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1.00 INTRODUCTION

1.01 BUILDING IDENTIFICATION AND NUMBERING

1.01.1 Dermoudy, in his October 1984 report\(^1\), clarified confusing numbering of buildings from established evidence. This evidence varied from the original drawings, Nos.DE 2858-60 of 10.8.43, prepared by the Allied Works Council (AWC), to a Naval Survey conducted in May 1949, to a Commonwealth Department of Works (CDW) Site Plan No.DE3625 of 5.7.65 (traced from RAAF Drg. No.49/50/187 of 1945), to numbers painted on remaining buildings by Dept of Agriculture caretaker, George Francis, in the period 1964-67.

1.01.2 NUMBERING ADOPTED IN THE 1984 REPORT AND IN THIS REPORT IS THAT USED IN CDW PLAN DE3625 ABOVE PLUS NEW ENTRIES FROM AND INCLUDING NO.71 ONWARDS.

1.01.3 NUMBERS IN BRACKETS, IN THIS REPORT, REFER TO NUMBERS PAINTED ON BUILDINGS BY GEO. FRANCIS AND WHICH ARE GENERALLY AT VARIANCE WITH ABOVE.

1.01.4 BUILDINGS NOS.1-31 ARE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT BY THEIR NAVAL USAGE (AWC PLANS).

Plate 1. Shell Store, building No.22, displayed the Geo. Francis No.17. Scavengers stole internal columns and the building is now in total collapse.
1.02 SEPTEMBER 1990 STATUS

1.02.1 All of the original World War II buildings on the site were designed in Melbourne by the Allied Works Council, Department of the Interior, in August 1943.

1.02.2 The 1984 Dermoudy report, referred to above, recorded some 41 sites as having standing structures varying from dangerous to good condition. This 1990 report records that this number is now tragically reduced to 28. Of 20 significant wooden framed buildings in 1983 only seven remain, three in reasonable condition and another four in poor/dangerous condition.

1.02.3 Whilst concrete floor slabs remain from the demolished buildings and whilst these are easily identified [plate 2], the intrinsic value of the site, apart from its extent, is its standing structures and in particular the wooden framed structure No.30 (26). This laboratory building [Cover Photo], built for the examination of depth charges and war heads, is one of the most significant examples of tropical architecture in the Northern Territory.

Plate 2. Steps and floor slab to Chief and Petty Officers Quarters, No.43, demolished prior to 1964, remain as important features.

1.02.4 Originally there were seven laboratory buildings of similar ilk constructed along the siding. Three (Nos.16-18) and a Laboratory Store, No.19, were destroyed in late 1962 in an accidental explosion during RAAF occupancy and another three (Nos. 11,12 and 26) and another Laboratory Store, No.13, were destroyed by fire between 1984 and the time of writing.

1.02.5 Of four Shell Stores recorded in 1983, Nos.22, 23, 28 and 29, only two of the wooden framed warehouse style buildings remain- No.23 (18) in dangerous condition and No.28 (24) in vandalised but reasonably stable condition.
1.02.6 Building No.1 (1), the Dockyard Store, was heavily vandalised and stripped of internal columns and most lower wall sheeting which at the time of writing has led to the collapse of its northern section. Similarly Building No.2 (2), the Empty Package Store, has virtually totally collapsed due to the same causes [Plate 3].

Plate 3. Empty Package Store, No.2, demolished by actions of scavengers.

1.02.7 The Shell Painting and the Shell Scraping buildings [Plate 9], Nos.24 and 25 (19 and 20), have both suffered roof and wall collapses due to ingress of rot into the structural timbers. This was caused by scavengers who removed wall sheeting thus allowing rainwater penetration into the woodwork.

1.02.8 Lack of supervision and maintenance has also led to termite infestation of some timbers. This possibility is of great concern to the most substantial of the remaining buildings, the 1956 RAAF Laboratory, No.57.
1.03 SEVERED RAIL CONNECTION

1.03.1 The complex as a railway siding ceased to exist following the closure of the NAR Birdum/Darwin railway immediately after Cyclone Tracy in 1975 and the subsequent disposal of major sections of the main line.

1.03.2 Fortunately Snake Creek siding was excluded from the disposals schedules and remains in situ within the complex, beginning at the western end of the Bridge, No.71 [Plate 4], and continuing through 2.85km to the original end 100m north of Shelter No.31 (27).
2.01 SETTING

2.01.1 The point where the access road meets the siding is Latitude 13° 13' 30"S; Longitude 131° 5' 15"E.

2.01.2 No survey plans exist for this place.

2.01.3 In this report the place has been given arbitrary boundaries which include other abandoned WW1 camp sites along the Eastern boundary and in the vicinity of the Katherine to Manton power transmission line pylon K-M 453:

(a) Northern boundary - a 900m extension of Strickland Road to the west

(b) Eastern boundary - western edge of the old Stuart Highway from intersection with northern boundary south to northern bank of Snake Creek,

(c) Southern boundary - northern bank of Snake Creek from old Stuart Highway west to railway bridge,

(d) Western boundary - eastern bank of Snake Creek from railway bridge north to a point due west of tank No.49, thence to western end of northern boundary,

(e) Bridge and remaining rail (un-included in above area) for a distance of 10m all round.

2.01.4 This place is under land claim: Finnis River No.39.
2.02 FENCING

2.02.1 There are no fences or barriers delineating the complex.

2.02.2 There is a padlocked double gate across the entry road to the NE of tank complex No.47 bearing a sign advising visitors that a key may be obtained from the Adelaide River Police Station. There is also a well worn vehicle detour track around the southern gate post indicating that the offer of a key was seldom accepted.

2.02.3 An attempt to rectify the situation in mid 1990 by installing a second set of gates closer to the Stuart Highway, in a decline to prevent similar detours from being formed, resulted in the new gates being totally destroyed by a vehicle driven from the inside of the complex. Presumably this vandal had entered the complex via the track over the plains to the north and was unwilling to backtrack when confronted with the new gates. These gates were replaced late September.

Plate 5. Second set of gates in two months illustrates seriousness of vandalism.
2.03 EXISTING ACCESS WAYS

2.03.1 ROAD.

(a) The current accepted entry to the complex is via the 750m long sealed road which leads WSW off the Stuart Highway 2.75km north of the township of Adelaide River. This road, constructed during WWII, is in need of urgent repair in a number of places but remains in good all-weather condition generally.

(b) Within the complex itself a sealed road runs the length of the siding from Building No.1 north to the end of the rail line. This road is usable, with caution, by all vehicles during the Dry Season but becomes questionable during the Wet Season due to areas where the paving has become damaged allowing deep ponding and bogging to occur. These patches effect less than 1% of the length of the road and are readily repairable.

(c) A sealed loop road serves Laboratory Building, No.57 and similar loop systems serve Camp Area, No.2. These loops are in fair all weather condition except for a floodway on one of the loops in Camp Area No.2 which can become overgrown and boggy in the Wet Season.

2.03.2 RAIL.

As reported in 1.03.1, the original 2.85km of railway siding lines are in situ within the complex and begin on the western end of the rail bridge, No.71. Some removal and vandalism has occurred to the point-switching mechanisms to some spur lines.

In general the siding is in good condition. It would only require minor repairs to wooden sleepers on the bridge, minor rail repairs and clearing along the line, to allow the passage of light rail vehicles, through the complex, in all weathers.

2.03.3 TRACKS.

(a) Access to the complex can be gained by most conventional two wheel drive vehicles in the Dry Season via existing rough tracks from the north or via a reasonably well defined track leading off the old Stuart Highway 900m north of the Snake Creek road bridge. Four wheel drive vehicles would have year round access via these tracks. From current ground scatter evidence it would appear that both of these tracks originated as access tracks to RAAF dump and disposal areas.

(b) Unsealed and roughly formed tracks within the complex provide access to the hill top squatters tanks Nos.48-51, Bore and Pump house No.18A and to the Detonator Stores, Nos.19A and 19B.

2.03.4 PATHS.

(a) A reasonably well defined foot track leads from Camp Creek Road into the complex immediately to the north of the railway bridge, No.71. This track which crosses Snake Creek would be seasonal in usability.

(b) Foot access to the complex from all directions, by bush-walking, in any weather, is always possible.
(c) Partially formed footpaths can be discerned in Camp Area No.1 leading among the relics of floor slabs and levelings. These, no doubt, eased AWC pedestrian access to dormitory sites along the rocky slopes of Mt. Sheppard during the construction phase of the complex.

Plate 6. Typical of tent bases scattered along northern slopes of Mount Sheppard.

2.04 SERVICES

2.04.1 Currently there are no power or telephone services available within the complex. A few steel poles remain.

2.04.2 The water reticulation system including the fire fighting main has been badly vandalised, stolen and neglected to the point where it virtually no longer exists. The bore at 18A remains as an obvious re-commissioning point for a water supply.

2.04.3 From a sewerage aspect it is possible that one of the abandoned latrine blocks or the septic tank and toilets at Laboratory No.57 may be capable of being re-commissioned.
### 2.05 SCHEDULE OF REMAINING STANDING BUILT FEATURES

2.02.1 For a description of the original buildings refer to Appendix 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLD NO</th>
<th>NAVAL USE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>ACTION REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>Dockyard Store</td>
<td>Northern half in total collapse, remainder in dangerous partial collapse.</td>
<td>Demolish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>Empty Package Store</td>
<td>Total collapse except for N.E. corner</td>
<td>Demolish remainder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Fair, paint beginning to peel from internal surfaces</td>
<td>Repaint internally.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>None.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Rusty interior with little paint remaining</td>
<td>None.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Advanced corrosion of most nuts and bolts, some sag in Armco sections apparent. Little interior paint remaining</td>
<td>Provide ARC mesh entrance barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18A</td>
<td>Pump House</td>
<td>All wall and roof cladding removed</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A</td>
<td>Detonator Store</td>
<td>Good, some minor spalling of concrete</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19B</td>
<td>Detonator Store</td>
<td>Good, some minor spalling of concrete</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (15)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>As Bldg 10</td>
<td>Provide ARC mesh entrance barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (16)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>As Bldg 10</td>
<td>Provide ARC mesh entrance barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (18)</td>
<td>Shell Store</td>
<td>Structurally unsound, all but one internal column removed. Walls and roof in sound condition</td>
<td>Replace missing columns, provide ARC mesh entrance barrier until completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 (20)</td>
<td>25 (19)</td>
<td>27,27A (22,23)</td>
<td>28 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Painting Room</td>
<td>Shell Scraping Room</td>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>Shell Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structurally unsound due to 75% collapse of walls and roof</td>
<td>Structurally unsound due to 70% collapse of walls and roof.</td>
<td>Doubtful structural integrity, as Bldg 10.</td>
<td>Reasonable except for removed lower sheeting on N, W and S walls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Exterior condition of Armco sections should be assessed by excavation in accordance with Burra Charter, Article 24.

^ Building has timber wall and roof framing.

+ Building has masonry walls, timber roof framing.
2.06 NON STANDING BUILT REMAINS

2.06.1 Many concrete floor slabs remain as relics of buildings removed following disposal action, accidental explosion, vandalism and bush fires.

2.06.2 Significant slabs are identified and located on the enclosed map.

2.06.3 Other un-recorded, nondescript slabs and levellings are evident in Camp Areas 1 and 2 and near Dumps 74 and 76.

2.06.4 A number of displaced and sacked fire hose cabinets remain at intervals along the siding as reminders of scavengers and vandals who destroyed the water reticulation system.

2.07 SCATTER REMAINS

2.07.1 Fire charred debris of destroyed buildings remains as it fell, sometimes interspersed with similarly charred building contents. A fine example of this is Cartridge Store No. 15 which, at the time of its destruction between 1967 and 1980, contained hospital furniture [Plate 7].


2.07.2 Buildings which have collapsed due to irresponsible scavenging of key structural components, such as columns, remain as heaps of rubble as they fell. Some of these buildings continue to be scavenged for usable corrugated iron sheeting.
2.07.3 Dump Sites 72-77 comprise scatters of dumped RAAF armaments paraphernalia including bomb components, bomb crates, rocket components and boxes, flares, munitions boxes, projectiles and similar objects, to Glycol drums, camp equipment, 2001 drums, vehicle and machinery components and many other objects too numerous to list in this study.

2.07.4 All of the dump sites have been burnt. No.72 in particular shows evidence of intense heat, probably from burning flares, which has melted bomb fuses for example, into barely recognisable shapes. The dumps can be roughly categorised according to the predominance of one class of object in each dump as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dump</th>
<th>Predominant Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Flares, projectiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73,74</td>
<td>Bomb crates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Ammunition boxes and clips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76,77</td>
<td>Glycol and camp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.07.5 A broad characteristic of scatter on the complex is the number of steel, hinged, rocket motor crates to be found in unexpected locations.

2.07.6 Along the track leading to the north of Dump 73 can be found a series of craters formed by the intentional demolition of condemned high explosive devices. Shrapnel from these activities is to be found in and around these craters.

2.07.7 Evidence of civilian dumping in the form of motor vehicles, bottles and other household debris, is axiomatic.

Plate 8. Bomb crates dominate scatter of Dump No.73
2.08 ASSESSMENT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

2.08.1 The following assessments are made in full recognition of the provisions of the "Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance", Clause 1.5, in that these statements do not involve or take account of such issues as the necessity for conservation action, legal constraints, possible uses, structural stability or costs and returns. These issues will be dealt with later.

2.08.2 AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

(a) Both the road access from the Stuart Highway and the rail access over the bridge have high aesthetic values. They help to maintain a sense of mystery in that the complex is invisible from established public ways and one must travel a certain distance before discovering this development hidden away in the foothills of Mt. Sheppard.

(b) By its very nature, an explosives storage area is novel to the general public, with few people having any conception of what to expect.

(c) The first impression is one of awe at its size and the fact that so few people know of its whereabouts. At nearly three kilometres in length, containing as great a length again of internal tracks and roads it is, in Territory terms, amazing.

(d) Visitors are pleased by the gentle meandering nature of the siding along the lower slopes of the ridge after its beginning at the simple but elegant rail bridge.

(e) The semi-underground, barrel vaulted, shelters possess the well known aura of caves or tunnels and this coupled to the strange, perhaps restricted, world of explosives laid somewhat bare in the dumps, never ceases to delight and mystify the visitor.

(f) The wooden framed laboratory building No.30 (26) [Plate 10] is probably unique in the world from both an aesthetic and a scientific point of view because of its architectural solution to handling humid tropical conditions [Plate 10]. The resultant building has the refined dignity of a Japanese temple and usually evinces comments of this kind from even the most prosaic of viewers.

(g) The Shell Painting and Scraping Rooms, Nos.24 and 25 (20 and 19) are also unique in function and aesthetic values [Plate 9].
Plate 9. Shell Scraping Room, Building No.25 (19) should be restored because of its unique architecture.

Plate 10. Examination of Warheads and Depth Charges Laboratory No.30 (26) combines best features of architectural solutions for controlling tropical conditions.
2.08.3 HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

(a) Australia's major battleground during WWll was the Northern Territory when many hastily constructed military installations were built to enlarge our defence capabilities.

(b) One of the largest was this complex which significantly remains as in situ evidence of the event.

(c) The majority of military installations were sold by the Commonwealth Disposals Commission as soon after hostilities ceased as possible. Fortunately, from an historic and scientific point of view, this one continued for some time under the aegis of the RAAF due to continuing global unrest.

(d) Despite the latent loss of a number of features the remaining structures must be considered to be highly representative of the historic event of war in the Northern Territory and Australia's role in global affairs.

(e) This complex allows a rare glimpse into a very limited time capsule at a time of highly significant events and constraints. The numbers of people who were associated with its construction and use are dwindling with time.

(f) Future generations now have the opportunity to experience at first hand how events in the early 1940's required special solutions and caused such remote and unique complexes to be formed.

(g) This complex is the best example of in situ evidence of Adelaide River Township's high profile during WWll.
2.08.4 SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

(a) The dumps give an historic and scientific insight into products and techniques that lasted only twenty odd years, the buildings remind us of the violent requirements of instruments of war and their specialised handling requirements in the neo-atomic age.

(b) The design of the storage buildings is critical for controlling the temperatures of their contents. The use of Armco semi underground shelters is a good example of using the natural insulating qualities of earth. The earth is used in another way as well- for strafing armour and blast protection in the event of accident or enemy action which otherwise could cause a chain reaction to destroy the whole complex. The spacing between buildings is also critical to this factor.

(c) The last remaining WW11 laboratory, Building 30 (26), [Plate 10], is the epitome of good tropical design techniques. It used the principle of wide eaves and roof space ventilation to its fullest and combined this with low heat inertia wall construction. Because this building was isolated, earth bunds were sufficient blast proofing. Where the laboratories were grouped eg. Building Nos.11, 12 and 13 [Plate 11] and 16, 17, 18 and 19, massive concrete blast walls were erected between each building.

Plate 11. Vandalised remains of two laboratories and a laboratory store.
Laboratory No.57, constructed in 1957, illustrates the final engineering approach to the temperature control of explosives—it was air conditioned.

2.09 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

2.09.1 One of the most complete and technically significant WW11 Military Sites in the Northern Territory.

2.09.2 A vital physical link in the history of the the only war fought on Australian soil and in particular the military history of Adelaide River.

3.00 CONSERVATION STRATEGY

3.01 IDENTIFICATION OF HAZARDS

3.01.1 FIRE

(a) The greatest threat to the remaining wooden buildings is fire, whether deliberately lit or not. Annual bush fires are a fact of life in the Top End and the vegetation within the place itself is a product of such events.

(b) When the complex was manned any outbreak of fire was of major concern and the well engineered fire main was an important part of fire control strategy. Even if this facility still existed it is doubtful whether in an unmonitored state it could be relied upon to provide water when required. Storage tanks are one of the favourite targets for irresponsible shooters, hydrants can be left turned on and hoses slashed and stolen.

(c) When occupied, vegetation control was carried out on a regular basis and monitored. Following abandonment, vegetation encroached up to and over the buildings and the smallest of bush fires has been capable of destroying buildings (some clearing was carried out around Building Nos. 28[24] and 30[26] in August 1990).

(d) Conversely a building destroyed by encroaching vegetation alight which, in turn, could spread fire to adjacent buildings.

(f) Fire fighting in such steep terrain is extremely difficult and apart from the necessity to save buildings, is probably of little consequence to the setting.

3.01.2 VANDALISM

Vandals in their inimitable style have employed arson, wrenching, ramming, stone throwing, shooting and graffiti in their efforts to destroy something of value.

3.01.3 SCAVENGING

The theft of internal columns and wall sheeting not only destroyed the aesthetics of the buildings but more importantly destroyed their structural integrity. In the first instance the buildings collapsed quickly, in the second, rainwater in the structural timbers encouraged dry rot with the same ultimate result but over a slightly longer time.

Scavenging has been particularly rife in this complex. The Department of Lands and Housing has recently had an official approach made to it to allow a certain organisation the right to scavenge. Fortunately after a disastrous episode with a caretaker granted similar rights, it refused.
3.01.4 LACK OF MAINTENANCE

(a) This is becoming more and more evident with the deterioration of the sealed roads within the complex. Attention is also wanting to some of the culverts which are adding to the road problems.

(b) Termite and dry rot infestation is uncontrolled.

(c) Rain water is penetrating the buildings through missing windows and doors adding to the problems above and creating others.

(d) The structural condition of the Armco Shelters can only be assessed by inspecting typical underground faces and fixings to determine the total amount of corrosion present. However it is evident that serious corrosion is underway and visitation to some shelters should be discouraged from a safety point of view.

(e) See Schedule 2.05 for report on condition of buildings remaining standing.

3.01.5 ISOLATION

Although only some 3km from a fully manned police station, and considerably less than most people have to travel to work daily, the apparent remoteness and desolation appears to have a deleterious effect on many people's minds, inciting many of the actions described above.

3.02 CONTROL OF HAZARDS

3.02.1 FIRE

(a) Vegetation control out to the far edges of earth bunds or a distance of 20m from all faces of the wooden framed buildings, whichever is the greater, must be conscientiously carried out at least once annually. This should be in the form of grubbing, raking and chemical control to absolutely ensure a TOTAL absence of growth within the prescribed areas.

(b) Fire detection and fire fighting techniques will depend heavily upon management and future development of the complex. For example, all of the wooden framed buildings, including Laboratory No.57, must be fitted with smoke detectors which should be hard wired to control panels. If smoke is detected the information could be sent to a number of possible recipients listed in descending order of preference:

- On site Caretaker/Manager
- Security firm in Darwin with 24 hour monitoring
- Adelaide River Police Station/ Bush Fire Brigade

(c) For any of the above to operate reliably and effectively a telephone line is essential.
(d) Electricity (in small amounts) is essential for the smoke detectors and could be solar generated and battery stored. If any form of occupancy is decided upon, town power would be more desirable than generators and should be utilised for energising the fire detector and telephone system.

(e) Fire fighting techniques within the buildings would ideally comprise automatic systems employing water (sprinklers) or compressed inert gas, backed up by a ring fire main and conventional hydrants. As discussed in 3.01(b) such an ideal could be impractical, if the complex remains unoccupied, due to vandalism and theft.

(f) Next on a descending scale would be an on site fire tender/tanker manned by a Caretaker/Manager. The drawbacks to this arrangement are many: absence from site, mechanical failure of vehicle/pump and ineptitude of the operator.

(g) Should the complex remain unoccupied fire fighting will have to depend upon the local Bush Fire Brigade whose response time would be critical to the survival of the buildings.

3.02.2 VANDALISM AND SCAVENGING

The only method available to combat these two scourges is fear of detection encouraged by publicised prosecutions which illustrate that detection is ongoing and effective.

(a) This fear can be encouraged by two methods, by showing active or passive threats of detection.

(b) Active threats can range from guard dogs to: police patrols, security firm patrols, caretakers, surveillance cameras, volunteer rangers and best of all, occupation.

(c) Passive threats can range from: well kept signs warning of laws and penalties to electronic alarms, purposeful looking fencing, tourist visitation to public education.

(d) To be completely fair, the public must be made aware of the area of concern and its boundaries. To this end, some form of delineation (fencing) of intruder-sensitive boundaries must be made and the number of entrance points restricted. Each entrance point must be clearly signed with heritage information and penalty warnings for law infringements.

(e) Two of the suggested boundaries (2.01.3) utilise portions of Snake Creek which generally has banks steep enough to discourage most 4WD vehicles. Mt. Sheppard and the ridge to the west of the majority of the length of the siding is rough and in parts, very steep. Therefore fencing need not be continuous to all boundaries but sufficient to discourage entry where unwanted access is easy. Thus 2km of fencing should be adequate.
(f) The comparatively well used track entering from the north should have barrier signs erected at its Camp Creek Road junction advising "No access to Heritage Site: Snake Creek WW11 Munitions Depot".

3.02.3 REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE

(a) In simple terms the requirements of this complex are to reconstruct, where feasible and practical, damage caused by hazards outlined in 3.01 above. The work scheduled is the minimum necessary to ensure public safety, basic stability and weather proofing of the buildings.

(b) Schedule 2.05 lists work required to selected standing buildings to stabilise and protect them from continuing degradation. The work scheduled is in accordance with the following ICOMOS (Burra Charter) definitions for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance under Article 1:

1.4 Conservation
1.5 Maintenance
1.6 Preservation
1.7 Restoration
1.8 Reconstruction

(c) Other works include road and culvert maintenance to original standard, replace rail sleepers to Bridge (No.71) and clear railway tracks of debris and vegetation.
4.00 MANAGEMENT

4.01 On site caretaker/manager

4.01.1 The ideal method of ensuring a safe future for the complex would be to engage the services of a full time caretaker/manager. There are several ways in which the prudence of such a solution can be justified economically:

(a) If we look at the destruction over the last seven years and put a conservative replacement estimate on the thirteen wooden framed buildings lost in that time of say $250,000 and add another $75,000 worth of damage to the remaining buildings and places, we derive an average figure of almost $46,500 per year.

Granted, if nothing is done and the complex allowed to become more derelict, the cost of annual damage must fall to zero when there is nothing left to maintain.

(b) If replacement insurance cover could be obtained for the present remote, unfenced, abandoned, unwatered, overgrown complex, and if public risk liability coverage was possible, the premiums would grossly exceed the figure of $46,500 in (a).

(c) Establishment costs would depend upon the scale of future development and the total role of the caretaker/manager. Should the complex be placed in private hands as a tourist destination it is possible that establishment costs could be borne by the operator. See Chapter 6.00.

(d) Operating figures could vary from outgoings for salaries and utilities costs for a paid caretaker to an income from rent and/or royalties from a private operator.

(e) A reduction in the standard, and establishment cost, of fencing would also be possible.

(f) Reduced insurance premiums because of reduced risks of illegal actions and possible fast fire fighting response.

4.01.2 Interpretation of a higher standard is possible with full time staffing instead of the rugged, passive type required by unmanned destinations.

4.01.3 Litter can be controlled.
4.01.4 MINIMUM BUILT FACILITIES

The following built facilities would be required for an on site caretaker/manager whether privately run or otherwise:

(a) 1200mm high star picket fence with three plain and two barbed strands, cyclone wire gates.
(b) Residence, new or adapted existing building.
(c) Town Power
(d) Telephone
(e) Water supply
(f) Sanitary system
(g) Smoke detectors as 3.02.1(b)

4.01.5 ENHANCEMENT FACILITIES

Although not critical the following enhancements would be desirable:

(a) Security lighting
(b) Public toilets (new or adapted existing latrine/toilet)
(c) Fire main with hydrants and header/storage tank
(d) Fire sprinklers or inert gas system
(e) Fire truck/tanker

4.02 PART TIME CARETAKER

4.02.1 Part time caretaking could be effected in two ways:

(a) A resident from nearby could be employed or contracted to man the complex during daylight hours or during set opening times. Security patrols at infrequent spacings during the night would be required as a secondary strategy.

(b) A private tourist operator with atleast two scheduled tours of the complex daily, backed up with security patrols as above.

4.02.2 MINIMUM BUILT FACILITIES

The following built facilities would be necessary whether 4.02.1(a) or (b) is adopted:
(a) Manproof fence, 1800mm high cyclone mesh, coiled Razor Ribbon on top, strand of Tiger Barb at base, similar gates.

(b) Solar power supply.

c) Telephone

(d) Smoke detectors as 3.02.1

4.02.3 ENHANCEMENT FACILITIES as 4.01.5(a)-(d).

4.03 UNATTENDED

4.03.1 The riskiest form of management of this complex would be to leave it unattended. Precedent is well established to prove such inaction to be disastrous.

4.03.2 Some improvement over past measures would be to install the minimum built facilities outlined in 4.02.2. plus security lighting.

4.03.3 Un-supervised inspection should be allowed using the system of collecting a key from a responsible body eg.- Police, National Trust, War Cemetery Curator, etc.. A returnable deposit, a fee and identification should be demanded.

4.03.4 Depending upon the results of the Land Claim a Board of Trustees could be established whose task it was to use fees gathered in 4.03.3 to maintain the complex and to pay for night security patrols if police support was not forthcoming. (Adelaide River Police are reluctant to be committed to 4.03.3 and regular night patrols because of emergency call-outs which can leave the station unattended).
5.00 INTERPRETATION

5.01 SUPERVISED VISITATION

5.01.1 The best form of interpretation is provided by guides backed up by museum quality displays in an interpretation centre.

5.01.2 This method ensures the least disturbance to the setting by obviating the necessity for signs, on or adjacent to features.

5.01.3 A manned interpretation centre can provide an additional point of income from the sale of brochures, postcards, memorabilia and refreshments.

5.01.4 Souvenir ing and compulsive theft is minimised. This could be of particular importance in the dumps where unexploded munitions may be found—highly unlikely but possible.

5.01.5 Graffiti is minimised and compulsive vandalism and arson eliminated.

5.01.6 Best control over litter.

5.01.7 Provides visitor feedback and an opportunity to gather on-going interpretive material from visiting previous users or occupants of the complex. Viz. diaries, plans, photographs, oral history, etc.

5.02 UNSUPERVISED VISITATION

5.02.1 Leads to the least desirable form of interpretation in that signage must be obtrusive to be effective and is an intrusion into the setting. The signs themselves can be subjected to theft and vandalism and are a source of on-going maintenance.

5.02.2 Hand-out brochures and maps (received with the entrance key) are environmentally the kindest form of unsupervised interpretation. Language difficulties can be a problem as well as the disposal of the brochures when finished with.

5.02.3 The necessary brevity of signs and brochures can cause a loss of subtle points of interest.

5.02.4 High quality displays in an on-site, unmanned, interpretation centre are open invitations to theft and vandalism.

5.02.5 Visitor feedback is minimal.
5.03 INTERPRETATION THEMES

5.03.1 MUNITIONS MUSEUM

(a) Assuming supervised interpretation is adopted and a suitable on-site interpretation centre is established, the possibility exists to make it the Territory's major Naval and Airforce Munitions Museum.

(b) With the co-operation of the two Services a full display of disarmed munitions typical of those stored on the complex, during their respective occupancies, could be displayed; eg. mines, torpedoes, Naval shells, bombs, rockets, flares, light and heavy ammunition etc.

(c) How the munitions were stored, transported and assembled, and the maintenance procedures they had to go through is a fascinating subject for most people and would form an important sector of the displays.

(d) It could also serve as an interpretation centre for WW11 Adelaide River.

5.03.2 ADELAIDE RIVER WW11 WAR ZONE

(a) Adelaide River became Forward Headquarters in the offensive phase of WW11, when the war was taken back to the Japanese increasingly on our terms.

(b) It is already on the tourist/military buff's itinerary because of the War Cemetery.

(c) There exists a plethora of military camp sites, airstrips, Army hospital, stores and ordnance depots, canteens, chemical warfare depot, AWAS HQ, tele-communications centre, rail sidings, cordial factory, Naval wireless station, to mention a few, in the environs of Adelaide River which could be used to reinforce the concept.

5.03.3 WW11 RAILWAY

The importance of the now defunct Birdum/Darwin rail link in the war effort is often neglected and should be featured. This siding with its railtracks in situ is now unique in the Top End and should be interpreted, as such, at the centre.
5.04 INTERPRETATION CENTER BUILDING

5.04.1 Having due regard for intrusions into the fabric, a new building is highly undesirable. It is better that one of the existing buildings be adapted if changes are minimal.

5.04.2 A building to house museum quality displays needs to be structurally sound, weatherproof, capable of being secured and air conditioned, equipped with a gantry for moving heavy objects, large enough for foreseeable display and storage purposes and simple to adapt.

5.04.3 These stringent requirements suggest the most suitable existing building for adaption is LABORATORY BUILDING No.57.

5.04.4 The existing derelic toilet and rooms to the rear of the building could be restored and adapted to office/living quarters for a curator (caretaker).

5.04.5 A simple barrier across the access road between Building Nos.32 and 33 would divert all entering traffic straight to this focal point building.

Plate 13. RAAF Explosives Laboratory, No.57, built in 1956 is best choice for adaption to interpretation centre/ munitions museum.
6.00 FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

6.01 GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE CONTROL

6.01.1 With almost all heritage matters the over-ruling factor in deciding options is money.

6.01.2 Even by adopting the cheapest options; i.e. the cost of restoration, providing security fencing, fire warning devices, non resident caretaking services, on going maintenance, etc. the cost to the owner to preserve this valuable heritage site is unfortunately relatively high if no income gathering from the result is possible.

6.01.3 There appears to be two options available to the owner (ownership depends upon the outcome of the land claim):

(a) bear the cost of restoration, etc. and attempt to gain income from self enterprise or from leases and royalties from private enterprise or:

(b) hand the responsibility for restoration, development, security and maintenance and income earning entirely over to private enterprise in exchange for a negotiated long term lease agreement.

6.02 EXCLUSIVE TOURIST RIGHTS

6.02.1 It is conceivable that a private tourist operator could operate a successful business on the complex provided that person was granted exclusive use rights.

6.02.2 Income could be derived from:

(a) entrance fees from individual visitors
(b) group tourist operators
(c) trolley rides (see 6.04.1)
(d) concession sales of refreshments, books, posters, etc.
(e) tours to other military sites around the Township
(f) camping
(g) youth hostel/backpacker accommodation
(h) subletting of storage space
(i) use of the complex for combat games
(j) army bivouacs
Plate 14. Evidence of recent war games by Army behind Laboratory No. 57. Other evidence can be found on top of Mount Sheppard.

Plate 15. Had this building No. 37 survived, it would have been ideal for adoption to Youth Hostel or school camping dormitory.
6.02.3 In return the operator could be expected to provide all or some of the following amenities, services or payments:

(a) establish residence/ office/ interpretation centre, utilities
(b) provide caretaker/ manager services to the complex
(c) undertake a progressive restoration program
(d) royalties

6.02.4 DISCUSSION

(a) Visitation figures given by the Curator of the Adelaide River War Cemetery (pers. com.) vary from 10-12,000 per month during the Dry Season down to 1,500-3,000 per month in the Wet.

(b) This would indicate annual numbers of approximately 80,000.

(c) Although desirable, it would not be essential for the tourist operator to be resident caretaker/manager.

(d) Should as high a level of activity develop as outlined in 6.01.2 consideration could be given to the eventual sale of the site under strict covenant provisions.

6.03 NON EXCLUSIVE TOURIST USE

6.03.1 Any one or all of the activities outlined in 6.02.2 could be performed by the owner or under lease by one or more private operators.

6.03.2 Any attempt by the owner to keep the more lucrative income earning aspects to itself or to allow too many operators, will diminish any chances of private enterprise undertaking responsibility for restoration.

6.04.1 RAIL TROLLEY

(a) A feature which would surely capture most imaginations would be a rail trolley (not necessarily motorised) which would traverse the entire siding including the Railway Bridge, No.71.

(b) This would restore some of the original atmosphere to the complex and provide a novel means of graceful travel which would have tremendous tourist appeal.

(c) It would also provide an excuse to ban private motor vehicles from the siding

(d) The possibility could exist for tours to begin from the Bridge, No.71
7.00 REVIEW MECHANISMS

7.01 OWNERSHIP

7.01.1 The results of the land claim will have an effect on implied legislative power to induce heritage sensitivity.

7.01.2 Pending Heritage Legislation may have some influence on privately owned heritage rated properties but the practical extent and practice of same is yet to be discovered. At the time of writing a private owner is under nothing more than a moral obligation to respect heritage responsibilities.

7.01.3 Should the land claim be successful and the property passes into private Aboriginal hands it is hoped that precedents set at such places as Victoria Settlement, Fort Dundas and Hermannsburg will be repeated. At these places great respect and care has been exhibited towards the European built history.

7.01.4 Kakadu and Uluru are successful examples of the willingness of Aboriginals to have their assets managed by others.

7.02 NATIONAL TRUST

7.02.1 Faced with toothless legislation the National Trust is the principal watch dog of heritage issues in the Northern Territory. It operates by example and by education and a with a great deal of public confidence and acceptance.

7.02.2 It would be hoped that in the event of a major leasing to a single body as suggested in 6.01.3(b), that the National Trust be requested by the owner to act as referee in determining heritage compliance by the operator, on a regular consultative basis.
8.00 STAGING

8.01 STAGING

8.01.1 As previously discussed, management decisions regarding the degree of security to adopt will have an effect on costs and possible staging strategies.

8.01.2 Ironically it appears that by simple regular maintenance and vigilance, the timber framed buildings could outlast the steel Armco shelters which, at this point in time, seem almost pristine by comparison to them.

8.01.3 It is recommended earlier in this report that the most dubious looking of the shelters be provided with ARC mesh barriers, which will allow visitors visual but not physical entry. Further scientific studies are needed to determine the structural integrity of all the shelters.

8.01.4 STAGE 1 Regardless of management decisions regarding security, the most urgent task is to fire protect (vegetation control, smoke detectors, telephone), waterproof and structurally stabilise the timber framed buildings and to undertake structural assessment of the Armco Shelters and to barricade dubious ones.

8.01.5 STAGE 2 Stabilise Armco Shelters. Results are likely to vary from moderate corrosion to condemnation. If the latter, two possibilities exist:

(a) replace with new Armco sections

(b) use existing failing sections as formwork and cast a concrete shell over them. Allow sections to deteriorate further until compelled to remove them because of danger of collapse.

8.01.6 STAGE 3 Re-roof rear section of Laboratory No.57.

8.01.7 STAGE 4 Fencing. See 3.02.2 (e)

8.01.8 STAGE 5 Instal town power.

8.01.9 STAGE 6 Re-equip bore, instal fire main, hydrants, storage/header tank.

8.02 STAGE 7. MANAGEMENT DECISION

8.02.1 Choose between owner options for income earning and management. See 6.00.
# 9.00 COST ESTIMATES

## 9.01 COST ESTIMATES

### 9.01.1 STANDING BUILT FEATURES

The following estimates are based upon each project being contracted out individually. Obviously an economy of up to 15% could be effected if a single contract was let for the whole (or majority) of the projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLD NO</th>
<th>NAVAL USE</th>
<th>ACTION REQUIRED</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>Dockyard Store</td>
<td>Demolish, save cladding.</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>Empty Package Store</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Repaint internally.</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Provide ARC mesh entrance barrier, paint.</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (15)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Provide ARC mesh entrance barrier.</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (16)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Provide ARC mesh entrance barrier.</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (18)</td>
<td>Shell Store</td>
<td>Replace missing columns, provide ARC mesh entrance</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>barrier until completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 (20)</td>
<td>Shell Painting Room</td>
<td>Urgent reconstruction. Provide safety fence until</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (19)</td>
<td>Shell Scraping Room</td>
<td>Urgent reconstruction. Provide safety fence until</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,27A</td>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>Provide ARC mesh entrance barriers.</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22,23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 (24)</td>
<td>Shell Store</td>
<td>Replace missing wall sheeting.</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (26)</td>
<td>Examinat'n of Depth Charges</td>
<td>Repair eaves in SE corner.</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Warheads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 (27)</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Provide ARC mesh entrance barrier.</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Store/ Office</td>
<td>Stabilise and re-clad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>Replace roof to rear building.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Replace defective sleep- ers.</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.01.2 NOTE ON SHELTERS

Estimates for worst case solutions:

(a) Excavate, grit blast inside and outside surfaces, replace all fixings, cut out rust patches, weld in new patches, epoxy zinc prime, paint, re-inter. 15,000 each

(b) Excavate, demolish Armco barrel vaulting and replace with new, epoxy/zinc prime outside surfaces and laps, repair end sections, re-inter. 25,000 each

(c) Excavate, use existing Armco as formwork, cast 150mm thick reinforced concrete barrel vault over outside. 45,000 each

9.01.3 Smoke detection system as 3.02.1(b) 12,000

9.01.4 Telephone 240

9.01.5 Electricity  
(a) solar (for smoke detectors) 900  
(b) town power connection 25,000

9.01.6 Fencing  
(a) manproof 80,000  
(b) 1200mm 12,000

9.01.7 Re-equip bore  
(a) solar 9,000  
(b) town power 8,000

9.01.8 Header tank and fire main, hydrants 30,000

9.01.9 Restore Laboratory 57 incl. air cond.  
Convert rear building to residence 140,000 70,000

9.01.10 Patch roads 5,000

9.01.11 Termite control 2,000
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The Depot is situated on the Western side of the Stuart Highway 70½ miles from Darwin and 2½ miles from Adelaide River.

A macadamised road leads in from the Highway to the Depot, a distance of approximately ¼ mile.

Generally, the Depot consists of Storerooms, Magazines, Laboratories, Examination rooms and living accommodation, and offices.

The Storerooms, Laboratories, Magazines etc., are laid out in one line on the western side of an asphalt road running from end to end, with a double railway track, (not correct) one on either side of the road linking up with the main line to Darwin at the southern end of the Depot.

A 4" firemain also runs the full length of the road with hydrants dispersed along it. Water is supplied by a bore pump driven by a single cylinder Southern Cross diesel engine, pumping up to 4 in number 15,000 gallon tanks on the top of the ridge on the west side of the Depot reticulating back to the firemain and domestic services.

The living accommodation and offices are in a group and have heads and washplace adjacent, fitted with a septic system of sewerage.

BUILDINGS

Nos. 1, 2, & 2A

Storerooms, contained in the one building built of corrugated iron with corrugated fibrolite roof overall size 60'6" x 35'6". The three rooms are separated by corrugated iron partitions. No. 1 Store fitted with single door 3'6" x 7' and wall racks, No 2 store fitted with double swing doors 4' x 12'. No. 2A store fitted with double swing doors 4' x 7' and wall racks. An overhead gantry rail enters No. 2 store from railway line in front.

All stores are fitted with electric light fittings complete. Flooring is concrete throughout, extending to 7' loading platform in front. Building is in perfect condition.
No. 3
Built of corrugated iron with corrugated fibrolite roof overall size 60' x 35'.
Concrete floor extending to 7' loading platform in front. Overhead gantry runs full length of building in centre, complete with 2½ ton block and endless chain.
Fitted with two sets of double swing doors, each 4'x7' and 10 corrugated iron double louvre type shutters. Electric light fittings complete.
Building in good condition.

No. 4 Shelter
Presumed a shell stowage. Constructed of corrugated steel bolted semicircular in section with flat steel plate ends. Concrete floor.
Internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front 6' x 7'.
Shelter covered with gravel to approximate depth of 2 feet.
Building in good condition.

No. 5 Shelter
Constructed of corrugated steel bolted semicircular in section with flat steel plate ends. Concrete floor.
Internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors 6' x 7'.
Shelter covered with gravel to approximate depth of 2 feet.
Building in good condition.

No. 6 Shelter
Constructed of corrugated steel bolted semicircular in section with flat steel plate ends. Concrete floor.
Internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front, 6' x 7'.
Shelter is gravel covered to an approximate depth of 2 feet.
Building in good condition.

No. 7 Shelter
Corrugated steel bolted semicircular in section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor. Internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front 6' x 7'.
Shelter is gravel covered to an approximate depth of 2 feet.
Building is in good condition.

No. 8 Shelter
Constructed of corrugated steel bolted semicircular in section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor. Internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front 6' x 7'.
Shelter is gravel covered to an approximate depth of 2 feet.
Steel corroding internally - building in fair condition.

No. 9 Shelter
Constructed of corrugated steel bolted semicircular in section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor. Internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front 6' x 7'.
Shelter is gravel covered to an approximate depth of 2 feet.
Slight internal corrosion - building in fair condition.

No. 10 Shelter
Constructed of corrugated steel bolted semicircular in section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor - Internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front 6' x 7'.
Shelter is gravel covered to an approximate depth of 2 feet.
Building is in good condition.

No. 20 Shelter
Constructed of corrugated steel sheets bolted in semicircular section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor, internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front 6' x 7'.
Shelter is gravel covered to an approximate depth of 2 feet.
Building corroding internally, in fair condition.
No. 21 Shelter
Of corrugated steel sheets bolted in semicircular section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor, internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front 6' x 7'.
Shelter is gravel covered to an approximate depth of 2 feet.
Building has slight internal corrosion, but otherwise in fair condition.

No. 23 Shell Store 60' x 35'
Corrugated iron walls and roof, unlined.
1 double swing door 8' x 12' with overhead gantry.
6 fixed glass windows and 14 louvre type shutters of corrugated iron.
Concrete floor extending to loading platform.
Building in good condition.

No. 24 Shell Painting Room
Constructed of corrugated iron walls and roof - unlined.
Dimensions 30' x 16'.
Room contains 1 concrete slab 9' x 2'9".
2 wooden benches 10' x 3'3".
2 double swing doors 8' x 12' with overhead gantrys.
4 fixed windows, 2 louvre type glass shutters.
Concrete floor extending to loading platform.
Building in good condition.

No. 25 Shell Scraping Room
Built of corrugated iron walls and roof - unlined.
Dimensions 30' x 16'.
Contains 1 concrete slab 24' x 4'.
2 double swing doors 8' x 12' with overhead gantrys.
4 fixed windows, 2 louvre type glass shutters.
Concrete floor extending to loading platform.
Building in good condition.
No. 26

Constructed of sheet fibrelite with corrugated fibrelite roof lined with wood fibre sheet.
Front room 20' x 16' has 2 double swing doors 6' x 12' fitted with overhead gantrys.
1 table 9' x 3'9" - 2 pits in deck 4' x 2' x 3' deep.
4 casement windows.
One back room 6' x 8' fitted with 4 wall shelves.
1 tin line shelf, 1 casement window.
Other back room 10' x 8' contains one low bench, 1 casement window, 1 door 2'9" x 6'6".
Concrete floor covered with corticene throughout.
Condition is poor - white ants have been active.

No. 27.

Corrugated steel sheets bolted in semicircular section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor, internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front 6' x 7'.
Building is in fair condition - with slight internal corrosion.

No. 27A Shelter

Corrugated steel sheets bolted in semicircular section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor, internal dimensions 50' x 6' x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel doors in front, 6' x 7'.
Building in poor condition, and plates torn and buckled.
Shelters No. 27 and 27A are on a common concrete base and loading platform and are covered to an approximate depth of 2' with gravel.

No. 28 Shell store 40' x 35'.

Corrugated iron sides and roof - unlined.
1 double swing door 8' x 12' with overhead gantry.
4 fixed glass windows, 12 corrugated iron louver type shutters.
Concrete floor extending to loading platform.
Building in good condition.
No. 30 Examination of D/Cs and Warheads
Sheet fibrelite walls with corrugated fibrelite roof. Lined with wood fibre sheeting.
Front room 20' x 16' with pit in centre 6' x 2'6" deep.
1 double swing door 8' x 12' fitted with overhead gantry.
4 casement windows.
1 Back room 6' x 8' fitted with 4 shelves and 1 casement window.
Other backroom 10' x 8' fitted with 1 low bench.
1 casement window and one back door 2'9" x 6'6".
Concrete floor extending to loading platform with corticene covering.
Building in fair condition, ceiling beginning to sag.

No. 31 Shelter
Corrugated steel sheets bolted in semicircular section with flat steel plate ends.
Concrete floor internal dimensions 50'6" x 24'6".
Central height 11'.
Double sheet steel door in front 6' x 7'.
Covered with gravel to approximate depth of 2 feet.