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Executive Summary

This Conservation Management Plan (CMP) relates to the place known as the ‘Cascades Female Factory’, South Hobart. The report analyses and assesses the cultural heritage significance of the place, and provides policies and strategies to guide future management, use and conservation activities at the site.

Cascades Female Factory

The Cascades Female Factory is a former female convict facility which operated between 1828 and 1856, and comprised five conjoined, walled and rectangular yards with a variety of predominantly sandstone buildings and structures. After 1856 it was used for mostly institutional purposes, before being sold in 1904 and subdivided. Most of the buildings and above-ground structures were progressively removed over the course of the first half of the twentieth century.

Focus of Report

The principal focus of the report, including the policies and recommended actions, and particularly management actions, is largely on a smaller area within the former Female Factory site, specifically Yards 1, 3, and Yard 4 South. This area is referred to as the ‘Cascades Female Factory CMP area’. The report also addresses and refers to the original extent of the Female Factory, and some elements located nearby, such as (reputedly) former staff cottages and a cemetery. Associations between the cottages and the Female Factory have not necessarily been confirmed and are recommended to be subject to further research.

After the initial circulation of the January 2007 draft, subsequent drafts were circulated for review and comment, including to the statutory heritage authorities. These latter reviews occurred during changes (and proposed changes) to the statutory heritage regime covering the place at both National and State levels. The statutory changes resulted in the preparation of updated heritage assessments and statements of significance for the site.

Heritage Significance

The assessment of significance concludes that the Cascades Female Factory is of potential international significance as an element in series of Australian convict places that collectively demonstrate the forced migration of convicts during the 18th and 19th centuries. Cascades Female Factory illustrates the use of transportation as a strategic tool to expand the political, economic and military strategic spheres of influence of Britain. The Cascades Female Factory has National, State and local significance for its social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values.

Heritage Listings

A summary of heritage listings for the former Cascades Female Factory yards and associated places is included at Appendix B. Sites and site components are variously listed in the National Heritage List, the Tasmanian Heritage Register and the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 (Heritage Schedules).

Nominations

The Cascades Female Factory (Yards 1, 3 and 4) is additionally proposed by the Commonwealth Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts to be
nominated for inscription in the World Heritage List, as part of a serial nomination of convict-related sites in Australia.
Site Management

The Cascades Female Factory CMP area has two forms of management: the Female Factory Historic Site Limited (FFHS) a non-profit organization manages Yards 3 and 4 South; the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service (Southern Region), within the Department of Tourism Arts and Environment (DTAE), manages Yard 1 and Yard 4 North.

The remainder of the former Female Factory landholdings, including Yard 2, Yard 5 and associated elements, are in private hands.

Significant elements

The Cascades Female Factory elements and components have variously been identified as ‘core’ or ‘supporting’ elements, which are the most significant in heritage terms, and elements of ‘contemporary value’ or of ‘little or no significance’.

Core elements are associated with the establishment and operation of the Female Factory in the first half of the nineteenth century, and are central to an understanding and appreciation of the operation and history of the place as a Female Factory/House of Correction for female convicts. Supporting elements are associated with the site in a secondary or supporting way, or provide evidence of later site development and use; some also contribute to the historic character of the Cascades Female Factory context and shed light on the historical development of the immediate area. Further research is also required in order to confirm or clarify the association with the Female Factory of some of the ‘supporting’ elements.

Priority actions & policy objectives

- Retain and conserve all significant fabric associated with the Female Factory, including fabric outside the current extent of the designated Cascades Female Factory (Yards 1, 3 and 4); this includes walls, structures and sub-surface remains. Conservation of these elements should be guided by the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 1999 and its Guidelines. Conservation of the fabric will also assist in protecting and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.
- Ensure that the highest level of statutory protection (i.e. State level) is afforded to all significant fabric associated with the Female Factory (within and outside Yards 1, 3 and 4).
- Establish a single entity with responsibility for future management of the designated Cascades Female Factory.
- Ensure future management of the Cascades Female Factory has regard for the policies and recommendations included in this report relating to presentation, interpretation and use of the site.
- Ensure that management of all significant fabric associated with the Female Factory (within and outside Yards 1, 3 and 4) is consistent in its application and implementation of the policies and recommendations included here.
Conservation Policy

The conservation policy is included at Chapters 5 and 6.

Chapter 5 includes policies and recommendations which are generally fabric related and focused, and principally directed at the ongoing management of the significant fabric and site overall. The policies and recommendations address general maintenance and repairs; site monitoring; management of sub-surface material and remains; objects and artefacts; setting, context and curtilage; restoration and reconstruction; adaptation and intervention; new works and development; views and vistas; presentation of site components; site recording; and policy implementation.

The emphasis of the policies and recommendations in Chapter 6 is not on conservation of fabric, but on site management and use, including policies which reflect and relate to the social values of the site. These address public access and use, community and stakeholder consultation, site promotion and interpretation, risk management, archives and future research. These also in part derive from, and support, the management ‘principles’ for places included in the National Heritage List (NHL), in recognition of the inclusion of the Cascades Female Factory in the NHL.

Further work

A number of recommendations for further work are included throughout this report, and are summarised in Chapter 6, and reproduced below. These recommendations typically derive from the scope and constraints of this report, particularly in relation to specific policies and recommended actions; the recommendations for further work also derive from feedback and comments received on previous drafts of the report.

History

Prepare a more comprehensive and up-to-date history of the former Cascades Female Factory which includes and/or addresses the following:

- Overview of the site within the historical development of both Hobart and South Hobart, including the geographical and landscape context; the historical relationship with, and connections to, the local South Hobart community; economic and other interactions between the factory and surrounding area, including the use of the quarry, local reservoirs, Hobart Rivulet, etc; use of local housing in relation to the Female Factory and later uses (including but not restricted to the history of the properties at 25 and 27 Degraves Street); reuse of salvaged fabric and materials from the former Female Factory, post-demolition; roads, tracks and verges around the site; historical access to Hobart.

- Overview of the former Female Factory as a functioning industrial site; the builders of the site; the economics of the factory operations; the former use as a distillery, etc.

- Expand on later phases and uses of the Female Factory site, including the history of demolition of factory structures; and researching the owners/occupiers of the Matron’s Cottage in the period after the factory and through the twentieth century.

- Investigate and research the history of the cemetery associated with the Female Factory, to clarify the dates of use and confirm the historical boundary/location
(which recently has been subject to review).
Incorporate key findings of family and genealogical research, which would help to personalise the history and introduce more of the individual women’s stories.

Incorporate key results of archaeological investigations, to shed further light on the physical aspects and development of the site.

Include more graphic material to illustrate historical overlays and site evolution.

Address the history, treatment, activities, etc of the children within the site, including the treatment of boys versus girls.

Integrate with a deeper understanding of women’s history in Tasmania generally, including connections to other female convict sites.

Include more information and analysis of the site’s historical links/connections to the broader British convict system, late eighteenth and nineteenth century philosophy on punishment and reform, political, religious and social attitudes, etc.

**Physical analysis**

- Provide a more detailed overview of the evidence remaining on yard walls of previous buildings, e.g. silhouettes of previous buildings and other evidence, including a detailed photographic record.

- Undertake more detailed physical analysis and investigation of the Matron’s Cottage, garden and outbuildings, to shed more light on their physical development and change, including clarifying the dates of development and change.

- Undertake more detailed analysis of the roads and verges around the site.

**Archaeology**

- Bring the results of the archaeological work into a more scholarly framework including
  - a comparable overview of the archaeology of the site in its regional and broader global contexts, which will assist in identifying archaeological research issues;
  - placing the results of all the Cascades Female Factory archaeological investigations into a broader (material culture) context; and
  - identifying archaeological issues to which the Cascades Female Factory research and analysis could contribute.

- Prepare an Archaeological Design Plan, to better inform the policies and future archaeological research and investigation, including for the Cascades Female Factory CMP area and, as appropriate, areas outside including the associated roads and road verges.

**Significance**

- Investigate the values attributed to the former Cascades Female Factory by Indigenous people, including the site of Truganni’s grave in Yard 1, and where appropriate incorporate this aspect of significance into the analysis and statements of significance.
• Investigate the social significance of the Cascades Female Factory in more detail, both to better understand and articulate this significance and aspects of community values, and potentially to reveal other aspects of social significance not canvassed in this report.

• Upon completion of the more comprehensive historical research and analysis referred to above, review the stated aspects of historical significance.

• Upon completion of the comparable overview of the archaeology of the site, review and expand on this aspect of significance.

• Undertake more detailed analysis and investigation of views and vistas associated with the Female Factory in the South Hobart context, to assist in identifying the most significant views, and making recommendations on their future management.

**Implementation**

• In conjunction with the site managers and Steering Committee, include:
  o detailed recommendations on current and future site management issues and needs;
  o recommendations on optimum site management; and
  o constraints relating to implementation of the CMP policies and recommendations.

• Include more analysis and understanding of site management in the context of local bodies whose actions, statutory roles, etc, can impact on the site and context, with appropriate policies.

• Include suggestions as to how policies can be implemented in conjunction with other agencies, organisations, etc.

• Identify appropriate potential repositories for archival materials.

• Include further investigation of current statutory context (including at local level), how this applies in relation to site management, and how this can be improved.

**Movable heritage**

• Provide more detailed description, discussion, overview and management recommendations for the movable heritage associated with the site, objects collection, artefacts, conservation, storage, etc.

**Condition**

• Undertake a more detailed condition assessment of the significant fabric, to better inform future maintenance and conservation works.
1.0 Introduction

This Conservation Management Plan (CMP) was commissioned by the Tasmanian Department of Tourism, Arts and Environment, and relates to the place known as the 'Cascades Female Factory', South Hobart. The principal aims of the report are to analyse and assess the cultural heritage significance of the place, and to provide guidance in the form of policies and strategies for future management, use and conservation activities.

The focus of the report, including the policies and recommended actions, and particularly management actions, is largely on a smaller area within the former Female Factory site, specifically Yards 1, 3, and Yard 4 South (see Section 1.3 below). This area is referred to as the 'Cascades Female Factory CMP area', and is consistent with the requirement of the Project Brief. The report also acknowledges the broader context and other significant associated areas and elements of the site, and addresses and refers to this broader context, but in a more limited way.

The report broadly follows the format of the Australia ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) guidelines for the preparation of conservation plans and the principles set out in the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999, adopted by Australia ICOMOS to assist in the conservation of heritage places (see Appendix A).

The CMP contains an overview history (chapter 2); a physical description and analysis of the current physical extent, nature and intactness of the complex, including archaeological material (chapter 3); an assessment of its heritage significance (chapter 4); a conservation policy (chapter 5); and recommendations on site management (chapter 6).

Heritage Significance

A statement of significance is included in Chapter 4 at Section 4.3. The statement concludes that the former Cascades Female Factory is of potential international significance historically, and of national, state and local significance for its social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values.

Steering Committee

This report has been prepared under the direction and guidance of a Steering Committee comprising representatives from the Tasmanian Department of Tourism, Arts and Environment, Parks and Wildlife Service, Heritage Tasmania and the Female Factory Historic Site Ltd.

Comments on draft report

A draft of this report (January 2007) was circulated for comment and review, including a period of public consultation, with feedback received from members of the local community; heritage professionals and academics within Tasmania and overseas; the Board of the Female Factory Historic Site Limited; Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority; and the Commonwealth Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.

After the initial circulation of the January 2007 draft, subsequent drafts were also circulated for review and comment, including to the statutory heritage authorities. These latter reviews occurred during changes (and proposed changes) to the statutory heritage regime covering the place at both National and State levels. The statutory changes also resulted in the preparation of updated heritage assessments and statements of significance for the site. Accordingly, the written assessments included in this report, especially at Chapter 4, have
been revised to reflect this and the assessments of the statutory authorities. As a place which is proposed for World Heritage nomination, the potential international significance of the place, as outlined in this report, reflects the assessment being undertaken by the Commonwealth Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.

1.1 Background to project

1.1.1 Project Brief

Reference is made to the Project Brief prepared by the Tasmanian Department of Tourism Arts and Environment:

The aim of the CMP is to distil and develop policies and strategies for the conservation and management of the site, which represents Tasmania’s and Australia’s female and children’s convict heritage.

The CMP is intended to build on work already completed (see Section 1.4 below), specifically the documentation prepared for nomination of the site to the National Heritage List, and previous conservation plans prepared for Yard 1 in 1992, and Yard 3 in 2000.

1.1.2 National Heritage List entry

The Cascades Female Factory (Yards 1, 3 and Yard 4 South) was entered in the National Heritage List (NHL) on 1 August 2007. The NHL comprises ‘natural, historic and indigenous places that are of outstanding national heritage value to the Australian nation’. The List is compiled and maintained by the Commonwealth Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA), and each place in the NHL has been assessed by the Australian Heritage Council as having national heritage values. Places on the List are protected under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999 (EPBC Act), which requires approval to be obtained from DEWHA before any action takes place which has, or is likely to have, a significant impact on the national heritage values of the place.

The DEWHA website contains the following further definition and description of ‘national heritage’:

Australia’s national heritage comprises exceptional natural and cultural places which help give Australia its national identity. Such places are a living and accessible record of the nation’s evolving landscapes and experiences.

National heritage defines the critical moments in our development as a nation and reflects achievements, joys and sorrows in the lives of Australians. It also encompasses those places that reveal the richness of Australia’s extraordinarily diverse natural heritage.

1.1.3 World Heritage Listing Nomination

The Cascades Female Factory CMP area (Yards 1, 3 and 4) is also proposed by the Commonwealth Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts to be nominated for inscription in the World Heritage List, as part of a serial nomination of convict-related sites in Australia. This nomination is in process.

1.2 History & Limitations on Approach

The Cascades Female Factory is a former female convict facility which operated between 1828 and 1856, after being established in a pre-existing distillery which was adapted and subsequently expanded. After 1856, the site was used in whole or part, and sometimes
simultaneously, for a variety of purposes including: a female prison, invalid depot, boys’ reformatory and training school, lunatic asylum, lying-in hospital, contagious diseases hospital, paupers’ home, and as the ‘Home of Mercy’, an Anglican charitable institution for prostitutes. The site was eventually sold in 1904, and subdivided, after which over the course of the first half of the twentieth century, most of the buildings and above-ground structures were progressively removed.

This CMP includes an overview of the history of the Cascades Female Factory (at Chapter 2) which addresses the context for the establishment of the site, and examines its physical development and expansion. Chapter 3 also contains historical information on the various site components. It was beyond the scope of this report, however, to include a comprehensive account of all aspects of the history of the site. This includes a history of the experience and treatment of the children historically accommodated at the site, and an overview of the site within the historical development of both Hobart and South Hobart. It is also apparent that many ‘histories’ of the Cascades Female Factory have been written in recent years; from different perspectives and for different purposes (such as the recent historical overview included in the June 2006 ‘National Heritage List Nomination’).

Given the apparent proliferation of such ‘histories’, it may be timely to take stock and consider preparation of a more complete and up-to-date history of the Cascades Female Factory. Such work could tap into recent family and genealogical research, as well as the results of archaeological investigations; it should also seek to place the site into the context of local development in South Hobart, and to expand on the history of later phases and uses of the Female Factory site. It would also be appropriate to return to the primary sources, some of which may not have been available for earlier studies, to review and confirm aspects of the history of the site as interpreted and documented to date.

1.3 Description

1.3.1 Location

The former Cascades Female Factory is located in Degraves Street, South Hobart. The overall former extent of the site is contained within a rectangular block bounded by Syme Street to the north, Degraves Street to the south, Degraves Lane to the east, and McRobies Road to the west. The broader context for the site includes surrounding residential development in South Hobart, the Hobart Rivulet to the south of the site, and the Cascades Brewery to the west of the site. Mount Wellington forms a steep backdrop to the site.

1.3.2 Original site components

The Cascades Female Factory comprised five conjoined, walled and rectangular yards constructed between 1828 and 1852. Buildings and structures within the yards included various forms of accommodation such as cell blocks, solitary cells, guards’ apartments and the matron’s cottage; and ancillary buildings and elements such as: a purpose built nursery, laundries, cook houses, medical quarters, latrines and assorted workshops. A chapel was also located within the complex. While the majority of these structures are no longer extant, in terms of above-ground fabric, they are still evidenced by below ground archaeological features, including foundations, footings and potential artefact deposits.

1.3.3 Cascades Female Factory CMP area

The Cascades Female Factory CMP area comprises three of the five yards which formerly made up the Female Factory complex: Yards 1, 3 and Yard 4. Yard 1 is public land and is a
proclaimed Historic Site (under the Tasmanian Nature Conservation Act 2002 and National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002). Its western boundary abuts a private property with an Apostolic place of worship, occupying the site of former Yard 2 and the east end of former Yard 5. The remainder of Yard 5 at the west end of the site was subdivided in the early twentieth century, and has been developed for private residential purposes. Yard 3 and Yard 4 South (including the Matron’s Residence) is owned by the Female Factory Historic Site (FFHS). Yard 3 includes the c1980 former fudge factory building which is partly used by FFHS and partly leased. Yard 4 North was recently purchased by the Tasmanian Government from a private owner and is now managed by the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service. A site plan (indicating site components and layout), is included at Figure 1. See also Section 0 below, ‘Site Ownership & Management’.

1.4 Key Reports & References

In preparing this CMP, a number of key documents and previous reports and studies were available for reference, and to a degree relied upon. This CMP draws on the research, analysis and in some cases, the recommendations of the previous studies. These (together with other references and sources) are listed in the ‘Bibliography’ at the end of this report, but are also identified below.

- Frost Lucy, Footsteps and Voices – A historical look into the Cascade Female Factory, Female Factory Historic Site, 2004.

The ‘Bibliography’ also identifies a number of reports by Kostoglou which have additionally been relied upon.

1.4.1 Recommended/required additional plans

The CMP is also intended to provide a reference point for, and be one of a suite of, related plans and documents which are yet to be prepared. These are as follows:

- Implementation Master Plan (to guide implementation of the recommendations, programs and actions identified in this CMP).
- Presentation Plan (based on the interpretation recommendations in this CMP, but to be expanded to include text and images for interpretation, and recommendations on methods, graphics, techniques, etc.), in preparation.
- Condition Assessment and Archaeological Zoning Plan (to be based on the recommendations in this CMP, and to address future management of archaeological excavations, exposed remains, future research, areas outside including the associated roads and road verges, priorities for investigations, etc), completed by ERM in October 2007.
• Tourism Plan/Strategy (to provide detailed strategic advice on tourism, marketing, promotion and dissemination of tourism-related information about the site, and direction on positioning the site for defined specific target markets).

• Business Plan (to address realistic visitation and operational goals).

In addition, more detailed plans may be prepared which relate to conservation policies and recommendations contained in this report, such as plans relating to collections, maintenance and capital works, landscape, emergency and risk management, etc.

Further, as outlined at Chapter 6 in 'Summary of recommended further work', a number of supplementary research and investigation tasks have been identified and recommended to be undertaken, which will result in future reports. These include:

• A more comprehensive and up-to-date history of the former Cascades Female Factory.

• Report/photographic record detailing the physical evidence on yard walls of previous buildings and structures (silhouettes of structures, fabric remnants, etc).

• Detailed physical/conservation analysis and investigation of the Matron’s Cottage, garden and outbuildings.

• Detailed physical/conservation analysis and investigation of roads and verges around the site.

• Contextual archaeology report, which includes an overview of the Cascades Female Factory in its regional and broader global contexts; and places the results of the archaeological investigations into a broader (material culture) context.

• Investigate and document the values attributed to the former Cascades Female Factory by Indigenous people.

• Undertake further investigation and documentation of the social significance of the Cascades Female.

• Management report relating to the movable heritage associated with the Cascades Female Factory site.

• Detailed condition assessment of all significant fabric.
Figure 1 Plan illustrating Cascades Female Factory and associated elements. Note that the historical boundary of the cemetery (6) has recently been reviewed, and may not be as extensive as indicated, being more constricted and closer to the boundary of McRobies Road and Syme Street. North is at top. The Home of Mercy site is not shown, but is located immediately east of Yard 4 (in vicinity of lots 32 and 1).
Figure 2  Elements of the former Cascades Female Factory, viewed from the north, with (from left to right) Yards 4, 3 (centre picture) and 1.

Figure 3  Elements of the former Cascades Female Factory, viewed from the north, with (from left to right) Yards 1, 2 (centre picture) and 5.
Figure 4  Entrance to Yard 1, Degraves Street (south elevation).
Figure 5  View of rears of former yards on Syme Street (north sides of properties) looking west (from left to right) Yards 4, 3 and 1 (walled yard in distance).
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1.4.2  **Associated elements outside the Cascades Female Factory CMP area**

Some facilities/components which were reputedly historically associated with the Cascades Female Factory are located outside the Cascades Female Factory CMP area, and outside the original factory boundary (see Figure 1). These are located in Degraves and Apsley streets and include: various possible former Female Factory employees’ cottages, the possible residence of the site Superintendent, the site of the associated cemetery to the north-west, and sites to the east of Yard 4. These elements are described in Chapter 3, and where appropriate, are otherwise referred to in this report, with some recommendations. Associations between the cottages and the Female Factory have also not necessarily been confirmed and are recommended to be subject to further research.\(^4\)

1.5  **Heritage listings & controls**

A summary of heritage listings for the Cascades Female Factory yards and associated places is included at Appendix B. Sites and site components are variously listed in the National Heritage List, the Tasmanian Heritage Register and the *City of Hobart Planning Scheme* 1982 (Heritage Schedules).

At **National level**, the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) provides protection for National and World Heritage places. For World Heritage places this protection extends beyond the property boundary and the buffer zone. Any action proposed to be taken inside or outside the boundaries of a National Heritage place or a declared World Heritage property that may have a significant impact on listed heritage values requires the approval of the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts. The EPBC Act requires that actions that have, will have or may have a significant impact on National or World Heritage values must be subject to a rigorous assessment and approval process. The Minister makes the final decision on whether or not to approve an action. Yards 1 and 3 and Yard 4 South are currently entered in the National Heritage List. The entry will need to be amended to include Yard 4 North.

At a **State level**, the *Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995* provides for the protection of heritage places through inclusion in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. All places entered in the Register are subject to Section 32 of the Act which states that: ‘A person must not carry out any works in relation to a registered place or a place within a heritage area which may affect the historic cultural heritage significance of the place unless the works are approved by the Heritage Council’. Yards 1, 2, 3 and 4 South are permanently entered in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. Some of the surrounding places which make up the Female Factory site (such as cottages at 17-21 Degraves Street and 3 Apsley Street) are also permanently entered in the Register. Other places including the remainder of Yard 4, Yard 5, the cemetery, the Home of Mercy at 32 Syme Street, Hope Cottage at 31 Apsley Street, Staff quarters at 3 Apsley Street, roads and road verges etc have been nominated to the Register and are currently being processed by Heritage Tasmania. Heritage Tasmania is also currently reviewing all old entries with the view to updating them. A draft entry for the site in its entirety (apart from 3 Apsley Street, refer below) will be considered by the Tasmanian Heritage Council at its meeting in February 2008.

At a **local level** the *City of Hobart Planning Scheme* 1982 (Heritage Schedules) allows for the protection of heritage places through the general planning scheme requirements.
Schedule F allows for the identification of specific buildings and sites (‘places’) of special significance within the Hobart municipality and provides a framework for control of development affecting such areas and places. In its consideration of applications for development the Council has regard to the definitions, conservation principles, processes and practices set down in the *Burra Charter*. Yards 1, 3 and 4 South, 17-21 Degraves Street and 3 Apsley Street are included in the South Hobart Precinct No. 26, through Schedule F (Heritage Area F11). It is anticipated that South Hobart Precinct No. 26 will be amended to include Yard 4 North.

The Schedule also allows for the recognition of Heritage Areas and a Council Heritage Register. The Council has the discretion to refuse or permit any proposed use or development within or adjacent to a place listed on the Council Heritage Register or within or adjacent to a Heritage Area. Yards 1, 3, the Matron’s Cottage in Yard 4 South (2-8 Degraves Street), and the properties at 17-21 Degraves Street and 3 Apsley Street are listed on the Council Heritage Register. There is some uncertainty about whether 3 Apsley Street is associated with the Cascades Female Factory; its current listing is only for architectural values and social associations. Further research is required.

1.6 Site Management

The Cascades Female Factory CMP area currently has two forms of management: the Female Factory Historic Site Limited (FFHS) a non-profit organization manages Yards 3 and 4 South; the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service (Southern Region), within the Department of Tourism Arts and Environment (DTAE), manages Yard 1 and Yard 4 North.

Yard 1

Yard 1 was acquired by the State Government in 1976, proclaimed as a reserve in 1976 (Women’s Prison Historic Site), and gazetted as the Female Factory Historic Site in 1981. The yard has been opened to the public since 1996, and is reserved under the *Nature Conservation Act 2002* and managed under the *National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002* with the Parks and Wildlife Service (officers of the Derwent Field Centre) the managing authority. The Parks and Wildlife Service has managed Yard 1 since its proclamation as a reserve, but prior to 1987 the management was not necessarily active in a heritage conservation sense, with the yard primarily used as a storage area. As the Historic Site is listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register it is also subject to the provisions of the *Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995* (Tas), and all works must be approved by the Tasmanian Heritage Council.

The Parks and Wildlife Service has a maintenance schedule for Yard 1, and any heritage concerns or required works are directed to the Historic Heritage Consultant within the Service. All major works are referred by the Historic Heritage Consultant to Heritage Tasmania and the Tasmanian Heritage Council for approval.

In 2001 a non-exclusive Licence Agreement was reached between the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and the FFHS, with regard to Yard 1. The licence allows the FFHS to: conduct guided tours of the site (Yard 1); to interpret the site appropriately during tours; and to organise, promote and hold ‘special events’ within the site.

Yards 3 and 4 South

FFHS owns Yard 3, which it acquired through Commonwealth Government funding in 1999. This yard contains a former fudge factory which now accommodates a small Visitor Centre.
and retail gift shop, FFHS administration offices and a leased commercial kitchen. The operation of: guided tours, the retail shop and leased kitchen space, provides limited income for the FFHS. FFHS also owns Yard 4 South, including the Matron’s Cottage (acquired in 2002). The lease over part of the factory in Yard 3 will continue until 2009. The FFHS Board will gift Yard 3 and Yard 4 South to the State by the end of 2009 or earlier. The Board of the FFHS meets on a monthly basis and is responsible for: short and long term corporate governance and management, policy development, planning, and interpretation of the site.

A ‘Conservation Covenant’ pursuant to section 37B of the Tasmanian National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 applies to Yard 3. Following representations to the Minister by FFHS, this was entered into in 2002 between the Government of Tasmania and the FFHS. The covenant has effect until the transfer of the land to the State. The purpose of the Conservation Covenant is to protect the conservation of the historic features of Yard 3, and to bind the landowner to manage the land according to a Conservation Management Plan and the terms and conditions of the Agreement. The portfolio Minister also has certain powers and obligations under the Agreement with regard to Yard 3.

Other elements

The remainder of the former Female Factory landholdings, including Yard 2 and Yard 5 and associated elements are in private hands. Yard 4 North has recently been purchased by the Tasmanian Government and will be managed by the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service.

Current staffing & expertise

Yard 1 and Yard 4 North:

- Derwent Field Centre staff, Parks and Wildlife Service (includes Senior Ranger)
- Historic Heritage Consultant, Parks and Wildlife Service

Yards 3 and 4 South:

- FFHS Project Manager (on-site, part-time)
- FFHS Historic Heritage Officer (not on-site, part time)
- Volunteers (on-site): who offer a range of skills including: data entry, retail, teaching, performing and creative arts, customer services, cooking, event management, tour guiding, research and book keeping, marketing and tourism.
- FFHS Board members: ten Directors, whose backgrounds include: law, National Trust CEO, chartered accountant, archaeologist, women’s affairs, history, research (historical/marketing), tourism and marketing.

1.7 Managing Heritage Significance

This report recognises that the former Cascades Female Factory site, incorporating the CMP study area, is a complex place in terms of the management of heritage values. The place overall has many ‘layers’; represented physically as well as in intangible ways, in terms of community perception and social value. The site is also located in the South Hobart context, an important physical and geographical setting. In this context the Cascades Female Factory was an evolving public institution for some 80 years, and had considerable physical presence and social and economic impact on its environs. This local importance continued to reverberate beyond the convict period.
The above-ground structures of significance within the Cascades Female Factory CMP area are generally limited in extent and intactness, being chiefly remnant walls from different periods of site development and expansion, and the altered Matron’s Cottage. However, these elements gain significance through being rare surviving fabric associated with a Female Factory of importance, in both international and national contexts. The presence of significant archaeological material and sub-surface remains (the ‘archaeological landscape’), contributes additional complexity to the management of significant fabric, including where such remains are found on adjoining private landholdings (which are understood to retain, to a greater or lesser degree, sub-surface remains).

The site is also of national significance as one of a group of convict-related institutional complexes in Tasmania and Australia. It is distinguished in this context through its exclusive association with female convicts. In terms of potential international significance, reflected in the Cascades Female Factory CMP area being proposed for nomination to the World Heritage List (see above), the Female Factory is also one of a small number of surviving or partly surviving sites associated with nineteenth century female convictism. Managing the most significant heritage values of the site (international and national), therefore, requires a focus on the convict period; most particularly, its history and fabric. This focus has implications for current and future site management (as discussed and outlined below at Section 1.8), including in relation to how the site will be used and presented in the future. It also has implications for a site which has evolved and changed physically over many years, reflecting later uses and changes in ownership, and acquiring later fabric. While heritage places are often valued for their demonstration of changes and accretions acquired over time (i.e. evolved sites), the international and national aspects of significance of the Cascades Female Factory derive directly from the convict period and use; hence the emphasis placed by this report upon this period and use.

The Cascades Female Factory CMP area has also, over time, acquired particular social and symbolic significance. The special history of the site has captured the attention and involvement of those with an interest in the history of women and children in the convict system, and in Colonial Australia. This interest increasingly encompasses genealogical research and the pursuit of family history, and a focus on the site for women’s historiography, including academic research. The social values associated with the place, while less tangible than the remnant fabric and physical attributes, also require management and conservation. This is addressed in Chapter 6 which includes recommendations relating to further research into, and documentation of, community attitudes and social significance. The chapter also covers community consultation, historic interpretation, community links, etc.

1.8 Future Management

The following table identifies a number of heritage actions and outcomes for the future management of the site, for the yards and associated elements, from ‘most preferred’ to ‘unacceptable’. It is of critical importance, in terms of conserving the identified heritage values of the place (social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values), that the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to all remaining significant (and original) fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, including fabric within and outside Yards 1, 3 and 4 South. The protection afforded through the State Historic Cultural Heritage Act...
1995, and inclusion of places and elements in the Tasmanian Heritage Register, would achieve this. Inclusion of the ‘Cascades Female Factory CMP area’ in the National Heritage List, and application of the EPBC Act to this area, would also achieve high level statutory protection to this area. Inscription in the World Heritage List would bring additional status to, and recognition of, the place.

The ‘most preferred’ actions and outcomes are those which support the following objectives:

- Introduce uniform statutory protection across the whole of the site to the conserve the identified heritage values, including protection of significant fabric and elements on public and private land, to ensure appropriate and consistent future conservation and management of this fabric.
- Assist owners and managers of significant fabric and elements to undertake appropriate management and conservation actions, where required, and future development which is sensitive and sympathetic to the heritage values of the site.
- Address future presentation of the site, with a focus on retaining and/or emphasising original yard plans/boundaries, providing for consistent and integrated landscape character across the whole site, and giving consideration to removal of non-significant elements to ensure the optimal presentation of significant fabric.

The policies and recommendations contained in Chapters 5 and 6 support these objectives.

It is also recognised that the ‘most preferred’ actions and outcomes have implications for the management of Yards 1, 3 and 4 with regard to resources and funding, housing existing on-site operations and visitor facilities, and generating income from the existing commercial operation.

The ‘acceptable’ outcomes will achieve the above objectives in part, and are generally more practicable for management in the short- to medium-term. The ‘unacceptable’ outcomes in some cases maintain the status quo, and also include inappropriate development of adjoining private land areas, meaning development which could result in negative visual and other impacts on the heritage values of the former Cascades Female Factory. Chapter 5 includes guidance and recommendations on development of the adjoining private landholdings, including Yard 2.

The table also assumes that Yard 1 will remain in public ownership.
INTRODUCTION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard/element</th>
<th>Most preferred outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable outcomes</th>
<th>Unacceptable outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yard 1</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain as public land and as a component of the Cascades Female Factory CMP area.</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong></td>
<td>Retain as public land and as a component of the Cascades Female Factory CMP area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A new building or structure constructed for wall stabilisation or interpretation purposes may be considered.</td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>If a new building or structure for wall stabilisation or interpretation of the Cascades Female Factory site is proposed, careful consideration should be given to the scale, massing, location and materials of the building, to ensure that the new works are sensitive and sympathetic to the heritage values and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain current character and presentation; remove visitor seating; no further openings or access points reinstated or introduced.</td>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Maintain current character and presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Yard 2      | <strong>Status/Protection</strong>   |                     |                      |
|             | Ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to all significant fabric associated with the former Cascades Female Factory, including sub-surface remains, through permanent inclusion of the site in Tasmanian Heritage Register. | <strong>Status/Protection</strong> | Ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to all significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, including sub-surface remains, through permanent inclusion of the site in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. |
|             | <strong>Development</strong>         |                     |                      |
|             | Maintain status quo and not include in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. | <strong>Development</strong> | Maintain status quo and not include in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. |
|             | <strong>Presentation</strong>        |                     |                      |
|             | Significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory is not managed or conserved in | <strong>Presentation</strong> | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard/element</th>
<th>Most preferred outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable outcomes</th>
<th>Unacceptable outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.</td>
<td>Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.</td>
<td>an appropriate manner. Future development has visual and other impacts on the significant heritage values of the Female Factory site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Encourage and assist current and future owners to:</td>
<td>Development Encourage and assist current and future owners to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• manage and conserve significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, as per the relevant statutory requirements; and</td>
<td>• manage and conserve significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, as per the relevant statutory requirements; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• if proposed, ensure future development has regard for impacts on the significant heritage values of the Female Factory site.</td>
<td>• if proposed, ensure future development has regard for impacts on the significant heritage values of the Female Factory site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The latter can be achieved through implementing statutory controls which address issues to do with the height and scale of new works, and the placement of new works in relation to the remnant perimeter walls. Constraints on future development should also apply to the existing church building which, due to its height and proximity has</td>
<td>The latter can be achieved through implementing statutory controls which address issues to do with the height and scale of new works, and the placement of new works in relation to the remnant perimeter walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard/element</td>
<td>Most preferred outcomes</td>
<td>Acceptable outcomes</td>
<td>Unacceptable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard 2</td>
<td>visual impacts on the Cascades Female Factory site, particularly on Yard 1. The most preferred development outcome for Yard 2 therefore, and if practical, would ameliorate these visual impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard 3</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convert to public land through ‘gifting’ to the State, and manage as an integrated component of the Cascades Female Factory. This would include removal of commercial leases/tenancies from factory building.</td>
<td>Convert to public land through ‘gifting’ to the State, and manage as an integrated component of the designated Cascades Female Factory. This may include retention of limited/restricted commercial leases/tenancies in factory building.</td>
<td>Not ‘gift’ to the State and maintain separate management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider future removal, replacement or modification of the factory building, as a means of enhancing the appearance and presentation of the yard, including the historic character of the yard.</td>
<td>Retain current factory building for Cascades Female Factory site use; this may include modification of the factory building but should not involve expansion of the building (footprint or scale).</td>
<td>Maintain or increase level of commercial leases/tenancies in factory building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If a replacement building is proposed to support Cascades Female Factory site management and use, careful consideration should be given to the scale, massing, location and materials of the building, to ensure that the new works are sensitive and sympathetic to the heritage values and</td>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove internal fencing between north and south components of yard. Review current landscaping and presentation of exposed archaeological excavations as part of</td>
<td>Retain current presentation of exposed archaeological excavations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard/element</td>
<td>Most preferred outcomes</td>
<td>Acceptable outcomes</td>
<td>Unacceptable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Presentation | presentation of the site. A new structure should not exceed the footprint of the current building.  

*Presentation*

Remove internal fencing between north and south components of yard. Review current landscaping and presentation of exposed archaeological excavations as part of Presentation Plan. | Presentation Plan. |  |
| Yard 4 South | **Status/Protection** Convert Yard 4 South to public land through ‘gifting’ to the State, and manage as an integrated component of the designated Cascades Female Factory.  

*Development*

No new built form to be introduced to yard.  

*Presentation*

Implement recommendations in this report regarding works to, and presentation of, the Matron’s Cottage.  

Review current landscaping and presentation of exposed archaeological excavations | **Status/Protection** Convert Yard 4 South to public land through ‘gifting’ to the State, and manage as an integrated component of the designated Cascades Female Factory.  

*Development*

No new built form to be introduced to yard.  

*Presentation*

Review current landscaping and presentation of exposed archaeological excavations as part of Presentation Plan. | **Status/Protection** Not ‘gift’ to the State and maintain separate management.  

*Presentation*

Retain current presentation of exposed archaeological excavations. |  |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard/element</th>
<th>Most preferred outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable outcomes</th>
<th>Unacceptable outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yard 4 North</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to all significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, including sub-surface remains, through permanent inclusion of the site in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Manage and conserve significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, as per the relevant statutory requirements; and&lt;br&gt;- If proposed, ensure future development has regard for impacts on the heritage values of the Female Factory site.</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to all significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, including sub-surface remains, through permanent inclusion of the site in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Manage and conserve significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, as per the relevant statutory requirements; and&lt;br&gt;- If proposed, ensure future development has regard for impacts on the heritage values of the Female Factory site.</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong>&lt;br&gt;Maintain status quo and not include in the Tasmanian Heritage Register.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;Significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory is not managed or conserved in an appropriate manner.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Future development has visual and other impacts on the significant heritage values of the Female Factory site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard/element</td>
<td>Most preferred outcomes</td>
<td>Acceptable outcomes</td>
<td>Unacceptable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The latter can be achieved through implementing statutory controls which address issues to do with the height and scale of new works, and the placement of new works in relation to the remnant perimeter walls.</td>
<td>The latter can be achieved through implementing statutory controls which address issues to do with the height and scale of new works, and the placement of new works in relation to the remnant perimeter walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard 5</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to all significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, including sub-surface remains, through permanent inclusion of the site in Tasmanian Heritage Register. Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.</td>
<td>Ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to all significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, including sub-surface remains, through permanent inclusion of the site in Tasmanian Heritage Register. Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.</td>
<td>Maintain status quo and not include in the Tasmanian Heritage Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider introducing local heritage controls for buildings (not just the archaeological remains) on the site of former Yard 5, in recognition of their historical role in the evolution of the former Female Factory site post-break up of the complex, and to assist with managing future development.</td>
<td>Consider introducing local heritage controls for buildings (not just the archaeological remains) on the site of former Yard 5, in recognition of their historical role in the evolution of the former Female Factory site post-break up of the complex, and to assist with managing future development.</td>
<td>Inappropriate development of land or allotments on former Yard 5, in terms of scale and visual impacts on the Female Factory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard/element</td>
<td>Most preferred outcomes</td>
<td>Acceptable outcomes</td>
<td>Unacceptable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Development** | Encourage and assist current and future owners to:  
  - manage and conserve any remnant original fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, as per the relevant statutory requirements; and  
  - if proposed, ensure future development has regard for impacts on the significant heritage values of the Female Factory site. | **Development** | Encourage and assist current and future owners to:  
  - manage and conserve significant fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory, as per the relevant statutory requirements; and  
  - if proposed, ensure future development has regard for impacts on the significant heritage values of the Female Factory site. |
<p>| <strong>Presentation</strong> | Ensure original extent of Yard 5 boundaries are marked or highlighted (made legible) through a form of streetscape landscaping, footpath marking, or modest signage. | <strong>Presentation</strong> | Ensure original extent of Yard 5 boundaries are marked or highlighted (made legible) through a form of streetscape landscaping, footpath marking, or modest signage. |
| <strong>Associated elements:</strong> former staff dwellings | <strong>Status/Protection</strong> | <strong>Status/Protection</strong> | <strong>Status/Protection</strong> |
| | Pending further research and confirmation of the nature of the historical associations with the Cascades Female Factory ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to these buildings through | Pending further research and confirmation of the nature of the historical associations with the Cascades Female Factory ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to these buildings through | Maintain status quo and not include in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard/element</th>
<th>Most preferred outcomes</th>
<th>Acceptable outcomes</th>
<th>Unacceptable outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permanent inclusion in Tasmanian Heritage Register (recognising some buildings are already included in the Register).</td>
<td>permanent inclusion in Tasmanian Heritage Register (recognising some buildings are already included in the Register).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Presentation</em></td>
<td><em>Presentation</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure all associated elements outside the extent of the five yards are marked or signposted (where appropriate), or otherwise interpreted so that their association with the Female Factory is understood.</td>
<td>Ensure all associated elements outside the extent of the five yards (former staff dwellings, cemetery, rivulet, etc) are clearly marked or signposted (where appropriate), or otherwise interpreted so that their association with the Female Factory is understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated elements: cemetery and Rivulet</td>
<td><em>Status/Protection</em></td>
<td><em>Status/Protection</em></td>
<td>Status/Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to these elements associated with the Cascades Female Factory, including sub-surface remains, through permanent inclusion of the site in Tasmanian Heritage Register. Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.</td>
<td>Ensure the highest level of statutory protection is afforded to these elements associated with the Cascades Female Factory, including sub-surface remains, through permanent inclusion of the site in Tasmanian Heritage Register. Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.</td>
<td>Maintain status quo and not include in the Tasmanian Heritage Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Presentation</em></td>
<td><em>Presentation</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure associated elements outside the</td>
<td>Ensure associated elements outside the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard/element</td>
<td>Most preferred outcomes</td>
<td>Acceptable outcomes</td>
<td>Unacceptable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extent of the five yards are marked or signposted (where appropriate), or otherwise interpreted so that their association with the Female Factory is understood.</td>
<td>extent of the five yards are marked or signposted (where appropriate), or otherwise interpreted so that their association with the Female Factory is understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtilage area including perimeter roads (see Chapter 5, Section 5.7.1)</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong> Where appropriate, ensure adequate heritage controls over significant fabric and structures within the broader curtilage area of the Cascades Female Factory, to manage the overall heritage character of the area, visual impacts on the Female Factory site, and future presentation of the site within this context. Also actively investigate opportunities for interpretation.</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong> Where appropriate, ensure adequate heritage controls over significant fabric and structures within the broader curtilage area of the Cascades Female Factory, to manage the overall heritage character of the area, visual impacts on the Female Factory site, and future presentation of the site within this context. Also actively investigate opportunities for interpretation.</td>
<td><strong>Status/Protection</strong> Maintain status quo and not achieve adequate heritage controls over significant fabric and structures within the broader curtilage area of the Cascades Female Factory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 Female Factory History

In addition to the historical overview provided below, Chapter 3 contains historical information relating to the various site components including their historical development and use; Chapter 4 also includes some additional historical information and analysis, provided in the context of comparisons with other female convict places.

Further work

As noted in Chapter 1, the historical overview included here is not a comprehensive account of all aspects of the history of the former Female Factory. Chapter 6 also provides recommendations for future historical research and investigation which may shed light on additional, or little understood, aspects of the history of the site including the historical South Hobart context in the period before and during the establishment of the Cascades Female Factory, and the uses and development of the former Female Factory history in the period after transportation ceased.

2.1 Introduction

The Cascades Female Factory located in South Hobart was one of 11 female factories that operated in Australia during the convict transportation era (see Table 1). As well as a site of punishment, it was a crucial administrative hub for processing and organising female convict labour. Recent reassessments of the contribution made by convicts to Australian economic and social life have highlighted both the importance of the role of female prisoners and the institutions and bureaucracies used to regulate their lives. While much of the Cascades Female Factory has not survived, the importance of the site is underscored by the number of convict women (and their children) who experienced confinement within the walls of this institution. In the order of a third of the 25,000 female convicts landed in Australia walked through the gates of the Cascades Female Factory at one time or another.

Female Factories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Factory</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Parramatta Female Factory, NSW</td>
<td>1804-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parramatta Female Factory, NSW</td>
<td>1821-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Female Factory, NSW</td>
<td>c.1818-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreton Bay Female Factory, NSW (QLD)</td>
<td>1829-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Macquarie Female Factory, NSW</td>
<td>c.1831-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst Female Factory, NSW</td>
<td>c.1832-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Hobart Female Factory, VDL</td>
<td>1822-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascades Female Factory, VDL</td>
<td>1828-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Town Female Factory, VDL</td>
<td>1824-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston Female Factory, VDL</td>
<td>1834-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Female Factory, VDL</td>
<td>1848-54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 List of female factories in Australia
2.2 South Hobart

Colonists were granted land in the South Hobart area as early as 1806. The availability of fresh water from the rivulets, coming down Mount Wellington, was an attraction, including for potential industrial purposes, as was the proximity to Hobart Town. The Rivulet would have supplied both water power and potable water.

By the mid-1820s, a variety of industries were established in the area, including timber and cereal mills, tanning and brewing. Quarrying of building stone was another local activity. The famous Cascade Brewery Company was founded in this period by Peter Degraves, and is Australia’s oldest continuously operating brewery. Degraves (1778-1852), was an engineer, shipbuilder and factory owner, who arrived in Hobart Town with his wife and eight children in 1824. He was granted 500 acres (202 ha) of land for himself and partner Major Hugh McIntosh at the Cascades in the same year, another 2000 acres (809 ha) on the face of Mount Wellington as far as the Organ Pipes in the following year. Degraves established a sawmill between Thomas Lowes’s distillery (the site of the future Female Factory) and the mountain. By the early 1830s, in addition to these operations, Degraves was also running a second sawmill, flour mill, and bakehouses in South Hobart. He diverted the waters of the rivulets to form dams and reservoirs to support his expanding industrial activities, although his appropriation of the local water supply was controversial, particularly when the volume decreased.

More generally, industrial activity in the area peaked around 1850 as water power began to be replaced by the first steam engines, but was still strong until around 1900. Agricultural activity also developed as more of the land became cleared and occupied, including market gardens, dairies, a hop field and orchards.

The transformation into a more residential suburb was supported through the introduction of improved roads and access to Hobart. One of the earliest tracks to the area followed the course of the Rivulet to the brewery at The Cascades (followed the course of present day Macquarie Street/ Cascade Road). Streets were later formed off the main thoroughfare, including streets on the hillside from about 1860.

The first residential subdivision of the area now known as South Hobart began in 1838, when the former landholding of Dr Thomas Birch (c.100 acres) was subdivided into approximately half acre allotments. These allotments were later subdivided again into the more dense residential development largely evident today. Birch (1774-1821) was a surgeon, merchant and shipowner, who arrived in Hobart Town in May 1808 as medical officer in the whaler Dubuc and remained as a settler. He was one of three surgeons in the town in this early period, but did not practice to any extent in the colony. Birch speculated in land and building, receiving grants or acquiring land in different areas of the colony.

Churches began to be established in the area from about the 1860s, including All Saints’ Anglican Church (1861) in Macquarie Street; St Peters Lutheran Church in Davey Street, which was originally a Wesleyan church dating from 1870; and the 1865 Baptist Church in Macquarie Street which was destroyed in the 1967 bushfires. Schooling was initially associated with the various churches, and was provided by philanthropic organisations before the Macquarie Street State School opened in 1895. South Hobart also had an ample supply of hotels and inns, principally on corner sites along Macquarie Street. The Globe Hotel on Davey Street was licensed in 1839 and the Cascade Hotel in 1847.
2.3 Women & Convict Transportation: An Overview

One of the key distinguishing features of British transportation policy in relation to both North America and Eastern Australia was the comparatively heavy use made of the labour of women. Women may have made up as much as 18 percent of all convicts transported to the American colonies in the eighteenth century, and 16 percent of those transported to New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land in the period 1788-1853. What is particularly striking about this is that women were almost totally absent from other British metropolitan transportation schemes. Of the 27,000 convicts sent to the British colonies of Bermuda, Gibraltar and Western Australia, none were female. While women were transported from the Indian sub-continent, the numbers who arrived in Mauritius, the Straits Settlements, Burma and the Andaman Islands were small — estimated at between five, and at the very most, ten percent. Indeed the number of female convicts transported to Mauritius was so small that no special arrangements were made for housing them. While there were some administrative efforts made in the Straits and Burma to separate female from male convicts (within rather than between jails), the Andaman Islands appear to have been the only place in the British Empire outside of Australia where a Female Factory was constructed. This building is no longer extant.

Transportation schemes operated by other European nations mirrored the British experience. Few women were transported by the Portuguese, Spanish and French. In part this reflects the nature of the work undertaken — largely fortification construction and military service. It is also a product, however, of the inhospitable nature of most penal destinations, which were usually considered unhealthy for Europeans. Convicts were sent to tropical areas precisely because they were expendable, but an important knock-on affect of this was that high death rates made it difficult to establish European settlements. The resultant lack of demand for skilled and semi-skilled domestic servants and agricultural workers meant that it made little sense to transport large numbers of women. While the French experimented with female transportation to both New Caledonia and Guyana in order to try and foster the development of a European colonial population, neither scheme was a success. Incentives were also provided to encourage the wives and children of convicts to rejoin husbands and fathers in the colonies where individual convicts were thought to be worthy of receiving such an indulgence. Horrific mortality rates (particularly in Guyana), and low birth rates ensured that these initiatives came to little.

As South Eastern Australia was characterized by a relatively benign disease environment and a climate that would support European crops, it was possible to use the labour of convicts to underpin settler colonisation. Indeed, it is significant that women were despatched to New South Wales on the First Fleet. Their presence demonstrates that it was always intended that the Botany Bay colonial venture would lead to a permanent outpost with a lower order population which reproduced itself. This distinguished the venture from later British schemes in which convicts were deployed purely for their labour power. Put simply, women were not transported to Western Australia and Bermuda since the aim there was to use convict labour to drive in infrastructure, not to assist in population development. By contrast the convicts transported to Eastern Australia were considered important for both production and population expansion.
2.4 Convict Women, Colonial Development & the Labour Market

Prior to 1819 the colony was organised along similar lines to colonial settlement schemes in the Atlantic world. Time-expired convicts were granted blocks of land of between 20 and 80 acres and encouraged to become small-scale producers. The aim was to establish a self-sufficient lower order that could contribute to the provisioning of the settlement and provide manpower to defend the colony if necessary. While many convicts were deployed on public works projects, others were assigned to private individuals. Most labour on small farms, however, was provided by family members and family formation was actively encouraged. Many female convicts found themselves in what Reid has called ‘de facto freedom’ within months of arrival. Given permission to marry, they were assigned to their husbands, effectively removing them from government control. According to the 1823 muster, 45 percent of all time-serving female convicts in Van Diemen’s Land were married. As a result, little government infrastructure was required for the management of female prisoners. Two rooms were set aside above the gaol at Parramatta in 1804 to serve as a factory for women who were awaiting assignment or undergoing punishment. No other facilities dedicated for the use of female convicts were established until about 1820.

The large-scale demobilisations that accompanied the end of the Napoleonic Wars led to an increase in convictions and a sharp rise in the number of convicts transported to Australia. The rising costs associated with administering New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land induced the British Parliament to commission John Thomas Bigge to write a series of reports on the state of the two colonies in the early 1820s (1822-23). Bigge was highly critical of small-scale farming. He thought that the future of the colony lay in fine wool production and recommended that in future land grants should be restricted to free immigrants with a minimum of £500 capital. Concerned about the mounting costs of Macquarie’s public works’ program, he hoped that an extension of the practice of assigning convicts would save the government £24/10/- a year for every convict placed in private service. He also argued that this would have other social benefits. He saw the key to a cheap system of convict discipline as lying in the distribution of the better behaved convicts to larger properties in the interior. There he thought they would be inculcated with the deferential values of the large estate. He recommended that assignment to those who held less than fifty acres should cease, and that facilities should be constructed for the punishment of the worst class of convicts undeserving of the ‘indulgence’ of assignment. In the case of female convicts this meant extending the system of factories.

As a result of Bigge’s report, settlement patterns in Eastern Australia changed. Generous grants of land and the promise of cheap convict labour helped to attract migrants with capital. European settlement broke out of the Cumberland Plain in New South Wales, and the Tamar and Derwent valleys in Van Diemen’s Land, as the amount of land devoted to agriculture and pastoralism increased. Many of the new settlers aspired to establish themselves as colonial landed elite, and most middle class households were organised along gendered lines. Work was considered to belong to the masculine sphere and was something not undertaken by women of status. Thus, in order to establish class credentials, it was necessary to hire at least one domestic servant. For much of the colonial period the only source of such labour was convict.

Imbalances between the sexes meant that other lower order women (those who were colonially born, time-expired or had arrived free) could readily acquire marriage partners if
they chose. Because their freedom of movement was restricted by a sentence, convict women could not necessarily exercise such freedom of choice. After the Bigge report, the number of convict women given permission to marry declined. Just 12 percent of serving convicts were assigned to their husbands by the time of the 1832 muster. While it had been relatively common for convict women to marry within months of arrival this practice abruptly stopped. Of those women who arrived before 1823, thirty percent had been married within a year, and fifty-five percent within three years. By contrast, just one percent of female convicts arriving after this period were married within a year, and less than ten percent after three years.¹⁹ The change reflected increasing bureaucratic intervention. From the mid-1820s marriage for convicts became a privilege that had to be earned. Successful applicants had to produce testimonials from the masters to whom they were assigned, and obtain the support of a clergyman before permission could be granted by the Superintendent of Convicts. While the process highlighted the increasing moral surveillance to which female convicts were subjected, it was clearly designed to direct a greater proportion of female convicts into the labour market.

As complaints from masters and mistresses about the poor quality of their convict servants abound, many historians have concluded that there was little demand for female convict labour. However, examination of Appropriation lists for Van Diemen’s Land demonstrates that this was not the case. It was common for over ninety percent of the women on board incoming transports to be assigned to settlers. Of those who were not assigned, the majority were suffering from bodily complaints or were pregnant or nursing young children. In most years the demand for female convict labour outstripped the supply. Analysis of female convict musters presents a similar picture. About three quarters of all eligible convict women were in assignment or had tickets-of-leave. Of those in the factory, the vast majority were undergoing punishment. Thus, in 1832, just 18 of the 284 women in houses of correction were in the ‘assignable class’.²¹

As per the system of classification, which related to the separate treatment of the convicts in different classes within gaols, the third class, or crime class, was at the bottom. Punishment for this class of convicts could include a meagre diet and clothes branded with a large yellow ‘C’ on petticoats and both sleeves of jackets. A convict could then, once out of punishment, rise up to the second or probation Class, with an improved diet and the yellow ‘C’ remaining only on the left sleeve of the jacket. The first class was the assignable class, where women could be sent to work for the settlers.²²

While earlier assessments of convict women assumed that they brought few skills to Australia this has been challenged by more recent revisions. The whole issue of ‘who the convicts were’ has been dominated by the writing of Georgian and Victorian commentators who were obsessed with what they saw as a decline in working class moral standards and a growth in crime. The notion that a significant proportion of illegal activity was committed by professional thieves who chose to live by crime and crime alone was commonplace. Such views were underpinned by the idea that the poor could be divided into the deserving (those who were impoverished through no fault of their own), and the undeserving (those who turned their backs on the habits of industry and chose a life of indolence). While the deserving poor were seen as suitable objects of charity, the undeserving were considered a threat to the moral fabric of society. It was widely assumed that the vast majority of those sentenced to transportation were drawn from the undeserving, and that significant numbers were professional criminals with no experience of legitimate work. Analysis of the occupational information contained in convict indents strongly suggests that this was not the
case. Nearly every prisoner landed in Australia confessed to some form of earlier employment — even if this was only labouring. As Nicholas pointed out, the cross section of skills recorded for male convicts reflect the composition of the British and Irish industrialising economy. Crosschecking against other variables also suggests that the information entered into the indent was broadly correct.\textsuperscript{23}

The situation for female convicts is slightly more complicated. While systematic occupational data for males was collected from 1814, this practice was not extended to women until after the publication of the Bigge report. A comparison of these returns with the 1851 Census for Great Britain suggests that the recorded skills of convict women do not match that of the population from which they were drawn. A far higher percentage of female convicts claimed experience in domestic service and fewer had experience in the textile industry than was the case in mid-nineteenth century Britain. The difference between the two populations may well be an artefact of the process through which occupational data was elicited from convicts. While the census was a snapshot of who was employed in which industry on a particular night, the Superintendent of the Prison Barracks was not necessarily interested in the last job that a convict had been employed in. The information in the indent was required in order to match convicts with colonial demand for particular skills. It was thus shaped by the questions (unfortunately unrecorded) directed at each prisoner. The large number of men (several thousand) who confessed to previous military experience strongly suggests that all men were routinely asked if they had served in the armed forces. It is possible that convict women were asked if they had any prior experience of domestic service. This would be logical since this was the area of work experience most in demand in the post-Bigge colonial female labour market. The high proportion of convict women who confessed to having been a domestic servant would fit such an interpretation. Many working class women worked as domestic servants in their teens and early twenties before moving on to other forms of work. Thus the experience of service would have been far more widespread than the number of women employed in the sector at any given point.\textsuperscript{24} It is thus possible that the process of interrogating recently-arrived convict women, led to the inflation of colonially useful former work experiences while those in other industries, notably textile manufacture, were undercounted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector of Employment</th>
<th>1851 Census %</th>
<th>Female convicts arriving in VDL 1820-39 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic offices and personal services</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, horticulture and forestry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional occupations and their subordinate services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, drink and tobacco</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal manufacture, machines implements, vehicles precious metals, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, printing, books, stationery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As well as aiding the process of allocating convict labour, the extraction of information from prisoners was designed to be intimidating. Male convicts were stripped to the waist and examined by 'a board of health' so that they could be minutely described. The process for female convicts appears to have been less invasive. The lack of distinguishing features recorded on the chest and back suggests that they remained fully clothed. Nevertheless, the experience must have been humiliating and demonstrated the power that the administration had over each convict.

Upon disembarkation, male convicts were marched to the Prison Barracks. There they were warehoused until they could be allocated either to the public works or to private assignment. Convicts who were retained to work for the government in Hobart and Sydney were usually housed in the barracks, and prisoners in transit between assignments or even colonies were also accommodated there, as were urban-based chain gangs. The barracks also contained offices for important officials and clerks who were employed in maintaining convict department records.

As the number of convict women shipped into Van Diemen’s Land increased, similar facilities were required to process them. A first storey wing of the Gaol in Hobart was initially set aside for this purpose. It contained a 13 by 10 ft room located across a landing from three cells measuring 8 by 7\(\frac{1}{2}\)ft. Two of the latter were designated as light cells, having an opening over the doorway to let in light, while the third was a true dark cell. This arrangement was considered unsatisfactory for a number of reasons, not least of which was that all prisoners, regardless of gender, shared the same yard, privies and washing facilities. This meant that the female prisoners were in constant contact with the Gaol gang who were housed on the first floor shackled in irons. Following an order by Macquarie in June 1821, a separate dedicated factory was established next to the Gaol on the corner of Murray and Macquarie Streets.

As demand for domestic service expanded in line with the growth in landed settlement, so the individual bargaining power of convict women, particularly those with skills, increased. As Reid points out, one of the reasons that masters and mistresses complained about the behaviour of female convicts was because, as a group of workers in demand, they were in a position to flex their industrial muscle. Others have argued that female domestic servants were at a disadvantage to other workers in that they were atomised in a way which made collective action difficult and were quartered in the house of their employer and were thus under constant supervision. Over 60 percent of women assigned in Van Diemen’s Land, for example, worked on properties where there were no other assigned female convicts. Nevertheless, all servants both free and unfree found themselves with more latitude for manoeuvre in Australia than they had experienced in the British Isles. Thus, while masters
and mistresses were quick to point out the trouble they had with their female convict
servants, they were equally disparaging about the quality of assisted migrants. Such
comments reflect middle class attitudes to working class women generally and the peculiar
circumstances of the colonial labour market that provided plebeian women, both bond and
free with considerable bargaining opportunities. 

Figure 6  ‘Female Factory from Proctor’s Quarry’, John Skinner Prout, c. 1844.
Source: State Library of Tasmania, Allport Library and Museum of Fine Arts.

Figure 7  ‘Female Factory, Cascades, Hobart Town’, Robert Proctor Beauchamp, c.1860s.
Source: State Library of Tasmania, WL Crowther Library.
Such arguments help to explain why, as the demand for domestic servants expanded, the number of female factories grew. As places of punishment they were required to try and curb bargaining power. Convict servants who overplayed their hand could be taken before the bench and sentenced to a period of ‘correction’ in the factory. The aim of the factory, as Surveyor-General John Oxley put it in 1810, was to teach women ‘habits of industry’. The master or mistress who ‘lost’ a convict to the factory had the right of a replacement. Accessing a bench, however, could be a costly procedure and delays in supplying substitute servants and the tedium of retraining all acted as disincentives. There was also no guarantee that a household who had been assigned a convict who could pleat or work with a needle or was a properly qualified cook, would be provided with a similarly skilled replacement.

In some circumstances the bargaining power of convict women could dramatically reduce and this was particularly the case with pregnancy. To retain an unmarried pregnant servant was to invite colonial gossip, and pregnant convicts were routinely returned to the Female Factory to give birth. They remained there with their child until the infant was weaned at which point the two were separated — the child being removed to a separate section of the Factory and then to the orphanage at the age of three and the mother subjected to punishment ahead of being reassigned. The whole process underscored the extent to which female factories were designed to operate in conjunction with the wider convict labour market.

Factories, however, were far more than mere places of punishment. They also provided accommodation for women between assignments and housed newly disembarked convicts awaiting allocation. This is one of the reasons why they were often located in close proximity to major urban centres and not in remote locations, as was invariably the case with penal stations. The typically urban location of factories also highlighted the extent to which the labour of convict women was deployed in towns. Many amongst the colonial elite owned urban properties which required the services of female servants, and many urban businesses employed female convicts as shop assistants, dressmakers and milliners.

2.5 The Development of the Cascades Female Factory

Reference is also made to the description of the historical development of the yards, contained in Chapter 3 at Section 3.5.

2.5.1 Yard 1 — 1828

The shortcomings of the Female Factory on the corner of Murray and Macquarie Street, Hobart, were widely recognised. A particular drawback was that water and firewood had to be shipped into the building on a daily basis. Indeed, by mid-1828, an average of 53 cart loads of water was shipped into the establishment every week. The decision to relocate the factory to the site of a former distillery at Cascades on the Hobart Rivulet was motivated by the need to secure local supplies of water and timber.

The distillery had originally been established in 1824 by Thomas Yardley Lowes as a result of a Government scheme to increase the local consumption of grain. The initiative came to naught, however, when a combination of drought (which forced up the price of grain), and the reduction of duty on foreign spirits, made the venture uneconomic. Lowes reputedly sold the complex to the government in 1827 for £2000. The design for the conversion of the Lowes distillery was heavily influenced by Elizabeth Fry, the English penal reformer. Fry used her connections with the Secretary of State for the Colonies to advocate the use of
architectural classification in buildings designed to house female convicts. As a result of Fry’s intervention several female factories were constructed in Australia along ‘classificatory’ principles, including those at Cascades and Launceston. A feature of these buildings is that they pre-empted many of the architectural principles of the probation system introduced in 1840 to aid the management of male prisoners. The design of the Cascades Female Factory was always compromised, however, by the structural limits of the existing building. While Bathurst had forwarded Fry’s plan for a new factory to be sited in Hobart Town as early as August 1823, there were insufficient resources to construct the spacious building with its enclosed children’s play ground, airing yards and garden. Instead the new factory was crammed inside the existing distillery wall, which was raised to the height of two storeys.

Plans were drawn up by the Colonial Architect John Lee Archer (1791-1852). Archer was appointed in December 1826 by the Secretary of State for the Colonies 'to fill the situation of Civil Engineer in Van Diemen's Land'. He arrived at Hobart Town in 1827, and served in the capacity of civil engineer and colonial architect for eleven years, in the first nine being responsible for all government buildings including those for penal and military purposes. Among the buildings he designed or was involved in are Parliament House; the Treasury and the Audit Department public offices in Hobart; the Ordnance Stores in Salamanca Place; several buildings at Anglesea Barracks; St John’s Church with the orphan schools and the parsonage at New Town; the nave of St George's Church at Battery Point; Old Trinity (the Penitentiary Chapel) in Hobart; St Luke’s Presbyterian Church at Bothwell; St Luke’s Church of England at Richmond; the gaol and gaoler’s house at Richmond; and parts of the gaol in Campbell Street, Hobart. In the engineering field, he also designed the stone bridge which carries the Midland Highway over the Macquarie River at Ross.

Archer’s plans provided for a range of buildings, each containing two floors, to be constructed along the south and east walls. A separate two-storied accommodation block (possibly a conversion of Lowes’ original house) was planned for the centre of the complex. A chapel was located on one end of it. The space between the central building and those abutting the exterior wall was divided into seven yards, each yard being enclosed by a high wall. These physical divisions were intended to be used to classify the internal institutional space and to separate women into different classes as Fry had outlined. There were separate yards along the southern face for a nursery and hospital. Access to the outside was via a gateway guarded by the Superintendent’s office and visitors rooms — spaces that controlled movements in and out of the institution. The living quarters for the Superintendent and his wife, the Matron, were located directly above the entrance. The First Class and Kitchen Yard were in the centre of the complex. Beyond them lay the Second and Crime Class yards. A block of solitary cells was situated in the north-west corner of the Crime Class Yard.

The building as actually constructed was even more cramped than Archer’s design. Rather than forming a central block surrounded by yards, the chapel and accommodation wing were joined onto the northern wall. Archer’s plans suggest that the original intention had been to limit the buildings along this side of the factory to a single storey, presumably to maximise the amount of sunlight that would have flooded into the yards. As built, however, these structures became substantial two storey buildings. Although the internal walls which separated each yard only extended to the first storey, the internal spaces must have been intensely gloomy. This was especially true of the Hospital and Nursery located at the southern end of the complex. Indeed, it has been noted that during the winter months the
sun did not shine on the Nursery Yard at all which remained a cold and perpetually damp place.\textsuperscript{42}

Each class of women in the factory was further distinguished by clothing. The third or crime class wore a large yellow ‘C’ on their petticoats and on both sleeves of their jackets. Those in the second or the probation class wore jackets with ‘C’ on the left sleeve while those in the assignable class wore unmarked standard institutional female slops. It was thus possible to easily distinguish between women of the various classes, and determine who was not in their designated space. It was impossible, however, to influence such control at night. In Fry’s design the chapel and rooms for matrons were located at the centre of the institution and the day and work rooms and cells arranged along galleried passages that extended on either side. This reflected the principles of Bentham’s ‘panoptican’, the idea being that the matron at a single glance could determine if any of the inmates were outside of their cells. While the Launceston Female Factory built in 1834 was established along these principles, there was never adequate space within the distillery complex at South Hobart to install separate sleeping cells for each inmate.\textsuperscript{43} Instead the women slept in four two-storied dormitories — one each for the three classes and an additional one for the cooks and other women who held positions within the institution. These rooms were bare, each was equipped with a night tub and hammocks, and the external windows clearly shown on Archer’s plan and probably part of the original Lowes building, were blocked to prevent escape.\textsuperscript{44}

Other than locked doors and lack of light, there was no means of controlling the women at night. As the Factory Superintendent later confessed, at times it was possible to hear the women singing and dancing.\textsuperscript{45}

2.5.2 Yard 2 (1832)

As soon as the distillery conversion was completed the limitations of the complex became all too apparent. Drainage problems were particularly acute and an extra £775 had to be spent levelling the yards. Despite this the building remained damp and moisture was said to ooze between the walls.\textsuperscript{46} It was also prone to flooding in wet weather. After a visit to the factory in January 1832 Arthur reported his dismay that the cracks in the unplastered walls were filled with insects and the blankets that the women were issued with were literally black with fleas. Part of the problem was caused by the amount of dirty laundry brought into the factory, which included the bedding from newly arrived convict transports. This made it hard to eradicate fresh infestations. Indeed several masters complained that they were sent female servants from the factory who arrived infected with lice.\textsuperscript{47} In an attempt to improve hygiene and lessen the pressures of overcrowding, a second Laundry Yard was constructed to the west of Yard 1 in 1832. This had the additional advantage of removing the existing washhouse from the Kitchen Yard, thus physically separating dirty linen from food preparation areas and the adjacent Nursery.

As the female convict population of Van Diemen’s Land more than doubled between 1828 and 1832 (from 725 to 1600), the new yard was also required to address the chronic problem of overcrowding. Its construction enabled an expansion in the Female Factory’s capacity to punish. Four new double solitary cells were constructed along the northern wall in which women could work in the front half during the day and be confined in the cell at the back at night. These supplemented the ill-ventilated solitary cells which had been built into the north-west corner of the old distillery building. A feature of Yard 2 was the washtubs located under a roof that ran down the side of a section of the west wall. The bulk of the interior of the yard was left open as an airing ground.
The enormous quantity of laundry processed by the factory is a reminder of the extent to which the Convict Department was maintained by its own charges. In this respect the work performed by women in the factory should be seen as part and parcel of the labour of other Public Works prisoners who slaughtered livestock, made casks, drove carts, manned brigs and other supply vessels, updated punishment books and maintained the physical infrastructure of incarceration. This work was not incidental, without it the Convict Department would have literally ground to a halt. All of these tasks expanded in scale as the number of convicts under sentence grew.

The increase in the amount of slop clothing and bedding that had to be provided was particularly costly. While these articles were chiefly supplied from the British Isles, the vagaries of shipping meant that there were frequent shortages. In order to combat this, a number of attempts were made to increase the local production of uniforms and other items required on a daily basis by the commissariat store. Convict shoes, for example, were increasingly manufactured in penal stations, rather than being shipped in on transport vessels. In February 1836 plans were drawn up to construct a fulling mill on the rivulet close to the factory (at the east end) in order to increase the local production of convict blankets. The mill appears to have been completed in the following year when it was included on a sketch map of the area. The same map indicates that a dam was constructed about half way between the brewery and the factory. The subsequent construction of the flood prevention trash-rack on the same site appears to have removed all trace of this. As a lithograph by J S Prout entitled ‘Cascade Valley 1844‘ in the possession of the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery depicts a millrace and water wheel, it seems that the mill complex was fully mechanised.48 There were certainly precedents for this. A mechanised fulling house had been constructed at Maria Island penal station.49 Indeed, the yarn required by the Maria Island operation was supplied from the female house of correction in Hobart. The annual output was valued at £2000 and was only closed when the Maria Island settlement was relocated to Port Arthur in 1832. The later attempts at establishing a weaving and fulling operation at the Cascades site had the effect of vertically integrating textile production, insuring that carding, spinning, fulling and weaving occurred on one site. It appears, however, that the looms were operated by male convicts at least some of the time.50

The mill at the Cascades Female Factory appears to have been less than successful. According to the returns of output for the months of January and February 1843, the total number of blankets manufactured was just 165 (although a further 610 were scoured for reuse). In this year there were 25,000 convicts on strength in Van Diemen’s Land, the vast majority of who were in Government service of some description or another. Clearly the factory output was insufficient to keep pace with the demands of the Convict Department. It is possible that one of the reasons for this was that while textile production was beneficial to the Government, it did not provide training in tasks that were in demand in the wider colonial economy. There was no colonial textile industry, and while the demand for female domestic servants remained high, there were always likely to be pressures to ensure that factory inmates were turned to tasks that increased their utility. While wool continued to be carded and spun in the factory, washing and needlework accounted for the bulk work undertaken. According to the 1843 returns, for example, the Female Factory ran-up 2500 pairs of trousers over the same two month period in which 165 blankets were manufactured.51
Seven percent of all laundry undertaken in 1852 and 45 percent of all needlework was for private individuals. While this provided income which could be offset against the running costs of the factory, it also represented an opportunity for women to undertake work that may have been more skilled than that required in the servicing of institutional needs. Female convicts often drew distinctions between those whom could or could not iron and those who could ‘get up fine linen’ or pleat etc. Indeed it is possible that the factory operated in a similar way to penal stations which employed their charges at different tasks ranging from unskilled punishment labour to highly skilled work. The aim behind this was to break refractory convicts by exposing them to hard physical labour and then, once they had learned to keep a still tongue in their head, re-skill them. In the factory low-skilled tasks were reserved for women in the Crime Class; especially picking wool, hair and oakum. The latter was a particularly unpleasant task that involved untwisting and pulling apart old hemp ropes and then rolling them into lengths so that they could be used to caulk vessels. Oakum picking was also a standard occupation in British gaols. As in Penal Stations, as women moved between classes the opportunity to take on more skilled work increased. In this respect an aim of punishment was to turn out compliant convicts who had been trained in tasks which, in the context of the wider colonial economy, were considered useful. Thus, both male and female convict establishments attempted to manufacture compliant workers as well as produce goods and services. In this respect the female house of correction acted as a factory in two senses — one of its crucial aims being to turn out what Foucault referred to as ‘docile bodies’ in addition to undertaking more conventional manufacturing and processing services.

2.5.3 Yard 3 (1842)

It is clear from plans of the Yard 2 extension that the original intention had been to install many more than the four double room punishment cells built along the northern wall of the Yard. The failure to introduce cellular accommodation had been identified as one of the shortcomings of the original design of Yard 1. Without such accommodation there was no means of preventing communication between the prisoners at night. In the aftermath of the damming Molesworth Select Parliamentary Committee Report into transportation in 1838, the procedures for processing male convicts were completely overhauled. One of the features of the introduction of the Probation System in 1840 was the greatly extended use of cellular confinement for managing male convicts. The approval of the construction of a new yard to the east of Yard 1 in 1842 enabled the principal of separate confinement to be extended to the Female Factory.

The new yard, which was not completed till 1845, consisted of two ranges of cellblocks each with room for 56 apartments (28 on each floor). In common with the four separate apartments that had been constructed ten years earlier, these were double-celled in that they consisted of two rooms. These may have been the only such cells constructed in Australia, and possibly also the only cells of this type constructed anywhere in the world for female convicts. They were described as ‘roomy’ and ‘well ventilated’. The wooden frame of the outer door contained a window that let in light. At night, however, the convict was confined in the dark of the inner cell. At least some of the outer doors were equipped with peepholes to permit surveillance and a conduct report was attached to each. A high wall was constructed between the two cell blocks dividing up the area reserved for exercise in order to minimise contact between the women.
Yard 3 was completed shortly after the Probation System was extended to cover female as well as male convicts. Under the new system convict women had to undergo a six month period of probationary moral and disciplinary instruction before they earned the right to become pass-holders and enter into a contract for employment with private individuals. From 1844 onwards, women undergoing probation were held on board the Anson, a converted hulk moored in the Derwent. Although Yard 3 may have been planned as separate probationary accommodation, it was used instead for solitary confinement. Its construction dramatically increased the capacity of the Female Factory to isolate and punish inmates.

As with other punishment institutions, the very existence of Yard 3 stands testimony to the ability of convicts to resist the Convict Department. The Cascades Female Factory had long been notorious as a site of disorder. A riot had broken out at the factory in February 1829, only a matter of weeks after the institution opened. During the subsequent disorder part of the accommodation block, in which some of the rioters had been confined, was set alight. While a variety of punishments were resorted to, including head shaving and solitary confinement, it proved difficult to break the connections between women who were free to converse with one another, particularly at night. After the Launceston Female Factory was opened in 1834 some women were transferred between the two institutions and others were further isolated through the expediency of assigning them to officers in penal stations. Nevertheless, the lack of discipline in the factory, and the hold that a group of women known as the 'Flash Mob' were thought to ‘perniciously’ exercise over other inmates, were the subject of press complaints.

Yard 3 was almost certainly intended as a solution to the anti-authoritarian influence of the 'Flash Mob' and other Female Factory inmates who were held to operate a lesbian counter-culture to the rule of the Superintendent. In this respect the development of Yard 3 mirrored the introduction of similar apartments in male convict barracks aimed at curbing homosexual practices.

Infant mortality rates and the removal of the nursery

One of the more controversial aspects of the Cascades Female Factory was the high death rate amongst inmates, especially children. The location of the factory had attracted criticism right from the start. While the building was known to be cold and damp in winter the atmosphere was often fetid in summer. Joshua Drabble, Superintendent of the Hobart Factory which Cascades had been designed to replace, had called for the new building to be constructed in an elevated and well-aired place, reflecting current medical knowledge. Many, including leading public health reformers, thought that sickness was spread by ‘pestiferous “miasmas”’. In other words, that bad air was the principal enemy — indeed bad air is a direct translation of malaria, a disease associated with swampy areas. Polluted water, sewage and industrial waste were all thought to be unhealthy because they admitted rank odours — in short if it smelt bad it was bad for you. The crucial point here is that it was the contaminated atmosphere that was held to be the transmitting agent.

Anti-contagionism, the theory that disease was spread by miasmas rather than personal contact, had an important effect on the physical layout of many Convict Department buildings, especially hospitals. The new penitentiary at Macquarie Harbour, for example, was constructed on the exposed western side of Sarah Island so that it would be regularly flushed out with fresh drafts of air. The only other building located on the exposed side of the island was the settlement hospital. The location of the Cascades Female Factory in a damp valley was thus controversial by the standards of the day. The high infant mortality rates
associated with the institution appeared to confirm the worst fears of the anti-contagionists. The atmosphere in the nursery was said to be particularly bad at night. The building was locked up from six in the evening until six in the following morning, and in the heat of summer nights the stench from bodily waste was said be 'very offensive and pernicious'.

It is difficult to calculate infant mortality rates for Cascades in the 1820s and early 1830s as there was no compulsory registration of vital statistics in Van Diemen’s Land before 1838. Prior to this only a proportion of infant deaths were reported to the coroner. In the same year as Civil Registration commenced, the True Colonist claimed that there had been a death rate of 208 out of the 794 infants born or admitted into the factory since 1830. This would amount to an infant mortality rate of 26 percent, but it is by no means clear how accurate these figures are. In the same year as the True Colonist report, the nursery was removed to temporary accommodation in Liverpool Street and then finally to Dynnyrne House in 1842.

This was a large stone building that had originally been constructed by Robert Lathrop Murray downstream from the factory and on the opposite side of the valley. Despite the higher elevation and greater access to sunlight, death rates among infants at Dynnyrne remained high; around 35 to 40 percent. As Kippen points out, this was two to three times the infant mortality rate in the general community. In 1850 the nursery was relocated to Cascades but removed two years later after continued high mortality rates only to be returned once more in 1854. Finally, after yet another inquiry it was relocated for good in 1855.

It is difficult to determine the factors that led to these high mortality rates. Rayner suggests that a principal cause of death at Dynnyrne House was that the drinking water was drawn from the rivulet downstream from the Cascades Female Factory — a noted problem with the factory was that in periods of heavy rain effluent was discharged into the nearby creek. Certainly a general feature of infant deaths in government institutions was the high number that were recorded to be caused by diarrhoeal disease — 41 percent as against 12 percent for infant mortality generally. As the Cascade Rivulet was one of the principal sources of water for Hobart Town, however, it is unclear why this should be a problem that would have peculiarly impacted on the Dynnyrne Nursery. Rather than the Cascades Factory being responsible for high death rates at Dynnyrne it is far more likely that the problem lay with the institutional character of both establishments. All institutions are prone to infant infection. Even in contemporary affluent societies diarrhoea rates amongst non-toilet trained infants in day-care centres can be comparable to rates in developing countries. The availability of water (even infected water) is usually thought to be beneficial if used to keep the environment clean. Cascades Female Factory had water in abundance. Whereas the damp conditions may have exacerbated infection rates and been responsible for other diseases, they are unlikely to have been the major cause of the diarrhoeal infection that accounted for so many deaths. Overcrowding, however, was almost certainly a factor. The usual source of diarrhoeal infection is other human beings. Cramped conditions and lack of clean nappies and washing facilities were all likely contributing factors. As the agents responsible for spreading common forms of diarrhoeal infection were not identified until the mid-nineteenth century, it is difficult to be overly critical of the Convict Department for not implementing effective measures to combat infection rates. Indeed all nineteenth century institutions convict or otherwise, suffered from similar problems. The infant mortality rate in the 1780s in the Lying-in Hospital in Dublin, for example, was 38 percent and, as Kippen points out, the hospitals and workhouses of industrialising Europe have been labelled ‘institutionalized infanticide machines’.
The early separation of convict mothers from their children almost certainly contributed to the institutional death rate. The clear intent was to separate mothers still under sentence from newly born children in order to satisfy the twin imperatives of returning women to the labour market and severing the parental link between mother and child. Since it was widely thought that poor parenting contributed to working class crime rates, enforced separation of mother and child was considered to result in a public good. Thus, children born to convict women out of wedlock were sent to the Orphan School where future contact between mother and child was discouraged.

As Anna Haebich and others have pointed out, there are clear parallels here with the use of institutions to break up indigenous family networks and inculcate Aboriginal children with European middle class values. Yet, it is important to note that, while both convict and Aboriginal children were exposed to a middle class morality, they were trained to perform service jobs. Thus it was argued that one of the benefits of sending young children to the Orphanage was that older inmates would acquire skills in minding infants.

Once their child was weaned, convict mothers underwent a period of six months ‘correction’ in the Crime Class before being returned to assignment. In effect, however, the punishment started long before this. It is clear that the general emphasis was to insure that institutional standards were consistent with those of a punishment station. Thus there was a reluctance to improve the quality of the rations provided to pregnant women and mothers, or to heat the rooms, or provide additional comforts — all measures likely to have improved mortality rates.

Figure 8 ‘The Reformatory, Cascades, Hobart’, undated.
Source: State Library of Victoria picture collection (Image No. a09416).
Figure 9  ‘Cells Division, Cascades Factory, Hobart’ (Yard 2, possibly north-west corner) undated.
Source: State Library of Victoria picture collection (Image No. a08483).

Figure 10  ‘Cells Division, Cascades Factory, Hobart’ (Yard 2, possibly north-west corner) undated.
Source: State Library of Victoria picture collection (Image No. a08482).
Figure 11  ‘The Cells, Reformatory, Cascades, Hobart’ undated. Note horse in centre picture, and demolition underway.
Source: State Library of Victoria picture collection (Image No. a09418).

Figure 12  ‘Solitary cells at the Cascades Factory, Hobart Town’ (Yard 2), dated 1926.
Source: State Library of Victoria picture collection (Image No. a08328).
2.5.4 Yard 4 (1850)

Due to the failure of the Dynnyrne experiment, the nursery was relocated back to Cascades in 1850. This time, however, it was sited within a purpose-built double storeyed building designed to accommodate 80 women and 150 children. The new nursery was constructed to the east of Yard 3 and was serviced by its own cookhouse, laundry, privy and washroom. Unlike most other buildings in the factory complex, it had large windows via which the building could be ventilated and sunlight let in. It was also unusual in that it possessed four fireplaces to keep it warm in winter. There was a separate mess room on the ground floor and quarters for weaned toddlers. Upstairs there were four dormitories each containing twenty berths for mothers and unweaned children. These were arranged in two double storeyed tiers.

The rules governing the new nursery had changed little from before. Each female convict confined with an illegitimate child was allowed to feed the child for the first three months after she had given birth. After that she had to take charge of an additional child every three months until nine months were up. At this point her own infant was considered weaned and she was removed to complete her punishment elsewhere in the factory. Her child was passed to the temporary care of another more recent arrival. Despite the new architectural arrangements the infant mortality rate failed to improve. This was almost certainly because the issues of crowded space, sub-standard diet and short weaning times had not been addressed. The nursery was removed from the factory for good in 1855.

Yard 4 also contained a separate enclosed area which housed the Matron’s Cottage and a self-contained room for messengers who were required to run errands into Hobart. A feature of the cottage was a bow window that opened onto the Nursery Yard allowing the Matron to keep an eye on her charges. This was symptomatic of the increasing surveillance that became a feature of later adaptations of the factory complex.

2.5.5 Yard 5 (1852)

Yard 5 was constructed in 1852, the year before the last transport vessel arrived in Van Diemen’s Land and transportation ceased (1853). Located to the west of Yard 2, it was never designed as a place of secondary punishment, but rather to house pass-holders awaiting employment. As such it was much more commodious than previous factory barracks and even possessed piped water. As well as skylights, the dormitory was lit by four dormer windows. The women slept in berths assembled on either side of a central aisle, each berth being separated by wooden battens. The room was heated by a fireplace and at one end there were quarters for staff who could survey the dormitory in a way similar to that envisaged by Fry in her 1820s design for a Female Factory. On the ground floor there was room for a mess hall sufficient to accommodate 400 women.

As Frost points out, however, improvements in the material condition of the women accommodated within the factory did not necessarily mean that they were better off. Along with improved hygiene and ventilation came an increase in surveillance and rigid imposition of the factory rules. This included the hiring of greater numbers of turnkeys who were assisted by ‘watchwomen’ drawn from amongst the convicts. It was their duty to patrol the dormitories at night to ensure that the convicts did not converse after the night bell had been rung. Although by the 1850s, night lighting had been introduced, this was merely to ensure that the dormitories could be adequately policed. This increase in surveillance experienced at the factory was similar to that which male convicts were subjected to in other locations, notably Port Arthur.
At the same time as Yard 5 was constructed the central accommodation block and internal walls were removed from Yard 1 opening up the space that had previously been divided into seven different areas. The drying frames were also removed from Yard 2 and relocated to a separate area outside of the factory. Both of these moves were intended to increase the surveillance of the inmates by removing internal obstacles. Stripped of its lines of washing, Yard 2 became a muster ground where the women could be ranked up on Sundays and ‘their clothing and personal cleanliness minutely inspected’. By this stage the factory had the capacity to subject 1000 women to its disciplinary regime.\textsuperscript{79}

2.5.6 Mary Hutchinson

Mary Hutchinson (nee Oakes) was matron of the Cascade Female Factory from 1832 to 1851. She was the daughter of the Superintendent at the Parramatta Female Factory in New South Wales, where she had spent time as a child. She also had experience as a Methodist Missionary on Tonga in the 1820s, and had lost six of her own children during infancy. At the Cascades Female Factory, she was the wife of the longest-serving Superintendent of the facility, and after her long stint at was appointed in charge of the Launceston Female Factory until 1854, when she retired.\textsuperscript{80} It has been noted that Hutchinson, as a ‘free’ woman, spent many more years inside the convict system than any woman sentenced by a British court.\textsuperscript{81}

2.6 Transfer to the Sheriff’s Department (1856)

After the end of transportation in 1853, the Cascades Female Factory was recycled as a welfare institution and over the next four decades a number of different institutionalised populations were transferred in and out of the various yards. The facility subsequently housed, under various organisations and forms of management, the mentally ill; aged and blind; paupers; boys under sentence; women giving birth to illegitimate children; and women deemed prostitutes. Many of these people had been through the Colonial convict system; others were affected by the ongoing human and societal impacts of the system. It has also been noted that the succession of institutions at the site represents the whole journey from the penal oppression of convict times to late philanthropy and social control.\textsuperscript{82}

In June 1856, the same year that Van Diemen’s Land was officially renamed Tasmania, the Female Factory ceased to be an Imperial Convict establishment and was handed over to the Colonial Sheriff’s Department to be used as a women’s gaol. The facility now allowed for the admission of ‘free’ women convicted locally or on remand, although many were in fact former factory inmates. Over the next few years the number of female convicts in the institution rapidly declined as the pass-holder system wound down.

From 1867 part of the establishment was turned over for use as an Invalid Depot. As the majority of the male and female pauper invalids who were confined within the walls of the old factory were time-served convicts, many resented the fact that they continued to be housed in a functioning penal institution. The physically able male paupers were employed in manual labour although their numbers were few. A few male paupers also instructed the children of female paupers and prisoners, who were still held within part of the facility. The women inmates repaired clothing and made bedding for themselves and the males did the washing.
Figure 13  The Chapel, Cascades Female Factory, undated (looking north). Note chickens in foreground.
Source: State Library of Victoria picture collection (Image No. a08481).
The nature of the institution became more complex again after 1869 when a Boys’ Reformatory Training School was also located there under the provision of the Training School Act. In the first year of operation, the Reformatory Training School operated out of Yard 3. The female paupers were transferred to the New Town Pauper Establishment in 1874.

In 1877, the same year as Port Arthur was finally closed, the female prisoners were transferred to the Campbell Street Gaol, Hobart. They were replaced by lunatics and paupers transferred from Port Arthur. Yard 1 became home to the male invalid depot and a Hospital for the Insane was established in Yard 4. The male lunatics remained at the Cascades for over another decade despite repeated medical opinion that the complex was unsuitable as an asylum. The male paupers were transferred to the New Town Pauper Establishment in 1879. In the same year the Reformatory School was moved to Hobart Gaol, although it returned to Cascades in 1884. It remained there until 1896 when it was also moved to the New Town Pauper Establishment.

The departure of the Reformatory School and the male paupers enabled the establishment of a Contagious Diseases Hospital in parts of Yards One and Two. Under the provisions of the Contagious Diseases Act 1879 any carrier of venereal disease who did not voluntarily report for treatment could be put in ‘The Lock’, as the Hospital became known. There they were forced to submit to medical examination. In practice the institution was used as a mechanism for controlling prostitution and medical treatment was combined with incarceration. The passing of the Contagious Diseases Act and the establishment of the Hospital followed a public outcry in Hobart over the infection of Royal Navy sailors with syphilis and the feared curtailment of future naval visits. The police had power to seek out and report suspected cases of women with contagious diseases to the Superintendent of
Police, who could then order a medical examination and the imprisonment and treatment of the woman for up to 12 weeks.\textsuperscript{85}

In 1890, the Hospital for the Insane was closed down. The Contagious Diseases Hospital was then moved from Yard 2 to Yard 4 and would remain until its closure in 1900. The male lunatics were sent to the hospital at New Norfolk and the Gaol (depending on their condition). From this point on the institution became known as the ‘Home of Mercy’, and was run by an Anglican charity. It was removed outside the walls of the former factory in 1895 to a house in Degraves Lane. Two years before the establishment of the Contagious Diseases Hospital, a Lying-in Hospital for single mothers was added to the mix of institutions located at the Cascades. It operated there until 1896.\textsuperscript{86}

The Home of Mercy was intended to care for ‘all fallen women’. Maud Montgomery, wife of the Bishop of Tasmania and the mother of Field Marshall Bernard Montgomery, was the main force behind establishment of the Home. The Anglican charity was also associated with the Lying-in Hospital at the Cascades, an offshoot of the Benevolent Society. Often, women who had been released from the Lying-in Hospital were sent to the Home for reform. Overcrowding of the Home led to establishment of Hope Cottage in 1896 to take some of the overflow of women.\textsuperscript{87}

By 1896, a large part of the complex was vacant. The Salvation Army had opened, in the previous year, a refuge for discharged male prisoners in Yard 5, which became known as the ‘Prison Gate Home’. The aim of the refuge was to prepare the men for civilian life, through putting them to work at tasks including gardening, making mats, and carpentry. Yet space at Cascades remained under-utilised and operations came under government scrutiny in 1897 as a result of a request for further space to accommodate a women's refuge. The decision was then made to sell the site. In 1904 the Home of Mercy and Salvation Army facility also moved to other premises as the State Government subdivided and prepared the 15-16 acre site for sale.\textsuperscript{88}

A time line documenting these changes is located at \url{http://www.femalefactory.com.au/timeline.htm}, and is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Colonial Government purchases site from Lowes Rum Distillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Cascades Female Factory opens in Yard 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Governor Arthur authorises construction of Yard 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Yard 2 opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Nursery moves from Yard 1 to house in Liverpool St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Governor Franklin approves plans for Yard 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Yard 3 opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Yard 4 opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Nursery returns to Cascades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Female convicts on probation transferred to Cascades from Anson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Nursery transferred from Cascades to New Town Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Yard 5 opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Transportation ceases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Nursery returns to Cascades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Nursery transferred from Cascades to Brickfields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Cascades Female Factory proclaimed a House of Correction (Gaol) for Females to be administered by local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Male and Female Invalids transferred to Cascades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Addition of a 'dead house' and a day room for males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Boys' Reformatory and Training School opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Female Invalids (and children) transferred to New Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Truganina is buried in front of the Chapel in Yard 1 of the Female Factory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Cascades Gaol closes, female prisoners (and children) transferred to Campbell St Gaol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Male Invalids and Imperial Lunatics from Port Arthur transferred to Cascades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Male Invalids transferred to New Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Contagious Diseases Hospital ('The Lock') opens in Yard 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Boys' Reformatory and Training School removed to Hobart Gaol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Boys' Reformatory and Training School reopens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Lying-in Hospital opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Imperial Lunatics transferred to New Norfolk Asylum or Gaol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Home of Mercy takes over running of the Contagious Diseases Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Contagious Diseases Hospital (Home of Mercy) relocates to Yard 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Contagious Diseases Hospital (Home of Mercy) relocates to outside Cascades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Salvation Army refuge for discharged male prisoners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7 Burial & Disinterment of Truganini

In May 1876 Truganini died at the house of her friend Mrs Dandridge in Macquarie Street, Hobart. She was sixty-four years old and her body was conveyed to Hobart Hospital. The Secretary of the Royal Society wrote to the Colonial Secretary asking for her body to be handed over, as Truganini had been the last ‘full blood’ Tasmanian Aboriginal. Following the undignified way in which William Lanney had been dissected in 1868, the Colonial Secretary refused the request and Truganini’s remains were laid to rest in front of the Chapel in Yard One of the former Female Factory. At some later point the grave was opened up and Truganini’s remains were disinterred, and her skeleton acquired by the Royal Society Museum in 1878. In 1888 it travelled to Melbourne, presumably for display as part of the Centennial International Exhibition held that year, and from 1904-47 it was on public display in the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery. Following disquiet in the local press, the skeleton was placed in museum storage in 1971 and three years later, after representation by the Tasmanian Aboriginal community, State Cabinet agreed that the remains should be cremated. This finally occurred in 1976 following a short legal battle with the Museum; Truganini’s ashes were scattered, as she had requested, in the D’Entrecasteaux Channel.89

Truganini is one of the most well known women in Tasmanian history, her life beginning in the most turbulent and violent period of early conflict between the European settlers and indigenous Tasmanians. She was born in about 1812, the daughter of Mangerner, Chief of the Recherche Bay people. In 1830-34, with her partner Woorraddy, Truganni accompanied George Robinson on his missions to Aboriginal tribes, serving as guides and interpreters, and as instructors in their languages and customs. In this way, they were recorded by Robinson in his journal, now considered to be the best ethnographic record available of traditional Tasmanian Aboriginal society.

This work also brought Truganini to the Aboriginal settlement on Flinders Island (Wybalenna) in 1835, where it was apparent that the resettlement program was preventing Aboriginal people from returning and living in Tasmania. The program on the Island also sought to ‘Christianize’ and ‘Europeanize’ the indigenous people. In 1839 she went to Port Phillip, returning in 1842 to Flinders Island; but disillusioned with this and yearning for her own country, she returned to Oyster Cove in 1847 where she was able to visit Bruny Island and other areas associated with her childhood. There she resumed some of her earlier life-style, diving for shellfish, visiting Bruny Island by catamaran, and hunting in the near-by bush. In 1874 she moved to Hobart with the family which had been appointed as her guardians, the Dandridge family.90

2.8 Demolition and subsequent history

Soon after the sale and subdivision of the former Female Factory, structures gradually began to be demolished although some were still being removed in following decades.91 Much of the material was salvaged for reuse, probably locally. Material from the various yards, including material associated with later development, is also believed to have been used as fill in the former yards.
In 1924, the buildings in Yard 1 were largely demolished, leaving only the external walls remaining. Tennis courts and club rooms were later introduced to the yard. In the early 1960s, a concrete besser block shed was built in the north-west corner of the yard, for a wine merchant. Other sheds were subsequently built and removed from the yard before it was purchased in 1976 by the State Government to be set aside as an historic site.

When the site was auctioned in 1905, Yard 2 was described as retaining cells at the rear, although these had been demolished by the 1930s and a paint factory was erected on the site in the mid 1940s. This was subsequently converted into a church during the 1980s, an entity which still occupies the site.

Yard 3 was subdivided into two allotments at the time of the auction. A succession of owners held title to one or both allotments until the 1940s, when a fruit processing firm bought the property to be used as a storage yard. The use as a storage depot was continued by a succession of owners into the 1980s, during which time the current factory building was constructed which was acquired for use as the fudge factory in 1994. In 1999, the yard and its plant were acquired by the Female Factory Historic Site Ltd using Commonwealth, (Cultural Heritage Projects Program) funding.

The Matron’s Cottage in Yard 4 avoided demolition as it could readily be converted into a private dwelling. A succession of owners occupied the cottage and undertook a variety of small businesses in Yard 4. In 2002 the southern most allotment containing the only intact building remaining from the Female Factory era, the Matron’s cottage and garden, was purchased by the Female Factory Historic Site Ltd through a grant from the State Government and substantial sponsorship from various sources.

A variety of owners gradually subdivided Yard 5 into domestic housing allotments throughout the first two decades of the twentieth century; these have remained to the present day.

2.9 Conclusion

The Cascades Female Factory was an important institutional complex which operated for 68 years. During that time convict women, infants and children, reformatory boys, male and female paupers, male lunatics, single mothers and working class patients diagnosed with sexually transmitted diseases were confined within its walls and sometimes subjected to invasive disciplinary and medical practices. The tone and tenor of the place was set, however, in the first 28 years (1828-56), when it was one of the most important institutions for processing female convicts within the British Empire, outside Britain. As an institution, the Cascades Female Factory stands testimony to the important role that convict women and their administrators played in the shaping of early colonial Australia. That historical experience was not replicated elsewhere, and it is one of the factors which make transportation to Australia internationally distinctive.

During its life as a convict institution the Cascades Female Factory acted as a distribution centre for female convict servants, managing their placement and return from private households. Between 1828 and 1844, the majority of female convicts arriving in Van Diemen’s Land passed through the Cascades Female Factory after disembarkation and prior to assignment. In the early 1840s, however, some convict women were assigned directly from their ship, were moved to Launceston directly from their ship for assignment, or were sent to Dynnyrne Nursery if they had unweaned children.  Many women who arrived before and after this date also experienced institutional life in the factory: either as a result of being sentenced to undergo punishment there, when in transit between assignments, as a
mother, or because they had been deployed there as convict labour. In this respect the Cascades Female Factory was much more than a place of punishment. Its closest male equivalent was the Prison Barracks, not a penal station. It is probably best described as a coercive institution set up to service the burgeoning demand for domestic servants. It also had subsidiary functions relating to government manufacturing and as a service depot for laundry.

While the design of the factory has attracted criticism from both contemporary observers and subsequent commentators, it was one of the first buildings constructed in convict Australia to embody the principles of classification. Indeed, although it was expanded to many times its original size, the basic architectural principles of John Lee Archer’s design were still evident in the 1850s. In terms of the architectural evolution of the factory, the most significant development was the increasing proportion of cellular accommodation and the growth in surveillance measures.

The decision to locate the factory within the recycled Lowes distillery was driven by factors other than mere cost cutting. While this site was certainly cold and damp, it was comparatively close to Hobart Town, the point where prisoners on incoming transports were disembarked and the single greatest market for female convict labour in Van Dieman’s Land. In order to operate as a laundry servicing depot for the Convict Department, it also needed to be sited within easy reach of a water and fuel supply. If the factory had been located on higher ground (as nineteenth century anti-contagionists advocated), it could not have fulfilled this function. As it was always envisaged as an industrial site, probably designed to function in conjunction with the weaving and fulling mill at Maria Island, a location on the Rivulet was a logical choice.

While lack of sunlight, cold and moisture probably contributed to the Cascades Female Factory’s high morbidity and mortality record, similar problems dogged other institutions which were more favourably situated. Rather than location, the principle killers (especially in relation to infants) were almost certainly overcrowding, lack of knowledge of disease pathogens, and disciplinary regimes which impacted upon maternal and infant nutrition.

Throughout its long life the factory functioned as a place where working class people (mostly, but not exclusively women and children) were subjected to disciplinary regimes. In this respect it was an important precursor of other institutions, including those employed to shape the lives of indigenous peoples. Its multi-purpose function serves as a reminder of the close relationship between prisons, workhouses, hospitals and reformatory schools. As with other sites of disciplinary control, its operation was underpinned by the use of paperwork. An important legacy of this is that it is possible to identify the thousands of individuals who walked through the factory gates over its long period of operation. Thus, although architecturally little remains, the place can be ‘reconstructed’ as an historical and social space.

In more recent times, largely beginning in the 1970s, the former Cascades Female Factory has assumed a contemporary role as the focus of research and investigation into colonial and convict women’s history. This interest has continued to grow and evolve, with an increasing awareness of the importance of the place and its history attracting Government support and funding for the purchase of parts of the site.
3.0 Physical survey, description and analysis

3.1 Introduction

The Cascades Female Factory is located in Degraves Street, South Hobart. The overall former extent of the site is contained within a rectangular block bounded by Syme Street to the north, Degraves Street to the south, Degraves Lane to the east and McRobies Road to the west. The principal address and streetscape interface of the site, as evidenced by the original main entrance to the first yard (Yard 1), is on Degraves Street. The Syme Street property boundary is a secondary streetscape.

After the end of convict transportation, and the subsequent institutional uses made of the site in the second half of the nineteenth century, the former Female Factory was increasingly neglected in terms of physical development. This neglect of the site, combined with the changing uses, led in 1904 to the substantial demolition of internal buildings and infrastructure and the sale of all five yards as separate properties at auction. A variety of private owners acquired the five yards and each then developed a separate history of its own. These distinct later uses and periods of occupation also brought, to a greater or lesser degree, continuing alterations to the original yard ground plans and periodic incidental demolition of all remaining convict-related structures and elements throughout the early to mid-twentieth century. Yards 2 and 5 were largely obliterated above the ground, with the removal of all internal buildings and external walls. In the remaining three yards the bulk of the perimeter walls survive, but the remaining internal buildings were lost to demolition, save for the Matron’s Cottage which remained in Yard 4.

Structure of Chapter

The chapter commences with a description of the setting and context for the site, and an overview of site components and associated elements. The archaeological resources are outlined at Section 3.5, followed by an analysis and assessment in Section 3.6 of the likely location, condition and extent of archaeological fabric that may survive in each of the former yard spaces. This latter section also includes conclusions about archaeological potential.

Section 3.3.3, which addresses Yard 4 South and includes a description and overview of the Matron’s Cottage, also provides comment on the heritage significance of the cottage. This is included in this section as part of the overall discussion and analysis of the cottage.

Site Components

The Cascades Female Factory currently comprises three of the five yards which formerly made up the Female Factory complex: Yards 1, 3 and Yard 4. Yard 1 is public land and is a proclaimed Historic Site (under the Tasmanian Nature Conservation Act 2002 and National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002). Its western boundary abuts a private property with an Apostolic place of worship, occupying the site of former Yard 2 and the east end of former Yard 5. The remainder of Yard 5 at the west end of the site was subdivided in the early twentieth century, and has been developed for private residential purposes. Yard 4 North has recently been purchased by the Tasmanian Government.
As outlined in Chapter 1 and detailed below, some reputedly associated buildings and elements are located outside the original Female Factory boundary. These include: various former Female Factory employees’ cottages, the possible residence of the site Superintendent, and the site of the associated cemetery to the north-west. Note that these associated elements and structures were not investigated or surveyed in any detail for this study and the nature of their association with, if any, the Female Factory remains to be confirmed through further research.  

A site plan (indicating site components, layout and associated elements) is included in Chapter 1 (Figure 1).

3.2 Setting & context

[See also discussion of setting and context in Chapter 5, Section 5.7]

The broader context for the site includes: surrounding residential development in South Hobart, the Hobart Rivulet to the south of the site which was associated with early industrial development in Hobart, and the Cascades Brewery to the west of the site. The area is part of the Hobart Rivulet catchment which drains the eastern slopes of Mount Wellington. The mountain in turn, forms a steep backdrop to the site located in the low-lying valley of the rivulet. Knocklofty Hill also forms a backdrop to the north of the site. These elevated backdrops contrast with the low scale of the site, and the cluster of Georgian cottages in Degraves Street. Development surrounding the block formed by the original five yards, and the rivulet, are part of the visual catchment of the site.
The perimeter walls to Yard 1 in particular, give the site considerable visual prominence in this valley context. Yard 1 clearly stands out when viewed from the surrounding elevated areas. The rectilinear plans/outlines of Yards 2, 3 and 4 are also evident, if not strongly defined by remnant stone walls. The plan of Yard 5 has largely been lost.

3.3 Extant Female Factory Yards & Structures

The tables referred to in the following overview (in Section 3.5) provide additional information and description of the yards, including the historical development and elements of the yards. Chapter 2 also provides an overview of the history of the yards.

3.3.1 Yard 1 (1824-28)

(See photographs in Appendix C, Figures 1-4)

The table at Section 3.5.2 below provides additional description of Yard 1. The yard is the oldest of the five yards, was associated with the original Lowes distillery, and has been open to the public for the longest period (since the mid-1990s) under Parks and Wildlife Service management.

It comprises the following:

- Perimeter walls on all (four) sides of the yard, built between 1824 and 1827. It is constructed of lime mortared ashlar/rubble sandstone with occasional brick or concrete block patching. The walls vary in height from 3.5 to 5.5 metres. The internal elevations were internal to buildings, rooms and courtyard spaces located within the yard. [See also Chapter 5, Section 5.3.5 for further description of the walls.]

- Entrance off Degraves Street (no gate). The concrete lintel dates from 1960s works.

- Infilled (brick) doorway opening to Syme Street.

- Infilled door and window openings in common wall to Yards 1 and 3.

- Apertures with bars *in situ* in the north wall (associated with solitary cells).

- Site of Truganini’s grave (1876-8).

- Yard surface includes extensive lawn areas and a concrete slab in the north-west corner which was associated with a post-WWII wine factory, demolished in the 1980s.

- Interpretive installation of three panels in concrete and metal; installed in the mid-1990s.

- Contemporary steel stairs, handrail and gate placed in south-east corner of yard, with doorway opening/pedestrian access to Yard 3, installed following archaeological investigation by FFHS. The opening is in the location of an original doorway/gateway.

- Contemporary visitor outdoor seating (concrete, timber and steels).

This yard also includes subsurface remains, and archaeological test excavations have been undertaken at several localities, revealing substantial sandstone footings consistent with the 1827 ground plan.
3.3.2 Yard 3 (1842-45)
(See photographs in Appendix C, Figures 5-7)

The table at Section 3.5.3 below provides additional description of Yard 3. The yard comprises the following:

- Perimeter walls constructed of lime mortared ashlar/rubble sandstone of which only the eastern and western walls survive to a general height of 4.5 metres. The walls have occasional brick or concrete block patching, although the east wall at its north end has a section reconstructed of concrete blockwork.

- Two exposed excavated areas (excavations undertaken in 1996 and 2001) with subsurface remains exposed (including footings), and timber retaining walls to openings. Coverings include a timber-framed, shingled and gabled roof shelter; and a steel-supported ‘Mylar’ fabric sail.

- Doorway opening, infilled with brick, on east perimeter wall. This was originally a connecting doorway between Yards 3 and 4 which was installed during the 1870s but subsequently bricked up on the west side when the yards were sold separately by the Crown in c.1904.

- Former fudge factory: large two-storey c. 1980s steel-framed, steel-clad building on a concrete base, currently partly used for leased commercial purposes including Hill Street Gourmet Food preparation and as a small office for Island Produce Tasmania, as well as for the FFHS organisation, administration offices, visitor centre for site tours and small retail shop.

- Yard surface includes asphalt and crushed stone/gravel toppings.

- Non-original fencing throughout, including to Degraves Street, includes cyclone wire and steel deck fencing, with timber gates to Degraves Street.

- ‘Garden of Reflection’ or memorial garden on the west of the yard, originally planted by the previous owners (who established the Island Produce Confectionery operation in the factory building). These owners acknowledged the history of the site, and opened the garden to visitors; this use has been continued and encouraged by the FFHS. The garden incorporates shrubberies, hedges, planter boxes, a fountain and pond, and outdoor seating.

- Doorway opening/pedestrian access to Yard 1, with sandstone step, located in south-west corner of yard.

- Car parking area, including on rear (north) of yard, accessed off Syme Street.

This yard also includes subsurface remains, which are believed to be additional to those revealed in the excavations identified above.

3.3.3 Yard 4 South including Matron’s Cottage (1850)
(See photographs in Appendix C, Figures 8-16)

The table at Section 3.5.4 below provides additional description of the yard, which comprises the following:

- Matron’s Cottage (1850 single-storey masonry cottage with additions, see below), associated outbuildings.
• Perimeter wall: remnant block sandstone wall up to three courses in height laid parallel to roadside verge of Degraves Lane.

• Doorway, with what is believed to be the original timber door, in west perimeter wall to yard. As noted above, this was originally a connecting doorway between Yards 3 and 4 which was installed during the 1870s but subsequently infilled when the yards were sold separately by the Crown in c.1904.

• Backfilled archaeological excavation on west of yard.

• Yard surface includes lawn and unpaved areas (sand); brick paving on north side of cottage in courtyard area.

• Timber paling fencing along boundary to Yard 4 North, Degraves Street and Degraves Lane.

• Plantings include contemporary and older shrubs and trees.

This yard also includes subsurface remains, which are believed to be additional to those revealed in the excavation identified above. A private easement is also located in this yard.

Matron’s Cottage & Outbuildings

(See photographs in Appendix C, Figures 8-16)

The 1850 Matron’s Cottage is located in the south-east corner of Yard 4 South. The building has a history of occupation as a residence and retains its domestic qualities and character. Although altered and extended, it also retains many of its original features as well as the overall form of the original 1850 component.

The following description provides an overview of the cottage, its current use and condition. It does not include a detailed physical analysis of the fabric, which is an action which should take place as part of ongoing conservation works.

Exterior

The cottage is a single-storey, double-fronted masonry building on a largely rectilinear plan, with hipped roofs over the two main building components, clad with corrugated steel, and verandahs on the west and east sides. The external walls are on a sandstone base and are a mix of face brick, cement rendered brick, over-painted brick, and also some limewash finishes. The south (side) wall of the building forms part of the south property boundary to Yard 4 (i.e. no setback to Degraves Street) and was originally a full height stone wall. Whether or not it still contains sandstone beneath the render is unclear, although it would appear likely. The west elevation was originally the principal façade, which faced into Yard 4. Windows are typically timber-framed, single pane double-hung sashes. One window on the south side is multi-paned and may reflect the design of windows to the original section of the building.

The original section of the cottage has four rooms accessed off a central east-west corridor, originally entered from the verandah on the west side. A generous bay window is located on the north side of the front ‘parlour’. As noted in Chapter 2, this window provided for views into the Nursery Yard area of Yard 4.

The west verandah is timber framed, with horizontal timber boarding to handrail height. The posts and roof framing are early if not original while the balustrade panels are a later addition. The roof over is a skillion, and clad with zincalume corrugated steel roofing; the
original lead overflashings have been removed. The verandah can be accessed from Yard 4, or externally from Degraves Street via a timber doorway at the south end set in an arched opening in the stone wall. This opening and doorway are shown at Figures 10 and 14 of Appendix C. This doorway is currently inoperable and protected by a clear acrylic screen. Until 2003 the doorway was infilled and rendered over; an action which possibly took place in the early 1900s when the building was sold and the new front added on the laneway side. The infilling has now been partially removed and the arch stonework has been stabilised.

The west façade originally had two entrances, both accessed off the verandah; one the front door of the cottage opening into a central corridor, and the other (to the south) to a single room (originally self-contained). This room (as noted in Chapter 2) is identified in the original plans as a ‘messengers’ room. The external (verandah) door opening to this room has been infilled and a new internal door installed in the room giving direct internal access off the central corridor. For the remainder of the west façade, the window to the south of the central doorway is in its original location and form; while the window to the north of the doorway has been altered to provide access to a bathroom of timber construction which has been inserted in the north end of the verandah. The bathroom has a small window on the west wall.

The north and south walls of the building originally extended to the east, creating an enclosed yard on the rear (east) of the cottage, abutting Degraves Lane. Two additional rooms, a verandah, a small central vestibule entered off the verandah, and a short north-south running passageway which provides access to a door on the north wall (originally a gate from the cottage yard to Yard 497), have been constructed within this rear yard space. As noted in earlier reports, these may have utilised the retained yard walls on the north, south and part east sides, although it may be that only the lower sandstone courses of the walls were retained as a plinth and footing for the new brick walls to these spaces.98 The remainder of the rear yard wall to the lane has either been removed to provide access to stone steps up to the verandah, or the remaining stone plinth courses retained to act as a retaining wall for an elevated garden bed in front of the verandah. The latter has timber posts and a solid timber boarded balustrade which is a later alteration. The concrete verandah floor is also a more recent replacement of an earlier floor.

These works reoriented the principal address of the building to Degraves Lane on the east side, and away from the original internal focus to Yard 4 on the west side. At this time the privy and other outbuildings were also demolished.99 It is assumed that these were replaced by a small freestanding water closet located in the north side garden.

Other works and additions include a small timber skillion addition to the north wall of the cottage, at the west end; infilling of the original east (rear) windows to rooms in the original cottage, and creation of new windows to these spaces in the north and south walls.

Interior

The interior of the cottage comprises six main rooms orientated around a central hallway and side corridor.

One enters the house from the east via a small entry hall which provides access to the central corridor, north side passage and two principal front rooms. This section of the building was constructed in the early twentieth century and is finished with strip hardwood floors, solid plaster walls, plain and moulded timber trims, and sheet or lath and plaster ceilings. While there have been later alterations, including replacement of some trims, the
spaces are predominantly intact as reflective of the period in which the addition was constructed.

The rooms have in recent times been refurbished and are currently presented, by way of colour scheme and some furnishings, as reflective of the later nineteenth century. They contain display material, including objects and documents, which provide information to the visitor about both the cottage and the site as a whole.

Moving to the west, the entry hall opens on to the central hallway into the original section of the cottage which comprised four rooms and a closet. On the south side of the corridor were the original kitchen and messengers’ room, and on the north side a bedroom and a parlour. The rooms, albeit older, are finished in a manner which is similar to the front of the house, including strip hardwood floors, solid plaster walls, simply moulded timber trims and ceilings covered in various sheet materials. The rooms have all been subject to various interventions including in some, the upgrading of mantelpieces and fireplaces, the replacement or removal of skirtings and trims and the replacement of ceilings. While evidence survives of most original treatments the overall presentation is a layered one in which a number of periods of occupation are reflected.

The rooms in this section of the cottage are variously used for research and resource purposes, or have been refurbished and furnished in a period manner to assist in interpreting the cottage as it might have been used and occupied by the original occupants.

Comment on significance

While Chapter 5 identifies the Matron’s Cottage as one of the key (‘core’) elements of heritage significance, the following comments are also included here.

The Matron’s Cottage evidences two distinct periods in the history of the Female Factory site: the late-convict and post-convict institutional period, and the post-Government disposal period. Of both periods it is understood that little has been documented regarding the manner in which the house was used.

In considering its historical significance, its association with the imperial convict establishment was relatively brief. Constructed in 1850 it is understood that it was purpose-designed for the matron responsible for the new nursery yard, Yard 4, also constructed at that date. The nursery operated until 1855 and in 1856 the establishment as a whole ceased to operate as an imperial establishment, changing to a colonial gaol. In its original design the house is of a quite conventional floor plan with, however, two less conventional design features which pertain expressly to its use. The first of these is the distinctive arched entry off Degraves Street and related messengers’ room, and the second is the matron’s parlour with its bay window looking into the nursery yard. Both features reflect the tailoring of the design to the specific location and function, and assist in conveying an understanding of the nature of the management and supervision of female convicts and their off-spring in this particular yard. While the role of the matron and her cottage in the larger complex is unclear, the house is distinguished from those of a similar or earlier age which survive on the south side of Degraves Street by its inclusion inside the complex.

Other than for the specific design features referred to, the cottage is comparable in basic form and materials to those of any number which survive in the Hobart and further afield and simply reflect the design practice of the time.
In the post-Government ownership period, significant alteration occurred, and the cottage was enlarged to accommodate its new owners. It is understood that limited investigation has occurred to date concerning the owners and occupiers associated with this later period. With regard to the physical changes which occurred, as with the original house they are typical and undistinguished in their design and execution. They are not changes which can be seen to inform in any unusual or distinctive way on the nature of the occupants and their lifestyle, or to provide any insight into their attitude to the past history of the place and its surrounds. Research into this aspect of the history of the cottage, however, may shed further light on the nature of changes to the cottage, including the ‘layers’ of fabric and change within the building.

The significance of this building derives from the fact that it is the only building within the five yard complex which survives from the pre-1856 imperial convict establishment period. It is a building which still contains within its plan form and fabric design, features which pertain to and illustrate the nature of management and supervision of the nursery yard in the late convict period.

What is not able to be assessed is any value which may relate to its use in the post-1856 to 1905 period of diverse institutional occupation and use of the complex, and in the substantial period of private ownership from 1905 to acquisition in 2002.

Garden & Outbuildings

The gardens and out-buildings comprise the front garden visible from Degraves Street and the north side garden, which contains a weatherboard laundry shed, a water closet and an asbestos-cement clad lean-too attached to the north wall of the house. The front garden comprises a single flower bed located between the front verandah and the retaining wall to the front boundary. While the garden bed is of no particular heritage significance by way of planting, the sandstone retaining wall appears in part to be formed from the base of the original wall which enclosed Yard 4. The stairs rising from the lane to the verandah also appear to contain re-used material from the wall.

On the north side of the house are the remains of an established garden with recently exposed brick paving in part, and the two weatherboard service buildings. The exact age of the buildings has not been investigated but it is surmised from their fabric, that they may well be contemporary with the extension of the original cottage in the early 1900s; the most likely scenario being that they replaced the demolished privy and outbuildings which originally sat along the eastern boundary wall.

Both buildings are simple stud-framed structures clad externally in feather edge weatherboards and unlined internally. The framing appears to be largely machine sawn. The condition of both is poor and extensive work is required, including stabilisation of the framing and replacement of much of the wall and roof cladding if they are to be retained.

On the north-west corner of the house is an asbestos cement-clad lean-too with a skillion roof. It has external access only, and appears to have been constructed in the inter-war period. It appears to be the last significant addition to the cottage and is in fair condition.

The area between the north wall of the cottage and the out-buildings is in part paved with brickwork laid in a simple geometric pattern of alternating header and stretcher courses. The paving has been recently exposed by the removal of a concrete paving slab and is in variable condition. Its age is uncertain although its appearance suggests that it may well date from the early 1900s.
Objects Collection

The collection currently known as the ‘Matron’s Cottage Collection’ and the ‘Archaeological Collection’ is referred to below at Section 3.7.

Arts Initiatives

The FFHS has supported a number of art programs relevant to the Female Factory. These include a major art piece based on the famous convict-made quilt, and the Rajah Quilt (1841), which has been installed in Yard 3.

3.3.4 Yard 2 (1832) (private land)

(See photographs in Appendix C, Figure 17)

The table at Section 3.5.5 provides additional description of this yard (note that this yard has not been surveyed for evidence of former Female Factory fabric or sub-surface remains):

- Apostolic Church/place of worship (originally constructed as a factory in the mid-twentieth century): a large masonry building extends across the yard (east-west), with two principal saw-tooth roofed components, and a substantially unarticulated parapeted façade to Degraves Street, with entrance. Highlight windows on the east elevation are visible over the shared perimeter wall to Yard 1.
- Sandstone wall footing runs the length of the driveway (related to the original Yard 2 external wall)
- Contemporary landscaping and plantings to south (Degraves Street) setback, and no front fencing.
- Driveways on east and west sides of the building, with vehicle crossovers to Degraves Street.
- Car parking and utilitarian yard space (gravelled surface) on north of site, with a medium-height timber paling fence to Syme Street.

3.3.5 Yard 5 (1852) (private land)

(See photographs in Appendix C, Figures 18-19)

The table at Section 3.5.6 below provides additional description of this yard (note that this yard has not been surveyed for evidence of former Female Factory fabric or sub-surface remains):
This former yard is occupied by private dwellings associated with residential subdivision and development typically dating from the early twentieth century.

A recent survey of Yard 5 has found that the eastern boundary of the yard extended into what is now the church property of Yard 2 (see Figure 16).

3.3.6 Yard 4 North (early 1850s)

(See photograph in Appendix C, Figure 20)

The table at Section 3.5.4 below provides additional description of this yard (note that this yard has not been surveyed for evidence of former Female Factory fabric or sub-surface remains):

- Perimeter wall: remnant original block sandstone wall up to three courses in height laid parallel to roadside verge of Degraves Lane.
- Private caravan and outbuildings/sheds variously constructed of timber, brick and steel; several are built against the sandstone perimeter wall to the adjoining Yard 3.
- Timber paling fencing along boundary to Yard 4 South and Degraves Lane.
- Car parking and yard.

This yard also includes subsurface remains which were partially exposed during excavations in Yard 4 South (see description at Section 3.5.4).
3.4 Associated Elements

Note that these elements were not investigated in detail as part of this study, including no internal investigation or survey.

3.4.1 3 Apsley Street, South Hobart

(See photographs at Appendix C, Figure 21)

This property (also known as ‘Heathville’) is believed to have been associated with the Cascades Female Factory, through being the residence of the Superintendent; although this has not been confirmed. The Superintendent of the Female Factory in c.1840 was the Reverend John Hutchinson. The house is located some distance to the east of the former Female Factory. The building is in the Colonial Georgian style: of single-storey form, masonry construction (over-painted brick), with a hipped steel-clad roof, prominent chimneys, and stone lintels and sills to the multi-paned timber-framed windows. The date of construction has not been confirmed; however a date of 1840 has been cited. The painter, Haughton Forrest, was also a resident.\textsuperscript{101}

3.4.2 31 Apsley Street, South Hobart

(See photographs at Appendix C, Figure 22)

This property (also known as ‘Hope Cottage’), is believed to have been associated with the Cascades Female Factory and first appears in plans dated 1859. It may therefore be related to the construction of Yards 4 and/or 5. It was named ‘Hope Cottage’ in 1896 when it became part of the Home of Mercy, which in turn had been established by the Church of England in 1890, as a rescue home for prostitutes, and operated out of Yard 4. Hope Cottage was also used to accommodate girls who were pregnant for the first time, as an adjunct to the Home of Mercy.\textsuperscript{102} The original/early component of the current building is a stone and brick cottage.\textsuperscript{103} It is still evident within the structure; marked by quoining to the side elevations, timber-framed, double-hung sash windows with stone lintels and sills, and original chimney. The building has been altered and extended and currently has a single-storey double-fronted presentation to the street, with rendered exterior, metal-framed corner windows, and hipped roof forms clad in steel.

3.4.3 17 Degraves Street, South Hobart

(See photographs at Appendix C, Figure 23)

This cottage is assumed to have been used as staff quarters by the Cascades Female Factory. A building at this location appears in J S Prout’s 1845 drawing of the Cascades area. The building is in the Colonial Georgian style and is of single-storey form, masonry construction, with face-brick walls with sandstone quoins, and a hipped steel-clad roof with a pair of prominent over-painted chimneys on the west chimney plane. The multi-paned timber-framed windows have stone lintels and sills. Two extensions to the east side of the building are evident on the north façade (Degraves Street), including a skillion-roofed brick addition and a flat-roof concrete block addition. Both the latter works also utilise sandstone quoining. The building is described as having a verandah supported on ‘rough timber posts’, although this has not been viewed.\textsuperscript{104} A timber shed/outbuilding is additionally believed to have been associated with the Cascades Female Factory’s use of the site. A sandstone drain from Yard 1 of the Female Factory is also reputed to run under the cottage.\textsuperscript{105} Neither the timber shed nor drain, were viewed as part of this study. The building sits very low to the
ground, including in respect of the adjacent Degraves Street footpath. It is possible that the footpath has been raised in this area of the street.

3.4.4 19 Degraves Street, South Hobart

(See photographs at Appendix C, Figure 24)

This cottage is assumed to have been used as staff quarters by the Cascades Female Factory, and the structure first appears in plans dated 1859. The building is in the Colonial Georgian style of single-storey form; masonry construction with two bays/building components (east and west) — each with a slate-clad hipped roof. The east bay appears to be the original/earlier bay. The walls are face-brick with sandstone quoins. Two of the three timber-framed windows on the north façade have stone lintels and sills, and a door is located centrally. The bay at the east end of the north façade has been altered with infill brickwork. A lantern light is located on the roof of the west bay. The east bay, as it presents to Degraves Street, is similar in overall building form to that of the adjacent building at 21 Degraves Street, including openings to the north façade, and roof form and pitch. A large external chimney is located at the rear.

3.4.5 21 Degraves Street, South Hobart

(See photographs at Appendix C, Figure 25)

This cottage is assumed to have been used as staff quarters by the Cascades Female Factory; although the structure first appears in plans dated 1892, long after the Female Factory ceased operating as a convict facility. The building is in the Colonial Georgian style and is of single-storey form, rendered masonry construction with a steel-clad hipped roof, pair of timber-framed, double-hung sash windows, and doorway opening (with step up) on the west side of the north façade. A skillion-roofed carport is attached to the west elevation; timber skillion-roofed additions are also attached to the rear of the building and carport.

The building, as it presents to Degraves Street, is similar in overall building form to the adjacent building at 19 Degraves Street, including openings to the north façade, and roof form and pitch. This may indicate a similar date of construction to that of 19 Degraves Street.

3.4.6 Home of Mercy site

(See photograph at Appendix C, Figure 26)

A structure, which is indicated on plans dating from 1859, was located to the east of Yard 4, at the east end of Degraves Street (on Degraves Lane); it is believed to have been associated with Yards 4 and/or 5. It was later occupied as a component of the Home of Mercy which operated out of Yard 4. The current steel factory building was constructed in c.1970.

3.4.7 Cemetery

(See photograph at Appendix C, Figure 28)

The table at Section 3.5.7, and the analysis of archaeological potential at Section 3.6.6 below, provide additional description of the former cemetery site. It is located to the north-west of the Cascades Female Factory. Recent research undertaken by Heritage Tasmania has revealed that the extent of the cemetery (the historical boundary) may not have been as large as previously thought. This research is based on an 1859 plan of the Female Factory.
which indicates it to be a quadrangle concentrated at the corner of McRobies Road and Syme Street, but not extending as far west as Nevins Road, nor as far north as Louden Street.  

Recent research has also revealed that a morgue was associated with the cemetery, believed to have been located on what is now Syme Street.

The cemetery is believed to have been in use in the period of the c.1820s to the 1870s, although it has also been noted that the cemetery may not have opened until the 1840s and that prior to this burials occurred at the Trinity Burial Ground (land now occupied by the Campbell Street State School). This requires further research for confirmation and clarification. Private residential development from the early twentieth century occupies most of the site today.

3.4.8 Hobart Rivulet

(See photographs in Appendix C, Figures 29-30)

The Hobart Rivulet was both geographically and functionally related to the former Female Factory. The rivulet was used as a drainage outlet by the Factory, and is also assumed to have provided water for domestic and/or industrial use within the Factory. A bridge was erected over the rivulet south of Yard 3, at or near the opening of the Factory in the late 1820s. This remained as the principal means of access to the site (and associated local development) until the site’s closure at the end of the nineteenth century. The bridge has subsequently been upgraded. The stonework, including stone retaining walls lining the rivulet in part, have not been investigated or documented for this report.

3.4.9 Blanket factory/mill site

A blanket factory/mill which, as noted in Chapter 2, was constructed in c.1836 and was associated with the Female Factory, was also located to the east of the Female Factory on the banks of the Rivulet. The site of the mill has not been investigated for this report.

3.4.10 Roads & road verges

Roads and road verges around the former Female Factory additionally have archaeological potential and archaeological remains. These are also referred to below at Section 3.6.7. No detailed assessment or survey of their archaeological potential has been undertaken.

3.4.11 Other

The sites of other associated elements, which are evident or referred to in historic records, such as the 1859 plan of the area, and include a quarry and reservoir, are not identified or discussed here. Further research is required in order to clarify the history, location, association with the Female Factory, and potential heritage significance of these elements.

3.5 Archaeological Resource

3.5.1 Introduction

The whole of the former Female Factory site - including built features, subsurface areas and remains, occupation and other archaeological deposits, artefacts and movable heritage objects - is considered to be a significant archaeological resource. This is complemented by
the potential archaeological resource of areas outside the perimeter walls, including the roads and road-side verges.

Archaeological excavations undertaken in Yards 1, 3 and 4 have revealed that a considerable sub-surface archaeological resource remains; for Yards 2 and 5 the extent of the archaeological resource is not at present fully known.

In Yard 1, test excavations at several localities have revealed substantial sandstone footings consistent with the 1827 ground plan designed by the noted architect, John Lee Archer. It has been suggested by archaeologist Kostoglou (2001, 2002) that these results indicate that the entire Archer ground plan within this yard survives intact at the footings level, beneath almost a metre of demolition rubble.

In Yard 3, several excavations undertaken by the same archaeologist (Kostoglou 2001, 2002) have produced similar results and indicate that the two solitary cell blocks survive in a similarly well preserved state at the footings level throughout the bulk of the yard-space. It is also possible that the c.1976 factory building erected in the centre of this yard may have been built on a sufficiently shallow cement slab as to have allowed the survival of fabric beneath this development.

An open area excavation undertaken by the same archaeologist in Yard 4 south (Kostoglou 2006) has produced similarly encouraging results with the exposure of the Sub Matrons cottage, covered walkway, Cookhouse and Nursery Dayroom at the footings level in near perfect condition. The archaeologist believes that this integrity extends northwards throughout the remainder of former Yard 4 despite its separate ownership and residential development throughout the twentieth century.

The following tables list and summarise the archaeological resource of the Cascades Female Factory, together with reference to historic standing/built structures.

Section 3.3 above provides information and description on the site's built form (yards and buildings).

[Please note that unless otherwise indicated, for the majority of the 'pocket' yard plans reproduced below in the right hand column, south is at left and north is at right.]
### Yard 1

[Note: unless otherwise indicated, the plan reproduced in the right column of the table below is an 1827 Ground Plan of the Female Factory at the Cascades.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 1 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Yard 1 entrance</td>
<td>Surviving extant fabric</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The entrance consisted of a 3.5 x 3 metre high centrally situated opening in southern aspect of perimeter wall. This opening was originally arched and gated when constructed in c1824, however in c1960s the gates and archway were removed and a concrete lintel inserted to create a higher clearance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Yard 1 perimeter wall</td>
<td>Surviving extant fabric</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 60 x 41.5 metre wide enclosure wall surrounding the distillery building was originally built in c1824 but subsequently enlarged in c1829 as part of the Yard 1 re-fit. Today, the wall varies in height from 3.5 to 5.5 metres between its eastern and southern aspects. Constituent fabric consists of lime mortared ashlar/rubble sandstone with occasional brick or concrete block patching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Original distillery building</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 x 15 metre long rectangular building erected in centre of Yard 1. This structure was reputedly the original distillery building erected by Thomas Lowes in c1824 but subsequently re-used as part of Yard 1 infrastructure until its demolition some time in the mid 19th century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Constables Apartment west</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 x 4 metre wide two storey apartment built immediately west of entrance overlooking Yard 1 interior. Still evidenced above the ground by render silhouettes on external wall and below ground by surface stone work (Kostoglou 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yard 1 Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram/photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 04  | Constables Apartment east  
7.5 x 4 metre wide two storeyed apartment built immediately east of entrance overlooking Yard 1 interior. Still evidenced above the ground by render silhouettes on external wall and below ground by surface stone work (Kostoglou 2002). | Surviving sub-surface footing | ![Diagram](image) |
| 05  | Nursery Yard internal perimeter walls  
A right angled pair of walls measuring 15 x 13 metres in dimension surrounded the south west corner of Yard 1 used as a 'Nursery Yard' confinement area during early to mid 19th century. This internal wall was subsequently demolished by the 1850s. | Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits | ![Diagram](image) |
| 06  | Hospital Yard internal perimeter walls  
A right angled pair of walls measuring 15 x 13 metres in dimension also surrounded the south west corner of Yard 1 used as a 'Hospital Yard' confinement area during early to mid 19th century. This internal wall was subsequently demolished by the 1850s. | Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits | ![Diagram](image) |
| 07  | Nursery room south  
A 'Nursery' room used for mothers and infants was situated in very south western corner of Yard 1. This 9 x 3.5 metre wide room had a fireplace at its northern end. By the 1870s this room had become Officers Quarters as part of the Invalids Depot. | Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits | ![Diagram](image) |
| 08  | Nursery room north  
A second 'Nursery' room was situated immediately north of/adjacent to feature 07. This 9 x 3.5 metre wide room had a fireplace at its southern end. By the 1870s this room had become the overseer’s suite as part of the Invalids Depot. | Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits | ![Diagram](image) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 1 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Hospital ward room</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘Hospital Ward’ room was situated in the very south eastern corner of Yard 1. By the 1870s this 3.5 x 2.5 metre wide room had been converted into Constables quarters as part of the Invalid Depot. Still evidenced above the ground by render silhouettes on external wall and below ground by surface stone work (Kostoglou 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dispensary room</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘Medicinal Dispensary’ room was situated immediately north of Feature 09 and both rooms shared a common doorway. This dispensary also boasted a single fireplace. By the 1870s this 3.5 x 2 metre wide room in association with its neighbour had been converted into Constables quarters as part of the Invalid Depot. Still evidenced below ground by surface stone work (Kostoglou 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sick ward room</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘Sick Ward’ room was situated immediately north of Feature 10. By the 1870s this 8.5 x 3.5 metre wide room also comprised part of the Constables quarters as part of the Invalid Depot. Still evidenced below ground by surface stone work. (Kostoglou 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kitchen Yard internal perimeter walls</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A wall measuring 13 metres in length enclosed the western central section of Yard 1 used as a ‘Kitchen Yard’ area during early to mid 19th century. This internal wall was subsequently demolished by the 1850s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘Kitchen’ room overlooked the southern end of the Kitchen Yard. It boasted a fireplace and nest of cooking pots at its northern end in addition to wash troughs and a bench at its southern end. This 7.5 x 3.5 metre wide room remained in use as a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yard 1 Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram/photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Cookhouse' until the final closure of the yard in the late 1890s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Washhouse</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 'Washhouse' was situated immediately north of Feature 13 within the Kitchen yard. In the 1870s, this 7.5 x 3.5 metre wide room was converted to Invalid accommodation as part of the Invalid Depot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>First Class yard internal perimeter walls</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A wall measuring 13 metres in length enclosed the eastern central section of Yard 1 used as an exercise Yard for First Class inmates during the early to mid 19th century. This internal wall was subsequently demolished by the 1850s. Still evidenced below ground by surface stone work (Kostoglou 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>First Class ward south</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘Ward’ room overlooked the southern end of the First Class Yard. It boasted a fireplace at its northern end. In the 1870s, this 7 x 3.5 metre wide room was converted to Invalid accommodation as part of the Invalid Depot. Still evidenced below ground by surface stone work (Kostoglou 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>First Class ward north</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A second ‘Ward’ room overlooked the northern end of the First Class Yard. It boasted a fireplace pots at its southern end. In the 1870s, this 7 x 3.5 metre wide room was converted to Invalid accommodation as part of the Invalid Depot. Still evidenced below ground by surface stone work (Kostoglou 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yard 1 Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram/photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Assignables class internal perimeter walls</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A wall measuring 13 metres in length enclosed the north eastern section of Yard 1 used as an exercise Yard for the Assignables Class inmates during the early to mid 19\textsuperscript{th} century. This internal wall was subsequently demolished by the 1850s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Assignables south Ward room</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘Ward’ room overlooked the southern end of the Assignables Class Yard. It boasted a fireplace at its northern end. In the 1870s, this 7 x 3.5 metre wide room was converted to a store room as part of the Invalid Depot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Assignables north Ward room</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A second ‘Ward’ room overlooked the northern end of the Assignables Class Yard. It boasted a fireplace at its southern end. In the 1870s, this 7 x 3.5 metre wide room was converted to a work shop as part of the Invalid Depot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Crime class south ward room</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘Ward’ room overlooked the southern end of the Crime Class Yard. It boasted a fireplace at its northern end. In the 1870s, this 7 x 3.5 metre wide room was converted to Invalids accommodation as part of the Invalid Depot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Crime class north ward room</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A second ‘Ward’ room overlooked the northern end of the Crime Class Yard. It boasted a fireplace at its southern end. In the 1870s, this 7 x 3.5 metre wide room was converted into Officers Quarters as part of the Invalid Depot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yard 1 Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram/photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>North west stairwell (north is at top of plan)</td>
<td>Potential surviving subsurface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Historic diagram/photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>In the 1870s as part of a re-fit for the Invalid Depot, a stairway was built into the existing 4 x 2 metre wide gap between the northern end of the north ward room (22) and the southern end of the north west solitary cell block (24). [The plan at right (and below for nos 24, 26 and 32) is for the Cascades Invalid Establishment c. 1870.][114]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 24  | North west solitary cells (north is at top of plan) | Potential surviving subsurface footing and deposits | ![Historic diagram/photograph](image) |
| 24  | An 8.5 metre squared solitary cell block containing twelve cells was erected in the very north western corner of Yard 1. By the 1870s these had been converted into water closets and an earth store. |

| 25  | Original chapel building | Potential surviving subsurface footing and deposits | ![Historic diagram/photograph](image) |
| 25  | A 10 x 7 metre wide chapel building is indicated on the 1820s design immediately north of the centrally situated distillery building (03). By the 1870s, this original chapel building in addition to the distillery building had been demolished. |

| 26  | Second chapel building (north is at top of plan) | Potential surviving subsurface footing and deposits | ![Historic diagram/photograph](image) |
| 26  | Between the early 1830s and c1870 a second chapel building and storehouse was erected between the original chapel and the Overseers accommodation wing situated alongside the north perimeter wall. It measured 11 x 10 metres in dimension. |

<p>| 27  | Overseers sleeping rooms wing | Potential surviving subsurface footing and deposits | <img src="image" alt="Historic diagram/photograph" /> |
| 27  | A pair of rooms each measuring approximately 17 x 4.5 metres in width were erected alongside the north wall of Yard 1 and used to house the overseers. By the 1870s the western room was being used as a store house while the eastern |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 1 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>room served to accommodate invalids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Yard privies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Four sets of privies were incorporated into the design of Yard 1 by Colonial Architect Archer. Each set contained three privies facing alternating directions/yards. In this way all six separate yard spaces were serviced by these amenities.</td>
<td>Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yard privies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yard privies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 Truganini's grave site (north is at top of plan)

The Aboriginal woman Truganini was interred immediately south of the second chapel building in 1876. Although she was subsequently disinterred two years later the grave may remain defined in some way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 3 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yard 3 perimeter wall</td>
<td>Extant walls with patching</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A 60 x 45 metre wide enclosure wall surrounding Yard 3 infrastructure was built when the yard was first laid out between c1842-1845. Today only the eastern and western walls survive to a general height of 4.5 metres. Constituent fabric consists of lime mortared ashlar/rubble sandstone with occasional brick or concrete block patching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Solitary apartments block west</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 50.5 x 5 metre wide solitary apartment block oriented north/south was erected parallel to apartment block east (35) when the yard was fist laid out between c1842-1845. It was a two storey structure containing 28 cells on each floor. It was subsequently demolished in 1885. Sub - surface remnants have been exposed in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.3 Yard 3

[Note: the plan reproduced in the right column of the table below is a plan for the Cascades Invalid Establishment c. 1870,115]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 3 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Solitary apartments block east</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 50.5 x 5 metre wide solitary apartment block oriented north/south was erected parallel to apartment block west (34) when the yard was first laid out between c1842-1845. It was a two storey structure containing 28 cells on each floor. It was subsequently demolished in 1885. Sub-surface remnants have been exposed in archaeological test excavations (Kostoglou 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Constables office/apartment west</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 10.5 x 4 metre wide two storey apartment building was built immediately west of the entrance overlooking the Yard 3 interior when the yard was first laid out between 1842-1845. By the 1870s this building was being used for various purposes by the Boys reformatory. This building was demolished some time prior to 1958. Sub-surface remnants have been exposed in archaeological test excavations (Searle 1997).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Office/apartment east</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 10.5 x 4 metre wide two storey apartment building was also built immediately east of the entrance overlooking the Yard 3 interior when the yard was first laid out between 1842-1845. By the 1870s this building was being used for invalid accommodation. This building was demolished some time prior to 1958. Sub-surface remnants have been exposed in archaeological test excavations (Searle 1997).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yard 3 Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram/photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 38  | Yard 3 underground storm water piping system  
'U' shaped configuration of parallel brick drains with connecting terra cotta pipes laid the length of Yard 3 during 1870s. Sub-surface remnants have been exposed in archaeological test excavations (Kostoglou 2002). | Surviving sub-surface archaeological feature | ![Historic diagram/photograph](image1) |
| 39  | Internal sleeper walls x 6  
Set of six parallel sandstone walls erected within internal courtyard separating two solitary apartment blocks in Yard 3. These were erected in 1877/78 as part of alterations to the complex. Sub-surface remnants have been exposed in archaeological test excavations (Kostoglou 2002). | Surviving sub-surface walls | ![Historic diagram/photograph](image2) |

3.5.4 **Yard 4**

[Note: the plan reproduced in the right column of the table below is a plan for the Cascades Invalid Establishment c. 1870.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 4 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 40  | Matrons cottage  
Extant brick cottage dating from original early 1850s construction of Yard 4. | Extant structure | ![Historic diagram/photograph](image3) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 4 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Perimeter wall remnant (Degraves Lane) Remnant block sandstone wall to three courses in height laid parallel to roadside verge of Degraves Lane. This fabric formerly comprised part of the eastern perimeter wall of Yard 4 erected during the early 1850s.</td>
<td>Surviving basal wall footing</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sub Matrons cottage A set of 11 x 10 metre wide cottage sandstone footings including a double fireplace and closet foundations were exposed during excavations in Yard 4 south (Kostoglou 2006). Surviving fabric consists of block sandstone external walls with cruder mortared sandstone rubble internal walls formerly supporting brick walls. This structure appears to have been erected as part of the original early 1850s yard plan.</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footings</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Covered walkway An 11 x 2 metre wide walkway situated between the Sub Matrons cottage and Cookhouse was exposed during test excavations in Yard 4 South (Kostoglou 2006). This feature linked a doorway to Yard 3 and the front yard of Yard 4. Remnant sandstock bricks indicate the walkway was paved while historic photos indicate that it was covered over.</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface archaeological surface</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Cookhouse/Wash house A set of 9 x 5 metre wide block sandstone footings comprising external walls to Cookhouse/Washhouse exposed during test excavations in Yard 4 south (Kostoglou 2006) This structure appears to have been erected as part of the early 1850s yard plan.</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Historic Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yard 4 Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram/photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 45  | Nursery apartments building  
A set of 43 x 6 metre wide block sandstone footings comprising the external walls of a two storeyed Nursery Apartments building were partially exposed during test excavations in Yard 4 south (Kostoglou 2006). Internal sandstone rubble walls were also evident at the southern end of structure. This building appears to have been erected as part of the early 1850s yard plan. By the 1870s it was serving as accommodation for the Insane. | Surviving sub-surface footing                                                                                                           | ![Diagram](image1.png)                                                                 |
| 46  | Internal security wall/gate  
A 4 x 1 metre wide block sandstone footing formerly supporting internal gates to Yard 4 inmates compound was exposed during test excavations in Yard 4 south (Kostoglou 2006). This gateway appears to have been erected as part of the original early 1850s yard plan. | Surviving sub-surface footing                                                                                                           | ![Diagram](image2.png)                                                                 |
| 47  | Storm water drains  
Assorted terra cotta and slate lined brick drain sections were exposed during excavations in Yard 4 South (Kostoglou 2006).                                                                                      | Surviving sub-surface drainage network                                                                                                 | ![Diagram](image3.png)                                                                 |
| 48  | NW toilets block  
A 15 x 2 metre wide toilet block appears marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory.                                                                                                          | Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits                                                                                 | ![Diagram](image4.png)                                                                 |
| 49  | Shelter shed  
A 16 x13 metre wide ‘Shelter’ shed with four equal internal partitions which was presumably lined with internal walls after its construction in the 1860s appears marked on the late 1870s block plan. | Potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits                                                                                 | ![Diagram](image5.png)                                                                 |
3.5.5  Yard 2

[Note: the plan reproduced in the right column of the table below is a plan for the Cascades Invalid Establishment c. 1870.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 2 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram or photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Boundary walls</td>
<td>Surviving</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Plan" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some sub-surface footings related to the Yard 2 external walls appear to be evident in the resident church garden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Solitary cells south</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Plan" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 24 x 3 metre wide cell block containing eighteen cells appears on the late 1870s block plan although it is absent from earlier drawings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yard 2 Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram or photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Cook house</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Historic diagram or photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 7 x 6 metre wide cookhouse boasting a double cooking fireplace was situated in south western corner of yard. This structure appears to date from the time of the yard’s original construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mess building</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Historic diagram or photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 37 x 8 metre wide building was erected beside western wall. This structure only appears on the late 1870s block plan upon which it is marked as the ‘Invalids Mess’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Yard</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Historic diagram or photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A large rectilinear yard space is indicated on the late 1870s block plan. However earlier plans indicate the location of a wood yard and ‘Condemned’ cells in this space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Solitary cells/dumb cell</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Historic diagram or photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original plans show a block of six solitary cells situated along the northern aspect of the west wall. However the late 1870s block plan shows these replaced by a single dumb cell and associated entrance way to the north solitary cell block.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Solitary cells north</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Historic diagram or photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A block of sixteen solitary cells were erected along the north wall of Yard 2 at the time of its original construction. Only fourteen appear in the subsequent late 1870s block plan, given the replacement of two cells by a Warden’s mess (60).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Warders mess</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Historic diagram or photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It appears that at least two of the pre-existing solitary cells in the very north eastern corner of the yard were subsequently replaced by a small mess building as indicated on the late 1870s block plan of the factory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yard 2 Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram or photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 10 x 8 metre hospital building was erected immediately south of cell block north some time after the establishment of the Yard. As indicated on the late 1870s block plan of the factory, this was used for invalid accommodation at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Store</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 6 x 3 metre store shed stood immediately east of the hospital building as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. This was presumably added along with the adjacent hospital after the Yard’s initial construction as it is not marked on original plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Water closets</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 7 x 2.5 metre wide set of water closets immediately east of the Store shed appears on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. These were presumably added after the Yard’s initial construction as they are not marked on original plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An 18 x 3 metre wide block abutting the eastern wall of Yard 2 as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. This was presumably added after the Yard’s initial construction as it is not marked on original plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Wash house</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 6 x 5 metre wide structure abutting the eastern wall of Yard 2 as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. This was presumably added after the Yard’s initial construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Historic diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Yard 2 Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 2 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram or photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Water tanks</td>
<td>Largely unknown but potential surviving sub-surface footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="HistoricDiagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A set of eight water tanks (sandstone) abutting the south eastern wall of Yard 2 as marked late 1870s block plan of the factory. These were presumably added after the Yard’s initial construction as they are not marked on original plans.

### Yard 5 Description

[Note: the plan reproduced in the right column of the table below is a plan for the Cascades Invalid Establishment c. 1870.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 5 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Cook house</td>
<td>Largely unknown, but potential surviving sub-surface basal wall footing and deposits</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="HistoricDiagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An 8 x 4 metre cookhouse boasting a double cooking fireplace stood in the very south eastern corner of Yard 5 as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory.

| 68  | Lavatory                                                                          | Largely unknown, but potential surviving sub-surface basal wall footing and deposits | ![HistoricDiagram](image)      |

A 3 metre squared lavatory building stood against the east wall immediately north of the Cook house as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory.

| 69  | Accommodation                                                                     | Largely unknown, but potential surviving sub-surface basal wall footing and deposits | ![HistoricDiagram](image)      |

A 37 x 8 metre wide accommodation block stood against the eastern wall of Yard 5 as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. An earlier plan implies that it contained four equally sized rooms (PWD 266/44).

| 70  | Ward/closets                                                                      | Largely unknown, but potential surviving sub-surface                             | ![HistoricDiagram](image)      |

An 11 x 8 metre wide building containing a ward and adjacent toilet closets/associated earth store stood in the north eastern corner of Yard 5 as marked on the late 1870s block.
physicaL survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yard 5 Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plan of the factory.</td>
<td>basal wall footing and deposits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Yard</td>
<td>The greater expanse of Yard 5 remained undeveloped as yard space as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Wash house</td>
<td>A 5 x 5 metre wide Wash house stood against the western wall of Yard 5 as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory.</td>
<td>Largely unknown, but potential surviving sub-surface basal wall footing and deposits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Verandah</td>
<td>A 27 x 2 metre wide veranda linked the Wash house to the very south western corner of Yard 5 as marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. It gave shelter to residents seeking to access a toilet block built immediately outside the west wall of the yard (77).</td>
<td>Largely unknown, but potential surviving sub-surface basal wall footing and deposits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.7 Associated Elements/External Features

[Note: unless otherwise noted, the plan reproduced in the right column of the table below is a plan for the Cascades Invalid Establishment c. 1870.119]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Associated Elements Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Cemetery site (north is at top of plan)</td>
<td>Assorted unmarked but in situ burials situated beneath later housing. Many damaged by housing and subsequent landscaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cascades Female Factory’s cemetery site was situated 150 metres to the north west in a quadrangular patch of ground at the intersection of McRobies Road and Syme Street. Its date of establishment is not known although it may have opened after the Factory’s opening in the late 1820s (requires further research). By the mid 1870s it was reported to be overcrowded and was closed shortly after. The cemetery was subsequently de-registered and re-developed for private...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Associated Elements Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 75 | **Degraves St. bridge and rivulet stone work**  
A bridge was erected over the Hobart Rivulet south of Yard 3 near the Factory’s opening in the late 1820s. It remained the principal means of access to the site until its closure in the 1890s. The bridge has subsequently been upgraded. | Remnant stone work comprising abutments | ![Bridge Image](image_url) |
| 76 | **Yard 5 outside closets (north is at top of plan)**  
A block of water closets situated immediately outside the south western external wall of Yard 5 is marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. These were presumably demolished by c1900. | Surviving sub-surface footing? | ![Closets Image](image_url) |
| 77 | **Yard 2 outside cesspool (north is at top of plan)**  
A ‘Cesspool’ situated immediately outside the north western external wall of Yard 2 is marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. This was presumably demolished by c1900. | Surviving sub-surface footing? | ![Cesspool Image](image_url) |
| 78 | **Yard 4 outside closets (north is at top of plan)**  
A block of water closets situated immediately outside the north western external wall of Yard 4 is marked on the late 1870s block plan of the factory. These were presumably demolished by c1900. | Surviving sub-surface footing? | ![Closets Image](image_url) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Associated Elements Description</th>
<th>Context condition</th>
<th>Historic diagram/photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Cottage (17 Degraves St)</td>
<td>Extant structure</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Historic diagram/photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A building at this location appears in J. S. Prout’s 1845 drawing of the Cascades area. It is assumed that this and neighbouring structures were used as staff quarters by the Female Factory facility. After that site’s closure, this cottage along with the others was auctioned by the Crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Shed (17 Degraves St)</td>
<td>Extant structure</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Historic diagram/photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A building at this location appears in J. S. Prout’s 1845 drawing of the Cascades area. It is assumed that this and neighbouring structures were used as staff quarters by the Female Factory facility. After that site’s closure, this property along with the others was auctioned by the Crown. Timber sheds in garden identified as out buildings for staff quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Cottage (19 Degraves St)</td>
<td>Extant structure</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Historic diagram/photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This structure first appears in plans dated 1859 and may therefore be related to the construction of Yards 4 and/or 5. It is assumed that this and neighbouring structures were used as staff quarters by the Female Factory facility. After that site’s closure, this property along with the others was auctioned by the Crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Cottage (21 Degraves St)</td>
<td>Extant structure</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Historic diagram/photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This structure first appears in plans dated 1892 and was auctioned along with the neighbouring cottages and Female Factory grounds in 1904. It is assumed that this and neighbouring structures were used as staff quarters by the Female Factory facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Associated Elements Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram/photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Hope cottage (31 Apsley St)</td>
<td>Extant structure</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This structure first appears in plans dated 1859 and may therefore be related to the construction of Yards 4 and/or 5. It was named ‘Hope Cottage’ in 1896 when it became part of the Home of Mercy which operated out of Yard 4. The building was offered for sale by the Crown in 1904 along with the other parts of the Female Factory property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Superintendents cottage (3 Apsley St)</td>
<td>Extant structure</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This house is rumoured to have housed the Superintendent of the Female Factory in c1840 and was described as such when it was offered for sale in 1990.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Home of Mercy site</td>
<td>Surviving sub-surface footing?</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This structure first appears in plans dated 1859 and may therefore be related to the construction of Yards 4 and/or 5. It was later occupied as part of the Home of Mercy which operated out of Yard 4. The building was offered for sale by the Crown in 1904 along with the other parts of the Female Factory property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This building survived until c.1970 when it was demolished and a new factory was built on the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Associated Elements Description</td>
<td>Context condition</td>
<td>Historic diagram/photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 86 | Yard 3 underground storm water piping system  
Sandstone/masonry lined storm water drainage network from Yard 1 and/or 2 discharging into Hobart Rivulet. A similar better documented system is recorded in Yard 3 and appears as feature 38. | Surviving sub-surface archaeologic al feature | ![Image](image.jpg) |

### 3.6 Analysis of Potential Archaeological Resource

This section summarises the potential extent of archaeological fabric (subsurface footings and deposits) which may survive in each of the former yard spaces and other areas referred to below. The assessment is based on limited test excavation work previously undertaken in Yards 1, 3 and 4 South; it is also based on the extent of known works and disturbance to the yards and spaces, including the presence of existing development. It is not based on a detailed archaeological assessment or survey. Some speculative assessment has also been provided for other relevant localities known to have hosted infrastructure related to the Female Factory.

Figure 30 illustrates the site components and their archaeological potential.

It is also noted that any archaeological fabric, material and artefacts directly associated with the Female Factory site, whether found in any area or space of high, medium or low archaeological potential; previously identified, documented and known; or identified in future work, are considered to be significant.

The level of archaeological potential is not a reflection of the level of significance of the yards and spaces referred to below.

#### 3.6.1 Yard 1

Test excavations in this yard have previously been undertaken by archaeologists Morrison (1987) and by Kostoglou (2001). Although Morrison’s report was inconclusive, it acknowledged the apparently impressive extent of fill situated within the yard at the location of the trench (see Figure 19). Kostoglou’s test excavations in two additional localities against the east wall were more revealing. At both locations excavation consistently revealed nearly a metre of assorted fill layers. Beneath this fill Kostoglou exposed sections of wall footings that related precisely to those specified in the 1824 Yard 1 construction plans drawn up by architect, John Lee Archer. This would potentially indicate that:

1. Given the relatively level nature of the ground within Yard 1, the level of fill throughout the yard could consistently be nearly a metre.
2. If this is so, then the intact and well-preserved footings noted by Kostoglou near the east wall could consistently survive in similar condition throughout the rest of the site.

3. Furthermore, the correlation of locations between re-discovered wall fabric and those specified on Archer’s plans suggests that his design was in fact employed at the site, thus guaranteeing a rich configuration of buried footings throughout the yard including the following:
   - All four wall-side ward complexes
   - Original centrally situated distillery building
   - Later chapel building
   - North-west solitary cell block

These speculations can appear more credible if one considers the amount of demolition material that would have been generated when all the resident buildings were destroyed in one singular demolition act. The resulting mass of demolition waste would have required removal if it was not instead merely compacted on site as fill, and a new working level established on top of this. Therefore, the archaeological potential of Yard 1 is deemed to be HIGH.

Figure 17  Detail view of Yard 1 test excavation and general view of Yard 1 looking north. Note depth of 750mm+ overburden/fill layers above historic footings at left.
Figure 18  Archer's 1820s design/plan for Yard 1 showing elaborate building floor plan, the footings of which are highly likely to remain in an excellent state of preservation. Test excavations by Kostoglou (2001) are highlighted in red (north is to right of picture).
Source: 1827 Ground Plan of the Female Factory at the Cascades.121

Figure 19  Plan indicating the location of the Yard 1 excavation (trench) undertaken by Morrison in 1987.
Source: Copy of plan provided by Heritage Tasmania.
Figure 20 Current views of the church building and the western driveway boundary of the church property. Note the in situ sandstone wall footing running the length of the driveway.

3.6.2 Yard 2

No archaeological excavation work has been undertaken within the former yard. However, the garden beds occupying the western side of the former yard appear to have remnant sandstone wall footings which may indicate that sub-surface archaeological vestiges of the Yard 2 perimeter wall survive. It is also possible that building footings within the yard, and other subsurface deposits, may survive in the northern half although the depth of construction for the current factory/church building may have obliterated these in the southern half of the site. Based on these considerations, the archaeological potential of Yard 2 is generally deemed to be MEDIUM, particularly for the area of the yard occupied by the church building, although further research may show that areas within the yard, outside the extent of the factory/church building, may be of higher archaeological potential.

Figure 21 Views showing depth of overburden/fill and resulting solitary apartment footings from test excavations in Yard 3.
Test excavations have previously been undertaken by archaeologists Searle (1996) and Kostoglou (2001). Searle’s excavation in the very south-western corner of Yard 3 revealed substantial bonded sandstone footings of the western Constables Apartment building that formerly flanked the main gateway. Kostoglou likewise found vestiges of the eastern apartment; however the bulk of his work in this yard focussed on the two solitary apartment blocks that occupied the bulk of the yard. Three variously located test excavations revealed that the sandstone footings to the western apartment block were situated precisely where original plans of the yard suggested they should be. These apartment footings remained in an excellent state of preservation along with various sub-surface walls and drains, buried beneath various layers of fill totalling nearly 500 mm in thickness. The locational diversity of these footings suggests that the survival of sub-surface structural remains beneath a relatively uniform fill layer throughout Yard 3 should be consistently excellent, although the degree to which the centrally situated factory building may or may not impact on the remains is not known. Historic plans for this yard which have now been ground-truthed through test excavation indicate that this yard should continue to contain the well-preserved remains of the following structures:

- Constables living apartment east
- Solitary cell block east (containing 28 solitary cells)
- Central courtyard sleeper walls
Based on these considerations, the archaeological potential of Yard 3 is therefore deemed to be HIGH.

3.6.4 Yard 4

Excavations have previously been undertaken by archaeologist Kostoglou (2006). Kostoglou’s excavation was confined to Yard 4 South although the results again appear to have applicability to the remainder of the yard including Yard 4 North which is in private hands. The excavation work undertaken in Yard 4 South revealed that the sandstone footings to all buildings in the south end of the yard (sub Matrons cottage, Cookhouse) were situated precisely where original plans suggested they should be. These footings also remained in an excellent state of preservation along with various sub-surface walls and drains buried beneath various layers of fill totalling between 200-700 mm in thickness. It is also assumed that this high degree of integrity will occur consistently throughout the remainder of the yard held in private hands. The total inventory of sub-surface remains (including footings and deposits) for this yard would therefore include:

- Sub Matrons cottage
- Cookhouse
- Nursery building
- Lavatory block
- North east building footings
- Assorted yard features

Based on these considerations, the archaeological potential of Yard 4, including Yard 4 North, is deemed to be HIGH, acknowledging also that excavations have confirmed the potential for Yard 4 South.

Figure 23 View of Yard 4 South excavation prior to backfilling. Note intact Cookhouse and Nursery footings striking north (top of picture) beneath property boundary.
Figure 24 1870s plan of Yard 4 showing major structures along west wall, although buildings along the east wall also appear in old photographs. Excavations by Kostoglou (2006) are shown highlighted in red (north is to right of picture).

Source: Plan for the Cascades Invalid Establishment.

3.6.5 Yard 5

The area formerly comprising Yard 5 is currently occupied by early twentieth century private housing allotments facing onto both Syme and Degraves streets. No archaeological excavation work has been undertaken in any of these allotments. However, anecdotal information suggests that much artefactual material has been removed from the sub-surface by the various occupants, although no information has as yet been forthcoming regarding any in situ structural material. Given the density of the resident housing and the abundance of old sandstone blocks on these properties it seems reasonable to assume that Yard 5 suffered the most heavily from demolition activities undertaken when the various yards were sold off in 1904. It may therefore be unlikely that little other than parts of the most basal footings continue to survive beneath the dwellings, however this is not known with any certainty and may be clarified in the future. At present, therefore, the archaeological potential of Yard 5 is deemed to be LOW, particularly for those areas occupied by buildings and structures, although this assessment may be reviewed.

3.6.6 Cemetery

The former Female Factory cemetery site is situated on a quadrangle-shaped piece of land concentrated at the corner of McRobies Road and Syme Street, and occupied by mid-twentieth century housing allotments and some later dwellings/residential development. Anecdotal evidence indicates that after closure of the cemetery in the 1870s, the site suffered two types of damage to its resident burials. These were:

1. Periodic flooding of the adjacent Hobart Rivulet prior to flood control works in the early twentieth century, which supposedly washed coffins and their contents downstream.
2. Construction of the mid-twentieth century houses which exposed and destroyed several burials.

Certainly the latter activity would suggest that no disinterment program was undertaken prior to the cemetery’s closure. Given that the cemetery was deemed to be full when it closed in 1876, many burials should still remain in situ beneath the back yards of the houses there. As such, the archaeological potential of this site is still deemed to be HIGH.

Figure 25 Northerly view showing housing allotments formerly comprising Female Factory cemetery site (bounded by red line).

3.6.7 Places & Sites outside Perimeter Walls

The Home of Mercy site has not been surveyed for archaeological remains or deposits. It is possible that building footings or other subsurface deposits survive outside the area occupied by the current factory, although the construction of the factory may have obliterated any remains in that area of the site. This site is considered to be of LOW archaeological potential in the area occupied by the factory building, although further assessment and information may require review of the potential.

The cottages in Degraves and Apsley streets, as identified above, have also not been surveyed for archaeological remains or deposits. While the properties have extant historic buildings, it may be that earlier structures (such as outbuildings or lean-tos) have been removed and/or the yard areas have subsurface deposits of archaeological interest. However, given the number of properties referred to, with their differing histories of use and change, no opinion is included here on their archaeological potential.

Some minor infrastructure related to the various Female Factory yards, which may also have been associated with the later use of the site, was situated beyond the perimeter walls, including cesspits, toilets and gardens. Some structural vestiges of these might possibly survive on the road-side verges. However, given their modesty of construction, the overall archaeological potential for these features/localities is deemed to be LOW.
3.7 Artefacts & Movable Cultural Heritage

As noted above, in addition to the archaeological remains associated with structural features, there are potentially artefacts and movable heritage objects associated with occupation and other archaeological deposits which may be uncovered or identified. The research potential of these objects is considerable, including their ability to provide insight into the material culture of the Female Factory inhabitants, and their living and working conditions and experiences.

Much of the ‘Matron’s Cottage Collection’, predominantly held in the cottage but also housed in the FFHS offices in Yard 3, is privately owned or owned by other institutions and is on loan to the FFHS. There are approximately 450 items in the collection, including: convict relics, furniture, decorative arts, documents and photographs, covering the late convict period through to the site’s closure in 1904. It is noted that not all items in this collection are provenanced to the Cascades Female Factory.

There are also currently over 2000 artefacts in the ‘Archaeological Collection’, derived from all stages of European occupation of the site although the majority of items come from the mid to late convict period. The items have been provenanced, tagged and stored in labelled bags and boxes, but have not as yet been catalogued. Many of the items have likewise been stored according to a fabric based system where similar fabric types are stored together in order to avoid chemical reaction.

The Female Factory Research Group additionally holds prints, archival material and records on site.
4.0  Assessment of significance

4.1  Introduction

As noted in Chapter 1 of this report, there have been several previous reports and studies of
the Cascades Female Factory, some of which have included detailed assessments and analyses of heritage significance. The most recent of these was the 'National Heritage List Nomination' prepared in June 2006.¹²⁵ The latter document included a comprehensive analysis of the heritage values of the place, including a detailed assessment against the National Heritage List Criteria.

This CMP does not propose to revisit the NHL assessment or to reproduce the assessment and analysis of the nomination in full. However, the comparative analysis has generally been relied upon and is partly reproduced below, with some additional information.

A statement of significance is also included at the conclusion of this chapter.

4.2  Brief comparative analysis

The following analysis reproduces and/or summarises that which was included in the
'National Heritage List Nomination' for the Cascades Female Factory.¹²⁶ Some information is also based on research published on the Cascades Female Factory website, and taken from other sources such as Australian Heritage Database citations.

Introduction

The Cascade Female Factory (1828-1856) is one of a number of convict female factory sites established in Australia. Other former female factory sites addressed below include those at Hobart (c.1821-c.1828), George Town (c.1822-c.1834), Launceston (1834-1855) and Ross (1847-1854) in Tasmania; at Port Macquarie (c.1821-c.1830) and Parramatta (1821-c.1848) in New South Wales; and at Moreton Bay, Brisbane (c.1824), and Eagle Farm (1836-1839) in Queensland. All these places have a strong connection with Australia’s convict history as centres of incarceration of women, and in most cases convict punishment and labour generally. Few of these places retain evidence of their association with female convict history.

Port Macquarie 1821 (NSW)

In the 1820s a number of penal settlements were established in remote locations of the then British colony of New South Wales for the secondary punishment of convicts. Port Macquarie was the first of these settlements in 1821, followed by Sarah Island, Macquarie Harbour, in 1821-1822. Port Macquarie, which ceased as a convict settlement in 1830, was also used for the incarceration of women.

A well from the former Gaol and Female Factory site (c.1825) has been identified as an archaeological site, and forms part of a group of archaeological features from the Port Macquarie convict establishment (including the Government House site).

Hobart Female Factory 1821 (Tas)

By 1820 the female convict population of Van Diemen’s Land was growing. A separate establishment for recalcitrant women convicts was proposed, as a means of preventing the women from consorting with male convicts. The Hobart Female Factory was constructed in 1821 adjoining the Hobart Gaol, on the corner of Murray and Macquarie Streets. Women convicts had, immediately before this period, been accommodated in the Gaol, in a first
storey wing. However, both buildings (the original Gaol and Factory) were poorly designed and constructed, and they allowed free communication between the male and female convicts, and also with the public on the adjoining streets. A survey of 1826 found that 109 women and children occupied four badly ventilated rooms. As a result it was decided to build the new Female Factory at the Cascades site in South Hobart; the relocation to Cascades also removed the convict women to a suitable distance from the town.

There is no known remnant fabric associated with the Hobart Female Factory, although no archaeological assessment has been undertaken to determine the potential of any remains.

**George Town Female Factory 1822 (Tas)**

A factory operated at George Town between c.1822 and c.1834, with a shed in the Lumber Yard serving as the original female factory. In about 1825 the Female Factory was moved to the former residence (parsonage) of the Reverend John Youl, the first chaplain in the north of Van Diemen’s land, after Youl had moved on to Launceston. A two-storey building housed the superintendent and his family, in addition to four small dormitories for the convict women, and a sick bay. Newspaper articles in 1832 and 1834 decried the very dilapidated state of the George Town building, and problems encountered which included: shortages of raw materials, machinery and food, unreliable supervision and, increasingly, overcrowding. In November 1834 a new factory was opened in Launceston and the women were moved there. In the mid-1830s, the house was refurbished and used as the Magistrate’s Residence and Policy Office, but it was vacated by the mid-1870s and finally demolished in 1889.

An archaeological investigation undertaken in 1996 revealed trenches from which the building’s foundations had been robbed for use in other buildings in the town.

**Launceston Female Factory 1834 (Tas)**

The Launceston Female House of Correction was designed by the Government Architect John Lee Archer (responsible for the Cascades Female Factory development) in 1832, and it opened in November 1834. At this time the George Town Female Factory was closed, and the women were moved to the new facility. The Launceston Female Factory was erected on the block now bounded by Paterson, Bathurst, Brisbane and Margaret streets in Launceston. It was originally designed to house 80-100 women, but overcrowding soon became a problem with more than 250 women housed in the factory in 1842.

There is no known remnant fabric associated with the Launceston Female Factory.

**Parramatta Female Factory 1804 (NSW)**

The first Female Factory at Parramatta was established in 1804, in two rooms above the existing Gaol. It was located near the eastern boundary of the precinct between the Governor's Domain and the then township of Parramatta, and became known as 'The Factory above the Gaol’. The Gaol was subsequently demolished and today the site is within Prince Alfred Park. The second Female Factory was established by Governor Macquarie on the Parramatta River to house women convicts. It was a three-storey structure completed in 1821 to house 300 women, which was subsequently enlarged.
In 1847 the facility was closed down by granting the remaining women convicts either discharge or tickets of leave, with the exception of those who were considered invalids and
lunatics. The Convict, Lunatic and Invalid Establishment was subsequently installed in 1848 in the Female Factory buildings. The site was also adjacent to a Roman Catholic Orphan School, and Girls Industrial School.128

Today the site is located in a group of nineteenth century sandstone buildings on the Parramatta River which form the earliest part of the expansive former Parramatta or Cumberland Hospital. While some of the early structures are no longer extant, stone yard walls survive from the 1819-20 compound, together with the five-sided boundary wall of the c.1840 prison compound, and various lengths of walling dating from the second half of the nineteenth century during the period in which the asylum complex was extended.

**Moreton Bay Female Factory 1824 (Qld)**

Moreton Bay Female Factory was established in September 1824 as a place of secondary punishment for convicts at Port Jackson and associated settlements; females were present at the site from at least 1825. The Female Factory appears on an 1839 plan by George Barney however the site is today occupied by the Brisbane General Post Office.

There is no known remnant fabric associated with the Moreton Bay Female Factory.

**Eagle Farm Female Factory 1836 (Qld)**

The Eagle Farm area was selected by Commandant Logan in 1829 as an agricultural establishment for the then four year old Moreton Bay penal colony. Agricultural activity appears to have ceased in 1832-33, owing to poor conditions at the site.
used for growing citrus crops, fruit and other crops, and for grazing. The most substantial building of the former convict prison, the Superintendent’s house, is believed to have survived until at least 1890.

Between 1912 and 1988 the larger Eagle Farm site was used for aviation purposes, becoming Brisbane Airport in 1949. Archaeological evidence of the Female Factory remained under the south-eastern end of the 13/31 runway, and was retained when the airport was closed and subdivided.

The Eagle Farm Female Factory is now an archaeological site with a surface of flat grassland with no visible structures or ruins. A study undertaken in 1991 determined that structural, artefact and environmental evidence from 1842 survives substantially intact.129

Ross Female Factory 1847 (Tas)

The Ross Convict Station Historic Site comprises 1.084 hectares on the edge of the village of Ross in the Southern Midlands of Tasmania. Brick and thatch huts were built on the site in c.1831 for convict gangs employed in public works, and in 1833-5 permanent stone buildings were constructed to house the chain gang employed constructing the Ross Bridge. In 1841 the site became a male convict probation station, also housing chain gangs working on the Hobart-Launceston road. In April 1847 a Female Factory was established at Ross to make the hiring of women to local landholders more convenient, and to establish a central-Tasmanian punishment station for women. Various modifications were made to accommodate women, and the first females were received at the Factory in March 1848. Ross was also made into a depot for pregnant women (a lying-in-hospital and nursery), to alleviate overcrowding in the Launceston Factory.

Ross proved an opportune location for a Female Factory as the necessary infrastructure was largely already in place and needed only modification to reflect the prevailing penal philosophies regarding the accommodation of women. Facilities included: stores, a surgery, overseers’ accommodation, washhouse, cookhouse and bakehouse. Several alterations occurred to the station during its years of operation; many reflecting historical events and practices. A nine-foot high fence was constructed during 1848 and 1849 following a riot in 1848, and several separate apartments were built in 1849 to curb homosexual tendencies among the female convicts. Animals and a large vegetable garden attached to the station were tended by male convicts who lived away from the factory.

During 1850-52 a Gothic style chapel was built to the rear of the site, a kitchen in the hospital yard, a ‘dead house’ (mortuary?), and a work room for the crime class abutting the south side of the complex. The chapel was originally proposed to be adjacent to the entrance to the station, but was actually sited to the rear of the site to facilitate its use by the local Catholic community following the factory’s closure. This illustrates contemporary realization that transportation was soon to be abandoned when the factory closed, which it did in 1854. By the late 1890s most of the remains of the convict establishment were demolished. From 1938 until 1974 the property was used as a working farm. In 1980 the management of Ross Female Convict Station Historic Site was transferred from the Municipality to the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service.

The site today consists of: a stone cottage which was built in the 1840s to serve as the Assistant Superintendent’s Quarters, a series of roughly discernible earthworks, foundations, remnants of paving, and a few plantings. The entrance to the station is a grassy ramp leading to a level terrace. The ramp is in the former north range of rooms and contains
remnants of stone footings and a stone lined drain on either side. A circular depression near the end of the ramp is the site of a well or privy that was in a yard. The middle range of the complex is marked by slight undulations in the ground and some stone fragments. Another circular depression just beyond the middle range is also the site of a well. Evidence of the nurseries and work rooms exist in a series of low, linear mounds with sunken hollows in between. Some of the stone footings of the west range are discernible at the edge of the terrace. The chapel site is marked by a high mound at the south east corner of the site. The stone footings of the solitary apartments are beside and below the chapel. There are extensive subsurface remains which are largely undisturbed.\(^{130}\)

**Conclusion**

The Cascades Female Factory, when compared to the other female factories in Australia, was the longest running of the sites in terms of dedicated female convict use. It also retains, in comparative terms, considerable structural and archaeological evidence of the Female Factory use. The division of the five yards is still largely discernible, including their extent and plan. Further, associated fabric and elements remain outside the former factory boundary, which have the ability to inform and enhance an appreciation and understanding of the Female Factory and its extent and operation, including within the local South Hobart context.

4.3 **Assessment of significance\(^ {131}\)**

**CMP statement of significance**

The Cascades Female Factory in South Hobart is of social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific significance for its association with Australia’s female convict history, and as one of the longest running and most intact of the 11 female factories established in eastern Australia in the first half of the nineteenth century. More than half of the 25,000 women transported to Australia came to Van Diemen’s Land, and most had a connection or association with the Cascades Factory.

The five conjoined rectangular yards with sandstone perimeter walls (secure walled compounds), were constructed between 1828 and 1852, reflecting the growth in convict arrivals to the Colony in this period. The yards were specifically constructed to house and reform convict women, and contained a variety of infrastructure including: cell blocks, solitary cells, dormitories, separate apartments, nurseries, laundries, cook houses, medical quarters, guards apartments, latrines, a church, internal yards, and assorted workshops. The end of transportation in the 1850s brought an end to physical developments at the site, and the subsequent neglect of the place reflects the Colonial government’s withdrawal from convict-related matters and official attitudes to former convict sites. The subsequent varied institutional use of the facility after 1856 (including: female prison, invalid depot, boys’ reformatory and training school, lunatic asylum, lying-in hospital, contagious diseases hospital, paupers’ home, and as the Home of Mercy, an Anglican charitable institution for prostitutes), underlined its increasing redundancy and led to the sale of all yards as separate properties in 1904, and eventually substantial demolition of internal infrastructure. Additional incidental demolition of original structures within the former yards occurred under various ownerships throughout the early to mid-twentieth century.

**Potential International Significance**

Cascades Female Factory is part of a series of 11 sites (‘Australian Convict Sites’) that are being nominated for World Heritage listing under criteria (iv) and (vi).
Criterion (iv): an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technical ensemble or landscape which illustrates a significant stage in human history: Collectively, the Australian Convict Sites are an outstanding example of the forced migration of convicts during the 18th and 19th centuries. Cascades Female Factory illustrates the use of transportation as a strategic tool to expand the political, economic and military strategic spheres of influence of Britain. The site provides unique physical evidence of the vital role of female convicts in the colonisation process. Female convicts’ contributions to population growth and economic development were critical to the survival and prosperity of the penal colony. In addition, Cascades Female Factory is a testimony to the use of transportation to punish criminals and deter crime in Britain. The severe treatment of female convicts and their infants illustrate this important element of convictism.

Criterion (vi): associated with events or living traditions, with ideas of with beliefs, with artistic literary works of outstanding universal significance: The Australian Convict Sites are closely associated with global developments in ideas and beliefs about the punishment and reformation of criminal offenders in the modern era. Cascades Female Factory is an example of one of the world’s first purpose-built institutions for punishing and reforming female offenders. The site also represents Australia’s unique system of female factories which was an important element of the rise of new regimes of ‘disciplinary punishment’ in the modern era. Special regimes to punish female criminals were an important development in the punishment of crime in the 19th century.

National Heritage values

The Cascades Female Factory is entered in the National Heritage List (Place ID 105932) for its outstanding significance to the nation. The Official Values are as follows:

Criterion A Events, Processes:

Cascades Female Factory is highly significant because of its association with the lives of convict women, its demonstration of the changing philosophies of punishment and reform as they relate to women and as a place of tremendous suffering and inhumane treatment.

Convict women made a significant contribution to the development of the colonies. They contributed their labour and their presence was regarded as contributing to social cohesion and stability and they populated the colonies.

Over half of the 25 000 convict women sent to Australia were sent to Van Diemen’s Land, the majority spending some time at Cascades Female Factory as it was the primary site for the reception and incarceration of women convicts. It was one of the colony’s longest running penal institutions operating from 1828 to 1856.

Female factories were a unique colonial response to the management of convict women, one that reflects both moral and penal philosophies. The factories were multifunctional but were intended largely for reform. They operated as places of work, places of punishment, hiring depots and places of shelter for women between assignments and those who were sick, infirm or pregnant.

The high exterior walls surrounding Yards 1, 3 and 4 South remaining at Cascades Female Factory demonstrate the need to isolate convict women from negative influences and in turn protect society from their corrupting influence. The matron’s cottage at Yard 4 South demonstrates its function both as the residence of the administrator and a model for civil society.
Cascades Female Factory had a range of infrastructure associated with its different functions, most of which is now archaeological remains. Yard 1 which was initially the full extent of the factory is thought to contain subsurface evidence of convict dormitories, twelve solitary cells, chapel, staff quarters, and separate courtyards and buildings for the nursery, hospital, kitchen and punishment, crime and hiring classes.

The changing approaches to punishment and reform are demonstrated in the move from convict dormitories in Yard 1 to the solitary apartments in Yard 3 built in 1845 which survive as sandstone footings and subfloor cavities. Isolation from fellow convicts was considered in the time of the probation system to be conducive to repentance and reform.

Cascade Female Factory is highly significant as a site of great suffering. Its appalling living conditions and excessively high infant mortality were the subject of numerous inquests and inquiries. Although the causes of suffering and the management regimes are very different, it can be considered along with Norfolk Island as a place of harshness and inhumanity.

**Criterion B Rarity:**

Cascades Female Factory is rare as the only remaining female factory with substantial extant visible fabric. The remaining walls in particular evoke a sense of the isolation, control and harshness experienced by women convicts and their children.

Cascades Female Factory as represented by Yards 1, 3 and 4 South is also uncommon in its extensive sub-surface occupational deposits which reflect the evolution of the Female Factory, and the later phases of its use.

**Criterion C Research:**

Yards 1, 3 and 4 South are largely unexcavated and have considerable archaeological and research potential. There are also extensive documentary and pictorial collections associated with the site. The archaeological potential along with the documentary and pictorial collections can significantly add to the knowledge and understanding of convict women and their children which is an emerging area of study and scholarship.

**Criterion G Social value:**

Cascades Female Factory is highly valued by community groups and historians as a place that reflects the significant story of convict women. The absence of intact historic sites and fabric associated with convict women makes what remains at Cascade Female Factory of national value.

The place has become an important catalyst for academic and community interest in the important role convict women played in the development of the colonies. Cascades Female Factory site is also valued as an important part of the wider story of women in Australia.

Other potential National Heritage values

The Cascades Female Factory has additional values which have not been formally assessed for National Heritage listing, but which nevertheless contribute to the historical significance of this place. These are presented below in the context of their potential suitability for assessment under specific National Heritage criteria.

**Criterion A Events, Processes:**

The Cascades Female Factory is significant for its post-convict institutional history, whereby over four decades through to the end of the nineteenth century the former Female Factory
was recycled as a welfare institution, with a number of different institutionalised populations transferred in and out of the various yards. The facility housed in these years, under various organisations and forms of management, the mentally ill; aged and blind; paupers; boys under sentence; women giving birth to illegitimate children; and women deemed prostitutes. Many of these people had been through the Colonial convict system; others were affected by the ongoing human and societal impacts of the system. In this way, the facility can be seen as one of the few places in Australia which can demonstrate aspects of the trajectory from convict institution to a place of late nineteenth century philanthropy and social control.

**Criterion E Aesthetic characteristics:**

The immediate context for the Cascades Female Factory includes: the nearby Georgian cottages, generally low-scale urban fabric, Mount Wellington backdrop and the adjacent Hobart Rivulet. This provides a setting which despite being gradually built-up and built-out, is still evocative and reminiscent of the setting in which the facility was historically established and frequently depicted in nineteenth century imagery. The stone walls of Yard 1 in particular are highly visible and contribute to the visual prominence of the site in its valley setting. The current character of Yard 1 is also particularly bleak and austere, and reinforces a sense of the oppressive nature of the place during its institutional history.

**Criterion G Social value:**

The Cascades Female Factory has acquired particular symbolic importance in the context of female convict history, which is increasingly emphasised and demonstrated through the growth in genealogical research, family history, academic research, and a range of women’s organisations and networks which focus on the Cascades site. The purchase and protection of Yard 1 in 1976, followed by the Female Factory Historic Site Limited acquisition of Yard 3 in 1999 and Yard 4 South and the Matron’s Cottage in 2002, also points to changing attitudes to convict history and convictism generally in Tasmanian and Australian society.

**Criterion H Significant people:**

The architecture of the Cascades Female Factory reflects the influence of Elizabeth Fry, the English penal reformer, who advocated the use of architectural classification in buildings designed to house female convicts. As a result of Fry’s intervention, several female factories were constructed in Australia along ‘classificatory’ principles, including Cascades and Launceston.

The Cascades Female Factory site is also significant for its association with noted Colonial Architect John Lee Archer, who was involved in the design of the institution from the beginning. Archer arrived in Tasmania in 1827, and served in the capacity of civil engineer and colonial architect for eleven years, in the first nine being responsible for all government buildings including those for penal and military purposes. Archaeological investigations have revealed that Archer’s ground plan design at Cascades was in fact implemented and the surviving sub-surface archaeology of Yard 1 expresses this. In this context, all remaining fabric associated with the Cascades Female Factory has the ability to inform and enhance an appreciation and understanding of the original extent and operation of the Factory.

The Female Factory is significant for its association with Mary Hutchinson who, over her tenure from 1832 to 1851, was the longest serving Matron of the Factory and perhaps the longest serving Matron in the Australian colonies. Hutchinson’s connections with female convictism came about through being the daughter of the Superintendent at the Parramatta
Female Factory, and through her later position in charge of the Launceston Female Factory.\textsuperscript{132}

**Criterion I Indigenous tradition:**

The Cascades Female Factory is significant for its association with Truganini. Truganini is the most notable Indigenous woman in Tasmanian history, and arguably the best known in Australian nineteenth century history. Her comparatively well documented life provides insight into the early conflict between Europeans and Indigenous Tasmanians. Truganini was buried in the Factory grounds and the illegal, covert disinterment of her remains for research is a reflection of the low regard in which Indigenous Tasmanians were held by nineteenth century white settlers. It particularly speaks of the cultural insensitivity of many medical and other researchers of this period. The significance of the site to Aboriginal people in Tasmania has not been documented or assessed for this study.

**State Significance**

The Cascades Female Factory is listed in the Tasmanian Heritage Register, refer Section 1.5. A proposed amendment to this entry is likely to occur in 2008. The boundary adjustment proposed in the amendment encompasses the boundary of the National Heritage place and proposed World Heritage place, but is much larger in extent. It includes elements that may hold archaeological potential, such as Yard 2, the graveyard, and the blanket factory site. The Amendment includes the following Draft statement of significance:

*The Cascades Female Factory provides an evocative insight into the lives and experiences of the convict women who served time in penal institutions in Australia.*

*The factory, which operated in a modified distillery from 1828 to 1856, was the largest and one of the longest serving penal institutions in Van Diemen’s Land.*

*In the early 1850s more than 1,000 women and 176 children were held at the Cascades Female Factory. The number of inmates fell following the end of transportation to the colony in 1853.*

*In a gully in the shadow of Mount Wellington, it was notorious for its damp and unhealthy conditions and for its high rate of infant deaths. Death rates for infants have been estimated as high as 40\% of the young inmates.*

*The Cascades Female Factory has strong association and special meaning for the community as a place of women’s history.*

*The structural configuration and evolution of the Cascades Female Factory demonstrates many important facets of the Colonial penal system over time, including changing social attitudes during the convict period and the subsequent end of transportation.*

*After the end of transportation, the Cascades Female Factory became a welfare institution for lunatics, invalids, paupers and prostitutes who were substantially human legacies of the Colonial convict system. This history tells the story of penal oppression in convict times through to late philanthropy and social control.*

*The ruins, archaeological remains and associated cultural deposits, as well as its collections, reveal subsequent layers of history from the time of the Female Factory to the complex’ subsequent use as a gaol, a paupers’ and invalids’ home, an asylum for the insane, a boys’ reformatory and later training school, contagious diseases hospital, and a home for ‘fallen women’.*

*The surviving physical evidence of the site (including below ground features and artefacts) has exceptional implications for scientific and historical research.*
It also holds strong associations with a number of individuals prominent in Tasmania’s history. These include the institution’s architect John Lee Archer; Quaker penal reformer Elizabeth Fry (whose influence was felt from England); Matron Mary Hutchison and the Aboriginal woman Truganini who was for some time buried in Yard 1.

The Cascades Female Factory is assessed as meeting most of the criteria required for a place to be entered in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. The following Draft value statements have been prepared as part of the proposed amendment to the Tasmanian Heritage Register entry for the place:

**Criterion (a) It is important in demonstrating the evolution or pattern of Tasmania’s history:**

The Cascades Female Factory represents aspects of the nineteenth century penal history of Tasmania, important to the past human occupation and evolution of the State and the nation.

Built c1828 the Cascades Female Factory is the oldest prison in Australia designed and administered solely for women which retains substantial built and archaeological fabric.

The evolution of its various yards demonstrates the changing nature of the penal system and the changing attitudes and beliefs associated with each different system of punishment and reform.

In particular, the place relates to aspects of women’s history, including the incarceration of women and children. It illustrates the central relationships that made up the female convict experience including those between women and the prison authorities, between women and men, between women and their children, with each other, and between women servants and their masters.

It was also a place of burial of Tasmanian Aboriginal, Truganini.

The place demonstrates not only a prison but also a factory, hospital, hiring depot and a nursery for the children of convict women.

The introduction of isolation cells at the Cascades Female Factory – Yard 3 – illustrates the nineteenth century disciplinary measures, and the intolerance of same sex relationships.

The institutional uses to which the main Yards and nearby areas were put after the closure of the Cascades Female Factory in 1877 represent the efforts of a series of governments to deal with various perceived social problems of the day, including poverty, insanity, juvenile crime, homelessness, children born out of wedlock, old age and venereal disease.

The site is one of the few historic places in Tasmania where the story from penal oppression to social control and philanthropy can be so clearly traced.

**Criterion (b) It demonstrates rare, uncommon or endangered aspects of Tasmania’s heritage:**

Of the female factories established in Tasmania, Cascades Female Factory has the most remaining above ground fabric and has a high level of integrity.

The separate apartments constructed in Yard 3 in 1845 are of significance as a rare example of this type of construction and design, possibly being the only example of double cells for female convicts in the world.
The Cascades Female Factory includes a rare example of the use of separate apartments for females, unique in Australia if not the world.

The Cascades Female Factory is one of the best documented female convict sites in Australia.

**Criterion (c) It has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Tasmania’s history:**

The Cascades Female Factory has high archaeological integrity with visible features of the early female convict phase as well as subsurface occupation deposits of this and later phases.

This makes it of exceptional interest for scientific and historical research.

The extensive collections relating the Cascades Female Factory, including moveable heritage artefacts, have not yet been analysed.

**Criterion (d) It is important as a representative in demonstrating the characteristics of a broader class of cultural places:**

As the female factory with the most extant remains, the Cascades site is the best representative of a nineteenth century colonial female convict prison in Tasmania. Characteristics include the construction method, design, fabrication and operation of the place. The philosophy, design and architecture of both colonial architect John Lee Archer and Quaker prison reformer Elizabeth Fry (whose advice was relayed from England) are evident in the remaining fabric and archaeological features of the place.

The cottages at 17, 19 and 21 Degraves Street, and 31 Apsley Street, South Hobart, are also of historic cultural heritage significance for their architectural values, with their ability to demonstrate the principle characteristics of mid-nineteenth century Georgian single storey cottages, of brick and sandstone.

**Criterion (f) It has strong or special meaning for any group or community because of social, cultural or spiritual association:**

The Cascades Female Factory has special meaning for the community because of its cultural, social and educational associations. In particular, the place is valued for its significant associations with female history in Tasmania. Historians’ description of the convict inmates as ‘the founding mothers of Australia’ has powerful resonance.

This is evidenced by the number of groups and associations who have a declared special interest in the place, the Government’s acquisitions of land, the number of publications and research documents related to the Female Factory’s history and the number of visitors to the site.

**Criterion (g) It has a special association with the life or work of a person, a group or an organisation that was important in Tasmania’s history:**

The Cascades Female Factory has special association with female convicts, who contributed much to the pioneering and colonial establishment of the colony and country.

It has strong associations with a number of notable people over its many years of operation.

Mary Hutchison who was important for her role as a female in the colonial public service, female factories and with Methodist missionaries to the Pacific, served as matron 1832-1851.
Yard 1 of the Cascades Female Factory is of significance for its associations with notable colonial architect John Lee Archer, who drew up the plans for the conversion of the former distillery and designed a range of buildings for the site.

Yard 1 is of significance for its special associations with Truganini, a Tasmanian Aboriginal, who was buried there in 1876, and whose body lay in the yard for a number of years before being exhumed.
5.0 Conservation Policy

5.1 Introduction

The conservation policy included in this chapter has been developed on the basis of the preceding analysis and assessment of the cultural heritage significance of the Cascades Female Factory, an examination and analysis of the fabric and physical extent of the place, and an evaluation of the overall conservation requirements. The policy specifically references the ‘Cascades Female Factory CMP area’ (Yards 1, 3 and 4 South) but is also responsive to the original extent of the Female Factory and its associated elements.

The policies and recommendations in this chapter are generally fabric-related and focused, and principally directed at the ongoing physical management and conservation of the significant fabric and site overall. Notwithstanding this 'fabric' focus, the policies are also intended to support conservation and interpretation of the identified heritage values, as these values are represented in, and demonstrated by, the fabric and physical remains of the place.

The policies and recommendations address general maintenance and repairs; site monitoring; management of sub-surface material and remains; objects and artefacts; setting, context and curtilage; restoration and reconstruction; adaptation and intervention; new works and development; views and vistas; presentation of site components; site recording; and policy implementation. Generally, conservation works, major maintenance works, and any interventionist works, should be undertaken under the direction of an appropriately qualified heritage/conservation practitioner.

Chapter 6, which complements this chapter, includes policies and recommendations more specifically relating to site management, including public access and use, risk management, site promotion, collections and archives management, funding, etc. Chapter 6 also includes policies which address conservation and management of the heritage values, including the social values of the site, covering matters such as community consultation, historic interpretation, future research, community links, etc.

Limitations & Review

As noted in Chapter 1, it was beyond the scope of this report to include a comprehensive account of all aspects of the history of the site; this limitation also applies to all aspects of the social and community context of the site, as well as the context of historical development in Hobart and South Hobart. Accordingly, the conservation policy acknowledges these limitations, and recognises that future work and research in these areas may have implications for aspects of the policy. This conservation management plan will be reviewed every five years, or earlier if demanded by change in the circumstances of site management, such as for example an urgent requirement for major maintenance work or a significant expansion in the need for visitor interpretation.

5.2 Policy objectives

The Cascades Female Factory is considered to have potential World Heritage values as one of a series of places demonstrating the convict system in Australia, and has National Heritage values for events/processes, rarity, research and social values.

The Cascades Female Factory is one of a group of convict-related institutional complexes in Tasmania and Australia, and is distinguished in this context through its exclusive association with female convicts. Internationally, the Female Factory is also one of a small number of
surviving or partly surviving sites associated with nineteenth century female convictism. Managing the most significant heritage values of the site therefore requires a focus on the convict period, history and fabric. The Female Factory has also, over time, acquired particular social and symbolic significance. The social values, while less tangible than the physical attributes and fabric-related aspects of the place, also require careful management and conservation. In addition, the site is located in the South Hobart context; an important physical and geographical association.

Having regard for the nature and level of significance of the Cascades Female Factory as a whole, the policies are framed in the context of the following conservation objectives (in descending order of importance):

- Retain and conserve *all significant fabric associated with the Female Factory*, including fabric outside the current extent of the designated Cascades Female Factory (Yards 1, 3 and 4 South); this includes walls, structures and sub-surface remains. Conservation of these elements should be guided by the Australia ICOMOS *Burra Charter* 1999 and its Guidelines (see Appendix A). Conservation of the fabric will also assist in protecting and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.

- Ensure that the highest level of statutory protection (i.e. National and State level) is afforded to *all significant fabric associated with the Female Factory* (within and outside Yards 1, 3 and 4 South).

- Establish a single entity with responsibility for management of the designated Cascades Female Factory.

- Ensure future management of the Cascades Female Factory has regard for the policies and recommendations included in this report relating to presentation, interpretation and use of the site.

- Ensure that management of *all significant fabric associated with the Female Factory* (within and outside Yards 1, 3 and 4 South) is consistent in its application and implementation of the policies and recommendations included here.

### 5.3 Significant site elements

In the development of the conservation policy, consideration has been given to the nature of the individual components and elements of the Cascades Female Factory, and their role in the history, operation and development of the place. The elements have variously been identified as ‘core’ or ‘supporting’ elements, or ‘elements of contemporary value’, and ‘little or no significance’. These designations recognise that:

- Some elements, including elements located outside the original five yards, are associated with the establishment and operation of the Cascades Female Factory in the first half of the nineteenth century, and are central to an understanding and appreciation of the operation and history of the place as a Female Factory/House of Correction for female convicts. They are also typically documented and recognised as such (generally *core* significant elements).
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• Other elements were associated with the site in a secondary or supporting way, or provide evidence of later site development and use; some also currently contribute to the historic character of the Cascades Female Factory context and therefore shed light on the historical development of the immediate area (generally supporting significant elements).

• Elements of **contemporary value** are generally of recent origin and typically have been introduced to the site as part of site management, to add visitor amenity, to assist in site interpretation, or are associated with FFHS operations and activities. The former fudge factory, which is partly leased for commercial purposes, is included in this category, although it predates FFHS control of Yard 3. While in some cases these elements are important to site management, they have no extrinsic heritage significance.

• Elements of **little or no** significance include elements on private land which are not associated with the history of the Cascades Female Factory, some of which are of recent origin. These elements are identified as being of little or no significance because they have no intrinsic heritage significance which derives from an association with the Female Factory.

As noted in Chapter 1, heritage places are often valued for demonstrating changes and layers of fabric or accretions acquired over time (i.e. they are evolved sites). The international and national aspects of significance of the Cascades Female Factory, however, derive directly from the convict period and use. Hence, elements such as the Apostolic Church in Yard 2 are not considered to be significant in the context of the Female Factory and its history. The church may have significance in another context, including social significance for the congregation associated with the church, but this has not been assessed or documented for this report.

The core and supporting elements are illustrated below at Figure 30.
Figure 30 Plan illustrating site curtilage, elements of significance and archaeological potential (note that the levels 'high', medium' and 'low' relate to potential, not to the significance of the archaeological fabric or remains; this is also discussed in more detail above). The historical boundary of the cemetery (6) has recently been reviewed, and may not be extensive as indicated, being more constricted and closer to the boundary of McRobies Road and Syme Street.
5.3.1 Core elements

All remaining original fabric associated with the Female Factory including:

- Yard 1: overall form and plan of yard, perimeter walls, including the original opening in the south-east corner (where access is provided to Yard 3) and sub-surface remains (deemed to be of high archaeological potential).

- Yard 2: overall plan of yard as defined by original yard walls/boundary, and sub-surface remains (deemed to be of medium archaeological potential).

- Yard 3: overall plan of yard as defined by original yard walls/boundary, remnant perimeter walls (east and west sides of yard), and sub-surface remains (deemed to be of high archaeological potential).

- Yard 4: overall plan of yard as defined by original yard walls/boundary, Matron’s Cottage (original component), remnant footing of perimeter wall on east side, and sub-surface remains (deemed to be of high archaeological potential).

- Yard 5: any sub-surface remains (deemed to be of low archaeological potential).

- Cemetery site: any in situ burials and/or sub-surface remains (deemed to be of high archaeological potential).

- Sandstone/masonry lined storm water drainage network from Yard 3, and Yard 1 and/or 2, which extends beyond the yard perimeters and discharges into the Hobart Rivulet.

- Minor infrastructure related to the various Female Factory yards situated outside the perimeter walls, including water closets (outside Yards 4 and 5) and a cesspit (outside Yard 2): (deemed to be of low archaeological potential).

- Hobart Rivulet: the close geographical relationship of the Rivulet with the former Female Factory emphasises its key role in supplying water for domestic and industrial uses within the site, and as an outlet for drainage from the Factory. The fabric of the remnant stone retaining walls is also significant.

- Home of Mercy site to immediate east of Yard 4; there is no significance attributed to the current factory building on the site. The archaeological potential has not been assessed, however should the site prove to have sub-surface remains associated with the Female Factory (albeit outside the extent of the five yards), then these remains would be included under this category.

The site of the 1830s blanket factory/mill, to the east of the Female Factory on the banks of the Rivulet, may have archaeological potential. If the site proves to have sub-surface remains associated with the Female Factory, then these remains would also be included under this category.
The site of Truganini’s grave in Yard 1 is also very significant, although not associated with the Female Factory use of the site, and somewhat anomalous in terms of the later history of the site. The association with Truganini is very significant and provides insight into this turbulent period of history in Tasmania, and attitudes to the former Female Factory site. It is also acknowledged that the significance of the site to Aboriginal people in Tasmania has not been documented during this study. Chapter 6 includes a recommendation in regard to further work.

**Policies 1**

*Core elements should be retained and conserved.*

*If alterations or changes are proposed, then the works should have regard for the identified aspects of heritage significance, and should be guided by the policies and recommendations included in this report. Works to these elements should also be subject to the relevant statutory approvals process.*

*Where these elements occur on private land, encourage and assist owners to undertake appropriate management and conservation of significant fabric and to avoid works or development which would negatively impact on the heritage values of the Cascades Female Factory.*

5.3.2 **Supporting elements**

[Please note that the significance of some of the elements listed below, as it derives from their historical associations with the Female Factory, remains to be confirmed through additional research and investigation, and as such should be considered provisional until more clearly demonstrated.]

Supporting elements:

- Matron’s Cottage early 1900s additions, outbuildings (contemporary with the additions), recently exposed brickwork paving on north side of cottage (also possibly contemporary with the early 1900s works).

- Dwelling at 31 Apsley Street, South Hobart: may have been associated with the Female Factory, but known to have been associated with a later use of the site, specifically the Home of Mercy.

- Dwellings at 17, 19 and 21 Degraves Street, South Hobart: reputed to have been associated with Female Factory, as staff quarters.

The property at 3 Apsley Street, South Hobart, has been identified as the possible residence of the Female Factory Superintendent. If this can be confirmed, the property would also be of supporting significance in relation to the Female Factory. The property is otherwise of significance in its own right, as a local property of comparatively early origin (reputedly c.1840).

There may also be other properties and dwellings located nearby which were associated with the Female Factory during its operation, or with later uses, which if investigated in detail may be assessed as supporting elements. This requires further investigation and research.
It has also been noted that the construction of nearby properties, including properties in the former Yard 5, may have incorporated original building materials salvaged from the demolition of the Female Factory buildings.\textsuperscript{133} This also requires further investigation, research and assessment.

The following items are additionally of significance in relation to the history, understanding and management of the site, although they have not specifically been assessed or catalogued during this study:

- Historic site plans, maps, images and other primary sources of information.
- Artefacts and objects associated with the site. (Further detailed assessment of the objects and artefacts, including an assessment which identifies/clarifies their relationship to the site, may elevate their significance to ‘core’ elements.)

### Policies 2

Supporting elements (such as cottages) should generally be retained and conserved, but in some cases provide greater flexibility than core elements with regard to change and alteration. Proposals for these elements will be subject to Hobart City Council and Heritage Tasmania approval processes.

If alterations or changes are proposed, then the works should have regard for the identified aspects of heritage significance, and should be guided by the policies and recommendations included in this report. Works to these elements should also be subject to the relevant statutory approvals process.

Where these elements occur on private land, encourage and assist owners to undertake appropriate management and conservation of significant fabric and to avoid works or development which would negatively impact on the heritage values of the Cascades Female Factory.

### Contemporary elements

These elements include:

- Yards 1, 3 and 4: all yard surfaces (lawn, concrete, gravel, bitumen, sand, car parking areas, etc), non-original fences and gates, recent landscaping and planting.
- Yard 1: outdoor seating; recent steel stairs, handrail and gate to east wall, interpretive panels.
- Yard 3: covers/shelters to the exposed excavations; former fudge factory.

### Policy 3

Elements of contemporary value typically can be retained, altered or removed. This is a general policy, however, and specific works or proposals relating to these elements, including replacement or alteration, should also have regard for policies and recommendations included elsewhere in this report which either address the specific element, or address matters to do with site presentation, new development, etc.

### Elements of little or no significance

These elements include:
• Non-Female Factory related fabric in Yards 2 and 4 North including buildings, structures, fences, gates, landscaping, planting, etc.

**Policy 4**

*Future works to these elements, including development on these sites, should be sympathetic to, and avoid unacceptable impacts on, the heritage values of the Cascades Female Factory.*

5.3.5 **Residential development/dwellings on site of Yard 5**

Early twentieth century residential development on the site of Yard 5 was not investigated or assessed in this study.

5.4 **Conservation & management of significant fabric**

The above-ground structures of significance at the Cascades Female Factory are generally limited in extent and intactness, being chiefly remnant walls from different periods of site/yard development and expansion, and the altered Matron’s Cottage. These are complimented by the presence of archaeological material and sub-surface remains. The conservation and management of these significant elements should be guided by the Australia ICOMOS *Burra Charter* 1999, and its Guidelines (see Appendix A).

**Policy 5**

*All future conservation works which affect elements of significance should be carried out in accordance with the principles of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 1999.*

5.4.1 **General maintenance & repairs**

This study did not involve a detailed assessment of the current condition of the significant structures and fabric of the Cascades Female Factory, which should be undertaken in order to inform future conservation and maintenance works. However, a number of issues were noted (these are addressed below). A consistent and regular approach to the maintenance of fabric is recommended. The approach should firstly be to maintain and ensure that significant fabric does not deteriorate and secondly to conserve significant existing fabric. To achieve the first objective, an ongoing cyclical inspection and maintenance program should be instigated to ensure that the significant fabric is maintained in good physical condition and its integrity is not jeopardised.

**Policies 6**

*Future conservation and maintenance works should be informed by a detailed assessment of the current physical condition of all significant fabric.*

*Introduce an ongoing cyclical inspection and maintenance program to ensure that the significant fabric is maintained in good condition and its integrity is not jeopardised.*

5.4.2 **Site monitoring**

Regular site monitoring helps to document and identify structural issues or deterioration of fabric, and assists in reviewing or tracking the impacts of conservation works and related programs.

In terms of current site monitoring, the situation is as follows:134
Yard 1 is monitored by Parks and Wildlife Service field officers and subject to cyclical maintenance schedules.

The FFHS staff and volunteers monitor the site on an informal day to day basis, as part of their regular use and presence on the site.

A builder (with conservation and heritage expertise) assesses the condition of the built fabric in Yards 3 and 4 South every 18 months or more often if required by the Project Manager, FFHS.

Heritage consultants and advisors within Heritage Tasmania are available to assess the site and provide advice at any time.

While this arrangement is currently reasonably effective, a coordinated program of regular and consistent monitoring should be introduced to the whole of the designated Cascades Female Factory, including monitoring the condition of the perimeter walls.

**Policy 7**

*Introduce a coordinated program of regular and consistent monitoring to the whole of the designated Cascades Female Factory site, including monitoring the condition of the perimeter walls.*

5.4.3 **Perimeter walls: Yard 1**

The Parks and Wildlife Service have undertaken a range of conservation, repair and stabilisation works to the perimeter walls of Yard 1 since assuming management of the yard in 1987. The works have included repairs of breaches; general wall consolidation works including stabilising and capping; insertion of steel ‘Hesbia’ reinforcing where necessary; consolidation with lime based mortars to hollow sections of walls; removal and relaying of loose masonry; removal of plant growth and roots from walls; applying damp proof courses to tops of walls and ledges; removal of previous hard and cement based repairs and repointing to the walls; repointing with soft lime based mortar; and removal of graffiti. A triangular iron angle frame was installed at the corner of the Degraves Street wall and Yard 3 in 1989. The stone pillars and archway of the original Degraves Street Entry door have also been stabilised and repaired.

Other works undertaken by the Parks and Wildlife Service have included the demolition of a large concrete block storage shed (used by the Service) in 1993, with the cement render removed from the stone walls. In 1995 timber tennis club rooms, a toilet block and gates were also removed. Around this time bollards were installed in the Degraves Street entrance, the current interpretative panels were erected, and the stone seats installed.

The Parks and Wildlife Service have been monitoring the structural condition of the Degraves Street wall in particular since 1998, with additional engineering surveys undertaken in March 2000 and December 2004. Measurements taken during these surveys indicated continual movement of the wall, especially in the critical section at the entrance. Following the latter survey, where it was revealed that the wall in developing an outward lean (tilt) was deemed to be in risk of collapse, temporary bracing was subsequently placed against the outer (south face) of the Degraves Street wall in May 2005. The bracing consists of a fourteen metre long ‘wale board’ placed longitudinally three metres up the outer perimeter wall and supported by six triangular timber frames.
The Service has sought engineering advice to try to determine the most appropriate long-term options for stabilising the wall, most recently in January 2006 which included a geotechnical investigation. The latter study concluded that the temporary supports had been loaded due to subsequent settlement of the wall, and also that the footpath (on the south side of wall) had settled approximately 100mm in the area most affected. The study also concluded that the most likely cause for the tilting and settlement was due to the foundations having insufficient strength to support the wall. Other factors also contribute to the subsidence of the wall:

- Lack of drainage in the silty and clayey material in Yard 1.
- Fill material of one metre thickness added to the ground which may have generated an active thrust converting the wall to a virtual retaining wall.
- Integrity of the wall was compromised by the disintegration of the mortar and imbalance of two sides of the wall due to the loss of plaster, mortar, etc on the yard site.
- Located in a demarcated fault zone, the wall may be experiencing tremors causing weakening and reducing the shear strength of the silty and clayey material.
- The possibility of the town water, released by a recent leakage of a water main and entering the yard causing the destabilisation of the clay and silt in the foundation.
- Excessive rainfall (storm runoff from Knocklofty Hill) affecting the stability of alluvial ground material below the foundation.

The report recommended the following remedial measures:

- Underpin the wall to stabilize foundations. Underpinning would involve excavation next to the wall on the inside face of the yard, as the timber props would prevent excavating in front of the wall.
- Straighten wall to its vertical position and repair any cracks/opening on sandstone façade. This may involve lifting in the wall in areas where settlement occurred.
- Drainage can be facilitated at Yard 1 subsurface to reduce the additional pressures caused by the water.
- Install timber or steel buttresses on the inside face of the wall and tie back the external sandstone face using anchors as detailed in Section 4.3.

Sandstone buttresses were also an option, albeit a more expensive option to the use of timber or steel buttresses/ties.

Whichever solution is implemented, it is recommended that bracing or other forms of propping should occur on the internal face of the wall, as external bracing would impinge on a public footpath. It may be possible to use the buttressing in an interpretive way, such as indicating where an internal wall (or walls), were originally located. An architectural solution, which was not explored in the 2006 report, may also be appropriate.

Total reconstruction of the wall, from foundations up, would be the least preferred heritage option, but ultimately may be an effective solution, albeit as a last resort.

Policy 8
Continue monitoring the condition of the Yard 1 south wall, and exploring options for straightening and stabilising the wall.

Where possible, restrict any bracing or buttressing (or other visible means of stabilising the wall) to the inner face of the south wall, to avoid visual impacts on the external wall to Degraves Street.

5.4.4 Perimeter walls: generally

The remaining perimeter walls to the yards are generally in good condition, with the current ‘patchy’ appearance of the walls a result of their historical management and use over a long period. Internal structures have historically abutted the internal face of the walls, and have been removed, leaving evidence of the junction of walls, division of internal spaces, internal surface treatments (such as whitewash), and in some cases part outlines (or silhouettes) of former buildings. Areas of the walls were also exposed historically to internal courtyards. The ‘patchiness’ additionally derives from a mix of dressed stone faces, different replacement materials and scorching and discolouration associated with fires. The current broken heights (tops) to the walls results from loss of stones as well as reflecting the historical placement and removal of different structures. The comparative lack of external openings (windows and doors) is additionally a reflection of the function of the place and the need to maintain security and control access and egress. The appearance of the walls contributes to the current character of the site, and is an aspect of their presentation which should be retained.

With regard to Yard 3, since 1999 the FFHS has undertaken a program of conservation, repair and investigative archaeological work on the perimeter walls. For instance, the wall between Yards 1 and 3 has been conserved and repaired by a qualified heritage builder. An archaeological investigation (by Kostaglou) revealed the original level of the floor for Yard 1 buildings and following advice from a structural engineer the bricked up door between the yards was opened. The original sandstone doorstep was located, and an architect-designed landing, gate and stairs installed in the opening, in a manner which has regard for protecting the wall fabric and form of the opening. The FFHS has also removed plants with invasive root systems from Yard 3 (Memorial Garden), following advice from a specialist heritage garden consultant.

In addition the sandstone wall between Yards 3 and 4 has been repointed to remove inappropriate mortar and replace with soft mortar, and removal of plant growth is undertaken regularly. This wall, in comparison with other extant walls on the site, is constructed of dressed sandstone and features pillars at various intervals along its length. New sandstone blocks were inserted in the wall where the original blocks had become fragile and were threatening the stability of the wall.

The recommendations included below relate to general ongoing maintenance and conservation of walls across the site. The recommendations are not intended to result in a uniformity of appearance to all walls, or a systematic ‘cleaning up’ of the walls, which would remove evidence of their historical use and treatment. Rather, the objective is to preserve this evidence (and historic surface treatments) while minimising further ongoing deterioration or structural problems. Investigation of structural integrity, original wall fabric and appropriate replacement materials should also precede any wall replacement works.

It is recommended that all future repairs to the walls be undertaken by a qualified stonemason. It is also important to consult with neighbouring private land holders about the walls adjoining their properties, including advising on the maintenance and management
issues identified above which have the potential to impact on the fabric and structural integrity of the walls. Private landowners should also be encouraged to remove any structures attached to the walls, and to manage vegetation and water build up.

The following recommendations relate to general ongoing maintenance and conservation of walls across the site.

- Ensure regular inspection and recording of walls, to monitor erosion and softening of sandstone.
- Replace timber work (door jambs, heads, etc) where necessary to support stonework.
- For severely decayed stone, replacement stone blocks should be identifiable as such, with a record kept of all replacements.
- When defective mortar is to be rectified or replaced, it is recommended that the original mortar be analysed to determine its composition and constituents to ensure a better match and avoid non-compatibility. This also applies to the capping.
- With regard to the uneven top courses, these should generally be consolidated as found (i.e. allowed to remain uneven), subject to fixing the capping and ensuring the stone work remains stable.
- The profile of the mortar capping for walls should limit its visual impacts while still effectively shedding water.
- Maintain evidence of chasing and pockets in walls.
- While it is generally preferred that evidence of minor associated elements such as iron and steel work (hooks, nails, straps, vents, minor piping, etc) be retained, these elements should nevertheless be monitored for impacts on the stone such as corrosion damage to the stonework, and if necessary be removed.
- Over time, and subject to an appropriate level of investigation, remove and replace existing concrete blockwork (including individual blocks) which has been built in contact with the stonework (concrete can accelerate deterioration).
- Ensure rubble walls in particular are capped to prevent water damage to core. Ashlar walls are less prone to such damage, but pointing to tops of walls should be regularly inspected and replaced if defective.
- Plant growth should also carefully be removed from wall faces and tops, although it is emphasised that such removal should in all cases avoid damage to walls; where there are deep roots, for instance, specialist input may be required.

Adjacent to the walls:

- Ensure proper drainage of water away from the walls, and avoid ponding or a build up of water adjacent to walls.
- Avoid placing any further fill against walls to avoid a build-up of pressure.
- Keep vegetation (trees, shrubs, garden beds and plantings) free of the walls.
- Remove hard surfaces such as bitumen pavements from adjoining the walls, to allow for evaporation of moisture.
Some time in the early 1900s most of the outer perimeter wall to Yard 4 was demolished. The eastern perimeter wall, between Yard 4 and Degraves Lane, remains at around 2-3 courses high. The remains are in poor condition and are subject to vandalism and removal of stones. The Presentation Report (currently in preparation) will include measures to address this.

**Policy 9**

*Future repairs to all perimeter walls should be undertaken by a qualified stonemason.*

*The appearance of the walls contributes to the current character of the site; this is an aspect of the site’s presentation which should be retained.*

*Encourage adjoining private land holders to avoid activities which may impact on the fabric and structural integrity of the walls. This may also involve a review of adjoining garden beds and proposed plantings.*

*Implement the ongoing maintenance and conservation works recommended above.*

**Reinstatement/reconstruction**

The reconstruction of demolished perimeter walls (and indeed demolished structures) is not a general recommendation, given the extent of demolition which has occurred across the site in the past. However, the reconstruction (or at least part reconstruction) of the Yard 4 South gateway and wall on Degraves Street (to the west of the cottage) may be considered for this area of the site. The reconstruction of the wall would assist in the historical interpretation and presentation of the Matron’s Cottage within Yard 4, and enable a better understanding of the original function and orientation of the cottage and its relationship to Yard 4 and the remainder of the former Female Factory. The reconstruction would also assist in improving the definition of the yard’s historical boundary to Degraves Street, and the presentation of the site to Degraves Street. Ideally a replacement fence would include a gateway of the same size, form and location as the nineteenth century element and as per *Burra Charter* principles would be based on rigorous research and investigation of the original form, etc.

**Policy 10**

*The reconstruction of the Yard 4 South gateway and wall to Degraves Street would be appropriate, subject to sufficient resources and detailed study of the original form of these elements.*

**5.4.5 Yard surfaces**

At present the surfaces to the Yards 1, 3 and 4 South are varied in their treatment, from the informal surfaces (lawn, soil) of Yard 1 to the more formally landscaped surface treatment of Yard 3. It is also recognised that the yards have variously been subject to a build-up of material fill over their original ground level surface.

A major art piece, based on the famous convict-made quilt, the Rajah Quilt (1841) has been installed in Yard 3. The exercise yards in Yard 3, where the convict women walked, have also been defined on the bitumen surface by the use of coloured gravel to assist with
interpretation. The discussion about presentation of the site (and yards) at Section 5.9 below includes recommendations on future landscaping of the yards.

In terms of maintenance, the current schedule of mowing, removing weed growth and litter, and other general tidying up of Yard 1 should be maintained by the Parks and Wildlife Service. The Memorial Garden in Yard 3 has been maintained by the FFHS, and this maintenance should also continue. As noted above, vegetation (trees, shrubs, garden beds and plantings) should continue to be kept free of the walls in all Female Factory site yards. Drainage of water across the yard surfaces should also be managed and monitored to ensure the walls are not impacted by excessive water build-up or trapping. In Yard 3, investigative archaeological excavations have also generally been in-filled under professional supervision, with the exception of two excavations which have been left open for public display.

**Policy 11**

*The Yards 1 and 3 maintenance program should be maintained.*

*Manage and monitor surface drainage to avoid impacts on walls.*

*Keep walls free of all vegetation.*

### 5.4.6 Matron’s Cottage

In 2003 a condition report was prepared for the Matron’s Cottage by the Tasmanian Heritage Office. The report focussed on the identification of priority works and provided indicative cost estimates. The works recommendations identified, inter alia, the need to address roof drainage and materials incompatibility issues, render and pointing repairs, external timber repairs and repainting and management of rising damp and associated salt levels. The recent inspection of the building in the course of the preparation of this report indicates that these works have in part been carried out. The FFHS has advised that works undertaken include treatment of damp to the north wall, and that the lower walls which where damp affected are in the process of drying out. This has been sufficient to permit the more recent internal redecoration of some rooms. The FFHS also advises that the stone window sills on this wall have been repaired and restored, the cottage roof repaired and new guttering and downpipes installed. Two rooms of a later period in the cottage have had rotting joists and floorboards repaired, windows rehung and walls repainted. Sagging and damaged ceilings have been repaired and electrical wiring checked and repaired where necessary.

While the purpose of this report is not to provide a detailed conditions assessment or recommendations it is evident that the cottage is still in need of immediate and ongoing repair and conservation works, ahead of restoration activity, and that the approach taken to these works needs to be informed by the conservation policies for the building and the site as a whole. This is particularly important where such works may involve the removal of later alterations or additions to assist in active fabric/building conservation. Works which will need to be addressed in the short and longer term include:

- conservation of fretting and decaying stonework and brickwork including repointing and possible poulticing;
- patching and repair of already painted and rendered external finishes;
- external timber repairs, conservation and repainting (where timber is already painted);
selective repair and replacement of subfloor structure and flooring (while having regard for possible impacts on potential subfloor archaeological remains);

ongoing treatment of dampness to walls and associated works to plaster and paint finishes;

repair and painting of internal timber work (again where timber is already painted);

general repair and patching of finishes;

upgrading of services (electrical, hydraulic, environmental, security, etc.); and

external works including repair or removal of outbuildings.

Paint & plaster

It is also recommended, with regard to future painting and choice of paint colours and finishes generally, that selection be based on research and investigation. The purpose of such investigation would be to establish the nature of the original decoration and, on the basis of this information, to make appropriate recommendations regarding repainting. Investigation work should be undertaken by a historic paint investigation specialist and typically would involve the sampling of individual elements to the exterior and interior surfaces, where required, and examination of those samples under a binocular microscope. The results would then be recorded on chromochronology sheets which give an indication of the colour systems which were used throughout the life of the building. The sheets are of a descriptive nature and colours considered to be important in establishing a sequence of schemes would be matched according to the Munsell System of colour notation. This would then lead to recommendations on appropriate and authentically sympathetic paint colour choices and finishes for the cottage. Once identified and established, the recommended paint schemes should inform all future painting works to the cottage.

With regard to internal plaster repairs, it is also recommended that the plaster be analysed to confirm if it is original lime plaster, including an analysis of its constituent parts. Once this is established, only plaster based on this analysis should be used for future repairs. Use of gypsum, unless found to be an original component, should be avoided with lime plaster.

Policy 12

Future works programming should be determined by the recommended immediate and ongoing repair and conservation works outlined above.

Undertake appropriate plaster and paint investigation and analysis in order to inform future repairs and establish a recommended future paint scheme/schedule for the cottage.

Cyclical maintenance

The following is a desirable minimum program for cyclical maintenance of the Matron’s Cottage.

Annual inspection:

Roof cladding, gutters, downpipes, drains and surface drainage, damp-proof course dampness treatments, roofspace, security and fire precautions and general safety.

1-2 yearly inspection:

- Roof cladding, gutters, downpipes, drains and surface drainage, damp-proof course dampness treatments, roofspace, security and fire precautions and general safety.
External: walls – cracking, dampness, pointing, timber trims and joinery – decay, putty, finishes, chimneys, flashings, and lighting.

Internal: floors, walls, ceilings – cracking, dampness, insect attack, finishes failure, joinery, fixtures and fittings, and building services.

Curtilage: vegetation, paving, drainage, outbuildings

A cyclical maintenance inspection should be undertaken by appropriately qualified persons who possess the necessary experience, skills, knowledge and understanding of the building type, construction and materials. Generally, day-to-day maintenance work can be carried out in accordance with the conservation policies without particular reference to a conservation specialist. However, major maintenance and any interventionist works, should be undertaken under the direction of an appropriately qualified heritage practitioner, subject also to the relevant statutory approval (Tasmanian Heritage Council). Where existing fabric needs to be renewed for maintenance reasons, the replacement generally should match the existing or if to be changed the original in design, materials and/or construction.

**Policy 13**

*Institute a cyclical maintenance program for the Matron’s Cottage as per the above recommendations.*

**Other recommendations**

The following works recommendations are made to ensure the long term conservation of the place:

- Commission a detailed inspection of the building to establish the condition of the fabric and to provide a priority conservation works program. This more detailed work should inform ongoing and future conservation works.

- Priority works should include conservation of the Degraves Street door and surrounding stonework, repointing of brickwork and stonework, repair and repainting of all external timberwork, stabilisation and repair of renderwork, ongoing treatment of dampness and replacement of decayed floor structure.

**Policy 14**

*An up-to-date condition report for the Matron’s cottage is a priority and must be completed before any major works, including some of those discussed above, are undertaken.*

*Any general policies or policy discussion within this CMP which may relate to the Matron’s Cottage is to apply only until such time as a more detailed report on the Matron’s Cottage is prepared.*

**Reinstatement/reconstruction**

The extent of the investigation of this building reveals that it is of primary (core) significance for its association with the imperial convict period, albeit this was brief. The fabric which survives from this period is therefore fabric which should be conserved ahead of any other actions which might be taken, including restoration of the cottage as a whole (and restoration of later fabric/building components). Such conservation should in the first instance focus on preservation of the original fabric/building components.
In considering this issue the major building elements fall into the distinct periods fairly readily:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850-1905</td>
<td>The four western rooms and central corridor, western verandah structure and form and remnant entry wall on Degraves Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1920s</td>
<td>The three eastern rooms and entry hall, the chimneys above roof level, the bathroom on the western verandah, the weatherboard outbuildings, modifications to the messenger room door and window openings, north side brick paving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-c1920s</td>
<td>The asbestos clad skillion on the north-west corner, some internal linings and trims, the matron’s parlour fireplace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accepting that conservation of significant fabric is a higher priority, the active reconstruction of fabric or form from the 1850-1905 period is a matter which needs to have regard to the significance of the fabric which is to be removed (generally identified as ‘supporting’ elements of significance) to make way for this work; the justification for the reconstruction or reinstatement (i.e. for structural stabilisation or interpretation purposes); and any other policy (or policies) relating to the long term conservation and management of the place as a whole.

Importantly any action of this nature which is taken should have regard to achieving a balance between the significance which derives from the evolved place, also taking into consideration the social significance of the place and the current role of the cottage in supporting programs and activities which reflect this significance. A ‘turning the clock back’ (reconstruction of the original cottage form) involving removal of all post-1905 additions and alterations is an option which may warrant serious consideration in the long term. But this is also related to future uses of the site, and the ability to accommodate some or all of the current Matron’s Cottage activities and operations elsewhere within the site, if these are required to be retained in the future. It is also the case that the historical use of the cottage during its post-1856 periods and phases is not fully documented (Chapter 6 includes a recommendation for further research into this, see Section 6.12), and a better understanding of these uses may inform future decisions regarding reconstruction of the cottage, or removal of later elements. In this regard the selective and unstructured removal of later fabric also needs to be avoided, other than that which is recommended here.

As per Burra Charter principles, any active reconstruction work should only be undertaken where the evidence is sufficient to enable to the work to take place without unsound conjecture.

**Policy 15**

*All surviving original fabric from the pre-1905 period should be actively preserved.*

*Decisions regarding reconstruction and restoration of original cottage fabric and form should have regard for the factors outlined above relating to significance, future uses, further research, etc."

*Active reconstruction should only occur in the context of an agreed conservation policy and where the evidence is sufficient to enable the work to take place without unsound conjecture.*
Adaptation/additions

Discrete interventions into the Matron’s Cottage, or to other remnant fabric of the Cascades Female Factory, may be contemplated but only where such works are required to support Cascades Female Factory site management and use. Such works must follow Burra Charter principles including the ‘cautious’ approach recommended by the Charter, where as little as possible is changed and works would not ‘distort’ the physical or other evidence provided by the place. This level of intervention would not necessarily provide additional usable space.

Any adaptation of the cottage which required change to fabric (physical intervention) should also ensure that:

- change is concentrated in an area of the building which has already been altered;
- is minimised or limited in extent; and
- is preferably located in an area of the building which has limited visibility (this is problematic in the case of the cottage, where only the north elevation of the building currently has limited visibility, and this is not the case when the public have access to Yard 4 South).

It is also preferable that the interventions:

- Ensure a contrast between old and new fabric, between nineteenth century and contemporary fabric, so as to retain clear evidence of the form and fabric of the nineteenth century material.
- Establish a palette of new materials for new works which can be used in any future intervention, to ensure consistency and avoid the proliferation of materials (as currently exists on the site). The palette can draw on local materials, at least in a selective way, but should not compete with, or detract from, the primacy of the sandstone used throughout the site.

In considering any future adaptation of the cottage (including one which is not currently contemplated), there are a number of general principles to apply:

- Retain sufficient intact external and internal fabric to ensure that the significance of the place is not unacceptably compromised and the building’s original use is still understood and recognised.
- Internal works should retain the overall domestic character of the cottage, and should generally work within the existing layout and internal plan. The additions on the east side of the cottage, as later elements, provide greater opportunity for alteration.
- New partitions or stud walls could be introduced, although there is limited opportunity to do this given the modest size of existing internal spaces. Any works of this sort should minimise physical impacts on significant cottage fabric.
- Where changes and alterations are made, there should be a focus on retaining original fabric where possible and where there is potential that it might be revealed or restored at a later date.
Where practicable, work should be reversible, not least since this allows for possible future reinstatement.

New or introduced fabric should be visually distinguished from the original fabric.

Windows should be retained in their current form, with no lowering of sills or widening openings.

There is very limited opportunity to undertake an addition to the cottage.

5.4.7 Garden & Outbuildings

As noted in Chapter 3, the condition of the weatherboard outbuildings in Yard 4 South is poor and if they are to be retained, immediate and future works would include:

- removal of creepers;
- replacement of corrugated steel roofing;
- repair and replacement missing and decayed weatherboards;
- reconstruction of doors and window;
- external repainting;
- possible replacement of flooring; and
- installation of services.

While these elements are generally identified as ‘supporting elements’ in the context of understanding the evolved nature (and later stages) of the site and use of the Matron’s Cottage, it may be that future site management ultimately requires their removal. In such a case, it is recommended that these elements be recorded (including photographic) recording prior to any such works.

5.5 Conservation & management of sub-surface fabric and remains

Archaeological remains at the Cascades Female Factory have the potential to yield information on the different phases of human activity at the site. Remains may include the sub-surface remnants of demolished buildings, walls, pathways and refuse dumps, as well as artefacts. These forms of archaeological evidence can shed light on the fabric of the Female Factory and activities undertaken at this place in the past. Archaeological evidence can be used to enhance site interpretation, as well as presenting opportunities for research.

The levels of archaeological potential for the different site elements are illustrated at Figure 30. A Condition Assessment and Archaeological Zoning Plan recently prepared by Environmental Resources Management Pty Ltd (ERM, October 2007)\textsuperscript{139} provides recommendations on managing the archaeological resources of the Female Factory. This document should be consulted for policies on managing sub-surface material and conserving components of the remaining fabric of the place.

Exposed structural remains

Yard 3 currently contains two sections of exposed in situ structural archaeology excavated by Searle (1996) and then Kostoglou (2001), and both have suffered variously from sustained exposure to the elements. With regard to the Searle excavation, only 3 x 1.5 metres is
exposed and this relatively modest section of composite sandstone and brick fabric has fared relatively well. In contrast the more recent and more substantial excavation by Kostoglou has suffered damage to the constituent lime based mortar that bonds the various masonry components. This is due principally to rainwater that continues to enter the trench despite the erection of a ‘mylar’ fabric sail/shade cloth over the trench. The sail is of inadequate size and, combined with the folded shape, results in water draining into the larger trench, allowing both excessive moss build up and degeneration of the exposed fabric. This will continue over time unless action is taken to remediate the problem.

Yard 4 also has an archaeological excavation which is currently infilled with geo textile fabric and sand, subject to a decision on how best to interpret and show this excavation. This will be addressed in the Presentation Plan currently in preparation. The investigation uncovered the Sub Matron’s Cottage, walkway, cook house and part of the purpose built nursery building. A structural engineer’s opinion was sought on the stability of the adjacent wall and it appears to be in sound condition.

Figure 31 View of Yard 3 excavation undertaken by Kostoglou (2002). This image shows exposed footings shortly after excavation.
The following tabular summary sets out landscaping and maintenance activities which are recommended to be implemented in Yard 3, as per recommendations in Kostoglou (2002). This should be read in conjunction with the more recent recommendations contained in ERM (2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Consultation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove all wind born litter</td>
<td>Papers and leaves to be removed with a soft bristle broom.</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove standing weed growth</td>
<td>Weeds are to be carefully removed by hand if the roots have not gained a purchase on any stonework or mortar. Otherwise poisoning is required.</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>Use of herbicide to be clarified with appropriate expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor water drainage from court yard and cell interiors</td>
<td>Note any sustained pooling of water on the courtyard base.</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Refer problem to conservation architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor cracking in drain cap stones</td>
<td>Not any new or additional cracking of drain fabric</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Refer new problems to cons. architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay membrane and coloured gravel in cell floor spaces</td>
<td>Lay membrane and cover with appropriately coloured gravel to highlight cells and prevent weed growth.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Install larger Mylar sail | Remove existing inadequate mylar shade cloth and replace with larger version to prevent water runoff into excavation (or other form of more appropriate protection/cover). | NA | Architect

Table 3 Recommended maintenance for exposed archaeological excavations

**Policy 16**

*Implement the recommended maintenance program for the exposed archaeological excavations, in accordance with the recommendations made in ERM (2007).*

*Replace the 'Mylar' sail/shade cloth in Yard 3 with a cover of more appropriate size and form.*

5.5.1 **Structural remains exposed in the future**

Lessons learnt at other archaeological sites and now highlighted at the Cascades Female Factory show how delicate excavated structural fabric can be when re-exposed for sustained periods of time. Although this aim has been achieved at other locations, the cost involved in acquiring the expertise and committing adequate resources to protect and maintain the fabric tends to be prohibitive in all but the best funded enterprises. Therefore any future long term exposure of excavated structural material would require the completion of a management document detailing the display design which also addressed all conservation issues and how to adequately redress them prior to any works. Each separate excavation location would therefore require its own document which would be forwarded as a matter of routine to the relevant agency (Heritage Tasmania) in order to obtain the relevant permits.

**Policy 17**

*No future excavations should remain exposed for interpretative purposes unless there are sufficient resources to do this sustainably, and to enable protection and management of the exposed material.*

*Prepare management documents to guide conservation and protection of exposed sub-surface remains across the site, prior to future proposals to excavate and expose material in situ.*

Chapter 6 also includes recommendations relating to future archaeological excavations, see Section 6.12.

5.5.2 **Archaeological material on private land**

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the archaeological potential of former yards and other associated elements which are outside the designated Cascades Female Factory. In summary these are as follows (they are also illustrated at):

- Yard 4 North is of high archaeological potential
- The cemetery is of high archaeological potential
- Yard 2 is of medium archaeological potential
- Yard 5 is of low archaeological potential
Roadside verges/areas outside walls are of low archaeological potential.

There is currently no statutory protection afforded to archaeological material/remains, for those sites which are not included in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. Of the above, none are currently included in the Register, but most have been nominated and are in the process of being assessed [the status of nomination with regard to Yard 4 North and the roadside verges is to be confirmed].

Future works in any of these areas should be subject to the approvals process and requirements of the Tasmanian Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995 with regard to the exposure or identification of archaeological remains. For the areas of high and medium archaeological potential, any works requiring excavation or disturbance of the ground should also be preceded by a pre-works archaeological investigation or sub-surface test excavation, undertaken by an archaeologist who can monitor the excavation and prevent damage to significant sub-surface structures, strata or deposits.

**Policy 18**

*For areas of archaeological potential on private land it is recommended that future works in these areas be subject to the requirements of the Tasmanian Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995 with regard to the exposure or identification of archaeological remains.*

5.5.3 Works related excavation

This activity is a necessary preliminary step for any works program that will impact on the Cascades Female Factory, below the ground. As noted above, any works requiring the removal of earth must involve an archaeologist who can monitor the excavation and prevent damage to significant sub-surface structures, strata or deposits. Larger works programs with the potential for such an impact should involve an archaeologist in the planning phase of the program. Limited excavations of this type further serve as ‘test excavations’ which gradually increase the coverage of archaeological knowledge throughout the site. Consideration should also be given to employing remote sensing technology.

**Policy 19**

*Involve an archaeologist in a monitoring role for works requiring excavation/ removal of earth and in the planning stage for any proposed major works.*

5.6 Objects & artefacts

The limited archaeological excavations to date at the Cascades Female Factory have already led to the recovery of at least 2000 artefacts of various fabrics and functions, of which the vast majority are currently in storage. This is a very significant artefact assemblage, which has considerable potential to aid future research and interpretation of the site, and to continue to enhance an understanding of the living conditions and operations of the site.

The recovered artefacts are from four localities:

- Yard 3 South (Searle)
- Yards 1 and 3 perimeter wall (Kostoglou)
- Yard 3 cells (Kostoglou)
- Yard 3 adjacent to eastern wall (Kostoglou)
There are also some miscellaneous and un-provenanced items recovered and/or donated by nearby residents. Ideally, these artefacts should all be re-catalogued and compiled as part of a master artefact register that can continue to incorporate new finds. The Port Arthur catalogue system provides a template which could be adopted.

The conservation and management of the artefacts involves proper storage conditions, handling and treatment of materials and fabric. While a detailed assessment of the current management and condition of the Cascades Female Factory artefact assemblage is not within the scope of this report, the study, conservation, storage and display of the artefacts is an important consideration in terms of the management of the Female Factory site overall. It is recognised that the display of artefacts has already commenced in a modest fashion within the Matron’s Cottage. Ultimately the display of artefacts may be better accommodated in a larger facility, or a facility which can safeguard the long term integrity of the artefacts. It might also prove feasible to arrange a custodial agreement with the Tasmanian Museum & Art Gallery (TMAG), whereby the TMAG agrees to curate and store the collection and a selection of objects at the Cascades site. The latter could include a rotating exhibition of objects based on a thematic or other approach.

It is also preferred that only those artefacts and objects with a demonstrated and verified association with the Female Factory be displayed on site (such as excavated objects and artefacts). Where objects are displayed which are not in this category, they should be clearly identified as such.

The development of a Collections Policy is recommended as a means of guiding future acquisition, display and interpretation of artefacts and objects.

There are a number of guides and documents relating to artefacts conservation and management in Australia. Heritage Victoria has published *Archeological Artefacts Management Guidelines* (February 2004), which includes guidance on establishing a catalogue for artefacts as well as methods of handling, storing, labelling and conserving artefacts. This document is available online at [www.heritage.vic.gov.au/information/conservation](http://www.heritage.vic.gov.au/information/conservation).

### Policy 20

*Establish a master artefacts register for objects and artefacts associated with the Cascades Female Factory.*

*Ensure proper storage, handling and display of objects and artefacts at the subject site.*

*Objects and artefacts displayed at the site should, in preference, have a demonstrated and verified association with the Female Factory.*

*Develop a Collections Policy to guide future acquisition, display and interpretation of artefacts and objects.*

### 5.7 Setting & context

As outlined in Chapter 3, the setting and context for the Cascades Female Factory includes the surrounding generally low-scale residential development of South Hobart, the cluster of Georgian cottages in Degraves and Apsley streets, the Hobart Rivulet and the backdrops of Mount Wellington and Knocklofty Hill. The subject site sits almost centrally within this context, in the bottom of the valley. This setting, despite being gradually built-up and built-out by urban development, is still very evocative and reminiscent of the setting in which the
Cascades Female Factory was historically established, and frequently depicted in the nineteenth century. The setting also remains visible from within the site, including some views of Mount Wellington and Knocklofty Hill from within the yard areas.

Yard 1 in particular is highly visible from the surrounding elevated areas, and the perimeter walls to Yard 1 contribute to the visual prominence of the site in its valley setting. The remnant stone walls are the most distinctive and demonstrative elements of the site, which distinguish it as a former place of incarceration. The walls obviously reflect the historical need to confine, conceal and secure the complex and its inhabitants. This prominence, and the associated landmark qualities of the Yard 1 walls, should be maintained. No new structures or elements of scale should be placed on the south side (streetscape side) of the Yard 1 wall, including in the vicinity of the entrance, as this is an important aspect of the streetscape presentation of the site.

The rectilinear plan of most of the yards is still largely discernible within the immediate context, even where the original perimeter walls have been removed. This is predominantly due to the subdivision pattern, although the north-south line of the Yard 2 west boundary is no longer evident (has been built over), and the Yard 5 boundaries have also largely been lost. Where feasible and practicable, all remaining outlines should continue to be legible and maintained as such in the immediate setting. This may be achieved through landscaping, and/or encouraging owners to respect the original yard boundaries. Subdivision of Yard 2 and Yard 4 North could potentially further dilute the evidence of the original yard plans.

**Policy 21**

*Maintain the visual prominence and landmark qualities of the Yard 1 walls within the local context.*

* Maintain and enhance the legibility of all the yard boundaries, where feasible and practicable.*

5.7.1 **Curtilage**

Defining an area of heritage ‘curtilage’ or area around a building, complex or site ensures that a ‘buffer’ is provided between the heritage elements and surrounding development, which acts as a ‘managed interface’ between old and new development. A curtilage can also provide for the conservation of the sensitive heritage values immediately surrounding the heritage place, and where appropriate, can maintain a setting of aesthetic value for the heritage place. Outlying or detached, but still associated, elements can also be captured within a curtilage area.

The curtilage area often follows the title boundary (or boundaries) of a property, but not always. In this case, as indicated at Figure 30 where a recommended curtilage area is defined for the Cascades Female Factory site, buildings to the south and east are included in the curtilage, as is the Hobart Rivulet and the former cemetery. The inclusion of these elements in the curtilage is primarily due to their historical association with the Cascades Female Factory. It also recognises that some of these elements retain, to a greater or lesser degree, archaeological remains which are associated with the Factory. The curtilage also captures archaeological elements located immediately outside the yard boundaries (such as the water closets and cesspit listed at Section 5.3 above).
Policy 22

Management of the curtilage area for the Cascades Female Factory should have regard for the identified aspects of significance of the subject site, and visual impacts on, and presentation of, the important streetscape presentation of the site.

5.7.2 Views & vistas

The prominence and visibility of the site within the immediate South Hobart context is addressed above. The strong physical presence and historically robust character of the site in this context is evident and emphasised in the many surviving historic images, including those taken from distant elevated areas around the complex. The retention of these distant views and vistas of the complex remains important today, and is an aspect of the ongoing presentation and interpretation of the site.

Views out of the yards, including views of the setting for the Cascades Female Factory, and views of Mount Wellington and Knocklofty Hill, are also important in terms of helping demonstrate the original geographic context for the site. These views would be impacted if structures of scale were built in proximity to the exterior of the yard walls.

Further detailed analysis and investigation of views would assist in identifying the most significant, and making feasible and practicable recommendations on their future management.

Policy 23

Where feasible and practicable, maintain important views of the site, including distant views and vistas.

Views out of the site, which take in the historic context and setting, including elevated areas of Mount Wellington and Knocklofty Hill, should also be protected where feasible and practicable.

5.8 New works & development

The following overview and recommendations are included as a guide to possible future site development. The table at Section 1.8 of Chapter 1 also refers to site development. Some references or recommendations are also made to areas and elements which are in private ownership.

Generally, the construction of new buildings or structures within the Cascades Female Factory site should not be undertaken where there is a risk that construction will impact subsurface archaeological evidence. Additionally, the current character of the site, the sensitive visual issues, and the desire to maintain the prominence of the remaining original walls and the Matron’s Cottage, may be adversely impacted by any new buildings or structures. Yard 1, the undeveloped portion of Yard 3, and Yard 4 South are areas of particular heritage sensitivity and consequently development should not be undertaken here. It is recommended that new development and works for other areas of the Female Factory site should only be considered when:
- the works are associated with new development which directly relates to, and supports, the management and/or interpretation of the site; and
- the proposed functions of new buildings or structures cannot be accommodated by the adaptive reuse of existing buildings.

New development could also occur in areas outside or adjacent to the original extent of the five yards. This is also discussed at Section 0 in Chapter 6.

Some demolition of existing buildings is recommended to enhance the presentation of the Female Factory. The Australian Government provided funding as a Centenary of Federation Grant to the Festival of Tasmania Ltd (FOTL) to enable its subsidiary, the Female Factory Historic Site, to purchase Yard 3. The Deed of Agreement between the Commonwealth and FOTL requires FOTL to seek Commonwealth approval before selling or disposing of the asset. Yard 3 site will be handed over to the Tasmanian State Government by the end of 2009. The Deed also requires the fudge factory building (including covered loading area) to have been removed from the site by the time of handover.

If the fudge factory building is proposed to be replaced, careful consideration should be given to the scale, massing, location and materials of the replacement building, to ensure that the new works are sensitive and sympathetic to the heritage values and presentation of the site.

A new building required for and associated with management of the site could include and accommodate administration and visitor facilities; interpretation, research and education programs; and collections management or archives activities. There is also the opportunity for quality contemporary structures to be built which aid delivery of an arts program for the site; for instance FFHS currently pursues a policy of interpretation through the arts.

Generally, where any new works or structures, or replacement buildings, are proposed for the remaining original yard areas (including yards in private ownership), it is recommended that the new works be low-scale so as to respect the generally low-scale nature of the overall site, and to avoid visual impacts on the Female Factory site, including impacts on the Matron’s Cottage and perimeter walls. It is also important to maintain the visual prominence of the walls within the designated Cascades Female Factory site, as they are viewed from within and outside the yards. In terms of the height and scale of new works, critical sight lines should be considered whereby new works should generally not be visible above the tops of the remnant perimeter walls as ‘backdrops’, when the walls are viewed from within and outside the yards.

The walls of the yards of the designated site are (now) largely freestanding linear elements, which is an aspect of their current presentation. This should be respected in any future development and no new buildings or structures should therefore be built adjacent to the walls.

Impacts on the formal geometry of the conjoined yards and overall site plan should also be avoided with any development. For instance, a proposal to place a structure across an original yard boundary (i.e. across the boundary between yards) would not be supported from a heritage perspective.

With regard to the material palette of new works relating to the Female Factory site, this could draw on local materials, at least in a selective way. As noted above for any new works to the Matron’s Cottage, it would be desirable to ensure consistency and avoid the proliferation of new materials across the site. A comparatively simple and consistent palette
of new materials would enhance the presentation and appearance of the site overall, and should assist in maintaining an emphasis on, and drawing attention to, the original fabric.
New materials should not compete with, or detract from, the primacy of the original sandstone used throughout the site.

New development and works should also have regard for the archaeological potential and management requirements of the various current and former site components.

**Policy 24**

*Any new works and development associated with the Cascades Female Factory should support the ongoing management and interpretation of the site.*

*No new buildings or structures should be introduced to Yard 1 or Yard 4 South.*

*A new building may be possible in Yard 3 or Yard 4 North, within the footprint of existing buildings, if it would not adversely impact on subsurface archaeological remains. Any proposal must be developed in accordance with the recommendations of the Archaeological Zoning Plan (ERM 2007)*

*New works in other areas should be low-scale and have regard for visual impacts on the perimeter walls and Matron’s Cottage.*

*No new buildings or structures should be built adjacent to the walls within the designated site, and should have regard for critical sight lines within and outside yards (i.e. visibility of works above remnant walls).*

*New works should avoid impacts on the formal geometry/plan of the conjoined yards.*

*New materials should not compete with, or detract from, the primacy of the sandstone.*

*New works should not impact on significant archaeological fabric, and should have regard for the archaeological potential and archaeological management requirements of the various site components.*

### 5.9 Presentation of site components

Presentation of the subject site is addressed above in a number of areas.

The current character of Yard 1 in particular is bleak and austere, with the yard being relatively featureless and grim. This is considered to be an important aspect of the current character of the yard and is of value in that it serves to reinforce in the present a sense of the oppressive nature of the place during its convict and institutional history. It is not necessarily reflective of the historic character, but of the site as it has evolved into the present.

In Yard 3, the presentation of the yard and of the exposed excavations would be improved through introducing a more consistent form of cover/shelter to the exposed areas. This could be reviewed as part of the future Archaeological Management Plan for the overall site. This should also be consistent with the recommendation relating to the replacement of the sail over the 2001 excavation in the yard (see Section 0 above).

The difference in ground surface level between the yards is a reflection of the historical use and development of the yards, and the relative quantities of fill placed over the footings of the demolished structures within yards. The different grades can be retained, subject however to the conservation and maintenance of the perimeter walls, which have been impacted in places by pressure exerted by the fill. The different grades can also be interpreted as an aspect of the management of the archaeological resource beneath the fill.
More generally, and as outlined above under ‘New Works & Development’, it is important in terms of overall site presentation to achieve a higher level of consistency and uniformity of appearance across the designated Female Factory site. This would help to reinforce the history of the place as a unified, albeit layered complex, an aspect of the place which is apparent when looking at the historic images. Again, a proliferation across the site of different new materials and treatments (for fences, surfaces, landscaping, etc) should be avoided, in preference to a relatively simple and consistent palette.

**Landscaping**

While this report does not contain detailed recommendations on landscaping or appropriate future planting programs, the overall objective is to achieve general consistency in landscape character across the whole of the Cascades Female Factory. This will assist in the presentation of the site, avoid overt contrasts or disparity between the yards, and enhance an appreciation of the historic character of the yards although it is recognised that historically, the yards were typically built up spaces. It would also be acceptable to distinguish, through an alternative but still complimentary form of landscape treatment, those areas within the yards which were originally used as open space or courtyards within the Factory. This has already occurred to a degree with Yard 3. This may additionally provide an opportunity to retain (or relocate) a memorial garden or ‘Garden of Reflection’ within the overall site, which it is recognised is valued by visitors to the site.

**Street fencing**

With regard to the boundaries on Degraves Street (the principal address of the site) and indeed to Syme Street (the secondary address), disparate ownership and development histories of the various yards have led to the use of different boundary materials, fencing, and landscape treatments.

Currently, the three yards which are accessible to the public (Yards 1, 3 and 4 South) are bounded on Degraves Street by three different fence types:

- Yard 1 retains its original sandstone perimeter wall
- Yard 3 currently has a chain mesh fence
- Yard 4 has a timber paling fence

These various fabrics fail to impart any sense of homogeneity. Furthermore with the exception of Yard 1 the use of modern fencing detracts from the historical character and ‘sense of age’ that visitors to the site expect. It could also be argued that the later fences further fail to impart any real sense of enclosure that should distinguish a facility such as this.

It is not suggested that the stone perimeter walls be reconstructed along the street boundaries of the yards within the designated site (save for Yard 4 south as noted above), but it is recommended that a more consistent street boundary treatment be established for both streetscape interfaces (Degraves and Syme streets). This is also to a degree dependent on future site security and visitor management. A form of landscaping or planting may be appropriate, as an interpretive means of demonstrating the original scale and prominence of the walls. If planting is proposed, regard should be had for appropriate species so as to avoid impacting on possible sub-surface remains and potential archaeological material.
Policy 25

Introduce greater consistency to the landscape character/treatment across the whole of the designated site.

The austere character of Yard 1 should be respected and reinforced through future management of the yard.

Introduce a more consistent form of cover/shelter to the exposed archaeological excavations in Yard 3.

Establish a more uniform street boundary treatment to the yards within the designated site (for both Degraves and Syme streets).

5.10 Site recording

In the unlikely situation (such as currently unforeseen circumstances involving accident or irreparable damage) whereby significant structures or elements are proposed for demolition, including associated elements, then it is recommended that a recording program be undertaken. This may include, but is not necessarily restricted to, measured drawings and a black and white archival quality photographic record (the latter is still regarded as a sound and archivally reliable form of recording); a digital or video record may also be undertaken. The records should be lodged with an appropriate repository, for future research purposes. A copy should also be retained by site management and used, where appropriate, in any future site interpretation.

It is also recommended that all works to the Cascades Female Factory, including maintenance, conservation or other works-related activities, be recorded, with records maintained by site management and held centrally.

Policy 26

Where a significant structure or element is proposed for demolition or removal (due to accident or irreparable damage) ensure an archival record is made prior to the works.

Maintain records of all works to the site, including maintenance, conservation or other works-related activities.

5.11 Policy implementation & review

It is noted that the Tasmanian Department of Tourism Arts and Environment proposes to commission a separate implementation and master plan in relation the CMP, which will detail aspects of how the report and its recommendations, actions and programs will be implemented.

Policy 27

Prepare a separate implementation and master plan.

Review this Conservation Management Plan at 5 year intervals or more frequently if required.
6.0 Site Management

This chapter includes policies and recommendations relating to the management and use of the Cascades Female Factory. As with the preceding chapter, the focus is on Yards 1, 3 and 4, the 'Cascades Female Factory CMP area', with reference where appropriate to the original extent of the Female Factory (other yards) and associated elements. The emphasis is not on conservation of fabric, as in Chapter 5, but on policies and recommendations which address conservation and management of the heritage values, support management and use of the site, and reflect and relate to the social values of the site (which are less tangible than fabric). These include policies and recommendations relating to site management, public access and use, community and stakeholder consultation, site promotion and interpretation, risk management, archives, future research, etc. These also in part derive from, and support, the management ‘principles’ for places included in the National Heritage List (NHL) as reproduced below.\textsuperscript{140}

It is also recognised that, although the social significance of the Cascades Female Factory has been assessed and identified as an aspect of heritage significance, it may be that a more comprehensive documentation of these values in the future would reveal other aspects of social significance which may require new or different policies and management approaches.

6.1 NHL Management Principles

The Regulations to the Commonwealth \textit{Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act} 1999 (EPBC Act) include a suite of ‘management principles’ for places included in the NHL. The principles relate to management activities which are largely addressed in this chapter; they include:

1. The objective in managing National Heritage places is to identify, protect, conserve, present and transmit, to all generations, their National Heritage values.

2. The management of National Heritage places should use the best available knowledge, skills and standards for those places, and include ongoing technical and community input to decisions and actions that may have a significant impact on their National Heritage values.

3. The management of National Heritage places should respect all heritage values of the place and seek to integrate, where appropriate, any Commonwealth, State, Territory and local government responsibilities for those places.

4. The management of National Heritage places should ensure that their use and presentation is consistent with the conservation of their National Heritage values.

5. The management of National Heritage places should make timely and appropriate provision for community involvement, especially by people who:
   
   (a) have a particular interest in, or association with, the place; and
   
   (b) may be affected by the management of the place.

6. Indigenous people are the primary source of information on the value of their heritage, and the active participation of indigenous people in identification, assessment and management is integral to the effective protection of indigenous heritage values.
7. The management of National Heritage places should provide for regular monitoring, review and reporting on the conservation of National Heritage values.

6.2 Statutory context

The Cascades Female Factory operates within a statutory framework with regard to works and uses of the site. These are referred to in Chapter 1 and outlined in more detail below. This framework requires consultation and negotiation, and a requirement to obtain statutory approvals before works (other than basic maintenance works) can occur at the site, at both local and State level. The inclusion of the property on the National Heritage List brings an additional level of approval and compliance; and similarly a requirement to undertake consultation (see management NHL Principles 2, 5 and 6).

It is of utmost importance that the highest level of statutory protection and control be afforded to all significant fabric associated with the Female Factory, both within the designated site (Yards 1, 3 and 4), and outside it. The protection afforded through the State Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995, and inclusion of places and elements in the Tasmanian Heritage Register, with a clear description of what fabric is significant and should be protected, would achieve this. Inclusion of these areas in the Register would also afford protection to any archaeological sub-surface remains or artefacts including those exposed in the future. National listing, and international (World Heritage) listing should it occur, would bring additional status and recognition.

The Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995 sets out the requirements for obtaining approval for work on places entered in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. The Act requires that a person must not carry out any works in relation to a registered place or a place within a heritage area which may affect the historic cultural heritage significance of the place unless the works are approved by the Tasmanian Heritage Council (THC), the statutory body which is responsible for the protection of places included in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. The THC comprises experts in various aspects of cultural heritage, rural environment and tourism, and is assisted by Heritage Tasmania which administers the Act, provides conservation advice to owners of listed places, government and community organisations, makes recommendations to the THC regarding nominated places, and advises on development applications.

‘Works’ to places entered in the Register include any development, physical intervention, excavation or action which may result in a change to the nature or appearance of the fabric of a place; and any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land. ‘Development’ includes construction, exterior alteration or exterior decoration of a building; the demolition or removal of a building; subdivision or consolidation; and construction of signs or hoardings. Internal works are also subject to the legislation if they are likely to affect the significance of the place, such as the removal of original internal fabric or components.

Policy 28

The highest level of statutory protection should be afforded to all significant fabric associated with the Female Factory (within and outside Yards 1, 3 and 4). All significant fabric and elements not already included in the Tasmanian Heritage Register, and subject to the statutory requirements of the State Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995, should therefore be included in the Register. Protection of the fabric will also assist in conserving and interpreting the social, historical, architectural, aesthetic and scientific values of the place.
Comply with all statutory obligations arising from inclusion within the Hobart City Council Planning Scheme, the Tasmanian Heritage Register, the National Heritage List and (if listed) the World Heritage List.

Nominate Yard 4 North for assessment and addition to the existing National Heritage List entry for the Cascades Female Factory.

6.3 Future Management

Implementation of the management principles listed above, and the policies and recommendations of this report, is best undertaken by a single management entity for the designated Cascades Female Factory. Consolidation of the management of the yards currently within the designated site, as will occur from 2009, is a crucial first step in this direction, although a future management entity has not as yet been identified.

Given the important position of the site within the group of convict-related sites in Tasmania, it may be desirable, in the long-term, to establish a single body with responsibility for managing all convict sites on public land in the State. This would ensure that management across all convict sites is consistent, priorities for funding and resources are identified and resources are allocated more effectively, future research is guided by strategic needs and directions, and promotion and marketing is enhanced.

Policy 29

Establish a single management entity for the whole of the designated site, with responsibility for implementing the NHL management principles and the policies and recommendations of this report.

6.4 Public/visitor access & use

The management objectives included above at Section 6.1 emphasise the importance of ‘transmitting’ the National heritage values of the Cascades Female Factory to the community, and of involving the community in decisions regarding the place. This emphasis reflects acknowledgement of the social values and social significance of the place. Maintaining and indeed enhancing community access (where possible and practicable) is seen as an important component of site management. However, this does not necessarily mean that public access should be unrestricted and available at all times. From a heritage perspective, it is not necessarily appropriate for a site such as this to have 24 hour uncontrolled access. It is also recognised that public access to Yard 1 is currently a requirement of the gazetted/public land status of the yard, and that the local South Hobart community has for some time used Yard 1 informally for recreational purposes. Event-related public use has also, in recent times, been encouraged through performances and community events held in Yard 1, and through exhibitions and other promotional activities conducted by the FFHS in Yards 3 and 4 South.

6.4.1 Visitor/tourism pressures

With regard to visitor numbers and tourism pressures, current concerns can be summarised as follows:

- Public access brings the risk of wear and tear on historic fabric including ground surfaces, and possibly also deliberate damage and/or removal of material from the site over time (such as stone).
Yard 1 is continually open to the public and after hours use of the yard for informal recreation purposes (such as ball games) may impact the surrounding wall fabric. Volunteers monitor this yard during opening hours, as do Parks and Wildlife Service field officers, however, it is not possible for this yard to be constantly supervised.

Yards 3 and 4 South currently have low visitor/tourism pressures and no vandalism has occurred to date in these yards. As awareness of the site increases, and more attention is focused on the site through its inclusion in the National Heritage List, then visitor numbers (and pressures) are likely to grow. This has the potential to impact on the exposed excavations in Yard 3, and on the fabric of the walls and Matron’s Cottage in Yard 4 South.

Increasing numbers generally are likely to put pressure on facilities, and highlight the lack of facilities such as the availability of refreshments, public toilets (although access can be provided to toilets, upon request) and dedicated car parking areas (see below).

Visitor use also requires consideration of site occupational health and safety issues, in terms of risk management. An OH&S Policy should be developed with this in mind.

Increased visitation may also impact on local and nearby residents.

### Policies 30

*As part of a master planning process, review the level of public access to the site.*

*Continue to informally monitor visitor numbers and impacts of visitors, including impacts on fabric.*

*Prepare a strategy for future visitor management in the context of protecting the fabric, and interpreting the identified heritage values, in anticipation of a continuing increase in interest in the site.*

*Prepare an OH&S policy for visitor use.*

#### 6.4.2 Visitor facilities

Current visitor facilities include:

- One room in Matron’s Cottage for use of sub-committee group, Female Factory Research Group.
- Two restored rooms in the Matron's Cottage used as a gallery space.
- Matron’s Parlour in Matron’s Cottage used for tours and small meetings
- Modest visitor centre and site shop in former fudge factory building in Yard 3, selling Tasmanian produce, including fudge, jams, books and crafts.

There are at present no toilet facilities on the site for general visitor use, and no dedicated car parking areas or visitor centre.

*Car parking*

There is limited car parking available for visitor use, although parking is available in the rear (north) of Yard 3 and on Degraves Street, where buses and coaches also park. This is potentially problematic for local residents, particularly if visitor use increases. Parking on Degraves Street also has implications for the presentation and visual appreciation of the
Degraves Street boundary of the Female Factory, particularly for the perimeter walls and entrance to Yard 1. These elements make the greatest contribution to the streetscape in this area. It is preferred that car parking spaces be placed in areas of limited visibility; this could include on the north of the site, as per the northern portion of Yard 3.

Visitor centre

Visitor experience and appreciation of the Cascades Female Factory, as well as administration of the site, and interpretation, would greatly benefit from the establishment of a dedicated and integrated visitor centre. The centre could utilise an existing structure in or adjacent to the site, or be located in a new structure in or adjacent to the site (subject also to the recommendation and policies regarding ‘New Works & Development’ at Section 5.8 in Chapter 5).

Such centres orient the visitor to a place, and generally contain exhibitions or displays about the place. They can also provide a range of services including bookings, information about local attractions and points of interest, displays and educational material, interpretation, retail sales, and site amenities (including food and beverage outlet). Visitor centres can also act as a starting point for trail and walks, and a departure point for tours.

The Matron’s Cottage could have a supplementary role in this function but provides limited opportunity for a full visitor centre operation due to constraints of size, building layout and heritage fabric (see discussion in Chapter 5, Section 5.4.6 on adaptation of the cottage). Preferred future uses for the cottage include house museum, supporting re-enactments, displaying artwork/exhibitions on female convict-related themes, and its ongoing role as a resource centre for research including genealogical research (as per existing database).

Policy 31

As part of a master planning process, investigate ways of improving and enhancing visitor facilities in and around the site, as appropriate.

6.4.3 Visitor movement throughout existing site

Controlling visitor movement into and across the site is important in terms of managing and conserving the significant fabric. Controlling visitor movement can also assist in presenting and introducing the site to visitors, and implementing an interpretation strategy.

The current situation, where the three yards in the designated site can all be entered off Degraves Street (albeit access is currently restricted to Yard 4 South), is not particularly satisfactory in terms of visitor orientation and appreciation of the original function of the yards. It may be appropriate, from both future visitor management and site security perspectives, to consider a single entrance and exit point to the site, so that visitors can be properly oriented and introduced to the site, and directed around it. It may also be appropriate to generally restrict pedestrian access to the south of the site (Degraves Street), while vehicle access/parking is limited to Syme Street. This has the advantage of separating the two, and limiting the visual impacts of the latter to the less sensitive area of the site.

Internal visitor movement within the site is currently only available between Yards 1 and 3. Ideally, the utilisation (reopening) of original doorways in the walls between yards can provide for internal movement between yards; the infilled doorway between Yards 3 and 4 South could be utilised in this way (subject to a favourable structural engineers report and conservation works on the timber door).
Vehicles (unless they are management vehicles required for specific purposes) should continue to be prevented from entering Yard 1.

**Opening to Syme Street in Yard 1**

At present there seems little justification to reopen the bricked up doorway in the Yard 1 north perimeter wall to Syme Street. The preference is to control the movement of visitors (and access) through the south of the site, where visitors generally arrive and depart, and through the east-west openings between yards.

**Policy 32**

*As part of a master planning process, investigate ways of improving visitor management and controlling access to and within the site, including the entrance of visitors to the site, and internal access to yards within the site.*

**6.4.4 Site security**

Site and building security are issues for any buildings or structures located in an area with public access. Significant heritage fabric can be damaged and defaced through vandalism, making future conservation and restoration more problematic and costly.

Site security is a moderate problem at the Cascades Female Factory. Low-level forms of site security, such as adequate lighting in combination with the current surveillance by Parks and Wildlife Service officers, and informal surveillance by FFHS staff, assist in the short-term. Site security is being addressed in more detail within the Presentation Plan currently in preparation. Any recommended changes or implementation of higher level security measures should have regard for heritage impacts and for issues of visual sensitivity and avoidance of physical impacts on significant fabric.

**Policy 33**

*Continue to monitor site security.*

*Implement the recommendations of the Presentation Plan (in preparation).*

**6.4.5 Lighting**

Introducing consistent but discreet lighting is a means of enhancing site security and presentation, and improving amenity for visitors. New lighting systems can be contemporary in form and materials, but should aim for consistency across the site. The placement of lighting and associated cabling/services also requires careful consideration so as to avoid or limit unnecessary physical impacts or damage to significant fabric, including impacts on significant subsurface material. Visual impacts on significant elements should also be addressed. Consideration could be given to placing uplighting near the foot of the perimeter walls, and at the entrance to Yard 1. The most energy efficient light sources should be investigated and desirably wide spectrum lighting which provides high quality illumination.

A decision on lighting requirements would also be subject to future site use, site security and visitor access, and whether night time access or use of the place is anticipated or proposed.

**6.4.6 Signage**

Signage is subject to Parks and Wildlife Service guidelines and relevant Tasmanian Heritage Council guidelines or practice notes. Accepting this, it is recommended that signage (including directional and promotional signage) be limited in extent and consistent across the
site. It is also important to avoid visual clutter with signage. Freestanding signage is recommended, preferably a single promotional sign placed on the Degraves Street frontage of the site either on the footpath or on the fence/entrance to Yard 3 where it will be limited in terms of visual impact on historic fabric. No signage should be attached to the perimeter walls, or to the fabric of the Matron’s Cottage. Introduction of signage should also have regard for not impacted on potential subsurface remains. Signage is being addressed in more detail within the Presentation Plan currently in preparation.

**Policy 34**

*Introduce consistent but discreet lighting and signage as a means of enhancing site security, presentation and improving amenity for visitors.*

*Implement the recommendations of the Presentation Plan (in preparation).*

6.5 Community consultation

The purchase of Yard 1 by the Tasmanian Government in 1976 reflected changing attitudes in both the Australian and Tasmanian communities to convict history. It also, specifically, reflected a desire to protect the remaining historic fabric of the Cascades Female Factory site, which was increasingly recognised for its particular significance in terms of the history of women and children in the convict system. The acquisition by the FFHS of Yard 3 in 1999 and Yard 4 South and the Matron’s Cottage in 2002 gave further emphasis, and impetus, to the growing awareness and appreciation of the site and its particular social and symbolic importance. The site has also captured the attention of those with an academic interest in the convict system and in Colonial Australia generally, and also increasingly family history and genealogical research.

The Cascades Female Factory, therefore, has a range of identified community and interest groups, as well as stakeholders, who can appropriately be consulted on aspects of site management and use. This is another management objective for places on the National Heritage List, whereby there is a requirement for ‘community input to decisions and actions that may have a significant impact on their National Heritage values’. Management of NHL places should also ‘make timely and appropriate provision for community involvement, especially by people who have a particular interest in, or association with, the place; and may be affected by the management of the place’.

The latter includes heritage groups and statutory bodies, as well as local tourism interests. The ‘National Heritage List Nomination’ report prepared for the Department of Tourism, Arts and Environment in June 2006 also includes a list of organisations with ‘an interest in the place’. In total, this represents a major reservoir of interest in the site and, in addition to consultation, has consequent opportunities for publicity and promotion, and tapping into expertise and skills.

In May 2006, a facilitated ‘Search Conference’ was conducted at the Cascades Female Factory, with a range of interested parties and stakeholders. The results of the conference were documented in the report *Footsteps Across Time.* There were a number of key findings of the conference, including the identification of potential future roles for the site in the areas of women’s history, convict history, tourism, arts, culture and archaeology. This conference again demonstrated and emphasised the high level of community interest in the site.
The Cascades Female Factory uses its website to publicise information about proposals affecting the place and conducts regular letterbox drops of the local resident to keep them informed.

**Policy 35**

*Continue current level of community consultation. Use the website to seek public comments about management planning and other reporting and actions affecting the place.*

6.5.1 **Undertaking consultation**

Community consultation is already an effective aspect of the current management of the Cascades Female Factory, which should be maintained and strengthened where possible. It is also, however, generally limited in terms of wider community engagement, given the social values of the site. The recommendation below at Section 6.5.2, which relates to better documenting the social values, should also include a requirement to clarify, and identify, all groups and interests, including members of the local community, who wish to be involved in aspects of consultation.

A formal and structured program for consultation is also recommended to be implemented, whereby the management entity for the site identifies responsibility for coordinating community consultation and response to targeted issues. The ‘community of interest’ in the site should also continue to be encouraged to participate in public and community oriented programs.

A copy of this CMP, prior to being finalised, should be made available for community viewing and feedback.

**Policy 36**

*Ensure the 'community of interest' in the site continues to be consulted and involved in aspects of site management, where appropriate.*

*Introduce a structured program for ongoing consultation.*

*Make this report (CMP) available for community consultation and feedback, prior to finalising the report.*

6.5.2 **Social values**

As noted in the introduction to this chapter, although the social significance of the Cascades Female Factory has been assessed and identified as an aspect of heritage significance, it is recognised that a more comprehensive documentation of these values could reveal other aspects of social significance which may require new or different policies and management approaches. Further analysis and documentation of these values would ensure that they are better understood; it would also, as noted above, help to clarify and identify groups and interests who wish to be involved in consultation.

**Policy 37**

*Undertake further work to more comprehensively survey and document community values and attitudes to the site, and identify which groups and interests wish to be involved in consultation.*
6.6 Aboriginal heritage values

The National Heritage List ‘management principles’ listed at Section 6.1 acknowledge that:

Indigenous people are the primary source of information on the value of their heritage and the active participation of indigenous people in identification, assessment and management is integral to the effective protection of indigenous heritage values.

The assessment undertaken for this report identified the site of Truganini’s grave in Yard 1 as being very significant. The association with Truganini is also of significance, for what it reflects of race relations in Tasmania in the nineteenth century; other aspects of Australian history in the post-contact period, including unsavoury scientific practices; and attitudes to the former Female Factory site and its use in its post-convict period.

The assessment also acknowledges, however, that the significance of the site to Aboriginal people in Tasmania has not been documented during this study. This includes the significance of Truganini’s grave, and any other significance which may be attributed to the overall site by indigenous people in Tasmania.

It is therefore recommended that further research be undertaken, including consultation with the indigenous community, to explore this matter in more depth and to better understand the nature and level of this significance. This work may also result in new or modified recommendations on the management of these values within the current context of the site.

Policy 38

Undertake further research and consultation with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community, to more fully explore and better understand the values attributed to the site.

6.7 Site promotion, marketing & tourism

The designated Cascades Female Factory (Yards 1, 3 and 4 South) is currently promoted through the following means and methods (including through initiatives of the FFHS):

- Guided tours, including commercial tours to Yard 1 and other tours conducted by the FFHS.
- Artistic projects to interpret the site (e.g. the ‘baby bonnet’s project’, and performance pieces for Yard 1).
- Exhibitions (e.g. Rajah quilt exhibition).
- FFHS website [www.femalefactory.com.au] assists in encouraging interest in the site, providing access to information on the site, as well promoting events, activities, etc.
- Female Factory Research Group database.
- FFHS brochures, approximately 30,000 per year (currently distributed in the south of the State, the Hobart airport, and also on the Spirit of Tasmania).
- ‘Morning tea with the Matron’ in the Matron’s Cottage, through arrangement with the FFHS.
- Promotion within Parks and Wildlife Service, DTAE.
- Tasmanian Heritage Register.
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- Tasmanian Visitor Information Network.
- DTAE Visiting Journalist Program.
- Distribution and publication of FFHS articles in special interest magazines e.g. 40 Degrees South.

All of the above make an important contribution to current promotion of the site. The profile of the place may also increase through inclusion in the National Heritage List. However, when a single management entity is established for the designated site, it is recommended that a strategy for future promotion and marketing be prepared. This could be undertaken as part of the ‘Tourism Plan’ which as noted in Chapter 1 (‘Introduction’), is proposed to be prepared for the site. The Tourism Plan is intended to provide detailed strategic advice on tourism and marketing, and direction on positioning the site for defined specific target markets.

It is additionally recognised that FFHS has an existing Marketing Plan for future promotion and marketing strategies, which should be reviewed as an aspect of this work.

It is also important to ensure that guided tours, whether run by the FFHS or private operators, deliver appropriate ‘messages’ about historical interpretation and conservation issues.

Educational programs, which are tied to school curriculum and can include teaching aides, are another means of promoting the site.

6.7.1 Links & connections

Successful long term site promotion would also benefit from establishing and maintaining links to other related publicly accessible historic sites and complimentary tourism/visitor related activities. Obvious links and connections for the Cascades Female Factory include:

- Other convict sites in Tasmania
- Other convict sites in Australia
- Historic places associated with the history of women and children in Colonial Tasmania and Australia

The site can also be promoted as one of the key sites for day visitors to Hobart, linked with other related or nearby attractions. Connections with other nineteenth century heritage places in Hobart, which were associated with colonial administration and infrastructure, could also prove rewarding for some visitors.

**Policy 39**

*Develop a strategy for future promotion and marketing of the site.*

*Investigate the establishment of (mutually beneficial) links to other related sites in Tasmania.*

6.8 Site interpretation

Interpretation uses various means and methods in order to present and deliver information to visitors and site users. It is intended to introduce them to the place, to get key messages across, and to assist in an understanding and appreciation of the history and significance of the place. Interpretation also assists in presenting and exploring aspects of social
significance. The information can be presented in a readable format, and through objects and artefacts, buildings and structures, archaeological remains, research, art works, and landscape elements. Additional supporting information can also be made available, including brochures, pamphlets, books and websites.

The Cascades Female Factory, in a location with a high degree of public interest, access and proximity to central Hobart, provides an outstanding opportunity for innovative and challenging interpretation for visitors and users of the site. The existing buildings within the Cascades Female Factory, and in some cases adjacent to or located nearby, may provide opportunities to support and/or participate in an interpretation program.

An ‘Interpretation Plan’ is proposed to be prepared for the designated site. The following recommendations are made in the understanding that a more detailed plan and strategy will be developed.

The interpretation can be any of, but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- A living, evolving and integrated narrative of the heritage site, fabric, stories and artefacts.
- A mix of formal and informal interpretation that allows people to access different levels of the Female Factory experience.
- Accessible via the website.
- Supplemented via interpretive publications such as books, brochures and interactive CDs.
- One which uses a range of media which will engage people in different ways, ensuring that the diversity of visitor needs and interests are met.
- One which uses interpretive themes which are linked to the delivery of public art, events and festivals.

Interpretation planning must be developed in accordance with other relevant site policies to ensure a cohesive product. Any activities associated with the interpretation must also have regard for impacts on the South Hobart urban/residential context.

The implementation and sustainability of the interpretation strategy for the Female Factory will also require:

- the continued involvement and support of the management entity;
- a robust financial framework;
- the support of stakeholders;
- quality control, refinement and the implementation of a continuous review and upgrade program; and
- identification of priorities and scheduling, i.e. a framework for implementation with realistic and achievable timeframes and funding sources identified.

The Interpretation Plan should also include clear articulation of accountabilities, responsibilities and roles for implementation of the strategy. It should also provide for regular evaluation, review and refinement. The evolving nature of the interpretive process must be respected, and every endeavour must be made to capture stories that come
forward. Consideration could also be given to establishing a ‘think tank’, to provide a forum for the ongoing generation of ideas and enthusiasm for interpretation. It should be made up of individuals with a strong interest in the history and interpretation of the Female Factory, who can be drawn from the public and private domains, including representation from the local community.

It is also recommended that interpretation for the designated site use a thematic approach. Themes:

- Bridge and link topics; they also express ideas and communicate the messages that people can take away with them from the site.
- Focus interpretation and provide a framework for the organisation of information. Meaningful ‘stories’ emerge from the masses of facts which could be communicated to an audience.
- Structure an activity around a place or feature which best ‘unveils’ or reveals a story.
- Gives the audience a thread and connection between facts. Key ideas are also easier to remember.

The practice of heritage conservation is also a valid topic for interpretation and is of particular relevance to the Cascades Female Factory, given the nature and extent of the current remnant fabric including the archaeological resource (see below).

The range of ‘interpretative devices’ can include:

- Walking trails utilising brochures and static signage which can be used for both guided and self-guided visits.
- Visitor Information Centre to orient the visitor and anchor the project.
- Artistic installations which provide opportunities to involve the public.
- Events which provide regular activities throughout the year and which link to the themes outlined.
- Paper based products.
- Education kits to supplement school group activities.
- A museum or interpretive facility
- Artists trail: use of paintings, photographs or illustrations to reveal stories.

6.8.1 Interpretation of Archaeological Sites

The archaeological resources of the Cascades Female Factory provide opportunities for archaeological interpretation, subject to the appropriate management of archaeological remains and artefacts, including those which are exposed in situ. It is also the case that, as outlined and recommended at Section 6.12, archaeological excavations should only be undertaken for research purposes, not expressly or principally for interpretation purposes.

Neither of the exposed excavations in Yard 3 has any associated signage indicating what the visitor is viewing within the exposed trench. Therefore despite the visual appeal of the exposed stonework and related features, there is no attendant information to impart knowledge about the identity of this material, the story behind it, or how it is managed and
conserved. This could be achieved through the installation of limited signage that would be visually unobtrusive yet sufficiently detailed to assist in ‘reading’ the material.

Although currently back-filled, the excavation in Yard 4 South was a substantial one and there is ample opportunity here to re-expose some of the more robust fabric and interpret it for public viewing.

Any new interpretation associated with the excavations, however, including signage, should be consistent with the approach and direction of the Interpretation Plan, once accepted and implemented.

6.8.2 Excavation activities

In the future, archaeological excavation may become an increasingly significant means of information recovery and consequently visitor education at the Female Factory site given that limited works of this type to date have already yielded significant results. The lack of surviving extant structures at the Female Factory site makes exposed archaeological fabric a potential drawcard for visitors.

As noted elsewhere in this report, archaeological excavations should only be undertaken for research purposes, and not principally for interpretation purposes, particularly given the disadvantages inherent in excavations intended to provide ‘features of interest’ for the casual visitor. Principal among these is the difficulty in maintaining the physical integrity of exposed remains as highlighted by example in Section 5.5 of this report. The inevitable degradation of archaeological fabric over time can only be offset by ‘best practice’ conservation works and environmental control systems, which by their requisite expense are usually beyond the means of all but the most high profile archaeological sites. It is also acknowledged that some more robust sections of remains exposed during research or works-related excavation work could remain exposed if conservation expertise was consulted and deemed it viable.

Research-related excavations typically would be backfilled/covered over thereby preventing deterioration of the exposed remains through sustained exposure to elemental forces. This process also still allows for the recovery of archaeological data which would contribute to the collective understanding of the site’s history and development, and hence site interpretation.

Policy 40

Develop and implement an Interpretation Plan/Strategy for the Cascades Female Factory which has regard for the recommendations included here.

6.9 Future uses

Given the level of heritage significance and the nature of the physical remains, including the archaeological resource, it is difficult to contemplate any future use for the designated Cascades Female Factory site, other than as a highly significant historic place which is on public land and managed by the State as a key historic site in the collection of convict-related sites in Tasmania and Australia.

Accepting this, the site in its current form already has a number of uses occurring within the buildings and spaces. These vary from the informal and public use of Yard 1 through to the commercial and administrative/site interpretation uses made of the facilities in Yards 3 and 4 South, as well as the commercial lease over part of the fudge factory in Yard 3. While this report includes recommendations elsewhere in relation to how these facilities may
appropriately be used or removed in the future, it is critically important that any future use (including possibly a proposal not contemplated by this current report), have regard for the special physical qualities and constraints of the site, and the policies and recommendations included in this report. Any future use should preferably not incorporate physical intervention into the historic fabric of the place, other than where it is contemplated or recommended here in order to achieve a particular site management or conservation outcome. Any future use should also maintain an element of public access and community involvement in the site. A long-term commercial use over the fudge factory, for example, is not a preferred heritage outcome.

Policy 41

Any future use of the site or its component parts, including a use not contemplated in this report, should have regard for conserving the identified heritage values of the site, the particular physical and fabric-related constraints, and the policies and recommendations included in this report.

Any future use of the site should maintain public access and community involvement in the site.

6.10 Risk management

Risks associated with public access, visitor management, site security, vandalism, etc, are generally addressed above at Section 6.4.

Fire

Immediate fire risk to the Cascades Female Factory is considered to be low as the site has large open spaces and the only flammable item is grass. Immediate surrounds also include gravelled car parks, bitumen roads and modified urban gardens. Higher fire risk areas within less than five km of the site include Knocklofty Reserve to the north-west and McRobies Gully to the north. These reserves are managed by the Hobart City Council and are covered by the 'Knocklofty Reserve and McRobies Gully Fire Management Plan 2005 (revision)'. Smaller Council owned land parcels located within the area are not covered by a fire management plan but are inspected by Council staff on a regular basis. The Hobart City Council’s annual Fire Abatement Program (starts each year in October/November and runs until the end of April) covers any fire risks on private land. The Abatement Program covers the privately owned vegetated hillside directly above Louden Street to the west of the Cascades Female Factory and Old Egg Farm to the north-east. Fosters Pty Ltd (Cascade Brewery) also owns an extensive amount of land in the wider area and has a fire management system in place, which works closely with the Hobart City Council and the Wellington Park Trust. The FFHS also has its own fire management plan in place.

Floods & drainage

Historically, the site was prone to flooding but this has not occurred for many years since the Hobart City Council undertook measures to control the Rivulet flow.

In terms of drainage, properties located to the north of Syme Street receive water runoff from properties immediately uphill, although Hobart City Council is intending to install a storm water drain to address any drainage issues in this area. Soil instability also occurs on the slopes to the north; however, this is also not a recognised concern for the Female Factory. New sewage systems have also been installed in Degraves Street.
The impact of water on the structures of the perimeter walls in particular is discussed in Chapter 5, Section 5.3.5.

Traffic & vehicle impacts

The Hobart municipality tip is located in McRobies Gully north-west of the Cascades Female Factory, with traffic required to exit down Degraves Street and therefore pass the site. The tip has been in operation since 1975 and Council considers the tip to have the capacity to stay open for another 10-15 years. The continual heavy traffic exiting the tip has been of concern for site managers and local residents, particularly heavy vehicle noise and the structural impact of ground and air vibrations on buildings. Hobart City Council is aware of these concerns and is assessing the situation.

Policy 42

Continue to monitor risks to the designated site, and if required, consider preparation of a Risk Management Strategy.

6.11 Archives & records

Chapter 5 includes a recommendation relating to the maintenance of site management records. More broadly, the management of archives and records relating to the history of the site, and importantly maintaining or supporting access to such records, is an important aspect of the operation of the Female Factory site. The ongoing (and increasing) interest in genealogy, family and women's history also relies on, and contributes to the collection of, historic records. These include written documents and manuscripts, family correspondence, official convict records and data, historic images, etc. A structured program should be established to encourage the donation of relevant records by the community, and copying, cataloguing, storing and making records available for researchers. All publications, research essays, and other relevant material relating to the Female Factory should also be catalogued and collated centrally.

Policy 43

Establish a program to encourage the donation of relevant records, papers and publications, and copying, cataloguing, storing and making records available for researchers.

6.12 Future research/historical research programs

Ongoing research into the history of the site, the female convicts and their lives, the family descendants, and the role of women in Colonial Australia underpins much of the research undertaken at and for the site, and is encouraged to continue. The existing Female Factory Research Group also actively promotes research into the site and provides a structure and focus for it. The research program supports regular displays/exhibitions, contributes to publications and brochures, and provides online research sources. International interest in women’s history is also growing, and the Cascades Female Factory is already positioned to tap into this and continue to promote an understanding and awareness of the site through such avenues.

The research and analysis undertaken for this CMP has, in addition, identified a number of areas where further research is required and would be of considerable benefit to future management of the site; this is identified below under 'South Hobart context' and 'Review site history'; see also discussion and recommended further work below.
Women’s history

The May 2006 ‘Search Conference’ of the Cascades Female Factory interested parties and stakeholders, identified a number of strategies in relation to enhancing the women’s history focus for the subject site. These included the provision of resources, such as an electronic database, to research personal stories and promoting the database and site to genealogy societies, media, etc (this has largely been implemented); offering fellowships for women’s history research and interpretation; focusing on-site interpretation on women’s experiences; developing links to institutions and researchers; developing curricula based on the Female Factory and its place in women’s history; developing a Female Convict Trail; holding an annual significant celebration; connecting with children-specific sites (such as Queens Orphanage, New Town); and generally being a focus for honouring women’s contribution.

Convict history

The May 2006 ‘Search Conference’, also identified strategies relating to convict history generally. These included strategies relating to communicating convict history to the community; again developing curricula for use in schools; providing genealogical research (or links) for all Tasmanian convict sites; forging stronger links between the convict story and the experiences of real people/families; and engaging with interested parties and groups in the countries of origin. This research would also assist in developing stronger links between the Cascades Female Factory and other convict-oriented research organisations, sites, etc.

Female Convict Records Research Service

This service is currently provided by the Female Factory Research Group. Family ancestors can be traced through the service and transcriptions of convict records provided.

South Hobart context

One of the areas in which further research is recommended is the history of the development of the immediate South Hobart context. An understanding of the history of the Cascades Female Factory within this context, including the impacts of the factory in terms of the physical, economic and social development of South Hobart, and the factory’s historical associations with the local community, would assist in future site interpretation. This work should include more detailed research into the history of nearby residential development, including the historic cottages in Degrawes and Apsley Streets, which are reputed to be associated with Female Factory staff. Establishing the building dates and uses for these cottages would add considerably to our understanding of the operation of the Female Factory. The research would also assist in determining the nature and extent of local heritage controls over the surrounding area, where these are deemed to be appropriate and justified.

Review site history

Also as noted in Chapter 1, Section 1.2, it may be timely to give consideration to preparation of a more complete and up-to-date history of the Cascades Female Factory, given the proliferation of site histories in recent years. Such work could tap into recent family and genealogical research; expand on the experience and treatment of the children historically accommodated at the site; and include the results of archaeological investigations. It could also expand on the history of later phases and uses of the Female Factory site. Research
into the historical development of South Hobart (as outlined above) could also be included, to produce an up-to-date and well rounded historic account. It may also be timely to return to the primary sources, some of which may not have been available for earlier studies, to review and confirm aspects of the history of the site. The history of the cemetery associated with the Female Factory also requires additional research. Such research could help to establish and clarify its dates of operation, and the exact location and boundaries. The research could also investigate the history of the burials.

As noted in Chapter 3, with regard to the Matron’s Cottage, it is also recommended that further research be undertaken to more fully document the manner in which the house was used in the late-convict and post-convict institutional period, and the post-Government disposal period.

Archaeological research

It is recommended that a strategy and policy be developed to govern and inform future archaeological investigations, taking the following principles into consideration. Excavation:

- Should only be undertaken in order to answer/clarify specific research questions which may address aspects of convict and colonial history, or particular site needs such as to inform an understanding of site layout and planning, structures, construction materials, etc.

- Should not be undertaken on a piecemeal and reactive basis.

- Can be selectively used as part of the interpretation, but only where the excavated areas can be properly maintained (to limit damage and deterioration of exposed materials, etc).

This strategy and policy should form part of the proposed Archaeological Management Plan (see also Section 5.9 above).

**Policy 44**

*Encourage ongoing research into aspects of the Female Factory history, including research which assists in future site management and interpretation, as well as research which generates community interest in the site.*

*Explore options for preparation of (commissioning) a comprehensive history of the Cascades Female Factory, which would draw together recent historical research and findings including family and genealogical research and archaeological investigations; expands on later development and uses of the site; and explores the role and impact of the site within the historical South Hobart context.*

*Develop a strategy to guide future archaeological investigation and/or excavation.*

### 6.13 Funding

**FFHS**

The FFHS does not have any ongoing funding for conservation works, interpretation, educational or archaeological works and research. These activities are currently carried out if and when management can afford to do so, and through applying for grants and sponsorship. When Yards 3 and 4 South are gifted to the State in 2009, the site will not be eligible for local and state funding programs.
Parks and Wildlife Service

The Parks and Wildlife Service fund the management of Yard 1, including regular supervision by ranger staff, and general ground and wall maintenance. Any work which is not routine cyclical works requires a separate project bid in terms of Parks funding.

Hobart City Council

The Hobart City Council maintains a Heritage Account, established under the provisions of the National Trust Preservation Fund (winding up) Act 1999. The Act states that funds in the Heritage Account are to be applied for the provision of financial or other assistance in relation to a place entered in either the National Trust Register or the Tasmanian Heritage Register. Priority is given to actual physical works, although heritage studies, conservation plans and educational projects etc., will also be considered if they are related to heritage listed places and are likely to assist future conservation works. Priorities are also given to work where there is a public benefit or community benefit. There is no set funding limit for individual projects, although the maximum grant is usually $5,000, with funding limited to 33% of the total project. Financial assistance is not available to places owned by the Council or by the Australian or State Government.

Tasmanian Heritage Council

The Tasmanian Heritage Council on behalf of the Tasmanian Government operates the Heritage Conservation Funding Program with the support of Heritage Tasmania. It assists heritage property owners with urgent and essential conservation works to heritage registered places. Places owned by the Tasmanian or Australian Governments or Government Business Enterprises are not eligible. Eligible applicants can apply for a maximum of up to one-third of the total cost of approved work, to a maximum of $25,000 per application. The remaining two-thirds are met by the applicant.

Australian Government Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts

The National Heritage Investment Initiative (NHII) is an Australian Government grants program that provides assistance to restore and conserve Australia's most important historic heritage places. Places owned by the Commonwealth Government or an Australian Government department, agency or authority are not eligible to apply.

Policy 45

Obtaining adequate funding for ongoing site management and development is critical to the conservation and presentation of the site and its significant values; all possible sources of funding should continue to be investigated.

6.14 Extension of designated site

It may be that as an option for future site management and development, consideration be given to the gradual acquisition of private landholdings which were formerly associated with the history and operation of the Female Factory (some of which are structures, others of which are believed to have archaeological remains). This is an option only, and could occur where feasible and practicable, and where the opportunity arises and resources allow. Such acquisition would bring remaining significant fabric under a single management entity within an expanded designated Cascades Female Factory site, and would help ensure a consistent management and conservation approach across the whole of the site. Consideration could also be given to the acquisition of nearby properties which were not historically associated
with the Female Factory, should the opportunity arise. Such properties may provide space and facilities for future site management operations.

**Policy 46**

*Investigate opportunities for future acquisition of private landholdings, where feasible and practicable, to bring significant fabric associated with the Female Factory under a single management entity and/or to provide space and facilities for future site management operations.*

**6.15 Summary of recommended further work**

**Policy 47**

*Undertake further work, including research, analysis and investigation in relation to the Cascades Female Factory site, to address knowledge 'gaps' and assist in completing additional plans and supporting documents.*

As is evident from the analysis and recommendations contained in this and preceding chapters, there is considerable scope for undertaking further work, research, analysis and investigation in relation to the Cascades Female Factory site. The work (or gaps) typically derives from the scope and constraints of the report in relation to research and analysis; the recommendations also derive from feedback and comments received on previous drafts of the report. Of particular note are recommendations relating to further work in regard to the history, archaeology and significance of the site. This further work may also require revision of the policies and management recommendations and approaches.

Also as outlined above at Section 1.4.1, this report forms one of a suite of related plans and documents, including a number of plans which are yet to be prepared. Some of the recommended further work can be considered when preparing these plans, including recommendations listed below under ‘Implementation’.

**History**

Prepare a more comprehensive and up-to-date history of the former Cascades Female Factory which includes and/or addresses the following:

- Overview of the site within the historical development of both Hobart and South Hobart, including the geographical and landscape context; the historical relationship with, and connections to, the local South Hobart community; economic and other interactions between the factory and surrounding area, including the use of the quarry, local reservoirs, Hobart Rivulet, etc; use of local housing in relation to the Female Factory and later uses (including but not restricted to the history of the properties at 25 and 27 Degraves Street); reuse of salvaged fabric and materials from the former Female Factory, post-demolition; roads, tracks and verges around the site; historical access to Hobart.

- Overview of the former Female Factory as a functioning industrial site; the builders of the site; the economics of the factory operations; the former use as a distillery, etc.

- Expand on later phases and uses of the Female Factory site, including the history of demolition of factory structures; and researching the owners/occupiers of the Matron’s Cottage in the period after the factory and through the twentieth century.
• Investigate and research the history of the cemetery associated with the Female Factory, to clarify the dates of use and confirm the historical boundary/location (which recently has been subject to review).

• Incorporate key findings of family and genealogical research, which would help to personalise the history and introduce more of the individual women’s stories.

• Incorporate key results of archaeological investigations, to shed further light on the physical aspects and development of the site.

• Include more graphic material to illustrate historical overlays and site evolution.

• Address the history, treatment, activities, etc of the children within the site, including the treatment of boys versus girls.

• Integrate with a deeper understanding of women’s history in Tasmania generally, including connections to other female convict sites.

• Include more information and analysis of the site’s historical links/connections to the broader British convict system, late eighteenth and nineteenth century philosophy on punishment and reform, political, religious and social attitudes, etc.

**Physical analysis**

• Provide a more detailed overview of the evidence remaining on yard walls of previous buildings, e.g. silhouettes of previous buildings and other evidence, including a detailed photographic record.

• Undertake more detailed physical analysis and investigation of the Matron’s Cottage, garden and outbuildings, to shed more light on their physical development and change, including clarifying the dates of development and change.

• Undertake more detailed analysis of the roads and verges around the site.

**Archaeology**

• Bring the results of the archaeological work into a more scholarly framework including
  
  o a comparable overview of the archaeology of the site in its regional and broader global contexts, which will assist in identifying archaeological research issues;
  
  o placing the results of all the Cascades Female Factory archaeological investigations into a broader (material culture) context; and
  
  o identifying archaeological issues to which the Cascades Female Factory research and analysis could contribute.

• Prepare an Archaeological Design Plan, to better inform the policies and future archaeological research and investigation, including for the Cascades Female Factory CMP area and, as appropriate, areas outside including the associated roads and road verges.

**Significance**

• Investigate the values attributed to the former Cascades Female Factory by Indigenous people, including the site of Trugann’s grave in Yard 1, and where
appropriate incorporate this aspect of significance into the analysis and statements of significance.

- Investigate the social significance of the Cascades Female Factory in more detail, both to better understand and articulate this significance and aspects of community values, and potentially to reveal other aspects of social significance not canvassed in this report.

- Upon completion of the more comprehensive historical research and analysis referred to above, review the stated aspects of historical significance.

- Upon completion of the comparable overview of the archaeology of the site, review and expand on this aspect of significance.

- Undertake more detailed analysis and investigation of views and vistas associated with the Female Factory in the South Hobart context, to assist in identifying the most significant views, and making recommendations on their future management.

**Implementation**

- In conjunction with the site managers and Steering Committee, include:
  - detailed recommendations on current and future site management issues and needs;
  - recommendations on optimum site management; and
  - constraints relating to implementation of the CMP policies and recommendations.

- Include more analysis and understanding of site management in the context of local bodies whose actions, statutory roles, etc, can impact on the site and context, with appropriate policies.

- Include suggestions as to how policies can be implemented in conjunction with other agencies, organisations, etc.

- Identify appropriate potential repositories for archival materials.

- Include further investigation of current statutory context (including at local level), how this applies in relation to site management, and how this can be improved.

**Movable heritage**

- Provide more detailed description, discussion, overview and management recommendations for the movable heritage associated with the site, objects collection, artefacts, conservation, storage, etc.

**Condition**

- Undertake a more detailed condition assessment of the significant fabric, to better inform future maintenance and conservation works.
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See information and overview at www.paragirls.org.au.

See information and overview at www.paragirls.org.au.

See citation in the Australian Heritage Database, place id 16490, file 4/01/001/0247.

See citation in the Australian Heritage Database, place id 100406, file 6/03/084/0048.

This statement draws on the analysis included in the 'National Heritage List Nomination', June 2006.

Mary Hutchinson has been honoured for her role in the colonial penal system with the new Women’s Goal at Risdon, Tasmania, being named after her.

Notes and corrections provided on Draft CMP January 2007.

Information provided by A Ryland, Heritage Tasmania.

Information provided by G Hall, Ranger, Parks and Wildlife Service.


140 Some of information and data included in this chapter was provided by A Ryland, Heritage Tasmania.

141 See Kostoglou, Parry & Knaggs, Mary. ‘Cascade Female Factory, Hobart: Yards 1, 3 and part Yard 4 National Heritage List Nomination’, for the Department of Tourism, Arts and Environment, June 2006, pp. 2-3.


143 Information provided by A Ryland, Heritage Tasmania.

144 Information provided by A Ryland, Heritage Tasmania.


147 Information provided by the Female Convict Records Research Service, 64 Oldham Avenue, New Town, Tasmania, 7008, 03 6278 7398, email ffrg@femalefactory.com.au.
Appendix A  Burra Charter

The Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999

Preamble

Considering the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice, 1964), and the Resolutions of the 5th General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (Moscow 1978), the Burra Charter was adopted by Australia ICOMOS (the Australian National Committee of ICOMOS) on 19 August 1979 at Burra, South Australia. Revisions were adopted on 23 February 1981, 23 April 1988 and 26 November 1999.

The Burra Charter provides guidance for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance (cultural heritage places), and is based on the knowledge and experience of Australia ICOMOS members.

Conservation is an integral part of the management of places of cultural significance and is an ongoing responsibility.

Who is the Charter for?

The Charter sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians.

Using the Charter

The Charter should be read as a whole. Many articles are interdependent. Articles in the Conservation Principles section are often further developed in the Conservation Processes and Conservation Practice sections. Headings have been included for ease of reading but do not form part of the Charter.

The Charter is self-contained, but aspects of its use and application are further explained in the following Australia ICOMOS documents.

Article 1. Definitions

For the purposes of this Charter:

1.1 Place means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.

1.2 Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects.

1.3 Fabric means all the physical material of the place including components, fixtures, contents and objects.

1.4 Conservation means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.
1.5 *Maintenance* means the continuous protective care of the *fabric* and *setting* of a *place*, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves *restoration* or *reconstruction*.

1.6 *Preservation* means maintaining the *fabric* of a *place* in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

1.7 *Restoration* means returning the existing *fabric* of a *place* to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling components without the introduction of new material.

1.8 *Reconstruction* means returning a *place* to a known earlier state and is distinguished from *restoration* by the introduction of new material into the *fabric*.

1.9 *Adaptation* means modifying a *place* to suit the existing use or a proposed use.

1.10 *Use* means the functions of a *place*, as well as the activities and practices that may occur at the *place*.

1.11 *Compatible use* means a *use* which respects the *cultural significance* of a *place*. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.

1.12 *Setting* means the area around a *place*, which may include the visual catchment.

1.13 *Related place* means a *place* that contributes to the *cultural significance* of another *place*.

1.14 *Related object* means an object that contributes to the *cultural significance* of a *place* but is not at the *place*.

1.15 *Associations* mean the special connections that exist between people and a *place*.

1.16 *Meanings* denote what a *place* signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses.

1.17 *Interpretation* means all the ways of presenting the *cultural significance* of a *place*.

**Conservation Principles**

**Article 2. Conservation and Management.**

2.1 *Places of cultural significance* should be conserved.

2.2 The aim of *conservation* is to retain the *cultural significance* of a *place*.

2.3 *Conservation* is an integral part of good management of *places of cultural significance*.

2.4 *Places of cultural significance* should be safeguarded and not put at risk or left in a vulnerable state.

**Article 3. Cautious approach.**

3.1 *Conservation* is based on a respect for the existing *fabric*, *use*, *associations* and *meanings*. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as necessary but as little as possible.

3.2 Changes to a *place* should not distort the physical or other evidence it provides, nor be based on conjecture.
Article 4. Knowledge, skills and techniques.

4.1 Conservation should make use of all the knowledge, skills and disciplines which can contribute to the study and care of the place.

4.2 Traditional techniques and materials are preferred for the conservation of significant fabric. In some circumstances modern techniques and materials which offer substantial conservation benefits may be appropriate.

Article 5. Values.

5.1 Conservation of a place should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.

5.2 Relative degrees of cultural significance may lead to different conservation actions at a place.

Article 6. Burra Carter Process

6.1 The cultural significance of a place and other issues affecting its future are best understood by a sequence of collecting and analysing information before making decisions. Understanding cultural significance comes first, then development of policy and finally management of the place in accordance with the policy.

6.2 The policy for managing a place must be based on an understanding of its cultural significance.

6.3 Policy development should also include consideration of other factors affecting the future of a place such as the owner’s needs, resources, external constraints and its physical condition.

Article 7. Use

7.1 Where the use of a place is of cultural significance it should be retained.

Article 8. Setting

Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate visual setting and other relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Article 9. Location

9.1 The physical location of a place is part of its cultural significance. A building, work or other component of a place should remain in its historical location. Relocation is generally unacceptable unless this is the sole practical means of ensuring its survival.

9.2 Some buildings, works or other components of places were designed to be readily removable or already have a history of relocation. Provided such buildings, works or other components do not have significant links with their present location, removal may be appropriate.
9.3 If any building, work or other component is moved, it should be moved to an appropriate location and given an appropriate use. Such action should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.

Article 10. Contents

Contents, fixtures and objects which contribute to the cultural significance of a place should be retained at that place. Their removal is unacceptable unless it is the sole means of ensuring their security and preservation: on a temporary basis for treatment or exhibition for cultural reasons: for health and safety: or to protect the place. Such contents, fixtures and objects should be returned where circumstances permit and it is culturally appropriate.

Article 11. Related places and objects

The contribution which related places and related objects make to the cultural significance of the place should be retained.

Article 12. Participation

Conservation, interpretation and management of a place should provide for the participation of people for whom the place has special associations and meanings, or who have social, spiritual or other cultural responsibilities for the place.

Article 13. Co-existence of cultural values

Co-existence of cultural values should be recognised, respected and encouraged, especially in cases where they conflict.

Article 14. Conservation processes

Conservation may, according to circumstance, include the processes of: retention or reintroduction of a use: retention of associations and meanings: maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpretation: and will commonly include a combination of more than one of these.

Article 15. Change

15.1 Change may be necessary to retain cultural significance, but is undesirable where it reduces cultural significance. The amount of change to a place should be guided by the cultural significance of the place and its appropriate interpretation.

15.2 Changes which reduce cultural significance should be reversible, and be reversed when circumstances permit.

15.3 Demolition of significant fabric of a place is generally not acceptable. However, in some cases minor demolition may be appropriate as part of conservation. Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit.

15.4 The contributions of all aspects of cultural significance of a place should be respected. If a place includes fabric, uses, associations or meanings of different periods, or different aspects of cultural significance, emphasising or interpreting one period or aspect at the expense of another can only be justified when what is left
out, removed or diminished is of slight cultural significance and that which is emphasised or interpreted is of much greater cultural significance.

Article 16. Maintenance

Maintenance is fundamental to conservation and should be undertaken where fabric is of cultural significance and its maintenance is necessary to retain that cultural significance.

Article 17. Preservation

Preservation is appropriate where the existing fabric or its condition constitutes evidence of cultural significance, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.

Article 18. Restoration and reconstruction

Restoration and reconstruction should reveal culturally significant aspects of the place.

Article 19. Restoration

Restoration is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the fabric.

Article 20. Reconstruction

20.1 Reconstruction is appropriate only where a place is incomplete through damage or alteration, and only where there is sufficient evidence to reproduce an earlier state of the fabric. In rare cases, reconstruction may also be appropriate as part of a use or practice that remains the cultural significance of the place.

20.2 Reconstruction should be identifiable on close inspection or through additional interpretation.

Article 21. Adaptation

21.1 Adaptation is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place.

21.2 Adaptation should involve minimal change to significant fabric, achieved only after considering alternatives.

Article 22. New work

22.1 New work such as additions to the place may be acceptable where it does not distort or obscure the cultural significance of the place, or detract from its interpretation and appreciation.

22.2 New work should be readily identifiable as such.

Article 23. Conserving use

Continuing, modifying or reinstating a significant use may be appropriate and preferred forms of conservation.
Article 24. Retaining associations and meanings.

24.1 Significant associations between people and a place should be respected, retained and not obscured. Opportunities for the interpretation, commemoration and celebration of these associations should be investigated and implemented.

24.2 Significant meanings, including spiritual values, of a place should be respected. Opportunities for the continuation or revival of these meanings should be investigated and implemented.

Article 25. Interpretation

The cultural significance of many places is not readily apparent, and should be explained by interpretation. Interpretation should enhance understanding and enjoyment, and be culturally appropriate.

Conservation Practice

Article 26. Applying the Burra Charter process.

26.1 Work on a place should be preceded by studies to understand the place which should include analysis of physical, documentary, oral and other evidence, drawing on appropriate knowledge, skills and disciplines.

26.2 Written statements of cultural significance and policy for the place should be prepared, justified and accompanied by supporting evidence. The statements of significance and policy should be incorporated into a management plan for the place.

26.3 Groups and individuals with associations with a place as well as those involved in its management should be provided with opportunities to contribute to and participate in understanding the cultural significance of the place. Where appropriate they should also have opportunities to participate in its conservation and management.

Article 27. Managing Change

27.1 The impact of proposed changes on the cultural significance of a place should be analysed with reference to the statement of significance and the policy for managing the place. It may be necessary to modify proposed changes following analysis to better retain cultural significance.

27.2 Existing fabric, use, associations and meanings should be adequately recorded before any changes are made to the place.

Article 28. Disturbance of fabric

28.1 Disturbance of significant fabric for study, or to obtain evidence, should be minimised. Study of a place by any disturbance of the fabric, including archaeological excavation, should only be undertaken to provide data essential for decisions on the conservation of the place, or to obtain important evidence about to be lost or made inaccessible.

28.2 Investigation of a place which requires disturbance of the fabric, apart from that necessary to make decisions, may be appropriate provided that it is consistent with the policy for the place. Such investigation should be based on important research
questions which have potential to substantially add to knowledge, which cannot be answered in other ways and which minimises disturbance of significant fabric.

Article 29. Responsibility for decisions

The organisations and individuals responsible for management decisions should be named and specific responsibility taken for each such decision.

Article 30. Direction, supervision, and implementation

Competent direction and supervision should be maintained at all stages, and any changes should be implemented by people with appropriate knowledge and skills.

Article 31. Documenting evidence and decisions.

A log of new evidence and additional decisions should be kept.

Article 32. Records

32.1 The records associated with the conservation of a place should be placed in a permanent archive and made publicly available, subject to the requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.

32.2 Records about the history of a place should be protected and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.


Significant fabric which has been removed from a place including contents, fixtures and objects, should be catalogued, and protected in accordance with its cultural significance.

Where possible and culturally appropriate, removed significant fabric including contents, fixtures and objects, should be kept at the place.

Article 34. Resources.

Adequate resources should be provided for conservation.
## Appendix B  Summary table of heritage listings
CASCADES FEMALE FACTORY
**Summary Table of Heritage Listings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/component</th>
<th>Tasmanian Heritage Register</th>
<th>City of Hobart Local List</th>
<th>National Heritage List</th>
<th>Register of the National Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yard 1</strong></td>
<td>Identifier – 3120</td>
<td>Individually listed as 16-18 Degraves Street in Appendix 1 to Schedule F (Heritage) of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982</td>
<td>Identifier – 105932 (nominated place)</td>
<td>Identifier – 100314 (registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Cascades Female Factory site</td>
<td>Extent – all of Yard 1</td>
<td>Also located within Heritage Area No 18, as identified on map F11 in Schedule F (Heritage) to the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982</td>
<td>Extent – All of Yard 1</td>
<td>Extent – (included as part of the wider ‘Cascades Female Factory Site’ registration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent – all of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifier – 11027 (registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent – Cascades Female Factory ruins, 18 Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yard 2</strong></td>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identifier – 100314 (registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Cascades Female Factory site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent – (included as part of the wider ‘Cascades Female Factory Site’ registration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yard 3</strong></td>
<td>Identifier – 7190</td>
<td>Individually listed as 16-18 Degraves Street in Appendix 1 to Schedule F (Heritage) of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982</td>
<td>Identifier – 105932 (nominated place)</td>
<td>Identifier – 100314 (registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Cascades Female Factory site</td>
<td>(commercial building)</td>
<td>Also located within Heritage Area No 18, as identified on map F11 in Schedule F (Heritage) to the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982</td>
<td>Extent – All of Yard 3</td>
<td>Extent – (included as part of the wider ‘Cascades Female Factory Site’ registration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
<td>Extent – boundary wall to west and sub surface deposits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/component</td>
<td>Tasmanian Heritage Register</td>
<td>City of Hobart Local List</td>
<td>National Heritage List</td>
<td>Register of the National Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yard 4</strong></td>
<td>Identifier – 3119</td>
<td>Screened for heritage</td>
<td>Identifier – 105932</td>
<td>Identifier – 100314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Cascades Female Factory site (inc. Matron’s Cottage)</td>
<td>Extent – the Matron’s Cottage</td>
<td>Individually listed as 2-8 Degraves Street in Appendix 1 to Schedule F (Heritage) of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982</td>
<td>(nominated place)</td>
<td>(registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8 Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also located within Heritage Area No 18, as identified on map F11 in Schedule F (Heritage) to the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982</td>
<td>Extent – Southern portion of Yard 4</td>
<td>Extent – (included as part of the wider ‘Cascades Female Factory Site’ registration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yard 5</strong></td>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identifier – 100314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Cascades Female Factory site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent – (included as part of the wider ‘Cascades Female Factory Site’ registration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cottage</strong></td>
<td>Identifier – 3117</td>
<td>Listed as 17-21 Degraves Street in Appendix 1 to Schedule F (Heritage) of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identifier – 11390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
<td>Extent – cottage and site</td>
<td>Also located within Heritage Area No 18, as identified on map F11 in</td>
<td></td>
<td>(registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent – all of site; part of group registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/component</td>
<td>Tasmanian Heritage Register</td>
<td>City of Hobart Local List</td>
<td>National Heritage List</td>
<td>Register of the National Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cottage</strong> 19 Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
<td>Identifier – 6252 Extent - cottage and site</td>
<td>Listed as 17-21 Degraves Street in Appendix 1 to Schedule F (Heritage) of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 Also located within Heritage Area No 18, as identified on map F11 in Schedule F (Heritage) to the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 Extent – all of the site</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identifier – 11390 (registered) Extent - all of site; part of group registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cottage</strong> 21 Degraves Street, South Hobart</td>
<td>Identifier – 2925 Extent - cottage and site</td>
<td>Listed as 17-21 Degraves Street in Appendix 1 to Schedule F (Heritage) of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 Also located within Heritage Area No 18, as identified on map F11 in Schedule F (Heritage) to the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 Extent – all of the site</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identifier – 11390 (registered) Extent - all of site; part of group registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cascades Female Factory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/component</th>
<th>Tasmanian Heritage Register</th>
<th>City of Hobart Local List</th>
<th>National Heritage List</th>
<th>Register of the National Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heathville</strong></td>
<td>Identifier – 3077 Extent – cottage and site</td>
<td>Individually listed in Appendix 1 to Schedule F (Heritage) of the City of Hobart Planning Scheme 1982 Extent – all of the site</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identifier – 100312 (indicative) Extent – all of site; part of group registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hope Cottage</strong></td>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identifier – 100312 (indicative) Extent – all of site; part of group registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemetery</strong></td>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identifier – 100314 (registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road verge</strong></td>
<td>Nominated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>