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1.0
Introduction

1.1 Background and Context of the Report

This Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared to accompany a Development Application to Randwick Council and a Section 60 Application to the NSW Heritage Office, for the demolition of the building known as Katingal at the Long Bay Correctional Complex at 1250 Anzac Parade, Maroubra.

1.2 Site Identification

The Long Bay Correctional Complex is located on the east coast approximately 12km south of the city of Sydney. The Complex contains seven separate correctional centres, in addition to several subsidiary buildings such as offices, houses and industrial workshops.

The building under consideration is known as Katingal, and is located on the south eastern side of the Long Bay Correctional Complex.

Location Plan
Long Bay Correctional Complex
1.3 Authorship

This Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared by Anita Krivickas, Heritage Consultant of Graham Brooks and Associates Pty Ltd, in January 2002.

1.4 Documentary and Photographic Sources

Documentary material for this report has been sourced primarily from the Long Bay Correctional Complex Conservation Plan, prepared by the Heritage Group of the Department of Public Works and Services in 1997, and the book *Out of Sight, Out of Mind: Australia's Places of Confinement, 1788-1988* by James Semple Kerr in 1988. The original plans of Katingal were located within the archives of DPWS, and historic photographs were located at the Mitchell Library.

All contemporary photographs were taken by Anita Krivickas on a site visit in November 2001.
2.0 **Historical Outline**

2.1 **Introduction**

The following summarised historical outline has been drawn from the *Long Bay Correctional Complex Conservation Plan*, prepared by the Heritage Group of the Department of Public Works and Services in 1997. Reference is also made to James Semple Kerr’s *Out of Sight, Out of Mind: Australia’s Places of Confinement, 1788-1988* published in 1988.

2.2 **Establishment of the Dual Institutions 1896-1918**

The construction of a new prison for Sydney to house ‘drunkards and petty offenders’ was first promoted during the 1870-1880s, however no serious steps were taken until 1896, when F.W. Neitenstein became Comptroller-General of Prisons. Neitenstein was particularly concerned about providing accommodation for low security males serving short sentences. At that time Darlinghurst Gaol was overcrowded with prisoners of all classes thrown together. A new Male Penitentiary was intended to promote ‘restricted association’, whereby inmates were kept separated except when at work, exercise or worship, and especial care was undertaken to prevent the corruption of first-timers and young offenders. Neitenstein estimated that 200 of the men at Darlinghurst at that time, including ‘debtors, persons awaiting trial, casuals, drunkards, vagrants’, could be better housed at a new Penitentiary.

Neitenstein was also concerned for the need for a ‘modern and humane’ prison for women to serve the whole of NSW. Up to that time women prisoners had not been adequately catered for in the prison system, and only small numbers could be received at country gaols with some inconvenience, while those in Sydney were housed in sub-standard conditions at Cockatoo Island.

The dual institutions of the Female Reformatory and the Male Penitentiary formed the basis of the Long Bay Correctional Complex.

Plans for the new prisons were produced by the Government Architect W.L. Vernon in 1898, and approved by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in 1899. The site under consideration was initially located near the University of New South Wales, however by the time of approval, the location had changed to Long Bay, not far from Prince Henry Hospital, and easily connected to the new tram line along Anzac Parade.

Construction of the Female Reformatory was given first priority, which began in 1901. Progress was slow, and by 1905 only one wing, the entrance block and the perimeter walls had been complete. The Reformatory was not completed until 1909, with much of the work put out to contract, although attempts were made to use prison labour. As one of the few purpose-designed women’s prisons in the world, the Reformatory was highly praised by the press, and excited the interest and admiration of overseas visitors.
By 1909 construction of the Male Penitentiary was also under way. The Governor and Matron’s residences, four warder’s cottages and a cottage for the prison electrician had also been constructed by this time. The tramline had been connected, although the road was not yet constructed, and prisoners were transferred in a special prison tramcar.

Construction of the Male Penitentiary continued however was not completed until 1914. During this lengthy construction period the role of the Male Penitentiary was expanded, from a place of short-term duration for low security inmates, to include long-term inmates, something more like a replacement for Darlinghurst Gaol. The final Penitentiary included six cell wings, a debtors’ prison, inebriates’ institution, hospital, observation ward, photo studio and fingerprint bureau. Upon opening in 1914 Long Bay became the State’s principal prison complex, and Darlinghurst and some other smaller prisons were closed.

The Long Bay Site in 1909

The Long Bay Site in 1918
2.3 Construction of Katingal

Katingal was designed as a special unit to house maximum security prisoners. At the time it was believed that by concentrating a number of dangerous prisoners in high security prisons, the problems of their management, and the disruption to other less dangerous prisoners, would be reduced.

The original concept of the gaol was developed by Comptroller-General W.R. McGeechan in 1968. Planning was undertaken by the Department of Public Works to the specifications of the Department of Corrective Services with no medical or psychiatric input into its design. The gaol contained 40 single cells, arranged into groups of five, with two exercise yards open to the sky, automatic doors and advanced security systems. Contact between staff and inmates was deliberately reduced to a minimum. The categories of prisoners to be incarcerated included dangerously violent criminals and those in need of protection. Security from external attack appears to have been an underlying intention.

By June 1969 DPWS had developed a scheme which accommodated 40 prisoners in single cells of 11'6" by 7'1", designed for complete physical separation between staff and prisoners. This was achieved through separate staff access and surveillance areas, and by the electronic control of doors. The cell areas flanked internal exercise courts open to the sky and arranged along the east-west axis of the building. These courts doubled as light wells which illuminated the spaces on which the cells fronted.
By 1971 it was evident that the cost of construction was to blow out to between $1.5 and $2 million. As a result, the design was modified and compacted, and the central exercise courts deleted and smaller elevated exercise yards at each end of the building added. As a result the prisoner’s living spaces were deprived of any sensory relationship with the outside world.

The construction of Katingal (an Aboriginal word meaning separation from social control) commenced in August 1972. The contract was let at $1.01 million, and works progressed in secrecy. There is only a single reference to the construction of Katingal in the department's annual report for 1974-1975: “The maximum security block is approaching completion and occupation is anticipated by October 1975.”

In April 1974, Corrective Services Advisory Council wrote to DOCS expressing concern about Katingal, particularly the lack of visual access to the outside world and the absence of a non-departmental representative on the Management Committee for the block. Extensive enquires from the public and interested persons about Katingal were fobbed off with distorted material about the complex. Works continued despite widespread concern. The gaol was occupied in late 1975. Despite being the ultimate repressive environment, it was unable to prevent the escape of a prisoner, Russell Cox in November 1977, and in fact his pursuit was hindered by the electronic systems and complicated means of exit from the building.

In April 1976, Justice Nagel commenced the Royal Commission into New South Wales Prisons. One of the recommendations in Nagel’s report on 4th April 1978 was the closure of Katingal. In June 1978, it was duly closed and the inmates transferred to Maitland and Parramatta Gaols. In 1979, Katingal was used as a Communications and Security Control Centre, and there was a proposal for a first floor Plant Room addition, however the proposal was not carried out. Part of the building is currently in use by the transport department, the cells are disused apart from a small museum of prison-related material housed in one of the cell groups.

(The original drawings for Katingal are included on the following pages.)
3.0 Description

3.1 Katingal

Katingal is located at the south eastern corner of the Long Bay Correctional Centre site. The building stands on its own on a sloping concrete plinth, separated from adjacent development by a concrete car park and wide grassed verges. At the north eastern corner of the car park is the security gate, a small concrete structure including concrete shelter over. A wire fence around the perimeter of the block has since been removed.

Externally Katingal appears as a small modern impenetrable fortress. Walls are virtually windowless, and are constructed of in-situ reinforced concrete, while the flat roof is of profiled metal sheeting. The building has a T-shaped plan, at the centre of which is a large plant room. A strip of windows along either side of the stem provide light into the staff areas, and have vertical timber slats for sun shading purposes.

Adjacent development includes the Special Purpose Centre constructed 1989 to the south east, the Remand Centre constructed in the 1950s to the north east, and Workshops, Garages, Nursery and Stores constructed between 1972-1990 to the east. To the north west is a small Pharmacy building constructed in the 1960s, a car park and beyond the Regional Offices constructed in 1985. To the south and south west is a large vacant grassed area.

Security gate at the north eastern corner of the site for Katingal. The boundary wire fence has since been removed.
Detail sun shading to windows of service wing.

Windowless facade (south west) behind which are the cells groups.
The T-shaped plan of the complex is reflected in its internal planning. The stem of the T comprises a service wing, with the cell wings forming the top. The service wing contains a vehicle dock at its end, through which the prisoners were brought into the complex, with various offices, central control room, kitchen and other service rooms located on either side of a central corridor. These rooms have concrete ceilings, carpet or ceramic tiled floors, while some of the offices have timber lined walls. The central control room has a large window overlooking the corridor with steel security bars, and a steel door. This wing is no currently being used.

The central corridor splits into two levels at the entrance to the cell wings, up half a flight of steps to the upper level, and down half a flight of steps to the lower level. A small lift servicing all levels is also located adjacent. Each cell group is identical, and comprises five single cells along a passageway, with a small workshop and shower recess adjacent to the central corridor. Access to each of the cell groups is from the central corridor through steel security gates. Steel security bars extend along the passageway of each cell group. Access into the exercise yard is at the far end of each cell group, at the same level as the upper level of cell groups, such that access from the lower level was up a flight of stairs. Each cell group is serviced by a rear service corridor, which allows control of the ventilation, light, visual access and serving of food, without any contact between the staff and prisoners.

Internally the environment is totally artificial, with no natural light or ventilation, and no visual contact with the outside, with the exception of sky views through the grilled ceilings of the two exercise yards.

The cell wings typically have painted concrete walls and ceilings, and painted concrete or rubber non-slip floor coverings. A typical cell is accessed through a sliding steel door, and has concrete plinths for the bed base and seat, concrete and stainless steel toilet, concrete hatch and table through which the food was served and a stainless steel mirror. Additional fittings were limited to soft bedding. The cell is lit by two fluorescent lights, which can be changed from the rear service corridor, and ventilation is through the toilet bowl. Such ventilation also made provision for the introduction of unspecified gases into individual cells, presumably for use in emergency situations. Flushing of the toilet was controlled by the prison staff. Visual access into each cell is through a small hatch in the sliding door and peep hole from the rear service corridor. Food was served through an ingenious hatch from the rear service corridor, which was fitted into a small table inside the cell. When the hatch is open to the service corridor, it is closed inside the cell. The hatch inside the cell only opens once the hatch to the service corridor is closed and locked.

A typical shower at the entrance to each cell group has painted concrete walls and floor with a single central shower nozzle. Water was controlled by the prison staff, and there are no taps within the shower recess. Observation of the shower by staff was also possible through a small double glazed window onto the central corridor. This window is fitted with a heat bar so that the window would not fog up, obscuring surveillance of the prisoner. Each cell group also included a workshop, which was simply a larger space open onto the passageway by steel security gates, with a narrow concrete bench and fixed stools around its perimeter. The walls above are clad with pin up boards. The two exercise yards at each end of the cell wings are identical, and have bare concrete walls and floor, and steel security grille overhead. The corners are tapered with steel panels to remove the blind spots from prison staff surveillance.
Surveillance of the cell groups was possible by an elevated observation platform, separated by some distance from the cell wings. This platform was at a height such that it allowed visual observation of both the upper and lower level cell groups. At the far end of this platform visual observation of the exercise yard was possible.

Ancillary rooms within the cell wings include an armaments store and visitor’s room.

Central control room showing windows and door to the central corridor.

Electrical control panel within Katingal.
View from the stair down the central corridor perpendicular to which are the cell wings.
View of typical upper and lower cell group from the elevated observation platform. The cell groups were separated some distance from this platform, and set behind steel security bars.
View of typical upper and lower cell group. The steel security bars to the lower cell group have been removed. Note the five sliding steel doors to each of the cells within this group.
Elevated observation platform from which the prison staff could survey the cell groups.
A typical cell showing concrete plinths for bed and seat, stainless steel toilet and mirror, concrete table and hatch for food, and peep hole. Walls and ceilings were painted concrete, concrete floor covered with non-slip rubber tiles. Cells were lit by two fluorescent lights and ventilated through the toilet.
Katingal, Long Bay Correctional Complex
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Padded cell within Katingal.
Looking along a typical rear service corridor behind one of the cell groups.
Equipment servicing a typical cell. Note ventilation pipes, sewerage drain, peep hole and hatch for food.
The fluorescent lights to each cell are accessed via the rear service corridor.

Food hatch in the closed position. When closed the hatch is accessible from inside the cell.
Food hatch in the open position. When open the hatch is not accessible from inside the cell.

Detail of the hatch and table inside the cell.
View of the shower recess showing double glazed observation window and single central shower head.
Detail of the shower observation window from the central corridor.

View of a typical workshop showing fixed concrete bench and stools.
Typical control panel located on the elevated observation walkway, which controlled the lighting, doors and flushing of toilets to the cells, and the gates to the exercise yard.

View of the exercise yard showing observation window from the observation platform.
Exercise yard showing concrete walls and floor, security grille overhead and tapered corners to prevent blind spots.
View of the visitor's room.
3.1.1 Condition and Integrity

Both externally and internally the building appears in sound condition, although is suffering from typical effects of deterioration mainly due to its vacancy and low maintenance.

Externally the top concrete fascia around the building is water stained due to storm water run off. The fascia has cracked above the vehicle dock entry, possibly exacerbated by the water run off. There are no downpipes to the building, and the gutters drain down the wall at a number of locations, which has also stained the external walls of the building. There is also evidence of rising damp along the base of the walls at certain locations. A number of steel roof elements, including brackets and air-conditioning equipment have some surface rust.

Internally much of the painted concrete of the cell wings appear in good condition, although is generally worn to the floors, and flaking in the exposed are around the exercise yards. The steel grilles of the exercise yards have some surface rust. Where security grilles have been removed internally, there is damage to the concrete walls.

Overall Katingal retains a high degree of integrity in its original layout and finishes. Having been only occupied for only a brief period (three years), the building has been largely vacant since closure, and used for subsidiary uses such as staff offices and storage.
4.0
Assessment of Significance

4.1 Assessment of Significance

The following statements of significance have been summarised from the Conservation Plan Long Bay Correctional Complex, prepared by the Heritage Group of the Department of Public Works and Services in 1997.

4.1.1 Long Bay Correctional Complex

On the whole, the site of the Long Bay Correctional Complex is of some significance for the following reasons:

- **Its Status and Continuity of Use**
  For over 80 years it has been in operation as the principal and largest prison complex in New South Wales.

- **Physical Evidence of Changing Penal Philosophies**
  The site contains evidence of the changing penal practices which have been tried since the turn of the century, (eg. the Reformatory, Penitentiary, Remand Centre, Training Centre, Katingal, Periodic Detention Centre).

- **Presence in the Landscape**
  The site’s mature landscape and buildings have a distinctive visual character and remain an important feature in the local landscape.

4.1.2 Katingal

The Katingal is of some cultural significance for the following reasons:

- **Penal History**
  It provides important physical evidence of the prevailing penal philosophy of the time. It represents a concept of managing maximum security prisoners which did not take into consideration the psychological or physical effects on inmates.

- **Social Values**
  Katingal is significant to the community generally as an infamous building and the physical manifestation of changes in the approach to imprisonment in the 1960s and 1970s.

  Katingal was the catalyst for fundamental changes in the structure and teaching of social sciences courses in the tertiary institutions. It would be a valuable resource for current studies.
4.2 Comparative Assessment

The Jika Jika maximum security complex was constructed to replace the existing H Division maximum security unit at Pentridge, Victoria with a structure which would enable prisoners to be effectively classified and segregated. Planning began in 1976 by the Public Works, advised by the Corrections Division, and the complex opened in 1980.

Also being a maximum security complex, Jika Jika was loosely based on Katingal, however with the benefit of an understanding of the problems encountered in its development and use. Despite their differences both Katingal and Jika Jika were modern approaches of subjugation in the prison system, albeit in a semi clinical “hands off” approach, the primary method being almost no staff/prisoner contact. Both complexes were brought about through the perceived need for separation of the more dangerous prisoners from the mainstream prison population.

While Katingal provided the basic concept for the new complex, the primary requirement which affected the overall planning was the need for more units separated into a dispersed pattern.

Similarities between Katingal and Jika Jika

- Separated staff and prisoners areas. The control and observation of prisoners at Jika Jika was via elevated covered walkways through the cell wings and recreation areas.

- Electronically operated system of control, thereby reducing the need for staff/prisoner contact.

- Covering of the recreation areas to prevent external attack or escape via helicopter.

Lessons learnt from Katingal in the planning of Jika Jika

- Living spaces increased, including larger cells and day rooms, and enlarged active and passive recreation areas;

- Fixed windows were provided to each of the cells, providing an outlook to the outside world, as a means of reducing the sensory deprivation and alienation experienced by prisoners at Katingal;

- Public exhibition of the proposed plan for Jika Jika in September 1978, after the public relations problems which surrounded the construction of Katingal.

Katingal has representative significance at a national level, as a maximum security facility constructed during the 1970s, which reflects the contemporary approach to confinement of maximum security prisoners at this time.
5.0 Heritage Listing Status

5.1 Introduction

The Heritage Management Framework comprises statutory and non-statutory identification of the various national and state heritage authorities, which provide authoritative statements regarding the heritage significance of a building and its worthiness for retention and conservation.

5.2 Australian Heritage Commission

The Long Bay Correctional Complex is not presently listed on the Register of the National Estate and is therefore not protected under the Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975. The Act forms the principal heritage management legislation for Commonwealth owned heritage properties.

Inclusion in the Register of the National Estate carries with it no statutory implications for non-commonwealth owned properties, but is an indication of the heritage status of the item.

5.3 NSW Heritage Council

The NSW Heritage Council was established to protect important items of the State’s environmental heritage through the gazettal of conservation orders. Where an item is subject to a conservation instrument under the Act, the Heritage Council is the operative management body for that item.

The Long Bay Correctional Centre was listed on the State Heritage Register in April 1999. As such, any applications for alterations or additions to the Centre must be referred to the NSW Heritage Office.

The official Statement of Significance for the listing reads:

"The former State Penitentiary is of considerable significance. It is the first purpose-built Penitentiary in NSW and includes a rare example of back-to-back cells. In conjunction with the former Female Reformatory, it is an important development in Australian penal design, and is the most complete expression of Frederick Neitzenstein's philosophy of reform. The siting of the Penitentiary has a strong visual impact in the surrounding landscape. The original buildings are of a unified scale and materials resulting in a harmonious appearance. The place has been used continuously as the principal prison complex in NSW and as Sydney's major metropolitan gaol for over 80 years. It has research potential in penal practices and building technology of the time."
5.4 Randwick City Council

The Long Bay Correctional Complex at 1250 Anzac Parade, Maroubra is listed as an Item of Environmental Heritage on Schedule 3 of the Randwick Local Environmental Plan 1998.

The Randwick City Council forms the operative heritage management authority over the Long Bay Correctional Complex. The general aim of the Randwick LEP 1998 is to ensure the conservation of the environmental heritage in the City of Randwick. This is achieved through an integration of heritage and conservation matters into the planning and control processes adopted by Council.

In accordance with the Randwick LEP 1998 the Council is required to notify the NSW Heritage Council of any applications for demolition or development of the Long Bay Correctional Complex prior to granting development consent, and take into consideration any comments received from the Heritage Council with 28 days after notice is sent.

The Long Bay Gaol Complex has been identified on the Randwick Heritage Study prepared for Council by Perumal Murphy Pty Ltd in 1987. The statement of significance reads:

"A grouping of considerable historic interest including many buildings of architectural value."

5.5 The National Trust

The property has not been classified by the National Trust (NSW). Listing on the Register of the National Trust carries with it no statutory implications. The Trust's listing is generally regarded as an authoritative statement about the heritage significance of a place and its worthiness for retention and conservation.

5.6 The Royal Australian Institute of Architects

The building is not listed by the Royal Australian Institute of Architects (NSW Chapter) on the List of Twentieth Century Buildings of Significance.

5.7 Long Bay Correctional Complex Conservation Plan

The Long Bay Correctional Complex Conservation Plan was not prepared in the context of any specific development or upgrading project. It is intended as a general aid to understanding the cultural significance of the overall prison, and the contribution made by each building component to that significance.

The overriding conservation policy for the Long Bay Correctional Complex, is one in which all conservation or development of the complex is undertaken in accordance with the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter). As such, the Conservation Plan identified appropriate actions for fabric identified of different levels of significance. These are outlined below:
Considerable Significance
Aim to retain all fabric. If adaptation is necessary for the continued use of the place, minimise changes, removal and obscuring of significant fabric, and give preference to changes which are reversible.

Some Significance
Aim to retain most of the fabric. If adaptation is necessary, more changes can be made than would be possible for fabric of considerable significance, but the same principles apply.

Slight Significance
Fabric of slight significance may be retained or removed as required for the future use of the place, provided that its removal would cause no damage to more significant fabric.

Intrusive
Intrusive fabric should be removed or altered to reduce intrusion when the opportunity arises, whilst minimising damage to adjacent fabric of significance.

5.7.1 Katingal

In relation to Katingal, the Conservation Plan establishes the following general conservation and adaptive re-use guidelines.

1. The current use of the office part of the building can continue for as long as necessary. If a different use is required for this part, it may be adapted to suit but external and internal alterations should be minimised.

2. Cell wings would be difficult to adapt to any use other than that of storage because of the lack of windows and the robust nature of the construction. If a feasible new use can be found for the cell wings they may be adapted to suit; but external and internal alterations should be minimised and at least one wing of cells on two levels should remain unaltered. It is thought there would be considerable interest from social science students and the general public in having access to part or whole of the building. The current use of one range of cells as a museum for prison officers could be continued or expanded for more open access.
6.0
Assessment of Heritage Impact

6.1 The Proposal

The current proposal is for the demolition of Katingal. At this time it is not certain what will be constructed in its place, with some thought being into the construction of a new Forensic Hospital.

Three alternative design options have been explored by DPWS, to ensure that a transparent methodology has been implemented in the planning of the Additional Support Units, and that the result is a balance between the client requirements and heritage objectives. These are described below.

6.1.1 Option 1: Continued use for prison facilities

Option 1 investigates the possibility of continuing to use Katingal to provide accommodation for inmates or office facilities for prison staff. This option is not considered feasible by DoCS and DPWS for the following reasons:

The 1976 Royal Commission into NSW Prisons resulted in the closure of Katingal as a maximum security prison complex. The building is not suitable for prisoner accommodation given its poor sensory contact with the outside world and inability to provide adequate spaces for training programs and exercise. Katingal does not provide accommodation for maximum security prisoners in accordance with the current policies of DoCS.

The layout and construction of the cell wings means that they can not be readily altered to comply with the provisions of the BCA and "Compendium of United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice" in the provision of natural light and ventilation.

DoCS have also previously had poor experiences in converting cells into staff accommodation, such that the inferior quality of staff accommodation likely to be achieved if it were housed at Katingal would outweigh any functional or operational advantages which may be gained at the site.

As such, Katingal is not considered to be suitable for re-use for either prisoner or staff office accommodation.

6.1.2 Option 2: Re-use as a museum

The second option explores the possibility of reusing the building for a prisons museum.

Long Bay Correctional Centre is an operational prison, and it is the intention for it to remain as such in the future. The re-use of Katingal as a museum is not considered a feasible option by DoCS considering the financial burden of retaining a building at the site which is not utilised for correctional purposes, the constraints on available site area for new structures, and the anticipated low level of visitors to the building.
6.1.3 Option 3: Mothballing and construction of new building adjacent to Katingal

The mothballing of Katingal is not considered to be an acceptable option, as the significance of the Long Bay Correctional Complex is partially defined by its continued use for corrective purposes. Mothballing is not considered a feasible and economic solution to the present needs of DoCS.

The retention of Katingal and the construction of a new building adjacent is not a preferred option, considering the reduced area available for the new building, and the resultant reduced level of services that could be accommodated within the new building.

6.2 Assessment of Heritage Impact

The Heritage Impact of the proposed demolition of Katingal have been assessed against the conservation guidelines established in the Long Bay Correctional Complex Conservation Plan, prepared by the Heritage Group of the Department of Public Works and Services in 1997.

1. The current use of the office part of the building can continue for as long as necessary. If a different use is required for this part, it may be adapted to suit but external and internal alterations should be minimised.

The office part of the building (service wing) is no longer in use. Continued use of this portion of the building for office use, or adaptive re-use could be easily achieved through minimal intervention. The re-use of the cell wings is not easily achievable however, given their unique layout and robust construction. It is not a feasible and economic use of the site to use only one portion of the Katingal building, and mothball the remainder of the building.

2. Cell wings would be difficult to adapt to any use other than that of storage because of the lack of windows and the robust nature of the construction. If a feasible new use can be found for the cell wings they may be adapted to suit; but external and internal alterations should be minimised and at least one wing of cells on two levels should remain unaltered. It is thought there would be considerable interest from social science students and the general public in having access to part or whole of the building. The current use of one range of cells as a museum for prison officers could be continued or expanded for more open access.

The re-use of the cell wings of Katingal would appear to be very difficult given their unusual layout and robust construction. The layout of the cell wings do not allow themselves to be readily altered to provide adequate quantities of natural light and ventilation for either prisoner or staff office accommodation, without severe intervention into the fabric. It would seem that the only possible re-uses of the building which could be possibly considered, are as a museum or for storage purposes, both of which are essentially mothballing the building, and do not warrant its retention.

The retention and mothballing of Katingal is also not considered to be an acceptable option, in consideration of the significance of the prison, which is partially defined by its continued use for corrective purposes. Mothballing of Katingal is not considered a
feasible and economic solution to the present needs of DoCS in particular given the financial burden of maintaining a building which is not directly used for correctional purposes, and which constrains the available site area for new buildings at the complex.

The primary significance of Katingal lies in the prevailing corrective service policy towards confinement of maximum security prisoners, which brought about its construction in the 1970s. At this time the essential approach was one of subjugation, essentially with no staff/prisoner contact. In this regard, Jika Jika, the maximum security prison at Pentridge Gaol in Victoria, was constructed in a similar manner, based on the experiences of Katingal. Although Jika Jika differs to Katingal in that it is not a restrictive in its sensory contact with the outside world, Jika Jika presently forms part of the Pentridge Gaol museum. Given that Jika Jika is to be retained, retention of Katingal does not seem essential as a representative example of this phase of maximum confinement.

Given the nature of the primary significance of Katingal, it is recognised that the building could be of interest to students of social science and the development of corrective service philosophy in Australia. However, it is not considered that the retention of Katingal is either necessary or the best way to represent and convey this significance, given that the retention of the building would be little more than mothballing, and place an undue financial burden on DoCS and the operational capacity of the Long Bay Correctional Complex. As such, it is considered that the significance of Katingal could be accommodated through extensive recording, including the standard archival and photographic recording endorsed by the NSW Heritage office, but also through the production of a video and virtual walk through of the building. Recording through these means would allow the significance of the building to be adequately conserved.
7.0 Recommendations

The recommendations that arise from this assessment of heritage impact are as follows:

- The current DA application for demolition should be approved by Randwick City Council, as there are no identified unacceptable impacts of the proposal on the heritage significance of the Long Bay Correctional Complex as a whole.

- Similarly, the current Section 60 application should be approved by the NSW Heritage Council.

- A photographic recording of Katingal should be undertaken prior to any construction works. Photographic recording should be undertaken in accordance with the guidelines established by the NSW Heritage Council, and should include the following:
  - Two sets of black and white proof sheets;
  - One set of coloured slides;
  - Annotated plans showing the direction of the photographs;
  - A copy of the original drawings sourced at DPWS archives; and
  - A video and sound recording of the interior of Katingal demonstrating its use and operation.

The photographic recording should be lodged with Randwick City Library.

- A virtual walk through of the building should be prepared and placed on the Internet, with a link to the DoCS web page.

- A copy of this Heritage Impact Assessment should be lodged with the Randwick City Library.