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1. Overview of the Oatlands Gaol Project

1.1. The site and context

The Oatlands Gaol (1836) was the largest regional gaol in the colony of Tasmania, able to hold up to 200 prisoners, and the only regional gaol attached to a Supreme Court House. The site has a long and fascinating history of penal servitude – as part of the foundation of Tasmania.

After decades of neglect and deterioration, Southern Midlands Council has acquired the building, and has undertaken a comprehensive restoration of the Gaoler’s Residence – the only standing building remaining of the site, as guided by the Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan 2006 (Williams 2006). Pursuant to the Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Plan (Williams 2010), the next phase of that project is to undertake landscaping of part of the Gaol Yard, and to implement a program of interpretation of the yard, landscape elements, Gaoler’s Residence and associated archaeological features and collections – in anticipation of the building and yard being opened to the public in mid-late 2011.

Figure 1.1 – Western wall of the Oatlands Gaol
The site consists of the Gaoler’s Residence, outer gaol walls, as well as around 2000 square metres of gaol yard, which offer significant archaeological research and interpretive potential. Whilst the Gaoler’s Residence has recently been the subject of an extensive restoration program, overall restoration and interpretation of the site is problematic, as the municipal in-ground swimming pool was installed in the gaol yard in 1955, which requires replacement and is causing significant conservation issues.

Much planning work has been done in order to guide the restoration and redevelopment of the Oatlands Gaol, within the overall strategic framework of Southern Midlands Council and Council’s Heritage Projects Program. Guiding the overall Heritage Program is the Southern Midlands Council Historic Heritage...
Strategy 2009-13, and deriving from which, the Oatlands Gaol Project Master Plan (2009) draws together the broad recommendations and directions from the various conservation planning and strategic planning documents developed for the site (see Section 1.4), and set goals and targets for the long-term management of the site.

The Oatlands Gaol is owned by Southern Midlands Council, having been transferred from State Government ownership in 2007. The site is approximately 2500 square metres, the main above-ground features are the Gaoler’s residence, sandstone perimeter wall, the municipal swimming pool and ancillary pool-related structures.

The current site precincts are generally referred to as the Gaoler’s residence, (which includes the approach driveway and the former Gaoler’s yard) and the gaol yard itself, which is the area surrounded by the perimeter walls, now containing the swimming pool. Within the gaol itself are other precincts, as defined on Figure 1.3, which relate to the specific historic uses of the site. Figure 1.4 shows the general relationship of current site features to historic site features:

![Figure 1.3 – Oatlands Gaol, general precinct plan (Adapted from TAHO PWD266/1547).](image-url)
Figure 1.4 – Historic site features (pink) overlaid on a current aerial photograph (adapted from GoogleEarth).

**Townscape context**

The gaol is in the heart of the Oatlands Military Precinct – the area bounded by High, Church, Barrack Streets and the Esplanade, which was the first settlement site of Oatlands, and the area earmarked to become the centre of a much larger town. There are several buildings remaining from the precinct, most notably the Supreme Court House, also owned by Council and adjacent to the gaol. The Callington Mill complex - an 1837 windmill recently restored to working condition by Council, is also nearby. The site therefore is well placed as one of a suite of heritage attractions in Oatlands.
**Town planning context**

The Oatlands Gaol and Gaoler’s Residence are listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register, therefore subject to the provisions of the Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995. Works to the site are subject to Part 6 of that Act, which requires works to be approved by the Tasmanian Heritage Council.

The Oatlands Gaol and Gaoler’s Residence are listed on Schedule 4 (Buildings and Works of Historical Significance) of the Southern Midlands Planning Scheme 1998. This makes the site subject to the provisions of Part 10 of the scheme, which sets the planning guidelines for works on the place.

The Oatlands Gaol and Gaoler’s residence are also included in the Oatlands Historic precinct Special Area, therefore subject to the provisions of Part 9 of the Scheme. Linkages to the gaol have also been considered in the Callington Mill Precinct Plan.¹

---

1.2. Historical background

The settlement of Oatlands
The first European documentation of the Oatlands district was on the map of Surveyor James Meehan in 1811, who, under the instruction of Governor Lachlan Macquarie, undertook the first survey between Hobart Town and Port Dalrymple (Launceston). Oatlands itself was named by Governor Macquarie on June 3, 1821;

At ¼ past 12, halted at the great lagoon [now Lake Dulverton] (about six miles from Knight’s in Westmorland Plains), and fixed on the site of a township on the banks of the said lagoon, naming it “Oatlands” (Macquarie 1821:91).

Bent’s Almanac of 1825 describes Oatlands as an ‘undeveloped site’ (Bent 1825:53), however, the founding of Oatlands was formalised in 1826, when Governor George Arthur divided the colony into nine Police Districts, and appointed Thomas Anstey as Police Magistrate of the Oatlands district (Ross 1830:13). Arthur deployed the Royal Staff Corps, with 35 skilled tradesmen (von Stieglitz 1960:42) to begin clearing the town site, to erect the government buildings and mark out streets. The first formal survey of the town site was undertaken by Surveyor William Sharland in August 1827 (DELM map M19). In 1829, Widowson (1829:108-10) described the township as;

The original road runs through the township of Oatlands, a few sod huts mark the site of the place. Only a few soldiers are to be seen, and a miserable gang of prisoners working in chains.

In a more optimistic account, Dr. James Ross described the township in 1829;

Several cottages are already erected, also an excellent soldiers’ barracks and officers quarters. These were built by the Royal Staff Corps, and a church and gaol are in progress (Ross 1830:29-30).

By 1829, there were several permanent buildings on the town site, and the Royal Staff Corps were recalled to New South Wales, the tradesmen being left under the control of Captain Mackay of the 21st Fusiliers (von Stieglitz 1960:43) to further establish the township. Sharland re-surveyed the town in 1832 (DELM map O/20), and the greater optimism in its established was evident, as Sharland surveyed 500 acres of allotments, with 50 miles of streets. Sharland reasoned that being half-way between Launceston and Hobart Town, Oatlands would one day be proclaimed the capital (Weeding, 1988:9). The census of December 1835 revealed that Oatlands had a free population of 598 plus 695 convicts (Statistics of Tasmania 1824-35, table 18).
During the 1830’s, Oatlands was booming, with seven hotels, stores, two breweries, wind and steam driven flour mills all thriving off the rural economy. Two hundred buildings were erected during this decade, predominately of sandstone (Weeding 1988:9). Oatlands continued to grow past the middle of the nineteenth century, and became one of the primary woolgrowing regions of Tasmania. This prosperity gave Oatlands a great foothold as a primary centre of the colony and the district was proclaimed a rural municipality in 1861, that year seeing Oatlands with a population of 2333 (Stat. Tas. 1866).

Gradually, following the end of the nineteenth century, with a decline in the wool industry, and a regained confidence in the urban economy, the Oatlands district ceased its rapid rise. Whilst it has always remained the centre of the southern midlands, by the late nineteenth century with the advance in the transport systems in the colony, expected need for Oatlands to become Tasmania’s central capital had passed.

The Oatlands Military Precinct
The early significance placed on Oatlands as being the central capital of the colony of Van Diemens Land is evident in the establishment of the military precinct – the area which accommodated the early government building. This region is the area traditionally bounded by High, Barrack and Church Streets and the Esplanade - which is now intersected by Campbell, Stutzer, Albert and Mason Streets. The earliest map of the precinct is Sharland’s 1832 survey of Oatlands (DELM O/20), which shows the Court-House (1828), Commissariat Store (1827), Guard-House (1828), First Barracks and Officer’s Quarters (1827-8). This map also shows the gaol reserve, although it is likely that this has been added to the map at a later time, as the survey was updated on more than one occasion up to 1839 (DELM O/11-12). It is interesting that this map does not indicate the location of the then current gaol and associated buildings (Gaoler’s House and Constables hut – see Section 3.5.1).

An 1834 sketch map (Figure 5) of a portion of the precinct shows the intended location of the new gaol. This plan indicates that it was intended to eventually extend the complex to four times the size of what was originally built, which would have enclosed a massive 8000 square metres. This is further discussed in Section 3.5.2, but demonstrates the importance of the gaol to the military precinct as a whole.
The next survey of the military precinct was undertaken by Calder (1845, DELM O/21) and shows the development of the precinct from Sharland’s map. This shows the conversion of the first Barracks to a Probation Station (labelled Prisoner’s Barracks), as well as addition of the Gaol (1837), Watch-House (1836), Superintendents and Roads Offices and Second Barracks (c1835) and a dozen ancillary buildings associated with the Barracks precinct and Officer’s quarters. This map shows the final general configuration of the gaol and demonstrates its domination of the precinct (see Figure 1.7).
An upgrade of the precinct was planned for 1847, with the addition of new Barracks and associated buildings adjacent to the gaol, facing Barrack Street (Figure 1.7), as well as a much larger, and more grand Supreme Court House, attached to the gaol walls. For an undocumented reason, however, these plans did not eventuate, but again reiterate the perceived importance of Oatlands and the military precinct in regard to the development of the Tasmanian interior. A detailed plan of the precinct was drawn at that time by F Lovett (Figure 2.3), based on Sprent’s earlier plan of the precinct (Sprent’s plan has not been located to date). This plan specifically maps out the military precinct, and proposed additions, further demonstrating the importance of the precinct at that time.
The disbandment of the official military precinct is demonstrated by Hogan’s (1859, DELM O/8) survey (Figure 1.9). This map shows that the former Barracks/Probation Station had been converted to a school and indicated the allotments and new streets proposed to be apportioned by subdivision and offered for sale. With the exception of the Gaol, School and Police Reserves, the entire precinct was sold to private individuals – the configuration of which is still evident in current titles.
Figure 1.9 – Hogan’s 1859 survey of the Oatlands Military Precinct (DELM O/8)
Although the above only provides a brief overview of development of the Oatlands Military Precinct, it can be seen that Oatlands Gaol was the most dominant building of the precinct, and was a critical part of the infrastructure which made up the nucleus of the proposed central capital of the colony. Aside from the significance assigned to individual buildings within the Oatlands Military Precinct, that area is of historic cultural heritage significance as it is the site of the longest running, and last disbanded regional military establishment in colonial Tasmania (excluding secondary-punishment facilities). With 6 of the 30 known buildings still standing, it also represents perhaps the most intact example of a precinct of its type and has significant potential in the understanding and interpretation of the military outposts, which so many colonial towns were founded around. Ongoing research into this precinct will result in a broader understanding of this site and settlement patterns of colonial Tasmania.

The original Oatlands Gaol
The central focus of the current site is the Oatlands Gaol, which is recognisable as the two-storey sandstone building in Mason Street, Oatlands. This however was not the original gaol, with another building predating this by ten-years. A memorandum from Lieutenant Governor George Arthur, dated September 1827, announced the erection of the first gaol at Oatlands;

*A log-jail, containing four cells for eight men each, will be constructed at Oatlands under the superintendence of Lieutenant Vachell Staff Corps, who will supply the tools from his stores and furnish the carts. A free overseer at a salary not exceeding £25 with 2 carpenters 2 sawyers and eight labourers will be furnished by the Engineer for this work.*

A small log hut for the Gaoler was commissioned at the same time, with George Elder appointed as overseer of the works under the supervision of Major Turton. The first mention of the erection of a gaol at Oatlands is in the Surveyor’s notes accompanying Sharland’s 1827 survey of the town site, which states that the site of the proposed gaol was marked in the plan by the letter ‘G’. This plan (Figure 9) indicates the intended site as being in the region of 82 High Street and that the Military Precinct was intended to be in the area bounded by High, Gay and Dulverton Streets. For some reason during the following year, the location of the Military Precinct was changed to the area defined in Figure 5 and the gaol was certainly not built on the original intended site.

---

2 TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:186-7
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The original gaol was eventually built probably within the military precinct as defined in Figure 1.7 and was certainly not on the site of the present building, as both were in consecutive use for a short period. The location of the original gaol is unclear, although it is possible that it was immediately in front of the Gaoler’s Residence (on the land now occupied by the two police houses). This assumption is based on a brief mention of the site by John Goulder, who stated in 1837 that he was the neighbour of the Oatlands Gaol (TAHO CSO 1/631/14270:225). It is unusual that Sharland’s plan of 1832 did not note the gaol, as it shows the location and name of other buildings in the military precinct. None of the 1840s plans of the precinct show the location of the old gaol, however by that time, considering the state of decay of that building (see below) it is imagined that it would have been demolished.

While the location of the original gaol is unclear, there are some detailed descriptions as to the construction of this building. From an 1832 description by Civil Engineer John Lee-Archer, the gaol was a building of log construction, with a shingle roof and saddle-boards. The interior was whitewashed, with a single fireplace and timber floor (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:220). Figure 1.11 is a detailed plan of the original gaol just prior to demolition, showing four principal buildings surrounding a yard enclosed by a 2.1 metre high paling fence.
Figure 1.11 – Plan of the original Oatlands Gaol, February 1837 (TAHO CSO1/631/14270:225).
The Gaolers residence was a crudely built hut of logs lashed together. A sod skillion was attached to the rear and the roof pitch was deemed very unsatisfactory, the whole being very low and damp (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:215-6). In May 1831, Edward Bolger, Gaoler at Oatlands wrote to the Civil Engineer requesting a new Gaolers residence, as the old one was past service. He also requested repairs to the gaol which had not been repaired since a previous escape attempt. (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:199, TAHO SC21/1:34 & 89). Bolger’s requests apparently fell on deaf ears, and eleven months later the Sherriff’s Office demanded action, reporting:

*It appears that the Gaol at Oatlands is really in a very dangerous insecure condition, in as much, that any person from the outside could without any difficulty and in very few minutes liberate all the prisoners confined therein.*

TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:212.

John Lee-Archer travelled to Oatlands in May 1832 to inspect the buildings. He reported that the Gaoler’s residence was in a very poor state and barely fit for repair. He recommended contracting repairs to the gaol, which included replacement of several logs and generally securing woodwork and whitewashing (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:210). Lee-Archer recommended that the entire complex (the Gaol, Gaolers House and Constables House) should be enclosed in an eight-foot high fence, with gates between the residences and gaol (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:215-20). Tenders for these repairs were called for by the Commissariat Office on the 21st July 1832 (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:221).

In a tender from John McDonnell, he mentions that the Gaol and Gaolers residence could be repaired by temporary measure, but that the principal timbers had rotted to a stage were a good job could not be made (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:223). Oatlands builder George Aitchison tendered for repairs to the other Government buildings, but refused to work on the Gaol, stating:

*I cannot tender for repairs to the Gaol it was built in a great hurry six or seven years ago for the reception of the Chain Gang and is nearly tumbling down it is very insecure for the purpose of a gaol (in its present state it is not worth repairing and a new gaol might be erected of free stone at a less expense than what the repair of the present one would cost. (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:225-6).

Only one tender was received as per Lee-Archer’s specifications - that of Mr. Foord of Hobart Town, which agreed to carry out the desired full repairs to the Gaol. Lee-Archer refused to accept the tender as it was well above the estimated cost and he refused to acknowledge the opinions that the building was beyond repair (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:227-30).

Some attempt at repairing the Gaol was made in late 1832 (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:47) however in January 1834, Gaoler George Dudfield again requested to the Sheriff’s Office that something be done about the state of the Gaol following several attempted escapes. The fence as recommended by Lee-Archer in his report two years earlier was never built (TAHO CSO 1/176/4296:244).
In 1833 Thomas Anstey described the gaol as:

The present Oatlands Gaol is composed of logs – it was some years ago, built in a great hurry, under Major Turton’s direction, for the immediate reception of the Chain Gang, and is, in all respects, inadequate to the purposes of a Gaol, for the use of even this district alone. The building, last year, in a state of great dilapidation, and the logs so loose as to be removable with ease, by any prisoners disposed to make an effort for his escape. The logs are constantly decaying and becoming daily more and more loose, and it is wholly unfit for the safe keeping of persons charged with flagitious crimes, unless such persons are secured in heavy irons.

Anstey was concerned about the freedom of communication between prisoners, even prisoners confined in opposite ends of the gaol could communicate and all prisoners could communicate with those outside the building. The lack of a gaol yard meant that prisoners could not undertake exercise and public complaints were forthcoming with prisoners being flogged in full public view. Anstey was an advocate of solitary confinement, classification and hard labour via the tread-wheel, none of which were safely possible with the old gaol. The notes accompanying the plan depicted in Figure 2.6 emphasises the security problems of the original gaol and indicates that some time after 1834 an enclosing fence was erected.

On February 12th, 1834, 65 year old crippled Bushranger, Matthew Renegan escaped from custody for nine days after being allowed outside confinement for exercise. This was obviously an embarrassment to the Government and indeed Gaoler Dudfield, who offered a £5 reward ‘from his own resources’ for the recapture of Rennigan. This highlighted the inadequacies of the Oatlands gaol, as the Government did not blame Dudfield for the escape, but the lack of infrastructure, in this case an enclosing gaol yard. On April 14th, 1834, three prisoners, James Deering, Richard Ryan and Henry Abrahams made their escape from the Oatlands Gaol. The men were outside the prison washing their shirts. Dudfield offered a reward of £10, for their apprehension, which occurred near Launceston ten days later. Again, their escape was attributed to the insecure nature of the gaol.

In September 1834, John Lee-Archer again inspected the Oatlands Public buildings and recommended that the Gaol, Gaoler’s House and Constables Huts be ‘put in a proper state of repair’ and that the rubbish and offensive dirt surrounding them be cleaned. He again inspected the public buildings in November 1835, but made no reference to the old Gaol, as by this time the new one was progressing.

Following the commissioning of the new gaol in December 1836, from July 1837 the old gaol was hired by the Roads Department for the housing of convicts on the chain gang. This is the last known

---
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documentation of this building and it is likely that by this time it was in a considerable state of disrepair. It is unlikely that the building survived for long after 1837.

Colonial Gaol

It is fortunate that a significant collection of documents relating to the colonial gaol period of the Oatlands Gaol have survived. The Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office (TAHO) holds hundreds of pages of documentation and plans of the buildings. The analysis of these documents can result in any number of avenues of investigation into all facets of the gaol, and are a resource which should be further utilised for research and interpretation.

However, even with the large amount of surviving documentary evidence, it can be imagined that an even larger amount has been lost. According to the Report on Gaols 1849, the records kept at the Oatlands gaol were;

- Memorandum book in which all occurrences were recorded
- Letter book
- Ration book
- Book of prisoners received and discharged showing their sentences and how disposed of.

Although none of these documents appear to have survived the years, a great deal can be learned about how this gaol functioned through other primary sources. In the research undertaken by Williams (2004), upon which a large portion of the research for the CMP is based, the records of the Police Department, Governor’s Office, Sheriff’s Office and the Oatlands Lower Courts were consulted, however yielded only scant information about the actual operation of the establishment. The records of the Public Works Department (PWD) provide a detailed picture of how the physical attributes of the site evolved. Newspaper articles from the time were also useful for documenting the operation of the gaol, however rely on significant searching for the location of this information. This insight into the operation of the gaol relies most heavily on the correspondence both to and from the Colonial Secretary’s Office (CSO). The CSO records (Archives Office of Tasmania) are the most accessible, detailed and best indexed records available which detail the operation of the gaol, therefore form the bulk of the primary source material examined here.

There are numerous avenues of historical examination particularly regarding the day-to-day operation of the gaol, which have not been explored here. During archival searches for this project, numerous themes were observed amongst the documentation, including health, religion and personal attributes of the inmates, officials and administrators of the gaol (i.e. Gaoler’s wives and children). It is hoped that the restoration and interpretation of the Oatlands Gaol will stimulate further exploration of these subjects.
For the purposes of the conservation management plan, only those records which have a direct bearing on the physical attributes of the site have been included here. Further detailed assessment of historical records can be found in Williams (2004), which also states that there is a plethora of further research and analysis which can be undertaken on the records of the Oatlands Gaol. Research into the other attributes of the site have been undertaken by Evans, and Townsend and should be used to support the physical history of the site.

With concerns as to the condition of the original Oatlands gaol, Lieutenant Governor Arthur visited Oatlands in May 1833 to inspect the condition of the building. Arthur expressed his determination for the erection of a new freestone gaol on a chosen site, presumably where the current building stands (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:47). Arthur’s desire was supported by Police Magistrate Thomas Anstey:

I believe it is manifest to His Excellency that a strong, and more commodious Gaol at Oatlands is indispensable; and as freestone, equal in quality to the best Portland, is to be found upon the very spot in unlimited quantities, and is quarried with the greatest ease, it would seem to be equally clear that the gaol should be built of that stone…….. A large substantial central Jail at Oatlands would obviously be a beneficial measure. – The advantages would be manifold – among the many it would embrace punishment by solitary confinement, the tread wheel etc. etc. (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:49).

It seems that Anstey’s belief in the need for solitary confinement as an efficient punishment was one of the main factors behind his push for a new gaol at Oatlands – a form of incarceration which was not possible in the old building (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:43).

Plans were drawn by Colonial Engineer, John Lee-Archer (See Figure 12), in line with requests from Governor Arthur based on an account he had read of the “state of the art” Auburn Prison in New York (TAHO CSO 5/97/2165:121-6, see also Brand 1990:14). It seems that right from the beginning, the dynamic between Governor Arthur and his Colonial Engineer, Lee-Archer, was not harmonious, constant debate between these two men perhaps resulted in the unsuitability of the finished product. The plans shown in Figures 13 and 14 show amendments and scribble, suggesting revisions of the original design prior to commencement.

By May 18th, 1834, a workforce was assembled and ready to commence construction of the new gaol, with 22 masons and mechanics withdrawn from the loan-gang (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:51,59,63). The old Military Barracks were used to house these prisoners while they worked on the new gaol (TAHO PWD 266/1576). Delay was experienced however, as the site of the gaol had not yet been decided upon (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:56). On June 18th, 1834, John Lee-Archer urgently requested an approved site plan from the Surveyor General so that work could immediately commence (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:57). Apparently, the Lieutenant Governor was stalling, as he claimed to support a more eligible place for the erection of a new...
gaol, rather than at Oatlands and refused to give the official go-ahead for construction (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:58). It is unclear as to why Arthur suddenly decided that his chosen site for the gaol may not have been the best option, nor is it clear as to the alternative location. In the meantime, Principal Superintendent of Works, Josiah Spode recommended that the Masons awaiting orders on the erection of the gaol be re-deployed for the laying of the foundations of the Callington Mill (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:60). It was not until June 12th, 1834 that Arthur had conceded the idea of a gaol at Oatlands and gave official approval (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:58).
On the August 11th, 1834, R. Hall of the Oatlands Public Works reported to John Lee-Archer, that he was ready to commence the foundations of the new gaol but was delayed by the lack of timber, lime and sawyers (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:71-4). Lee-Archer immediately sent a further five pairs of sawyers to the site and tenders were called for the provision of lime and timber (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:68,74-5). Timber was cut on George Wilson’s Blue Hills property (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:100-1). Lime was furnished by Mr. Makersey of Oatlands, which was deemed inferior by the Commissariat Office. On July 17th, 1835, tenders were again called for the provision of lime and a cheaper and better quality alternative was supplied by Samuel Hall of Apsley (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:103, see also Williams 2003:94-7). Lack of stone-carts
(TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:79-82) and disputes over cartage contractors (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:91, TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:107-110) added to the delays in construction of the new gaol.

By mid-February 1835, the foundations were reported to have been proceeding very fast, with over 2000 loads of stone having been carted to the site. Progress, however, was slowed by lack of stone-cutters and masons (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:87-90). At this time, however, Lee-Archer produced a second plan for the gaol. It is unknown why the original plan was revised, as no records seem to have survived detailing any dissatisfaction of the 1834 plan, although a later account by Lee-Archer indicated that Governor Arthur was responsible for the rearrangement of the building (TAHO CSO 5/97/2165:121-6). Plans from April 1835 (TAHO 1.13 & 1.14) show that the original single yard had been separated into four separate yards, the room for men-on-route was moved from behind the Gaoler’s residence to the north-eastern corner of the complex and the entire yard widened. The most significant change, however, was the addition of the Women’s Division and the replacement of the solitary cells in the upper level of the gaol with lock-up rooms, a debtors ward and hospitals for both men and women. The balcony as depicted on the original plan was enclosed with a timber wall to form a gallery.
Figure 1.13 – Ground level plan of Lee-Archer’s second design for the Oatlands Gaol. This plan shows which parts of the gaol had been built (brown ink) by March 1835, and those which had not (pink ink) (TAHO PWD 266/1546).
Figure 1.14 – Upper level plan of Lee-Archer’s second design for the Oatlands Gaol. This plan shows which parts of the gaol had been built (brown ink) by March 1835, and those which had not (pink ink) (TAHO PWD 266/1546).
Questions were raised as to the design of the gaol in April 1835, with a memorandum issued by Governor Arthur expressing his concern that the lock-up room, women’s rooms, men-on-route’s room and hospital were all too narrow. Later plans show that these were widened, probably at much inconvenience, as Lee-Archer’s plan from March 1835 shows that they were already in progress. Lee-Archer inspected the new gaol in November 1835 and reported the progress:

Quantities of work performed – Foundations of rubble stone 273 perches. Walling of Gaol room for men on route and Gaoler’s House, ashlars and throughs 418 perches. Rough picked and draught work to the above, 10000 feet. Well in the centre of Gaol Yard sunk 60 feet.
Quarry Road – Made a new road from the main quarry to the new Gaol by which a saving of cartage has accrued to Government of nearly one mile, thereby enabling one cart to perform as much work as hitherto had employed two.
New Quarry – Opened a new quarry for ashlar approximating still nearer to the works distance about 500 yards.

With the gaol partially constructed in early 1836, it was decided that a watch-house should be added. Oatlands Police Magistrate, John Whitefoord, submitted a request to the Lieutenant Governor’s Office for an additional building, housing a watch-house, cells and constables apartments to be erected in the north-eastern corner of the gaol yard, where the Javelin Men’s Building was planned to be erected.

Although plans were drawn for the conversion of the partially completed Javelin Men’s Building (Figure 15), the idea of a Watch-House within the gaol complex was abandoned due to a perceived lack of security and a separate watch-house was built to the east of the gaol. At the same time, it was planned for a new Commissariat Store to be erected on the eastern side of the main gates, attached to, but outside the Gaol walls (Figure 16). This plan was also abandoned for an undocumented reason.

11 TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:155
12 TAHO CSO 1/741/16037:196
13 TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:122
14 Ibid, pp.125-129
15 Ibid, pp.130-32
16 TAHO PWD 266/1587
17 TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:137
Figure 1.15 – The 1836 plans for conversion of the partially completed Javelin Men’s Building into a Watch-House. The grey walls show what was already built in mid-1836, with the red walls proposed to be added (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:137).

Figure 1.16 – 1836 plans for a Commissariat Store to be erected on the northern wall of the gaol complex (TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:137).
On September 5th, 1836, Oatlands J.P. John Pedder informed the CSO that the hospital and women’s rooms were completed and with the exception of the glazing of the Men’s Division and Gaoler’s Residence that the buildings were complete. On September 9th, 1836, the Oatlands Police Magistrate, John Whitefoord, issued a memorandum describing the new facility and that it should be fit for occupation from December 1st of that year. On October 10th, 1836, the Colonial Secretary requested the Police Chief Magistrate to inform Whitefoord that the new building should be ready for occupation on December 20th of that year and that the former gaol should be surrendered to a Mr. Murdock by December 25th, presumably for the housing of the Road Gang as previously arranged. No plans were found here which show the design of the gaol at completion, however documentation suggests that only minor changes to Lee-Archer’s second plans of mid 1835 were made prior to 1844 (Figure 1.17).

18 TAHO CSO 1/691/15206
19 Ibid, p.152
20 Ibid, pp.139-40
As previously stated, a comprehensive history of the gaol is beyond the scope of the CMP. The history presented here is limited to the major events which acted to shape the physical form of the site. Several themes will be explored here which were the main catalysis to the physical change of the site. These include, but are not limited to:

- Modification of the complex to alleviate security inefficiencies
- Alterations and additions to cater for a changing penal system
- Overhauls of the drainage and sanitation systems
- Alterations and demolition as the complex was scaled down
Whilst not considered to be the only historical occurrences which had major impact on the evolution of the site, from the historical documents thus-far analysed these themes appear to be the major influencing factors. These themes are further explored in the historical report and archaeological survey (Williams 2004).

**Security of the Oatlands Gaol**

Many primary documents make reference to the first Oatlands Gaol being ineffective in its security, the solution being the construction of the new gaol. However, the history of the Oatlands Gaol is plagued with the escape of inmates, with the first reported escape from the new gaol being in its first year of occupation, when John Byron escaped from the facility in August 1837. He lowered himself from the upper storey with his bedding and scaled down the covered top of the wooden staircase to reach an unfinished portion of wall. Police Magistrate John Whitefoord blamed the escape on the unfinished state of the gaol and its peculiar design.21 This was the first mention of the inadequacies of the design of the Oatlands Gaol.

In February 1838 two men escaped from the gaol, which resulted in the additional barring of windows. On the 23rd of the same month, George Jackson escaped from the gaol by ‘cutting’ through his cell door with a knife he had smuggled and knocking of the lock of the main gates (which was only held by two nails). A Javelin Man, Perkins, had neglected to lock the inner gate for the night. Jackson had also removed his handcuffs with an axe and wedge found in the Outer Yard but not his leg-irons. This prompted the installation of ring-bolts into certain cells for the chaining of prisoners likely to escape.22

In early March 1838, four men, Edward Thomas, John Russell, John Williams and John Richardson, escaped the gaol by removing the boards and battens from the ceilings of their cell, accessing the roofspace and, using their bedding attached to the chimney, lowered themselves down the outside wall of the gaol from the skylight. Common escapes, particularly early in the life of the gaol, would certainly have been an embarrassment to all involved in the planning and operation of the facility, all involved were quick to try and pass the blame. The Oatlands Gaol had soon proven to be an inefficient facility – much of this inefficiency, as already hinted by Whitefoord,23 was blamed on the design.

With eight prisoners having escaped from the Oatlands Gaol within the first year of occupation, the Oatlands Police Magistrate, John Whitefoord wrote to the Chief Police Magistrate:

> I would therefore take the liberty of suggesting that a Board of Inquiry be immediately held to report upon the state of the building generally as a secure place of custody.

---

21 TAHO CSO 5/56/1246:188-9. This document refers several times to the gaol being unfinished, where earlier documents relay that the building had been finished six months earlier.

22 *Ibid*, pp.103-9,124

23 TAHO CSO 5/56 1246:188-9
The Sheriff, John Beaumont, immediately recommended that a Board of Inquiry be assembled to investigate the unexpected and frequent escapes from the new facility.24

A Board of Inquiry was assembled in March 1838 to inspect the state of the Oatlands Gaol and advise on alterations which would make it a more secure place of confinement. This board consisted of the Sheriff, the Visiting Magistrate of Constitution Hill, the Civil Engineer and the Oatlands Police Magistrate. The Board visited the gaol on the April 20th, 1838 and recommended:

- A pump to be installed to the well to replace the rope and windlass.
- The doors of the main yard and women’s yard to be doubly boarded, inside and out. The slide in the doors to the main yard to be removed and all bolts in the door jams be plated in iron.
- All bolts throughout the gaol to be replaced by those of a superior kind.
- Twenty padlocks of the best description to be supplied.
- The whole of the ceilings in the upper rooms of the gaol to be lined with two-inch stringy bark or gum boards and to be securely screwed into the ceiling joists with 3 inch screws.
- The skylight to be repaired and covered with an iron gate bolted into the stonework.
- All chimneys to be fitted with iron grates and iron bars leaded into the stonework.
- The main gate to be fitted with one large cell bolt and padlock.
- The present women’s kitchen [sic – actually refers to the men’s kitchen] to be altered into a Javelin Men’s room, the window opposite the fireplace to be removed and a two ½ - inch thick, six-panelled door fitted to an inch and a half jam with narrow architrave to be fitted to the present doorway and passage of the Gaoler’s house.
- Two ten-gallon coppers to be provided for the kitchen.
- The ceiling of the men’s kitchen to be repaired and whitewashed.
- A sentry box to be provided as well as two more Javelin Men employed.

These works were expected to cost £150.25 Tenders were called by Colonial Engineer John Lee-Archer for these additional works.26 In reference to these works, Lieutenant Governor Franklin observed:

The necessity for these repairs and alterations, so soon after the completion of the building, involves a reflection upon the Engineer Department, which appears to render explanation, on the part of the Civil Engineer highly necessary.27

In defence, the Colonial Engineer, John Lee-Archer replied:

---

24 TAHO CSO 5/97/2165:86, 110-8
25 TAHO CSO 5/97/2165:90-8
26 HTG 15/6/1838:433
27 TAHO CSO 5/97/2165:121
I would like to take the opportunity of briefly stating, for the information of His Excellency, that in my opinion the defects of this building are to be attributed to the following circumstances: In the first instance, the design for this gaol was made at the desire of His Late Excellency Colonel Arthur, from a description of the American Prison at Auburn\textsuperscript{28}, in a work written by Capn. Baird Hall – the whole was to be composed of small cells of strong masonry, & each cell covered with heavy flag stones – In accordance with this design the cells on the lower story, only, have been completed, an alteration having been suggested by Colonel Arthur in the arrangement of the upper story, it being supported that day-rooms would be absolutely necessary in a gaol of this description, and thus, when the apartments became larger, in the upper story the plan of securing the ceilings with flag stones was necessarily abandoned, and a lined ceiling of gum boards substituted.

Lee-Archer went on to suggest that the escapes through the ceiling were the fault of a lack of watch and the absence of a sentry box in the yard. He implied that the escape of Jackson earlier that year was through negligence on the part of the Javelin Men leaving the inner gate unlocked and a lack of guarding to allow Jackson to saw through his cell door and gain tools to aid his escape. Lee-Archer also implied that the Ordinance Stores had cut costs by supplying locks of inferior quality for the cells and gates.\textsuperscript{29} It seems that perhaps John Lee-Archer’s designed was doomed from the start, with questions as to its efficiency raised by Governor Arthur as early as April 1835 when only the foundations had been completed.\textsuperscript{30}

The design of gaol was again criticised in 1841, with the number of solitary cells deemed larger than necessary and the sleeping rooms were too insecure to use. The cells and wards being directly beside an external wall was the major point of concern for security at the facility. It was then recommended that:

- The gaol wall be surrounded by a second fence.
- Accommodation to be provided for Javelin Men in the Outer Yard.
- Step ladder [stairs to upper level?] opposite female solitary cells to be fenced
- Mr. Smie’s [presumably the Gaoler] window to be made into a door or French doors and a gang-way to look out in the angle [?]
- Three water closets in the debtors yard – 1 for debtors, 1 for Javelin Men and 1 for main yard. The wall height of water closets to be raised to the same height as surrounding wall.
- Cells to be lined with 2 inch plank.

It was also recommended that the depth of the gaol buildings be doubled, with cells along the eastern wall to be converted into wards. An extension to the southern wall of the complex was to provide a yard behind the

\textsuperscript{28} Whilst the original plans of the Oatlands Gaol (Figure 12) bears resemblance to sections of the much larger Auburn Prison, the plans were subsequently changed so much that the finished building was significantly different.

\textsuperscript{29} TAHO CSO 5/97/2165:121-6

\textsuperscript{30} TAHO CSO 1/691/15206:155
main building equal in size to that in front. 31 It seems, however, that these works were never undertaken. P
Mason, Sheriff, wrote to the CSO on January 12th, 1841:

The building is spacious and surrounded by a strong wall, yet the interior is so inconveniently planned as to make it difficult to alter in so as to render it secure and commodious without a considerable outlay of money. TAHO CSO 5/274:7123:162.

Mason recommended:

- Replace worn out fastenings on doors and windows with strong iron bolts.
- Division of long upstairs rooms in male Division each into two or more smaller rooms as a means of separating prisoners.
- To turn the six cells on the left hand side of the men’s yard into 3 small rooms to be used as sleeping berths.
- Erect a fence in front of the solitary cells to prevent persons in the yard holding communications with solitary prisoners.
- Divide the two debtors rooms into four smaller rooms and cut off the debtors yard from the Outer Yard and main gate by running a wall across, a wall 40 feet in length.
- Divide one of the two large rooms in the women’s Division into two apartments and remove a water closet which stands in the corner of the women’s yard into the opposite corner to prevent the possibility of escape provided by it.
- Provide the Gaoler with a better view of the establishment from the upper floor of the Gaoler’s residence.

Whilst some of these alterations were eventually undertaken (the debtors wall pre-1855 and removal of female privy 1849) it seems that these recommendations were not accepted immediately.

The Report on Gaols 1849 again criticised the design of the Oatlands Gaol in terms of the security it provided. Although enclosed by a 25 foot high wall, the security was lessened by the placement of buildings and wards against the perimeter wall. This report states that escapes and attempts have been frequent, in one case by prisoners cutting their way through the walls. (TAHO CSO 24/87:1812:137). As early as 1841, Oatlands Gaoler P. Fraser had stated that:

"they [the walls] are strong and high enough…. Although it is not difficult for an expert house-breaker to get through them". TAHO CSO 22/10/406:163-4.

These problems apparently continued, as in 1851, J. Burnett, Sheriff, wrote to the CSO:
My Under Sheriff, who has just returned from Oatlands gives such an alarming account of the insecurity at that place.......... some very desperate characters remain in it......... I have repeatedly represented to His Excellency the great insecurity of the Gaol at Oatlands......

With questions as to the security of the gaol stemming from issues such as cost-cutting and inefficiencies in design, the Oatlands Gaol was subject to constant alterations and additions. With the constant (and often heated) debates between Governor Arthur and Colonial Engineer John Lee-Archer, different authorities obviously had often very different opinions as to how the gaol should be operated, how effective systems were and indeed as to the form of the physical layout of the complex. The archaeological survey (Williams 2004) further discusses the security issues of the Oatlands Gaol and how these acted to shape the physical evolution of the site.

![Figure 1.18 – Phase plan of the Oatlands Gaol 1849-c1855](image)

**Adaptation to suit changing penal requirements**

The previous section has detailed the security deficiencies, resulting in alteration of the complex, however, other major works to the gaol were the result of different requirements for that complex within a changing penal system. Whilst a full examination of the place of the Oatlands Gaol within the colonial penal system is

32 TAHO CSO 24/261/5855:275 & 281
beyond the scope of the CMP, factors such as the upgrade of the Oatlands Police Court to a Supreme Court in 1841 and overcrowding of other female establishments within the colony, resulted in the need to change of the physical layout of the facility.

The status of Oatlands as the major judicial site in the interior was upgraded in 1841, when the Oatlands Police Court House was upgraded to a Supreme Court House. It was then necessary to make modifications to the gaol for the accommodation of both remanded and sentenced prisoners, as well as the construction of gallows. The required physical separation of different classes of prisoners was not possible with the established infrastructure of the Oatlands Gaol, which was identified as a major shortfall in its effectiveness. As can be seen on the plans of the Oatlands Gaol, the large, open-plan men’s yard did not lend itself to the separation of classes – a reflection of its original function as a facility for incarceration of only two types of prisoner – sentenced and debtors.

Plans were drawn in 1856 (Figures 18 and 19) which intended to overhaul the men’s Division, combining the solitary cells in the eastern wing into a single mess-room and to convert the Chapel into a dormitory. The introduction of more wards would, to a degree, rectify the problem of separating classes of prisoners – more than the original design of one debtors ward, four smaller wards and 23 solitary cells allowed. These plans indicate that the entire façade of the eastern wing was to be demolished, the stone lower wall to be replaced with boards. These works, however, were never undertaken. At the same time, plans also indicate that walls were constructed to separate the south-western corners of both the Men’s and Women’s yards from the overall yards and another Javelin Men’s Yard had been added - allowing further separation of prisoner classes.

33 TAHO CSO 24/87:1812:137, 146
34 TAHO PWD 266/1549. This section of the Men’s yard was commonly referred to as the ‘Debtor’s Yard’.
35 TAHO PWD 266/1552
36 TAHO PWD 266/1551
Figures 1.19 (top) & 1.20 (bottom) – Proposed alterations to H.M. Gaol, Oatlands, plans by W. Kay, Director of Public Works, July 1856 (TAHO PWD 266/1556-7).
A major upgrade of the gaol was undertaken in 1849, part of these works included the construction of two condemned cells and a yard, for prisoners awaiting execution – further establishing infrastructure for separation of prisoners within the complex. These, together with the gallows, form perhaps the most enigmatic precinct of the Oatlands Gaol - being the only rural gaol in the colony where executions were undertaken. The first mention of the Condemned Cells was in 1848:

……. The necessity of at least two or 3 condemned cells being erected in that gaol [Oatlands] without delay… to ensure the safe custody of such unfortunate beings also to render their receiving religious instruction without being more or less exposed to the gaze or annoyance of their fellow prisoners. J. Crouch, Sheriff, 18/4/1848.37

The Sheriff’s department had recognised the need for the Oatlands Gaol to include condemned cells, however were forced to wait until the following year due to the expense of the undertaking. Determined to get the cells constructed as soon as possible, the Sheriff (Crouch) suggested that the inner walls of the gaol be lowered 8-10 feet and that the stone could be re-worked to construct the condemned cells. Crouch suggested that this would have the added advantage of allowing the Gaoler an uninterrupted view of the entire establishment from the upper level of the Gaoler’s house.38 This proposal was rejected by the Colonial Secretary, who, in May 1848, concluded that the works would be budgeted for 1849.39

By June 1849, plans indicate that the Condemned Cells had been constructed.40 Figures 1.20 - 1.23 show very detailed specifications of the condemned cells and Figure 25 confirming that the cells were built quite accurately to those plans. The specifications indicate a sandstone building, with a shingled roof, a timber floor, planked walls and ceilings, and a corner fireplace in each cell – a luxury not afforded to most other prisoners. A private yard was provided and had iron bars enclosing the top. Bedboards folded down from the walls, and hoppers over the windows ensured that no view of the yard could be gained from within, but some light was still let in. The fact that eight men spent their last days within these cells makes this an enigmatic part of the site.
Figure 1.20 – Plan of proposed condemned cells, Oatlands Gaol (TAHO PWD 266/1559).

Figure 1.21 – Section (from north) of proposed condemned cells, Oatlands Gaol (TAHO PWD 266/1560).
Figure 1.22 – Section (from west) of proposed condemned cells, Oatlands Gaol (TAHO PWD 266/1561).

Figure 1.23 – Northern elevation of proposed condemned cells, Oatlands Gaol (TAHO PWD 266/1559).
Between 1844 and 1860, a total of eighteen men were executed by hanging at the Oatlands Gaol.\footnote{Rieusset 2004} This makes the site unique, as it is the only regional gaol (outside Hobart Town and Port Dalrymple/Launceston) where executions occurred on a regular basis\footnote{Ibid.}. In 1855 the \textit{Private Executions Act} was passed which banned public executions in Tasmanian gaols (\textit{The Examiner} 11/8/1855). Prior to this, hangings were reported to have occurred ‘in front of the gaol gates’.\footnote{Ibid.} See Williams (2004:67-69) for further discussion on the gallows, and a comparative analysis of that structure. Figure 1.25 describes the atmosphere of a public execution:
Plans to convert the Oatlands Gaol to a female factory

In addition to the need for the Oatlands Gaol to be constantly upgraded to meet the needs of a changing convict system the use of facility was again questioned in 1841, with the proposal to construct an entire new gaol (hence overcoming design inefficiencies) and convert the facility into a Female Factory.

Overcrowding of the female establishments in Hobart Town and Launceston, resulted in the need for further establish Female Factories in other parts of the colony. The bid to convert part of the Oatlands Gaol into such a facility was opposed by Oatlands Gaoler P. Fraser, who argued that the arrangement of the Oatlands
Gaol interior was already very impractical and that the addition of more buildings would only act to make the plan worse. Fraser described the female section as being able to accommodate 20 women. Fraser suggested that with the addition of more buildings in that Division, it would be capable of holding no more than 50 women, however this would reduce the open space in the yard to a point where it would “destroy the efficiency of the gaol”. Fraser suggested that a new gaol should be constructed at Oatlands, with the current one being refitted as a Female Factory capable of holding 200 women.44 This suggestion, however, was apparently given little consideration and was not carried through. This again demonstrates the dissatisfaction the authorities held with the Oatlands Gaol.

The records show no further suggestion of a Female Factory at Oatlands and it can be presumed that the opening of the Ross Female Factory in 1848 replaced any desire to establish such a facility at Oatlands. Many documents do refer to the Female Division of the Oatlands Gaol as a Female Factory (i.e. PWD 266/1552), although it is very unlikely that this was ever an official title of the Division. The maximum number of women incarcerated at any one time prior to 1848 was six (TAHO CSO 24/87:1812:137), certainly less than capacity and less than would be expected in contemporary Tasmanian Female Factories, as described by Casella (2002:28-36).

44 TAHO CSO 22/10/406:159-65
Overhaul of drainage and sanitation systems

The earliest instance of major works to the completed gaol was in 1839 (less than two years from opening), which focused particularly on the ineffectiveness of the drainage system. An 1839 report to the Director of Public Works states that the following works were required:

- A drain required around the exterior of the buildings to take away water from the eaves to be conducted to the privies. Constructed in stone.
- A main drain to run from the gaol to connect in with the drain from the prisoners barracks, to cross the road near Mr. Robinsons, length 260 feet. Constructed in stone.45

The Report on Gaols 1849 states that there were privies in the women’s yard and that pots were placed in a spare cell in the Men’s Division, which were emptied daily into the cesspool of the Women’s Division privies and then left to air in the yard. All prisoners were provided with a bucket (without a cover) for night use which was emptied and cleansed each morning.46 This suggests that from the earliest usage of the complex, there were significant shortcomings in the drainage and sanitation system.

With frequent blockages in the drain running from the Men’s Division privies to the cesspit of the female’s and Gaoler’s privies on the other side of the complex, 47 plans for the overhaul of the gaol privies were drawn by the Director of Public Works in June 1849 (TAHO PWD 266/1448, 1551), which are illustrated and further examined in Section 13.10. The Gaoler of that time, Peter Pegus, received criticism from the Director of Public works for not reporting these blockages sooner, is it was revealed that the problem had been long-running.48 Under instruction from the Director of Public Works, the 1849 upgrade included demolition of all privies, the filling of at least one old cesspit and new privies and cesspits constructed in each of the Gaoler’s, Men’s and Women’s Yards. The problematic drain running from the old Men’s Division privies, across the complex to join the women’s privy cesspit, was disused and the new men’s privy built with its own cesspit on the eastern side of the complex. A drain was also installed to take overflow from the well into the main drain on the western side of the complex.

It was reported on August 6th, 1851 that the drains in the gaol required cleansing and some reconstruction, as in places the stonework covering them had given way. The drains in the receiving (outer) yard (these are not depicted on any known plans), main yard and yard leading to the female factory were lifted and re-laid with a greater fall. Stone was brought to the gaol for prisoners to break into metal for fill in the yard and two hundred loads of gravel were brought in, both for a foundation for the drain, and to face the heightened ground of those yards. Works were undertaken by a Mr. Clayton at a cost of £20.49

45 TAHO CSO 5/185/4480:44-50
46 TAHO CSO 24/87/1812:137-8
47 TAHO CSO 24/74/320:39-6
48 Ibid. pp.30-64
49 TAHO CSO 24/281/6258:311-6
With the inefficiency of the drainage and sanitation systems of the complex requiring a full upgrade within the first fifteen years of the life of the gaol, again questions would have been raised as to the suitability of its original design and construction.

Figure 1.27 – William Kay’s pre-June 1849 plans of the proposed upgrades to the Oatlands Gaol, showing the addition of the Condemned Cells, the original privy locations and the intended locations for the new privies (TAHO PWD 266/1548).
Municipal Gaol

Although the gaol was able to hold up to 200 prisoners, the maximum number of men in the gaol at any one time prior to 1848 was 70, the maximum number of women prior to 1848 was six – well under the expected capacity of the complex. By 1849 Oatlands was the only remaining fully functional rural (outside Hobart Town and Launceston) gaol in the colony. By 1857 the number of men in the Oatlands gaol had...
decreased to only 16.\textsuperscript{53} By 1863, the facility had apparently run the course of its life as a colonial gaol and at the end of that year the operation of the complex was handed over to the Municipality of Oatlands, to be run as a municipal Gaol.

The 1883 \textit{Commission of the state of Penal Discipline in Tasmania}, gives a good description of the function of the Oatlands gaol following the end of the convict era and its downgrade to a municipal gaol. A detailed plan of the remaining parts of the gaol was drawn by George Shields, Clerk of Works (PWD) at this time (Figure 30) which indicates that it was apparently intact from the last known complete plan dating from 1849\textsuperscript{54} (Figure 1.29).

\textsuperscript{53} TAHO CSO 24/261/5855:276-85
\textsuperscript{54} Care should be taken when interpreting this plan, as it seems that Shield’s has copied it verbatim from Kay’s 1844 plan of the site (TAHO PWD 260/1550), roughly adding major post 1844 features which are not necessarily accurate in terms of content and scale.
Shields reported that the buildings at that time were in fair order, but that the roofs would need re-shingling or covering in iron. The buildings were occupied by the Superintendent of the Municipal Police, as well as the Watch-house Keeper and Constables. The 1883 commission indicated that Oatlands was the only regional gaol in which long-term sentences were still served, provided that the prisoners could be put to labour. All other gaols sent long-term prisoners (generally serving sentences of more than one month) to the Launceston or Hobart Gaols.
Figure 1.30 – A c1890 photograph of the Oatlands Gaol (State Library of Tasmania).

Figure 1.31 – The Oatlands Gaol 1904 (The Weekly Courier 20/12/1904:18).
The gaol continued operating as a municipal gaol with little change for the next 50 years. The Gaoler’s residence and former Javelin Men’s Building were used as accommodation for the Sergeant and Constables.
respectively. Apart from the removal of some internal walls, and a section of outer wall immediately at the rear of the Gaoler’s Residence (See Figures 1.31 & 1.33) no evidence has been found to suggest that there were any major alterations or demolition to the complex through this period (see further discussion in Section 3.5.4). Figures 34 and 35 show that the roof of the men’s Division had been covered in iron between 1901 and 1926. Photographic evidence dating from 1926 shows that the Men’s Division (Figure 35) and Condemned cells (Figure 25) were still standing, but dilapidation had started to become apparent.

Figure 1.34 – The Men’s Division showing solitary cells with the Debtor’s ward above, early 1900’s (State Library of Tasmania).
Figure 1.35 – The Men’s Division, showing solitary cells with chapel above c1926 (State Library of Victoria Heritage Collections).

Figure 1.36 – The southern wall of the Oatlands Gaol 1935 – the Watch House in the background (Oatlands District Historical Society).
The last references cited here which relate to a Gaoler at Oatlands is the appointment of Sergeant Walter Kirkham as Gaoler in February 1932, who replaced Sergeant Herbert Crosswell who was appointed in November 1930. The Gaol return of 1936 indicates that there were 2 prisoners in the Gaol. The Mercury newspaper (23/3/1934) described the use of the gaol during that year, which apparently marked the transition to new police infrastructure within Oatlands. With the construction of two new police lock-ups at Oatlands, this article reported that the use of a portion of the gaol to hold prisoners would be discontinued and also states that generally the buildings and walls were in a good state of repair. At this time the Gaoler’s residence was still in use as police quarters, but the former Javelin Men’s Building had been abandoned several years earlier. During the 1930’s, three new police houses were built in Oatlands, two on the reserve in front of the gaol and one near the Court house in Stutzer Street – all of which are still standing, with one still used by police. This apparently spelled the end of the Oatlands Gaol’s use as a penal/correctional facility.

Figure 1.37 – Phase plan of the Oatlands Gaol c1855-1937.
Demolition and post-gaol use.

By the mid 1930s, the Oatlands Gaol had apparently become a white-elephant, surplus to the needs of the district – although, this was not the first time a major change in usage heralded doom for the building. With the gaol decommissioned as a colonial institution at the end of 1863, it seems that the complex was soon deemed far beyond the needs of the district. In 1879 the Oatlands Municipal Council applied to the Governor to transfer ownership of the site to the council and demolish the buildings for the purpose of reusing the stone to build the Town Hall on the site – as the Warden summarised in a letter to the Colonial Secretary (3/9/1879):

The gaol and site value was not great and that savings on site and materials for town hall would outweigh this.

The Colonial Secretary responded:

In view of the possible future requirements of this colony as regards to penal discipline, I cannot at present recommend that the request of the Oatlands Municipal Council be completed. 57

The complex apparently had won a reprieve in 1879, nonetheless, the demolition of the Oatlands Gaol was commenced prior to 1901, with the *Weekly Courier* (20/7/1901) reporting that a portion of the gaol had been pulled down by the Government to provide building materials for the State School. From photographic evidence (Figures 1.31 & 1.33) it is likely that this portion was a section of the western wall directly behind the Gaoler’s residence and possibly some parts of the inner walls, as Figure 1.34 shows that part of the wall enclosing the Debtor’s Yard had been demolished by that time. Figure 1.38 shows that by 1907 more of the internal walls had been removed as the Men’s Division buildings could be seen through the removed section of wall behind the Gaoler’s Residence – this would only be possible with removal of the wall between the Men’s and Women’s Divisions. No evidence was found which suggests that any buildings had been demolished during the period as a municipal gaol. The Gaoler’s Residence, Men’s and Women’s Divisions, the Condemned cells and Javelin Men’s Building were all still standing up to 1937, when the next phase of demolition commenced. 58 If any buildings were lost during the early twentieth century, it is likely that they were only ancillary buildings, such as privies. Figure 42, a post-demolition plan from 1937, shows that by that time several minor structures were added to the former gaol yards, such as stables, tanks and sheds, in support of the domestic use of the buildings (also seen in Figure 1.38).

Little historical data on the gaol seems to have survived the first quarter of the twentieth-century, it was not until the mid 1930s that the gaol was thrown into the media spotlight, with plans for its impending demolition. *The Mercury* (6/11/1937:10) ran a brief article showing the demolition of the Men’s and Women’s Divisions of the gaol (Figure 38).

---

57 TAHO CSD 10/54:1235
58 TAHO MCC24/39
Figure 1.38 – Photograph showing the first stage of demolition on the western wall of the gaol. The Men’s Division can be seen in the background, suggesting that some of the inner walls had been removed by this time. A more recent building in the Gaoler’s Yard can also be seen (The Weekly Courier 27/4/1907:24).

Figure 1.39 – Demolition of the Men’s (left) and Women’s Divisions (right) in November 1938. The caption incorrectly describes the upper level of the women’s Division as the chapel (The Mercury, 6/11/1937:10).
The Oatlands Municipal Council had, shortly before, received a letter from the Tasmania Society in regards to the historical value of the Gaol and its potential for tourism. The advice of this letter was heeded and council requested to the Commissioner of Police that the demolition of the gaol cease. This request was referred to the Chief Secretary, who agreed to visit Oatlands and discuss concerns about the demolition and inspect the site. This visit apparently did not eventuate, and the council received notification from the Commissioner of Police that demolition would continue, as the site had gradually been demolished over several previous years. The Warden of the Oatlands council again wrote to the Commissioner of Police on December 3rd, 1937 requesting that the gaol arch and four remaining cells be preserved. Whilst the gaol arch was subsequently relocated, it seems that the remaining cells were demolished. The contractor who successfully tendered for the demolition of the gaol and removal of stone was a man named Harry Gain.

59 The Examiner, 5/11/1937:5, TAHO MCC 24/39
60 Ibid, 10/11/1937
61 Ibid, 20/11/1937
62 TAHO MCC 24/39
Figure 1.40 – Demolition of the Men’s Division, late 1937 (photograph loaned by Graeme Raphael, Oatlands).

Figure 1.41 – Demolition of the Men’s Division, late 1937 (photograph loaned by the Oatlands District Historical Society).
Figure 1.42 – Photograph of the Men’s Division (the well and condemned cells in the foreground) taken just before 1937.63

A plan by G. Hodgson, dated April 1938 (Figure 1.43) illustrates the post demolition remnants of the Oatlands Gaol. This plan notes the height of walls remaining at that time and that the current yard level was 3’1” (approx. 95cm) above bedrock in the south-eastern corner. This plan implies complete destruction of the cells along the eastern wall, the Javelin Men’s Building, most of the Women’s Cells and half of the cells along the southern wall of the men’s Division. Portions of the internal walls and several cell walls remained at that time (as seen in Figure 40), however as depicted in Figure 43, these were demolished by 1946. Figure 43 shows that the gaol itself has been largely demolished to ground level by that time, leaving an open yard (with several modern outbuildings). A portion of the Men’s Division remained in the south-eastern corner (the Turnkeys room) and subtle shading within the yard suggests shallow archaeological deposits (further detailed in Williams 2004).

63 This original photograph was offered for sale on eBay in 2005 but was unable to be obtained by SMC. Figure 41 is a low-resolution scan of that image taken from the website. The copyright owner is unknown and the image will be removed from this document should the rightful copyright owner request so.
Figure 1.43 – Hodgson’s April 1938 plan of the Oatlands Gaol site, showing proposed locations for the swimming pool and associated buildings (although different to the eventual layout) (TAHO PWD 266/1554).
Figure 1.44 – Aerial photograph of the Oatlands Gaol 1946 showing the state of the yard following the 1937 phase of demolition and before the installation of the pool (DELM).
With plans for the swimming pool apparently shelved due to the Second World War and after more demolition of the site, the pool was opened in the early 1950s. By this time, the outer walls had been demolished to a height of 3 metres on the western side and 1.5 metres on the eastern side – meaning that over half of the outer wall had been lost by that time.

The opening of the swimming pool heralded the next phase of the life of the Oatlands Gaol – the primary purpose for which it is used in 2006. The Gaoler’s residence, still being almost wholly extant has served a variety of uses since 1938, including a private residence, WWII soldiers base, an art school and public meeting rooms (Country Women’s Association and Rural Youth). The building has served no specific purpose since the early 1980’s, with regular maintenance by the Southern Midlands Council preventing its deterioration, the Oatlands Gaoler’s residence offers significant potential for a variety of future uses.64

The gaol yard, being filled to accommodate the pool, has remained relatively undisturbed for over 50 years. This may have acted to preserve archaeological deposits beneath the fill therefore offering a valuable resource for future research into the site.

**Overview of developmental sequence**

The Oatlands Gaol and Gaoler’s Residence has several phases of usage relevant to conservation management and interpretation:

- Indigenous/pre European period (pre 1820’s)
- First gaol (1827-c1837)
- Colonial gaol (1834-1863), including phases of:
  - Construction (1834-36)
  - Pre major renovation (1836-1849)
  - Post renovation (1849-1863)
- Municipal gaol (1863-1936)

With the decommissioning of the Gaol in 1936 and the continued use of the Gaoler’s Residence, since 1936 these parts of the site have had separate histories since then. In the case of the gaol, these phases can be summarised as:

- Demolition (1937-1954)
- Swimming pool (1954-present)

---

64 See Reed 1998.
And the Gaoler’s residence as:

- Police and private residence (1936 – c1970)
- CWA/Rural Youth meeting place (1970s)
- Vacant (pre1984-present)
1.3. Statement of historic cultural heritage significance

The following statement of significance for the Oatlands Gaol is developed from the criteria for entry into the Tasmanian Heritage Register (s16 of the Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995).

A. It is important in demonstrating the evolution of the pattern of Tasmania’s History.

The Oatlands Gaol complex is of historic cultural heritage significance because of its ability to demonstrate over 180 years of penal/police infrastructure in a regional centre. Having superseded an 1827 gaol (probably adjacent), the complex operated as a centrally administered colonial gaol for 28 years from 1836. With the formation of Municipal Government in Tasmania, the complex became a municipal gaol, as it operated for a further 63 years, until closure in its centenary year of 1936. The Gaoler’s Residence still used for police accommodation until the 1950s, new police houses were built immediately in front during the late 1930s – one of which is still used for police purposes. Together with the adjacent Court House, the Oatlands Gaol therefore is demonstrative of the needs of policing the district through two centuries, as well as the various colonial and Tasmanian penal/police systems.

B. It demonstrates rare, uncommon or endangered aspects of Tasmania’s heritage

The Oatlands Gaol complex is of historic cultural heritage significance as a rare example of a colonial gaol in Tasmania. Apart from Richmond it is the most extant example remaining of at least ten contemporary gaol complexes. As the only regional colonial gaol where executions were commonplace, the site may yield rare archaeological remnants of the gallows – the only other example of such being largely re-created gallows in the remnants of the Hobart Gaol.

C. It has the potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Tasmania’s history

The Oatlands Gaol complex is of historic cultural heritage significance as a major archaeological site, which may yield information about over a century of penal servitude in Tasmania. Archaeological survey has ascertained that the half-acre gaol yard is beneath almost a metre of mid-twentieth-century fill, and that there may be archaeological remains beneath - several metres in depth in places. Further study of the physical layout of the complex may yield information about the architecture of colonial incarceration, which might be interpreted to analyse contemporary attitudes towards such. The study of artifacts derived from this place may be interpreted to analyse the lifestyles of those once exiting within – adding depth to the ephemeral history of such. Study of the Gaoler’s residence and its fabric may yield information about the domestic lives of those free, who were living in the complex.

D. It is important as a representative in demonstrating the characteristics of a broader class of cultural places

The Oatlands Gaol is of historic cultural heritage significance as it represents several phases of penal/police infrastructure in Tasmania. It is representative of a large Georgian sandstone government building, and of the architecture of John-Lee Archer. The Oatlands Gaol, together with other c1830 Tasmanian penal sites are representative of Governor Arthur’s attitudes towards criminal reform, which was influenced by a much wider reform system.

E. It is important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement

Not assessed.
F. It has strong or special meaning for any group or community because of social, cultural or spiritual associations
The Oatlands Gaol is of historic cultural heritage significance as it is the most recognisable building remaining of the Oatlands Military Precinct, and together with the Court House is considered to be an icon of the colonial settlement of the district. When analysing the history of these places, the names of the Gaoler’s, Police Magistrates, staff and inmates filter through to today’s community – with many current families descending from these figures. This represents a cultural continuity in the township, of which the residents are well aware and proud of. The Oatlands community has provided great interest in the conservation of the gaol, as demonstrated by community participation in various restoration and archaeological projects to date.

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 Oatlands Gaol complex is of historic cultural heritage significance as it represents the attitudes of Governor Arthur towards penal reform in Tasmania. It is an example of the architecture of John Lee-Archer, who is perhaps the most noted of pre 1840s Tasmania Colonial Architects/Engineers. The design of the complex was a brainchild of Arthur’s as he strove for he ultimate regional penal facility, and his constant interference in the Lee-Archer design process has well documented (and long-lived) disagreement between the two.
1.4. Planning background

1.4.1. Southern Midlands Council Strategic Planning Framework

The planning and implementation of the Oatlands Gaol Project has been guided by a number of documents (all of which have been endorsed by Southern Midlands Council and relevant statutory authorities where relevant). The day-to-day management of the Oatlands Gaol is undertaken by Council’s Heritage Project Manager. A working group provide support for management, and progress is reported to Council every three weeks through the Heritage Project Officer’s report.

Conservation planning

Much planning work has been done towards the restoration and reinvigoration of the site, including the following documents:

- Historical report and archaeological survey
- Remedial works report
- Structural report
- Structural report addenda
- Conservation Management Plan
- Archaeological test-trenching plan
- Master Plan
- Archaeological Research Design
- Use and Development Plan
- Gaol Arch Relocation Project Plan
- Fire engineering survey

All of these documents have been endorsed by Council, and their recommendations adopted into strategic planning documents. Where necessary, statutory endorsements have also been obtained. References to these documents, and their recommendations, will be made where appropriate through the current document.

---

65 Williams, B. 2003: Oatlands Gaol Historical Report and Archaeological Survey.
67 Spratt, P. 2005: Oatlands Gaol Structural Report
70 Williams, B. 2005: Oatlands Gaol – Stage II Archaeological Program, Rationale and Research Design.
71 Williams, B. 2009: Oatlands Gaol Project Master Plan
72 Williams, B. 2010: Oatlands Gaol Archaeological Research Design and Method Statement
73 Williams, B. 2010: Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Plan
74 Williams, B. 2011: Oatlands Gaol Arch Relocation Project
75 Castellon Pty. Ltd. 2011: Oatlands Gaol Fire Safety Assessment
Strategic planning

The overall strategic management of the gaol, as per other Council heritage assets, is guided by the Southern Midlands Strategic Plan 2006-11. This document is produced by Council under the requirements of the Local Government Act 1993, and is supported by an annual operational plan, and is also linked to the Southern Midlands Community Plan.

Heritage management is specifically guided by the Southern Midlands Council Heritage Strategy 2009-13, which sets the goals and benchmarks for the heritage and heritage projects programs for the next five years. This document also links the gaol project to other Council heritage projects (i.e. Callington Mill and the Oatlands Supreme Court House), as well as larger regional heritage, tourism and education initiatives.

The Oatlands Gaol project is also guided by the Oatlands Integrated Development Strategy, which links the heritage projects of Oatlands with overall community and economic development initiatives. Also, the issues and options surrounding the swimming pool relocation have been considered by the Southern Midlands Recreation Plan, and more specifically in the Midlands Aquatic and Recreation Centre Feasibility Analysis.

The current document aims to provide a broad, yet all encompassing directional framework for the future management of the gaol, drawing recommendations and strategic directions from the abovementioned conservation planning and strategic planning documents. It is hoped that this document will assist Council with long term planning, and support budgetary decisions when scoping the priority and/or sequence of projects to meet these goals.

1.5. Vision statement

Visions from the Oatlands Gaol Project Master Plan.
The Oatlands Gaol Project Master Plan (2009) gives an overarching vision statement for the interpretation of the site:

The largely extant Gaoler’s Residence provides a unique opportunity for the promotion and interpretation of the site and its place in the wider penal system of the district and the colony. Being one of only two buildings of its type in Tasmania, the Gaoler’s residence offers significant opportunities as guided by the adaptive usage policy as defined in Section 8.4.6. Although having been subject to widespread demolition, the gaol yard provides great opportunity for archaeological research into colonial confinement and the penal system, as well as the on-site interpretation of such (see Williams 2004). This half-acre site also has the opportunity for use as an open-air public space (i.e. non-impact recreational use).

Overall, the site has the potential to become a significant drawcard. Alongside Callington Mill, the gaol could provide the focus of heritage tourism in the Southern Midlands and become an icon of the convict history of the region (Williams 2006:165).

The Master Plan (pp.10-12) sets the following objectives for the Gaoler’s Residence:

- Complete the restoration of the Oatlands Gaoler’s Residence as per the recommendations of the Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan. Due for completion April 2011.

- Develop a use plan for the building, and if necessary a business plan for any commercial uses identified. Seek partnerships and linkages with other appropriate projects/organisations. Plan completed and endorsed July 2010.

- Develop an interpretation plan for the building, within the context of the overall gaol complex and the wider Oatlands Military Precinct, the use/business plan and other local heritage sites/initiatives. Plan completed January 2011.

- Seek external funding wherever possible towards the restoration/interpretation project. Pursue partnerships where appropriate. To pursue in 2011.
And the Gaol yard itself:

- Undertake the necessary restoration and stabilisation on the gaol perimeter wall, as per the *Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan*. **Currently being undertaken – due for completion June 2011.**

- Undertake and encourage archaeological research in the gaol yard, informed by a test-trenching program and detailed archaeological management plan. **Archeological Management Plan endorsed December 2010, First-stage archaeological works undertaken Jan-Feb 2011.**

- Develop the gaol yard as freely accessible public open space, guided by a landscape plan informed by original site layout. **Landscape concept plan developed and endorsed November 2010.**

- Formulate an interpretation plan for the gaol yard, linked with other local heritage sites as appropriate, with a particular focus on on-site archaeological resources. **The current document.**

**Visions & interpretation policy drawn from the Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan 2006**

Similarly, as drawn from the *Oatlands Gaol Conservation Plan 2006*, Southern Midlands Council’s objectives for the site are:

- To conserve the physical fabric of the Oatlands Gaol site, including*:
  - Structural stabilisation
  - Appropriate restoration
  - Removal of modern accretions where appropriate to reveal the primary significance of the site, whilst still maintaining secondary significance where appropriate
  *In accordance with the *Burra Charter* and legislative requirements.

- To protect and promote the cultural values of the site for both current and future interpretation

- To encourage use of the site and associated artifacts as a research commodity

- To preserve, interpret and promote the site as:
  - An integral part of, and tangible link to the judicial administration of early Tasmania and the Oatlands district
- A major component of the Oatlands Military Precinct, in particular its associations with the Oatlands Supreme Court House
- An example of Governor Arthur’s colonial disciplinary infrastructure
- An example of John Lee-Archer’s Georgian civil architecture

Whilst still acknowledging the other layers of site usage provided these do not obstruct the interpretation of the primary significance of the site.

- To encourage appropriate adaptive re-use of the site with long-term strategic management and an acceptable level of sustainability

- To explore linkages with relevant agencies as a means of further promoting the site.

Section 8.4.7 (p176) of the Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan sets specific policy for interpretation of the site:

Interpretation should focus on the presentation of the dominant significance of the site (i.e. pre 1863), whilst still acknowledging other layers of significance and their associations with usage of the site, provided that this does not prevent interpretation of the dominant significance. Interpretation should consider all facets of the history of the site, i.e. social, physical, thematic etc. Interpreting the physical fabric without historical/social perspective should be avoided.

Interpretation need not wholly directly relate to the usage of the site, however linkage to the site should be made. I.e. the dominant theme of interpretation could be incarceration, with sub themes relating to minor associations such as Governor Arthur, John Lee-Archer, stonemasonry etc. Linkages to other sites, whether local or thematic, should be encouraged. The Oatlands Gaol has a particularly strong linkage with the nearby Oatlands Supreme Court House. Interpretation of these two sites within the context of each other should be a primary consideration.

All interpretive installations must comply with the policies in this document relating to introduction of new fabric/buildings. Interpretation should be aesthetically pleasing, appropriately themed, effective and engaging. Uniformity (i.e. branding) of installations and products is encouraged where practicable. Linkages with external brands (i.e. Convict Trail, Heritage Highway etc) should be encouraged where appropriate.

In addition, Section 4.4.8 (P169) specifically details policy for archaeological interpretation:
As the site has significant potential for display of collections and artifacts, this usage should be encouraged. However, the establishment of any collection (and subsequent display) should be guided by Policy 7. For example - collections should be relevant to the site, and have the ability to assist in the interpretation of one or more key themes.

Furthermore, Section 10.4 (p198) of the conservation plan sets targets for future interpretation management of the site:

Section 6.5 has described SMC’s desire to use the Oatlands Gaol as a publicly accessible site which acts to interpret the rich and varied cultural heritage of the district. For this to occur to best-practice, a detailed interpretation policy should be developed for the site, alongside or as part of the interpretation plan for the wider Military Precinct or other locally or thematically linked sites. This should be based strongly on the statement of significance (Section 5.4) and the broad aims of the site administrator (Section 6.5). Appropriate interpretation is necessary for the adequate presentation hence sustainability of the site – enriching the visitor’s experience.

Research has been recently undertaken for the Oatlands Supreme Court House Interpretation and Collection Management Plan (Gurnhill 2006), which has explored visitor trends and community desires for access and interpretation of the court house, and associated publicly-owned historic sites at Oatlands [e.g. Oatlands Gaol]. This research should form the basis for a similar plan for the Oatlands Gaol, and eventually be extended to wider thematic and local sites (i.e. Oatlands Military Precinct, Southern Midlands Convict Sites, Heritage Highway etc.)

A key component of any interpretation planning should consider the best way to allow regular public access to the site. Section 5.4 described the community significance of the Oatlands Gaol, therefore access to the building will strengthen these values. Broadly, the following points should be considered in the development of an interpretation planning:

- Utilisation and expansion previous visitor research into potential visitation [this has been undertaken as part of the Oatlands Marketing Plan as part of the Callington Mill redevelopment].
- Liaison with key stakeholder groups to find their desires, and to incorporate the findings into the plan [this has been undertaken as part of the consultation towards the adoption and endorsement of the Oatlands Gaol Project Master Plan 2009, and other documents cited in Section 1.4].
- Further review of historical and thematic literature to gain an understanding of the site’s key themes and linkages [ongoing project which is progressing].
- Development of innovative interpretive media for installation in the building [the aim of the current document and interpretation project]
- Understanding of the best way for the public to access the building (i.e. opening hours, staffing levels) [this has been undertaken as part of the Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Plan 2010].
- Development of strategy scenarios for the application of these findings – SWOT analyses of various scenarios alongside public consultation [this has been undertaken as part of the Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Plan 2010].
- Consideration of fit with other local and regional tourism/heritage strategies and thematically linked sites, i.e.
  - Tourism Tasmanian strategies
  - Local heritage and tourism strategies
  - Richmond and Hobart Gaols [this has been undertaken as part of the Oatlands Marketing Plan as part of the Callington Mill redevelopment, as well as the development of the Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Plan 2010].
- Consideration of fit with other local heritage sites/attractions, in order to strengthen overall attraction and avoid duplication, i.e.
  - Callington Mill
  - Oatlands Supreme Court House [this has been undertaken as part of the Oatlands Marketing Plan as part of the Callington Mill redevelopment, as well as the development of the Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Plan 2010].
- Development of collection acquisition, management and display policies [this has been undertaken in the development of the Southern Midlands Council Heritage Collections Policy – Endorsed May 2008].

As can be seen from the above points – Southern Midlands Council have, since endorsement of the Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan 2006, been working towards the implementation of a strategically planned business and interpretation model for the Oatlands Gaol. With the policy and planning base outlined above, coupled with the completion of the Gaoler’s Residence restoration – now is considered to be the opportune time to implement the interpretation visions for the site, as guided by the current document.
1.5. Interpretation – Aims and Approaches

1.5.1. Why Interpret?
The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS, 2005: 12) states that interpretation means:

‘all the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place. Interpretation may be a combination of the treatment of the fabric, the use of and activities at the place, and introduced explanatory material. It may include exhibitions, events, publications, art works and other forms of expression, and is not confined to the place’.

The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS, 2005: 74) also states that ‘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’.

The Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) and the Department of Industry, Resources and Science (2001: 21) explain that ‘interpretation, broadly, describes the process of helping people in their discovery and appreciation of heritage. Effective interpretation requires the combination of information (about why the place is special), education, inspiration and entertainment. It deals in stories, ideas and experiences which explain, guide, reveal, arrange, question, share and provoke’. Interpretation enables management and staff to influence the way that visitors experience a site.

The Tasmanian Experience Strategy of 2002 emphasises the need ‘to create extraordinary and unforgettable holiday experiences by focusing on presentation, interpretation and customer engagement. Connection with place, quality infrastructure and personalised service are vital to the success of any holiday, but it is interpretation and engagement that make the difference between a pleasant break and an unforgettable experience’ (Tourism Tasmania, 2002: 1). Further, ‘experiences are memorable events or interactions that engage people in a personal way and connect them with a place… (and) connection with place is the foundation with all Tasmanian experiences.’ (Tourism Tasmania, 2002: 4).

Larson (2001: 18) further stresses the need for interpretation by stating that ‘if audiences were simply seeking knowledge, most would have little reason to experience the site at all’. Here, he identifies the difference between information and interpretation, where interpretation goes beyond stating just facts and figures and focusing only on tangible products of history, to instead consider also ‘the intangible meanings those tangible resources present. Intangible meanings include, among others: systems, processes, relationships, values, ideas and beliefs’ (Larson, 2001: 18).

It is important that interpretation recognizes that visitors bring with them unique and personal ways of ‘seeing’ and understanding the site they are visiting. Bennett (1998: 22) argues that ‘we cannot vouchsafe
museums or heritage sites a singular meaning. For the ways in which they are experienced and made sense of will vary in accordance with the differing historical cultures of their visitors’. They can also vary for each individual. Similarly, Meinig (1979: 33) states that:

Even though we gather together and look in the same direction at the same instant, we will not – cannot see – the same landscape. We may certainly agree that we see many of the same elements – houses, roads, trees, hills -… but such facts take on meaning only through association… Any landscape is comprised not only of what lies before our eyes, but what lies in our heads.

By providing a variety of interpretive activities and choices for visitors at the Oatlands Gaol, the different ways in which visitors make meaning of the site will be accommodated, and possibilities for visitors to relate to and connect with the site will be improved. This idea is further discussed below, through the notion of making interpretation ‘relevant’.

Interpretation is an important part of any sustainable tourism operation. Effective interpretation can ensure that benefits are gained by the local community, the visitor, the place itself and the operation.

Carter (2001:4) states that ‘good interpretation helps visitors to explore and understand a little more about the places they visit. In doing so, it adds depth to tourists’ experience making a visit something more than just a trip to see the sights’. Further, ‘it visitors feel that a place is interesting or exciting, they are more likely to recommend it to others. Good interpretation makes for satisfied customers, and satisfied customers are good for business’ (Carter, 2001: 4).

1.5.2. Interpretation as a Tool to Enhance Understanding
Australia ICOMOS (2005: 74) argue that approaches which may enhance understanding at heritage places include:

- Interpreting the place from the perspective of human use and experience;
- Interpreting the ‘layers’ of history and the impacts on the environment; and
- Interpreting the place in relation to current events.

**Tilden’s Approach**

Freeman Tilden, the first interpreter, argues that interpretation is ‘an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by first hand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information’ (Tilden, 1977: 8). Tilden (1977: 8) further identifies six principles of interpretation, as follows:

1. Any interpretation that does not somehow relate to what is being displayed or described to something within the personality or experience of the visitor will be sterile.
2. Information, as such, is not interpretation. Interpretation is revelation based upon information. But they are entirely different things. However, all interpretation includes information.

3. Interpretation is an art, which combines many arts, whether the materials presented are scientific, historical or architectural. Any art is in some degree teachable.

4. The chief aim of interpretation is not instruction but provocation.

5. Interpretation should aim to present a whole rather than a part, and must address itself to the whole man rather than to any phase.

6. Interpretation addressed to children should not be a dilution of the presentation to adults, but should follow a fundamentally different approach. To be at its best it will require a separate program.

---

**Hein’s Constructivist Approach**

The key components to Hein’s (1998: 34) constructivist learning rely on the notions of education or learning that is relevant to the audience, and include participation of the audience:

- ‘Learning requires active participation of the learner in both the way that the learner is employed and in the product of the activity, the knowledge that is acquired. (This) includes ways for learners to use both their minds and their hands, to interact with the world, to manipulate it, to reach conclusions, experiment, and increase their understanding’.

- ‘The conclusions reached by the learner are not validated by whether or not they conform to some external standard of truth, but whether they ‘make sense’ within the constructed reality of the learner’.

Notions of the ‘constructed reality of the learner’ have parallels with the earlier notions of Ham and Tourism Tasmania regarding the importance of relevance in interpretation.

Hein (1998: 165) states that ‘when planning exhibitions or programs, museum staff should consider multiple ways to involve their audience by exploiting all the senses’, including musical, spatial, and bodily-kinesthetic intelligences as well as other learner capabilities. In addition, the challenge for a constructivist model of learning is to find experiences that stimulate and challenge the audience. ‘The organizing principles will inevitably permit visitors to pick and choose what subject they want to pursue, or even what branch of the subject’ (Hein, 1998: 38).

Further supporting the notion of participatory interpretation, Regnier, Gross and Zimmerman (1994: 6) state that ‘interpretive programs should involve the senses, challenge the intellect, and touch the emotions’.

The need for interpretation to challenge visitors is also recognized by Larson (2001: 21), who argues that ‘interpretation cannot just pander to existing perspectives. It also has the responsibility to provoke new feelings and new thinking… Provocation provides access to greater complexity, understanding, appreciation
and attachment… (and that interpretation strives) for the ah-ha moment, or the statement, ‘I never thought of that before’.

Carter (2001: 5) states that there is an important difference between interpretation and information: ‘information just gives facts, but interpretation can provoke ideas, perhaps even jolt people into a completely new understanding of what they have come to see’.

The TORE Approach

Sam Ham has identified four main components of interpretation: that it is Themed, Organised, Relevant and Enjoyable. This has been further developed by Tourism Tasmania as the TORE approach.

Good interpretation must be **Themed**, that is, it must relate to the message of significance of the place or object being interpreted. Interpretation is thematic if it has a major point. Ham (1992:23) states that ‘presentations which don’t have themes often beg the question ‘so what?’…. But presentations which do have themes seem to be going somewhere, and it’s easy for us to organise all the facts and supportive details in our minds because we can stick them to the theme… Themes not only help interpreters select from their wealth of knowledge which few facts and concepts to put into their presentations, but if they reveal in advance what the theme is, and how it will be organised, their audiences also benefit in terms of understanding and comprehension’. Ham (1992:33) further argues that ‘when our communication isn’t thematic, it seems unorganized, difficult to follow and less meaningful to our audiences. This is simply because they can’t easily see where the communication is going, and they don’t know how to connect all the information they’re receiving’.

Carter (2001: 6) argues that themes can assist in focusing and structuring activities, as well as by providing a clear thread, ‘rather than a series of unconnected facts. This makes it more interesting and more memorable’.

Interpretation must also be **Organised**. That is, it must be presented in a way which is easy to follow. Any interpretive strategies should be organised around five or fewer main points or ideas in order to be interesting and understandable (Ham, 1992: 20).

Interpretation must also be **Relevant**, or meaningful, to its audiences. Ham (1992:12) argues that ‘when information is meaningful it’s because we’re able to connect it to something already inside our brains. Meaningful information is said to have context, because we understand it in the context of something we already know’. Tilden (1977: 13) argues that ‘the visitor is unlikely to respond unless what you have to tell, or to show, touches his personal experience, thoughts, hopes, way of life, social position or whatever else’. Hein (1998: 156, 176) states that ‘it is not only difficult, but almost impossible to learn something without making an association with familiar categories’, and that ‘people need to connect to what is familiar, but learning, by definition, goes beyond the known; it leads to new agreeable places’.
Larson (2001: 19) argues similarly, stating that ‘the role of interpretation is to facilitate connections between the meanings of the resource and interests of the visitor. Interpretation does not provide answers: it poses questions. Interpretation does not teach: it offers opportunities for emotional and intellectual connections. Interpretation does not educate: it provokes increasingly sophisticated appreciation and understanding. Interpretation does not tell people how it is: it reveals personal significance... Central to effective interpretation is the understanding that resources possess a plurality of meanings’. Larson (2001:22) further believes that ‘new meanings and perspectives should be introduced as an addition to, or in relationship to existing meanings and perspectives. Interpreters first establish relevance and then provoke new understanding and appreciation’.

Moscardo (2001: 21) also stresses the importance of providing personal connections in interpretation, stating that ‘it is clear that being able to find or make a personal link is a major factor influencing visitor satisfaction with a tour experience’. Moscardo (2001: 21-22) provides the following suggestions as ways to make personal connections:

- Using humour, analogies and metaphors which build links between the interpretive content and the everyday experience of the visitor;
- Giving visitors the opportunity to ask questions;
- Telling stories (particularly those which have characters who can be related to);
- Giving visitors opportunities to interact, participate and make choices about their interpretive experiences; and
- Challenging visitors and giving them information about what they can do in their everyday lives.

The fourth essential quality of good interpretation is that it is Enjoyable. This is not the main goal of interpretation, but is one of its essential qualities. As stated in the Port Arthur Historic Site Interpretation Plan (PAHSMA, 2001: 7) ‘this principle refers to the ways in which serious ideas and information can be best communicated to ensure that our visitors want to stay around to listen, and are helped to remember what we tell them... Most importantly, (enjoyable communication) should be friendly and participatory’. Moscardo (2001: 22) argues that participatory interpretation also provides a way to personalize the experience for visitors.

1.5.3. Thematic Interpretation

Building on Ham’s notion that interpretation must be themed, Tourism Tasmania (2005a: 6-7) state that a theme ‘is a take-home message; it’s the moral of the story or main conclusion a visitor takes away from an interpretive activity... or device... In thematic interpretation we understand that visitors are going to forget most or all of the colourful facts we present to them. But we know that if the conclusion they draw from all
those facts is meaningful and important, it will provoke them to thought and they’ll continue to think about the conclusion even when the facts that supported it are long gone from their memory’.

Tourism Tasmania (2005a: 7) further describe thematic interpretation by explaining that ‘you might prefer to describe it as wondering, marveling or pondering, however, thinking is what leads the visitor to attach meanings to the thing and the place being interpreted. Meaningful things and places matter to us. And that’s what thematic interpretation at its best, does: it causes the visitors to make meaning’.

Thematic interpretation is based on ‘strategic communication about the places you interpret for visitors and the kind of experience you can offer’ (Tourism Tasmania, 2005: 6). Further, Tourism Tasmania (2005a: 6) states that ‘strategic interpretation is purposeful. It has an intended outcome, such as enhancing visitor experiences, promoting your business…, producing positive word-of-mouth advertising, protecting fragile or vulnerable features, or keeping visitors safe from hazards’.

The main purpose of thematic interpretation is to lead visitors to draw conclusions from the facts they are presented with, ‘and in doing so, to provoke them to think more deeply about the place, its features and the qualities that make it special. The thinking that visitors do creates meanings and memories of the place’ (Tourism Tasmania, 2005a: 11).

Thematic interpretation ‘assists in the development and delivery of visitor experiences that have impact well beyond the time your customers spend with you. It enables you to influence their thinking and their impressions of your product after they return home’ (Tourism Tasmania 2005a: 2). In thematic interpretation, ‘it’s the thinking that matters most to us, not the facts... Thinking is what leads the visitor to attach meanings to the thing and the place being interpreted. Meaningful things and places matter to us’ (Tourism Tasmania, 2005a: 4).

1.5.4. Additional Aims of Communication
In addition to the interpretive approaches outlined above, including those of Tilden, Ham, Hein and Tourism Tasmania, James Carter (2001: 7-8) also offers a range of other aims of communication and interpretation. These include to orientate, inform, entertain, persuade, explain, promote an organisation, influence behavior, and to develop a sense of place.

Orientating visitors includes making them feel comfortable in their surroundings, by providing them with some locational and geographical knowledge. Informing visitors is about catering for the small minority of people who enjoy information in addition to interpretation. Ways of doing this can include information or fact sheets. Carter’s concept of entertaining, is similar to that of the TORE approach, outlined above.
Some organisations have a clear objective to persuade people to do something or to influence what they think about something, and this needs to be considered when devising interpretive activities.

The notion of explaining is particularly important where visitors cannot see the whole of the site. Promotion of an organisation can be an important way to show that the organisation is caring for and managing the site. Interpretation can be used to influence the ways people act. This can include subtly steering people away from fragile areas. Involving local people in interpretation, and in thinking about what makes their place special, can help them find a new sense of pride in their area.

1.5.5. Interpretation as a Conservation Tool
Visitors always have an impact on the places they visit, and these impacts can threaten the values and significance of the site - the very reasons why people visit them in the first place. Interpretation can be an important and effective tool of conservation – raising awareness and appreciation of the heritage values of a place.
2. Oatlands Gaol - Key historic themes

Further to the recommendations of Section 10.4 of the Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan 2006, as outlined above, and in-line with the initiatives deriving from the Southern Midlands Historic Heritage Strategy 2009-13, in September 2009, a working group of relevant Council Officers, interpretation and heritage experts, and community members was convened to discuss the themes of relevance and importance to the Southern Midlands, including the Oatlands Gaol. The aim of the workshop was specifically:

- To workshop the significant historic themes which relate to the Southern Midlands, and what interrelatedness these themes may have.
- To explore opportunities within the southern midlands for interpretation, in-line with the directions of the Southern Midlands Heritage Strategy 2009-13, and any other relevant heritage/tourism or planning documents.
- To consider linkages outside the region, which may complement and value-add to Southern Midlands interpretive initiatives.

The workshop was undertaken with the relevant strategic background provided by documents including:

- Southern Midlands Historic Heritage Strategy 2009-13
- Tourism Tasmania Thematic Interpretation manual
- Heritage Office of NSW – NSW Historic Themes

The group undertook a ‘whiteboard’ session, whereby ideas of key historic themes were workshopped. The themes were developed, then broken into relevant ‘sub-themes’ – each linked to a ‘potential opportunity’ as guided by the Southern Midlands Historic Heritage Strategy 2009-13. Possible linkages to other projects (i.e. regional tourism or research linkages) were also identified for each initiative. Upon workshopping the themes and sub-themes, the group realised that there were two overarching themes which were a common thread through all of the themes – that of:

- people
- event
- place – linking the stories of people with historical events, tied to the place (or landscape).

All themes and sub themes were inextricably linked with people/event/place (or the ‘who/what where?’).

The following table summarises the themes workshops. Whilst this is not considered to be exhaustive, it provides a summary of the obvious key themes, which either:
- Link to current SMC initiatives.
- Represent unique or different opportunities for the Southern Midlands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub theme</th>
<th>Specific SMC site, example, message</th>
<th>Immediate opportunities (i.e. within scope of the SMCHS09-13)</th>
<th>Linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People, place and event (who, where, what?)</td>
<td>Convicts &amp; convictism</td>
<td>The convict experience</td>
<td>Presentation of all SMC convict and penal sites (below) as a suite of places representing incarceration and indenture. Also the assignment system - convicts in private service.</td>
<td>Installations at Gaol, Court House, Military Precinct.</td>
<td>Other Tasmanian convict sites, in particular Port Arthur, Cascades, Maria/Sarah Islands, Woolmers/Brickendon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women and children</td>
<td>Oatlands Gaol.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female factories (Ross, Cascades, George Town, Launceston).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Probation stations at Oatlands, Lovely Banks, Jericho, Colebrook, Spring Hill, Broadmarsh, Antill Ponds.</td>
<td>Jericho Probation Station - Refresh interpretation at public part of site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road stations</td>
<td>Road stations at Tunbridge, Picton, Green Ponds, Oatlands, Spring Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convict industry</td>
<td>Convict timber station at Tunbridge Tier, Coal Mines at Colebrook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil establishment</td>
<td>Military precinct and regional civilian sites. Commandant’s Houses at Oatlands and Jericho. Oatlands Gaoler’s Residence.</td>
<td>Superintendent’s, Gaoler’s and Commandant’s houses Oatlands, as part of Military Precinct Interpretation. Oatlands Gaoler’s Residence.</td>
<td>Other Tasmanian sites of those types. Researchers (Hamish Maxwell-Stuart, John Carter).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance and scandal</td>
<td>Any convict site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supplying the convicts</td>
<td>Commissariat, Convict gardens/farms.</td>
<td>Commissariat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploration &amp; Settlement</td>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Early land routes (Bell’s line). Early plans and surveyors - Macquarie, Sharland, Sprent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement patterns and evolving land-use</td>
<td>Interpreting the cultural landscape, natural values etc. Treelessness.</td>
<td>Southern Midlands Cultural Landscape Project (as part of Southern Midlands Heritage Project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penal &amp; police infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Centralisation and decentralisation</td>
<td>I.e. Once all towns in the district had a school, post office, hotel etc... now it's much more centralised.</td>
<td>Former school, post office, hotel buildings etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology influencing population dispersal</td>
<td>I.e. changing rural technology, impacting population of farm villages and dispersal of people - the demise of the farm village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatlands as a central capital</td>
<td>Oatlands Military Precinct</td>
<td>Military precinct interpretation. Emphasising the fact that Oatlands had a Supreme Court House etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry &amp; commerce</strong></td>
<td>Gads &amp; punishment</td>
<td>Oatlands Gaols x 2, site of Jericho Gaol.</td>
<td>Gaoler's residence project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Houses &amp; law</td>
<td>Court Houses at Oatlands, Colebrook, Bagdad, Kempton.</td>
<td>Court house interpretation project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building</strong></td>
<td>Quarry sites, timber stations, limekilns, brickworks</td>
<td>Quarry sites around Lake Dulverton</td>
<td>Ross quarries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and sly-grog</td>
<td>2x Oatlands breweries. Hotels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway</td>
<td>Stations, platforms, formations, tunnels, culverts, good sheds.</td>
<td>Parattah Railway Station, Apsley line, walking/bike tracks.</td>
<td>Other railway sites in Tasmania.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural life &amp; agriculture</strong></td>
<td>Gentrification 'recreating the homeland'</td>
<td>Homesteads and farm villages.</td>
<td>Woolmers, Brickendon, Clarendon, Fonthill, Entally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonscapes and abandoned mansions (rural decline)</td>
<td>Lower Marshes - desolate landscape with huge Georgian mansions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the sheep's back</td>
<td>Farm complexes, woolsheds, sheep dips. Stockyards.</td>
<td>Woodsdale shearing museum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Personalities (specific men and women – note that the 'ordinary' lives are also an overarching theme i.e. 'people'). |
|---|---|---|
| John Lee Archer | Lee-Archer's buildings - Oatlands Gaol, Court House, Watch House Anglican Church. | Court House and Gaol, Oatlands Anglican Church. |
| Governor Arthur | Arthur’s influence on the development of the 'Oatlands as a city' idea. | Court House, Gaol & Military Precinct. Port Arthur |
| Solomon Blay (Hangman) | Oatlands Gaol and Court House | Oatlands Gaol and Court House. Hobart Penitentiary. |
| Jorgen Jorgensen | Jorgensen and his wife, Norah Corbett, had linkages with Oatlands Gaol and Court House. | Oatlands Gaol and Court House. Ross Bridge |
| Bushrangers | Martin Cash, Mathew Lemon, Michael Howe all have Southern Midlands Connections. | Oatlands Gaol and Court House. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aborigines</th>
<th>Traditional land use &amp; culture</th>
<th>TAHO, TALSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact &amp; 'Black line'</td>
<td>Military precinct and regional civilian sites. Commandant's Houses at Military Precinct, Court House.</td>
<td>Oatlands Gaol and Court House.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status and class distinction</th>
<th>Free versus bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servants and Masters</td>
<td>Convict sites (as per above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convict slavery</td>
<td>Oatlands Gaol and Court House, Military Precinct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Other Tasmanian convict sites and research (as above) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emancipation and opportunity</th>
<th>Convict made good sites - i.e. houses and farms owned by ex-convicts (i.e. Thomas Burbury).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free people in a convict society</td>
<td>Gaoler's Residence, Commandant's house - any domestic place associated with a convict site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Georgian Village & architecture | Oatlands, Kempton town centres. Callington Mill precinct. Oatlands Court House and  
| Drystone walls               | Oatlands drystone walls. Continuation of drystone wall building training.          |
From the above table, it can be seen that the Oatlands Gaol and Gaoler's Residence have been identified as having the potential to provide opportunity for the interpretation of the following key historic themes in relation to Oatlands, in-line with local and state interpretation and heritage planning strategies, and with the potential to provide linkages to other regionally and thematically linked sites and initiatives:

- Gaols and punishment
- Convicts and convictism
- Women and children in colonial society
- The colonial civil establishment
- Resistance and scandal
- Governor Arthur
- Colonial Architect John-Lee Archer
- Hangman Solomon Blay
- Bushrangers
- The ‘Black-Line’
- Georgian architecture, and the evolution and restoration of the built environment.
3. Audience research

The Australian Heritage Commission, and the Department of Industry, Science and Resources (2001: 21) argue that ‘the foundation for developing a quality visitor experience is a thorough understanding of the characteristics of your market or visitors. Who are they? Where do they come from? What are their expectations, needs and motivations? How do they want to be informed? What else is important to them?’

In Interpretation Planning, an understanding of the audience is vital to interpretation delivery and outcomes. This is integral to implementing strategies which are relevant, in accordance with the principles of TORE (Tourism Tasmania, 2005). In addition, Regnier, Zimmerman and Gross (1994: 13) state that ‘the better you know your audience, the better you can prepare your program’. Larson (2001: 22) further argues that it is important to ‘know when a situation is interpretive, and when it is not. A situation is not interpretive when the audience has no interest in opportunities for emotional and intellectual connections to the meanings of the resource’.

Heritage places are a fundamental part of Tasmania’s tourism industry. The Tourism Tasmania ‘Tasmanian Visitor Survey Data’ shows that 32% of tourists to Tasmania visit a publicly open historic house.

Tasmania is attractive as a tourist destination because of a matrix of often competing assets including its built and cultural history, unique environment and gourmet foods. Tourism Tasmania has identified Tasmania as a core visitor appeal. In 2004, 585,600 (78%) of all visitors to the state visited Hobart. Of these, 72% visited one or more historic sites during their stay (Tourism Tasmania, 2005).

Governed by their Strategic Plan 2007-12 (Objective ED4), SMC’s approach to heritage management is largely founded on the recommendations of the Tourism Vision, Oatlands Historic Properties report (Reed & Hepper 1998). This document addressed the tourism potential of the principal public heritage buildings in Oatlands. This report found that 55% of visitors were drawn to Oatlands for a heritage experience (exceeding state average) and that 68% of visitors would stay longer if heritage sites were more accessible and better interpreted. The overall finding of this report was that strategic interpretation and promotion of Oatlands heritage sites could be the catalyst to economic development – contributing to a sustainable future for the community through immeasurable flow-on effects.

In 2000, SMC commissioned a team of researchers to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of tourist experiences in the region (Graham, 2007: 7-8). Amongst the key findings of this research was the lack of accessibility and interpretation of Oatlands historic sites. Initiatives such as the opening of the Oatlands Supreme Court House (May 2010) and the Callington Mill Complex (November 2010) are examples of Southern Midlands Council’s demonstrated commitment and capacity to address this issue. The Oatlands...
Gaol has the potential to follow suit. There is currently no regular public access to the building and the on-site interpretation relies on brief plaques, which give little detail of the rich history of that building. Nonetheless, this report concluded that Oatlands does hold potential to promote heritage as a unique product. Careful interpretation planning, and appropriate installations and promotions would convert this under-utilised site into a major heritage asset, engaging tourists and immersing locals of the rich and diverse cultural heritage upon which the region was founded.

The demand for heritage tourism experiences at Oatlands is supported by Tourism Tasmania’s Tasmanian Visitor Survey data. As stated above, this data shows that 32% of tourists who visit Tasmania visit a publicly open historic house. Of the visitors to Oatlands, 58% have visited a historic house somewhere in Tasmania – this is evidence that a larger proportion of tourists visit Oatlands with the expectation that heritage properties will be open.

The primary focus of this Plan is directed at the tourist market, with a high priority placed on measuring the probable flow-on effects to the community. However, this Plan is also aimed at the local market, fostering a sense of ownership by the community and being a key facility in the exploration of one’s own heritage – particularly through the passive use of public open space in the heart of the town.

Visitor research will form a crucial aspect of the Interpretation Project. Small museums and interpretation centres are successful when they understand their different audiences and have a careful strategy for providing what interests them. As such, audience research will be undertaken as part of this project to shape and inform the Interpretation Plan. In order to provide appropriate access to the collection, the needs and desires of the audience must be understood.

**Oatlands Gaol and Supreme Court House Audience Research**

In mid 2006, audience research was undertaken to attempt to ascertain the visitor expectations towards Oatlands historic sites. This research was carried out over the winter months, due to the timing of the project. As such, certain limitations and difficulties arose, due to the low numbers of visitation.

Audience Research questionnaires were distributed in the Oatlands Tasmanian Visitor Information Centre, and at the Oatlands Historical society. The survey was advertised on the (then closed) Oatlands Supreme Court House, and Gaoler’s Residence. Visitors were encouraged to fill in questionnaires and either leave them at these places, or return them in a pre-paid envelope.

In addition, opportunistic samples were taken during the Oatlands Spring Festival (Sunday 15 October 2006). During this festival, the Oatlands Court House was open to visitors, and those who visited completed
questionnaires. In addition, other people attending the Spring Festival were approached and asked to complete questionnaires.

It was the initial aim of audience research that those who completed questionnaires should be visitors to the area. However, the method used at the Spring Festival for ensuring that audience research was undertaken, resulted in residents and other locals completing questionnaires. This is not considered a hindrance to the project, or to the audience research component thereof, as it is important that the local community are also engaged in interpretation at the Court House.

A full overview of results was published as part of the Oatlands Supreme Court House and Collections Public Access and Interpretation Plan (Gurnhill 2007).

Those who completed questionnaires were in Oatlands for three main reasons: either they were locals, they were there for the Spring Festival, or they were there because of the history and heritage of the town. Both males and females stated that they most enjoyed aspects of Oatlands related to its history and heritage, despite their reasons for visiting.

A large percentage of both males and females had not experienced many of the services and facilities offered at Oatlands. However, of those experienced, most visitors were either satisfied or very satisfied. Females expressed some dissatisfaction with levels of access to historic buildings and interpretation signage.

Women stated that they would like to find out more about the history of the town and its buildings in general, while men were particularly interested in finding out more about Callington Mill.

The topics which both were most interested in include the building and its architecture, collections, convictism, domestic life and archaeology. In addition, females were interested in related sites, while males were more interested than females in administration systems and technology and education.

The types of interpretive media which were preferred by both genders include self-guided tours, museum-style displays and signage panels. In addition, females preferred interactive activities and guided tours, but were not very interested in audio tours. Males also preferred publications and brochures, though were not so interested in a website, guided tours, soundscapes or a gift shop. Of a moderate level of interest for females were media including publications, soundscapes, brochures, guided tours, video and a gift shop, while men were moderately interested in interactive displays and videos.

Additional comments provided by one female indicated an interest in seeing a model of the historic township. In their comments, males stated that the authenticity and historic character of the township and individual places needs to be retained; that there needs to be more advertising and signage within the
township itself; that historic sites should be linked; and that there is interest in the history of convictism, military and police in Oatlands.
4. Interpretation spaces, concepts and media.

This section will detail the spaces within and around the Oatlands Gaol which are currently available for interpretation and public access.

As shown in Figure X, only one-third of the site is currently accessible as an historic site – the remainder of the site being covered by the Municipal swimming pool. Current planning assumes that only that portion of the site is available for interpretation in the near future – a review of the interpretation plan would be required should the pool be relocated and the site be further opened up for interpretation.

This section will also propose the stylistic basis and media which may be employed to communicate information to visitors deriving from the statements of significance (Section X) and key historic themes (Section X) of the site.

4.1. Branding and style

In 2009, Southern Midlands Council commissioned the document Oatlands Identity - Guidelines for Usage (Creating Preferred Futures 2010). This provided a stylistic base to the branding of Council driven initiatives and partnerships throughout the region – setting the basis for interpretation products (e.g. panels, brochures, logos etc), as well as associated merchandise. The Oatlands Gaol approach will utilise this approach as the basis for interpretation, to achieve consistency with other heritage sites and interpretation products.

Figure 4.1 – Oatlands Gaol logo and basic interpretive colour scheme, as developed in the Oatlands Identity – Guidelines for Usage.
Interpretation signage

While individual interpretation projects will dictate content and therefore the graphic approach, it is still possible to retain consistency with a number of common features:

- Specified typefaces Neuzelt Grotesk Bold Condensed and Meta Light and Bold (see page 3).
- Specified colours (see page 3).
- Black banner on top, carrying the headline.
- Relevant logo placed bottom right, with additional colour blocks to lend emphasis where necessary.
- Key number for each panel placed bottom right, for example OH10.09, where OH is a two-letter contraction of the project (Court House), 10 is the year of production (2010), and 09 is the panel number.

Figure 4.2 – Basic interpretation signage layout and styles, as developed in the Oatlands Identity – Guidelines for Usage.
4.2. Archaeological interpretation – Former men’s kitchen.

*Life in the Gaol – Artifacts of Institutionalism and Domesticity*

**Space:**
As guided by the *Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Plan* (Williams 2010), it is intended that two rooms of the Oatlands Gaoler’s Residence (the ground floor rear foyer, and former men’s kitchen) be used as publicly accessible interpretation space – to be open daily as un-staffed secure displays (occasionally staffed by regular users of the building). The former men’s kitchen is proposed to be used for archaeological interpretation.

![Figure 4.3](image)

Figure 4.3 - Currently being restored, the former Men’s Kitchen will soon provide 22 square metres of easily accessible public interpretation space.

**Concept:**
It is intended that the former Men’s kitchen (approx 25 square metres) be used as a space to interpret the archaeology of the site – utilising the artifact collection deriving from excavations in the gaol itself, as well as the collection of artifacts yielded from underfloor spaces within the Gaoler’s Residence.
In particular, the underfloor collection comprises of over 1000 items, mostly related to the use of the Gaoler’s Residence over 100+ years. This collection consists of a wide variety of items, including:

- Documents relating to gaol operations
- Coins, jewellery and watches
- Toys and games
- Food, smoking and alcohol
- Construction of the building
- Fabric and clothing
- Hygiene and health

Figure 4.4 – Some of the 1000+ artifacts which have been recovered from the underfloor of the Gaoler’s Residence.

This collection, coupled with the growing collection of artifacts excavated from the different divisions from within the gaol, has the potential to demonstrate wide ranging stories of experiences and life within the gaol – both as a convict and free person, and would be a substantial and meaningful basis for interpretation of the wider site and colonial/convict system – upon which future archaeological projects would build.
Examples:
An example of how archaeology has been used to interpret the history and management of an historic site is found within Hyde Parks Barracks Sydney. Here, large display cases house an array of archaeological artifacts, from different contexts from that building, as well as displays on archaeological process and procedure. This will form the basis for the Oatlands Gaol display.

Figures 4.5 and 4.6 – Archaeological artifact displays and a ‘mock-dig’ as displayed and interpreted at Hyde Park Barracks, Sydney (Photos – Brad Williams 2011).

Proposal:
It is proposed that the space include a contemporary designed display case, which includes the ability to interpret archaeological processes, as well as multi-faceted thematic interpretation of the artifacts yielded from archaeological excavations and underfloor clearance. This would be based on the models successfully developed by the Hyde Park Barracks, and be aimed at providing the visitor with an appreciated of archaeological processes from excavation to display – as supplemented by the ability to view the archaeological conservation laboratory in the former women’s kitchen through the glass door from the downstairs rear foyer (see below).

A ‘mock-dig’ as used at Hyde Park would be established in the display case, as well as thematically interpreted groupings of artifacts which convey messages of the history of the site, and the people who lived within – within the context of archaeological investigation and heritage management.

Space:
As outlined in Section 4.1, the former men’s kitchen and rear downstairs foyer are proposed to be set up as public access spaces for interpretation, as per the *Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Plan* (Williams 2010). The rear downstairs foyer is a space of approximately 4 metres square, with a door on each wall. One door leads to the front foyer, one leads to the former women’s kitchen (current conservation lab) – these have been fitted with lockable frameless glass doors to allow secure vision into other parts of the building. The back door is off this space, as well as the door to the former men’s kitchen. This space offers wallspace, as well as the opportunity for secure viewing of other parts of the building – in particular the archaeological artifact processing laboratory, which offers the opportunity to interpret the heritage management aspects of the gaol and its collections.

Figure 4.7 - Currently being restored, the rear foyer will soon provide 12 square metres of easily accessible public interpretation space. The walls will be left intentionally unfinished as part of interpreting the layers of history and decoration of that room – the earliest layers representing a stark and institutional colour scheme.
**Concept:**
This area would be set up as both static interpretation of the history and evolution of the gaol, and the lifeways of people within the gaol. Views through to the archaeological artifact processing laboratory would be interpreted as a ‘real-life’ heritage/collection management facility – the concept revolving around ‘dig it, find it, clean it, conserve it, display it’ – highlighting the ‘one-stop’ heritage management philosophy of the Oatlands Gaol as further detailed in the *Oatlands Gaol Use and Development Strategy* (Williams 2010).

A touchscreen is also proposed for this area, which would allow less-static and easily changeable content on various facets of the gaol’s history, and the people associated with it.

**Examples:**
Similar banners and touchscreens have been recently installed in the Callington Mill visitor centre (Oatlands), and similar free standing panels have been successfully used in the Oatlands Supreme Court House. Callington Mill also has a touchscreen which has proven to be very popular and successful.

Figures 4.8 & 4.9 – Freestanding panels and banners at the Oatlands Supreme Court House, and Callington Mill.
Proposal:

It is proposed that the downstairs rear foyer of the Gaoler’s Residence be fitted with static interpretation media (banners) which detail the history and evolution of the gaol. Whilst the former Men’s Kitchen will be focussed on the physical remains (archaeology and artifacts) of the gaol, this space will be more static and print-based (mostly owing to spatial constraints). It is proposed that seven canvas print banners (2400mm x 800mm) be installed hanging from the ceiling, that will interpret the history of the gaol, loosely based around the themes of:

- The original Oatlands Gaol
- Gaolers and staff
- The inmates and rogues
- Evolution of the building and complex
- Life in the gaol – daily routine
- Women and children
- The site as an townscape icon – gaol to pool to historic site

The touchscreen would further explore the content of the banners, and add greater length and depth of information and allow more regular changing and updating of that information. This would also be much
more interactive to allow the user to dictate the level and type of interpretation they desire. The touchscreen would also incorporate sound, which would provide another level of experience within this space.

**Space:**
As guided by the *Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan 2006*, the restoration of the Gaolers Residence has taken care in restoring the building with the maintenance of the layers of history and phases which that building represents. Throughout the building, layering of architectural features have been retained and preserved as visible remnants of the evolution of the building.

![Figure 4.11 (left) – Twelve layers of wallpaper in the Gaoler’s bedroom, dating back to 1850. Figure 4.12 (right) – The former women’s kitchen, now the artifact lab, where all periods of fabric have been retained, including the 1836 flagstones and fireplace, 1850s plaster, 1930s dado and wallpaper and the 2010 lab fitout. This allows interpretation of all phases of history.](image)

**Concept:**
So often is it that the contents of a particular building are interpreted, and the building itself is ignored. In terms of interpretation, historic buildings are not just the spaces in which we mount exhibits – often the
buildings can be the exhibits themselves. The layers of fabric, i.e. building materials, linings, decorative finishes, can tell as much (or more) about a building as the contents or historical records. The archaeology of standing structures – the layers of history, are a wealth of knowledge about the tastes of those using the building, and the atmosphere created within living spaces.

This concept involves exposing and preserving the layers of building fabric and finishes which demonstrated the evolution of the building and the tastes of those using the building. Care must be taken to convey depth of time and fabric history, and carefully balance their presentation in a way which conveys that history without distorting or obscuring the primary significance of fabric and spaces. The Oatlands Gaoler’s Residence restoration has achieved this, however still needs to be supplemented by interpretation.

Examples:
In Hyde Park Barracks, as well as the Sydney Mint, care has been taken in the restoration of those buildings to maintain representative samples of fabric from all eras, which have accompanying panels to convey the history of the fabric.
Proposal:
With the restoration of the Gaoler’s Residence having had regard to maintaining visibility to layers of building fabric through the building – an approach to interpreting the fabric as seen at Hyde Park is already well placed to occur. In every room of the building, paint layers have been exposed, and the new paintwork has been chosen to replicate earlier (in most cases original) colour schemes. Where possible, ‘windows’ have been left open to allow viewing of construction methods, such as the internal brick-nogged walls, morticed ceiling construction, plastering techniques etc. Where necessary due to the fragility of fabric, glass screens have already been installed to protect fabric. As yet, however, no interpretation has been installed to these elements.

It is proposed to install a series of glass panels, with very simple interpretive text transferred onto the glass, in proximity to each fabric element that is to be interpreted. This will mostly be limited to the type of fabric, method of production, and its date of origin, and in the case of paint a British Standard colour. These installations will be designed to be very discrete, with the viewer drawn to them by the presence of a peeled back layer – so as to not promote a proliferation of signage through the building.
4.5. Archaeological footprinting. *What lies beneath?*

**Space:**

As detailed above, a large part of the 2200 square metre Oatlands Gaol yard is covered by the municipal in-ground swimming pool. However, recent archaeological work has ‘reclaimed’ the outer and gaoler’s yards and the entire footprint of the Javelin Men’s Division (see Figures 1.3 & 1.4). This offers an opportunity to interpret the archaeological remains of the site, and to install interpretive landscape elements so as to convey the feeling of layout and space of the original site.

![Figure 4.15 – Looking across the outer yard from the Gaoler’s Residence – the pool fence to the right, and recently exposed archaeological remains in the distance.](image)

**Concept:**

The *Oatlands Gaol – Archaeological Research Design & Method Statement* (Williams 2010) details the substantial archaeological potential that the 2200 square metre Oatlands Gaol yard holds. Pursuant to that research design, in February/March 2011, students from the University of Sydney and LaTrobe University undertook an archaeological summer school excavating the footprint of the Javelin Men’s division and the condemned cells yard at the Oatlands Gaol.

To be detailed in a forthcoming archaeological (and project) report, these excavations demonstrated that the Oatlands Gaol has very substantial and significant archaeological deposits beneath the ground, which have
the potential for research into the key historic themes which the site represents, and also the potential for in-situ interpretation of the archaeology of the site.

Whilst the excavation and interpretation of the wider site is currently inhibited by the ongoing operation of the swimming pool, the recent excavations have allowed the clearance of fill and exposure of remains over one-third of the site – being the outer and Gaoler’s yards areas (see Figure 4.3). The exposure of these remains offer significant opportunities for in-situ interpretation of structural archaeology. Figures 4.16 – 4.21 show examples of the concept of keeping remains exposed, and/or footprinting remains in landscaping elements, as a means of interpreting original layouts and spaces of archaeological sites.

Examples:
The interpretation of in-situ archaeology in Australia has only recently gained popularity, despite being widespread overseas for decades. The first successful project was undertaken at First Government House in Sydney in the 1980s, which has lead to the other Sydney sites also taking up the concept, such as Hyde Park Barracks and in more recent times the Sydney Mint. All of these sites have utilised open archaeological trenches with in-situ remains within new development of sites. Of greater value is the recently completed Sydney YHA (Cumberland/Gloucester Streets, Sydney), which has incorporated a substantial mid-nineteenth century archaeological site with the complete redevelopment of the site, which also includes an archaeological learning centre aimed at school groups.
In Tasmania, the interpretation of in-situ archaeology has been slower to take hold. Sites such as Port Arthur (hospital) and the Cascades Female Factory have done some work with archaeological footprinting, whereby footprints of buildings which are still buried have been outlined in contrasting landscape elements at ground level. Cascades also has some exposed remains in open trenches with shelters built over them, which successfully conveys the layout of portions of the site and the time depth of the burial of remains. Most recently, the redevelopment of the Menzies Centre in Hobart has included the retention and interpretation of in-situ archaeological remains, heavily supplemented by artifacts and discrete interpretation, to very successfully incorporate archaeology within an ultra-modern redevelopment.
The current and future rounds of archaeological interpretation at the Oatlands Gaol will draw concepts from all of these examples – with the possible ultimate aim of eventual incorporating an educational element into the site, along the lines of ‘The Big Dig’ as a collaborative project with the Centre for Heritage at Oatlands.

Proposal:
Although much of the site is currently inaccessible, the current round of archaeological interpretation will concentrate on the outer yard and Javelin Men’s Division. The footprint of the Javelin Men’s building has recently been exposed, so that its depth, construction and location is now definitively known. Whilst it is most desirable to leave these remains exposed, the nature of the structure is such that prolonged exposure may result in degradation, therefore it is proposed that these be reburied, and that landscape elements interpret the footprint.

It is proposed to lower the ground level of the entire area to just above the historic ground level, and the entire yard be gravelled (as per the landscaping proposal outline din Section 4.7). The footprint of the building is to be outlined in sandstone paving, set in lime mortar on top of the original remains, and the ‘internal space’ of the building is to be filled with a contracting coloured gravel. An interpretation panel (as per outline in Section 4.8) will be installed to detail the functions and history of the building, and in the building will be displayed and interpreted.

![Figure 4.22 – Archaeological remains of the Javelin Men's building.](image-url)
4.6. The gaol arch. Moving around……

Space:
The front façade of the gaol once portrayed its dominance as a townscape element - and a symbol of the fortress that it was intended to be. Much of the feeling of the scale of the place was lost when the outer walls were largely demolished in the 1930s. The front of the site – originally comprising the façade of the Gaoler’s Residence, the gaol arch, and massive wall, is now only a portion of what it once was.

Figure 4.23 – The original façade of the Oatlands Gaol, showing the arch (top – image courtesy of the Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office) and the front of the site as it stands today.
Concept:
Upon demolition of much of the site in the late 1930s, the gaol arch was relocated to High Street. The Oatlands Gaol Conservation Management Plan 2006 recommended relocation of the arch back to its original location, pending public consultation, and assuming that funding was available to do so. Funding is currently in-hand to relocate the arch, as part of the Oatlands Gaoler’s Residence restoration, as funded by the Tasmanian Government’s Urban Renewal and Heritage Fund. A round of informal public consultation has recently been undertaken by Southern Midlands Council has indicated widespread support for returning the arch to its current location – pending a statutory approvals process to be forthcoming in April 2011.

Proposal:
The relocation of the arch is part of the overall Oatlands Gaoler’s Residence restoration project – this current proposal is for the interpretation of the arch and its history. The interpretation will focus on the story of the arch, the locals 1930’s fight to retain it, its movement to High Street, and eventual relocation to its original location. This interpretation will be in the form of a panel mounted on a sandstone block, as used elsewhere in the Oatlands Military Precinct exterior interpretation.

A future project will consider the feasibility of replicating and reinstalling the original gaol gates, as known from historical images.
4.7. Landscaping and open space. *Adaptive reuse.*

**Space:**
As detailed above, a large portion of the Oatlands Gaol site is currently inaccessible as a historic site due to the presence of the municipal swimming pool. Nonetheless, one-third of the site, including the boundary between the outer/gaoler's yards and the men's/women's divisions are outside the area currently used by the pool. This allows that portion of the site to be presented and interpreted as an historic site, whilst not inhibiting the community use of the pool.
Concept:

As guided by the principles of the *Oatlands Gaol Project Master Plan* (Williams 2008), the gaol yard is intended to be utilised as meaningfully interpreted public open space. It is intended that the wider site be freely open to the public, with the layout and archaeology of the site being interpreted, despite the fact that most buildings have been demolished. As per the concepts of archaeological footprinting outlined in Section 4.4, it is proposed that the original lines of walls of the gaol – being the epitome of symbolism in terms of incarceration, classification and control, be re-laid in an interpretive manner.

It is proposed that the original lines of walls be ‘rebuilt’ with gabion stone walls to interpret their original lines, and supplement the interpretation of spaces as outlined in Section 4.8. Gabion walls are considered to be appropriate, as they offer the following advantages:

- They utilise traditional materials (stone) however in a contemporary context, therefore in keeping with heritage sites, but readily interpretable as new work (consistent with *Burra Charter* principles).
- No excavation is required for their foundations – therefore archaeological remains need not be disturbed.
- They are wholly removable/reversible, therefore have no long-term heritage impact.
**Examples:**
Gabion walling has been successfully used at similar historic sites, such as the Cascades Female Factory, and Ross Female Factory.

![Figure 4.27 – Gabion walls at the Ross Female Factory.](image)

**Proposal:**
It is proposed that gabion walls of 1500mm height be erected along the lines of wall between the outer/Gaoler’s yards, and the men’s/women’s divisions, as well as the line between the Gaoler’s and outer yards. On top of these walls, it is proposed that barbed wire be installed, both as an interpretive device, and to provide practical security for the swimming pool complex. It is proposed that original doorways and gateways be defined by gabion cages of differing colour stone, so that these can initially be interpreted as former openings, and should the pool be removed in the future, these can be removed to provide actual openings in the wall to supplement interpretation of the original layout of the site.
4.8. Hanging around – the condemned cells and gallows

Space:
Just beyond the Gaoler’s and outer yards is the area which once contained the condemned cells and gallows. As detailed above, the Oatlands Gaol is unique as the only regional gaol where executions were common – with 18 executions being held there.

Whilst the condemned cells and gallows are within the area which is still occupied by the pool, interpretation is still possible on the outside of these areas.

Figure 4.28 (Left) - The area of the gallows yard, as viewed from the Gaoler’s yard. Figure 4.29 (right) – The area of the condemned cells (showing archaeological remains of walls and paving) as viewed from the outer yard.

Figure 4.30 – A 1926 photograph of the condemned cells (red arrow denoting the area of paving/walls recently uncovered). State Library of Victoria.
**Concept:**
Together with the gabion walling, with contrasting stone walling to depict former gateways and openings (as outlined in Section 4.7), it is proposed to install interpretation panels relating to the condemned cells and gallows (consistent with other exterior panels in the area, as shown in Section 4.6). Although this is only considered to be a temporary installation – i.e. to be reviewed should the pool be removed), it will convey messages about those parts of the site not currently accessible, and show that there are very significant parts of the gaol beyond what is currently being interpreted (as per Section 4.9).

It is also proposed to construct a contemporary interpretation of the stairs which once lead to the gallows, which were within the outer yard (hence currently accessible).

![Figure 4.31 – 1851 plan of the Oatlands Gaol gallows, showing stairs in the outer yard (outlined in red). TAHO PWD/266/1549.](image)

**Examples:**
The stylistic outlining of stairs has been used in Hyde Park Barracks to portray the line of stairs which have since been removed. This has been achieved through a combination of steel stairs, and steel cabling to portray the original lines of the stairs.
Proposal:
It is proposed that a steel and steel cable interpretive stairway be built in the location of the original gallows stairway within the outer yard of the Oatlands Gaol. Detailed specifications would require engineering design, with the concept possibly being extended in future to the other side of the wall to show the gallows platform and other associated infrastructure. These would be a stylistic portrayal of the stairs, designed to give people the feeling of the ‘morbid walk to death’ – and play on the macabre aspects of the extreme functions of the gaol and Supreme Court at Oatlands. Panels as described above would be used to interpret and supplement the stairs and their meaning. Obvious links to the condemned cells would also be interpreted.
4.9. The yard beyond. Scale of the site.

Space:
By necessity of retaining the pool, the current project is constrained to the Gaoler’s and outer yards – which is only one-third the overall site. It is considered necessary that the currently proposed interpretation areas include strong references to the extent of the wider site, to convey the scale of the site, and that the physical treatment of the site also include subtle indicators of the former size of the site.

Concept:
A panel will be installed in the outer yard which shows early plans of the site, which will instantly convey that we currently only access a small part of the site. This interpretation will also detail the overall functions of different parts of the site, and form a cohesive ‘base’ for the other interpretive projects to radiate off.

The concept of scale (further to the Arch relocation and interpretation outlined in Section 4.6) can be conveyed by the installation of poles at three corners of the site (i.e. the three corners where the original wall have been removed) to the original height of the wall (i.e. six metres from ground level – which is four to five metres above current wall height).

Also, to convey that the Gaoler’s Residence is a remnant of a much larger site, the neated corners of the Gaoler’s Residence (i.e. where gaol walls have been removed) will be intentionally made ‘jagged’ by installing protruding sandstone blocks, to convey that something has been removed from those corners.

Examples:
Steel poles have been used at the corner of the main cell block at the Saltwater River Coal Mines (probation station) on the Tasman Peninsula. Here, the building has been demolished, leaving only the subterranean cells – red metal poles show the original height of the building.
In a concept further than proposed here, the Cascades Female Factory has used steel framing representing former building lines to interpret that building (also forming a structural brace for the adjacent original stone wall). This concept may be considered for future interpretation works at the Oatlands Gaol.

The Sydney Mint has used jagged wall edges to interpret where original walls have been removed – to evoke the ‘incompleteness’ of the site as supplemented by interpretation.
Proposal:
With the municipal swimming pool currently comprising two-thirds of the Oatlands Gaol site, substantially constraining the current restoration project (as detailed in the conservation management plan), ‘future archaeology’ offers a significant opportunity in ‘reclaiming’ the wider site. As detailed in Section 1.3, there are a wealth of plans and records which document the layout and history of the wider gaol site – tied in with the interpretation of the history and evolution of the gaol proposed for the rear downstairs foyer of the Gaoler’s Residence, it is proposed that an orientation panel be erected in the area of the former outer yard, which allows visitors to gain an feel for the overall layout of the site, whilst standing amongst it. This would also supplement the experience of future public archaeology programs that are aimed at progressively investigating the remains which are currently inaccessible due to the presence of the swimming pool.

As per above, it is proposed that three black metal poles be erected at corners of the gaol yard, to depict the original wall height. Reference to these poles will be made in interpretive material.

A stonemason will be engaged to remove the patches from the two rear corners of the Gaoler’s Residence, and install the jagged edges using recycled stone from the site.
4.10. Off site interpretation

Concept:
As a means of supplementing the on site interpretation at the gaol, for promoting the site, as well as providing a ‘take-home’ souvenir of the gaol, a brochure will be developed.

Examples:
Southern Midlands Council has already developed a series of brochures for Oatlands heritage sites (i.e. Oatlands Township, Supreme Court House, Callington Mill, Military Precinct) consistent with the Oatlands Identity – Guidelines for Usage. The Oatlands Gaol brochure would follow this example.

Proposal:
It is proposed that a brochure for the Oatlands Gaol be designed, in-line with the previously developed brochures, as an additional and complementary part of that suite. This brochure will pick up on the themes explored on the on-site interpretation, as a concise overview of the heritage values of the site, and visitor experiences offered.

4.11. Summary of interpretation initiatives.

The following Figure outlines the areas of interpretation initiatives as detailed in this plan. This provides the basic landscape plan (including some landscape and restoration initiatives which are part of the Gaoler’s Residence Restoration Project (i.e. not part of the interpretation project), but will support the implementation of the latter project.
Figure 4.36 – Overall landscape and interpretation space plan for the Oatlands Gaol (red numbers make reference to the sections in this document.)
5. Costings and implementation strategy

Section 4 has detailed the proposed interpretation installations and media, drawn from the history of the site and statements of significance outlined in Section 1, in-line with the interpretive approaches also outlined in that section.

Note that the interpretation plan must be reviewed at such a time as the pool is able to be relocated – hence allowing access to a greater part of the site. This is not expected to be within the timeframe of the current project.

The following table outlines the indicative costings of implementation the recommendations of Section 4, and below is the indicative implementation timeframe of those recommendations should finding for the project be secured:

5.1. Estimated costings for implementation

The following are cost estimates for the implementation of the project as proposed. These have been developed in comparison to similar projects (e.g. those already undertaken by Southern Midlands Council, and/or others), as well as actual quotations/estimates from relevant tradespeople and service providers. The table indicates the derivation of cost estimates.
5.2. Indicative timeframes for implementation:

The following provides an indicative timeframe for implementation of the Oatlands Gaol Interpretation Project – subject to the obtainment of funding.

Early 2011:
- Finalise interpretation Plan.
- Seek funding for the project

June 2011:
- Completion of works program at Gaoler’s Residence and Gaol arch relocation (as a separate project).

Should funding be secured:

July 2011:
- Obtain required permits from statutory bodies (i.e. Tasmanian Heritage Council).
- Obtain detailed engineering designs for installations (poles, stairs, display cases).

August:
- Collate historical research and engage graphic designer for panels and brochure.
- Audit artifact collection and develop principals for thematic interpretation of exhibits (including supplementary panels/tags for exhibits).

September 2011:
- Commence construction of gabion walls.
- Construction and installation of display cases

October 2011:
- Complete gabion walls.
- Install gravel surfaces to outer yard and gaoler’s yard.
- Install stone footprint of Javelin Men’s building, and gravel ‘interior’.
- Fabrication of panels, banners etc.
- Printing of brochures.

November 2011:
- Installation of panels, banners.
- Installation of poles and gallows stairs.
- Population of display cases.
December 2011:
- Distribution of brochures.
- Official opening.

February 2012:
- Acquittal of project.
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