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# 1. Project Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Impact Statement for:</th>
<th>Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre, Holker Street, Silverwater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This statement forms part of the development assessment for:</td>
<td>Minor preparation works to support a larger REF for the site and includes site establishment activities, temporary fencing, construction works on the perimeter for a temporary gatehouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference:</td>
<td>Heritage Act - State Heritage Register 00813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address and property description:</td>
<td>Primary address: Holker Street, Silverwater NSW 2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot/Volume Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lot 22 DP 876995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lot 421 DP 824053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Trevor Potts, Justice Infrastructure and Assets, Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For:</td>
<td>Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre, Justice Infrastructure and Assets, NSW Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The potential impacts have been assessed with reference to the guideline documents and criteria published by the NSW Heritage Council.

The main objective of this report is to outline the minor nature of the works and how any impacts will be mitigated.

The HIS accompanies a request for exemption under Section 57 of the Heritage Act 1977 using Standard Exemption No. 7: Minor Activities with Little or No Adverse Impact on Heritage Significance to the Office of Environment and Heritage.

## 1.1 Background

The proposed early works at the Silverwater Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC) include minor preparation works to support a larger development for the site. The larger development proposes a 440 Bed Maximum Security Expansion as a part of the Prison Bed Capacity Program (PBCP). This larger development proposal will be addressed with a Section 60 application to the Office of Environment and Heritage, and will be accompanied by a Review of Environmental Factors (REF).

The minor preparation works addressed within this Heritage Impact Statement are reversible and include site establishment activities, temporary fencing and construction of the temporary gatehouse.
1.2 The Site

The site is located on the northern side of Holker Street, Silverwater. The Parramatta River is located to the north of the site and Jamison Street is to the east of the site.

**Figure 1.1:** Location map showing the Silverwater Correctional Centre (NSW Government, 2018).

**Figure 1.2:** Arial view of the Silverwater Correctional Centre (Google Maps, 2018).
1.3 Heritage Context

The site at Holker Street, Silverwater, is located within the Silverwater Prison Complex, which is listed as a Heritage conservation Area on the State Heritage Register. It is also listed in Schedule 5 of the Auburn Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2010 as an item of State heritage significance.

The site is therefore subject to the heritage provisions of the NSW Heritage Act 1977.

The Silverwater Correctional Complex Conservation Management Plan (CMP) was prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd for the Department of Commerce in November 2004. The proposed early works are in accordance with the conservation policies in the CMP. The proposed works are located in a landscape area that has low significance, involves no existing buildings and with no archaeological potential.

1.4 Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP

The following sections of the Silverwater Correctional Centre CMP specifically relate to the proposal and are considered in the assessment:

- Section 2.7 of the CMP refers to the development of the centre and the construction of the MRRC;
- Section 2.8.3 identifies the MRRC as part of the Silverwater Correctional Complex, which
the site is located in;

- Section 3.3 describes the site precincts and Section 3.6 specifically describes the MRRC precinct;
- Section 4.3.3 identifies the significance of the MRRC Precinct;
- Section 4.4.2 identifies landscape areas of significance;
- Section 4.5 refers to the Statement of Significance for the Silverwater Correctional Complex;
- Section 5.7 lists the assessed value of buildings;
- Section 6.2 summarizes the archaeological potential for the MRRC;
- Section 6.3 contains the Archaeological Zoning Plan relevant to the MRRC;
- Section 7.3 discusses corrective services operational requirements; and
- Section 8 contains the conservation policies relevant to the MRRC.
2. History

The following history is sourced from the Department of Justice Correctional Services Section 170 Heritage Register; https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/heritageapp/ViewHeritageItemDetails.aspx?id=5045306.

The site that would become Newington estate formed part of the territory occupied by the Wangal clan (of which Bennelong is the best known) that formed part of the larger Darug (coastal) language group. The Wangal clan or tribe were documented as having occupied the southern side of the harbour from Long Cove to Parramatta and Rose Hill. Known archaeological sites along the Parramatta River and hinterland record fishing activities adjacent to the Newington Armory and bark from trees within the vicinity of the site were cut for use as shelters. Limited observations of Aboriginal life in the Homebush Bay area are recorded. Records from neighbouring areas would suggest that the Wangal would have actively participated in river fishing, eeling, gathering shellfish as well as hunting kangaroos, wallabies and other small land mammals, reptiles and waterfowl.

Land grants in the area started as early as 1797 after an exploration party with Governor John Hunter up the Parramatta and Duck and George's Rivers. Shortly after, two officers, formerly of the Sirius, Lieutenant John Shortland and Captain Henry Waterhouse, each received a grant of 25 acres, which they stocked with animals especially brought from the Cape of Good Hope (South Africa). A First Fleeter marine, Isaac Archer, was next lessee, receiving his 80 acre grant next to Shortland Farm on 26 August 1800. The Waterhouse grant was known as Waterhouse Farm and later formed part of the grounds of Newington. These earliest grants were made north of Parramatta Road, because the sole means of transport then was the Parramatta River, adjacent to the north.

In 1800 Richard Aitkens took out a lease on land east of Duck River and north of the Sydney-Parramatta Road, but it was soon cancelled. The area was included in a grant of 1290 acres made in 1807 to John Blaxland (1769-1845), who arrived in the colony that year, as a wealthy free settler. The grant covered all the land between the Parramatta River and Parramatta Road, Duck River and Haslam's Creek, except for land held by Waterhouse, Shortland, Archer and Haslam.

A farm or rural villa estate, factory and saltworks were established and Blaxland's "Newington House" built between 1829 and 1832. The name commemorated Blaxland's family property in Kent. John Blaxland and his younger brother Gregory (the explorer) began to develop a cattle industry, breeding fat cattle, and slaughtering and salting them. They were the first to produce usable salt, made from brine gathered from the marshes on the river near the house. The site of the Queen Victoria Building in George Street, Sydney was used by Blaxland to graze some of their herds of cattle. Blaxland had been promised 8000 acres before he left for NSW, but it was not until 1831 that he was finally given the full quota of his land, when he received 10,240 acres in different areas. He finally held 29,000 acres in the colony.

The present Newington house was built in the style of an English Regency-style mansion, with disciplined English gardens, and a private chapel (St.Augustine's) built in 1838. The house was and remains an integral element in a landscaped setting (with the chapel off to its eastern side) which has been somewhat altered over time due to its location in the grounds of a correctional centre. Elements of the landscaped grounds of the house are extant, including scattered individual and groups of mature tree plantings and the outline of the formal carriage loop north of the house. The carriageway fabric today is a mix of gravel and broken concrete. No original 1830s fabric remains on or near the ground surface (Erdelyi, 2010).
In the 1840s a monolithic sandstone verandah colonnade was added to house. Blaxland died in 1845 and the family moved away, leasing the property to owners of a slaughtering industry. After Blaxland's death the property was used to manufacture salt and slaughtering, the home's kitchens were converted into a piggery and its once beautiful dining room used as a barn (Roberts, 2013, 1) - the house was considerably neglected.

The house had carriage loops to its east and north with 2 prominent hoop (Araucaria cunninghamii) and Norfolk Island (A.heterophylla) pines, garden beds cut into lawn areas and spikey plants (eg: Agave sp. in a pedestal urn and New Zealand cabbage trees (Cordyline australis) nearer to the house. A pond and 3 tiered fountain was site east of the house in the centre of agrass 'island' between two drives. A 1953 photograph from the same location shows the hoop pines gone and 3 prominent Canary Island palms (Phoenix canariensis) east and north of the house. (Read, Stuart, pers. comm. from photographs supplied 5/06 from Dpt.of Commerce).

In 1863 Rev. John Allen Manton, a Methodist clergyman, who had been engaged to undertake missionary pastoral work in the newly developed city of Parramatta, acquired (by lease) Newington on behalf of the Methodist Church to start a boy's school. By 16 July 1863, his objective had been achieved, and 19 boys formed the nucleus of what was to become the third of the GPS schools, Newington College. (Roberts (2013, 4) says 16 boys enrolled on 16th July (ranging from age 7-16: from as far afield as Goulburn and Yass: two already lived on the Newington Estate), with several more enrolling on the following days). Two who entered on 20 July were the first Theological students (ibid, 2013, 4).

While the new school was a major undertaking for the Wesleyan Methodists, they had already been involved in developing education in the colony for more than two decades. A short-lived Wesleyan Grammar School was founded in 1840, followed by a number of day schools based on existing Sunday Schools. From 1849, the Wesleyans, along with the other major churches, operated many denominational day schools, which continued until the NSW Public Schools Act of 1866. Newington College's founding was part of the developments that transformed the education landscape in New South Wales from the 1860s to the 1880s. While Manton and his colleagues advocated for a secondary school, some Wesleyans were more concerned to see a university college, while still others advocated for an institution for training ministers (Roberts, 2013, 1).

A week later some two hundred people, many travelling by chartered steamer from Sydney, gathered there for the formal inauguration. The opening was the culmination of years of advocacy and fund raising within the Wesleyan community across NSW. One of the most tireless advocates was Rev. Marnton, a Wesleyan minister who had served as chaplain at the penal colony of Port Arthur and later founded Horton College at Ross, in Tasmania's midlands. He was appointed Principal when the establishment of the new school was finally approved by the Church in January 1863 and served in this role until his untimely death in the following year (ibid, 2013, 1).

The College's first home was the Georgian mansion built by Blaxland. Extensive repairs were just one task completed before the school could move in. Another was securing teachers. Masters sought from England had not arrived before the opening day. Manton regarded the arrival in Sydney of 22 year old Rev. James Egan Moulton at the end of May 1863 as a gift from God. Moulton served as initial 'Head Master' until November 1863 (ibid, 2013, 1). The college's location meant that all the early period students were boarders (ibid, 4).

The old bell, which had summoned Blaxland's convict servants, now called the boys to lessons, and free hours could be spent roaming the surrounding gardens and parklands. The chapel was later used as a school room for Newington College from the 1860s. During
the College's occupation the house was restored.

The site at Silverwater was only leased and provided no long term security for a growing school. In 1869, the Methodist Conference decided to use land bequeathed to the Church at Stanmore, in Sydney's inner west, as a permanent home for the College. Between 1876 and 1880, the Gothic sandstone building familiar to later generations of students was built, financed through fund raising and a massive loan. The school moved to Stanmore in July 1880 (ibid, 4).

In 1880 the school was moved to its present site at Stanmore (Canterbury Road). The 19 original pupils had by then swelled to several hundred, but the first headmaster, John Manton, did not live to see the changeover. He died in September 1864 and was buried at Parramatta, the pupils of the first Newington forming a marching guard of honour along the whole route.

Part of the site was bought by the NSW government in 1880 as an asylum for aged destitute women. In 1881 the site was subdivided. By 1887 the house was the centre of the Silverwater State Hospital/State Hospital & Asylum (retaining this role until 1969). The Dormitory Block built in 1896 was intended for this purpose.

Between 1911 and 1918 the asylum was converted for use as a State Hospital. Irwin House and the Engineer's Cottage were built at this time.

A 1911 photograph taken east of Newington House looking west shows carriage loops east and north with 2 prominent hoop (Araucaria cunninghamii) and Norfolk Island (A.heterophylla) pines, garden beds cut into lawn areas and spikey plants (eg: Agave sp. in a pedestal urn and New Zealand cabbage trees (Cordyline australis) nearer the house. A pond and 3 tiered fountain was east of the house in the centre of a grass 'island' between two drives. A 1953 photograph from the same location shows the hoop pines gone and 3 prominent Canary Island palms (Phoenix canariensis) east and north of the house (Read, S., pers. comm. from photographs supplied 5/06 from Dpt.of Commerce).

In 1968/9 the Department of Corrective Services took over management of the site for use as the Silverwater Correctional Centre (SCC), a new minimum security men's prison and women's prison (Mulawa Correctional Centre MCC). Development occurred on the site throughout the next 20 years, although it was not until 1985 that a major redevelopment of the site took place when an expansion of the present built form was undertaken to the north and west. Significant buildings were constructed between 1986-88 to enable additional accommodation at Mulawa.

In the early 1990s additions to the facility included a minimum security facility and periodic detention centre.

The topography of the surrounding site to the north and north west, namely Millenium Parklands, has substantially changed as part of the preparation for the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games, and development of the Parklands. This has included large areas of ground grading and addition of extensive amounts of fill (contaminated soil and subsoil), formed into landscaped spiral mounds. The Parklands now physically cut off the former connection of the Newington Estate to the Parramatta River.

A new Mental Health Assessment Unit and Clinic was approved in early 2004 as part of a current program to improve facilities at MCC (NSW Department of Corrective - Services Heritage and Conservation Register, 1995)(Pollon, 1996)(BBC, 2004).
3. **Site and Building Descriptions**

3.1 **Context within the Site**

The site is located within the Metropolitan Remand and Recreation Centre (MRRC). Commencing construction in 1990, the MRRC opened in 1997 (Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd, 2004, p. 25). Irwin House, dating from c.1890s, has been incorporated into the upgrading of the MRRC. The location of the MRRC is shown in the figure below.

![Site precincts identified in the CMP](Graham Brooks and Associated Pty Ltd, Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP, 2004, p.38). The MRRC is in the south eastern corner of the site.

3.2 **Current Use**

3.2.1 **Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre**

This centre is a major regional facility for male offenders and a Mental Health Assessment Unit. Inmates who arrive at the MRRC:

- come directly from court on remand, or
- are transferred from other correctional facilities throughout NSW to stay at the MRRC while they attend court in the Sydney metropolitan area, or
- are housed at the MRRC while they wait for a vacancy to occur at their centre of classification.

The Department of Justice is strongly committed to additional facilities on the site. As part of the Prison Bed Capacity Program, a 440 Bed Maximum Security Expansion is proposed within the MRRC as a part of the Prison Bed Capacity Program (PBCP).

In a historical context, this proposal is a continuation of the process of change and adaptive re-use that has characterised development at the site since its earliest settlement around 1807. The proposed early works will assist in the preparation for the larger works for the PBCP.

The following photographs illustrate the subject areas associated with the proposed early works the MRRC precinct. These have been provided by Justice Infrastructure and Assets, Department of Justice.
Figure 3.2: Aerial view of Oval area to install Temporary Fence

Figure 3.3: Looking south along Jamison Street; the location of the proposed temporary gatehouse.

Figure 3.4: The location of the proposed temporary gatehouse, looking south.

Figure 3.5: Looking north along Jamison Street.

Figure 3.6: Looking north along Jamison Street.

Figure 3.7: Looking north along Jamison Street.
4. Significance

4.1 Statement of Significance

The following Statement of Significance is sourced from the Corrective Services Section 170 Heritage Register, which is available at:

Silverwater Correctional Centre is of exceptional significance as: it is the core remaining part of John Blaxland’s Newington Estate and of the State Hospital & Asylum for Women, for its subdivision and subsequent use for a variety of institutional functions, as an expression of a philosophy regarding the care of the aged. (NSW Department of Corrective Services Heritage and Conservation Register, 1995) (modified, Read, S., 2004)

Individual components of significance include:

Newington House

Newington House is a substantial and reasonably intact example of the rural colonial villa, and is an important reminder of the expansion westwards towards Parramatta and the Blue Mountains, and the setting of the land along the Parramatta River. It demonstrates the quality of life of prominent citizens and families from early settlements. With Elizabeth Bay House and Camden Park, it is one of the three great houses of (the County of) Cumberland (Rachel Roxburgh, 1980).

It is associated with a notable NSW family, being built for John Blaxland, whose entrepreneurial business activities were amongst the earliest in the colony, and whose more famous explorer brother Gregory assisted in activities generally relative to this site. Its use since initial occupation as the Blaxland house has reflected a number of social changes in use as a college, asylum/hospital, and prison administration building. It has continued to be the prominent building on the site and accommodated senior officers in each phase of its history.

The house is unusual in architectural terms, for its character rather than its quality; externally it forms a typical Regency structure, its initial conception somewhat marred by the awkward later placement of the verandah, which however presents a fine portal to the house. Internally the main items of significance are the room layout and the rigorous but rustic character of its joinery, where aspirations to the manner and style of a (John) Verge house are seen in primitive form, revealing more general standards of workmanship of the day, and thus the joinery is idiosyncratic in detail rather than of refined quality.

The building has aesthetic value in its relationship with the family chapel and with Parramatta River, although the latter has been diminished by landfilling operations on the former tip site to the north. The remaining garden setting of the house, which includes the carriage loops, is also aesthetically significant notwithstanding the positioning of the Mulawa Correctional Centre security fence. (BBC, 1995) In its heyday the Estate was famous for its landscaped gardens and orchards. (Read, S., 2004)

Archaeological potential/value: see Description

Chapel

St. Augustine’s Chapel is a simple, substantial demonstration of the strong religious convictions of early settlers. It has social significance in being associated with a range of occupants of the site, including weekend chapel/weekday school rooms during the
Blaxland family era, classroom during the Newington College occupancy, residential accommodation during the asylum/hospital era and a chapel during the prison phase.

Surrounds

An area of great historical interest and significance as the focus of the site containing the essential components of the original Newington House surrounds and chapel. The significant elements include:

- the carriage loop in front (north) of the house currently divided by a security fence and the trees and shrubs in and around it;
- the carriage loop east of the house with the service and formal parts, the trees and shrubs around it, the bollard on the corner and pond;
- the open landscape between the house and the chapel;
- the remaining relationship of Newington House and the Parramatta River (once its sole means of access);
- the archaeologically sensitive area at the rear of Newington House and the site of Blaxland's original cottage and other outbuildings and structures (eg: well); and
- the archaeologically sensitive area east of the chapel where the former vault was located and in general around the chapel.

The trees of significance in this precinct include a group of Araucarias (Bunya pines & hoop pines) and Moreton Bay figs (Ficus macrophylla) in the Mulawa Correctional Centre compound (remnant of a former landscaped walk to the river), the extremely rare Schotia afra (Kaffir bean, Boer bean) and the surviving turpentines (Syncarpia glomulifera) which are likely to be indigenous to the site. (BBC, 1995)(modified, Read, S., 2004)

Irwin House

Irwin House is of considerable heritage significance as:

- a well designed Federation building (believed to be former Nurses' Quarters) of outstanding architectural merit represented by fine details in the timber verandah, the roof, gable ends, chimneys and the brickwork and sandstone detailing;
- having unusual design as no other hospital buildings of this type are known from the period c1895 possibly for staff accommodation (medical nursing and domestic staff);
- being sympathetically planned in an open lawn landscape with trees, including an avenue, all of which provide an attractive setting for the building (Philip Cox et al, 1993)

Engineer's Cottage (former)

The Engineer’s Cottage’s principal significance is that it forms part of the complex of buildings and grounds erected during the early phase of transition of the site to the State Hospital & Asylum for Women. As part of this complex it was a key building in providing accommodation for the site engineer. It has played a role as a dormitory/support building to the core areas of the site in each of the changes of use of the complex since 1913. Hence its continuity of use and association with the main complex are also significant.

The cottage has historic and aesthetic values as a good example of Federation domestic architecture and particularly of the work of the Government Architect’s office in the time of Walter Liberty Vernon. The Federation attributes are demonstrated by the massing, roof
forms (and detail), verandah joinery, ceiling details, the use of stained glass in windows and the range of window types used in the building. The degree of intactness of the Federation elements is a key element of the building's aesthetic significance. The aesthetic value of the building is heightened by its setting as an individual building in a garden setting (Philip Cox et al., 1993)

Superintendent's Cottage (former)

The aesthetic values of the former Superintendent's House building are heightened by its setting as an individual building in an established garden setting, adjacent to a remnant landscaped walk formed by mature rainforest tree species and palms, including Moreton Bay fig (Ficus macrophylla), hoop pine (Araucaria cunninghamii), Bunya Bunya pine (A. bidwillii), cotton palms (Washingtonia robusta) and swamp mahogany (Eucalyptus robusta). (Cox et al., 1995, modified Read, S., 2004)

Landscape

The process of redevelopment and adaptation to new uses that has characterised the site has resulted in the site having low overall landscape integrity. What remains is a series of individual species and smaller groups or avenues of trees representative of previous occupations and uses. The site has been divided up into a number of precincts to assess the significance of this landscape and buildings in their setting. (continues to itemise precincts and their significance, and vegetation components and their significance) (see section 7 of Planning Workshop, 1993)

4.2 Landscape Significance

The following significance for the MRRC Precinct landscape is sourced from the CMP.

Located to the southeastern section of the site, this precinct has had the most recent substantial changes with the erection of the 900-bed Metropolitan Remnant and Reception area in the mid-1990s. This precinct incorporates Irwin House, a vestige of the Hospital period and its surrounding curtilage.

The erection of the centre involved the removal and relocation of a number of trees and palms, particularly Canary Island Date Palms (Phoenix canariensis) and Moreton Bay Figs (Ficus macrophylla). Of note are the two large Moreton Bay Fig trees that are now located at the open space of the precinct. All other significant vegetation has either been removed or relocated.

As noted above, Irwin House has been incorporated into the upgrading of the Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre. Major trees have been retained and incorporated into the complex, notably the Hoop Pine (Araucaria cunninghamii). Detailed gardens have been implemented around the building. Other significant trees in the precinct include the palms, jacarandas, and the Kurrajong (Brachychiton populneus) and Brown Pine (Podacarpus elatus) in the courtyard of Irwin House (Graham Brooks and Associated Pty Ltd, Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP, 2004, p.64-65).

The figure below shows the graded significance within the landscape at the Silverwater Correctional Complex. The landscape significance of MRRC is identified as being of little significance in the CMP. Irwin House, located within the subject site, is identified as being of considerable significance (Graham Brooks and Associated Pty Ltd, Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP, 2004, p.68).
Figure 4.1: The landscape area within the MRRC precinct (circled red) is identified as being of little significance. The landscape area surrounding Irwin House is of considerable significance (Graham Brooks and Associated Pty Ltd, Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP, 2004, p.68).

4.2 Archaeological Significance
The CMP identifies a number of archaeological zones within the Silverwater Correctional Centre. These include:

1. No archaeological potential
2. Low-moderate potential
3. High archaeological potential

All of the MRRC, excluding Irwin House and its gardens, are located within Zone 1. The figure below shows the archaeological zones within the Silverwater Correctional Complex.
4.2 Building Significance

The CMP grades buildings within the Silverwater Correctional Centre as being of exceptional, considerable, some or little significance or intrusive. The table and figure below rates and shows the significance of buildings located within the MRRC precinct.

Table 1: Graded significance of buildings located within the MRRC precinct (Graham Brooks and Associated Pty Ltd, Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP, 2004, p74-75).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Constructed</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Administration</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Visitors</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Intake</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Inmate accommodation Irwin House</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Exceptional significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Laundry, Maintenance</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Inmate accommodation</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Archaeological Zoning Plan for Silverwater Correctional Centre. The Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre is circled red (Graham Brooks and Associated Pty Ltd, Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP, 2004, p.82).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G - Inmate accommodation</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H - Inmate accommodation</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I - Industries</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J - Library and workshops</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - Clinics</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Assessment Unit</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Little significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.3:** The assessed heritage value of buildings. The Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre is circled red (Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP, 2004, p.76).
5. Proposal

5.1 Justification

The proposed early works at the Silverwater Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC) comprises of minor preparation works which will support a larger development application for the site. The larger development proposes a 440 Bed Maximum Security Expansion as a part of the Prison Bed Capacity Program (PBCP). This larger development proposal will be addressed within a more detailed NSW Heritage Act, Section 60.

The early works addressed within this Heritage Impact Statement include site establishment activities, temporary fencing and construction of a temporary gatehouse to Jamieson Street.

The new beds will support the Department of Justice’s Better Prisons program to lift standards, strengthen accountability and help meet the government's target to reduce adult reoffending. Due to a surge in population of females in NSW Correctional Centres, combined with a decrease in available accommodation, there is currently a critical shortage of beds in NSW.

Figure 5.1: Area identified for the Early Works associated with expansion at the MRRC (shaded blue) (Department of Justice, 2018).
5.2 Summary of Works

The proposal includes the following early works at the MRRC:

1. Temporary Site establishment - removal Early 2019
2. Temporary Construction Fence - removal Early 2021
3. Temporary Gatehouse (Construction Entrance) - removal Early 2021

The figure below shows the locations for each component of the proposed early works.

![Figure 5.2: Detailed site plan showing the location of the areas associated with the proposed early works within the MRRC (Department of Justice, 2018).](image)

A more detailed description of the proposed early works is below.
5.3 Site Establishment

Demountable sheds will be delivered, placed and accommodated on site. Sheds will be connected to services to liven up the site accommodation. The site establishment will be located on the oval (refer to Figure 5.2 above).

5.4 Proposed Fencing

The existing outer exercise yard fences for Fordwick, Goldsmith and Hamden cell blocks is to be demolished. Piling matt works and a Macem fence panelling are proposed (refer to No. 2 in Figure 5.1 above). The temporary construction fence will be removed at completion of construction activities in early 2021. Works for the fencing include:

- Demolition of the existing Macem fencing yards and 4m chain wire fence with razor wire to oval;
- Piling Matt Excavation in accordance with the EWHMP. Material stock piles and surrounded by sediment control;
- Piling Foundations: Precast driven piles installed to depth of refusal within contaminated ground (estimated depth 12m)
- Piling Capping Installation: Excavate strip footing in piling matt, trim piles, tie reinforcement and place concrete;
- Macem Fence Panelling: Core strip footing, with the use of a mobile crawler crane the fence panelling will be manoeuvred into place, temporary propping installed and the core holes grout filled once they have reached their required strength, the temporary props can be removed.

The fence proposed is a 5m high macem fence, with razor wire coil and a dual run of microphonic cable along the length of the fence. With Continuous VMD, it will have PTZ cameras at all corners, dual run microphonics and a typical 5m “sterile zone” on either side of the fence. Continuous VMD surveillance is proposed along the entire length of the perimeter and VMD cameras will be fitted to adjacent building or yard fence structures or dedicated poles.

Lighting will be provided via light poles located on the construction side of the fence, spaced typically at 15m. PTZ cameras will be provided at every change in direction, both internally and externally. Internal PTZ cameras will be mounted with the VMD cameras and external PTZs mounted from external perimeter lighting poles.
Figure 5.5: Proposed location of the temporary fence (indicated by the red line) (Department of Justice, 2018).

Figure 5.6: Section of the proposed macem fence and lighting detail (Department of Justice, 2018).
5.5 Temporary Gatehouse (Construction Entrance)

Proposed works for the temporary gatehouse (construction entrance). This will involve excavation and shoring works directly outside the perimeter fence and sterile zone of the MRRC (refer to No. 3 in Figure 5.2 above). The temporary gatehouse will be an arrangement of modular 'site sheds' with temporary construction fencing adjacent installed as detailed in section 5.4 above. The temporary gatehouse will be removed at completion of construction activities in early 2021.

Figure 5.9: Proposed location of the temporary gatehouse (Department of Justice, 2018).
6 Assessment

6.1 Introduction
This Heritage Impact Statement has been prepared in relation to the impact assessment criteria in the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage guidelines, Altering Heritage Assets and Statements of Heritage Impact.

The assessment provides a detailed analysis of the statutory controls applying to this site with regard to heritage.

6.2 Overview of Heritage Impacts
As construction for the Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC) commenced in 1990 and opened in 1997, this precinct does not contribute to the significance of the site. It is therefore appropriate the proposed early works and the larger development occur within the MRRC precinct rather than in areas or buildings with a higher level of significance.

The proposed works, including site establishment, temporary fencing and temporary gatehouse, is appropriate in that it is minor and temporary works. It is appropriately located within the site as the landscape area within the MRRC precinct has been identified as being of little significance.

The proposed early works are appropriate in that they will assist in the larger development proposes for the 440 Bed Maximum Security Expansion as a part of the Prison Bed Capacity Program (PBCP), which will continue the site’s association with the continued use as a correctional centre. The proposed early works will not have an adverse impact on the heritage significance of the site.

6.3 Evaluation Against Relevant CMP Policies
The Silverwater Correctional Complex Conservation Management Plan (CMP) was prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd for the Department of Commerce in November 2004. The proposed early works are in accordance with the conservation policies contained within the CMP.

The following commentary evaluates the proposed development against the most relevant policies of the Silverwater Correctional Complex, 2004:

8.3: Future Use of the Site

**Metropolitan Remand and Recreation Centre:**

*The conservation area adopted around Irwin House should be retained and maintained.*

**Comment:**

The proposal does not affect the conservation area around Irwin House.
There should be no new buildings or structures constructed within the conservation area.

Comment:
No new buildings or structures are proposed within the conservation area around Irwin House.

Security fences should be preferably to the perimeter of the conservation area.

Comment:
The proposed security fencing will be located outside, and away from, the conservation area.

The reinstated garden around Irwin House should be retained and maintained.

Comment:
The garden is being retained as part of the proposal.

Significant trees in the garden such as the figs, palms, pines and jacarandas should be retained.

Comment:
No trees will be removed as part of the works.

8.4: Archaeological Management

Zone 1 (no archaeological potential):

No further archaeological work required within Zone 1.

Comment:
The proposed early works are located within Zone 1. No archaeological works will be required with the preparation works for the temporary gatehouse.

There are no constraints, upon archaeological grounds, to any future works, redevelopment or excavation of areas within Zone 1.

Comment:
Noted.

However, if during the course of any future works, redevelopment or excavation any previously unrecorded or undetected archaeological relics are uncovered, work should cease in the vicinity of that relic and advise sought from the NSW Heritage Office.

Comment:
Noted. JIA have also engaged the services of an ARD (Extent) to guide any archaeological works on site (prior to and during construction), as part of mitigation of development impacts.
6.4 Office of Environment & Heritage Guidelines

The Office of Environment and Heritage has published a series of criteria for the assessment of heritage impact. The relevant "questions to be answered" in the NSW Heritage Manual "Statements of Heritage Impact", provided below, have been considered in the preparation of this assessment. Though the precinct is part of the heritage conservation area, the questions relevant to “New development adjacent to a heritage item” have been considered because of the low heritage significance of the subject site within the MRRC precinct, which is adjacent to precincts, buildings and settings with considerable and exceptional significance.

The following aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the item or conservation area for the following reasons:

Comment:

The significance of Metropolitan Remand and Recreation Centre precinct has been identified as being of little significance in the CMP. The precinct is located in a landscape area of little significance and the subject site excludes Irwin House which is of considerable significance. The heritage significance of the wider Silverwater Correctional Centre will not be affected by the proposal, given its location within the site and because it involves early works that include minor preparation works which will support a larger development application for the site. The works include temporary components, such as the temporary fence and temporary gatehouse. The works will contribute to the ongoing use of the site as a correctional centre.

The following aspects of the proposal could detrimentally impact on heritage significance. The reasons are explained as well as the measures to be taken to minimise impacts:

Comment:

The minor preparation works may have no adverse impact as they will alter existing views to the Silverwater Correctional Centre, such as the perimeter and temporary gatehouse. This is a minor and temporary impact as the gatehouse is not permanent. Other works are temporary, are located internally within the site. In addition, the subject area is located within a precinct that has a low level of significance.

Security fencing will need to be erected during the construction period so that the site is secure and safe for both construction workers and inmates. The fence may detract from the visual aesthetics of the site, though it will be located within an area of little significance, which is acceptable.

The following sympathetic solutions have been considered and discounted for the following reasons:

Comment:

No other areas or buildings have been considered for the bed capacity program within the site as the MRRC operationally important and precinct is appropriate for the larger scale of the future PBCP. The proposal is appropriate as it consists of minor works that will have no adverse impact on the heritage significance of the site. The works will contribute to the ongoing use of the site as a correctional centre with the increased capacity.
New development adjacent to a heritage item

*How is the impact of the new development on the heritage significance of the item or area to be minimised?*

Comment:
The impact of the proposed works on the heritage significance of the Silverwater Correctional Centre has been minimised due to the temporary nature of the works. The location of the proposed works is within a precinct that has a low level of significance and is associated with buildings of low significance.

*Why is the new development required to be adjacent to a heritage item?*

Comment:
The subject site is required to be adjacent to considerable and exceptional items of significance as the MRRC precinct is the most appropriate site for the PBCP. It will also result in the ongoing use and improvement of facilities as a correctional centre ensuring the correctional centre can meet increasing demands.

*How does the curtilage allowed around the heritage item contribute to the retention of its heritage significance?*

Comment:
The curtilage for the landscaped area surrounding Irwin House is defined by the surrounding MRRC buildings. The proposed works are outside this curtilage and will not impact on its heritage significance. The proposed works are located within a precinct and associated with buildings that are identified as being of a low level of heritage significance. Given the minor nature of the proposed works, the significance will not be impacted on by the proposal.

*How does the new development affect views to, and from, the heritage item? What has been done to minimize negative effects?*

Comment:
Views to the site will be minimally impacted by the proposed works. The most visible impact will be the perimeter and temporary gatehouse on the eastern boundary, adjacent to Jamison Road. This impact is acceptable as it will be temporary, as will be the initial site establishment works. Other works are located within the MRRC precinct and given its large area, will have minimal impact on views from the outside. Fencing will be visible from outside the site. Given its relatively transparent character, this is acceptable.

*Is the development sited on any known, or potentially significant archaeological deposits? If so, have alternative sites been considered? Why were they rejected?*

Comment:
The site is located within Zone 1: “No archaeological potential”, as identified in the CMP. The relevant CMP policy states, “No further archaeological work is required within Zone 1”. Resulting from the site works for the construction of the MRRC in the 1990s, there are no known, or potentially significant archaeological deposits within the precinct.

*Is the new development sympathetic to the heritage item? In what way (e.g. form, siting, proportions, design)?*

Comment:
The proposal is sympathetic to the Silverwater correctional Complex given the small scale, temporary nature and location within the MRRC precinct.
Will the additions visually dominate the heritage item? How has this been minimised? Will the public, and users of the item, still be able to view and appreciate its significance?

Comment:
The works will not visually dominate the Silverwater Correctional Centre given their minor nature and small scale. Views to the complex will predominantly remain the same, particularly from Holker Street.

6.5 Standard Exemptions for Works Requiring Heritage Council Approval

The proposed minor works are located within the MRRC precinct which is identified as low heritage significance, as are the subject buildings within the precinct. The proposed works are minor, temporary and located within the site. Therefore, the proposal will have little or no adverse heritage impact. Accordingly, the proposal meets the following Standard Exemptions under the Heritage Act 1977:

Standard Exemption 7; Minor activities with little or no adverse impact on heritage significance

1. Anything which in the opinion of the Director-General is of a minor nature and will have little or no adverse impact on the heritage significance of the item does not require approval under subsection 57(1) of the Act.

6.6 Mitigation Measures

The Works Method below has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines from the Office of Environment and Heritage Maintenance Series. The contractor needs to be notified of the requirements in the Works Method for the minor preparation works at Silverwater Correctional Centre to mitigate potential impacts on the heritage significance of the site as follows:

6.1.1 Legislation

- Ensure that the contractor is advised of the obligations under the Heritage Act 1977.
- Any works not specified as part of the Lendlease Contractor’s Detailed Description of Early Works MRRC will require separate assessment and cannot be carried out as part of these works.

6.1.2 Contractors

- Any works carried out pursuant to the Exempt Development Requirements must be specified, supervised and carried out by licensed tradespeople with knowledge, skills and experience appropriate to the work.
- Contractors are to be briefed of the State heritage significance of the Silverwater Correctional Centre.

6.1.3 Avoid Damage to Significant Areas

- Equipment laydown areas and contactor vehicles must be located away from heritage buildings and areas of exceptional or considerable significance to minimise any potential impact to the external or internal fabric.
- Contactors vehicles must not be parked near heritage structures or landscaped areas which could inadvertently be damaged.
6.1.4 If Relics are Discovered

- If relics are discovered, work must cease in the affected area and the Heritage Council must be notified in writing in accordance with section 146 of the Heritage Act 1977. Depending on the nature of the discovery, assessment and an excavation permit may be required prior to the recommencement of work in the affected area.
7 Conclusion and Recommendations

7.1 Conclusion

Silverwater Correctional Centre is listed as a heritage conservation area on the State Heritage Register. It is also listed as a heritage conservation area on the Auburn Local Environmental Plan 2010.

The Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre was constructed in the 1990s. Its buildings and landscape setting are identified as being of little heritage significance. There is no archaeological potential within this precinct.

As the proposal involves minor temporary internal works, they will not have an adverse impact on the heritage significance of the site. The heritage significance of the wider Silverwater Correctional Centre will not be affected given the location within the MRRC precinct. The works will be temporary components, such as the temporary fence and temporary gatehouse. The works will contribute to the ongoing institutional care within Silverwater Correctional Centre.

Therefore, the proposed site establishment, temporary fencing, and temporary gatehouse works are considered to be minor and will have little to no adverse heritage impact on the heritage significance of the site.

The proposal is consistent with the conservation policies of the Silverwater Correctional Complex Conservation Management Plan, prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates in 2004.

The proposal meets the requirements for Standard Exemption 7: *Minor activities with little or no adverse impact on heritage significance* under the *Heritage Act 1977*.

7.2 Recommendation

It is recommended the works method (Section 6.6 of this report) be implemented and carried out as part of the works, should the Office of Environment and Heritage endorse the Standard Exemption 57(7) Exemption Notification application.
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