

**AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF POLICE
MANAGEMENT
MANLY NSW 2095**

STATEMENT OF HERITAGE IMPACT



12 DECEMBER 2008

NOEL BELL RIDLEY SMITH & PARTNERS PTY LTD
2 McManus Street, McMahon's Point NSW 2060. Telephone 9922 2344 Facsimile 9922 1308

ABN 16 002 247 565

**AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF POLICE MANAGEMENT
MANLY NSW 2095**

STATEMENT OF HERITAGE IMPACT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	III
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1 Background	4
1.2 Objectives & Methodology	4
1.2.1 Limitations	4
1.2.2 Identification of Authors & Sources	4
1.2.3 Acknowledgments	5
1.2.4 Copyright	5
2.0 HERITAGE LISTING.....	6
2.1 Commonwealth Government Listing	6
2.2 State Government Listing	6
2.3 Local Government Listing	6
3.0 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PLACE.....	6
4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT (THE PREFERRED PROJECT SCHEME)	8
5.0 VISUAL ASSESSMENT AND IMPACT ON HERITAGE ITEMS IN THE VICINITY	9
6.0 ALTERATIONS TO THE AXIAL HOSPITAL GROUP AND COTTAGE ACCOMMODATION.....	14
7.0 IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL ON THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PLACE	15
7.1 Demolition of a building or structure	15
7.2 Minor partial demolition (including internal elements)	16
7.3 New development adjacent to a heritage item (including additional buildings and dual occupancies)	16
7.4 New landscape works and features (including carparks and fences)	18
7.5 Tree removal or replacement	19
8.0 EBPC ACT SIGNIFICANT IMPACT GUIDELINES	21
8.1 UNKNOWN, UNPREDICTABLE OR IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS	23
9.0 CONCLUSION	24
APPENDIX – HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN RECOMMENDATION COMPLIANCE TABLE.....	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Statement of Heritage Impact was prepared following earlier heritage assessments and a Historic Heritage (Conservation) Management Plan in order to assess the impact of a redevelopment of the Australian Institute of Police Management at Manly as set out in the accompanying preferred project scheme.

The site generally shares heritage significance with North Head as a whole for military, quarantine, defence, ecological and Indigenous heritage values. Specifically, the site was developed from 1916 as the Seamen's Isolation Hospital to treat merchant seamen for sexually transmitted infections. The design of the original buildings reflects this. However it was only used for a short term for this purpose and has been adapted over the course of the twentieth century - most recently (from 1957) to accommodate the Australian Institute of Police Management and its predecessor institutions.

In the preferred project scheme, structures of lesser significance are removed, structures of higher significance retained and adapted and new structures using common forms and materials are introduced in a way that retains both the core heritage fabric and the setting of the whole complex as an isolated, harbour-side, bushland setting. The setting of the core Axial Hospital Group is largely restored by the removal of more recent structures to the north of them and the recovery of open space between the group and the water. The preferred and eventual long term objective of restoration and reconstruction of the core buildings themselves is maintained in the development despite not being realised as part of this development. That objective can only fully be achieved through a reduction in the intensity of use from current levels. This proposal allows that objective to remain as a long term goal.

This Statement of Heritage Impact finds that the proposed development generally satisfies the recommendations of the Historic Heritage Management Plan for the site and therefore has an acceptable impact on the heritage values. Details of mitigating measures that should be taken prior to implementation are set out in this report.

NOEL BELL RIDLEY SMITH & PARTNERS ARCHITECTS PTY LIMITED



ROBERT STAAS
Director/Heritage Consultant

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

This Statement of Heritage Impact, prepared by Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners, was commissioned by Brewster Hjorth Architects on behalf of the Australian Federal Police (AFP). It accompanies the preferred project scheme to redevelop the Australian Institute of Police Management site at Manly and follows a Historic Heritage (Conservation) Management Plan of the site prepared by Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners in 2007 and revised 2008.

1.2 Objectives & Methodology

The objective of this Statement of Heritage Impact is to assess the heritage impact of the redevelopment of the Australian Institute of Police Management at Manly, NSW as required under the Director-General's (of the NSW Department of Planning) Requirements. It assesses the impact of the proposal against the recommendations of the Historic Heritage Management Plan (HHMP) for the place in accordance with Recommendation 9 of that HHMP.

The impact of the proposal is assessed against each of the HHMP's recommendations in the appendix and a separate Visual Assessment at Section 5.0. The NSW Heritage Office's guidelines for preparing Statements of Heritage Impact have been used and the relevant questions contained in that document have been responded to. The 'Significant Impact Guidelines' of the Commonwealth Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts have also informed the assessment of impacts contained herein. The Statement should be read in conjunction with the Historic Heritage Management Plan.

The terms *fabric*, *place*, *preservation*, *reconstruction*, *restoration*, *adaptation* and *conservation* used throughout this report have the meaning given them in the *Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter)*.

1.2.1 Limitations

Inspection of the physical fabric was carried out without any physical intervention in the place. Visual inspections were carried out from ground level.

1.2.2 Identification of Authors & Sources

This report was prepared by Robert Staas, Heritage Consultant and Director, and Don Wallace, Senior Heritage Consultant, of Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners Architects.

The main documentary sources consulted in the research for this report are listed below.

- Australian Institute of Police Management Historic Heritage Management Plan, Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners, December 2008;
- Peter Freeman Conservation Architects & Planners Consultant Team 'Australian Federal Police - Australian Institute of Police Management North Head - Heritage Assessment' - Final March 2006;

- Collard Clarke Jackson Canberra Pty Ltd et al., 'Australian Institute of Police Management - Manly Project - Master Plan Report' - March 2003.

1.2.3 Acknowledgments

The Author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the following people in the preparation of this report:

- Ms Vicki Rushton, Brewster Hjorth Architects
- Ms Audrey Chee, Urbis
- Mr Michael Dametto, Thinc Projects

1.2.4 Copyright

This report is copyright of Noel Bell Ridley Smith & Partners Architects Pty Limited and was prepared specifically for the owners of the site. It shall not be used for any other purpose and shall not be transmitted in any form without the written permission of the authors.

2.0 HERITAGE LISTING

2.1 Commonwealth Government Listing

As part of a larger listing of the greater part of North Head, the site is a listed place on the National Heritage List.¹ While the land is included in this listing the listing partly excludes the former Seamen's Isolation Hospital from one of the assessed values.

2.2 State Government Listing

The place is not listed under the NSW Heritage Act. It is not on the State Heritage Register nor have any conservation orders been placed upon it.

2.3 Local Government Listing

The place is listed as a heritage item in Schedule 4 of the Manly Local Environment Plan 1998. There it is cited as 'The Australian Police Staff College'.

3.0 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PLACE

North Head and the former Seamen's Isolation Hospital (*now Australian Institute of Police Management*), is an area of great cultural and natural richness and diversity, having outstanding remnant native flora and fauna, and expressing historical themes of quarantine, military and recreational use.

Quarantine Beach and Stores Beach were the first ships' quarantine sites in Australian history. North Head was one of a group of six Sydney sites that were the first military reserves in Australia, and the headland subsequently became the first site officially reserved for quarantine purposes. The Isolation Hospital complex was a later component of the Quarantine Station and the North Head Quarantine Station and the Seamen's Hospital together comprise the oldest and most intact example of quarantine facilities in Australia. The stone walls that define the major North Head precincts, and for the eastern boundary of the AIPM Precinct, provide evidence of relief work carried out during the Great Depression of the late 1920s and the 1930s, and foreshadowed construction of the military facilities at North Head, many of which were provisioned through the SIH site at Stores Beach jetty. The current Police usage is a part of a continuing use of this significant area.

It is significant as an interface between Australia's European and Asian history, and Collins Beach is considered to be an iconic 'contact' site for Australia's European and Aboriginal history. North Head has special associations with former Quarantine Station and the Isolation Hospital inmates (over several

¹ The Australian Institute of Police Management is Lot 2766 of Deposited Plan 752038. As such it is included within the land listed on the National Heritage List by the following description: "About 277 ha, at Manly, comprising the whole of the headland, to Low Water, south of a line commencing at Low Water north of Collins Beach on the alignment of the north-west boundary of Lot 2763 DP752038, then easterly via that alignment and boundary and then following the north-westerly boundaries of Lot 2774 DP752038, Lot 2728 DP752038, Lot 2764 DP72038 and Lot 2763 DP752038 to the most northerly point of Lot 2763 DP752038, then generally easterly via the north-east and northern boundaries of Lot 2763 DP752038 and the alignment of the latter segment to Low Water. Excluded is the North Head Sewage Treatment Plant being the whole of Lot 1 DP604428." - Commonwealth of Australia Gazette, No. S 70, Friday, 12 May 2006.

historical periods), and with significant historical figures. North Head is associated with Governor Bourke, who in 1830 declared it a military reserve. It is also associated with the Director of Health Cumpston, with the former Postmaster-General Sir Archie Parkhill, and to Ray Whitrod, Commonwealth Police Commissioner.

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT (THE PREFERRED PROJECT SCHEME)

The proposed development includes the alteration and addition of the complex to continue to accommodate the Australian Institute of Police Management.

The proposal is set out on the following drawings:

- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A01 - Location and Cover
- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A02 - Existing Site Analysis
- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A03 - Demolition Plan
- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A04 - Ground Floor Plan
- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A05 - Level 1 Plan
- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A06 - Roof Plan
- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A07 - Site Elevations 01
- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A08 - Site Elevation 02
- Brewster Hjorth Architects 20816-10.A09 - Site Elevations 03

Alterations and additions include:

- The demolition of ten buildings shown on A03 including 2 accommodation blocks, the Senior Common Room, the Administration Building, together with other buildings of minor significance;
- The retention and adaptive reuse of the main hospital group including dining room, kitchen, Spring Cove Cottage (former Dispensary) and the existing Syndicate Rooms;
- The retention of the early staff accommodation (Kookaburra Cottage, Harbour Cottage and Garden Cottage);
- The addition of two two-storey short term residential accommodation blocks with classroom incorporated in one block;
- The addition of a new amenities block;
- The addition of a new Administration Building;
- An extension to the west of the Library; and,
- Alterations to the landscape.

5.0 VISUAL ASSESSMENT AND IMPACT ON HERITAGE ITEMS IN THE VICINITY

The site lies above the southern shore of the sheltered cove known as Spring Cove at North Head. Although much of the site is cleared and developed, its southern edge above the rocky shore of the Cove and the surrounding land outside the site is wooded. The site is adjacent to heritage items on all sides. Those heritage items include:

- North Head as a whole (including the Quarantine Station and the AIPM site itself);
- Manly District Hospital to the northeast;
- St Paul's College and the Cardinal's Palace across Spring Cove; and,
- Former Gasworks Site across Spring Cove at Little Manly Point.

The existing site and some of its structures are visible from some parts of these heritage items. There are other heritage items further away but these do not have visual relationships with the AIPM site. The visual relationships between the heritage items and those from adjacent landforms and the water to the site in general are not ones characterised strongly by built form, designed landscapes or controlled vistas. More simply, the visual relationships derive from views to the AIPM site being read as a group of buildings of generally similar form and materials set above a narrow foreground of woodland above the shore line with a larger rising background of bushland to either side and behind of the group. These relationships are confined to the 'valley' on either side of Spring Cove with more distant views from the open water to the west.

The preferred project scheme generally retains the quality of the existing views to the site and retains the foreground and background of bushland setting. Additional buildings will be visible from outside the site but the character retains the site as a compact and isolated development of one and two storey scale. The earlier visual setting of the northern foreground of the Axial Hospital Group is restored by the removal of two existing dormitory blocks.

Key views include:

- The view from Collins Beach;
- The view from the land across Spring Cove; and,
- More distant views from the Harbour west of Manly Point.

The view from Collins Beach shows the existing buildings almost completely hidden from view by the foreground vegetation and due to the lower viewing height. This view will change through the removal of existing dormitories and restoration of the earlier northern setting of the Axial Hospital Group but will remain largely hidden as it is now.

The most notable change will be from across Spring Cove where, as the land is at a similar height, the new buildings will be more visible. Nevertheless the quality of the view as a compact group of similar forms using visual common materials (sheet and plank fibre-cement walling and corrugated metal roofing) in an isolated bushland setting above the water will be retained.

More distant views from the water such as that from the Manly Ferry are so distant that the changes to the perceived character of the view will be virtually imperceptible to the casual observer. This is due not only to the distance from the complex but to the visibility of the North Head plateau behind the group which further diminishes the perceived scale of the development.

Views from the site are principally to the water at the north and west. New buildings have been sited to take advantage of these views. The removal of the linear dormitories at the north of the site means that parts of earlier historical views from and to the Axial Hospital Group will be restored.

In summary, the redevelopment includes new buildings proposed for the site which will be visible from outside the site but will retain the character of the site as a complex of small scale one and two storey buildings of similar materials and forms set in an isolated, harbour-side, bushland setting. The redevelopment will not intrude into the visual settings of other heritage items.



Figure 1 View from east on Collins Beach in 2007.



Figure 2 Photomontaged view from east on Collins Beach showing proposed redevelopment.



Figure 3 View from northwest across Spring Cove near the location of the former Gas Works in 2007.



Figure 4 Photomontaged view from northwest across Spring Cove near the location of the former Gas Works showing proposed redevelopment.



Figure 5 Distant view to the site from the Manly Ferry on the Harbour in 2007.



Figure 6 Photomontaged distant view to the site from the Manly Ferry on the Harbour showing proposed redevelopment.

6.0 ALTERATIONS TO THE AXIAL HOSPITAL GROUP AND COTTAGE ACCOMMODATION

The Axial Hospital Group and the three cottages, Kookaburra, Garden and Harbour Cottages, are of higher significance than those buildings proposed to be removed. The Axial Hospital Group is to be retained, partially reconstructed/restored and adapted in the redevelopment. The three cottages are to be retained and preserved. In principle, this is in accordance with the historic heritage management plan. The more detailed impacts of the intervention of adaptation are set out below.

Axial Hospital Group

The adaptation of the Axial Hospital Group retains the existing exterior form of the linked ward pavilions with minor alterations to some openings. Internally, the adaptation removes some parts of original walls to this linked group but also removes later intrusive fabric so as to partly restore the original form. The adaptation continues earlier adaptive responses to the original wards. The adaptation conforms to recommendations of the historic heritage management plan and allows for the eventual reconstruction of the group to be carried out at a later date if demand for the intensive use of these areas has been reduced. This anticipated reconstruction is not made more difficult by the works proposed in the preferred project scheme. The adaptation will secure the use of the buildings and the minor adaptations, despite involving some removal of early fabric, will have a modest impact on the heritage value of the place as a whole. The retention and adaptation of the linked ward pavilions as proposed can be seen to have a minor and acceptable impact on the heritage value of the place. The adaptation should be augmented with interpretation explaining the nature of the adaptation and the significance of the place.

Within the Axial Hospital Group is also the former dispensary now known as Spring Cove Cottage. The building will be retained and conserved in its existing form. Despite its interior walls currently being mostly in their original locations, previous alterations to finishes and layout for short term domestic use has obscured an earlier ability for the interior to properly demonstrate its original clinical use. The design should be supplemented by signage which explains the currently obscure use of the building.

The Cottages

No works are proposed to the cottages. They are to be retained and preserved in their existing state. This accords with the Historic Heritage Management Plan.

Bushfire Protection Works

Certain works are proposed to manage the risks of bushfire in a bushfire assessment. Proposed works to early and original buildings including adding a gutter guard to the gutters and screens to some windows that do not face the north or the harbour. Screens are currently in place on some buildings. Although somewhat visually intrusive, the screens will assist in safeguarding life and the physical integrity of the buildings and are, in any case, completely reversible.

7.0 IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL ON THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PLACE

The following questions in the left column are taken from the NSW Heritage Office's guide to preparing Statements of Heritage Impact. Answers to the questions posed are set out in the right column.

7.1 Demolition of a building or structure	
Have all options for retention and adaptive reuse been explored?	Options for retention and adaptive reuse have been explored. The proposal retains the most significant parts of the complex and adaptively reuses them to continue the existing use of the complex as a whole.
Can all the significant elements of the heritage item be kept and any new development be located elsewhere on the site?	All elements of high significance and most elements of moderate significance are to be retained. The administration building is of moderate significance and is proposed to be demolished. All other structures to be demolished are of lesser significance. New development of the scale acceptable in the vicinity of the significant items means that there are no alternatives to redeveloping the sites of some elements of moderate and low significance.
Is demolition essential at this time or can it be postponed in case future circumstances make it retention and conservation more feasible?	Demolition is essential to the redevelopment proposal due to the accommodation requirements of the operation. Postponement of demolition would mean the establishment would not be viable and alternative uses for the whole of the site would need to be considered.
Has the advice of a heritage consultant/specialist been sought? Have the consultant's recommendations been implemented? If no, why not?	The preferred project scheme is a development of an earlier masterplan which was informed by a heritage assessment and outline strategy prepared by Peter Freeman. Noel Bell Ridley Smith + Partners have provided further conservation management planning and heritage advice to the revised plan which has less heritage impact than earlier schemes. The preferred project scheme has responded to consultation on the original project application and has more beneficial impacts than all earlier schemes considered. (continued on next page)

	(continued from previous page) The degrees to which the preferred project scheme meets the recommendations of the Historic Heritage Management Plan are outlined in the appendices.
7.2 Minor partial demolition (including internal elements)	
Is the demolition essential for the heritage item to function?	Minor partial demolition of elements of high and moderate significance is limited to the interiors of the Axial Hospital Group. This minor demolition is essential for the complex as a whole to function in its current use.
Is the resolution to partially demolish sympathetic to the heritage significance of the item (e.g. creating large square openings in internal walls rather than removing the wall altogether)?	- Refer Section 6.0. - Except for the new opening in the western wall of the easternmost pavilion of the Axial Hospital Group, internal walls to be demolished are intrusive and are not original. Their removal has a beneficial impact and allows the reconstruction of lost original walls.
Are important features of the item affected by the demolition (e.g. fireplaces in buildings)?	Refer Section 6.0.
If the partial demolition is a result of the condition of the fabric, is it certain that the fabric cannot be repaired?	The partial demolition is not the result of the condition of the fabric but of operational and functional requirements.
7.3 New development adjacent to a heritage item (including additional buildings and dual occupancies)	
How is the impact of the new development on the heritage significance of the item or area to be minimised?	The impact of the new development is minimised by confining the location and scale of the new structures within development zones provided for in the Historic Heritage Management Plan. In part these provisions and the resulting preferred project scheme improves on some relationships by, for instance, the removal of the dormitory blocks immediately north of the Axial Hospital Group and restoration of the northern setting of the original ward

	pavilions. The impact on the curtilages of Harbour Cottage and the Garden Cottage is limited by confining development almost completely to the east of these and limiting the height to that already on the site as a one and two storey complex. Their principal views to the north and west are retained. Adverse impacts of the development on the curtilage of the Axial Hospital Group are limited by retaining new development south of the Jetty Road and beneficial impacts on the curtilage are rendered by the removal of the dormitory blocks in front of the Group.
Why is the new development required to be adjacent to a heritage item?	New development is required adjacent to the heritage structures as the functional requirements needed at the site cannot be met fully within the existing buildings.
How does the curtilage allowed around the heritage item contribute to the retention of its heritage significance?	The curtilage around the elements of highest significance retains the perimeter significant planting and fauna habitat, significant roadways and restores the views between the Axial Hospital Group and Spring Cove that has been lost since the dormitory buildings were built on the site.
How does the new development affect views to, and from, the heritage item? What has been done to minimise negative effects?	- See Visual Assessment in Section 5.0. - The preferred project scheme has potential for interpretation both within and outside the site to increase understanding and appreciation of the site and nearby heritage items.
Is the development sited on any known, or potentially significant archaeological deposits? If so, have alternative sites been considered? Why were they rejected?	Archaeological potential is limited to the roadways of the site which have largely been retained in their existing alignments. Some intrusion onto the alignment of the more recent (post 1929) Quarantine Station Road has been necessary to allow the extent of accommodation necessary to meet the functional requirements of continuing use. Archaeological investigations have confirmed that at the western end of the Jetty Road, no evidence of an earlier road surface was found under the present bitumen roadway. Gravel under the grass in the west of the bitumen surface indicates that part of the route was gravel surfaced. This gravel was perhaps replaced elsewhere by the bitumen where the road ran adjacent to the hospital buildings. Provision will be made for further archaeological investigation

	during works.
Is the new development sympathetic to the heritage item? In what way (e.g. form, siting, proportions, design)?	The new development is sympathetic to the structures of the site by limiting the scale of new structures to the height of the lantern on the roof of the existing library, setting these new buildings south of the Jetty Road and by using materials and forms similar to those used in the original buildings, whilst ensuring that new buildings will be readily identifiable as contemporary, introduced buildings.
Will the additions visually dominate the heritage item? How has this been minimised?	The redevelopment represents an increase in density on the site but this impact has been minimised by retaining the scale of the buildings to one and two storeys in individual parts of the site and by retaining the scale of the Axial Hospital Group as the longest contiguous development on the site. The visual setting and prominence of the Axial Hospital Group will be restored by the removal of the dormitory buildings which are now in front of them and currently visually dominate them and conspicuously obscure the group's relationship with the water.
Will the public, and users of the item, still be able to view and appreciate its significance?	Access to the site will not change. Views to the significant structures on the site will be partly restored by the removal of elements of little significance.
7.4 New landscape works and features (including carparks and fences)	
How has the impact of the new work on the heritage significance of the existing landscape been minimised?	Impact of the new work has been minimised by retaining elements of natural significance and fauna habitat including areas at the northern shore of the site, the grove and rock outcrop at the south of the site and the remnant watercourse through the site. New structures have been limited to previously disturbed sites with no identified cultural plantings.
Has evidence (archival and physical) of previous landscape work been investigated? Are previous works being reinstated?	The historical development and remnants of the landscape have been investigated in previous heritage assessments. No items - other than natural elements and the roadways - have been identified as having significance. While the roadways and watercourse will be retained and as far as possible reinstated, there is no proposal to reinstate other elements of the landscape

	other than recovery of open space north of the Axial Hospital Group and the reinstatement of the watercourse in this location which is currently lost.
Has the advice of a consultant skilled in the conservation of heritage landscapes been sought? If so, have their recommendations been implemented?	Assessments of the landscape have been carried out by consultants with knowledge of cultural landscapes. Recommendations related to the cultural landscape are included in the Historic Heritage Management Plan. The implementation of these recommendations is shown in the compliance table in the appendix of this Statement of Heritage Impact. Further recommendations are contained within an arborist's report and in the management plan for the natural values both of which have in turn informed the landscape plan.
Are any known or potential archaeological deposits affected by the landscape works? If so, what alternatives have been considered?	The only elements identified having potential archaeological significance include the roadways. Possible disturbance to these elements would be caused by minor incursion of structures rather than landscape works and should be managed by employing further archaeological expertise. Indigenous archaeological deposits and their treatment are covered in a separate report on Indigenous Cultural Heritage.
How does the work impact on views to, and from, adjacent heritage items?	See visual assessment in Section 5.0.
7.5 Tree removal or replacement	
Does the tree contribute to the heritage significance of the item or landscape?	As shown in the paragraphs below, four trees are being removed to allow for the development of new structures. These are trees 8 (which is also damaged by termite activity), 18, 50a and 89. None of these trees proposed to be removed relate to the early and original landscape or use of the site for its original and most culturally significant purpose. The landscape associated with the early use of the site as Seamen's Isolation Hospital was apparently quite barren with wooded parts at the

	southeast and a few trees north of the Axial Hospital Group.
Why is the tree being removed?	Moore Trees Arboricultural Services' <i>Arborist Development Assessment Report</i> indicates the trees to be removed. Five trees will be removed as they are in poor health or have structural problems from which the tree will not recover. Four trees will be removed as they are exotic and do not represent the natural National Heritage values of the place. These exotics do not appear to be associated with the most culturally significant use of the site. Fourteen trees are being removed as they are small being less than 5 metres in height. Two scheduled for removal are growing in a poor location. Only four trees are being removed to allow for the development of new structures. These trees are tree 8, 18, 50a and 89.
Has the advice of a tree surgeon or horticultural specialist been obtained?	The condition of the existing trees and recommendations for their management are set out in Moore Trees Arboricultural Services' <i>Arborist Development Assessment Report</i> September 2008.
Is the tree being replaced? Why? With the same or a new species?	The proposal includes a landscape plan with proposed new plantings across the site which will augment those trees removed and will be compatible with the natural values of the place and its continuing amenity.

8.0 EBPC ACT SIGNIFICANT IMPACT GUIDELINES

The 'Significant Impact Guidelines' of the Commonwealth Department of Environment and Heritage (now Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts) for a National heritage place with cultural heritage values are set out below for background despite the exclusion of the AIPM site from the historic heritage values shown in the National Heritage List assessment as gazetted. Therefore, any action cannot impact on historic heritage values of a National Heritage Place as there are none in the listing. Nevertheless, it has been determined previously that the redevelopment has potential for significant impact under the guidelines and is being assessed as a 'controlled action'. Moreover the place has 'potential' Commonwealth Heritage historic heritage values. Responses to the possibilities set out in the guidelines are shown in the right column.

An action is likely to have a significant impact on historic heritage values of a National Heritage place if there is a real chance or possibility that the action will:	
Permanently remove, destroy, damage or substantially alter the fabric of a National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;	All elements of high significance and most elements of moderate significance are to be retained. The administration building is of moderate significance and is proposed to be demolished. All other structures to be demolished are of lesser significance. New development of the scale acceptable in the vicinity of the significant items means that there are no alternatives to redeveloping the sites of some elements of moderate and low significance.
Extend, renovate, refurbish or substantially alter a National Heritage place in a manner which is inconsistent with relevant values;	The development includes extensions and new buildings and landscape features within the site but these are all consistent with relevant values.
Permanently remove, destroy, damage or substantially disturb archaeological deposits or artefacts in a National Heritage place;	The development has been informed by archaeological advice and physical investigation into former roadway surfaces. Further archaeological advice will continue during construction. Potential Indigenous cultural deposits are considered separately in the

	Indigenous Archaeological Assessment.
Involve activities in a National Heritage place with substantial and/or long term impacts on its values;	The activities proposed continue existing uses which have been long established and shown to be of acceptable and sustainable impact.
Involve the construction of buildings or other structures within, adjacent to, or within important sight lines of, a National Heritage place which are inconsistent with relevant values;	The construction of buildings has been designed to retain the scale and character of the place and within the context of views to the whole of North Head from the harbour will be virtually imperceptible at most commonly perceived vantage points or passages. The scheme restores earlier significant sight lines to and from the place by the removal of more later additions of little significance.
Make notable changes to the layout, spaces, form or species composition of a garden, landscape or setting of a National Heritage place which are inconsistent with relevant values;	Changes are made to the landscape but the character of the place and the species used are consistent with relevant values.
Restrict or inhibit the continuing use of a National Heritage place as a cultural or ceremonial site causing its values to notably diminish over time;	Provision is made in the ongoing management of the place for continuing cultural access to Indigenous groups and individuals upon request. The development also continues the cultural and ceremonial use of the place for the education and development of members of inter-jurisdictional police services.
Permanently diminish the cultural value of a National Heritage place for a community or group to which its National Heritage values relate;	There will be no diminution of cultural values which relate to its National Heritage values.
Destroy or damage cultural or ceremonial , artefacts, features, or objects in a National Heritage place;	- Potential Indigenous cultural or ceremonial artefacts, features or objects are considered separately in the Indigenous Archaeological Assessment. - No significant cultural or ceremonial artefacts, features or objects will be destroyed or damaged.

Notably diminish the value of a National Heritage place in demonstrating creative or technical achievement.	The National Heritage values of the place do demonstrate outstanding or significant creative or technical achievement.
---	--

8.1 UNKNOWN, UNPREDICTABLE OR IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS

Impacts include beneficial, neutral and minor adverse impacts. All known impacts have been identified. Mitigating measures have been put in place to manage unpredictable impacts. Adverse impacts that are irreversible are identified as being minor and have been preceded by recording.

Key Actions	Impact	Unknown	Unpredictable	Irreversible
Removal of dormitory blocks and restoration of northern setting to Axial Ward Group	Beneficial	No	No	Yes
Demolition of Administration Building	Minor adverse	No	No	Yes
Addition of New buildings	Neutral	No	No	No
Preservation of Cottages	Beneficial	No	No	N/A
Break through opening in western wall of easternmost pavilion ward	Minor adverse	No	Yes – underlying extent and condition of original fabric cannot be predicted before invasive investigation.	Depending on the intactness and condition of underlying fabric the opening in the wall may or may not be able to be reversed without loss of original fabric. The opening can be built up at a later stage in matching materials however.
Reconstruct lost walls in Axial Hospital Group	Beneficial	No	No	No

9.0 CONCLUSION

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

- The items of highest significance including the Axial Hospital Group and the three staff cottages are all retained and conserved;
- The Axial Hospital Group is retained, adaptively reused and partially restored;
- The three staff cottages are all retained and preserved;
- Removes elements of low significance and allows for continued use of the place and restoration of the northern open setting of the Axial Hospital Group; and,
- The redevelopment includes new buildings of similar scale, form and materials which retain the character of the complex in its isolated, harbour-side, bushland setting.

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

- Only minor negative impacts by elements of the redevelopment outside the scope of the recommendations of the Historic Heritage Management Plan have been found and these are detailed with mitigating measures in the below and in the appendix.

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

- There remain options for the longer term realisation of restoration and reconstruction of the early core of the Axial Hospital Group but this cannot be done while current uses and demand for accommodation is retained on the site and within the project budget. The proposed redevelopment goes some way to recovering the original building configuration and retains these options for the longer term when demands on use may change; and,
- The preferred project scheme reduces the potential impact of previous redevelopment schemes/draft master plans by retaining more elements of higher significance, restoration of open space and by paying greater attention to echoing forms and materials evident in the precinct.

Visual Impact and Impact on Heritage items in the Vicinity

The redevelopment includes new buildings proposed for the site which will be visible from outside the site but will retain the character of the site as a complex of small scale one and two storey buildings of similar materials and forms set in an isolated, harbour-side, bushland setting. The redevelopment will not intrude into the visual settings of other heritage items. The redevelopment will expose historical views to and from the Axial Hospital Group that are now concealed.

Impacts on the Heritage Item and Mitigating Measures

The adaptation of the Axial Hospital Group continues earlier adaptive responses to the original wards. The configuration of the original pavilions is being retained in the development, despite the retention of the intrusive but functional infills at this stage. The retention and adaptation of the linked ward pavilions as proposed can be seen to have a minor and acceptable impact on the heritage value of the place and the interior restoration of raked ceilings and open interior form of the easternmost ward pavilion has a beneficial impact. The adaptation should be augmented with interpretation explaining the nature of the adaptation and the significance of the place. The cottages are to be retained and preserved in their existing state and this approach will have no adverse impact on their heritage values.

**APPENDIX – HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN RECOMMENDATION
COMPLIANCE TABLE**

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
Recommendation 1 The future conservation and development of the place should be carried out in accordance with the principles of the Australian ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter) as revised in 1999 and should be coordinated with the principles of 'Ask First' and IUCN's Australian Natural Heritage Charter for Indigenous and natural heritage values in planning and management related to these values.	Complies.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required. Particularly with ongoing coordination of cross cultural and natural values.
Recommendation 2 The statement of significance in this plan should be adopted as a basis for future decision making, planning and work on the place.	Complies.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 3 The recommended policies and conservation options discussed in this document should be adopted as a guide to future conservation and development of the place irrespective of the use to which it is put.	Complies.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 4 Before any major works are undertaken review all available documentary and physical evidence in order to guide effective conservation work.	Complies. Review of documentary and non-invasive physical investigation has informed proposed conservation work.	Further investigation of physical evidence will be required to implement the reconstructive and restorative work proposed.
Recommendation 5 All work at the place shall be undertaken on the basis of evidence. Conjecture, guesswork or prejudiced decision making are not acceptable.	Complies.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 6 Retention,	Complies.	Options for

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
enhancement and retrieval of the Cultural Significance of the place should be adopted and implemented as opportunities arise, taking into consideration the changing needs of the Owner, availability of funds and other constraints.	Possible options for further reconstructive and restorative approaches have been investigated but do not currently meet the operational requirements of the owner and users.	further reconstructive and restorative opportunities remain and will be reviewed in the ongoing management of the place.
Recommendation 7 An adopted procedure for coordinated planning and decision making for the place should be established. These procedures should ensure that decisions on development are made in the context of sound conservation practice. The planning and decision making procedure may need to be reviewed periodically to ensure its continued ability to meet this objective.	Complies. A one-off procedure has been established for the proposed redevelopment which has included review of planning options.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required. It should include a more formalised procedure as recommended by the policy.
Recommendation 8 As the Australian Institute of Police Management has likely Commonwealth Heritage values: its management should be provided for in the Australian Federal Police's 'heritage strategy'; it should be listed on its 'heritage register' on which its condition should also be monitored and it should be recommended to the Australian Heritage Council for consideration for inclusion on the Commonwealth Heritage List.	This recommendation is not dependant on the preferred project scheme although the scheme is consistent with its potential Commonwealth heritage values.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 9 In general terms, an adverse effect on any item or aspect of greater significance may be permitted provided: • It makes possible the recovery of aspects of greater significance, • It helps to secure the future security of the place, • There is no feasible alternative, • Care is taken to minimise the adverse	The proposal has minor adverse effects on some elements of significance but those impacts meet these provisions. The preferred project scheme also achieves	

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
effect, and The effect is assessed in a Statement of Heritage Impact.	significantly greater beneficial impacts than earlier master planning for the site by the recovery of the northern setting of the Axial Hospital Group and retention of all early staff cottages.	
Recommendation 10 Existing arrangements of limited access directly onto the site coupled with visibility from public land and water should continue.	Complies. There will be no change to current visitation. Refer Section 5.0 for visual assessment.	
Recommendation 11 Occasional access to the area for indigenous people to maintain cultural traditions should occasionally be provided in light of the Darwala Lia Report.	Access for indigenous people is not explicitly provided for in the proposal.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 12 It should be recognised that the existing security allows for adequate safeguarding of the heritage values embodied in the place and should be continued.	Complies. There will be no significant change to current security.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 13 Consultation with the Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (or Commonwealth Department responsible for administration of the EPBC Act from time to time) and other stakeholders should continue to ensure the Australian Federal Police's consultation obligations – specifically under sections 324S and 341S - are satisfied. In particular where change to the fabric including adaptation, demolition or other conservation processes are proposed the specific consent of the Department should be sought.	Consultation with the Department and other stakeholders is ongoing.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 14 The AFP in consultation with the Department of Environment, Water,	Specific approvals for this preferred	Ongoing management of

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
Heritage and the Arts should use the NSW Heritage Office 'Standard Exemptions for Works' (see Appendix 5.3) as a basis for determining work which is exempt from specific approval.	project scheme (Action application) are being sought. Future minor works may employ this recommendation.	place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 15 Adaptation of internal spaces is an acceptable form of action to ensure the conservation of the whole place. Internal adaptations of the buildings of the Seamen's Isolation Hospital period that are retained in accordance with Recommendation 32 should be guided so as to retain heritage significance.	Complies. Some internal adaptations are proposed for buildings of this period but these have been guided by their heritage significance. Principally they involve the removal of later intrusive elements, partial reconstruction of earlier ward walls in the Axial Hospital Group and minor opening up of part of an early ward wall to facilitate adaptive use. The scheme goes some way towards the eventual reconstruction of the Group while retaining purposeful use of the place. Refer Appendix 6.0.	More detailed investigation of the physical evidence will be required during construction.
Recommendation 16 Should circumstances lead to a change of use for the building, new uses should be selected which are most compatible with the retention and recovery of the original character and identified cultural significance of the place.	Complies. The use of the complex in general is not proposed to change. Proposed uses of individual buildings are compatible.	
Recommendation 17 Should the place be	Not applicable.	

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
sold or leased – even if the change of use would result in no physical change to the place – a covenant the effect of which is to protect the Commonwealth Heritage values of the place must be included in the contract for lease or sale in accordance with the provisions of sections 324ZA and 341ZE of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.	Sale or lease of the place is outside the scope of the preferred project scheme.	
Recommendation 18 Proposed adaptation or changes which would require the introduction of particular services and/or structural alterations which would have a strong adverse effect on the character and/or heritage significance of the building are unacceptable.	Complies. No changes or adaptive works which would have a strong adverse effect are proposed. Refer Section 6.0.	
Recommendation 19 Proposed changes of use to any part of a building should only be considered in the context of a coordinated plan for the whole building.	Complies. Changes to individual buildings have been considered in the coordinated redevelopment of the whole site.	
Recommendation 20 A planned maintenance and repair program should be initiated for the building based on a comprehensive understanding of the building's present state, construction, character and materials with regular inspections and prompt appropriate preventative maintenance and repair when required.	Although there will be some repair works to existing significant buildings, a program of maintenance does not form part of this proposal.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 21 Consultants, tradespeople and supervisory staff should be appropriately qualified in their relevant fields and have knowledge and experience of sound conservation practices.	Complies. The advice of consultants of varied disciplines has been coordinated with those with conservation knowledge in the development of the proposal.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
Recommendation 22 Care should be taken by both tradespeople and supervisory staff that significant fabric is not damaged by maintenance and repair activities.	Complies. Guidelines are included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan.	
Recommendation 23 Colour schemes: Whenever painting is contemplated for significant external fabric only authenticated heritage colour schemes should be adopted. This should involve investigation of the physical evidence of surviving schemes.	Complies. No repainting of significant external fabric is proposed.	
Recommendation 24 Only surfaces originally painted should be repainted for the axial hospital group and the cottages.	Complies. No known unpainted surfaces of these buildings is proposed.	
Recommendation 25 The importance of habitat protection and protection of the natural heritage values should be borne in mind and integrated into the development and use of the place. Specifically the open northern area, escarpment and access to these areas and across the site should be retained as open space managed in accordance with expert ecological advice.	Complies. The habitats and natural heritage values identified at the site have been integrated into the proposed development.	Ongoing ecological advice should be a part of the future management of the site.
Recommendation 26 The watercourse flowing from the south of the site to the north should be remediated and, wherever possible, recovered as an open course supplemented with interpretation.	Partly complies. The watercourse is to be remediated and partly recovered as an open course as part of the proposed scheme.	Specific interpretation should be included as part of the signage proposed for the redevelopment.
Recommendation 27 The bushland south of the library should be retained undeveloped.	Complies. The bushland is to be retained and reinforced as part of the landscape plan.	
Recommendation 28 The former jetty road should be retained and recovered as open space as far as possible and supplemented with interpretive material. (See also	Complies.	Specific interpretation should be included as part

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
Recommendation 47 regarding disturbance if excavation is considered.)		of the signage proposed for the redevelopment.
Recommendation 29 The actual alignment of the former quarantine station road – which dates from after the 1920s and is not early and original - may be retained and recovered as open space but may be partly developed as long as the possibility of a physical link between the two institution is retained. In any case, the presence of the former road and its significance should be supplemented with interpretive material. (See also Recommendation 47 regarding disturbance if excavation is considered.)	Partly complies. The general lines of the roadway will be retained as open space but parts of their actual locations will be built upon.	Specific interpretation should be included as part of the signage proposed for the redevelopment.
Recommendation 30 Although off the site and outside the control of the Australian Federal Police, opportunities to reconstruct the original ferry jetty near the site and opportunities for the construction of a new jetty that would interpret historic access while providing non-car based transport access should be explored.	Opportunities for reconstruction of the jetty do not form part of the proposal but their future implementation is not made more difficult by the proposal.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 31 Views to and from the place should be retained and new development sited to minimise impacts on and take advantage of these views.	Complies. Refer Section 5.0 for visual assessment.	
Recommendation 32 The following structures must be retained and conserved in perpetuity in accordance with the specific conservation recommendations presented elsewhere in this plan: • The axial hospital group including ward blocks, dining room, kitchen and dispensary; and, • The former staff cottages including Harbour Cottage, Kookaburra Cottage and Garden Cottage.	Complies. All these structures will be retained in the proposal.	
Recommendation 33 If preceded by the recording outlined in Recommendation 53, the following structures may be retained and	Partly complies. All buildings proposed for	Recording as outlined will need to be carried out

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
adapted or demolished depending on future use requirements: • Two dormitories north of the axial hospital group; • The Senior Common Room; • The Library and Administration; • The Syndicate Building; and, • The other minor buildings not mentioned here or above in Recommendation 32.	demolition are included here.	before the implementation of the proposal.
Recommendation 34 Limited new structures may be constructed on certain parts of the site to maintain the continued viable use of the Australian Institute of Police Management. They should be limited to the following sites for which more detailed controls are set out in recommendations which follow: • South of the axial hospital group east and west of the kitchen (Development Area A) • South of the southern east-west roadway (Development Area B) • West of the axial hospital group and east of Harbour Cottage and Garden Cottage (Development Area C).	Complies. The proposed new structures fit within these development zones.	
Recommendation 35 All new structures should be coordinated with the existing palette of materials and forms and be of a contemporary and simple design so as to be identifiable as new work.	Complies. The new structures utilise materials and forms in a way which is of a contemporary and simple design and is identifiable as new work.	
Recommendation 36 Structures in Development Area A should be limited to be no higher than the original ward blocks of the axial hospital group, should not extend further east or west of the group and should be of an apparently lightweight contemporary construction.	Complies. The proposed new structures fit within these guidelines.	
Recommendation 37 Structures in Development Area B should be limited to the height of the existing library roof lantern, should retain the existing open space south of	Complies. The proposed new structures fit within these guidelines.	

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
the library and should be of an apparently lightweight contemporary construction.		
Recommendation 38 Structures in Development Area C should be limited to the height of the existing library, separated by a roadway from the axial hospital group, and should be of an apparently lightweight contemporary construction.	Complies. The proposed new structures fit within these guidelines.	
Recommendation 39 The reconstruction and restoration of the form of the axial hospital group to its earliest form of linked pavilion forms without connecting infill is the eventual goal of conservation and should be carried out when the operational requirements of the owners and users of the site allow. In the meantime, the group may be retained with minor adaptation to allow continued use and the infilled materials should be progressively removed wherever and whenever possible.	Complies. Although the reconstruction and restoration of the original form of this group does not form part of this proposal, the eventual implementation of this work is not made more difficult by the adaptive works which retain the use and viability of the complex.	
Recommendation 40 Limited adaptation which does not adversely affect the character or significance of the place as a whole may be permitted in areas of lowest significance or limited visual prominence.	Complies. Adaptation is limited wherever possible to areas that have already been altered and are of limited visual prominence.	
Recommendation 41 The open balustrade of the open air walkway linking the pavilions of the axial hospital group should be retained but may be modified by the addition of fine cable infill to conform to safety standards such as the Building Code of Australia. Supplementary stanchions to strengthen the balustrade and handrails may be introduced as long as they are on the inside plane of the balustrade and of a recessive colour.	Complies.	

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
Recommendation 42 The Garden Cottage, Kookaburra Cottage and Harbour Cottage should be retained as examples of the staff accommodation provided at the former Seamen's Isolation Hospital.	Complies.	
Recommendation 43 The adapted parts of the interior of the cottages may continue to be adapted to suit compatible uses.	Complies.	
Recommendation 44 The exterior form of the Garden Cottage should be restored and reconstructed as far as possible by the recovery of the northern verandah and eventual renewal of original materials where these have been lost. This should be informed by detailed physical investigation of the fabric.	Implementation of this recommendation is not within the scope of the preferred project scheme.	
Recommendation 45 The rear verandah of the Garden Cottage may be infilled as long as any infill is identifiable as introduced and is of a simple contemporary design.	Implementation of this recommendation is not within the scope of the preferred project scheme.	
Recommendation 46 Removal of major services shall take into consideration the level of significance of the fabric affected and the new work shall generally be concealed.	Only minor services are proposed to be removed.	
Recommendation 47 Further archaeological advice should be sought if excavation is proposed for the Jetty Road or the Quarantine Station Road.	Partly complies.	Excavation on the line of the former roadways necessary for erection of new buildings should be preceded by more detailed archaeological advice and a watching brief during construction.
Recommendation 48 In the case of unforeseen discovery, work should cease and	Dependant on construction.	Ongoing management

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
expert heritage advice should be called upon to assess the nature and significance of the discovery. As a minimum, the discovery should include a recording of it.	Implementation of this recommendation is provided for in the Construction Environmental Management Plan.	during construction and an archaeological watching brief during construction will be necessary.
Recommendation 49 Relevant and experienced professional conservation advice should be provided for all conservation, adaptation and repair works proposals and programs throughout the site.	Proposal has included such advice.	Ongoing management and specialist advice during construction will be necessary.
Recommendation 50 Consultant advice and contractual work on identified significant components or fabric should be limited to firms or persons with proven expertise in conservation-related projects in the relevant field.	Proposal has included such advice.	Ongoing management and specialist advice during construction will be necessary.
Recommendation 51 A comprehensive collection of all relevant archival material should be copied and kept for reference by the Building Owner. This should include, but not be limited to, the following: • <i>Copies of all extant archival plans, specifications and reports</i> • <i>Copies of all significant original and early photographic records of the place</i> • <i>A copy of this plan and any subsequent specialists reports including contracts and accounts.</i> • <i>An itemised record of all maintenance and conservation works including documents and specifications.</i>	This has not been done as part of this proposal but is part of the ongoing management of the site.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 52 The Australian Federal Police should seek from engineering firm GHD a thorough review of their records to confirm availability of the original drawings for the Seamen's Isolation Hospital.	This has not been done as part of this proposal but is part of the ongoing management of the site.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 53 Structures that are to be demolished or adapted should be recorded	A photographic record has been	The 2007 photographic

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
photographically and in drawn form and the record kept on durable stock in a permanent archive. Unless the buildings have been subsequently altered the survey carried out by Collard Clarke and Jackson in 2003 may be used to provide the drawings of such records.	undertaken (2007) and the drawn form as prepared by Collard Clarke and Jackson in 2003 are considered to reflect the current configuration of the buildings.	record should be supplied to relevant approval authorities and permanent repositories prior to construction.
Recommendation 54 All changes carried out to the physical fabric of the retained structures - including maintenance and repair work - should be recorded on a log which is periodically copied and stored offsite in a permanent archive.	A log has not been included as part of the proposal.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 55 The monitoring and recording recommended in the two preceding recommendations should be kept on the 'heritage register' the Australian Federal Police is obliged to maintain under the provisions of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.	Implementation of this recommendation relates to the operations of the AFP and not to this preferred project application.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 56 Those charged with the management and operation of the AIPM should be supported by ongoing training in heritage management so as to integrate best practice principles into the facilities operations and implement this conservation management plan.	Training does not form part of this proposal.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 57 Those charged with the management and operation of the AIPM should be supported by adequate professional services and resources to carry out the recommendations of this conservation management plan.	The development of the proposal has been supported by professional advice.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 58 The history, development, use and care of the place should continue to be research so as to improve understanding of the place.	This is a recommendation for ongoing research.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.

CMP Recommendation	Compliance of Proposal	Further Mitigating Measures Required
Recommendation 59 Opportunities for interpretation and promotion with adjacent sites should be coordinated with the NSW Department of Environment and Conservation Parks and Wildlife Service, Sydney Harbour Federation Trust and the managing corporation of the Quarantine Station.	This proposal includes specific interpretive signage.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 60 Specific interpretation at the place should be developed specifically for where heritage values are obscure.	The preferred project scheme includes a proposal for a coordinated signage system with opportunities for interpretation although the precise content of interpretation is yet to be determined.	The proposal should include interpretive signage to obscure the most obscure aspects of significance.
Recommendation 61 The implementation of this management plan should be reported in the Australian Federal Police's Annual Report and include the content described under section 516A (6) of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.	Implementation of this recommendation relates to the operations of the AFP and not to this preferred project application.	Ongoing management of place in accordance with this recommendation will be required.
Recommendation 62 This conservation management plan should be reviewed before December 2013 or earlier if the need arises. The review should include consideration of the performance reviews and monitoring set out in section in the recommendations.	Does not form part of the preferred project scheme.	Review in 2013.