

[REDACTED]

From: Rachael Eggins [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 8 April 2021 10:40 AM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Stop the early works for the War Memorial redevelopment

Categories: Orange category, Green category

Dear NCA,

I am writing as a resident of Canberra to express my opposition to the early works proposed at the War Memorial, and to the expansion in general.

I believe that the early works should be immediately stopped, that any further redevelopment must involve thorough community consultation, and that the preservation of the eucalypts that surround the area should be prioritised.

The expansion of the War Memorial to showcase large military equipment is not needed. The message of the War Memorial is best conveyed through the personal stories that are told via images and smaller artefacts.

I also believe the NCA should release a response to all submissions it receives on this issue.

Dr Rachael Eggins

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Rosie Yuille [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 28 April 2021 2:01 PM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Application to NCA for approval of early works associated with the AWM redevelopment

Categories: Green category, Orange category

I am writing concerning the application to the NCA for approval of the early works associated with a redevelopment project at the Australian War Memorial. I understand that these early works include the demolition of Anzac Hall and the removal of over a 100 trees. I also understand that final approval for the construction phase of the development is yet to be given. I find it hard to accept that approval for such destructive and irreversible “early works” can be justified before the final approval for the next stage is complete. Supposing final approval was not given - would we be left with a gaping hole where Anzac Hall was and a huge dirth of trees, or are we to assume that the final approval is a foregone conclusion and therefore this early works approval is also a foregone conclusion? I hope this is not the case as it would seem to make a mockery of the process.

I have had a look at the arborist’s report and counted 116 trees to be removed. Most of these trees appear to be mature eucalypts in good health. This is a massive sacrifice for a controversial expansion. It may be decades before any replanted trees can properly replace those to be removed. In the meantime the Memorial loses much of its ‘nestled in bush land’ appeal. As a long term Canberra resident I think this is a great shame.

The demolition of Anzac Hall also seems to be a gross waste given that it is barely 20 years old. I know there has been much written about this and I leave it to others more expert than I to argue this.

Thank you for very carefully considering this application particularly with reference to the removal of so many healthy trees and the destruction of Anzac Hall - both irreversible “early works”.

Yours sincerely,

Rosie Yuille
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 28 April 2021 7:05 PM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Proposed expansion of the Australian War Memorial

Categories: Green category, Orange category

I wish to add my voice to those concerned about the proposed development of the Australian War Memorial (AWM) and what this expansion of exhibition space to display more machines of war says about Australia's society and our values.

I understand that the role of the National Capital Authority is to ensure that development in Canberra is consistent with its standing as the symbol of Australia's national life and values. Accordingly, I fail to see how the proposed development fits with the established role of the AWM which is one of commemoration of those who fell in war, for quiet reflection on war and especially on the great waste of human life. There is no need to expand the AWM simply to showcase promoted displays of huge military machines which serve only to glorify war. That would be against the purpose of the AWM which is to portray symbolically the evil, horror, loss and sadness of war. Such a portrayal is a better fit with Australian values than displays of equipment whose sole purpose is to cause death and destruction. If such a museum-like display is considered necessary then it should be located in a warehouse in Mitchell or Hume and funded by the companies that manufacture weapons.

Arriving in Canberra in 1965, the AWM was one of my first weekend outings. I was interested to learn more of Australia's history and to understand Australia's participation in wars. My visit was quite daunting as I realised what many of my male relatives had undergone in WW1 and WW2 and why they were said to be 'changed' and 'different' on their return. I did not need to see an army vehicle, a tank, an aeroplane or a ship to comprehend the horror and terror of war. The photographs and dioramas provided more than adequate information including how Australian society was impacted.

The present semi-rural setting of the AWM is magnificent. Surrounded by grassed areas and large trees (and many rowdy birds) it provides a wonderful setting for visitors, both national and overseas, to appreciate the beauty of Canberra. It would be a great shame to destroy this sacred place that illustrates Australia's national life and values so well.

Valerie Baxter
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Terry Fewtrell [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 29 April 2021 9:37 AM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Submission on War Memorial plans

Categories: Green category, Orange category

This submission is necessarily short, but nonetheless heartfelt. I need to express my dismay and horror at what is proposed for the redevelopment of the Australian War Memorial and the consequences that will flow from it.

Firstly, I think it needs to be said that there has not been a really meaningful opportunity for the public to comment on the proposals. The process conducted by the AWM was deceptive and misleading. That itself is a sad indictment on the bona fides of those behind the proposals. So sadly, but importantly, it falls to the NCA to recognise the damage that the proposals will do to the physical environment of the vicinity of the Memorial and the strength of feeling and grievance of those who have most to do with the Memorial, the citizens of Canberra.

In that sense we see ourselves as custodians of a precious space that presents a uniquely Australian setting for the remembrance of the sacrifice of service men and women. That is about to be destroyed if the proposals go ahead. Seemingly now only the NCA can stop this destruction, that evokes the insensitivity of the sad loss of the Juukan Caves in Western Australia. When will we learn?

The proposal trashes architecture that only a few years ago we lauded as the best of our culture. To simply demolish that now to make way for something bigger is a complete misreading of what the public entrusted to those responsible for the Australian War Memorial. What is proposed will turn a beautiful memorial to sacrifice into a brash museum of the artifacts of war. That is a terrible distortion of the Charles Bean legacy and intention. We are better than this crass proposal would suggest.

The Land Axis is a fundamental part of the Canberra geometry and geography. For almost 100 years the War Memorial has set the tone of the Axis and the Parliamentary Triangle, as gradually other structures have emerged. That progress has always enhanced the symbolism, amenity and instinctive Australian characteristics of the central Canberra spaces. Sadly, that will change with the War Memorial development plans. What currently is an expression in built-form of the lean modest simplicity of the ANZAC story and mentality is to be replaced by a bloated self-promoting boasting. Surely it falls within the mandate of the NCA to name this for what it is and to point out that it does not fit or work with the Canberra that we have developed.

It is instructive that at the other end of the Land Axis we now have a building that speaks eloquently and beautifully, symbolically and in built-form, of our nation, people and aspirations. We can do better than what is proposed for the AW. Indeed, it is largely a case of retaining what is currently there, as it well expresses the Australian ethos. Certainly, to lose the wonderful forecourt and its natural atmospheric would be a tragedy.

I would urge the NCA to be brave and state what is recognised by most Australians who have looked at this proposal – that it is inappropriate in its present form and needs to be reconsidered and significantly reduced. Thank you.

Terry Fewtrell
[REDACTED]