

From: John Black [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 29 April 2021 8:44 AM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Block 3, Section 39, Campbell - Australian Way Memorial

Categories: Green category, Orange category

I don't object to the expansion of Australian War Memorial. I do object to the following below for reasons stated. Surely expansion can be planned without the destruction of these items. Plans need to be revisited so items currently planned for destruction can remain.

Expansion could be achieved without destruction similar to approach taken by Louvre Museum Pyramid in Paris where new section was added without destruction of original museum. This new section has become a landmark in its own right. The same could be achieved at the Australian War Memorial creating a new Landmark for Canberra, Australia, for those that have served since the original ANZACS in conflicts since. A new monument landmark for them in their own right, conjoined being the complete Australian War Memorial. Instead of destruction and replacement of part of existing memorial.

Removal of 100 Mature Trees

These should not be removed.

Reasons: -

- These trees are as old as the war memorial itself forming part of the heritage and significance value of the war memorial itself.
- Mature trees take significant time to grow again to this size.
- In light of current climate change concerns is ignorant of the capacity of these trees to capture and store carbon
- Trees are visually attractive adding to character and maturity of the Australian War Memorial.
- Are home to many Australian animals adding to significance to the "Australian" part of the "Australian" war memorial.

Demolition of ANZAC Hall

This should not be demolished.

Reasons:-

- Building is of significant national architectural significance.
- Destruction is a waste of limited natural resources.
- Part of original ANZAC memorial and destruction will lose that connection.
- Australian as a young country already has a shortage of structures of heritage significance already. So why demolish one that is becoming a structure of significant heritage significance.

Please consider these and others and the options proposed.

Regards John Black

Concerned Australian Citizen about the proposed loss of some Australian national significance.

From: Ray Edmondson [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 25 April 2021 3:04 PM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Submission to Australilan War Memorial enquiry on "early works"

Categories: Green category, Orange category

I am opposed to the planned extension to the Australian War Memorial and therefore opposed to the present application.

In the World War II film *Forty Thousand Horsemen* it is Chips Rafferty who spells out what Australians are fighting for: "it's the right to start off as a rouseabout and finish up as Prime Minister. It's the right to tell the boss what he can do with his job if you don't like it. And it's the right to get up on a soapbox in the Domain". In other words, they fought for democracy, freedom, transparency - and accountable government.

In Australia we enjoy freedom of speech, thought and conscience, and access to our collective national memory, including *Forty Thousand Horsemen* itself. A large part of that memory resides in our national cultural institutions, including the National Library, the National Museum, the Film and Sound Archive and the Australian War Memorial. I've spent my working life amongst them.

In recent years the present government has placed most of those institutions on hard rations. Budgets have been frozen, staff have been reduced through so-called "efficiency dividends", services and collecting activity has been curtailed, and preservation work has fallen behind. All except one: the Australian War Memorial, which has been spared the worst of these privations. And then a year or so ago, seemingly out of nowhere, the Memorial scored a bonus: \$498 million for a building extension.

It seems the Government is not short of cash, handing out taxpayers' money for all manner of rorts and dubious enterprises over the last several years - "efficiency dividends" notwithstanding. Everyone knows the picture. Nobody, of course, could begrudge the Memorial, like all the other institutions, being properly funded for its responsibilities. But why has it been singled out for such special treatment? Ever since the project was announced, I have mused on what that half-billion dollars could achieve for the nation if it was fairly spread around where it is really needed: the cultural institutions, the ABC and SBS, setting up an Integrity Commission, perhaps even boosting the Auditor General's office - so it can better root out Government inefficiencies and make the taxpayer's dollar go further.

The plans have been heavily criticised from an architectural, heritage and financial perspective, to say nothing of the fears of turning a place of remembrance into a Disneyfied military theme park. The question of whether the extension is needed at all has been thoroughly challenged by authoritative voices, including previous directors of the Memorial. There have been scores of submissions to the Parliamentary enquiry, overwhelmingly opposed to the development.


Nevertheless, whatever the Government's real agenda may be, it is determined that the project will proceed, come what may, money no object. It has been railroaded through the approval stages with unseemly haste and emotional blackmail, while observing the form of consultation but ignoring its substance. An accountable government would, at the very least, would have justified the project by responding coherently to the detailed objections. It has not. Instead it has deputed Memorial Director Matt Anderson to merely declare that critics "are entitled to their views", making it perfectly clear how far it values honest consultation and explanation.

Now we are faced with an application to the NCA to approve what are referred to as "early works". Clearly they are nothing of the sort. They will cause permanent damage to the Memorial and its surrounds. It is what the "Yes Minister" television series would refer to as "salami tactics". Once these works are approved it will be impossible for the NCA not to approve the entire project when the time comes.

Consideration of the approval of these "early works" should be deferred by the NCA until it has received a Works Approval application from the Memorial for the rest of the project. It could then responsibly consider all components of the project as a single package, and hopefully do so independently of the relentless Government pressure.

This is Australia, not North Korea, and I doubt if it's what Chips Rafferty thought we were fighting for.

Dr Ray Edmondson OAM



[REDACTED]

From: Rose Costelloe [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 27 April 2021 1:24 PM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Submission regarding planned 'early work' on the changes to the Australian War Memorial

Categories: Green category, Orange category

Dear friends at the National Capital Authority

I expect you are finding yourselves between a rock and a hard place at the moment, due to the fact that you are the final arbiter of whether 'early work' on the half a billion-dollar plan to irrevocably change the nature of the sacred space that is the Australian War Memorial goes ahead or not. And with that, the destruction of the many healthy and beautiful old growth trees and the ANZAC Hall.

A bit like how the Commonwealth Environment Minister Sussan Ley and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs must have felt when they were alerted to the fact that the mining company Conzinc Riotinto of Australia (CRA) planned to legally destroy Juukan Gorge in Western Australia. It is highly likely they felt somewhat differently after the site was destroyed. Perhaps. Perhaps not.

I imagine the pressure to approve the plan is quite strong. It would take people with courage and ethical beliefs to stand up to the current government and pathetic opposition and deny approval.

I am saying this because it is up to you people.

And I wish you well in your decision-making. After all, your names will go down in history one way or another, as having significant power at this point in time. Power as to whether Australians are able to continue to grieve at a war memorial that is a solemn, sacred, beautiful and quiet place befitting reflection on the lives of the loved ones who died in the service of their country, fighting in necessary as well as ill-conceived wars. Or not.

Good luck.

Rose Costelloe
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Francis Hutchinson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 30 April 2021 9:08 AM
To: Works Approval Consultation
Subject: Australian War Memorial(AWM)

Categories: Green category, Orange category

I have a number of relevant objections to the proposed 'early works' in relation to the AWM:

1) The proposed 'early works' will cause substantial damage to the important heritage and architectural integrity of the existing War Memorial. There will be also some destruction of old growth trees in the immediate surrounds that will detract significantly from landscape and context of the AWM.

2)The proposed 'early works' cannot be reconciled with the notion of a fully considered, well-integrated overall planning process. What appears to be sadly lacking is due regard for important matters of heritage, architectural significance and remembrance with these proposed 'early works'. As things stand, insufficient attention is being given to what will be irretrievably lost. Any headlong rush to expand the War Memorial can result in inadequate planning outcomes.

3) The Heritage Impact Statement makes clear the importance of the ANZAC Hall. For many Australians like myself whose relatives have been lost in previous wars, there is a seeming undue haste with these 'early works'. There is a short-sighted ordering of priorities and processes. The proposed works appear to lack, in some significant respects, consistency as regards the National Capital Plan(<https://www.nca.gov.au/planning-heritage/national-capital-plan>)

4) The demolition of Anzac Hall is cited as a component of these 'early works'. This is highly problematic. All components of the project need to be fully considered in terms of heritage, quality of design and other relevant criteria. They should not be rushed.

5) A thorough assessment needs to be made of all the components of the project. This should be completed before any 'early works' of a major and irreversible kind get the go ahead.

Dr F.P. Hutchinson
[REDACTED]