of dry stone wall needs to be removed to create a break for new openings such as farm openings, road widening or road breaks.
- The section of dry stone wall needs to be removed so utility services can be installed and no viable alternative exists. The dry stone wall must be reconstructed afterwards.
- It can be demonstrated that the removal of the part of the dry stone wall does not negatively affect the significance of the wall.

Encourage the retention of dry stone walls in favour of contemporary walls or gateway treatments in development.

Encourage the retention of original openings, posts and wires in repair or maintenance programs.

Encourage the removal of alterations that detract from the cultural significance of the dry stone wall.

Encourage the reconstruction of features where they have been removed or lost.

Avoid the use of reproduction dry stone walls and faux-style buildings in public spaces and heritage areas.

Construct wall ends where new openings have been created in a dry stone wall.

MELTON PLANNING SCHEME

Support the construction of additional stone courses to increase the height of an existing dry stone wall only where it is consistent with the type of dry stone wall.

Discourage the use of concrete mortar within a dry stone wall.

Allow additional wires above a dry stone wall, if required for farming purposes, provided the new posts do not disturb the structure of the dry stone wall.

Encourage the reuse and recycling of stone and dry stone walls for other dry stone walls.

Allow subdivision that does not detract from the heritage value of the dry stone wall provided it:

- Minimises the number of new openings in a dry stone wall.
- Applies a landscape buffer on either side of a dry stone wall.

Policy guidelines

Consider as relevant:

- Establishing a five metre wide landscape buffer on either side of the dry stone wall.
- Use a professional dry stone waller when either:
 - Reconstructing a section of dry stone wall.
 - Creating new openings.
 - Constructing new wall ends.

Policy documents

Consider as relevant:

- *Shire of Melton Heritage Study: Environmental History* (David Maloney, 2007)
- *Shire of Melton Dry Stone Walls Study* (Planning Collaborative (Vic) Pty Ltd, 2011)

15.03-2S
31/07/2018
VC148

Aboriginal cultural heritage

Objective

To ensure the protection and conservation of places of Aboriginal cultural heritage significance.

Strategies

Identify, assess and document places of Aboriginal cultural heritage significance, in consultation with relevant Registered Aboriginal Parties, as a basis for their inclusion in the planning scheme.

Provide for the protection and conservation of pre-contact and post-contact Aboriginal cultural heritage places.

Ensure that permit approvals align with the recommendations of any relevant Cultural Heritage Management Plan approved under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006*.

Policy guidelines

Consider as relevant:

- The findings and recommendations of the Aboriginal Heritage Council.
- The findings and recommendations of the Victorian Heritage Council for post-contact Aboriginal heritage places.

Policy documents

Consider as relevant:

- *Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006*