

Sent: Thursday, 22 December 2022 8:01 PM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Block 2 Section 4 Parkes – Anzac Park East Redevelopment

Submitted on Thu, 2022-12-22 20:01
Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:
Are you an individual or an organisation?
Individual

First name
James

Last name
Cotton

Email
j.cotton@adfa.edu.au

Postcode
2609

What Works Approval application are you making a submission for?

- WA102975 - Construction of a new commercial office building, - WA102646 – Construction of a mixed-use residential development

- WA102975 - Construction of a new commercial office building

The comments below refer to both developments. It is essential to regard this site as a unity. See below.

- WA102646 – Construction of a mixed-use residential development

WA102975, WA102646
Block 2 Section 4 Parkes

I wish to make 2 criticisms of these plans.

1. As the application notes, the intended structures must principally address the key role of this complex in one of the most important architectural sites in the National Capital. It is the site of one of the Gateway (Portal) buildings, the pair of buildings that flank the most significant ceremonial axis in Canberra, ANZAC Parade, which was planned to frame the view from Parliament House (Old and New) to the War Memorial. In an act of vandalism the original building was destroyed. The complex that replaces it must match and pay respect to the Gateway, the remaining Gateway building (including its height and overall character) and the Gateway concept.

The intended plan for the replacement Portal building flanking Anzac Parade provides for a building that is higher, longer and wider than the remaining Portal building. As it is the eventual intention of matching this structure on the West side, this design in effect is closely setting the parameters for that future building and the future vista. Why the replacement building should vary these dimensions is unclear. At the very least, the design should be re-cast to match those dimensions. While the limited use of masonry ('masonry' in the architectural notes) cladding rather than concrete is a positive feature, the balance of glass and pre-cast concrete is quite different from that seen in the existing Portal building.

The suggestion that the remainder of the development has no bearing on the heritage values associated with the Portal buildings is untenable. Here we have in the proposal an adjacent set of non-descript, off-white pre-cast boxes, at best of average merit. No doubt straightforward to design and build, and maximisers of floor area, they state no

ambition for the site. The design of the whole area must be integrated.

2. The intended plan crowds the site with multiple structures.

There are two related critical points to make of these structures.

First, they will most obviously further upset the concept of the Gateway (as discussed above).

In addition, their proposed use will locate residential space within clear sight and close proximity to the most important security premises in the country. This proposal is quite simply a threat to public safety. From these premises all ingress and egress of individuals and vehicles by way of the main car park entrance could be scrutinised, a fact that may well require expensive tax payer funded surveillance of occupants and movements; it may also require additional precautions taken within the building, again costly. There should not be any such structures so close to such a facility. Whatever is built should be no larger in footprint than the former building and no closer to the Chifley Building than the former building. The face closest to the Chifley Building should be suitably screened. The entry and exit to the car parking should not be opposite the main entry and exit to the Chifley Building. For years the hoardings around the site proclaimed that the 'next chapter' of the city's history was being written here. At least this much of the information employed by the developer is accurate: this task should be taken more seriously.

I have read and understood the submission terms and conditions above.

Yes

No, I do not consent to the publication of my submission.

No

You may edit this submission and approve for publishing at:

<https://www.nca.gov.au/node/22059/webform/submission/2528/edit>