



**The electronic version of this report does not contain appendices A B C D E these can be obtained from the Committee Office of the Legislative Assembly**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR  
THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

# **Inquiry into the establishment of an ACT prison: justification and siting**

**First interim report in the prison series**

**Report No. 3 of the  
Standing Committee on Justice  
and Community Safety**

**July 1999**



## **Resolution of Appointment**

That—

The following general purpose standing committees be established to inquire into and report on matters referred by the Assembly or, matters that are considered by the committee to be of concern to the community...

...a Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety to examine matters related to administration of justice, legal policy and services, registrar and regulatory services, electoral services, consumer affairs, corrective, emergency and police services and fair trading and any other matter under the responsibility of the portfolio minister.

Legislative Assembly for the ACT, *Minutes of Proceedings*, No.2, 28 April 1998, p 15.

### **Terms of Reference**

Inquire into and report on the establishment of a prison in the ACT with particular reference to:

- (1) the justification for the prison;
- (2) the process used by the ACT Government to establish the prison including the use of consultants;
- (3) the philosophical approach of the prison and whether it should be publicly run or privately run;
- (4) community involvement in the development, design and siting of the prison;
- (5) Australian and international best practice models for prisoner rehabilitation and avoidance of deaths in custody;
- (6) cost-effectiveness issues in the establishment and running of the prison;
- (7) any other related matter.

## **Committee Membership**

Mr Paul Osborne MLA (Chair)

Mr John Hargreaves MLA (Deputy Chair)

Mr Trevor Kaine MLA

Mr Harold Hird MLA

Secretary: Ms Fiona Clapin

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Background to the inquiry .....	1
Inquiry plan .....	2
Conduct of the inquiry .....	2
Visits to prisons.....	3
Government activity to date .....	3
Acknowledgments.....	4
<b>2. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PRISON</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Arguments in favour of an ACT prison .....	5
Arguments against an ACT prison .....	11
Conclusion .....	14
<b>3. SITING OF THE PRISON</b> .....	<b>16</b>
Background.....	16
Government's siting guidelines .....	18
When is the best time to choose the site? .....	19
What is the process once the site is selected? .....	19
The four sites .....	20
1. <i>Honeysuckle Creek</i> .....	20
2. <i>Kinlyside, Block 584</i> .....	22
3. <i>Majura Block 611</i> .....	24
4. <i>Symonston Block 4, Section 102</i> .....	26
Conclusion .....	28
<b>APPENDIX A: SUBMISSIONS</b>	
<b>APPENDIX B: PUBLIC HEARINGS</b>	
<b>APPENDIX C: GOVERNMENT'S SITING GUIDELINES</b>	
<b>APPENDIX D: TOTALCARE REPORT</b>	
<b>APPENDIX E: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</b>	



## 1. INTRODUCTION

*'An ACT prison system would ... provide the ACT Government with an unparalleled opportunity to develop an innovative, best practice prison facility which is truly committed to the principles of 'rehabilitation' ...rather than simply punishment'<sup>1</sup>*

### **Background to the inquiry**

1.1. On 24 August 1998 the committee decided to inquire into the establishment of an ACT prison so it could scrutinise Government activity, facilitate community input and contribute to the design of the prison if evidence presented found a prison was needed in the ACT.

1.2. The committee endorses the view expressed by the Minister for Justice and Community Safety in ACT Corrective Services Discussion Paper (1996) that:

*The ACT has a unique opportunity to build a 'model' correctional facility that avoids mistakes and capitalises on the successes of other jurisdictions.<sup>2</sup>*

1.3. Prisons are often seen as a political no-win situation. The perceived wisdom is that there is no political kudos in working with prisons and the public is only interested in avoiding having a prison in their backyard.

1.4. The evidence presented to this inquiry shows that, to the contrary, there are many individuals and groups in our local community who have wider concerns than the location of the prison and wish to make a positive contribution to the rehabilitation of prisoners. Fifty submissions have been received and witnesses have indicated a strong interest in being involved in the design of the prison during the public hearings. Further evidence of community interest is the recent formation of a Community Prison Coalition.

1.5. The committee was encouraged by the community goodwill and community interest shown in the prison project. It indicates that the ACT community is sophisticated enough to want to participate in the building of a community prison based on principles of restorative justice. The committee found no support for old-style warehousing where prisoners are locked away with no interaction with the community until they are released. Further, the committee did not find support for the

---

<sup>1</sup> ACTCOSS (Submission 25)

<sup>2</sup> ACT Corrective Services Discussion Paper, *The Possible Establishment of a Correctional Facility in the ACT* (1996), Forward.

old fashioned retributive model of incarceration. On the contrary, the committee found much support for the restorative justice model.<sup>3</sup>

1.6. The inquiry has been very interesting and a good learning experience for committee members. The written submissions, together with discussions with witnesses at public hearings and visits to interstate prisons enabled committee members to increase their understanding of the complex issues related to imprisonment and the planning of a prison.

### ***Inquiry plan***

1.7. This is the first interim report on this inquiry. The committee's next report, which will be tabled in the Assembly in August 1999, will address the important issues of prison design and programs, cost-effectiveness, community involvement and accountability. It will also consider whether the prison should be public or private. The committee plans to continue this inquiry until the prison is established with further interim reports to be presented to the Assembly over the next two years.

### ***Conduct of the inquiry***

1.8. The committee advertised for submissions in October 1998 and continued to accept submissions until June 1999. Fifty submissions were received. (See Appendix A for details)

1.9. Public hearings were held on 17 March 1999, 18 May 1999 and 10 June 1999 and were attended by 38 people and sixteen organisations. (See Appendix B for details).

---

<sup>3</sup> eg Bishop Power and Bishop Randerson (Transcript, 17 March 1999), ACTCOSS (Submission 25), ACT Council of Churches (Submission 9), Leonard Barratt (Submission 2), Prisoners Aid (Submission 8), Social Justice Committee of Anglicare (Submission 24) and others.

## ***Visits to prisons***

1.10. Committee members visited 9 prisons in Victoria, South Australia and Queensland, comprising a selection of public and private prisons. Those visited include;

- Mt Gambier Prison (SA, Group 4 Corrections-State-owned, privately managed)
- Fulham Prison (Sale, Vic, ACM-State-owned, privately managed)
- Port Phillip Prison (Laverton, Vic), Group 4-State-owned, privately managed)
- Metropolitan Women's Correctional Centre (Deer Park, Victoria, CCA-State-owned, privately managed)
- Lotus Glen Correctional Centre (Mareeba, Queensland, State-owned and managed)
- Townsville Correctional Centre (Townsville, Qld, State-owned and managed)
- Borallon Correctional Centre (Brisbane Qld, CCA-State-owned, privately managed)
- Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre (Wacol, Qld, ACM-State-owned, privately managed)
- The new prisons SEQ1 and SEQW under construction near Wacol, Queensland.

1.11. Committee members also visited Belconnen Remand Centre and two committee members who were part of the Third Assembly's Legal Affairs Committee visited other prisons including Junee before this inquiry began.

1.12. While this report draws on the lessons learnt on these visits, the next report will provide more detail about these visits because it will specifically address the issue of prison design.

## ***Government activity to date***

1.13. The committee is encouraged by the progressive attitude taken by the Government to the philosophy of the prison. For example, the Minister for Justice and Community Safety recently stated the new prison will be the most accountable in Australia with private-sector or other Government operators expected to relinquish

commercial-in-confidence status to enable better scrutiny and oversight by the community.<sup>4</sup>

1.14. The committee also endorses the Government's recent announcement it will establish a community advisory body to oversight the project<sup>5</sup> but notes that to date, the Government has played a very limited role in facilitating community consultation, appearing to leave most of this work to our committee. The committee acknowledges that the workshops organised by the Department of Justice and Community Safety have been a positive step and very successful according to all reports but, the committee considers it is time for the Government to take a more active role in facilitating general community consultation in other forums.

1.15. The committee notes its disappointment that the Government was unable to produce a Government submission addressing the general terms of reference until late May 1999, more than five months after the closing date for submissions for the inquiry. The lateness of the submission has impeded the committee's consideration of this very important issue and delayed our reporting timetable.

## ***Acknowledgments***

1.16. The committee wishes to thank all those who participated in this inquiry. The ACT community has demonstrated that there is a lot of untapped goodwill with many community members wishing to contribute to the development of a best-practice model prison. The committee urges the Government to take advantage of this goodwill and community interest and to ensure those interested have the opportunity to participate in the development and operation of the prison.

1.17. The committee thanks the South Australian, Queensland and Victorian Governments for facilitating our visits to prisons in those states.

1.18. The committee also expresses its appreciation to James Ryan and Eddie Issa (officials of ACT Corrective Services) for their assistance during this inquiry.

---

<sup>4</sup> Media Statement, Minister for Justice and Community Safety, 23 June 1999.

<sup>5</sup> Speech by Minister for Justice and Community Safety to International Council of Jurists, 12 May 1999.

## 2. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PRISON

### ***Arguments in favour of an ACT prison***

2.1. The issue of whether the ACT should have a prison has been considered in numerous reports over the last 15 years. All the reports recommended a prison should be established.<sup>6</sup>

2.2. The overwhelming majority of submissions supported the need for an ACT-based prison with community representations recognising the validity of economic and social arguments in favour of an ACT prison.

2.3. The arguments in favour of establishing a new ACT prison include:

- to enable the ACT can take responsibility for its own citizens and provide for improved accountability;
- to allow more control over rehabilitation and restoration;
- the need to replace Belconnen Remand Centre due to poor design, high operational costs and limited capacity;
- to provide opportunities for families to visit without substantial expense;
- to provide for convenience for legal representatives to gain access to their clients; and
- to create cost benefits including economic flow-on benefits for the ACT.

### **Responsibility and accountability**

2.4. The Alternatives to Violence Project suggested:

*the ACT community should be responsible for our own affairs and we can be more effective in managing positive outcomes for inmates and the community by dealing with local problems at a local level- prisons cultivate and maintain their own values, standards and mores which are continuously exported to the general community- as*

---

<sup>6</sup> eg Vinson Report (1984), Australian Law Reform Commission Report (1988), Paying the Price (1991), ACT Corrective Services Discussion Paper (1996), and the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs (1997)

*long as we are tied to the NSW system that culture will be continuously imported to the ACT, when ex-prisoners can be more criminal on release than before they went in, by establishing our own prison system from the beginning, we would have the opportunity to make a custodial sentence a constructive experience through the implementation of best practice models, unencumbered by the violent and negative prison culture for which NSW is notorious.<sup>7</sup>*

2.5. Another submitter noted:

*In a democracy, a community, through its elected government, should have ultimate responsibility for its prisons. The lines of responsibility become very blurred when prisoners are sent to prisons in another jurisdiction.<sup>8</sup>*

2.6. The committee has concerns about adequacy of accountability arrangements under the current arrangements where ACT prisoners are sent to NSW. The committee noted when information is difficult to obtain, responsibility and accountability are not guaranteed. In-camera evidence substantiated feelings of lack of accountability and difficulty in apportioning responsibility.<sup>9</sup> The committee welcomed the Government's recently announced position on transparency, noting its intention to remove 'commercial-in-confidence' protection from any contract let to manage the prison.<sup>10</sup>

2.7. The creation of a locally-based prison complex should result in a considerable improvement in accountability processes.

### **More Control Over Rehabilitation and Restoration**

2.8. Another major argument in favour of an ACT prison is that the ACT community can gain control over rehabilitation programs for offenders. Most submissions received gave a strong emphasis to the goal of rehabilitation and how this could be achieved.

2.9. The ACT Government emphasised that if ACT Corrections have control over the full criminal justice process from remand through imprisonment to transitional release into the community, they can ensure an integrated approach to individual case management, including the development of appropriate rehabilitation programs.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Alternatives to Violence Project (Submission 17)

<sup>8</sup> Canberra Schizophrenia Association (Submission 5)

<sup>9</sup> In-camera evidence was received about the experiences of ACT prisoners housed in NSW prisons on 18 May 1999.

<sup>10</sup> Minister for Justice and Community Safety, Press Release, 23 June 1999.

<sup>11</sup> ACT Government (Submission 47)

2.10. The ACT Parole Board suggested that the ACT should be in a position to design, construct and manage the new prison in a fashion which will maximise the opportunities for rehabilitation, while ensuring a security regime which meets community expectations.<sup>12</sup>

2.11. With the exception of a few submissions, which were specifically directed at siting issues, all of the witnesses before the committee addressed elements of the continuum of the justice system. Some spoke of their concerns about the remand centre and some spoke of the need for and nature of programs within the proposed jail, such as anger management, sexual dysfunction, general education programs and trade programs. Some spoke of the need for detoxification services, some spoke about infectious disease and other implications of IV use, and some spoke of the absence of structured programs for prisoners on release.

2.12. It became obvious to the committee that the processes of restorative justice could not be guaranteed in the NSW system and that consideration of having a jail in the ACT must, if best practice was to be our aim, include articulation of the continuum of restorative justice. Further, the committee agreed that this consideration should conclude prior to consideration of whether a public or private prison model is appropriate.

2.13. The previous Official Visitor informed the committee that:

*The present NSW system has many problems, and has an unenviable record of murder, suicide and violence, amongst prisoners and against warders. Certainly we should be concerned about utilising a prison system that puts some offenders under protection, where that protection often results in those offenders being locked up for 18 hours a day under conditions that can permit their assault, rape and sometimes their death.*

2.14. Another individual submitted:

*many of the NSW prisons are of dubious benefit in relation to the rehabilitation of prisoners committed to their care, and...prisoners leave these institutions far more damaged emotionally and often physically than when they were committed.<sup>13</sup>*

2.15. The Quakers also point out:

*An ACT correctional facility would offer the possibility of weekend leave and work release programs to selected prisoners. These options have previously not been possible in Canberra or at best been difficult for ACT prisoners despite them being some of the most positive rehabilitative programs available.<sup>14</sup>*

*Personal contact with the Parole and Probation section of ACT Corrective Services could be started prior to the prisoners release date to offer post release assistance.*

---

<sup>12</sup> ACT Parole Board (Submission 10)

<sup>13</sup> Leonard Barratt (Submission 2)

<sup>14</sup> Quakers (Submission 11) pp3-4.

*Previously this has not been possible for ACT prisoners serving NSW sentences. Also the ACT Parole Board is dependent on reports and information from the NSW Corrective Services on the behaviour of any ACT prisoner due for release into Parole supervision.<sup>15</sup>*

2.16. The committee was disturbed to hear of wasted human potential when prisoners are warehoused and not properly case-managed. There is no justification for allowing a situation to continue where a large number of prisoners come out of prison with greater emotional damage than when they entered the prison. Prisons should be seen as opportunities to redress social, emotional, educational and skill deficiencies in prisoners so they are less likely to commit crimes upon release.

### **To replace Belconnen Remand Centre**

2.17. The Belconnen Remand Centre is overcrowded and poorly designed. It was constructed in 1976 and intended to hold only 18 remandees. The design was based on Katingal the ‘electronic zoo’ at Long Bay Gaol which was closed down following the Nagle Royal Commission in 1978. The design faults include a claustrophobic environment, a lack of reasonable opportunities for recreation and exercise and an unacceptable standard of security.<sup>16</sup> The poor design means that the BRC’s staff ration is 0.7 offenders to one custodial officer compared to the national average of 1.5 offenders to one custodial officer.<sup>17</sup>

2.18. The overcrowding at Belconnen Remand Centre has meant prisoners are housed in the police cells at the Watch House and regularly transported to Goulburn.

2.19. The Ombudsman’s submission also drew attention to the deficiencies of the BRC:

*the establishment of a new prison could help overcome...continued problems with overcrowding at BRC...difficulties due to the limitations of the existing Remand Centre in accommodating a range of special categories of detainees including security risk prisoners, detainees with special needs and mental or physical health problems, female detainees etc...the BRC facility built in 1976 is outdated and conditions for both staff and detainees are substandard...the current BRC is inadequate to provide training, education programs or meaningful activities for detainees on lengthy remands<sup>18</sup>*

---

<sup>15</sup> *ibid*

<sup>16</sup> ACT Government (Submission 47)

<sup>17</sup> *ibid*

<sup>18</sup> ACT Ombudsman (Submission 23)

2.20. The CPSU also believes there is an urgent need to upgrade the remand centre and notes that from an industrial perspective a new correctional facility will relieve some urgent OHS issues.<sup>19</sup>

2.21. Committee members have visited Belconnen Remand Centre and witnessed the design inadequacies first-hand. The committee acknowledges the need to replace Belconnen Remand Centre as a matter of urgency.

### **Family contacts**

2.22. The previous Official Visitor pointed out that it is almost impossible for families to maintain any regular contact with ACT prisoners incarcerated in NSW jails except Goulburn. Travel time to Junee and Mannus Correctional Centres is over 3 hours by car. For families without cars, it takes 6 hours by public transport and requires overnight accommodation. The costs for a mother with small children on social security is prohibitive.<sup>20</sup>

2.23. The committee was informed that Prisoners Aid provides some financial assistance. A woman travelling by public transport to Junee is entitled to \$70 a month but this does not cover the cost of bus and train fare and accommodation ( \$25-\$60 per night) and without private transport she would need to walk for 30 minutes to reach Junee Correctional Centre because there is no available public transport between Junee and the prison.<sup>21</sup>

2.24. ACTCOSS noted that under the current system:

*in some cases families have chosen to leave the ACT in order to be closer to their relatives in prison, and then been placed at a further disadvantage when the prisoner is moved without notice to another facility in another part of NSW<sup>22</sup>*

and

*families of Aboriginals and Torres Strait islanders have expressed particular concern about the dislocation felt when their relatives are transferred without notice to distant parts of NSW. This has had a negative effect on the ability of families and communities*

---

<sup>19</sup> CPSU (Submission 33)

<sup>20</sup> Bill Aldcroft (Submission 1)

<sup>21</sup> *ibid*

<sup>22</sup> ACTCOSS (Submission 25)

*to effectively assist in the rehabilitation process...the devastating impact of incarceration on these families cannot be underestimated<sup>23</sup>*

2.25. The ACT Council of Churches notes that sending prisoners to NSW doesn't mean they necessarily go to Goulburn, they could go anywhere in NSW. The Council advised that once ACT sentenced prisoners are sent to the NSW system, control is lost of the conditions under which they serve and end their sentences.<sup>24</sup>

2.26. The Quakers submitted:

*One of the most compelling arguments for the establishment of an ACT Correctional Facility is to end the dislocation of prisoners from family and friends, and the consequent difficulties that arise from these limited visits. Distance and cost of travel to NSW prisons mean that frequent visitation is prohibitive for most wives and children and the resulting lack of contact is detrimental to the prisoner's rehabilitation and for the domestic readjustment of the family unit on his release.<sup>25</sup>*

2.27. The committee found the argument that a locally-based prison would provide opportunities for regular contacts between prisoners and families very convincing. The committee received consistent evidence during interstate prison visits that contact with families can contribute significantly to a prisoner's wellbeing and rehabilitation.

### **Cost savings and economic flow-on benefits**

2.28. The present arrangements with NSW cost \$190 per inmate per day for ACT inmates compared with the national average of \$144 per prisoner per day.<sup>26</sup>

2.29. The ACT Government has produced a Cost Benefit Analysis which compares the cost of continuing with the present system to building a new remand centre and building a combined remand and prison facility. The cost benefit analysis indicates that the best option is to construct a combined remand and prison centre. The construction cost is estimated at \$33m. According to the Government, there would be efficiencies in staff to prisoner ratios and new employment opportunities with up to 250 jobs created on-site and a further 125 jobs created off-site during the construction period.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> *ibid*

<sup>24</sup> ACT Council of Churches (Submission 9)

<sup>25</sup> Quakers (Submission 11)

<sup>26</sup> Minister for Justice and Community Safety, Speech to International Council of Jurists, 12 May 1999.

<sup>27</sup> ACT Government (Submission 47)

2.30. The prison would also create jobs for members of the caring professions involved in rehabilitation programs.<sup>28</sup>

2.31. ACTCOSS argued:

*with the development of a new prison in the ACT...there would flow many opportunities for existing enterprises to expand currently provided services, while there would also be significant opportunities for new and innovative organisations to provide programs in the human services area. In a research and development sense, there would also be significant opportunities to develop a body of expertise across the ACT's 5 tertiary institutions<sup>29</sup>*

3.12. Without access to alternative economic modelling expertise, the committee can only rely on the Government's estimates of cost-savings and economic flow-on benefits. We will have to wait and see if the Government's predictions translate into reality. But our experiences in visiting prisons in other states (such as Mount Gambier Prison in South Australia, and Fulham Prison in Sale Victoria) gave us confidence that these benefits do accrue to local communities when they establish new prisons.

3.13. The committee is keen that all of the jobs created will be based in the ACT, rather than other states, which could be a danger if a private operator is given the contract. This issue will be addressed in more detail in the committee's next report.

### ***Arguments against an ACT prison***

2.32. Very few submissions argued against establishing an ACT prison. This is significant because submissions were received from such a wide range of community groups. Those who did argue against the prison did so on mainly on philosophical grounds and due to the fear that it would lead to more people being imprisoned (known as 'net widening').

### ***Philosophical objections***

---

<sup>28</sup> RI Morse (Submission 6)

<sup>29</sup> ACTCOSS (Submission 25)

2.33. Justice Action stated it:

*unequivocally rejects the proposition of building a prison in the ACT. Prisons have historically failed to rehabilitate, reform or 'deter' criminal activity'. Furthermore by brutalising its inhabitants, prison is in fact, counterproductive to the provision of a 'safer living environment' for the 'general community'.*

and

*Other options to imprisonment run the risk of being downgraded with community involvement minimised and a culture dependent upon punishment and ostracism propagated.<sup>30</sup>*

2.34. The Family and Friends for Drug Law Reform also claim that the case for expanded prison facilities has not been made out because prisons are filled with drug users who would be more appropriately be dealt with under health programs, rather than the criminal justice system.<sup>31</sup>

2.35. The issues raised about integrating drug strategies with corrections policies are important and the committee urges the Government to develop effective coordinating strategies and policies so that fewer drug-addicted prisoners are incarcerated. The committee acknowledges that in an ideal society we would not need to have a prison but since that is not the case, the most appropriate option for ACT prisoners is for them to be housed locally.

### **Net widening**

2.36. The major argument against establishing an ACT prison is the danger of 'net widening'. The Minister for Justice and Community Safety defines this as when the judiciary sentences people to imprisonment who would not, in current circumstances, be sentenced.<sup>32</sup>

2.37. The NSW Council for Civil Liberties argued:

---

<sup>30</sup> *ibid*

<sup>31</sup> Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform (Submission 43)

<sup>32</sup> Tabling Speech, Minister for Justice and Community Safety, Private briefing with Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety, 17 June 1999.

*The Council wishes to register its strong opposition to the construction of a prison in the ACT. Historically we know that extra prison capacity will be filled. A prison in the ACT will almost certainly mean greater levels of imprisonment in the ACT.*<sup>33</sup>

2.38. The Minister for Justice and Community Safety has recently acknowledged concerns about the dangers of net-widening:

*the Government is conscious of the possibility that the opening of a new prison will create 'net widening'...*

*This is a complex issue – the pattern and trends of crime indicate that more people are resorting to serious crimes to feed drug habits, and that it is inevitable that there will be – indeed, needs to be - a corresponding increase in sentencing. But that concern needs to be balanced against a view in other states that the more beds you provide in prisons, the happier the judiciary is to fill them.*

*As a community, we need to have a serious debate about ways to prevent 'net widening' – ways to ensure, within the range tolerated by the separation of powers, that the judiciary does not simply see the creation of a new prison as a challenge.*<sup>34</sup>

2.39. The committee notes that the ACT currently has the lowest rate of imprisonment in Australia. The rate is 30% less than that of the next lowest jurisdiction (Victoria) and 59% lower than the national average.<sup>35</sup> However even without a new prison the ACT has also experienced the second highest rate of increase in prisoner numbers with an increase of 22.5% over the last two years.<sup>36</sup>

2.40. There has been a nationwide trend increases in prisoner numbers from 9,500 in 1984 to over 19,000 in 1998.<sup>37</sup> This follows 20 years of data indicating a slow and predictable rise in numbers.<sup>38</sup> The Government's Discussion Paper (1996) attributed the increases to increases in crime and increases in police 'clear up rates'.<sup>39</sup>

2.41. The Social Justice Committee of Anglicare expressed concerns about the trend to increases in prison populations:

*-it is no doubt more than a coincidence that this period corresponds to a period of major increases in long term unemployment, cuts in social services, de-institutionalisation of people with mental illness and so on.*

*while prison sentences are likely to become more common in the ACT because of local availability of a correctional facility, the Committee considers on balance the benefits*

---

<sup>33</sup> NSW Council for Civil Liberties (Submission 16)

<sup>34</sup> Tabling Speech, Minister for Justice and Community Safety, Private briefing with Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety, 17 June 1999.

<sup>35</sup> ACT Corrective Services Discussion Paper (1996)

<sup>36</sup> Professor David Biles, Transcript, 18 May 1999, p3.

<sup>37</sup> *ibid*, p2.

<sup>38</sup> *ibid*

<sup>39</sup> ACT Corrective Services Discussion Paper (1996)

*outweigh the risks. To minimise the risks it is imperative that community-based sentencing options be improved and strengthened<sup>40</sup>*

2.42. The committee is very aware of the arguments that the absence of a local prison may act as an incentive for magistrates to use other sentencing options. The committee endorses the view of the Social Justice Committee about increasing community-based options and hopes that a strong awareness of the dangers of net widening will minimise its effects.

## **Conclusion**

2.43. The committee found the arguments in favour of establishing a prison in the ACT to be persuasive. The establishment of a multi-purpose correctional facility together with a holistic correctional services policy framework and community-based sentencing options should result in a net social benefit. Increased control over rehabilitation of prisoners within our local community should eventually result in less crime, benefiting the whole community.

2.44. The committee also considers it is time for the Government to begin developing the tender specifications by seeking expressions of interest from experts from the field of corrections. This committee signals its interest in being closely involved in the tender development process and our next report (due in August) will clearly set out the principles which should be reflected in the specifications.

## **Recommendation 1**

**The committee recommends that an ACT prison complex (including a remand centre) be established.**

---

<sup>40</sup> Social Justice Committee of Anglicare (Submission 24)

### *Recommendation 2*

**The committee recommends that the Government continue to recognise the important role of the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety in the process of establishing an ACT prison by:**

- **consulting with the committee on major decisions; and**
- **providing the committee with a briefing every two months on progress towards the establishment of a prison.**

### *Recommendation 3*

**The committee recommends that the Government:**

- **invite expressions of interest in the provision of project direction services; and**
- **award a contract as a result of these expressions of interest to provide specifications for prison programs and recommended outcomes, in such form as to provide an outline of an architectural brief.**

### 3. SITING OF THE PRISON

#### **Background**

3.1. Consideration of where the prison should be located comes under the inquiry's term of reference (4) which requires the committee to consider 'community involvement in the development, design and siting of the prison'.

3.2. The committee agreed to participate in the site selection process after a request from the Minister for Justice and Community Safety made during a private briefing. During this meeting, the committee agreed to consult with the community about the sites and provide a recommendation to Government.

3.3. The Government provided the committee with 6 possible prison sites:

- Majura Block 611 (127ha), 76-88 Avonly Road off Majura Road, Avonly Cottages;
- Majura, Block 596-598 (114 ha), end of Pialligo Avenue;
- Pialligo, Block 3, Section 18 (302 ha);
- Oaks Estate, Block 1, (12.4 ha) Corner Railway Street and Mountain Road;
- Fyshwick, Block 1, Section 48, (4.15ha), Corner Newcastle Street and Canberra Avenue; and
- Symonston, section 102, Block 4 (205ha).

3.4. These sites were originally identified by PALM at the request of the Corrections Project Committee.<sup>41</sup>

3.5. The committee visited these six original sites on 11 February 1999. After considering the merits of six sites, the committee identified two sites as being suitable: Majura and Symonston. The other four sites were eliminated because of size of site, gradient of site and proximity to dwellings. Concerned that all of the six original sites suggested by the Government were concentrated in the one area (and one electorate-Molonglo), the committee identified two additional sites for consideration: Honeysuckle Creek (Brindabella electorate) and Kinlyside (Ginninderra electorate).

---

<sup>41</sup> ACT Government (Submission 49), p2.

3.6. On 20 March 1999, the committee advertised in *The Canberra Times* seeking community comment on the suitability of the four sites with a closing date of 6 May 1999. The advertisement invited interested members of the community to consider the sites against the Government *Siting Considerations* paper. The committee also wrote to individuals and organisations thought to have an interest in the prison siting issue.

3.7. On 12 April 1999, the committee chair wrote to the Minister for Justice and Community Safety seeking specific information on how each of the four sites met the prison siting guidelines. The committee sought:

- (a) comments and rankings on each of the sites against the criteria listed in the *Siting Considerations* paper;
- (b) details of land ownership and leases on the four sites and surrounding sites;
- (c) land use category for the four sites and any proposed developments for the sites;
- (d) projected comparative development and infrastructure costs for each of the sites if a prison were to be built on them;
- (e) information on environmental issues including the time frame, costs and processes needed to address environmental matters; and
- (f) an explanation of how the original six sites were identified.

3.8. On 1 June 1999, the Government responded with a submission which included a detailed analysis of each site.<sup>42</sup> The Government's siting submission included information requested by the committee together with a report by Totalcare, *Comparative Development and Infrastructure Costs for Prison Sites* and a letter from Environment ACT addressing the environmental issues for each site. The Totalcare report is attached in Appendix D and the letter from Environment ACT in Appendix E.

3.9. The majority of submissions received for the committee's prison inquiry addressed the general terms of reference and did not address the prison siting issue. Submissions addressing the siting issue were received from:

- Sundown Village;
- Weston Creek Community Council;
- Tuggeranong Community Council;
- Maureen and Tom Campbell;

---

<sup>42</sup> ACT Government (Submission 49)

- Alison Neiberding and Peter Kimber;
- Jennifer Ipkendanz;
- Bill Aldcroft;
- the Hall and District Progress Association;
- Stuart Weller;
- the Real Estate Institute;
- Friends of Grasslands; and
- the ACT Rural Lessees Association.

3.10. The committee heard from a Friends of Grasslands, the Hall and District Progress Association; Jennifer Ipkendanz and the ACT Rural Lessees Association. during public hearings.

### ***Government's siting guidelines***

3.10. The Government's siting guidelines, *Siting Considerations* are at Appendix C. This document provides guidelines on area and site characteristics, land ownership, community location, accessibility, services, environmental impact and community acceptance. Based on American prison guidelines, these guidelines suggest the site should be no smaller than 48 hectares for a 300-bed prison, with the actual prison being much smaller than the 48 hectares. The extra room is needed to accommodate a number of building complexes, to be visually contained to minimise intrusion into neighbouring areas, to incorporate a buffer, and to limit development constraints.

3.12. The committee found the siting guidelines very useful. However the committee's consideration of the sites was not based entirely on the guidelines because the committee was also tasked with evaluating the sites on grounds of cost-effectiveness. The committee relied on the Totalcare report for information about development costs for each site.

3.13. Within the siting guidelines, the committee found a conflict between criteria for distance from residential areas and the criteria for integration in the community and has attempted to identify a prison site which balances these two objectives. Submissions on the siting issue exemplified this conflict with the REI suggesting it should be in a non-residential area such as Honeysuckle Creek and the former Official

Visitor stating that Honeysuckle Creek is ‘an outrageous suggestion’ and would be one of those ‘out of sight out of mind’ propositions.<sup>43</sup> He further stated that ‘under no circumstances should the ACT Correctional Centre be located in some remote rural area.’<sup>44</sup>

3.11. The committee is very supportive of the aim of integrating the prison into the community but still placed a strong emphasis on avoiding effects on property values and maintaining community safety and perceptions of safety. While the committee was told often by those working in prisons that the safest place to live is next door to a prison because escapers will wish to flee as far away as possible, the committee was aware that this was probably not the perception of the average Canberra resident.

### ***When is the best time to choose the site?***

3.12. During public hearings some witnesses indicated it is premature to decide on a site for the prison before design principles have been established.

3.13. The committee recognised that the figure of 300 may alter after further investigation. It notes that the size of the blocks (at 48 hectares) may be too small or if expected prisoner classifications vary, a current prison building model may be inappropriate.

3.14. The committee appreciates this argument but recognises this must be balanced against the need to establish the prison as soon as is reasonably possible, to alleviate the pressure at Belconnen Remand Centre. The committee also considers that the siting guidelines provide a flexible framework which can accommodate many styles of prison design.

### ***What is the process once the site is selected?***

3.15. The process following the committee’s site selection will take some time with the need to conduct a Preliminary Assessment (PA) and possibly an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Government has informed the committee that by legislation the site of a corrective facility requires the conduct of a PA. As ACT Corrective Services is the proponent, it must prepare and meet the costs of the PA. A consultant will need to be engaged to prepare the PA, at a rough cost of between

---

<sup>43</sup> Real Estate Institute (Submission 42) and Bill Aldcroft (Submission 38)

<sup>44</sup> Bill Aldcroft (Submission 38)

\$60,000-\$80,000. The PA process, depending on the level of objection and the need for further studies, could take up to 6 months. However the actual preparation of a PA by a consultant may take between 6-8 weeks.<sup>45</sup>

3.16. The PA once completed is submitted to the Minister responsible for the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1999*. The Minister must decide within 42 days whether to accept the PA, reject the PA or refer it for an EIS. Of the 106 PAs so far submitted in the ACT, only 4 have gone on to the EIS stage. It is only in exceptional circumstances that an EIS will be required by the Minister. The EIS requires the conduct of a range of specialised studies focusing on ecology, noise, transport, parking, infrastructure.<sup>46</sup>

3.17. The committee suggests the Government take account of potential design changes when preparing the PA and the EIS.

## ***The four sites***

### ***1. Honeysuckle Creek***

#### **Description**

3.18. The site is accessed from the western end of Apollo Road, which comes off the Naas Road south of Tharwa. The site is characterised by steep and rugged bushland with large exposed boulders. Because the site is within the National Park with vast surrounding bushland, bush fires are prevalent in the area and have the potential to be a risk to any prison. The block and surrounding areas have shallow soils with large rock outcrops. These features combined with the rugged nature of the terrain and the alpine climate of the area indicate that cropping activities would not be successful. According to Totalcare, the contour and steep gradient of the land are such as would not permit the location of a prison.<sup>47</sup>

3.19. This land use category under the Territory Plan does not permit the construction of a prison, and a variation to the Territory Plan would be necessary. The land is Territory land and there are no registered or unregistered leases on the property.

3.20. The site is nominated for inclusion as heritage listed property. The site is now part of the Namadgi National Park, and a picnic /BBQ area has been established to the

---

<sup>45</sup> ACT Government (Submission 49), p2.

<sup>46</sup> *ibid*

<sup>47</sup> *ibid*

west of the tracking station building sites. According to Totalcare the site would cost \$2,730,000 to develop. Advice from Environment ACT indicates that there are significant ecological constraints with establishing a prison on the site.<sup>48</sup>

3.21. The Honeysuckle Creek site is a significant distance from Canberra Hospital. With a travelling time of up to an hour by car to Civic, this site is not accessible by public transport (to either of the universities or the CIT Reid campus). There is also a limited range of options for employment and industry in the area.<sup>49</sup>

### **Community comment**

3.22. As mentioned above, submitters had contrasting views on the suitability of this site with it supported by the REI but strongly opposed by the former Official Visitor.

3.23. The Rural Lessees Association informed the committee this site is wholly unsuitable because:

- productive land would be taken out of production to the detriment of the ACT economy;
- its resumption would lead to water entrophication if not properly controlled; and
- the access road and infested with kangaroos presenting the prospect of kangaroo/car collisions.<sup>50</sup>

### **Committee comment**

3.24. This site is considered unsuitable because it is the most expensive to develop and is located too far from public transport, courts and community support facilities (including education, health, police and fire services) and because of the concerns raised by the Rural Lessees Association. In addition, families and friends of prisoners and detainees would have significant problems in visiting a prison located at Honeysuckle Creek without private transport.

---

<sup>48</sup> ibid

<sup>49</sup> ibid

<sup>50</sup> ACT Rural Lessees' Association (Submission 46)

## **2. Kinlyside, Block 584**

### **Description**

3.25. The site between block 584 and 587 has no registered lease. The land use category under the Territory Plan is "Residential/Hills, Ridges and Buffers" and does not permit the construction of a prison, without a variation to the Territory Plan.<sup>51</sup>

3.26. The Minister for Urban Services issued a Media Release on 25 May 1999 identifying Kinlyside as the site for the ACT's first rural residential development. Lots are expected to be marketed in the year 2000.<sup>52</sup>

3.27. According to Totalcare, the site would cost \$690,000 to develop, making it the second cheapest site after Symonston. Advice from Environment ACT indicates that there are ecological constraints with establishing a prison on the site.<sup>53</sup>

3.28. The block is a large irregularly shaped block to the east of Hall village. The block does not currently have an existing street frontage, although future construction of Clarrie Hermes Drive will provide a frontage to the southern boundary of the site. The site is bisected by Halls Creek, which is highly eroded. Gently sloping land exists on both sides of the creek, with the upper reaches of the northern part of the block having steeper gradients. The southern portion of the block has sloping land. The site is currently covered by grasslands with some tree cover. Grass fires have been a feature in the past. The flatter parts of the block adjacent to Halls Creek have deep soil profiles supporting grasslands. These soils, with improvement, should support cultivation for cropping. The building of a prison could complement the protection of native grasslands and native species, as much of the area around the actual physical structures would be buffer zones to aid visual surveillance.<sup>54</sup>

3.29. The nearest major hospital to the Kinlyside site is Calvary Hospital in Belconnen, approximately 10 minutes drive and the University of Canberra. Australian National University and CIT campuses are within 20 minutes drive of the site. Kinlyside is more than 20 minutes drive from the Magistrates and Supreme Courts. Mitchell, Belconnen and Canberra Central may provide more employment opportunities. ACTION bus services are currently provided to the new areas in Gungahlin including the adjacent suburb of Nicholls. As residential development increases, a suitable bus service may be available to service a prison on this site. The Kinlyside site is close to, but not abutting, residential housing.

---

<sup>51</sup> ACT Government (Submission 49)

<sup>52</sup> *ibid*

<sup>53</sup> *ibid*

<sup>54</sup> *ibid*

3.30. The Government informed the committee that the community of Hall would have concerns with safety, security, a reduction in property values, the impact on visual community setting and the development of a 'negative town' reputation. The Government further advised that in community consultations Planning and Land Management conducted in Gungahlin mid last year, a group of residents advised that they would welcome the prison in Gungahlin as it would generate important employment opportunities for Gungahlin residents.<sup>55</sup>

### **Community comment**

3.31. The committee received representations from the Village of Hall and District Progress Association about this site.<sup>56</sup> The Association put forward the view that each of the other sites identified would be more suitable than the Kinlyside site because they are reasonably close to the city but not in close proximity to substantial suburban development.

3.32. The Rural Lessees Association considered this was an unsuitable site as the area is designated urban in the near term.<sup>57</sup>

3.33. Ms Neiberding and Mr Kimber raised concerns about the prison being known as the Kinlyside prison, and thus creating a negative association with their family name.<sup>58</sup>

### **Committee comment**

3.34. The committee considers Kinlyside is a suitable site for the prison as it has the second cheapest development costs and meets all the criteria in the siting guidelines. The prospect of rural residential development could complicate the development of this site for a prison but the committee considers this is a matter for the Government to decide in consultation with the local residents. The committee acknowledges that the Government is in the process of developing a Master Plan for Hall and that the Government has supported the creation of a significant buffer around the village.<sup>59</sup> The committee supports this site with the proviso that there would be a significant buffer around the village and that the prison would be considered as part of the Master

---

<sup>55</sup> *ibid*

<sup>56</sup> Village of Hall and District Progress Association (Submission 40) and Transcript 10 June 1999.

<sup>57</sup> Rural Lessees Association (Submission 46)

<sup>58</sup> Ms Neiberding and Mr Kimber (Submission 35)

<sup>59</sup> Village of Hall and District Progress Association (Submission 40)

Plan. The committee also suggests the Government take notice of the concerns raised in Submission 35.

### **3. Majura Block 611**

#### **Description**

3.35. The land use category under the Territory Plan is broadacre. The site is a large deep block with frontage to Majura Road. The block is covered by grasslands with some dispersed trees in the higher steeper land. Grass fires have been a feature in the past. The land has limited or no development constraints such as flooding. The Majura Valley is the route of the proposed Very High Speed Train and Majura Parkway and this may affect the north west corner of the block but the worst case scenario does not inhibit the development of the block as a prison. The site is under the path of aircraft using Canberra Airport. Environmental constraints are not a major issue although there are two main Aboriginal sites that would have to be avoided but should not be a problem with careful design.<sup>60</sup>

3.36. The site is ranked by Totalcare as the third most expensive to develop with a projected cost of \$1,035,000.

3.37. The site is 15 minutes from Calvary and Canberra Hospitals and 10-15 minutes to Civic. The site is reasonably located to employment and industry centres but not easily accessible by public transport. It is approximately 20 minutes drive to the courts.

#### **Community comment**

3.38. The Tuggeranong Community Council suggested this would be the best site because it would provide a buffer to external perimeter and clear to visual surveillance and because there are no neighbouring areas, there would be no intrusion on residential areas. The Council also noted it is easily accessible for visitors and close to courts.<sup>61</sup>

3.39. The Rural Lessees' Association suggested this site is unsuitable because it would mean rural land would be taken out of production and although its closeness to

---

<sup>60</sup> ACT Government (Submission 49)

<sup>61</sup> Tuggeranong Community Council (Submission 34)

Canberra is an asset, its location so close to the airport would be detrimental to the management of the prison and its staff.<sup>62</sup>

**Committee comment**

3.40. Members were impressed with the site upon initial viewing because it appeared to meet all of the criteria in the siting guidelines. It was also far enough away from residential housing to pose no threat to property values or community safety, but still close enough to the city to enable reasonable access to courts, community facilities and for visitors.

3.41. However, the site initially shown to the committee in an inspection organised by officials of the Department of Justice and Community Safety and PALM appeared to change on a second inspection and in the Totalcare attachment to the Government submission.

3.42. While it would not cause any problems with community safety concerns or reductions in property values, public transport would have to be provided creating additional costs.

3.43. The site now identified is not considered suitable by the majority of the committee because its nightlights are likely to interfere with night time air traffic to Canberra Airport and it is more expensive than two other suitable sites. The committee notes that this concern about nightlights has been identified without the assistance of professional expertise such as CASA. The committee's position on the suitability of this site could change if such professional advice could eliminate the nightlights as a problem.

3.44. One committee member, Mr Hird MLA, did prefer Majura as a potential site, but the actual site he prefers is next to Block 611, where the nightlights are not a problem. This is the site originally shown to members on the first site inspection.

---

<sup>62</sup> Rural Lessees' Association (Submission 46)

#### **4. Symonston Block 4, Section 102**

##### **Description**

3.45. The Monaro Highway and Jerrabomberra Avenue form the eastern boundary of the property; Mugga Lane the western boundary and Narrabundah Lane the northern boundary. The land use category under the Territory Plan is broadacre. The contour and gradient of the land would permit the location of a prison. The land has limited or no development restraints, such as flooding. The western higher part of the block is characterised by steeper sloping woodlands. The lower eastern portion of the block is gently sloping grasslands with the area closest to the Monaro highway containing a number of ephemeral (usually dry) streams that drain eastwards under the Monaro Highway. Bush fires and grass fires have been a feature of this site in the past. The eastern, flatter portion of the block is covered in soils supporting grasslands. The higher western portion of the block has shallower soils.

3.46. This land is Territory-owned and there is no registered lease on the property. However there is an unregistered quarterly lease covering the actual block and an adjoining block. The Government advised that acquisition impediments would be minimal.<sup>63</sup>

3.47. According to Totalcare, Symonston is the cheapest site to develop with costs estimated at \$150,000. Advice from Environment ACT indicates that there are some ecological constraints with establishing a prison on the site, but the building footprint and the design and construction methods employed can be modified to take into account these issues. The Government advised that ‘negotiation with Environment ACT on these matters would ensure that the establishment of a prison at Symonston proceeds in an environmentally sensitive fashion and in a manner compatible with the protection of these native grasslands’. The Government further advised that ‘the establishment of a prison could complement the protection of these grasslands and native species, as much of the area around the actual physical structures would be buffer zones to aid visual surveillance’.<sup>64</sup>

3.48. A prison built on this site would be close to a range of education and health support facilities. Woden Police station is also close, as are fire services (located at Fyshwick). Access to facilities and services in Woden would be approximately 5 minutes by car. The site also provides a range of potential employment and training opportunities in the surrounding area. Potential employment and industry centres on major transport routes from the site include Woden, South Canberra, Fyshwick and Queanbeyan. The site at Symonston also is near transport routes to Civic, providing reasonable access to the Australian National University and the CIT campus at Reid.

---

<sup>63</sup> *ibid*

<sup>64</sup> *ibid*

Access to these facilities is approximately 15 minutes drive. The Symonston site is within 20 minutes drive of the Magistrates and Supreme Courts.<sup>65</sup>

### **Community comment**

3.49. The committee received three detailed submissions from the lessee, Ms Jennifer Ipkendanz. Ms Ipkendanz has strong objections to this site being used for a prison. Her objections are based mainly on environmental concerns. Ms Ipkendanz questioned how Totalcare engineers and architects could have visited the site without her being aware of the visit. She also raised significant environmental concerns about the natural grasslands and endangered species (Eastern Lined Earless Dragon) challenging how the environmental value of the site could be preserved with the construction of a prison. She notes that the additional costs of preserving environmental assets should be taken into account in the cost assessments as should the additional costs for road works identified as \$100,000 on page 8 of the Totalcare report. Ms Ipkendanz also pointed out that the site identified by Totalcare is 27 ha not the required 48 ha and the prison could have a noise impact on the Sundown Village Complex.<sup>66</sup>

3.50. The submission received from Friends of Grasslands presents an optimistic view of how ecological values can be maintained with development. Friends of Grasslands noted that that locating the prison at Symonston could result in positive environmental outcomes rather than negative outcomes if the prison was carefully sited and contained within a large broadacre buffer zone.<sup>67</sup>

3.51. The Sundown Village raised objections to the siting of a prison at Symonston. The village has 44 homes and approval for 44 more. The motel part of the Village has 174 rooms and regularly hosts 100 visits or more per year of school groups and senior citizen groups. The Village is adjacent to the ACT Government's Long Stay Caravan Park. The Village expressed concerns for resident safety and noted the majority of the elderly residents were experiencing stress because of concerns about contact with prison escapees.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> *ibid*

<sup>66</sup> Jennifer Ipkendanz (Submissions 26,36 and 50)

<sup>67</sup> Friends of Grasslands (Submission 44)

<sup>68</sup> Sundown Village (Submission 29)

### **Committee comment**

3.52. The committee rates the Symonston site as suitable as it is the least expensive to develop and meets all of the siting guidelines. There could be environmental barriers but advice to date indicates the prison complex could be located in such a way as to protect the grasslands and native species. The committee trusts that the PA and possibly EIS would provide for further work on the assessment of environmental impact. The committee recommends that if this site is chosen by the Government, that community consultation and education is undertaken for nearby residents, particularly those at the Sundown Village and Longstay Caravan Park.

### **Conclusion**

3.53. The committee has given careful consideration to where the new prison complex should be sited.

3.54. The siting guidelines produced by the Corrections Committee were very useful in directing the committee's attention to the important issues to be considered in relation to the site.

3.55. The committee was disappointed that the Majura site fell out of contention towards the end of the process. Members were impressed with the site upon initial viewing because it appeared to meet all of the criteria in the siting guidelines. Importantly it was far enough away from residential housing to pose no threat to property values or community safety, but still close enough to the city to enable reasonable access to courts, community facilities and for visitors.

3.56. However, the site initially shown to the committee in an inspection organised by officials of the Department of Justice and Community Safety and PALM appeared to change on a second inspection and in the Totalcare attachment to the Government submission. The second inspection raised doubts in the minds of committee members that the Majura site may not be acceptable because the night lights of the prison could present a danger to airport traffic. The Majura site also was reported as being much more expensive to develop compared with Symonston and Kinlyside. On the basis of potential obstruction to aircraft and cost, the committee eliminated this site as a contender.

3.57. The committee has decided to recommend two sites to the Government. This will give the Government some flexibility if one site becomes untenable due to new information or community rejection. Based on the information available to the committee at this stage, the two sites recommended for consideration for a prison site are Kinlyside and Symonston.

3.58. While the Symonston site rates well on cost, there are some environmental and community concerns which will need further attention from experts. Also there is some doubt about where the actual site would be located because the site identified by Totalcare was only indicative.

3.59. Kinlyside was also rated suitable for a prison site. It appears to meet all of the criteria in the siting guidelines, although according to Totalcare, it would cost more to develop than Symonston. The main difficulty with this site concerns the Government's plans to develop it for rural/residential, although the Minister for Urban Services has claimed that it would be possible to do both. Whatever the Government decides, the committee encourages the Government to incorporate new plans for Kinlyside into the Management Plan.

3.60. One committee member, Mr Hird MLA, informed the committee that he preferred Majura (the block next to Block 611) and Symonston as sites for the ACT prison complex. Mr Hird does not support Kinlyside as a suitable location for the prison and therefore does not agree with the following recommendation.

#### ***Recommendation 4***

**The committee recommends that the Government consider either Kinlyside or Symonston as a site for the new ACT prison complex.**

Mr Paul Osborne MLA

Chair

30 June 1999



## **Appendix A: Submissions**

1. Mr Bill Aldcroft
2. Mr Leonard Barratt
3. Ms Jennifer Holmes
4. Confidential
5. Canberra Schizophrenia Fellowship Inc.
6. R I Morse
7. Corrections Corporation of Australia Pty. Ltd. and Concrete Constructions
8. Prisoners Aid (ACT) Inc.
9. ACT Council of Churches
10. The Parole Board of the ACT
11. The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Canberra Regional Meeting
12. Victims of Crime Coordinator
13. The Law Society of the ACT
14. Justice ACTION
15. The Salvation Army
16. NSW Council for Civil Liberties Inc.
17. Alternatives to Violence Project
18. Assisting Drug Dependents Incorporated (ADDINC)
19. Australian Institute of Criminology
20. The Uniting Church - Presbytery of Canberra Region
21. Ms Hellen Cooke
22. Mr Doug McIver
23. ACT Ombudsman
24. Social Justice Committee of ANGLICARE
25. ACT Council of Social Service Inc (ACTCOSS)

26. Ms Jennifer Ipkendanz
27. Official Visitor, Belconnen Remand Centre, Periodic Detention Centre
28. Women's Electoral Lobby ACT
29. Sundown Village
30. Australasian Correctional Services Pty Ltd
31. Weston Creek Community Council
32. Tom Campbell
33. Community and Public Sector Union, ACT Branch
34. Tuggeranong Community Council Inc
35. Mrs Alison Neiberding and Mr Peter Kimber
36. Ms Jennifer Ipkendanz (supplementary)
37. Mr Fred Leftwich and Mr Jim Jeffrey
38. Mr Bill Aldcroft (supplementary)
37. Mr Fred Leftwich and Mr Jim Jeffrey
40. Village of Hall and District Progress Association Inc.
41. Mr Stuart Weller
42. The Real Estate Institute of the ACT Ltd
43. Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform
44. Friends of Grasslands Inc
45. Women's Alcohol and Other Drug Working Party (WAOD)
46. ACT Rural Lessees' Association
47. ACT Government (general)
48. Pamela Burton
49. ACT Government (siting)
50. Ms Jennifer Ipkendanz (supplementary)

## **Appendix B: Public Hearings**

### **Wednesday 17 March 1999**

- Ms Lyn Morgain and Mr Adam Stankevicius (ACTCOSS)
- Mr Leonard Barratt
- Ms Maureen Cane and Ms Deborah Felton (ADDINC)
- Bishop Richard Randerson and Bishop Patrick Power (ACT Churches Council)
- Dr Hugh Smith (Prisoners Aid)
- Mr Brenton Holmes (Anglicare)
- Ms Charlotte Henderson, Ms Fion Brooke-Watson and Mr Peter Olorneshaw (Alternatives to Violence Project)
- Ms Jennifer Ipkendanz
- Major Marie Gittins (Salvation Army)
- Dr Brian Turner and Mr Bill Aldcroft (Quakers)

### **Tuesday 18 May 1999**

- Professor David Biles
- Mr Tim Gooden and Ms Sue Bull (Community and Public Sector Union, ACT Branch)
- Mr Bill Bush and Mr Brian McConnell (Families and Friends for Drug Law Reform)
- Ms Sukalpa Goldflam and Ms Barbara Knight (Women's Alcohol and Other Drug Working Party)
- Mr Ian Morse
- Mr Michael Swzarcbord, Ms Lynne Grayson and Mr James Ryan (ACT Corrections Health Board)
- Mr Fred Leftwich and Mr Jim Jeffrey and Mr Paul Brandy
- Mr Art Langston and Mr Geoff Robertson (Friends of Grasslands)
- Mr Harold Adams (Rural Leaseholders Association)
- Professor David Hambly and Mr John Hyndes and Mr Greg Cadman (ACT Parole Board)

## **APPENDIX C: GOVERNMENT'S SITING GUIDELINES**

## **APPENDIX D: TOTALCARE REPORT**

## **APPENDIX E: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**