



# BOGGO ROAD PRECINCT

DUTTON PARK

ALLOM  
LOVELL  
ARCHITECTS  
BRISBANE ◊

**BOGGO ROAD PRECINCT**  
An Assessment of Impact of Proposed Works  
for  
the Department of Public Works



© COPYRIGHT Allom Lovell Pty Ltd, August 2005  
G:\Projects\05005 Boggo Road Phase 2\Reports\r01.doc

ALLOM  
LOVELL  
ARCHITECTS  
BRISBANE ◊

BOGGO ROAD PRECINCT

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

□  
1

1	BACKGROUND	1
2	A BRIEF HISTORY	2
3	ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE	5
4	CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE	7
5	ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT UPON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE	8
6	THE BCC HERITAGE PLACE CODE	10
7	NOTES	11

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

□  
1

The Former Boggo Road Gaol at Annerley Road, Dutton Park is listed in the Queensland Heritage Register and in the Brisbane City Council's Heritage Register in the Brisbane City Plan 2000. The broader site of which the listed area is a part is now to be redeveloped. A master plan has been prepared and planning is now complete for site development and infrastructure works.

1 BACKGROUND

As part of the brief for phase one infrastructure planning for the proposed development of the site the potential cultural heritage significance of the place was acknowledged.

For example the brief stated "that protection and conservation of the old gaol (Division 2) buildings has always been contemplated". Indeed, a conservation management plan for that part of the site listed in the Queensland Heritage Register was carried out in October 2002. Following that study the boundaries of the listed area were modified and extended.

Amongst other requirements of the principal consultant's brief for the phase one work were those requiring "a Cultural Heritage Management Plan to be prepared to establish protocols for dealing with any artefacts that may be found during site works". The brief acknowledged that anecdotal accounts suggested "that subsurface artefacts, building remains and graves may still exist on the site" although "these accounts are inconsistent with official records"

Studies to satisfy that brief were carried out in January and early February 2005 by Allom Lovell Architects: Brisbane and by Austral Archaeology. That work, and indeed the present study, were carried out in accordance with the process established in the The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance) and in the Guidelines to that document.

The study relied upon a desk audit of existing documents and of earlier studies of the site and upon information made available during the course of the study.

During the study pertinent issues were raised and largely resolved with the project team. In this the report on phase two designs further issues relating to heritage have been resolved in discussion with members of the project team and client representatives. The present document is largely a revised version of that earlier report. No new material is introduced in Sections 2, 3 or 4.

In order to properly understand the history of the place, the archaeological evidence and the cultural significance of the place however the findings should be read together with the report by Austral

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

Archaeology. Some reference to the report "Boggo Road Gaol: Conservation Management Plan" by Robert Riddell Architect will also be helpful.

2 A BRIEF HISTORY

The Boggo Road site was identified for use as Brisbane's prison from 1880 when Portion 205 and part of Portion 206, Parish of South Brisbane, County of Stanley became a Gaol Reserve. The gaol, Brisbane's third after earlier ones at Queen Street and Petrie Terrace, opened in July 1883.

The site at that time was largely undeveloped. The adjacent land was marked for use as a cemetery (later Dutton Park Cemetery), as an orphanage and as an endowment for the Girls Grammar school (now the site of the Princess Alexandra hospital). Early maps also show an incinerating works in what is now Rawnsley Street to the immediate south of the present site.

The first gaol building on the new site was designed by Colonial Architect FDG Stanley. It consisted initially of a single cell block surrounded by a high brick wall. The original building contained 54 cells including two "punishment" cells at a lower or basement level. The gaol was soon overcrowded, not the least because of the large number of women prisoners and, as a result, was extended several times within a few years of its opening. The brick wall surrounding the cell blocks contained a reception area, offices and warden's accommodation in a building, integral with the wall, at the entrance to the compound facing Annerley Road. An underground water tank or cistern was built at this point probably gathering rain water from the roof of the entrance building. Two new accommodation wings were added in 1886-87 and in 1890 further extensions of existing wings took place to bring total accommodation at that time to 178 cells. Prison population was far greater and many of the cells were, of course, shared.<sup>1</sup>

In 1887 a Board of Inquiry into the management of Queensland's gaols examined the issue of over crowding, the need for separating prisoners generally and of conditions for women prisoners particularly. As a result of the inquiry and the subsequent Prisons Act 1890 a new women's prison was proposed. After a delay of more than a decade it was eventually constructed in 1903 on the same site and immediately adjacent to the earlier building.

Superficially similar to the men's prison it was thought at the time to be of the most modern design and an improvement on the earlier building in terms of prisoner accommodation. Designed within the Public Works Department it is thought that architect William Patrick Hendry was probably responsible for the design although others in the Department and better known including JS Murdoch, Thomas Pye and AB Brady the Government Architect may also have been involved. The design is

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

thought to be broadly based on the prison built in Townsville in 1890-92. When completed the new women's prison accommodated 80 prisoners.<sup>2</sup>

The gaol continued to grow and by 1911 buildings on the broader site included a lock hospital built in 1901 of timber and containing two large wards, kitchens, washhouses and matron's quarters all enclosed by an iron sheeted stockade and a reception house for the insane built in 1902 of brick in the same style as the new women's prison. Both were located in the north east corner of the site behind the 1883 building.<sup>3</sup>

Also in 1911 a sewerage system was introduced to the site to serve both the men's and women's prisons, the reception house for the insane and the lock hospital. Sewage drained to a septic tank in the south eastern portion of the site adjacent to existing vegetable gardens.<sup>4</sup>

By the early 1920s the number of women prisoners had declined dramatically and the remaining inmates were moved to a timber building constructed immediately to the south of the existing women's prison along Annerley Road and incorporating a former VD hospital building relocated to the site from Brisbane General Hospital at Herston. Separate buildings accommodated a kitchen, laundry, store, WCs and bath house and the whole was surrounded by a high galvanised iron fence. A new matron's cottage was constructed adjacent to the new facility.<sup>5</sup>

The former Women's prison became No 2 Division for men. Prisoners were transferred to it from St Helena Island Penal establishment in Moreton Bay and that prison closed.<sup>6</sup>

The existing workshop within the former women's prison was converted to provide more prisoner accommodation and, in 1929, a new workshop block was constructed at the north eastern corner of the now No 2 Division. Designed to provide workshop facilities for the entire prisoner population in seven separate workshops and built in reinforced concrete and steel. The outer wall of No 2 Division was extended to accommodate the new facility. A tunnel was constructed to allow prisoners from No 1 Division access to it.<sup>7</sup>

In about 1920 the reception house for the insane had been converted for use as a VD hospital and in 1949 was converted again to become yet another women's prison. The earlier timber prison to the south of No 2 Division was used for a time for men prisoners and was known as Division 3 but later was used for storage. It was demolished in the late 1960s when the southern part of the site was set aside and developed for use by the State Archives authority and a government operated Vehicle Inspection Station.<sup>8</sup>

At about the same time work commenced on the construction of a new No 1 Division prison designed to be built around the early brick gaol. The design of the new facility was undertaken by the Department of

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

□  
4

Public Works to the design of architect Frank Stoopman and was constructed using largely a Departmental labour force. It was not until 1978 that the new complex was complete and the last of the original buildings enclosed within it were demolished. Little documentary evidence survives of the manner and detail in which the demolition work was carried out or the extents to which early footings, drains or the sub surface punishment cells were removed.<sup>9</sup>

The new No 1 Division was a large prison and not without some problems. Following an enquiry carried out in 1987 it was itself demolished in the early 1990s. Apart from an elevated and level platform where the prison stood, some remnant stores once accessed from outside the wall on the southern side and the encircling roadway little remains of the building. Nothing remains above ground of the earlier prison buildings.

In 1977 a two storied administration building was constructed at the entry to the site at Annerley Road. The building is now the Dutton Park Police Station. In 1979 five accommodation units were constructed to the south of No2 Division. These structures, part of the building programme associated with the new gaol, were designed by Public Works architects.<sup>10</sup>

In 1980 construction of a new women's prison at Boggo Road began. Built in two stages the first was opened ready to receive its first inmates in 1982. The second stage was completed twelve months later.

Once again designed by the Public Works Department the architect in this instance was Ralph Bailey. The fourth women's prison on the site was, like the first, a purpose designed building based on a developing philosophy of prisoner care and rehabilitation in which inmates were allowed a degree of self respect and of community within the secure enclosure. Based in part upon the prison work of Western Australian architects Forbes and Fitzharding and upon the public housing work of James Stirling in Britain the design was also, according to Bailey developed in discussion with the newly appointed superintendent Matron Goddrich.<sup>11</sup>

Located at the eastern end of the site and adjacent to the railway line the buildings were primarily single storied in white painted reinforced concrete. They are, by comparison with earlier prison buildings, light and airy with top lighting and individual areas separated by courtyards. The chapel at the northern end is particularly domestic in scale.

In 1987 a new visitor's facility was constructed adjacent to No 2 Division and part of the old gatehouse renovated to allow interview rooms for prison support professionals. Ralph Bailey was again the architect in charge within the Works Department.<sup>12</sup>

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

□

5

Six new punishment cells were also constructed as part of No 2 Division to replace the infamous “black holes” of No 1 Division but the building was decommissioned in 1989 following the recommendations of a Commission of Review into Corrective Services in 1987.

By the early 1990s Division 1 had also been decommissioned, the “new” gaol building demolished and the site levelled. Public interest in the No 2 Division gaol led however to the listing of that part of the site in the Queensland Heritage Register in February 1993.

The women’s prison closed in 1999. Although damaged it remains largely as constructed.

Other buildings surviving at the site include the former State archives building and associated garages and stores, the vehicle inspection station and the former administration block adjacent to the site entry at Annerley Road.

### 3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

The brief for the phase one study did not anticipate any re-assessment of buildings within the precinct.

While the former No 2 Division gaol is listed in the Queensland Heritage Register and consequently subject to the provisions of the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 no other buildings within the precinct have been identified as being of potential cultural significance. The brief set out the Heritage Objectives as being the protection and conservation of the old gaol buildings including the view shed from Annerley Road and the ‘adaptive re-use’ of the gaol in accordance with the Conservation Management Plan for that building as a focus of the precinct under the ownership of the Queensland Government.

A further Heritage Objective was the retention of the road between Annerley Road and the place where No 1 Division gates once stood as a significant historical feature of the site.

It was also suggested in the consultant brief that the wider precinct may contain cultural significance in archaeological remains of subsurface artefacts, graves and foundations. Some former prison wardens who were present during the construction of new exercise yards in the 1970s have claimed that human remains may exist on site on the basis of observations made at that time. Wardens Steve Gage, Edmund Fortune and Don Walters independently made written statements reporting seeing what might have been graves at the eastern end of the site. A map prepared by Warden Gage claimed to locate these sightings precisely.<sup>13</sup>

While documentary research carried out within the Department of Works found no evidence of any burials on site the rumour has persisted. DNA

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

tests carried out on samples collected by Warden Fortune in 1974 by the Molecular Archaeology and Residue Services Unit of the University of Queensland were inconclusive.<sup>14</sup>

The phase one study then set out to determine the veracity of the various claims by archaeological excavation. Application was made to the Director of Cultural Heritage within the Environmental Protection Agency for approval setting out the objectives and proposed methodology of the archaeological study. Approved activities included an *archaeological test excavation program to determine the existence or otherwise of grave sites within the former gaol boundaries....*

As part of the program opportunity was also taken to explore the likelihood of other below ground remains of the 1883 gaol building including the early punishment cells and brick rain water cistern and of the underground tunnel built in 1929 to link No 1 Division and No 2 Division gaols. Approval was also obtained for this work.

Mapping was carried out by overlaying early plans over current survey drawings and these formed the basis for locating initial trenching. Later further trenching was carried out at the advice and suggestion of some of those individuals who had been present during the construction of the exercise yards in 1974.

The work was carried out in two stages. In January 2005, archaeologist Charles Parkinson of Austral Archaeology travelled to Brisbane to be present during the digging of a number of test pits being carried out as part of the geotechnical survey of the site.

Some pits, particularly those at or adjacent to the former No 1 Division revealed building rubble mostly from the 1970s building. It was noted that a pit toward the western end of the site excavated without archaeological supervision some days earlier revealed a dressed sandstone block.

Subsequent archaeological excavation, carried out in February 2005 by Ashley Matic and Pamela Kottaras also of Austral Archaeology consisted of machine excavation and controlled archaeological testing at a number of identified locations. The results of that work are reported in the attached report by Austral Archaeology. Importantly archaeological excavation failed to find any evidence of human burials on site despite careful and repeated work in the area noted by former warden Steve Gage in 2003 in his letter to John Banks, the former President of the Boggo Road Gaol Historical Society and in on site directions by former warden Eddie Fortune and other members of the Society.<sup>15</sup>

Neither was any evidence found of punishment cells associated with the 1883 building. That part of the site to the east of the precinct in which these once (or may have) existed has been widely disturbed by major

## AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

□

7

earthworks probably in both the 1970s and the 1990s. By contrast in that part of the site to the west the early profile remains evident and indeed evidence of the gates to No 1 division are visible in the pavement. Both the brick cistern and the tunnel linking the two Divisions were located in excavations in this area.

On the basis of the work carried out Austral Archaeology concluded that no evidence of burials or punishment cells existed in the eastern half of the site which appears to have been completely reshaped during the demolition process. Recommendations are that while no archaeological involvement is required at the eastern part of the site during bulk excavation a watching brief is recommended at the western end as well as a full archaeological excavation of both the cistern and the former tunnel linking No 1 Division and No 2 Division.

#### 4 CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural significance is the term used to describe those places that are especially valuable to the community, over and above their utilitarian purpose or function. The *Burra Charter* of Australia ICOMOS defines cultural significance as *aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present and future generations*.<sup>16</sup> This definition is commonly accepted within conservation practice in this country.

The cultural significance of the former women's gaol, more recently No 2 Division, is well established in studies by Robert Riddel architect and by the Environmental Protection Agency in the citation accompanying the listing of this place in the Queensland Heritage Register. The listing boundary forming part of that citation includes the former women's gaol, the later detention cells and reception centre and a curtilage to allow the landmark qualities of the early gaol to be protected. The boundary extends to the east in anticipation of a later development of the listed site to provide new services and facilities to support the former gaol complex.

While some discussion with officers of Q Build as to the future use of the listed place and indeed the manner in which any new use may be integrated with the wider development has taken place no further work relating to the boundaries of the listed site has been carried out as part of the present study. It is noted that the listing boundary has not been surveyed or precisely described.

Recent approvals by the Queensland Heritage Council for work within the listed area include exemption certificates for the removal of a recent wire perimeter fence and the demolition of five "home units" constructed in 1977 to the south of the site.

That part of the site containing No 2 Division is also listed in the Brisbane City Council's Heritage Register. While Council normally adopts both the listing boundary and description of cultural heritage significance of

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

□

8

the Queensland Heritage Council at this time Council's definition of the listed area relates to the Real Property Description and, as a result, the listed area includes the former Division 1 administration building, presently the Dutton Park police station.

The cultural significance of the wider site is however clearly of a lesser order. Indeed, the wider site has largely been cleared and, apart from the women's prison of 1983, little above ground evidence of earlier prison occupation or use remains. While the women's prison may have some interest as the last of a series of gaols built on this site it is not claimed to have cultural significance. More recent ancillary prison buildings including the administration building, the archives building and the vehicle inspection station similarly have not been identified as being of cultural significance.

All that remains of the 1883 gaol and later 1970s gaol built around that early structure is the level platform broadly marking the site of these two structures. Ground levels have been raised in this area probably as a by product of demolition. A perimeter road survives together with some early wire perimeter fencing. Neither are thought significant. The roadway leading to the primary entrance of the site remains. Although realigned, probably when the former administration building was constructed, it has some value in marking the pattern of use of the site and has been so recognised in the brief to consultants for the present study.

5 ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT UPON CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

The impact of the proposed development upon the cultural heritage significance of the place is illustrated in documents prepared by Connell Wagner Pty. Ltd. and by Tract Consultants Pty. Ltd.

The following comments are based on Connell Wagner drawings No 9954-SK-C-003 Revision 1 and 9954-SK-C-002 Revision 1 and on Tract drawings 705058 SD01-03 inclusive Revs. 00 and 704058 SD01 Rev.1.

The scheme involves the construction of new roads within the site and its subdivision into a series of allotments to be developed for residential, commercial and mixed use activities. That part of the site listed in the Queensland Heritage Register remains and a sufficient area reserved to the east of the former gaol building to allow an ancillary building to be constructed within the listed site. A pedestrian spine or corridor runs diagonally across the site from the existing Dutton Park Railway Station to the south western corner of the site. An underground bus tunnel is to enter the site mid way along the eastern boundary and will swing to the north before rising to ground level at Annerley Road.

AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS

Existing ground levels are to be adjusted. The platform on which the former Division 1 gaol stood is to be cut away and lower parts of the site filled. The archaeological features identified as being of some cultural significance lie generally within a zone immediately to the east of the listed portion of the site and of the early entrance roadway. Both are likely to be affected by the proposed development.

The height and bulk of proposed new buildings at the site are not clearly defined. The arrangement of those buildings on site has been planned in such a way that they will not compromise the views of the listed building or indeed views out from within the listed gaol complex.

In particular constraints upon the building envelope within the newly created Lot 3 will protect and enhance views of the gaol from the east and allow for an appreciation of that massive elevation from the pedestrian spine.

No new construction is proposed within the listed site other than that directly related to the use and management of the former gaol itself. The proposals illustrated within the listed site are, it is emphasised, indicative only but are located in areas of relatively minor significance in terms of views of the place.

The proposed works do impact upon the curtilage to the No 2 Division gaol in road widening at Annerley Road and on the early entry road to the site adjacent to the listed site. These aspects of the site are identified in earlier studies as being significant. The widening of Annerley Road and the consequent loss of part of the listed site has been planned in a way which will have no effect upon views of the place nor upon the cultural heritage significance of the place. The embankment will be reformed to emphasise the aesthetic and architectural significance of the gaol as a place apart built upon the highest part of the site.

Similarly the necessary construction of the bus tunnel “portal” and allied entry to the site at Annerley Road has been planned in a manner which sets construction back within the site and protects the views of the listed place. The necessary adjustment of levels within the listed site to allow these road works has been carefully and sensitively planned to retain accessibility to the former gaol and the existing forecourt or entry area.

The former administration building is to be demolished as part of this work to allow road works to be constructed away from the listed site. The building is listed in the Brisbane City Council Register but is not considered culturally significant. No other above ground structures at the broader site are considered so significant as to warrant their protection.

Neither has archaeological investigation established that any below ground evidence survives which would require any amendment to the

## AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS



proposal. While minor remnants of building materials survive it is noted that no evidence was found of any human remains at the site and the suggestion that up to twelve graves was observed while drains were being laid in the mid 1970s cannot be verified.

A detailed archaeological excavation of the cistern and former tunnel is however recommended before construction work begins.

Works generally, including infrastructure development at the site will not adversely affect the cultural heritage significance of the site. Nor will the construction of the proposed bus tunnel that is to be cut across the site from east to west impact adversely upon the significant aspects of this place.

## 6 THE BCC HERITAGE PLACE CODE

Section 3.2.1 of the Heritage Place Code of Brisbane Citiplan 2000 sets out Performance Criteria and Acceptable Solutions for development of or in a heritage place.

In particular it is a requirement of the Performance Criteria of the Code that:

*The proposal must not damage the cultural heritage significance of the heritage place, but provides for its future protection; ...must be based on, and take account of, all aspects of the cultural significance of the heritage place; ...must protect the fabric and setting of the heritage place, while providing for its use, interpretation and management and, ...must be based on the issues relevant to the conservation of the heritage place, with appropriate opportunity for community comment on the findings.*

The present proposal satisfies both the Performance Criteria and Acceptable Solutions. The proposal will not damage the cultural heritage significance of the place, will provide for its future protection, is based on and takes account of all aspects of the cultural significance of the heritage place and protects the fabric and setting of the place. While the present proposal does not provide for its immediate use, interpretation and management it is based on the issues relevant to the conservation of the heritage place and accommodates anticipated future conservation and development in a responsible and informed manner.

The proposal acknowledges the cultural significance of the heritage place as identified in various conservation studies and assessments carried out by others in accordance with *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance* and the various guidelines to that document.

On balance the impact of the proposed development upon the cultural significance of the heritage place is acceptable and satisfies Section 3.2.1 of the Heritage Place Code of the Brisbane CityPlan 2000.

## AN ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF PROPOSED WORKS



Section 3.2.2 of the Heritage Place Code of the Brisbane CityPlan 2000 also requires that development on land adjoining a heritage place be subject to the code's provisions regarding significant views. *Views of the heritage place identified as significant in the Heritage Register citation must not be impaired by any aspect of the proposal, including landscape and building elements.*

The proposed development on land adjacent to that site requires some consideration of the impact the proposed development may have on significant views of the listed heritage place.

Examination of the broader context of the proposed development indicates that direct views of this place are not adversely affected by any aspect of the proposal. Important views toward the heritage place have been acknowledged and in planning for the development and new use of the wider site the listed place is both integrated and its significance recognised as part of the proposed new development.

## 7 NOTES

This section contains additional information used in the preparation of the report, including a series of end notes that provide bibliographic references to the texts used in the research.

- 
- 1 *Queensland Heritage Register* entry File No 601033.
  - 2 Robert Riddel, 'Boggo Road Gaol: Conservation Management Plan' pp. 22.
  - 3 Stephen Murray, 'Annual reports information on Brisbane Prison 1900-1987', July 2003.
  - 4 Ibid.
  - 5 Ibid.
  - 6 Ibid.
  - 7 Ibid.
  - 8 Ibid.
  - 9 Ibid.
  - 10 Ibid.
  - 11 Discussion with Ralph Bailey in 2005.
  - 12 Ibid.
  - 13 Statutory Declaration of E Fortune dated 26 November 2003 and copy held by the Public Works Department and letter from John Walters to Archaeo Cultural Heritage Services dated 11 December 2002 and copy held by the Public Works Department.
  - 14 'Mars 470: Forensic short report for: The Boggo Road Gaol Museum', Kenneth E Duszka and others, University of Queensland Archaeological Services Unit, November 2003.
  - 15 Letter from Steve Gage to John Banks dated December 22 2003 and copy held by the Public Works Department.

---

<sup>16</sup> *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance (the Burra Charter)*, reprinted in Peter Marquis-Kyle and Meredith Walker, *The illustrated Burra Charter: making good decisions about the care of important places* (Sydney: Australia ICOMOS, 1992) pp. 69-71.