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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Artefact Heritage have been commissioned by GHD, on behalf of the Department of Justice, to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC) 440 bed expansion project (the proposed development). This will involve a 440-bed expansion for maximum security male inmates within the existing and operational MRRC. The proposed development will also include the construction of a new outdoor sports area, gym, programs and interview buildings, a new health clinic, footpaths and upgrades and expansions to existing buildings.

The MRRC is located within part of the Silverwater Correctional Complex (SCC) a 26.1-hectare property in the City of Parramatta Council Local Government Area (LGA). The SCC was established in 1968-9 and is listed on the State Heritage Register (SHR), Auburn Local Environment Plan (LEP) 2010, Sydney Regional Environmental Plan 24 (SREP 24) and NSW Department of Corrective Services Heritage and Conservation s170 register and contains an item listed on the Register of the National Estate (RNE).

In addition to modern structures which serve the SCC, Inrwin House, associated with the Newington Hospital and Asylum (1880-1968) is located within the study area. Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel (constructed as part of the Newington Estate 1807-1863) are located outside of the study area, although they are in view of the proposed development.

This HIA will be included in a Review of Environmental Factors (REF) to assist with planning approvals.

Overview of Findings

• The proposed development would occur within the curtilage of the State significant Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area listed on the Auburn LEP 2010, SHR, SREP 24 and NSW Department of Corrective Services Heritage and Conservation s170 Register.
• The proposed development would occur within view of Newington House, St Augustine’s Chapel (listed as individual items on the Register of the National Estate and Corrective Services NSW s170 register), Irwin House (listed as an individual item on the SREP 24 and Corrective Services NSW s170 register) and the State significant Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve (SHR Item no. 01850 and RNE no. 15054).
• Provided all mitigation measures and recommendations are followed, the proposed development within the MRRC would result in the following heritage impacts:
  − Negligible impacts to fabric associated with Blocks A, B, B32, C, D, E, J, U, Irwin House, Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel
  − Moderate impacts to the existing MRRC Sports Oval resulting in minor impacts to the SPCCA
  − Moderate visual impact on the SPCCA as a whole as a result of new development within the Sports Oval
  − Negligible impacts to views ‘to’ and ‘from’ Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel
  − Moderate impacts to views ‘to’ and ‘from’ Irwin House due to the increased roof line on the Visits Building (Block B) and proposed Accommodation Block (Block O)
- Moderate impacts to views ‘to’ Irwin House from the Visits Building (Block B) due to the replacement of an existing mesh wall with a masonry wall containing windows
- Minor visual impacts to the SHR listed Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve

- The study area contains areas of nil, low-moderate and high archaeological potential for State significant archaeology. The proposal would result in the following heritage impacts:
  - Negligible impacts to potential archaeological remains within the eastern portion of study area (Sports Oval and Blocks F, G and J)
  - Minor to moderate impacts to potential archaeological remains containing State significance associated with Irwin House (Block I)
  - Minor impacts to potential archaeological remains of State significance within the western portion of study area (Blocks B, C, D, E and U)

- Impacts associated with the proposed Staff Carpark (Block U) would consist of:
  - Minor to moderate impacts to potential archaeological remains that may exist in the vicinity of the existing staff carpark
  - Negligible impacts to significant fabric or structures associated with the existing staff carpark
  - Moderate to minor visual impacts ‘to’ and ‘from’ the SPCCA

**Recommendations**

- A Section 60 application would be submitted to the NSW Heritage Council for impacts within the SHR curtilage. It is possible the proposal may require presentation to the NSW Heritage Council and exhibition during the approval process.
- The design of new structures within the SHR curtilage would be sensitive to the heritage values of the place. While functional and institutional design may be appropriate, the form and finish of the buildings should consider the heritage context of the site. A heritage architect should be consulted during detailed design.
- A comprehensive archival recording, following the Heritage Division’s guidelines (Heritage Office 1998 and 2006), should be conducted prior to works commencing. This would be carried out under guidelines for State significant items and focus any surrounding landscapes, complexes or buildings that would be altered by the proposed development.
- A Heritage Interpretation Strategy should be prepared to explore and guide opportunities for providing historical and archaeological interpretive displays to inmates, visitors and members of the public.
- The proposed development may impact areas with potential for State significant relics within the western portion of the study area. However, the extent of these impacts cannot be assessed until detailed architectural designs and constructability information has been confirmed. Therefore, an in-depth Archaeological Research Design (ARD) should be prepared to support a relevant archaeological excavation permit or exemption/exception application once detailed designs have been finalised. This would be submitted and approved by NSW Heritage Division prior to works commencing.
• It is recommended that a vibrations assessment be carried out as per the *Assessing Vibration: A Technical Guideline* (Department of Environment and Conservation 2006) document prior to works commencing.

• In order to mitigate the minor to moderate impacts associated with the removal of two Moreton Bay Fig trees from the Sports Oval, it is recommended that translocation is considered following recommendations set out in the arborist report. However, if this is not feasible, the option to propagate cuttings from the trees should be adopted and propagated cuttings planted in appropriate locations across the SCC site.

• The endorsed CMP for the SCC prepared in 2004 expired on 26 March 2009. Therefore, it is recommended that an updated CMP for the SPCCA be prepared as part of the proposed development.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Artefact Heritage have been commissioned by GHD, on behalf of the Department of Justice, to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC) 440 bed expansion project (the proposed development).

This HIA will be included in a Review of Environmental Factors (REF) to assist with planning approvals. The REF must meet the requirements of Sections 111 and 112 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) and Clause 228 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 (EP&A Regulation).

1.2 Overview of the proposal

The proposed works involve the 440-bed expansion for maximum security male inmates within the existing and operational MRRC. This will include upgrades and expansion of the existing Gate House (Block A), Visits Building (Block V), inmate property store (Block C), current cells in Darcy (Block D), laundry facility (Block E), gym facility (Block J), the conversion of the existing workshop area (Block E) into a re-therm kitchen and addition of sixteen special management cells within Darcy (Block D) into segregation cells (providing 31 in total).

In addition, the project would include the construction of a new outdoor sports area and building, four two storey accommodation units for housing (within the existing Sports Oval), programs and interview buildings, a new health clinic and footpaths. Service upgrades and expansion works for existing staff and visitor carparks will also occur. A detailed description of proposed works can be found in Section 7.0.

1.3 The study area

The study area is located within the MRRC, which occupies the southeast corner of the Silverwater Correctional Complex (SCC) as shown in Figure 1. The SCC comprises Lot 22, DP 876995, a 26.1-hectare property within the City of Parramatta Local Government Area (LGA) and was established in 1968-69.

The SCC is listed on the Sydney Regional Environmental Plan 24 (SREP 24), State Heritage Register (SHR) and Auburn Local Environment Plan (LEP) 2010 and NSW Department of Corrective Services Heritage and Conservation s170 register.

In addition to the study area, the SCC houses the Silverwater Women’s Correctional Centre and the Dawn de Loas Correctional Centre.

The study area is bounded by Holker Street to the south, Jamieson Street to the east, the Silverwater Women’s Correction Centre to the west and the ‘Support Area’ (occupied by Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel) to the north.

---

1.4 Purpose and scope of the report

This report has been prepared to support the REF for the proposed MRRC project (referred to hereafter as the proposal). It provides an outline of potential heritage impacts associated with the proposal and will be used to guide the REF determination process. The purpose of this HIA is to:

- Provide a historical background for land within the SCC and MRRC (the study area);
- Undertake an analysis of the built fabric that may be impacted by proposed development within the study area;
- Provide significance assessments for heritage listed items in and in view of the study area;
- Assess potential impacts to heritage listed items that may occur as part of the proposed development;
- Assess the non-Aboriginal archaeological potential of the study area;
- Outline heritage management and mitigation strategies for the proposal.

1.5 Report structure

- Section 1 – Introduction: Provides an introduction and background of the proposed works;
- Section 2 – Report Background: Outlines the scope of this heritage assessment and outlines the analysis methodology;
- Section 3 – Legislative Context: Describes the relevant heritage legislation and provides an overview of the listed heritage items in and in view of the study area;
- Section 4 – Historical Background: Outlines the non-Aboriginal history of the study area;
- Section 5 – Site Analysis: Describes results from the site inspection, including an analysis of built heritage fabric, potential archaeological remains and impacts to views and vistas from surrounding heritage listed items;
- Section 6 – Heritage Significance Assessments: Outlines the heritage significance of the study area and heritage listed items within view of the study area;
- Section 7 – Historical Archaeological Assessment: Assesses the potential non-Aboriginal archaeological resources in the study area;
- Section 8 – Proposed Works: Provides further information on the scope of the proposed works and justification for potential impacts that may occur as a result of the development;
- Section 9 - Heritage Impact Assessment: Assesses impacts to heritage listed items and potential archaeological resources as a result of the proposed development;
- Section 10 – Mitigation Measures: Outlines heritage requirements and potential mitigation measures to address heritage impacts;
- Section 11 – Conclusions and Recommendations: Presents a summary of the study's findings, outlines further legislative requirements and provides advice to reduce or mitigate heritage impacts to heritage and potential archaeological remains within the study area.
1.6 Methodology

This HIA has been prepared using the document *Statement of Heritage Impact* 2002, prepared by the NSW Heritage Office, contained within the *NSW Heritage Manual*, as a guideline.

1.6.1 Significance grading

This report includes an assessment of the relative contributions of individual components of the SPCCA to its heritage value. Components are assessed according to the grading in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional (E)</td>
<td>Rare or outstanding element directly contributing to an item's local and state significance.</td>
<td>Fulfils criteria for local or state listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (H)</td>
<td>High degree of original fabric. Demonstrates a key element of the item's significance. Alterations do not detract from significance.</td>
<td>Fulfils criteria for local or state listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (M)</td>
<td>Altered or modified elements. Elements with little heritage value, but which contribute to the overall significance of the item.</td>
<td>Fulfils criteria for local or state listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little (L)</td>
<td>Alterations detract from significance. Difficult to interpret.</td>
<td>Does not fufill criteria for local or state listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive (I)</td>
<td>Damaging to the item's heritage significance.</td>
<td>Does not fufill criteria for local or state listing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6.2 Impact assessment

In order to consistently identify the potential impact of the proposed works, the terminology contained in Table 2 has been referenced throughout this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Actions that would have a long-term and substantial impact on the significance of a heritage item. Actions that would remove key historic building elements, key historic landscape features, or significant archaeological materials, thereby resulting in a change of historic character, or altering of a historical resource. These actions cannot be fully mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Actions involving the modification of a heritage item, including altering the setting of a heritage item or landscape, partially removing archaeological resources, or the alteration of significant elements of fabric from historic structures. The impacts arising from such actions may be able to be partially mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Actions that would result in the slight alteration of heritage buildings, archaeological resources, or the setting of an historical item. The impacts arising from such actions can usually be mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Actions that would result in very minor changes to heritage items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Actions that would have no heritage impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7 Limitations

This report addresses impacts to Non-Aboriginal archaeology and heritage only. The Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve is not readily accessible to the public. Therefore, potential visual impacts as a result of the proposed development could not be assessed from inside the reserve. The interiors of Block D or Block E were not accessed as the buildings were occupied at the time of the inspection.

1.8 Report authorship

This report has been authored by Adele Zubrzycka (Senior Heritage Consultant) and Jessica Horton (Graduate Heritage Consultant). Sandra Wallace (Principal) provided management input and review.
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Figure 1. Location of the study area.
2.0 LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

2.1 Relevant Legislation

2.1.1 The World Heritage Convention

The Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and National Heritage (the World Heritage Convention) was adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) on 16 November 1972, and came into force on 17 December 1975. The World Heritage Convention aims to promote international cooperation to protect heritage that is of such outstanding universal value that its conservation is important for current and future generations. It sets out the criteria that a site must meet to be inscribed on the World Heritage List (WHL) and the role of State Parties in the protection and preservation of world and their own national heritage.

The concept of a buffer zone was first included in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in 1977 and recognises the value of the environment that surrounds a site. The buffer zone acts as an additional layer of protection for World Heritage sites. It is a space that is itself not of outstanding universal value, but that influences the value of a World Heritage site.

- No heritage items within or in the vicinity of the study area are listed on the World Heritage List.

2.1.2 National and Commonwealth legislation

2.1.2.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999

The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (the EPBC Act) provides a legal framework to protect and manage nationally and internationally important flora, fauna, ecological communities and heritage places. These are defined in the EPBC Act 1999 as matters of national environmental significance. Under the EPBC Act 1999, nationally significant heritage items are protected through listing on the Commonwealth Heritage List or the National Heritage List.

National Heritage List

The National Heritage List (NHL) was established under the EPBC Act, which provides a legal framework to protect and manage nationally and internationally important flora, fauna, ecological communities and heritage places. Under the EPBC Act, nationally significant heritage items are protected through listing on the NHL or the Commonwealth Heritage List.

- No heritage items within or in the vicinity of the study area are listed on the National Heritage List.

Commonwealth Heritage List

The Commonwealth Heritage List has been established to list heritage places that are either entirely within a Commonwealth area, or outside the Australian jurisdiction and owned or leased by the Commonwealth or a Commonwealth Authority. The Commonwealth Heritage List includes natural, Indigenous and historic heritage places which the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities is satisfied have one or more Commonwealth Heritage values.

- There are no items within the study area listed on the Commonwealth Heritage List.

All heritage databases were searched in March-April 2018.
2.1.3  State legislation

2.1.3.1  Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) establishes the framework for cultural heritage values to be formally assessed in the land use planning and development consent process. The EP&A Act requires that environmental impacts are considered prior to land development; this includes impacts on cultural heritage items and places as well as archaeological sites and deposits.

The EP&A Act also requires that Local Governments prepare planning instruments (such as Local Environmental Plans [LEPs] and policies such as Development Control Plans [DCPs]) in accordance with the Act to provide guidance on the level of environmental assessment required.

2.1.3.2  Heritage Act 1977

The NSW Heritage Act 1977 (Heritage Act) is the primary piece of State legislation affording protection to heritage items (natural and cultural) in New South Wales. Under the Heritage Act, ‘items of environmental heritage’ include places, buildings, works, relics, moveable objects and precincts identified as significant based on historical, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic values. State significant items can be listed on the NSW State Heritage Register (SHR) and are given automatic protection under the Heritage Act against any activities that may damage an item or affect its heritage significance. The Heritage Act also protects ‘relics’, which can include archaeological material, features and deposits.

The Heritage Act also provides protection for ‘relics’, which includes archaeological material or deposits. Section 4 (1) of the Heritage Act (as amended in 2009) defines a relic as:

    ...any deposit, artefact, object or material evidence that:

        (a) relates to the settlement of the area that comprises New South Wales, not being Aboriginal settlement, and
        (b) is of State or local heritage significance\(^3\)

Sections 139 to 145 of the Heritage Act prevent the excavation or disturbance of land known or likely to contain relics, unless under an excavation permit. Section 139 (1) states:

> A person must not disturb or excavate any land knowingly or having reasonable cause to suspect that the disturbance or excavation will or is likely to result in a relic being discovered, exposed, damaged or destroyed unless the disturbance is carried out in accordance with an excavation permit.\(^4\)

Excavation permits are issued by the Heritage Council of NSW, or its Delegate, under Section 140 of the Heritage Act for relics not within SHR curtilages, or under Section 60 for significant archaeological remains within SHR curtilages. In some circumstances, a Section 60 permit may not be required if works are undertaken in accordance with the Standard Exemptions for Works Requiring Heritage Council Approval or in accordance with agency specific exemptions.

The Heritage Act defines ‘works’ as being in a separate category to archaeological ‘relics’. Works refer to past evidence of infrastructure. Works may be buried, and therefore archaeological in nature, however, exposure of works does not trigger reporting obligations under the Heritage Act. The following examples are commonly considered to be works: former road surfaces or pavement,

---


\(^4\) Ibid.
kerbing, evidence of former infrastructure (such as drains or drainage pits where there are no relics in association) and building foundations.

The State Heritage Register (SHR)

The SHR was established under Section 22 of the Heritage Act and is a list of places and objects of particular importance to the people of NSW, including archaeological sites. The SHR is administered by the New South Wales (NSW) Heritage Division of the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) and includes a diverse range of over 1,500 items, in both private and public ownership. To be listed, an item must be deemed to be of heritage significance for the whole of NSW.

- The study area is located within the SHR listed Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area (SHR no. 00813).
- The study area is located within view of the SHR listed Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve (SHR no. 01850)

Section 170 Registers

The Heritage Act requires all government agencies to identify and manage heritage assets in their ownership and control. Under Section 170 of the Heritage Act, government instrumentalities must establish and keep a register which includes all items of environmental heritage listed on the SHR, an environmental planning instrument or which may be subject to an interim heritage order that are owned, occupied or managed by that government body.

- The study area is located within the s170 Department of Corrective Services listed ‘Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area (Newington House, Chapel, Irwin House, Former Superintendent’s Residence)’ which has State significance (SHI no. )
- The study area contains the s170 Department of Corrective Services listed ‘Silverwater Correctional Complex - Irwin House’ (SHI no. 3360127)
- The study area is in view of the s170 Department of Corrective Services listed ‘Silverwater Correctional Complex - Newington Chapel & Grounds’ and ‘Silverwater Correctional Complex - Newington House & Grounds’ (SHI no. 3360126 and 3360125 respectively)

Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No.24 (Homebush Bay)

The Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No.24 (SREP 24) (Amendment 2) was designed to define objectives for the Homebush Bay Area which encourage co-ordinated and environmentally sensitive development of the Homebush Bay Area and to guide and co-ordinate the development of the Homebush Bay Area. It replaced planning instruments previously applying to the Homebush Bay Area with a simplified planning framework and provided flexible development controls by allowing a wide mix of uses in the Homebush Bay Area.

- The subject site falls within the SREP 24 listed Silverwater Prison Complex locality. This includes the following individual items of heritage significance:
  - Newington House
  - St Augustine's Chapel
  - Irwin House
  - Margaret Catchpole Building
  - Caroline Chisholm Building
  - Former Superintendent's Residence
  - Former Ward Block (demolished in 1996)
  - Former Engineer's House
2.1.4 Local legislation

The MRRC is located in the City of Parramatta local government area. This LGA was created on 12 May 2016, through the amalgamation of parts of Parramatta City, Auburn City and Holroyd City councils. Prior to this amalgamation, the MRRC was located in the Auburn LGA. As such, the relevant local planning instrument and development control plan is the Auburn Local Environmental Plan 2010 and the Auburn Development Control Plan 2010.

Auburn Local Environmental Plan 2010

The Auburn LEP 2010 applies to those parts of the City of Parramatta and Cumberland LGAs that were located in the Auburn LGA prior to the 2016 council amalgamation process. This includes the study area.

The following clauses apply to heritage items, land within the vicinity of heritage items and historic archaeological relics or sites within land subject to the Auburn LEP 2010, under Schedule 5.10 of the LEP:

(1) Objectives

The objectives of this clause are as follows:

(a) to conserve the environmental heritage of Auburn,
(b) to conserve the heritage significance of heritage items and heritage conservation areas, including associated fabric, settings and views,
(c) to conserve archaeological sites,

(2) Requirement for consent

Development consent is required for any of the following:

(a) demolishing or moving any of the following or altering the exterior of any of the following (including, in the case of a building, making changes to its detail, fabric, finish or appearance):

(i) a heritage item,
(ii) a building, work, relic or tree within a heritage conservation area,

(b) altering a heritage item that is a building by making structural changes to its interior or by making changes to anything inside the item that is specified in Schedule 5 in relation to the item,

(c) disturbing or excavating an archaeological site while knowing, or having reasonable cause to suspect, that the disturbance or excavation will or is likely to result in a relic being discovered, exposed, moved, damaged or destroyed,

(e) erecting a building on land:

(i) on which a heritage item is located or that is within a heritage conservation area, or
(ii) on which an Aboriginal object is located or that is within an Aboriginal place of heritage significance,

(f) subdividing land:

(i) on which a heritage item is located or that is within a heritage conservation area, or
(ii) on which an Aboriginal object is located or that is within an Aboriginal place of heritage significance.

(4) Effect of proposed development on heritage significance
The consent authority must, before granting consent under this clause in respect of a heritage item or heritage conservation area, consider the effect of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the item or area concerned. This subclause applies regardless of whether a heritage management document is prepared under subclause (5) or a heritage conservation management plan is submitted under subclause (6).

(5) Heritage assessment
The consent authority may, before granting consent to any development:

(a) on land on which a heritage item is located, or
(b) on land that is within a heritage conservation area, or
(c) on land that is within the vicinity of land referred to in paragraph (a) or (b), require a heritage management document to be prepared that assesses the extent to which the carrying out of the proposed development would affect the heritage significance of the heritage item or heritage conservation area concerned.

(7) Archaeological sites
The consent authority must, before granting consent under this clause to the carrying out of development on an archaeological site (other than land listed on the State Heritage Register or to which an interim heritage order under the Heritage Act 1977 applies):

(a) notify the Heritage Council of its intention to grant consent, and
(b) take into consideration any response received from the Heritage Council within 28 days after the notice is sent.6

- The study area is located within the Auburn LEP 2010 listed ‘Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area’ (LEP no. C00813).

2.1.5 Non-Statutory considerations

Register of the National Estate
The Register of the National Estate (RNE) is no longer a statutory list; however, it remains available as an archive.

- The study area is located within view of the RNE listed:
  - Newington Arms Depot Conservation Area (Item no. 15054)
  - Medical Superintendents House (former) (item no. 2962)
  - Newington Chapel (Item no. 2959)
  - Newington (Item no. 2958)
  - Silverwater Saltmarsh (Item no. 6544)

---

National Trust of Australia (NSW)

Listing on the National Trust Heritage Register does not impose statutory obligations and is more an indication in which the item is held by the heritage community.

- There are no items listed on the National Trust within the study area or in proximity to the study area.

2.1.6 Summary of heritage listings

Table 3 and Figure 2 provide a summary of heritage listed items within and outside of the study area.

**Table 3. Summary of heritage items in and within view of the study area.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Listing No.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Relationship to study area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW 2141</td>
<td>SHR Item No.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Holker Street, Homebush Bay, NSW 2140</td>
<td>SHR Item No.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>20m east. Across Jamieson Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW 2141</td>
<td>Corrective Services NSW Section 170 Register. SHI database no. 3360124</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Correctional Complex - Irwin House</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW 2141</td>
<td>Corrective Services NSW Section 170 Register. SHI database no. 3360127</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Prison Complex locality.</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW 2141</td>
<td>Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No 24—Homebush Bay Area</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Prison Complex</td>
<td>Silverwater, NSW 2141</td>
<td>Auburn LEP Item No.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Correctional Complex - Newington Chapel &amp; Grounds</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW 2141</td>
<td>Corrective Services NSW Section 170 Register. SHI database no. 3360126</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>18m north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Correctional Complex - Newington House &amp; Grounds (and respectively)</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW 2141</td>
<td>Corrective Services NSW Section 170 Register. SHI database no. 3360125</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30m north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington Arms Depot Conservation Area</td>
<td>Homebush Bay, NSW, Australia</td>
<td>RNE Item No. 15054</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>20m west. Across Jamieson Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Superintendents House (former)</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW, Australia</td>
<td>RNE Item No. 2962</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>45 m north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>RNE Item No.</td>
<td>Heritage Reference</td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington Chapel</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW, Australia</td>
<td>2959</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>18m north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>Holker Street, Silverwater, NSW, Australia</td>
<td>2958</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>30m north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Saltmarsh</td>
<td>Holker Street, Homebush Bay, NSW, Australia</td>
<td>6544</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Heritage items within and outside of the study area.
3.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 Aboriginal history

The study area is located within the traditional lands of the Wangal clan who forming part of the larger Darug language group. Little is known of the Aboriginal occupation of Homebush Bay prior to European occupation. However, using resources from neighbouring areas, it can be concluded that the Wangal would have engaged with the surrounding woodland, riverine, mudflat, saltmarsh and mangrove environments to retrieve animal and plant resources.7

3.2 Phase 1: Early European settlement and land use (1797-1807)

Land within Liberty Plains (as land now occupied by Silverwater, Homebush, Rookwood and Lidcombe were once known) was first settled in 1797, following an exploration party with Governor John Hunter up the Parramatta, Duck and George’s Rivers in 1788.8 The earliest known European settlement within and around the study area took place in 1797, when two 25-acre grants were given to Captain Henry Waterhouse and Lieutenant John Shortland to the south of the Parramatta River (shown in Figure 3). In 1800, first fleeter marine Isaac Archer received an 80-acre grant abutting Shortland’s farm to the east.

The Waterhouse grant became known as Waterhouse Farm, while Shortland’s grant was named Shortland Farm. These would later form part of the Newington Estate (discussed below) and are now located within land occupied by the SPCCA and part of the study area.

Little is known about land use in the area during this time. However, Waterhouse kept a flock of Merino sheep on the property before returning to England in 1800.9 The farm was later put up for sale and an advertisement in the Sydney Gazette dated 6 January 1805 stipulated that ‘All persons are prohibited from cutting spars or timber of any kind on the above grounds’. This suggests that the majority of land within his grant had not been cleared or formally occupied.10

During this time, the most convenient mode of transport in Liberty Plains was via the Parramatta River. The location of these early land grants, to the south of the Parramatta River, east of Duck River and north of Parramatta Road would have allowed for ease of access to and from the properties (Figure 3).

In 1806, a 50-acre grant was given to Samuel Haslam, approximately 1.6 kilometres north of the study area. Later that year, Judge-Advocate Richard Aitkens took out a lease on land east of Duck River and north of Parramatta Road. His lease was cancelled shortly thereafter and the area (which covered approximately 1290-acres) was granted to free settler John Blaxland in 1807.11

---
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3.3 Phase 2: Newington Estate and industry (1807-1863)

3.3.1 John Blaxland’s Newington Estate

Blaxland called his 1290-acre grant ‘Newington’, after his family estates in Kent (shown in Figure 4). The Newington Estate covered land between Parramatta River and Parramatta Road, Duck River and Haslam’s Creek and excluded Waterhouse, Shortland, Archer and Haslam’s grants. These were purchased by Blaxland in 1808 and consolidated into the estate. The majority of land within the estate occupied low lying swamps.

During his first decade of occupation, Blaxland established a small cottage, farm, slaughterhouse and saltworks - developing a cattle industry and producing the first usable salt in the country. By 1838, the saltworks produced 1,000 tons of salt and employed 70 convict labourers. Documentary evidence suggests that the estate included a kitchen, coach house, stable, barns, sheds, workmen's cottages and service buildings. A plan prepared in 1859 shows the location of a wharf, various structures, paddocks, salt pans and dams associated with the estate (Figure 4). It is unclear whether the study area was occupied by any of these structures, as the plan is largely indicative, however, it is probable that they outside of the study area, or on land now occupied by modern buildings associated with the SPCCA.

In 1829, Blaxland commenced the construction of the grander and larger ‘Newington House’ (shown as it stood in 1894-5 in Figure 5). This replaced his first cottage and continues to occupy land to the north of the MRRC’s boundary. Newington House was built in the English Regency style, surrounded by pristine English gardens and was completed in 1832. A chapel (St Augustine’s) was built for the family and their servants in 1838. The chapel is thought to have been designed by James Houison and served as a school for the children of the estate and surrounding area. The chapel is also located to the north of the MRRC’s boundary and sits 112 metres east of Newington House.

3.3.2 Industrial use

Blaxland passed away in 1845 and his family vacated the estate. In 1851, the Australian Trust Company sold the property to recover funds from an earlier mortgage taken out by Blaxland in 1843. The Blaxland family had managed to recover the estate by 1854 and went on to advertise subdivided land within its southern boundary for sale in the same year (outside of the study area). This was largely unsuccessful, and they were forced to lease the property to the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

The church went on to establish an abattoir (1860), rendering plant (1862) and bone-crushing mill (1866) at the estate. The property was also used to manufacture salt and for slaughtering livestock. The kitchens were used as a piggery and the dining room converted into a barn. During this time Newington House was neglected.
Figure 3. Post-1806 St John Parish map showing Waterhouse, Shortland, Archer, Haslam and Blaxland’s land grants in relation to the study area. Parramatta Road can be seen in the bottom left corner. Source. Land and Property Information, Historic Maps Viewer.

Figure 4. Reuss and Browne’s map of the subdivisions of Parramatta and environs dated to 1859 showing indicative location of the study area. Source. State Library of NSW.
3.4 Phase 3: Newington College (1863-1880)

In 1863, Reverend John Allen Manton acquired, by lease, Newington on behalf of the Methodist Church to start a boy's school. By July 1863, nineteen boys were enrolled and formed the precursor to the third GPS school in NSW. The college’s first home was the regency mansion built by John Blaxland and during the college’s occupation, the house was restored. By 1880, the pupil count had grown from nineteen to several hundred and the college moved to its current site at Stanmore.

No significant structures were constructed on the estate during this period and land use within the study area is not known.
3.5 Phase 4: Hospital and Asylum (1880-1968)

The NSW Government purchased part of the site in 1880 for use as Benevolent Asylum for aged and destitute women. By 1881, the estate had been subdivided and by 1887 the house became the centre of the Silverwater State Hospital / Hospital and Asylum, which would remain its role until 1969. The location of the new asylum and hospital allotment are shown in Figure 7.

Occupation of the Newington Estate and land within the study area had a significant impact on the original layout of the Newington Estate, and included the erection of nurse’s quarters, Irwin House, support buildings, toilets, laundry, ‘dead house’, stables, dairy, piggery and fowl yard. A dam was also excavated during this phase and used to supply water to the facility. The dam was established near the corner of what is now Holker and Jamieson Streets, within the study area and existing Sports Oval. The location of the dam and structures (based on an 1896 plan of Newington House and Outbuildings prepared in the same year) are shown in Figure 6.

This plan also shows that the majority of the study area was occupied by paddocks associated with the dairy, piggery and fowl yard, although a series of structures occupied the northwest corner of the site, which is presently associated with Blocks C and D. Photographs taken of cows and pigs reared at the institution are shown in Figure 9 and Figure 10. Holker and Jamieson Streets had also been formalised by this phase, and a now removed Blaxland Street can also be seen running in an east west alignment across the centre of the Asylum property, within the northern portion of the study area.

In circa (c) 1892, land to the east of the study area was resumed for the Newington Armament Depot (as shown in Figure 11). This now encompasses the 47-hectare SHR listed Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve (Figure 14). During the First World War, the asylum was converted into a State Hospital and it was during this time that Irwin House and Engineer’s Cottage were built.

By 1914 the site officially became a hospital. The hospital continued to expand across the northern and western edges of the Newington Asylum and Hospital property over the following decades, as shown in an aerial photograph taken of the site in 1943 (Figure 12). This aerial also shows the location of structures (including Irwin House), paddocks and dam within the study area and suggests that the southeast corner of the property remained relatively undeveloped during this period (with the exception of the dam and a small building at the corner of Holker and Jamieson Streets). It is likely the latter was demolished during the construction of the SCC secure perimeter zone or Bradshaw Rubbish Tip (discussed in Section 3.6.1)

---
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Figure 6. 1886 Plan of Newington House and Outbuildings. Source. Godden Mackay, 1995, p. 4.

Figure 7. Undated St John parish map showing newly granted land for Newington Asylum within study area and John Blaxland’s original 1890-acre grant. Source. Land and Property Information, Historic Maps Viewer.
Figure 8. Newington State Hospital Site Plan, 1932. The curtilage of Irwin House is outlined in orange. Source Department of Commerce Plan Room, SH3121.
Figure 9. Group of shorthorns, porkers, Newington Asylum, no date. Source. State Library of NSW.

Figure 10. White boar, Newington Asylum, no date. Source. State Library of NSW.
Figure 11. 1906 subdivision plan of the Newington Estate, Borough of Rookwood, Parramatta River showing land resumed for Military purposes (now the Newington Armament Depot and Reserve) and Newington Asylum. Source. National Library of Australia.

Figure 12. 1943 aerial photograph showing extent of development during this period. This includes a dam and building in the southeast corner of the property and various structures and plantings along the western end of the study area (including an avenue of Camphor laurels). The curtilage for Irwin House is outlined in orange. Source. SixMaps.
3.6 Phase 5: Silverwater Correctional Complex -1968 to present

By 1969, the Department of Corrective Services took over management of the Newington Hospital and Asylum for a new minimum-security men’s prison to be called the Silverwater Correctional Centre (Figure 13) and a women’s prison to be called the Mulawa Correctional Centre. An aerial photograph taken of the Newington Armament Depot in 1970 shows land within the study area remained undeveloped during this time (Figure 14).

Throughout the next 20 years, the site was subject to various developments, however, it was not until 1985 that major construction works occurred. This saw the present building form expand to the north and west as well as additional accommodation built at Mulawa (northwest of the study area).

The 1990s saw the introduction of a minimum-security facility and periodic detention centre. In addition to these works, the topography of the surrounding site to the north and north west, primarily Millennium Parklands was altered as preparation for the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games and development of the Parklands.

Figure 13. Silverwater Corrections Centre, 1977. Source: State Library of NSW.

---
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3.6.1 Bradshaw Rubbish Tip (1982 to c.1986)

Between 1982 and c.1986, land now occupied by the Sports Oval and Blocks G and F was used as a rubbish tip by Bradshaw Waste Industries. Prior to this, the area consisted of a partially grassed ‘sloping, rocky site’ used by inmates as a cricket ground and football oval. The establishment of the rubbish tip was approved (without a formal tender process) under an internal agreement that it be used to dump ‘non-rotting waste’ for one year, after which funds generated by the tip would be used to construct a new sports oval for inmates.

The promised oval was never established and by 1989 the area was barren and ‘covered in clay and gravel incapable of use as a sports or recreational field’ (as shown in Figure 15). In 1989, the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) opened an official investigation into the tip (referred to as the ‘M92 site’), and possible corrupt conduct by Bradshaw Waste Industries Pty Ltd and other individuals involved in the project. Although the investigation found that there was insufficient evidence to warrant consideration of the prosecution of any person associated with the project, Bradshaw Waste Industries were required to pay the SCC $25,000 to remediate the site.

The investigation also found that household refuse (rotting waste) had been dumped at the site over time. Further information regarding the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip can be found in Section 6.4.1.

33 Canberra Times, Tuesday 12 September 1989, page 2.
34 Canberra Times, Tuesday 12 September 1989, page 2.
36 Independent Commission Against Corruption. 1990.
3.6.2 Sports Oval (1990 to 1996)

Land use within the former Bradshaw Rubbish Tip between 1990 - 1996 is unknown, however, the Sports Oval as it appears today was formalised alongside the MRRC by 1997. Two large fig trees were also removed from an unknown location and planted in the Sports Oval during this period.\footnote{37}{Graham Brooks and Associates, 2004, p. 52.}


3.6.1 MRRC (1994 - present)

Construction for the MRRC commenced in 1994. The project included the establishment of the majority of buildings within the study area (Blocks C, B, D, E, G, G H and J). It also involved the demolition of the Electrician Workshop & Boiler Room, Feed Shed, Fuel Store and Dormitories and removal of Blaxland Street, all associated with the Newington Hospital and Asylum (Figure 12). Various original plantings, including Canary Island Date Palms and an avenue of Camphor laurel trees which once lined the now removed Blaxland Street (shown in Figure 12) were also removed during this phase. The majority of plantings associated with Irwin House were retained.\footnote{38}{Graham Brooks and Associates, 2004, p. 65.}

The MRRC was officially opened in July 1997.\footnote{39}{Graham Brooks and Associates, 2004, pp.25-36.} A Mental Health Assessment Unit (not to be altered under the proposed development) was added to the site in 2003. Today, the MRRC can accommodate up to 1,163 inmates.

Newington House, St Augustine’s Chapel and Irwin House were all converted for SCC use during this period and their original landscaped settings were significantly altered.\footnote{40}{Blaxell, G. 2017. Newington in Decay. Northern District Times. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.library.usyd.edu.au/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy1.library.usyd.edu.au/docview/1903638142?accountid=14757} Newington House, Irwin House and St Augustine’s Chapel were restored between 1998 and 2000.\footnote{41}{Graham Brooks and Associates, 2004, pp. 25-26.} An aerial photograph of the site as it appears today is shown in Figure 16.
Figure 16. Aerial photograph of the SCC showing the MRRC as it appears today. Image by SKYCAM Australia. Source. Department of Commerce.
4.0 SITE ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

A site inspection of the study area was carried out on Monday March 5, 2018 by Adele Zubrzycka (Senior Heritage Consultant, Artefact Heritage). The aim of the inspection was to assess visual impacts to and from the study area and identify impacts that may occur to items containing heritage significance or areas of archaeological potential. The inspection was undertaken on foot and a photographic record was made.

4.2 The Study Area

The study area is located within the MRRC, which occupies the southeast corner of the SCC as shown in Figure 1. The study area is bounded by Holker Street to the south, Jamieson Street to the east, the Silverwater Women’s Correction Centre to the west and the ‘Support Area’ (occupied by Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel) to the north.

The proposed works will be occurring within and directly adjacent to the following structures and landscaped areas:

- Block A (main gate)
- Block B (visitor area)
- Block C (reception)
- Block E (laundry)
- Block D (Darcy)
- Block I (Irwin House)
- Block J (gym and industries)
- Newington House
- St Augustine’s Chapel
- Block U (staff parking); and
- Sports Oval.

The location of these structures and landscaped areas are shown in Figure 17. A description of these areas, accompanied by photographs taken during the site visit, is detailed below.
Figure 17. Location of buildings within and adjacent to the study area. Moreton Bay Figs trees are circled.
4.3 Site Inspection

Block A (main gate)

Block A is a modern, single storey brick structure occupied by the main entrance to the MRRC. The building is located immediately east of a north-south aligned public access road to the complex, directly north of Block U (as shown in Figure 18).

Figure 18. View north towards Block U and Holker Street from the exterior gardens of Block A (visible to the left).

Block B (visitor area)

Block B is a modern, triangular shaped, single storey structure occupied by indoor and outdoor visiting rooms and seating (Figure 19 - Figure 21). The structure is located in the centre of the western boundary of the project area, between Block C (to the north) and the Mental Health Screening Unit (MHSU) building (to the south) and the historic Irwin House (to the northeast). Block C is separated from Irwin House by a partially transparent metal fence. The outdoor area provides the best views of the house and gardens, as shown in Figure 21.

A modern stormwater drain inlet within the outdoor area was noted during the site visit and may be indicative of subsurface disturbance in the area (Figure 22).

No significant fabric or evidence of archaeological remains were identified in Block B during the site inspection.
Block C (reception)

Block C is a modern single storey brick building containing storage lockers, reception desks and security facilities for visitors and staff entering and exiting the MRRC. The structure is located within the north western corner of the project area and accessed via Block A (Main Gate). Works proposed within Block C will involve adding increased storage space for prisoners. Due to the contemporary nature of the building, no fabric considered to contain heritage significance was identified during the site visit.

Block E (laundry)

Block E is a modern, single storey, slightly L-shaped building located along the northern boundary of the project area, to the west of Block F, north of Irwin House (Figure 23) and east of Block D. The building houses the prison’s laundry facilities and includes outdoor loading zones (Figure 24).

No fabric considered to contain heritage significance was identified during the site inspection.
Block J (gym)

Block J (gym) is located in the southeast corner of the project area, between Blocks F, G and H. Block J comprises of a modern, single storey gym facility with concrete and carpeted floors, low panelled ceilings and a caged extension (shown in Figure 25, Figure 26 and Figure 27).

The gym block did not contain any fabric considered to contain heritage significance.
Sports Oval

The Sports Oval comprises of an irregularly shaped rectangle occupying the south-eastern corner of the project area (Figure 28). It is accessed via Block J and bounded by a gravelled footpath (Figure 32). Two decorative garden beds flank the entry to a grassed area in the centre of the oval (Figure 28 and Figure 29). The grassed area contains various established trees, including two mature figs (noted to contain heritage significance in the SCC CMP, 2004) shown in Figure 32 and Figure 33. The decorative garden beds are bounded by re-purposed dressed sandstone blocks (Figure 29) including two carved faces (Figure 30). The blocks themselves appear to date to the 19th century and may represent an earlier building or sandstone boundary fence associated with earlier occupation phases at the site. These were relocated by inmates to their current location in 1999. The carved faces were also produced by a former inmate using repurposed sandstone.42

Erosion or landscaping works appear to have gradually removed topsoils within the oval as evidenced by root systems sitting higher than the surrounding ground level (Figure 28 and Figure 32). This may also reflect translocation of the trees in the past which did not provide an adequately sized areas for roots to grow.

Although the majority of the oval was grassed, some exposed areas were identified near gravelled footpaths and tree roots. These contained what may be re-deposited fill containing broken sherds of whiteware ceramic and gravels (Figure 31). Whether the fill was associated with the gravelled footpath or post-Bradshaw Rubbish Tip filling events could not be confirmed. No evidence of an earlier dam visible in the 1886 plan (Figure 6) and 1943 aerial photograph (Figure 12) was found in the oval.

A visual assessment of the area proposed for a new indoor sports facility located between Blocks F and G (Figure 34) and temporary gatehouse located to the north of the Sports Oval and east of Block G (Figure 35) did not identify any heritage items or intact landscape features/archaeological remains. However, the area between Blocks F and G contained two mature Eucalyptus trees (Figure 34) and modern concrete footpaths. Land proposed for the temporary gatehouse showed evidence of a modern dirt access road (Figure 35).

Figure 28. View east towards Sports Oval and associated trees, garden beds and associated facilities. Erosion around trees can be seen in the background.

Figure 29. Garden bed and associated dressed boundary stones. Block H can be seen in the background. View southwest.
Figure 30. Detail of carved sandstone feature associated with garden bed, carved in 1999. View southeast.

Figure 31. Example of imported fill containing gravels and ceramic within the Sports Oval.

Figure 32. View west towards Block J showing heritage fig tree and Sports Oval. Erosion around trees can be seen below the fig tree to the left. Gravelled footpath is visible to the right.

Figure 33. Heritage fig tree near eastern boundary of the Sports Oval, view southeast.

Figure 34. View north towards Block G basketball courts and two eucalyptus trees where proposed indoor Sports building would be located.

Figure 35. Area proposed for temporary gatehouse during proposed development. Block G can be seen to the left and evidence of a vehicular access track can be seen in the foreground.
Block U (staff parking)

Block U comprises of a modern two-storey carpark constructed in 1996-7 (Figure 36, Figure 37 and Figure 38). The carpark is located in the southwest corner of the project area, along the Holker Street boundary (Figure 37), outside of the facility’s secure perimeter zone.

It does not contain a basement level and is surrounded by mature gardens with ornamental plantings to the north and south (Figure 36 and Figure 39). These are likely to date to the construction of the carpark in 1996-7. No areas likely to contain archaeological remains or heritage fabric were identified during the inspection, however; the absence of a lower level may mean that subsurface archaeological remains could exist below the structure.

Figure 36. View north of Block U (left) from access public access road and path. Mature gardens can be seen in the foreground.

Figure 37. View north towards Block U entrance.

Figure 38. View north towards Block U (indicated by arrow) from Holker Street and Silverwater Correctional Complex.

Figure 39. View northeast of Block U from visitor and staff entrance road to the complex.

Existing open-air staff carpark (Support Area)

The existing open-air staff carpark is located outside the MRRC in the northern portion of the SCC, east of the historic Newington House (Figure 40) and north of the historic St Augustine’s Chapel (Figure 41). The SCC CMP identifies this as the ‘Support Area’.

The carpark covers a large area and consists of formalised concrete, asphalt and gravel surfaces (Figure 42 and Figure 43). It is relatively flat; therefore, view lines to and from St Augustine’s Chapel, Newington House and the Parramatta River have been retained. Various introduced and native trees including palms and eucalypts have been planted along the carpark and within the grounds of Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel (Figure 40, Figure 41 and Figure 43).
No evidence of significant development (with the exception of the carpark itself) or structures considered to contain heritage significance were identified within the carpark during the site inspection. However, mature trees were recognized to contribute to what remains of the historic landscape associated with the Newington Estate. View lines to and from St Augustine’s Chapel and Newington House would not be affected by the proposed works.

Figure 40. View northwest of Newington House from access road.  
Figure 41. View east of St Augustine’s Chapel from access road. Secure perimeter zone can be seen to the right, the existing open-air staff carpark is to the left.

Figure 42. View west towards area proposed for carpark extension.  
Figure 43. View south towards St Augustine’s Chapel from existing carpark.

4.3.1 Views and vistas to and from the study area

Views to and from the MRRC

Secure perimeter zone fencing associated with the MRRC is highly visible from Holker and Jamieson Streets, as shown in Figure 44 - Figure 46. While the fencing impedes views towards low lying features such as the Sports Oval, structures within the SCC and MRRC such as Block H are visible from these road corridors (Figure 44 and Figure 45). Figure 46 provides an example of views towards Holker Street, Jamieson Street and the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve from the MRRC.
Views to and from Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve

The Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve is located immediately east of the study area on Jamieson Street as shown in Figure 47. Public access to the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve is restricted. Therefore, an assessment of views towards the SCC and MRRC from within the reserve was not carried out. However, views towards the study area were assessed from its western boundary (which fronts onto Jamieson Street), shown in Figure 48 and Figure 49.

The majority of the reserve’s western boundary is screened by established trees which reach an average height of three metres (Figure 48). It is likely that views towards the MRRC from the reserve would be obstructed by these plantings. An example of views towards the existing MRRC Sports Oval and proposed location of new modular based units from outside the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve boundary is shown in Figure 49.
Figure 47. View north towards Jamieson Street (centre), Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve (right) and south east corner of the study area and secure perimeter zone (left from Holker Street.

Figure 48. View south towards the south east corner of the study area and secure perimeter zone from Jamieson Street and the eastern boundary of the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve. Trees screening the western boundary of the reserve can be seen to the left.

Figure 49. View towards the study area and Sports Oval from the eastern boundary of the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve.
5.0 HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

5.1 Items within the study area

The following assessment is based on information drawn from the Silverwater Correctional Complex CMP prepared by Graham Brooks and Associated prepared in 2004 and State Heritage Inventory (SHI) listing for the Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area.

5.1.1 The Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area (SPCCA) - SHR no. 1546 and LEP Conservation Area no. C00813

The SPCCA represents a well-known landmark within Silverwater. The complex houses the Silverwater Women’s Correctional Centre, a maximum-security institution for women and the major reception centre for female offenders in NSW; the MRRC (the study area), a maximum security correctional facility for men and the Dawn de Loas Correctional Centre Area 1 & 2, a minimum security correctional facility for men.43

In addition to modern structures within the SPCCA, the following buildings are considered to contain heritage significance within the item’s SHR, LEP, s170, SREP 24 and RNE listings. A significance grading for buildings within the study area (based on the SCC CMP, 2004) that may be affected by the proposed development can be found in Table 5:

- Newington House
- St Augustine’s Chapel
- Irwin House
- Margaret Catchpole House
- Caroline Chisholm Building
- Former Superintendent’s Residence
- Former Ward Block
- Former Engineer’s House

The State Heritage Inventory statement of significance for the SPCCA is as follows:

Silverwater Correctional Centre is of exceptional significance as: it is the core remaining part of John Blaxland’s Newington Estate and 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.44

---


5.1.2 Assessment of heritage significance

Table 4 below provides an assessment on heritage significance for the site of the SPCCA. The assessment was sourced from the SCC CMP prepared by Graham Brooks and Associated prepared in 2004.45

Table 4. Assessment of Heritage Significance for the SPCCA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Historical Significance</td>
<td>The SPCCA site is the core of the Newington Estate, the earliest settlement in the district and the home of John Blaxland, and Important colonial figure who developed several important early industries. The development of SPCCA provides a continuous record of institutional and private occupation over more than a 190-year period. In addition to this, Newington House gives a history of the buildings use as a college, asylum, hospital and prison, as well as reflecting the changing attitudes towards such institutions over a 110-year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Associative Significance</td>
<td>The SPCCA shares a historical connection to John Blaxland. Blaxland was an important businessman during the early nineteenth century, whose land grant and settlement was the first in the area. Blaxland built Newington House and the Chapel seen today at SCC.55 Walter Liberty Vernon also has an association with the Silverwater Correctional Complex as the architect of several buildings within the complex including the cottages and possibly Irwin House. The SPCCA was the original site of Newington College in 1863 until it was relocated to Stanmore in 1879. The site has association with the institutional care of women from the early asylum for poor and destitute women in 1886 through to the present correctional centre, Mulawa Correctional Centre.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Aesthetic or Technical Significance</td>
<td>Parts of the SPCCA have high aesthetic value. Newington House and Chapel contain important design and aesthetic elements; however, its integrity has been diminished following the landfilling operations on adjoining land and by the buildings and vegetation formed at Mulawa Correctional Centre. Similarly, Irwin House has fine detail and aesthetic appeal. However, its integrity has been diminished with the demolition of other buildings and the subsequent redevelopment of land.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – Social Significance</td>
<td>The site has association with the institutional care of women from the early asylum for poor and destitute women in 1886 through to the present correctional centre, Mulawa Correctional Centre.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Research Potential</td>
<td>Components of SPCCA have the ability to demonstrate a way of life and usages. Newington House and Chapel demonstrates the quality of life from early settlement as lived by prominent citizens and families and their religious conviction.50 Catchpole and Chisholm Houses, which were formerly used as the Asylum, demonstrate the social custom of accommodating and treating destitute women in the nineteenth century. The hospital buildings demonstrate the change in philosophy of health care. Irwin House combines this whilst exhibiting the fine qualities of Federation architecture.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1 Significant buildings in and adjacent to the study area

The SCC CMP (2004) includes a schedule of all buildings within the SPCCA and grading of significance based on those identified in Table 1. Buildings located within and directly adjacent to the study area identified within the schedule have been replicated in Table 5 below and are shown in Figure 17.

**Table 5. Significance grading for main buildings within and directly adjacent to the study area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newington House</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>30 m north of the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington Chapel (St Augustine’s Chapel)</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>18 m north of the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin House</td>
<td>c.1911-1918</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Within the study area (no direct impacts to the structure itself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block A</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block B</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block C</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block D</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block E</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block J</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block U (carpark)</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Within the study area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1 Significant fabric

The site inspection identified two garden beds bounded by re-purposed dressed sandstone along the western extend of the Sports Oval (Figure 29). These are not original elements of the landscape and were moved to the site in 1999. However, they are likely to represent earlier structures that occupied the Newington Estate or Newington Asylum and Hospital and are associated with work carried out by inmates as part of a diversionary program within the MRRC.

Therefore, they are considered to have moderate significance as a contributing element to the history of the SPCCA.

---

52 Graham Brooks and Associates, 2004, p. 63
53 Ibid, p. 63
5.1.2 Significant plantings

A landscape component for the SCC CMP (2004) was prepared by Taylor Brammer Landscape Architects Pty Ltd in October 2004. This provided supplementary information for the CMP upon the request of the NSW Heritage Council. The document includes a significance grading for trees and plantings within the SCC (L1 to L4) and divides the site into precincts. The study area is located within Precinct 3.5. The location of these precincts and associated grades of landscape significance are shown in Figure 50.

Taylor Brammer note that trees and plantings establishment during the SCC’s construction are typical of the random use of native plants in the mid-late 20th century and not significant. However, the relocation and incorporation of various trees and palms associated with earlier occupation phases is also known to have occurred post-1968. These trees and palms ‘continue the established landscape heritage character of the site’ and contain ‘some significance’.

The study area is identified as containing Irwin House (assessed as containing considerable significance) and two ‘relocated’ Moreton Bay Fig trees. The document states that these were relocated from an unknown area to the Sports Oval at some time after 1990. Trees and Precincts located within and directly adjacent to the study area and their grades of significance are detailed in Table 6 below.

It should be noted that the two Moreton Bay figs were not allocated a significance grading in the landscape component of the CMP.

The southwest corner of the Irwin House curtilage now includes land occupied by the Visits Building (Block B) contact visits courtyard. This area has been stripped of any original vegetation and contains a grassed lawn and concrete slab occupied by tables and seats (shown in Figure 21). The area would be modified as part of the proposed works (as shown in Figure 55).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct/Tree</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precinct 3.5 (not including Irwin House and grounds)</td>
<td>Established 1990s</td>
<td>Little Significance</td>
<td>Within study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct 3.6 (including Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel and curtilage)</td>
<td>Established 1807-onwards</td>
<td>Exceptional significance</td>
<td>Directly north of study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin House and grounds</td>
<td>c.1911-1918</td>
<td>Considerable significance</td>
<td>Within study area. No direct impacts to original or significant vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two relocated Moreton Bay fig trees (<em>Ficus macrophilia</em>)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Some significance (not allocated a category number in the SCC CMP landscape component)</td>
<td>Within the study area in Sports Oval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

55 Taylor Brammer Landscape Architects Pty Ltd, 2004, p. 11.
Figure 50. SCC precincts and levels of landscape significance. The study area is outlined in red, Irwin House in pink and the Moreton Bay Fig Trees are indicated by green arrows. It should be noted that the location of the figs is not representative of their true location within the Sports Oval today. Source: Taylor Brammer Landscape Architects Pty Ltd, 2004, p. 14.

5.2 Items outside of the Study Area

5.2.1 Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve (SHR no. 01850)

The Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve is part of the former Royal Australian Navy Armament Depot, Newington, which operated at the site until December 1999. The site currently spans 100 hectares containing various heritage items from the original depot and the 48-hectare Newington Nature Reserve. The southern part of the depot was developed as the athlete’s village for the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games and now forms the suburb of Newington.

The Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) NSW State Heritage Inventory (SHI) database contains the following statement of significance for the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve:
The former Royal Australian Navy (RAN) Armament Depot - Newington known as Newington Armament Depot and including the area now known as the Newington Nature Reserve, is potentially of State heritage significance as a place which demonstrates the historical and technical development of systems and regulations of explosives handling and storage from the 1890s to 1999 and also demonstrates the importance of Sydney as a Navy Port. Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve is historically significant as it contains physical evidence demonstrating the history of European occupation through to the end of the 20th century. The site is a valuable tool for research relating to the early settlement and development of the colony of NSW and the development of defence from colonial times.

Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve is potentially of State significance as an extensive cultural landscape containing features from all periods of its human occupation as well as regionally rare forest and wetlands. Newington Nature Reserve is reserved under the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 because of its significant ecological values; these extend beyond the boundaries of the Reserve into other parts of the site. The site's estuarine wetland and forest communities are rare remnants of ecological communities that once dominated this region. These provide a valuable resource for research and include a number of rare and endangered ecological communities, flora and fauna including Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest, Coastal Saltmarsh, the Green and Golden Bell Frog, Wilsonia backhousiae and the White Fronted Chat. The site supports 144 bird species and ten bat species including the only known maternity roost of the White-striped Freetail bat in the Sydney area. In addition, it supports the only remaining example of a complete zonal succession from eucalypt forest, saltmarsh, mangroves and tidal mudflats on the Parramatta River estuary.56

Table 7 below provides an assessment on heritage significance for the site of the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve. The assessment has sourced from the SHI listing for the item.57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A – Historical Significance</strong></td>
<td>Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve is historically significant through its exhibition of European occupation along Parramatta River. In addition, it was the site of an early land grant to John Bliaxland, an important businessman, whose house was located on adjacent land. The site demonstrates the importance of Parramatta in opening the colony and the early rural settlement of Parramatta. The Armament Depot demonstrates the evolution of systems and regulations of explosives handling and storage over 90 years and the role of Sydney as a major port for the Australian Navy Fleet. In addition to this, it is highly illustrative of the extent of involvement of the Royal Australian Navy and the US Navy during World War Two and the logistics provided by Australia to the Allies.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B – Associative Significance</strong></td>
<td>The Newington Armament Depot has association with John Bliaxland. Bliaxland was the first European to develop the land at Newington. The site is also associated with the Royal Australian Navy who occupied the site from 1921 until 1997, the Royal Navy (British) and the US Navy.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

57 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C - Aesthetic or Technical Significance</td>
<td>The site contains an unusual mixture of historic buildings, some of which are partially submerged within earth mounds. It makes for a remarkable landscape with its open parkland bordered by forest and wetland together with its relationship to the Parramatta River. Newington Armament features and outstanding collection of turn of the century brick structures which display the application of Federation design to purpose built industrial buildings.(^{60})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Social Significance</td>
<td>Newington Armaments Depot is of social value to the former Navy employees and their families who lived and worked on the site up until the 1990s.(^ {61})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Research Potential</td>
<td>Newington Armaments Depot has high potential for interpretation and research into technological developments in explosives handling and storage. It illustrates the development of blast containment structures and design philosophies to accommodate changing international explosives regulations. The buildings constructed for the US Navy during the Second World war are significant examples of military storehouse technology. Specific building types demonstrate the adaptation of building technology for armaments handling and storage and the specific nature of armaments work practices. Research conducted within the endangered estuarine wetland and forest communities is used to inform an adaptive management regime, thereby assisting conservation of these communities. This research has wider application to management of other lands that support similar ecological systems and species.(^ {62})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Rarity</td>
<td>The Royal Australian Navy Armament Depot at Newington was unique in the history of NSW for its role as the major storage and supply depot of explosive navy armament to service the fleet facilities in Sydney Harbour from 1895 to 1998. It was the only place in NSW where there was a combination of operational activities and physical facilities for the Australian, the US and the Royal Navies on the one site. Three &quot;endangered ecological communities&quot;, listed under the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 (Coastal Saltmarsh; Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest; Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest) are found on the site. The Turpentine Ironbark Forest is also listed as critically endangered in the Environment Protection Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, the nature reserve is the only remaining example on the Parramatta river of a complete estuarine zonation, from tidal mudflats, to mangroves, saltmarsh, swamp oak flood plain forest and eucalypt forest. Almost all similar sequences have been cleared in the Sydney Basin. The site is home to part of a listed &quot;endangered population&quot; of the White-fronted Chat and to the saltmarsh plant Wilsonia backhousei, both of which are listed as &quot;vulnerable species&quot; under the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. A Green and Golden bell frog population is found on site which is &quot;endangered&quot; under the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 and vulnerable under the Environment Protection Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. The site is the only known maternity roost of the White striped Freetail Bat in the Sydney area and is also the only known maternity roost of this species in a building. The site is home to 144 species of birds, including migratory shorebirds and 10 species of bats.(^ {63})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Representative Significance</td>
<td>The forest and wetland demonstrate the characteristics of their respective classes of ecological community. Newington Armaments Depot is an excellent example of an armament depot that has evolved over the course of the 20th century. The integrity of the precinct is significant as it is able to demonstrate all periods of the life of the facility.(^ {64})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{63}\) OEH, Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve, 2015.
\(^{64}\) OEH, Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve, 2015.
6.0 HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

6.1 Introduction

This section of the report assesses the non-Aboriginal archaeological potential at the site of the study area. This assessment involves discussing previous archaeological work in the area, an appraisal of the history of land use on the site (prior to, and concurrent with, the building of the SCC), analysing levels of historical ground disturbance and the presentation of mapping showing areas of likely archaeological remains (archaeological potential). Archival research will then inform the significance of any potential remains.

6.2 Land use summary

European occupation of study area has been divided into five general phases of historical activity, which are discussed below.

- **Phase 1 (1797-1807)** – Pre-Blaxland Farms
- **Phase 2 (1807-1863)** – Blaxland Family Estate and Industrial Activity
- **Phase 3 (1863-1879)** – Newington College
- **Phase 4 (1879-1968)** – From Asylum to Hospital
- **Phase 5 (1968-present)** – Silverwater Correctional Complex (SCC)

6.2.1 Phase 1 (1797-1807)

Phase 1 occupation of the study area was associated with two 25-acre land grants given to Henry Waterhouse (Waterhouse Farm) and John Shortland (Shortland Farm) in 1797 and minor pastoral and agricultural activities. The extent of land use is unknown; however, documentary evidence indicates tree clearing did not occur during this phase, suggesting formal occupation of the farms did not occur.

6.2.2 Phase 2 (1807-1863)

Phase 2 is associated with the establishment of the Newington Estate. This included the construction of the first (c1807-1879) and second (1832-present) Newington House, St Augustine’s Chapel, kitchen, coach house, stables, barn sheds, workmen’s cottages and additional outbuildings. Salt pans and buildings associated with small scale industry and pastoral activities such as a piggery and dairy were also established on the estate during this phase.

The exact location of the first Newington House is unknown. However, an 1879 description of the Newington Estate suggests the first house was a weatherboard structure that sat behind the new residence. The second Newington House continues to occupy the SCC today and will not be impacted by the proposed development.

St Augustine’s Chapel, which also remains within the SCC although outside the study area, once housed a vault along its eastern elevation which was accessed via a staircase.

---

68 Ibid, p. 78.
The precise location of the various outbuildings associated with Newington House and the surrounding estate is unknown, although they are likely to have been centred around Newington House (just north of the study area) and the estate’s salt pans (approximately 400 metres north of the study area along the banks of the Parramatta River). A plan prepared in 1859 shows the approximate location of these structures (Figure 4). Paddocks and tracks are also included on the plan.

Later occupation of the site by the Wesleyan Methodist Church (1860-63) included the establishment of industrial activities such as an abattoir, rendering plant and bone crushing plant. The location of these structures is unknown, although they would likely have been located some distance from the study area due to their noxious nature.

Archaeological remains associated with Phase 2 outbuildings, less permanent structures or evidence of landscape modifications is likely to have been destroyed by works associated with the Phase 4 occupation and construction of the MRRC.

6.2.3 Phase 3 (1863-1879)

No known significant building works or landscape alterations were made to the study area or SCC during the Newington College phase of occupation.

6.2.4 Phase 4 (1879-1968)

Phase 4 is associated with the establishment of the Newington Asylum and Hospital which involved the construction of dozens of structures including Irwin House, nurse’s quarters, bathrooms, and administration buildings (shown in Figure 8). Much of this work would have destroyed the archaeological evidence from previous phases. Various buildings constructed during this phase remain within the SCC today and the area around Margaret Catchpole and Caroline Chisholm House may contain archaeological evidence from the first phase of construction for the asylum. Blaxland Street (now removed) was also established during this phase. The street ran along the centre of the Asylum and Hospital property in an east west alignment, as shown in Figure 6.

Figure 7, which was prepared in 1886, shows land within the northwest corner of the study area was occupied by three buildings. These have since been demolished and the area is presently associated with Blocks C and D. The remainder of the study area remained undeveloped during this phase with the exception of a dam in the southeast corner of the study area (now associated with the Sports Oval).

By 1943, Irwin House and a series of hospital buildings had been constructed along the western edge of the study area, while a series of long single-storey structures occupied land now associated with Blocks F and G (shown in Figure 8 and Figure 12). The dam shown in the 1886 plan continued to occupy the south eastern corner of the study area and a new single storey building and yard occupied the corner of Holker and Jamieson Streets. The remainder of the study area, which is today occupied by the Sports Oval is undeveloped, although two or three fenced in paddocks can be seen to the north of the dam. These are shown in Figure 12. No trees occupy this portion of the property.

The vast majority of structures built during this phase were demolished as part of Phase 5 developments (detailed below).
6.2.5 Phase 5 (1968-present)

Development within the study area associated with the SCC included restoration works to Irwin House, Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel; demolition of Phase 4 buildings; the establishment of the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip and subsequent formalisation of the MRRC Sports Oval; construction of the secure perimeter zone fence; construction of Blocks B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J and U (carpark) and the removal of Blaxland Street and various established trees across the study area.

This phase is likely to have had the most impact on archaeological evidence for Phase 2 and 4 occupation within the study area.75

6.3 Known impacts to the study area

The study area has undergone various impacts over time, the majority of which occurred during phases two, four and five, which are detailed below.

6.3.1 Phase 2 (1807-1863)

Impacts to the study area during this period are associated within the construction of buildings, industries and landscape features within the Newington Estate. This would have involved extensive vegetation clearance, subsurface impacts associated with the construction of buildings and the removal/disturbance of intact soils as a result of pastoral and horticultural activities.

Archaeological remains associated with Phase 1 occupation of the site is likely to have been removed, disturbed or truncated during these activities.

6.3.2 Phase 4 (1879-1968)

Impacts to the study area during this period included the construction of various buildings, a dam, landscaping works and the removal/disturbance of intact soils as a result of pastoral and horticultural activities designed to serve the Newington Hospital and Asylum.

These works are likely to have involved localised disturbance associated with road construction, landscape clearing and levelling, the establishment of buildings, plumbing, drainage and recreational facilities. Various outbuildings associated with the Newington Estate were likely demolished during this phase.

As a result, some archaeological remains associated with Phase 1 and 2 occupation within the study area is likely to have been removed disturbed or truncated.

6.3.3 Phase 5 (1969-present)

Known impacts to the study area during Phase 5 development are associated with the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip (c1980-1990), construction of buildings within the MRRC including Blocks B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J and U and the establishment of roads, service corridors and the secure perimeter zone fencing.

These activities also involved the demolition of buildings constructed during Phase 4 occupation of the site, including a single-storey building at the corner of Holker and Jamieson Streets, a group of buildings along the northern section of the study area (now occupied by Block C and D, a group of buildings along the eastern side of the study area (now occupied by the MHSU and Block H) and removal of Blaxland Road and its associated plantings.

Sports Oval

The MRRC Sports Oval occupies land used for the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip between c1982-1990. Establishment of the tip involved deep excavations to accommodate waste materials (discussed in Section 6.4.1). Landfill within the tip was compacted and capped with clay prior to the establishment of the oval and MRRC in the mid-late 1990s. Additional fill materials were then introduced to the site to create the Sports Oval. The site inspection noted ceramic and glass fragments on the surface of the oval near the gravel footpath. This may represent fill imported during remediation works. It is likely that use of the site as a tip would have removed any archaeological remains associated with Phases 1-4 including a dam shown in 1886 plan (Figure 6) and 1943 aerial (Figure 12).

Irwin House

The majority of land surrounding Irwin House and gardens has not undergone any significant disturbance events since its construction in c1911. However, the southwest corner of its property boundary (shown in Figure 52) has been subject to unknown levels of disturbance associated with the establishment of a contact visits courtyard east of the Visits Building (Block B) - shown in Figure 20.

Remainder of study area

The CMP for the SCC notes that the construction of the MRRC required major excavation for trenches and foundations, which would have destroyed any archaeological evidence that may have existed for earlier phases of occupation.

However, the majority of structures constructed during this phase are single-storey buildings founded on concrete slabs. Although their establishment is likely to have resulted in localised disturbance, deep archaeological remains such as wells, refuse pits, footings, cisterns or cellars associated with earlier phases may have been retained.

6.4 Previous assessments

6.4.1 Geotechnical investigations

A number of geotechnical investigations have been carried out within the study area since 1990. Investigations relevant to this report are detailed below:


Douglas Partners carried out geotechnical investigations within the study area to assess the nature and depth of fill and contamination associated with the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip. Investigations were carried out in fifteen test bores to the depth of underlying Ashfield Shale bedrock (within the Wianamatta group of Triassic Age) and were focused on filled platforms across the site.

All bores encountered a 1.5 – 2-metre-thick layer of clay capping across the area, which was overlying a 2.5-13 metre thick layer of putrescible waste fill. This contained ‘dark grey sandy clay and rubbish including household and industrial waste matter consisting of plastic, cloth, wood, metal and paper, as well as concrete and other building rubble, tins, etc’ (shown in Figure 51). Waste fill had been laid directly over shale bedrock. Gas bubbles in shallow water were observed during the investigation. All but one bore encountered bedrock directly below the waste fill, with Bore 15 encountering an 800mm thick layer of clay between waste fill and bedrock. Soils were found to contain moderate to high levels of contamination.

---


Douglas Partners carried out supplementary geotechnical investigations to further assess the extent of contaminated waste fill within the study area. Investigations were carried out via four test bores and ten inspection pits.

Investigations found that waste material did not extend past the southern, eastern and northern edges of the site. Areas outside of waste fill layers comprised of orange brown and red brown and grey natural clay generally in a very stiff condition. Soils above waste fill were found to reach depths of 1.5 – 2.5 metres across the site and consist of silty or sandy clay with gravel, rubble and occasional building debris.

The variable depth of fill layers above natural clay or shale bedrock also suggests that a number of large, deep pits had been established across the site to accommodate waste materials, rather than a single, site wide excavation.


Douglas Partners carried out background, geotechnical and groundwater investigation works within the study area to inform future planning for a ‘Low Use Parkland’ with further future developments as playing fields, landscaped open areas and car parks.

The background analysis revealed the study area had remained a cleared and grassed landscape between at least 1955 to 1982 and had been subdivided into fenced paddocks during this period. Some evidence of localised disturbance associated with clearing of soil in the south-central portion of the area was noted in a 1961 aerial photograph of the site.

At some time between 1982 and 1986 the site was used for land fill (Bradshaw Rubbish Tip). A photograph taken of the site in 1986 indicated that land filling activities had ceased, and the surface had been covered with fill material and graded. This supports findings of the ICAC investigation discussed in Section 3.6.1.

Douglas Partners recommended regrading of the site to support proper drainage, capping of waste material using a clay plug at least 1 metre thick and diverting stormwater away from the site.


6.4.2 Archaeological investigations

Thorp - Archaeological Assessment and Survey: Homebush Bay - 1985

Thorp carried out an archaeological survey encompassing Silverwater Detention Centre and Malawi Prison, Newington Arms Depot, the Homebush Abattoir, and the land immediately surrounding those sites in 1985. This included land within the study area.

No archaeological sites could be located during the survey, although this was not considered to be indicative of the removal of archaeological resources. Thorp concluded that extensive landscaping and changes in the topography may have covered these elements and substantial areas of relatively untouched land suggest that subsurface remains of early occupation phases may remain intact. Thorp also noted that the reduced degree of impact caused by later developments indicates a strong probability of archaeological resources within the area.

Godden Mackay - Silverwater Correctional Complex: Archaeological Management Advice - 1995

Godden Mackay prepared an archaeological assessment for the SCC by overlaying an 1886 plan of Newington House and outbuildings (shown in Figure 6) onto a contemporary aerial photograph of the site. A site survey was also carried out.

The assessment found that land within the current study area had low potential to contain archaeological remains and/or deposits associated with pre - 1886 structures and land use. However, land directly south of Newington House (outside of the study area) was considered to contain high archaeological potential. The report did not address potential remains of the dam once located at the corner of Holker and Jamieson Streets.

---

Archaeological monitoring was carried out around Newington House (20 metres north of the study area) in conjunction with service installation works in 1995. Monitoring was recommended as per findings of the Godden Mackay, Silverwater Correctional Complex: Archaeological Management Advice (1995) assessment, which is detailed above.

Archaeological monitoring identified deposits and features directly related to the construction of Newington House between 1829 and 1832. These included brick vents, original verandah steps and a brick arch within the building’s verandah and along its northern elevation.

In addition, a sandstock brick feature, at least three courses high and bonded with cement render was identified 10 metres south of Newington House. The feature had been partially disturbed during construction of a modern driveway.

The SCC CMP includes an archaeological assessment land within the study area and surrounding SCC property. It includes the following statement for the study area (MRRC):

The Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre was opened in 1997. It was constructed behind (to the south) of Newington House. As a brand new modern facility it required major excavation for trenches and foundations. Such excavation is still continuing. The extent of construction activities for The Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre would have most certainly destroyed any archaeological evidence that may have existed. Such construction and trenching still continues. Irwin House (constructed c1910) and its gardens remain within the Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre and are being maintained. Apart from Irwin House and gardens, this area does not contain any archaeological potential.

An archaeological zoning plan prepared for the SCC (shown in Figure 52) includes three archaeological zones: Zone 1 (no archaeological potential), Zone 2 (low-moderate archaeological potential) and Zone 3 (high archaeological potential).

The majority of the study area (excluding Irwin House and gardens) is located in Zone 1. The curtilage for Irwin House is assessed as being in Zone 3. However, it should be noted that the portion of the study area located within Zone 3 has been subject to some disturbance associated with the establishment of the contact visits courtyard to the north of Block B (Visits Building).

---

Figure 52. Archaeological Zones within the Silverwater Correctional Facility including Irwin House. The study area is outlined in red while Irwin House and grounds is outlined in purple. Source. Graham Brooks and Associated, 2004.

Comber Consultants Pty Ltd – Archaeological Monitoring of Demolition and Excavation Works at Mulawa Women’s Correctional Centre – 2005

Comber Consultants carried out archaeological monitoring within the Mulawa Women’s Correctional Centre (50 metres west of the study area) in 2005. Works were carried out after the demolition of the Mary Reiby House and Ann Conlon House and included monitoring of machine excavations for modern building footings and drainage/service trenches.

Although the monitoring area was assessed as having potential to contain significant archaeological remains, the area was found to be highly disturbed and no evidence of earlier structures were identified. The only archaeological evidence found at the site consisted of an isolated refuse deposit containing artefacts dating to the Newington Asylum and Hospital phase of occupation.

AHMS – Muluwa Correctional Centre Stage 1 Development: Archaeological Excavation Report – 2009

AHMS carried out archaeological excavations within the Muluwa Correctional Centre (100 metres north of the study area and just east of Caroline Chisholm House) in 2009. Works included machine and hand excavations in three areas.

Excavations revealed the remains of a carriageway, filled drainage trenches and circular pits that likely related to landscaping activities during the Newington Estate phase of occupation (Phase 3). Remains associated with the Newington Asylum and Hospital (Phase 4) were also identified. These included a realigned section of a carriageway, footings for a demolished dining room, a brick cistern, a Water Closet (demolished in 1969), brick footings for a ‘shelter’ and a night watchman’s hut. Some remains had been truncated or disturbed by later SCC developments.

6.5 Archaeological potential

Various activities took place within the study area during occupation Phases 2, 3, 4 and 5. These involved the construction of residential and light industrial structures and associated items.

Landscape modifications and disturbance are also likely to have occurred through the development of buildings, gardens, drains and land clearance.

Potential archaeological evidence related to these activities is discussed below. The location of structures within the study area associated with each phase are illustrated in Figure 53.

6.5.1 Assessment of archaeological potential

A level of archaeological potential has been identified and mapped to indicate the degree to which archaeological remains are likely to survive within the study area. The mapping of archaeological potential addresses the potential archaeological remains in the area. The overview map shows the likely remains within the study area in Figure 53. The identified levels of archaeological potential are:

**Nil Potential** – where there is no evidence of historical development or use, or where previous impacts such as deep basement structures would have removed all archaeological potential.

**Nil to Low Potential** – where there has only been low intensity historical activity, such as land clearance or informal land use, with little to no archaeological ‘signature’ expected; or where previous impacts were extensive, such as large-scale bulk excavation which would leave isolated and highly fragmented deposits.

**Low Potential** – where research has indicated little historical development, or where there have been substantial previous impacts which may not have removed deeper subsurface remains entirely.

**Moderate Potential** – where analysis has demonstrated known historical development with some previous impacts, but where it is likely that archaeological remains would survive with localised truncation and disturbance.

**High Potential** – where there is evidence of multiple phases of historic development and structures, with minimal or localised twentieth-century development impacts, and where it is likely that archaeological resources would remain intact.

---

6.5.2 Summary of archaeological potential

Table 8 provides an overview of the occupation of the study area, potential archaeological remains associated with this occupation and the potential for these remains to survive in the study area today. It is based on past structures and landscape modifications within the study area and activities that may have destroyed, truncated, disturbed or preserved their remains.

Table 8 Summary of potential archaeological remains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Potential Archaeological Remains</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 1797 – 1807</td>
<td>There is no documentary evidence of former structures within the study area. Potential for isolated evidence of land clearance, pastoral land use or informal land use is considered unlikely as remains would be highly ephemeral and likely removed during later occupation phases.</td>
<td>Sports Oval (east): Nil Remainder of study area (west): Nil to Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 1807 – 1863</td>
<td>There is no documentary evidence for former structures occupying the study area although unrecorded outbuildings associated with Newington House may exist in areas now occupied by Blocks C, D and E. Remains associated with former fence lines including post-holes of former timber fence lines, garden remains and yard scatters.</td>
<td>Sports Oval (east): Nil Remainder of study area (west): Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 1863 – 1879</td>
<td>No known building activities occurred during this phase of occupation.</td>
<td>Sports Oval (east): Nil Remainder of study area (west): Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 1879-1968</td>
<td>The Sports Oval was once occupied by a dam and paddocks (shown in Figure 6 and Figure 12), which would be evidenced by post-holes of former timber fence lines, garden remains and yard scatters. Remains of the dam may include clay packing used to seal dam walls, timber shoring or artefactual remains associated with its construction. However, these remains likely to have been destroyed during occupation of the site by the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip during occupation Phase Five. The remainder of the study area was occupied by various buildings, plantings and roads associated with the Newington Hospital and Asylum. Although impacts associated with Phase 5 developments may have disturbed or removed archaeological evidence of these features, deep remains such as footings, wells, refuse pits or cisterns may continue to exist in areas outside of the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip boundary.</td>
<td>Sports Oval (east): Nil Remainder of study area (west): Low-Moderate Irwin House High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 1968 – present</td>
<td>Evidence of the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip and subsequent landscape filling within land now occupied by the Sports Oval. Evidence associated with modern building footings, concrete slabs and services across the remainder of the study area.</td>
<td>Study area High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Assessment of archaeological significance

6.6.1 Introduction

The Heritage Division of the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) issued a new set of guidelines in 2009: *Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and ‘Relics’*. These guidelines call for broader consideration of multiple values of archaeological sites beyond their research potential. The following section presents a discussion of the potential archaeological resource’s research potential and an assessment against the NSW heritage significance criteria.

Consideration of archaeological research potential is required when undertaking a significance assessment of an historical archaeological site. Bickford and Sullivan developed three questions to assess the research potential of an archaeological resource (Bickford & Sullivan 1984:23-24).

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

6.6.2 Archaeological significance assessment

Potential archaeological remains within the study area are likely to represent deep remains such as footings, wells, refuse pits or cisterns associated with Phases 2 and 4 (in areas outside of the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip boundary). Additional remains associated with Phase 1 occupation of the site may exist within the study area, although the potential for this is nil-low.

A full discussion of the heritage significance of the archaeological potential within the study area is presented in Table 9. Areas of archaeological potential are illustrated in Figure 53.

Table 9. Significance assessment for archaeological remains within the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Historical Significance</td>
<td>The potential archaeological resource associated with Phase 1 and 2 (evidence of pastoral activities and Newington House outbuildings, cultivation fields) would have historical significance for its ability to provide information relating to the early European settlement and land use within the area between 1797 and 1807 and later development of the Newington Estate between 1807 and 1863. This would yield information regarding early pastoral, horticultural, industrial and domestic practices within NSW during this period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Newington Estate is directly associated with successful landowner and merchant John Blaxland. If archaeological remains associated with Newington House outbuildings were identified within the study area they may provide further details regarding the layout of the property and function of the buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential archaeological remains associated with Phase 3 (undocumented Newington College structures or activities) and 4 (Newington Asylum structures and pastoral/agricultural activities) would have historical significance for their associations with Newington College (1853-1879) and Newington Hospital and Asylum (1879-1968). Each phase is associated with historical reforms and in NSW educational and health institutions from 1860 onwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If substantial and intact archaeological resources associated with Phase 1-4 occupation of the study area were found, they would have State significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Associative</td>
<td>Phase 1 occupation of the study area is associated with naval officers Henry Waterhouse and John Shortland, who each owned small farms in the vicinity of the MRRC. Potential archaeological remains associated with Phase 2 occupation would be associated with the Blaxland family, prominent members of the colony during this period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3 is associated with Newington College, an important educational centre which is now located in Stanmore. It later became associated with the Newington Hospital and Asylum (Phase 4), which provided care for members of the NSW community and is associated with significant phases of health care in NSW during this period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If substantial and intact archaeological resources associated with Phase 1-4 occupation of the study area were found, they would have State significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Aesthetic</td>
<td>Although it is recognised that exposed in situ archaeological remains may have distinctive/attractive visual qualities, only rarely are these considered ‘important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Therefore, the potential archaeological resource does not meet the significance threshold for local or state significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Social</td>
<td>No formal assessment of social significance for previous occupation phases and the present SPCCA has been carried out. However, the potential archaeological remains associated with Phase 2 and 4 occupation within the study area may contain social significance amongst descendants of the Blaxland family and past patients of Newington Asylum and Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Potential archaeological remains associated with Phases 1 and 3 are unlikely to contain social significance due to the short-term occupation of the study area during these periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If substantial and intact archaeological resources associated with Phases 2 and 4 occupation of the study area were found, they would have State significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is unlikely that potential archaeological remains associated with Phases 1 and 3 would meet the significance threshold for local or state significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Research</td>
<td>Potential archaeological remains associated with Phase 1-4 occupation within the study area would have the ability to yield information relating to early agricultural practices and pastoral activities (and their evolution) across the site over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>They would also yield information regarding built structures and activities associated with the Newington Estate (Phase 2) not recorded in available documentary resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, if archaeological remains associated with Phase 4 occupation of the site were identified, they would have the ability to provide information regarding buildings that occupied the area during this period as well as undocumented activities. Such remains could provide insights into mental health and aged care facilities in NSW between 1879 and 1968.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If substantial and intact archaeological resources associated with Phase 1-4 occupation of the study area were found, they would have State significance under this criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria Discussion

**F – Rarity**

If intact archaeological remains associated with Phases 1 and 2 were identified within the study area they would be considered rare due to limited information available regarding land use during this period. In addition, although some archaeological excavations have been carried out across the SPCCA over time (see Section 6.4) much of its archaeological resource has not been investigated.

If archaeological remains associated with Phases 3 and 4 were identified within the study area they would also have the ability to provide rare insights into structures and activities constructed and carried out in the area during this period. However, structural remains associated with these occupation phases would not be considered particularly rare, as intact examples of institutional architecture built during the same time continue to exist within NSW.

If substantial and intact archaeological resources associated with Phase 1 and 2 occupation of the study area were found, they would have State significance under this criterion.

It is unlikely that potential archaeological remains associated with Phases 3 and 4 would meet the significance threshold for local or state significance under this criterion.

**G – Representative**

If intact archaeological remains associated with Phase 1 occupation were identified within the study area, they would represent physical evidence of pastoral activities that took place in the first decades of European settlement in NSW. However, unless structural remains associated with Waterhouse or Shortland’s Farms were found within the study area, such remains would be largely ephemeral.

Potential archaeological remains associated with Phase 2 occupation would be representative of large and industrious estates established in NSW during the early to mid-19th century.

Potential archaeological remains associated with Phases 3 and 4 would have the ability to represent early-19th to mid-20th century institutional landscapes including their structures or cultural artefacts.

If substantial and intact archaeological resources associated with Phase 1 - 4 occupation of the study area were found, they would have State significance under this criterion.

### 6.7 Statement of archaeological significance

Substantial and intact archaeological remains within the study area may have historical, associative, social significance, research potential and representativeness at a State level. Archaeological remains associated with Phase 1 may represent early evidence of pastoral activities within the study area during this period, while those associated with Phase 2 occupation would represent a large multi-use estate which included residences, pastoral activities and light industry. Occupation of the site during Phases 3 and 4 (and today) was primary institutional, with any archaeological remains relating to a significant period of educational, medical and mental health service development and response in NSW.

It should however be noted that the likelihood for intact remains associated with Phases 1-4 surviving in the study area is nil in the Sports Oval, and nil-moderate across the remainder of the site. This is due to the various development impacts that have occurred over time.
Figure 53. Assessed archaeological potential within the study area. Note land within the Irwin House curtilage will not be impacted under the proposed development.
7.0 PROPOSED WORKS

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 Proposal features

The proposed development would involve providing new buildings and refurbishing some existing buildings and facilities within the MRRC to cater for an additional 440 inmates.

Plans showing the proposed facilities are provided in Figure 54 - Figure 59.

7.1.2 New building works (Blocks L, M, N, O, P, R, T, U, V, W and X)

The new buildings proposed to expand the capacity of the MRRC and accommodate the additional inmates are described below. These buildings would be constructed in the south-eastern corner of the proposal site, in the location of the existing outdoor Sports Oval (shown in Figure 54).

The approximate floor areas of the new buildings are listed Table 10.

**New indoor sports building (Block L)**

A new multi-purpose indoor sports building would be constructed within the new accommodation area, between Block O and P. The facility would include a single storey basketball court and associated spaces including communications, mechanical equipment, AV, storage, inmate change facilities, an officer post, WCs and a cleaners’ room.

Design for the building will incorporate a pitched roof and rectilinear openings including large, louvred openings to achieve ventilation for the basketball court. External cladding is pre-finished metal wall cladding.

**New satellite health facility (Block M)**

The new satellite health facility will be located in an area currently occupied by the Sports Oval, to the west of proposed Block N. It will be located between proposed cell blocks O, P R and T, to the south of a proposed secure covered link. An ambulance bay would be located in close proximity to the clinic.

Block M will comprise of a double storey building containing health facilities including holding cells, consultation rooms, nurses station, officer post, offices and associated staff facilities. Mechanical plant and communications spaces are located on the first floor. External cladding is pre-finished metal wall cladding.

**New satellite programs building (Block N)**

The new satellite programs building is located in an area currently occupied by the Sports Oval, to the east of proposed Block M, between proposed cell blocks P and R and to the south of a proposed secure covered link connecting Blocks N, P, M, V and O.

Block N will comprise of a double storey building containing program rooms, cultural / religious spaces, courtyard, interview rooms, office post, staff rooms, breakout space and WC facilities. Mechanical plant and communications spaces are located on the first floor. External cladding is pre-finished metal wall cladding.

**New accommodation units (Blocks O, P, R and T)**

The proposed accommodation units would be located within the existing Sports Oval and would consist of four two-storey units each housing 110 inmates, split across two wings. About two thirds of
the cells in each unit would be single cells, and one third would be double cells, with accessible cells provided on the ground floor of each cell block wing. Each cell block would be split into two 55 bed accommodation units.

The units would be a modular cell pod design used for other Prison Bed Expansion Program projects. The majority of the structures would be constructed off-site and would be transported to the site for final works and fit out. This would reduce the duration of construction and the works required on site.

The accommodation units would also include an inmate yard (two per accommodation unit) and inmate amenities. All existing infrastructure and plantings (including two mature Moreton Bay Figs) would be removed to accommodate the units.

**New Staff Carpark (Block U)**

The new staff carpark will replace an existing staff carpark located to the south of Block A (gatehouse) and comprises a four-storey structure of concrete construction. This would provide 33 per cent additional carparking spaces. The location of the carpark is shown in Figure 54.

**New Gym (Block V)**

The new Gym building would be located within the existing Sports Oval to the south of proposed new cell block O and west of proposed Block M, connected to these blocks by a secure covered link. The building comprises a single storey building open-air gym with WC and equipment room at its eastern end. The gym would be partially enclosed in mesh fencing between steel columns and the eastern part of the building is constructed in blockwork.

**New storage tank and pump shed enclosure (Block W)**

The proposed storage tank and pump shed enclosure is located within the existing Sports Oval on the southern boundary of the MRRC site, between proposed new cell blocks T and R. The pump shed enclosure would comprise a single-storey blockwork building while the enclosure would consist of a concrete slab surrounded by a steel fence.

**New electrical plant storage (Block X)**

The proposed single storey electrical plant building is located within the existing Sports Oval on the eastern boundary of the MRRC, to the east of proposed Block N. The building would be constructed with blockwork.

**Table 10. Floor area of new facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New building works</th>
<th>Approximate floor area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New accommodation units – four units of 2,600 m² each</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and interview facilities</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical clinic</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor sports facility</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total area</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.3 Existing building expansion/upgrades (Blocks A, B, B32, C, D, E, J and U)

The works that would be undertaken to existing buildings within the MRRC to facilitate the proposed expansion and meet the needs of the additional inmates are described below.

The approximate area of the expansions to the existing facilities are listed in Table 11.

Block A - Main Gate

Works within Block A (main gate) would include minor internal alterations and the construction of a two-storey addition at the southern end of the building (location shown in Figure 54). Block A is located within the western side of the MRRC precinct, to the north of the staff carpark (Block U). The new addition would include a new staff entry and plant on the ground floor and a master control room, secure equipment room, and cleaning and WC facilities on the first floor. The addition is constructed in blockwork and clad in lightweight wall cladding.

Block B - Visits building

The visits building (Block B) would be redeveloped and expanded to provide capacity for additional visitors and inmates. This would include additional interview rooms and professional visits rooms.

The building would also include visitor amenities, including children’s play areas. A detailed design of the proposed upgrade is shown in Figure 55.

Block C - Expansion of the reception inmate storage area

The reception inmate storage (Block C) would be expanded to provide additional capacity. This is likely to involve extending the building to the north and installing an improved storage system for optimal storage capacity and efficiency.

Block D - Conversion of existing special management cells

The existing special management cells in Darcy 3 (Block D) (cells 1 to 16) would be converted into segregation cells. This would involve upgrading the cells to the required segregation standards, with an individual yard provided at the rear of each cell. These works would provide the MRRC with a total of 31 segregation cells upon completion.

Block E - Redevelopment and expansion of the laundry and kitchen

The laundry and kitchen facilities (Block E) would be redeveloped and expanded to cater for the additional inmates.

The laundry, which serviced the SCC as a whole prior to incurring fire damage, would be reconstructed and expanded to service the expanded facility.

The existing workshop area located adjacent the laundry would be converted to a rethermalisation (retherm) kitchen, which would service the MRRC facility as a whole. Detailed designs for these proposed upgrades and expansions are shown in Figure 56 - Figure 59.

Block J - Redevelopment and upgrade of the gym

The existing gym (Block J) would be redeveloped and upgraded to provide additional capacity. This would include provision of two segregated gym areas for managing multiple inmate groups simultaneously, and provision of a new outdoor recreation area with secure fencing.
New secure entry link to the Mental Health Screening Unit

A new secure entry link would be provided to the existing Mental Health Screening Unit (MHSU), to replace the existing entry point near the visits building. This would enable segregation of inmate movements from the visits area, providing greater security.

B32 - Minor modifications to the B32 building

The B32 building was used as a waiting area for inmate legal visits. Redevelopment of the B32 building would also allow it to function as the central radio pickup and drop off point for all staff by adding capacity to store and charge handheld radio and personal duress alarms.

New Staff Carpark (Block U)

The new staff carpark will replace an existing staff carpark located to the south of Block A (gatehouse) and comprises a four-storey structure of concrete construction. This would provide 33 percent additional carparking spaces. The location of the carpark is shown in Figure 54.

Table 11. Floor area of expanded facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion area</th>
<th>Approximate floor area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits building</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32 building</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate storage</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation cells</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry and kitchen expansion</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area</td>
<td>3,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.4 Ancillary/infrastructure works

The other works that form part of the proposal are as follows:

Services upgrades

To be confirmed

7.1.5 Operational characteristics

Commencement of operation

It is anticipated that the new facilities would be operational in 2021.

Hours of operation

There would be no change to the operating hours of the MRRC as a result of the proposal.

Inmate, staff and visitor numbers

Once the proposal is operational, the MRRC would have the capacity to accommodate up to 1,603 inmates.

Staff numbers would increase by about 140 full time equivalent staff during operation, to a total of about 625.
The proposal would enable the visitor capacity to be doubled, from about 65 visitors per hour to about 130 per hour.

Site access

Access to the MRRC would continue to be via the SCC access road off Holker Street.

7.2 Construction of the proposal

7.2.1 Staging

The MRRC would need to operate at 100 per cent capacity during construction of the proposal. As a result, a staged approach to construction is proposed to minimise the potential for operational impacts on the centre.

Construction is proposed to be undertaken in five phases which are summarised below:

Phase 1

- site preparation works for the new building works
- modification of external fence to enclose the sports oval and establishment of new temporary internal secure fence line
- construction of a temporary secure gatehouse for construction access off Jamieson Street
- removal of two Ficus Macrophylla (Moreton Bay fig) located on the Sports Oval
- commence carpark expansion works outside the secure fence line
- commence construction works to the kitchen and laundry
- commence works to visits building

Phase 2

- commence work in the Darcy block segregation cells
- commence works to inmate property store
- continue work to carpark, visits buildings, and kitchen/laundry

Phase 3

- construct new modular cell accommodation
- construction of indoor recreation building
- construct ancillary buildings (programs, clinic)
- continue works to visits building

Phase 4

- commissioning of buildings
- construction of paths, internal roads, landscape and secure links
- removal of temporary fencing
- removal of temporary secured gatehouse on Jamieson Street and reinstatement of external fences
7.2.2 Temporary facilities

During construction, temporary facilities would be required both on and off-site. On-site temporary facilities would include a temporary construction fence, inmate storage, and a temporary gatehouse for construction access off Jamieson Street.

7.2.3 Construction resources

**Workforce**

An average workforce of 80 personnel is assumed during the construction period, with a peak workforce of up to 180 people at key periods.

**Equipment**

Equipment likely to be required for the construction work would include:

- excavators or similar earthmoving equipment
- air compressor
- bulldozer
- concrete pump
- crane
- front-end loader
- grader
- concrete truck
- hand tools
- welding equipment.

7.2.4 Construction compound/s, access and vehicle movements

**Construction compound**

The contractor would establish a compound area within the proposal site to accommodate construction activities for the duration of the construction period. The compound area would accommodate the following facilities:

- site office
- amenities
- stockpiles
- fuel storage.

All plant and equipment would be stored on the site in a controlled and secure environment, in accordance with relevant standards and guidelines.

**Fencing and security**

A new temporary secure fence would be erected prior to establishing the main expansion construction site. The temporary secure construction fence would be clad/covered to a height sufficient to eliminate views of construction activity. The revised fencing and temporary gatehouse arrangements would be integrated with the existing security systems.
In the event that the temporary fence is accessible from building rooftops, anti-climb preventative measures would be added to the existing assets to maintain the operational security integrity of the MRRC.

**Construction site access**

Access and egress of operational staff and vehicles would take precedence over construction personnel and vehicles/deliveries. Construction access to the new expansion area would be via a temporary secure gatehouse located off Jamieson Street. The refurbishment works to existing buildings within the MRRC would be accessed via the existing MRRC gatehouse off Holker Street.

**Workforce parking and transport to site**

Construction workers would park off-site. It is assumed that most construction personnel would travel to the site via public transport.
Figure 54. Overview of proposed Master Plan for the MRRC. The heritage curtilage for Irwin House is outlined in purple. Source. Guymer Bailey Architects, March 2018.
Figure 55. Detail of proposed Visits Building (Block B) design. The significant landscape and archaeological potential curtilage for Irwin House is outlined in purple. Source. Guymer Bailey Architects, March 2018.

This diagram has been removed for security reasons.
Figure 56. Proposed elevations for the retherm kitchen and laundry (Block E: laundry and workshop). Source. Guymer Bailey Architects, March 2018.

This diagram has been removed for security reasons.
Figure 57. Existing ground floor plan of Block E (laundry and workshop). Source. Guymer Bailey Architects, March 2018.

This diagram has been removed for security reasons.
Figure 58. Proposed ground floor plan for the retherm kitchen and laundry in Block E (laundry and workshop). Source. Guymer Bailey Architects, March 2018.

This diagram has been removed for security reasons.
Figure 59. Proposed section plan for the retherm kitchen and laundry in Block E (laundry and workshop). Source. Guymer Bailey Architects, March 2018.

This diagram has been removed for security reasons.
8.0 HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.1 Introduction

This section will assess heritage impacts to study area and its significant elements as a result of the proposed works. Impacts will be graded in accordance with the terminology outlined in Table 2. The assessment is based on information provided in the Master Plan and updated on 22 March 2018. Detailed information regarding the extent of excavations or level of impact to buildings and building fabric is not known.

8.2 Impacts to the SHR listed SPCCA

8.2.1 Impacts to fabric

Proposed impacts to fabric within the study area would be associated with modifications to Blocks A, B, C, D, E, J and U and the removal of dressed sandstone garden boundaries and two Moreton Bay fig trees within the existing Sports Oval. Many of these works will take place within MRRC structures that were constructed after 1996 and have been assessed as having little significance in the CMP for the SPCCA (see Section 5.1.1).

Block A

The gatehouse (Block A) would be internally modified and a new two-storey addition constructed at its southern end.

Assessed impacts

Due to the late date of construction and lack of significant heritage fabric within with Block A, impacts to fabric associated with the building are considered neutral and would not reduce the heritage significance of the SPCCA.

Block B

The Visits Building (Block B) will be expanded and new interview rooms, professional visits rooms, visitor amenities and children’s play areas added to the building and courtyard. A temporary visits space will be established in the adjacent Industries Building (Block J) while these works take place.

Although the extent of impacts to fabric within the building are not presently known, they would likely involve the removal of existing partitions, built-in furniture and additional elements that make up the current layout of the building and courtyard. These works will also include landscaping.

Assessed impacts

Due to the late date of the building’s construction and lack of significant heritage fabric identified during the site inspection, impacts to fabric within the building are considered neutral and would not reduce the heritage significance of the SPCCA. In addition, no original landscape elements associated with Irwin House would be impacted by the proposed development.

Block C

The proposed development would include the expansion of inmate storage facilities within the Reception Building (Block C) to the north and involve the installation of a new storage system.
Assessed impacts

Due to the late date of construction and lack of significant heritage fabric within Block C identified during the site inspection, impacts to fabric within the building are considered neutral and would not reduce the heritage significance of the SPCCA.

Block D

NB. These designs are currently on hold pending brief clarification

The proposed development would include the conversion of current Special Management Cells in the eastern wing of the Darcy Block (Block D) into 31 segregation cells with an individual yard at their rear (as per the NSW Facility Assets Correctional Standards). Although the extent of impacts to fabric within the building are not presently known, it is likely that these works would involve the removal of existing partitions, built-in furniture and additional elements that make up the current layout of the cells.

Assessed impacts

Due to Block D’s late date of construction, impacts to fabric within the building are considered neutral and would not reduce the heritage significance of the SPCCA.

Block E

The proposed development to the Laundry and Workshop (Block E) would include expansion of the existing laundry space, addition of new washers, dryers, work and storage spaces, as well as the conversion of the existing workshop to a rethermalisation kitchen.

Although the extent of impacts to fabric within the building are not presently known, it is likely that these would involve the removal of exterior walls, existing partitions, washers, dryers, storage spaces and shelving.

Assessed impacts

Due to Block E’s late date of construction, impacts to fabric within the building are considered neutral and would not reduce the heritage significance of the SPCCA. However, the size of the structure would be increased, and its interior would be significantly altered from its original layout.

Block J

Works within Block J will involve the expansion and upgrade of the existing gym to allow for increased capacity within the MRRC as a result of the proposed development. This will include the provision of two segregated gym areas and a new outdoor recreation area with secure perimeter fencing to the east of the building.

Assessed impacts

Due to Block J’s late date of construction, impacts to fabric within the building are considered neutral and would not reduce the heritage significance of the SPCCA. However, the size of the structure would be increased, and its interior would be significantly altered from its original layout.

Block U (Staff Carpark)

Works within Block U (existing two-storey staff carpark) would involve the addition of a third level to increase its capacity by 33 percent.
The addition of a third level to the existing Block U carpark would involve direct impacts to structural elements of the building in order to accommodate the extra level.

**Assessed impacts**

Due to Block U’s late date of construction (post-1996), impacts to fabric within the building are considered neutral and would not reduce the heritage significance of the SPCCA.

**Irwin House (Block I)**

Irwin House is located within the MRRC immediately northeast of Block B. The structure itself is considered to contain exceptional heritage significance within the SPCCA CMP, 2004. The landscape surrounding the house (shown in Figure 50) is considered to contain ‘considerable significance’ in the SCC CMP, 2004 landscape component.

**Assessed impacts**

No development works are proposed to take place within the building or gardens immediately surrounding the structure (see Figure 54 and Figure 55). However, they will take place in an area assessed as containing ‘considerable’ landscape significance in the SCC CMP, 2004 landscape component. It should however be noted that this area comprises a small portion of the overall curtilage and has been significantly altered through the establishment of a contact visits courtyard to the north of Block B.

Due to these prior impacts and contemporary nature of the contact visits courtyard, direct impacts to significant heritage fabric are not anticipated. Vibration should be minimised so that impacts as a result of nearby works are avoided.

**Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel (Support Area, Industry, Newington House and Chapel)**

Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel are located within the ‘Support Area, Industry, Newington House and Chapel’ complex of the SPCCA. They are both considered to have exceptional heritage significance within the SPCCA CMP, 2004.

**Assessed impacts**

No development works are proposed to take place within the buildings or their surrounding gardens. Therefore, direct impacts to heritage fabric are not anticipated. Vibration should be minimised so that impacts as a result of nearby works are avoided.

**Sports Oval**

The proposed works will result in the removal of two garden beds bounded by re-purposed dressed sandstone and two mature Moreton Bay Fig trees. The two garden beds are not included in the SCC CMP; however, this HIA has assessed them as elements of moderate heritage significance due to their potential associations with earlier occupation phases within the Newington Estate and Newington Asylum and Hospital. The two Moreton Bay Fig trees are considered to contain ‘some significance’ in the 2004 CMP.

**Assessed impacts**

The removal of two garden beds and two Moreton Bay Fig trees would have a major-moderate impact on the study area and moderate to minor impact on the SPCCA as a whole.
8.2.2 Impacts to potential archaeological remains

**Blocks A, B, C, D and E (western portion of study area)**

Proposed developments within and around Blocks A, B, C, D and E would involve the expansion of Block A and E’s existing footprint along the south and southeast elevation of the buildings (respectively), the addition of a new secure footpath to the south of Block J (industries building) and the potential for new service connections to upgraded buildings.

Although the extent of subsurface impacts associated with these developments is not known, excavations to accommodate footpaths, landscaping and potential service trenches may occur. These works are likely to impact only small portions of the study area, as the majority of works would be taking place within existing structures.

**Assessed impacts**

Land within the western portion of the study area was assessed as having no archaeological potential within the CMP (2004) – see Section 6.4.2, Figure 52 and Figure 51. However, this document has assessed the area as having and low-moderate potential to contain archaeological remains associated with Phase 4 occupation of the site (depending on the extent of previous impacts in isolated areas).

Therefore, the proposed development may impact significant archaeological remains. However, the limited nature of these excavations and low-moderate archaeological potential within the area means that impacts to the heritage significance of the SPCCA would be minor if managed appropriately.

**Irwin House (Block I)**

Proposed development around Irwin House will comprise upgrades to the contact visits courtyard associated with Block B. Irwin House was assessed as having high archaeological potential in the SCC CMP, 2004 (see Section 6.4.2 and Figure 52); however, the proposed works will take place in an area that has been subject to disturbance activities associated with the establishment of a contact visits courtyard to the north of Block B. The extent of these subsurface excavations are not known.

**Assessed impacts**

The proposed development may impact significant archaeological remains associated with Irwin House. Impacts to the heritage significance of the SPCCA would be minor to moderate depending on the nature of works and archaeological management.

**Block U (Staff Carpark)**

The proposed works will require the replacement of the existing staff carpark (Block U) with a four storey carpark.

**Assessed impacts**

The proposed works may impact an area assessed as containing low-moderate archaeological potential. This would have a minor to moderate impact to the SCC depending on the nature of subsurface excavations associated with the current carpark’s construction.

**Sports Oval and Blocks F, G and J (eastern portion of study area)**

Proposed developments within the existing Sports Oval and surrounding Blocks F and G would involve the addition of four modular based cell blocks to accommodate 440 beds, construction of a new two storey clinic building, construction of a single-storey program and interview building and
construction of a new indoor sports centre and secure perimeter fence. Works are also proposed to involve the removal of two mature Moreton Bay Fig trees currently occupying the Sports Oval.

Although subsurface impacts associated with these developments is not known, excavations to accommodate footings, service corridors, footpaths, landscaping and tree removal would occur.

Assessed impacts

Land within the Sports Oval and associated with Blocks F, G and J has been assessed as contain nil archaeological potential for remains associated with Phase 1-4 occupation due to previous impacts associated with the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip.

Therefore, impacts to potential archaeological remains as a result of the proposed works are not anticipated.

8.2.3 Visual impacts

8.2.3.1 Impacts to the SPCCA

Blocks A, B, B32, C, D and J

The majority of works within Blocks A, B, B32, C, D, E and J will consist of modifications to the interiors of Blocks A, B, B32, C, D E and J. However, an additional storey will be added to Block B and a two storey addition will be constructed along the southern elevation of Block A.

Assessed impacts

These aspects of the project would have a negligible to moderate impact on views and vistas to and from the SPCCA, Irwin House, Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel.

Block E

The proposed extension of Block E would slightly alter the existing MRRC landscape and structure itself. However, as the works would only increase the footprint slightly, visual impacts would be minor.

Irwin House (Block I)

Irwin House is located directly northeast of Block C and directly south of Block D. The proposed development would include alterations to the exterior elevation of Blocks C including a new children’s play area, visitor amenities and addition of a (shown in Figure 55). Views ‘to’ and ‘from’ Block B and D from Irwin House are currently screened by mesh security fences around each modern structure and can be easily viewed from walkways that run along the outer extent of the structures.

However, the proposed development will involve the removal of this mesh fence and replacement with a stone wall. The wall will include windows which will provide clear views to the building although it will further enclose the western corner of the item and reduce sight lines ‘to’ the building from the Visits Building. An existing awning over these walkways will be removed.

The Reception Building (Block C) will be expanded to the north and may involve the installation of a new storage system.

Assessed impacts

There will be moderate impacts to views ‘to’ and ‘from’ Irwin House due to the increased roof line on the Visits Building.
There will be moderate impacts to views 'to' Irwin House' from the Visits Building due to the replacement of an existing mesh wall with a masonry wall containing windows.

Therefore, visual impacts to views and vistas as a result of the proposal would be negligible.

**Staff Carpark (Block U)**

The proposed construction of a new four storey staff carpark to replace Block U (staff carpark) would not mirror the height of existing buildings within this portion of the SPCCA and would be visible from Holker Street, the MHSU building, exterior walkways within the MRRC and the significant Engineer's Cottage.

However, this portion of the study area is largely associated with modern buildings and its original landscape has not been retained.

**Assessed impacts**

The construction of a four storey carpark would have a moderate to minor impact on the heritage significance of the SPCCA.

**Sports Oval**

The proposed works would involve minor exterior expansions to Block E and Block J; the addition of four, double storey modular based cell blocks, a new two storey clinic building, a single-storey program and interview building and a new indoor sports centre and secure fence within the existing Sports Oval. Works would also involve the removal of established fig trees and garden beds currently occupying the Sports Oval.

The additional of new structures, secure fencing, removal of two garden beds and boundary stones and removal of two fig trees would significantly alter the MRRC Sports Oval landscape which is largely undeveloped. These additions would be visible from Holker and Jamieson Streets.

The Sports Oval landscape is considered to contain ‘little significance’ in the SCC CMP (2004) as impacts associated with the Bradshaw Rubbish Tip have removed any original Newington Estate or Newington Hospital and Asylum landscape features.

However, the oval represents one of the last remaining openly landscaped areas within the complex. In addition, the two Moreton Bay Fig trees are considered to have ‘some significance’ within the overall landscape of the SPCCA.  
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**Assessed impacts**

Due to the relatively visible nature of the Sports Oval from surrounding streets, the proposed works are considered to have a major impact on the MRRC Sports Oval and minor to moderate impact on the heritage significance of the SPCCA as a whole.

Visual impacts as a result of developments within the existing Sports Oval to Irwin House, Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel would be negligible to moderate as views towards the Sports Oval are already obstructed by Blocks F, G and J. However, the addition of double storey structures will

8.2.3.2 Impacts to Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel

Modifications to Block C

The expansion of Block C to the north would be slightly visible from Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel. Although this may alter views towards the MRRC from the items, the complex has already altered a significant portion of the original Newington Estate landscape.

Assessed impacts

Visual impacts to views and vistas ‘from’ the items would be moderate to minor and visual impacts ‘to’ the SPCCA as a whole would be minor to negligible.

Modifications to Block E

It is unlikely that the proposed extension of Block E would be visible from Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel as views towards Block E are obstructed by a secure permitter zone fence. Therefore, visual impacts to the items would be negligible.

8.2.3.3 Impacts to the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve

The Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve is located across Jamieson Street from the study area and listed on the SHR. The Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve comprises a large, cleared and grassed nature reserve that is not presently accessible to the public. A line of established trees (on the Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve side of the street) and secure perimeter zone fence blocks (from the MRRC side of the street) currently obstruct views towards low lying structures within the MRRC.

Although the undeveloped nature of the reserve and the Sports Oval complement each other when viewed from Holker and Jamieson Streets (see Figure 47), the secure perimeter zone fence breaks this continuity. The addition of new buildings and removal of two fig trees within the existing Sports Oval would significantly alter its existing landscape. However, the extent of development within the remainder of the MRRC and SCC complex, and reduced nature of views to and from the MRRC and reserve would reduce the extent of visual impacts associated with the proposed development.

Assessed impacts

Visual impacts to the SHR listed Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve as a result of the proposed development would be minor.

8.2.4 Summary of impacts

Impacts to archaeological remains

The majority of works will take place within areas of nil archaeological potential (with the exception of some areas in the western portion of the study area and vicinity of Irwin House). Therefore, impacts to potential archaeological remains associated with the SPCCA would be negligible to moderate, depending on the nature of subsurface excavations and levels of archaeological management.

Impacts to fabric

No built structures considered to contain heritage significance would be directly impacted by the proposed development. Therefore, impacts to these items as a result of the proposal would be negligible.
The removal of two garden beds, two fig trees (containing 'some significance'), and construction of new buildings within the Sports Oval would have a moderate impact to the MRRC landscape and minor to moderate impact on the heritage significance of the SPCCA.

**Impacts to views and vistas**

The proposed modifications to, and addition of, buildings within the study area would have a minor to moderate impact to views and vistas 'to' and 'from' the area from the surrounding complex and Irwin House, Newington House and St Augustine's Chapel.

**8.2.5 Justification**

There is currently a high demand for male remand beds in the Sydney metropolitan area. The lack of existing remand and reception facilities has contributed to a shortage of front-end maximum-security beds and increased transfers of inmates to regional locations where beds are available.66

The proposed works are essential to meet this demand and would provide increased capacity for the MRRC by proving an additional 440 beds to the complex. These works will also allow for modernised facilities within the complex including a laundry, retherm kitchen, sports facility and clinic. The works would allow the site to continue in its exiting use.

**8.3 Relevant conservation policies**

Works associated with the MRRC project should be in accordance with CMP policies for the SCC prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd in 2004. Policies relevant to this HIA from the CMP are outlined in Table 12 below.

**Table 12. Silverwater Correctional Complex Relevant Conservation Policies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Assessment of impacts against recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1 Management Policy</td>
<td>Conservation Management Policies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conserve the complex in accordance with the NSW Heritage Act 1977.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer any development proposals that fall outside the scope of the CMP to the NSW Heritage Council for approval under the s60 of the Heritage Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Archaeological material should be managed in accordance with the NSW Heritage Act 1977 and the Heritage Amendment Act 1998.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The philosophies, methodologies and guidelines outlined in the Burra Charter should be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>The proposed works will not have a direct or major impact on significant heritage fabric within the study area or SPCCA. Therefore, significant buildings will be conserved in accordance with the NSW Heritage Act 1977.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is intended that a section 60 application is submitted for proposed works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This HIA was prepared under the philosophies, methodologies and guidelines set out in the Burra Charter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Policy 8.2
Revision of Heritage Listings

The Department of Corrective Services should approach the Australian Heritage Commission, Planning NSW, NSW Heritage Office and the National Trust of Australia to encourage the revising of the heritage listing of the study area. Silverwater Complex should be revised from being a conservation area to a Prison Complex housing heritage items.

Policy 8.3
Future Use of the Site

Future changes should ensure the conservation of the significant elements within the site.

For MRRC specifically:

- The conservation area adopted around Irwin House should be retained and maintained and there should be no new buildings or structures constructed within this area.

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

- The reinstated garden around Irwin House should be retained and maintained. Significant trees within the garden such as the figs, palms, pines and jacarandas should be retained.

For the Service Area, including Newington House and Chapel:

- A conservation area should be adopted around Newington House and the Chapel. There should be no new buildings or structures constructed within the conservation area.

- The existing open relationship between Newington House and the Chapel should be maintained.

- There should be no new buildings or structures located over the carriage loops or the lawn areas enclosed by the loops. All components of the carriage loops and associated significant vegetation should be retained to provide a setting and curtilage to Newington House.

Response

The proposed development does not include a provision for revising the heritage listing of the study area.

Policy 8.4
Archaeological Management

The CMP includes an Archaeological Zoning Plan to facilitate the management of archaeological resources within the complex. This is shown in Figure 52. The project area falls within Zones 1 and 3.

Management strategies for Zone 1 consist of the following:

- No further archaeological work is required within Zone 1.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Assessment of impacts against recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are no constraints, upon archaeological grounds, to any future works, redevelopment or excavation of areas within Zone 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• However, during the course of any future works, redevelopment or excavation, if any previously unrecorded or undetected archaeological relics are uncovered, work should cease in the vicinity of that relic and advice sought from the NSW Heritage Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management strategies for Zone 3 relevant to the project consist of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• These areas should not be redeveloped in such a way that the remaining landscape would be destroyed or disturbed. Minor works for the installation of services (such as water, electricity, telephone etc) can be undertaken, but archaeological excavation should be undertaken prior to such installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>An Unexpected Finds Policy would be prepared and followed within Zone 1 areas and areas considered to contain nil archaeological potential within this document upon the commencement of the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, it is recommended that an in-depth archaeological assessment as part of the section 60 or section 57 exemption application be carried out in areas assessed as having low-moderate and high archaeological potential in this document prior to works commencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.5</td>
<td>Conservation and Use of Buildings of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The conservation and management of the site shall be undertaken in accordance with the Burra Charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Buildings with Exceptional and Considerable Significance should be conserved and used in a manner that does not compromise the significance of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New works should be undertaken in such a manner that does not result in a lessening of cultural significance or damage to heritage fabric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Elements identified as intrusive detract from the overall significance of the place. Where possible the preferred option is for their removal, conversion to a more compatible form or replacement in a way, which helps to retain or recapture the overall significance of the item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In relation to Newington House:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use as administrative facility or other appropriate use that will enable the large rooms to be retained for offices and conference rooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retention of original layout and special arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tight control of changes to openings and details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservation of original joinery and plaster work in situ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In relation to the Chapel:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A use, which enables the original space to be retained such as a classroom, chapel or meeting room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservation and retained of the stained-glass window.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservation of any remains of the original vault.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          | In relation to Irwin House:
### Policy | Assessment of impacts against recommendations
--- | ---
| | - The retention of the original symmetrical plan with its linking covered walkways and the continuation of symmetry in any future changes.
| | - The retention of the roof and verandah, retention of details such as chimneys, ventilators and post brackets.
| | - The creation of flexible and functional spaces by opening selected interior wall arches in the accommodation wings.
| **Response** | The proposed development will not involve direct impacts to buildings with Exceptional and Considerable Significance within the study area. Therefore, the proposed development complies with Policy 8.5.
| | A vibration assessment should be carried out prior to works commencing to ensure the items are protected during the construction phase of development.
| **Policy 8.6** | **Curtilage of Key Elements**
| | - The curtilage of Newington House and Chapel should comprise the area and trees on the Newington lawn extending into Mulawa and the area to the east and immediate rear of the house.
| | - The heritage curtilage of Irwin House is defined by its landscaped setting, which should be retained and maintained.
| **Response** | The proposed development will not encroach upon the heritage curtilage of Irwin House or the Newington House and Chapel and no key elements of these items will be impacted.
| **Policy 8.8** | **Site Landscaping**
| | - Reinforce the scenic vistas towards the Parramatta River from Newington House by way of controls over location and heights of new buildings and structures.
| | - Instigate a succession-planting regime to ensure the continuation of the identified significant landscape character that reinforces the relationship of Newington House and the walk to Parramatta River.
| | - Retain all significant trees in order to maintain the identified significant character or the site.
| | - Undertake a program of tree surgery and horticultural improvement to all significant trees.
| | - The landscape treatment to all new development on the site should respect the established hierarchy, history and significance of the identified planting and landscape spaces.
| | Trees of significance should be retained in accordance with the policy recommendations outlined below:
| | - **Category L1** Retain because of historic, aesthetic, horticultural, landscape and contextual value. Provide appropriate care and protection during and after construction. May be relocated if feasible.
| | - **L2** May be relocated if feasible. Retain because of historic, aesthetic, horticultural, landscape and/or contextual value.
| | - **L3** Of no heritage significance, but some contribution to overall landscape. May be removed if affected by future development after reassessment of species.
| | - **L4** May be removed due to poor health, intrusive or too close to historic buildings.
8.4 Statement of heritage impact

The SoHl summarised in Table 13 has been developed from the Heritage Division's guidelines for Statements of Heritage Impact (2002).

Table 13: Statement of Heritage Impact for the proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Consideration</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the proposal respect or enhance the heritage significance of the site of the SPCCA and nearby heritage items?</td>
<td>The proposed development will not involve direct physical impacts to the intact curtilages of Newington House, Irwin House and St Augustine's Chapel. The majority of subsurface excavations required for the proposed works will take place within areas considered to contain nil or low-moderate archaeological potential. Therefore, impacts to unrecorded archaeological resources within the study area have been avoided where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the proposal could have a detrimental impact on the heritage significance of the site of the SPCCA and nearby heritage items?</td>
<td>The proposed addition of four new two-storey cell blocks, a programs and interview building, a clinic and an indoor sports oval will significantly alter the appearance of the MRRC and Sports Oval and increase the existing height of many buildings associated with SPCCA. It will also include the removal of the last remnant of open landscaping within the study area. This is considered a minor to moderate impact on the SPCCA as a whole. The removal of two Moreton Bay Fig trees and two garden beds within the Sports Oval would be detrimental to the heritage significance of the SPCCA as it would involve direct impacts to elements that contribute to the past and present history of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the impact of the new development on the heritage significance of the item or area to be minimised?</td>
<td>The majority of the proposed development's design footprint has been prepared to avoid direct impacts to areas of high archaeological potential and significant buildings and landscapes within the SPCCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Consideration</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the new development required to be adjacent to a heritage item?</td>
<td>The MRRC and SCC has limited space available for new developments of this size. Therefore, the existing Sports Oval is the only available area within the MRRC and surrounding SCC property boundary that can accommodate the proposed development without encroaching on significant landscapes, impacting archaeological remains or reducing heritage listed curtilages. In addition, the MRRC was considered the most suitable site for this expansion after a rigorous evaluation and due diligence process carried out by Corrective Services NSW in 2017.⁸⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

9.1 Introduction

This report has assessed that the overall potential impacts to the SPCCA as minor to moderate. In order to reduce impacts to the heritage significance of the SPCCA, the following mitigation measures are should be followed:

9.1.1 Sensitive design

Design of the new elements within the SHR curtilage should be planned to minimise heritage impacts. Although it is appropriate that new and expanded structures are utilitarian and institutional in nature, visual impacts should be considered. Design of the new buildings in the Sport Oval should be as sympathetic as possible, with an appropriate form and palate. It is therefore recommended that a heritage architect be consulted during the detailed design stage of the proposal.

9.1.2 Opportunities for interpretative displays

The heritage significance of the SPCCA is strongly associated with the history of the Newington Estate, Newington College and Newington Asylum and Hospital. Its current use as a correctional facility has also provided continuity to the site’s evolution as an institutional landscape that has adapted to social, economic and cultural change over time.

The addition of new structures within the MRRC and construction of a new four storey carpark within the SPCCA would allow for the site’s history to be interpreted and displayed to visitors, inmates and staff in new buildings or included in modifications to the existing main gate (Block A) or reception building (Block C). The requirement for heritage interpretation is also included in the CMP for the site (discussed Section 8.3).

Therefore, it is recommended that a heritage interpretation plan for the MRRC be guided by the development of a heritage interpretation strategy. Reuse of any significant elements such as the carved (1999) and dressed (Phase 3 or 4) sandstone garden features should be considered in the plan.

9.1.3 Non-Aboriginal archaeological investigation

This report has provided a non-Aboriginal archaeological assessment which has identified several areas of potential for State significant relics. Ground disturbing works within the western portion of the MRRC may impact these archaeological resources.

The extent of these impacts cannot be assessed until detailed architectural designs and constructability information has been provided during later design phases. However, the addition of new services, footings and footpaths would require localised subsurface excavations

Once detailed designs have been finalised, an in-depth Archaeological Research Design (ARD) would be prepared. This would would be based on information provided in this assessment and involve further research, including a detailed historical and archaeological literature review. The ARD would highlight the research potential of the site by assessing appropriate research questions and themes. This research approach would then inform an archaeological methodology for further excavation provided in that report.

The ARD would support an application for relevant archaeological excavation permits or exemption/exceptions applications, depending on the nature and extend of the proposed development. These would be submitted and approved by NSW Heritage Division prior to works commencing.
9.1.4 Archival recording

The MRRC and any surrounding landscapes or complexes that may be altered by the proposed development would be archivally recorded prior to construction works commencing. This should include a detailed recording of the Sports Oval and its associated elements.

Although Block A, B and E are not considered elements of heritage significance within the complex and are considered to contain ‘little significance’ as individual buildings within the SPCCA CMP, the ongoing evolution of the site should be recorded.

The archival recording should follow guidelines set out in How to Prepare Archival Recording of Heritage Items (NSW Heritage Office 1998) and Photographic Recording of Heritage Items Using Film or Digital Capture (NSW Heritage Office 2006).

9.1.5 Vibration assessment

The proposed development will not involve direct impact to heritage fabric associated with Irwin House, Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel. However, vibrations related with the works may damage fabric associated with these buildings.

Therefore, it is recommended that a vibrations assessment be carried out as per the Department of Environment and Conservation 2006 Assessing Vibration: A technical Guideline document prior to works commencing. This would allow for an assessment of potential impacts associated with vibrations and provide detailed recommendations on how to mitigate and prevent potential impacts to fabric.

9.1.6 Removal of Moreton Bay Fig trees

Two options for managing the mature Moreton Bay Figs within the Sports Oval were considered in an Arboricultural and Ecological assessment prepared by GHD in August 2018. GHD concluded that there was less than 50 per cent likelihood that the trees would survive translocation from the Sports Oval to another area. An alternative option to propagate cuttings from the existing trees prior to their permanent removal and plant them in suitable locations within the study area was also considered.

In order to mitigate the minor to moderate impacts associated with their removal, it is recommended that translocation is considered following recommendations set out in the arborist report. However, if this is not feasible, the option to propagate cuttings from the trees should be adopted and propagated cuttings planted in appropriate locations across the SCC site.

---

10.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 Conclusions

• The proposed development would occur within the curtilage of the State significant Silverwater Prison Complex Conservation Area listed on the Auburn LEP 2010, SHR, SREP 24 and NSW Department of Corrective Services Heritage and Conservation s170 Register.

• The proposed development would occur within view of Newington House, St Augustine’s Chapel (listed as individual items on the Register of the National Estate and Corrective Services NSW s170 register), Irwin House (listed as an individual item on the SREP 24 and Corrective Services NSW s170 register) and the State significant Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve (SHR Item no. 01850 and RNE no. 15054).

• Provided all mitigation measures and recommendations are followed, the proposed development within the MRRC would result in the following heritage impacts:
  − Negligible impacts to fabric associated with Blocks A, B, B32, C, D, E, J, U, Irwin House, Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel
  − Moderate impacts to the existing MRRC Sports Oval resulting in minor impacts to the SPCCA
  − Moderate visual impact on the SPCCA as a whole as a result of new development within the Sports Oval
  − Negligible impacts to views ‘to’ and ‘from’ Newington House and St Augustine’s Chapel
  − Moderate impacts to views ‘to’ and ‘from’ Irwin House due to the increased roof line on the Visits Building (Block B) and proposed Accommodation Block (Block O)
  − Moderate impacts to views ‘to’ Irwin House from the Visits Building (Block B) due to the replacement of an existing mesh wall with a masonry wall containing windows
  − Minor visual impacts to the SHR listed Newington Armament Depot and Nature Reserve

• The study area contains areas of nil, low–moderate and high archaeological potential for State significant archaeology. The proposal would result in the following heritage impacts:
  − Negligible impacts to potential archaeological remains within the eastern portion of study area (Sports Oval and Blocks F, G and J)
  − Minor to moderate impacts to potential archaeological remains containing State significance associated with Irwin House (Block I)
  − Minor impacts to potential archaeological remains of State significance within the western portion of study area (Blocks B, C, D, E and U)

• Impacts associated with the proposed Staff Carpark (Block U) would consist of:
  − Minor to moderate impacts to potential archaeological remains that may exist in the vicinity of the existing staff carpark
  − Negligible impacts to significant fabric or structures associated with the existing staff carpark
  − Moderate to minor visual impacts ‘to’ and ‘from’ the SPCCA
10.2 Recommendations

- A Section 60 application would be submitted to the NSW Heritage Council for impacts within the SHR curtilage. It is possible the proposal may require presentation to the NSW Heritage Council and exhibition during the approval process.

- The design of new structures within the SHR curtilage would be sensitive to the heritage values of the place. While functional and institutional design may be appropriate, the form and finish of the buildings should consider the heritage context of the site. A heritage architect should be consulted during detailed design.

- A comprehensive archival recording, following the Heritage Division’s guidelines (Heritage Office 1998 and 2006), should be conducted prior to works commencing. This would be carried out under guidelines for State significant items and focus any surrounding landscapes, complexes or buildings that would be altered by the proposed development.

- A Heritage Interpretation Strategy should be prepared to explore and guide opportunities for providing historical and archaeological interpretive displays to inmates, visitors and members of the public.

- The proposed development may impact areas with potential for State significant relics within the western portion of the study area. However, the extent of these impacts cannot be assessed until detailed architectural designs and constructability information has been confirmed. Therefore, an in-depth Archaeological Research Design (ARD) should be prepared to support a relevant archaeological excavation permit or exemption/exception application once detailed designs have been finalised. This would be submitted and approved by NSW Heritage Division prior to works commencing.

- It is recommended that a vibrations assessment be carried out as per the Assessing Vibration: A Technical Guideline (Department of Environment and Conservation 2006) document prior to works commencing.
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