



Australian Government  
National Capital Authority

# Consultation Report

Draft Development Control Plan No:171/08/0003  
Belconnen, Sections 44 and 49 (Cameron Offices)

*Prepared for the National Capital Authority by consultants Campbell Dion, June 2008*





4 June 2008

Mr Todd Rohl  
Managing Director  
Planning and Urban Design  
National Capital Authority  
GPO Box 373  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

25 Somerset St  
Duffy ACT 2611  
T 02 6288 3719  
F 02 6287 3606  
E [cambdion@netspeed.com.au](mailto:cambdion@netspeed.com.au)  
URBAN PLANNING  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
HERITAGE CONSULTANTS  
ABN 77 077 202 499

Dear Mr Rohl

**REPORT ON PRECONSULTATION – DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL  
PLAN NO.171/08/0003 – BELCONNEN SECTIONS 44 AND 49**

In accordance with your instructions I have invited nominated stakeholders to examine and make comment on the draft Development Control Plan No. 171/08/0003 prior to the document being published for public consultation.

**Stakeholders**

The following stakeholders were identified:

- |  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| • Australian Bureau of Statistics                        | Gaby Langhorn    |
| • ACT Planning and Land Authority                        | Garrick Calnan   |
| • Belconnen Community Council                            | Steven Bounds    |
| • Commonwealth Superannuation (Comsuper)                 | Matt Stevens     |
| • Department of Environment, Water Heritage and the Arts | Margaret Hammond |
| • Department of Finance and Deregulation                 | Julie Doyle      |
| • Department of Immigration and Citizenship              | Con O'Rourke     |
| • Royal Australian Institute of Architects               | David Parken     |

**Methodology**

Each stakeholder was initially contacted by telephone to identify a contact person. Contacts were forwarded a copy of the draft Development Control Plan and invited to meet with me to explain the pre-consultation process, the nature of the proposed DCP and to answer any questions arising.

Each contact person was telephoned following despatch of the DCP by email to ensure receipt and to obtain an indication of whether a meeting was required. Where contacts elected not to meet they were requested to reply in writing as a record of their views.

The outcomes of the pre-consultation exercise are discussed below.

The following stakeholders requested meetings:

- Australian Bureau of Statistics;
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship;
- Belconnen Community Council.

The following stakeholders responded by email:

- ACTPLA;
- Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Department of the Environment, Water Heritage and the Arts;
- Department of Finance and Deregulation;
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship;
- Royal Australian Institute of Architects;

The following stakeholders provided responses in meetings but did not confirm in writing:

- Belconnen Community Council

The following stakeholder did not respond

- Comsuper

The running sheet for contact with stakeholders is at Annex A.

#### **Stakeholders Responses**

##### **ACT Planning and Land Authority**

The Authority did not address the DCP in its comments. It expressed the view that the land should be degazetted and developed in accordance with the Territory Plan. In conversation the Authority expressed concern that other ACT agencies were not consulted.

ACTPLA was reminded that this was a pre consultation exercise and that opportunity for full comment would be available when the DCP was released under NCA protocol for public consultation.

##### **Australian Bureau of Statistics**

ABS was agreeable to the proposed development of the land but had some concern about parking in Benjamin Way and the possible impact it might have on the Bureau's arrangements for short stay parking in front of its building. It suggested that the final sentence of paragraph 4.1 be deleted.

##### **Belconnen Community Council**

The Council Chair and Chair Planning Committee (Bryan Rhinehart) met with me on 20 May 2008. The Council members had clearly read the DCP but limited their remarks to general support for the consultation process proceeding. They saw the development as being desirable for the growth of the Town Centre.

The Council declined to make a written response because of the voluntary nature of the organisation and the existing correspondence load.

**Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts**

The Department's response generally related to the conservation of the heritage values of Wings 3-5. The Department expressed concern that potential developments could impinge on the remnant heritage buildings through the restriction of views into and from the heritage place, and that new development may have an adverse impact on the urban design of the heritage place through inappropriate spatial separation or incompatible building form.

The Department expressed the view that the DCP should contain a heritage objective to reflect the importance of the site in relation to Cameron Offices and that the retention of the heritage place needed to be protected by the DCP in the event that protection through other controls was compromised.

The Department thought more information about the master planning of Sections 44 and 49 needed to be included in the DCP so that the end result could be appreciated.

The Department drew attention to references in the DCP to the earlier Territory Plan and recommended they be removed or updated.

**Department of Finance and Deregulation**

The Department made a number of editorial changes to the DCP (See Table One below) and suggested that there be more information provided in some sections of the development control plan. The Department did not oppose the DCP but suggested that sections required some preamble that set the controls against the existing situation with respect to that control, and cited the object on which the control was predicated.

**Department of Immigration and Citizenship**

The Department responded by email confirming that it did not consider that the proposed development would adversely impact on its tenancy of buildings in Chan Street and Benjamin Way.

**Royal Australian Institute of Architects**

The Institute did not have time to canvass comments from the general membership but did provide comments from Eric Martin (Heritage) and Sheila Hughes (Urban Design).

Both commentators drew attention to a need to consider the remnant Cameron Offices in the DCP to ensure that the new developments reflected the heritage values and context of the remnant Offices. The RAIA expressed concern regarding the lack of controls in the Territory Plan that would ensure an appropriate urban design for Sections 44 and 49 in the context of the surrounding precinct.

The Institute provided some editorial comment. (see Table One Below)

## TABLE ONE EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The editorial comments in the stakeholder responses are set out below

Section	Comment	Agency	
Preamble	This should clarify; The Cameron office buildings wings 3, 4, and 5 and stratum sections 193, 194 and 195 (the Bridge) be retained. That some of the sites referred to in the DCP have already been developed. The ABS offices have been constructed on block x and car parks provided on block y. If possible it would be useful to explain whether the car parks are temporary or permanent features or are there known proposals for redevelopment? Does the likely redevelopment in the short term realistically only relate to B10, B20 and part of B11 on S.44?	DEWHA	
1.2	This land is located in the Belconnen Town Centre and from 198x to 200x accommodated the Cameron Offices occupied by the Commonwealth Government. Redevelopment of the subject site for offices, residential and/or other uses should have a significant positive impact on the function and structure of the Town Centre with a view to revitalising the Belconnen Town Centre	DOFAD	
1.3	The purpose of this DCP and DCP drawing is to provide planning and design guidance for the redevelopment of the subject site and retention of the remaining significant heritage buildings on the subject site within the framework of the National Capital Plan and the Territory Plan	DOFAD	
1.3.1	Delete Buildings have been demolished	RAIA	
2.1	Suggest should include a heritage objective. For example to provide for the retention of the Cameron offices (Wings 3, 4, and 5) and allow for redevelopment of adjoining blocks while not adversely impacting on the heritage values of the place.	DEHWA	
2.6.1	Maximum building height should be limited to (RL) of original buildings	RAIA	
3.1	Indication of overall land use for the precinct? Insert opening sentence/s	DOFAD	
3.1(d)(i)	Please check that this is accurate. We did not have the map to cross reference this	DOFAD	
3.1(d)(ii)	These references appear to be incorrect		
3.1 ii	Reconsider whether <i>"To use the premises for any uses included in the Territory Plan B2B 2.1 Schedule 1 Precinct b except car parking"</i> is appropriate. The office spaces are part of the heritage value of the place. The continued use of the building for offices would reflect the past use and hopefully ensure that the internal open plan layout is not compromised. Uses that could require internal reconfiguration of space/external changes could be problematic as they could impact on the heritage values. It is recommended that this clause needs to ensure office is the majority use of the floor space. Could add, other uses that are compatible with the heritage values may be considered where in accordance with clause/schedule x,y of the Territory Plan. with the exception of uses x,y,z, (i.e. delete all uses that would obviously be incompatible).	DEWHA	
3.7.2	Needs to be broader consideration of any development for the adjacent streets. Needs to be in context of Town Centre.	RAIA	
4.1	Car parking for the ABS office development on Blocks 5 and 6 Section 49) shall be provided at a rate of 1 space per 100m <sup>2</sup> of gross floor area (GFA) ( <i>confirm this is correct</i> ) as shown in the Lend Lease Consortium Master Plan dated October 1990 ( <i>can this document be attached to the DCP?</i> ). The parking for the development should be located within Blocks 5, 6, and 7 of Section 49 Belconnen. Consideration may be given to locating a small number of the total car parking within the verge of Benjamin Way ( <i>Can this be done? Presumably all car parking needs to be on site</i> ) directly accessible from the street if requested by the Territory.	DOFAD	Comments in italics by DOFAD
4.1	Delete last sentence	ABS	
4.8.1	Potential requirements of the ACT Heritage Act need to be written into DCP	RAIA	
5.8.2.2	Delete DEH Insert DEWHA	RAIA	
6.1	The maximum building height on Sections 44 and 49 is AHD		Comments in italics

	613.7 metres excluding roof plant ( <i>Please indicate how many storeys that would equate to</i> ).		by DEWHA
6.8.2.3	Needs to be a stronger statement now on to what extent development can occur and not adversely affect the significance such as heights, closeness to buildings etc.	RAIA	Refers to relationship with remnant Cameron Offices
8	<b>Heritage environment and Moral Rights Obligations</b>	DEWHAA	
8.1	After ' <i>The heritage significance</i> ' insert " <i>and values</i> " Reiterate that Cameron Offices buildings Wings 3,4, 5 and stratum section 193, 194 and 195 need to be retained. Then differentiate between the need to retain these wings versus providing for impact assessment for redevelopment on the remainder of the blocks covered by the DCP		
8.2	Qualify that any demolition proposals would relate to buildings on blocks other than wings 3, 4 and 5 and the bridge (as they need to be retained).	DEWHA	
8.7	Delete 8.7 and renumber 8.5	DEWHA	
8.8	Delete 8.8 and renumber 8.6	DEWHA	
17.1	Any land use on the site will be developed in accordance with the relevant objective and controls of the Territory Plan current at the date of commencement ( <i>what is the date of commencement</i> ) of the Holding Lease for the sites and the provisions relating to the maximum building height, gross floor area and setback as set out in this DCP ( <i>These matters are not set out in the DCP</i> )	DOFAD	Comments in italics by DEWHA

Stakeholder written responses are at Annex B.

### Conclusion

Stakeholders responding to the invitation to comment of the draft DCP were advised that they would be provided with a further opportunity to comment under the protocol applied by the NCA to public consultation on planning matters. In a number of cases it appeared that this information needed to be reiterated and emphasised. However, as indicated in the table above, stakeholders generally took a constructive approach to the proposed DCP.

However, ACTPLA and RAIA both adopted a negative attitude to the DCP. At the basis of the RAIA concerns was a resentment towards the Commonwealth because the Institute's application to the Minister to register the whole of Cameron Offices had been unsuccessful. This was reflected both in initial correspondence with the Institute and in its response.

Notwithstanding this major concern the Institute did raise legitimate urban design issues in its submission and these are recorded above and in the attached responses (Annex 'B').

ACTPLA did not address the DCP at all. Its fundamental position was that it did not want to add credibility to the document by commenting on it. The Authority was of the view that the land ought to be declared Territory land in which case, the Territory Plan would apply and the DCP would have no effect.

The Authority raised concern that the pre-consultation exercise did not encompass the views of other interested agencies including TAMS and ACTEW who might have wished to comment on infrastructure issues. Once again attention was drawn to the nature of the exercise and the opportunity for fuller comment in due course.

Yours sincerely

Paul D Cohen FPIA MURP  
Certified Practicing Planner



## ANNEX 'A'

### CONTACT RUNNING SHEET

Name	Organisation	Number	email	Action	Status
Mark Flanigan	Water Environment and Heritage	6274 1111	Mark.Flanigan@environment.gov.au  <a href="mailto:Margaret.Hammond@environment.gov.au">Margaret.Hammond@environment.gov.au</a>	26/5/08 Rang follow up left message 27/5/08 New contact Tayo (Theo Hooy ) 6274 2015 27/5/08 email from M Hammond wants drawing Rang P Dewhurst requested dwg emailed to me <i>Advised Margaret Hammond that Monday morning is latest I can accept comment.</i> 2/6/08 Rang MH. Said she had prepared comments and they were with supervisor. Said I would have to close off mid morning Tuesday but I was eager to get her comments. 3/6/08 Received comments by email	Finalised
Julie Doyle	Finance and Deregulation	6261 1111	Karishma. Deshmukh@finance.gov.au	Contact by phone. email back will provide advice in writing. 26/5/08 Written response received	Finalised
David Parken	RAIA	6121 2000	David Parken@raia.com.au	22/5/08 Sent Request on his return from OS. 27/5/08 Rang and spoke same day Rang Spoke to Samantha. Hasn't looked at it yet. Has Exec this week. 3/6/08 Written comment received	Finalised
Gaby Langhorn	ABS		gabs@abs.gov.au	Meeting at ABS. No concerns. Will confirm in writing 26/5/08 Follow up 2/6/08 Received written advice	Finalised
Steven Bounds	Belconnen Community Council	6251162 2		20/5/08 Meeting Discussed with Steven Bounds and Brian Rhynehart (Council Planning Committee) No concerns with proposal. Did not propose to respond in writing	Finalised
Matt Stevens	Comsuper	0407269 675	matt.stevens@comsuper	26/5/08 Left message 27/5/08 Promised to respond by COB today 30/5/08 Asked for response by COB today	
Con O'Rourke	Immigration and Citizenship	6264 1247 0412 614 633	con.o'rourke@immi.gov.au	26/5/08 Meeting 0900 Briefed O'Rourke and staff on DCP 30/5/08 rang no response on phone or mobile left msg re reposnse by COB 30/5/08 Received written response	Finalised
Jacqui Lavers	ACTPLA		Jacqui.lavis@act.gov.au	14/5/08 Requested comment 15/5/08 Received written comment	finalised



**WRITTEN RESPONSES FROM STAKEHOLDERS**

**PAUL COHEN**

---

**From:** Calnan, Garrick [Garrick.Calnan@act.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 3 June 2008 9:50 AM  
**To:** cambdion@netspeed.com.au  
**Subject:** FW: PRECONSULTATION DCP SECTIONS 44 AND 49 BELCONNEN

---

**From:** Lavis, Jacqui  
**Sent:** Thursday, 15 May 2008 10:31 AM  
**To:** Calnan, Garrick  
**Subject:** FW: PRECONSULTATION DCP SECTIONS 44 AND 49 BELCONNEN

could you please prepare the necessary letter as referred to here

**Jacqui Lavis**  
Executive Director Planning Services  
ACT Planning and Land Authority  
Phone: 02 6207 1950 Mobile 0400 957 930  
email: jacqui.lavis@act.gov.au

---

**From:** Lavis, Jacqui  
**Sent:** Thursday, 15 May 2008 10:30 AM  
**To:** 'cambdion@netspeed.com.au'  
**Subject:** FW: PRECONSULTATION DCP SECTIONS 44 AND 49 BELCONNEN



Hi Paul,

Having discussed this with Garrick, my view is that the appropriate course of action is that National Land be degazetted in this instance, so that the Territory Plan can apply.

We will be advising the NCA accordingly

**Jacqui Lavis** | Executive Director

**Planning Services** | ACT Planning and Land Authority

 (02) 6207 1950 / 0400 957 930  jacqui.lavis@act.gov.au

*Please consider the  before printing this e-mail*

---

**From:** PAUL COHEN [mailto:cambdion@netspeed.com.au]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 14 May 2008 3:40 PM

3/06/2008

**To:** Calnan, Garrick

**Subject:** PRECONSULTATION DCP SECTIONS 44 AND 49 BELCONNEN

Garrick

I have been briefed by NCA to consult with nominated stakeholders as part of the pre-consultation process.

I will provide a written report to NCA on comments received as a result of my meetings

The Draft DCP is attached.

The references to the repealed Territory Plan will be removed.

Can we meet early next week please?

Regards

Paul Cohen

-----  
This email, and any attachments, may be confidential and also privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies of this transmission along with any attachments immediately. You should not copy or use it for any purpose, nor disclose its contents to any other person.  
-----

3/06/2008

**PAUL COHEN**

**From:** Gaby Langhorn [gaby.langhorn@abs.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Monday, 2 June 2008 11:04 AM  
**To:** cambdion@netspeed.com.au  
**Subject:** Notification: Development Control Plan [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi Paul

I see now why you didn't receive my first email message - the email address was incorrect. Strange the message didn't bounce back to me as 'unsent'. My apologies - here it is again.

Regards

Gaby Langhorn  
 Manager  
 ABS House Property Services  
 Development Control Plan

**Development Control Plan**  
 ABS HOUSE PROPERTY SERVICES Gaby Langhorn 14/05/2008 03:28 PM  
**ABS HOUSE PROPERTY** 14/05/2008 03:38 PM  
**SERVICES**  
 Sent by Gaby Langhorn

**Send** To: cambdion@netspeed.com.au  
 CC:  
**Subject** Development Control Plan  
**Protective Mark** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Categories** 05 Business Services\Belc Bus Interchange Project  
**Visibility** Limited Readers  
**Editors** Gaby Langhorn/Staff/ABS, CO CSD Business Services  
**Readers** Gaby Langhorn/Staff/ABS, CO CSD Business Services  
**Document Usage** Financial Management - determines recordkeeping action  
**Document Id** GLAN-7EM8FD

<b>Edit Log</b>	14/05/2008 03:28:34 PM; Gaby Langhorn; Document created. 14/05/2008 03:40:29 PM; Gaby Langhorn; No monitored fields were changed
-----------------	---

Hi Paul

2/06/2008

Many thanks for the opportunity to chat with you this afternoon.

On reviewing the Development Control Plan I queried a couple of paragraphs and ask that perhaps the last sentence of para 4.1 be removed.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics is, in principle, agreeable to the proposed development of the parcel of land where Cameron Offices used to occupy.

Regards

Gaby Langhorn  
Manager  
ABS House Property Services

---

Free publications and statistics available on [www.abs.gov.au](http://www.abs.gov.au)

**PAUL COHEN**

---

**From:** Hammond, Margaret [Margaret.Hammond@environment.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 3 June 2008 11:46 AM  
**To:** cambdion@netspeed.com.au  
**Cc:** Wurst, Ilse  
**Subject:** Preliminary comments on the DCP for Cameron Offices [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Paul

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Development Control Plan (DCP) and drawing for Sections 44 and 49 Belconnen including stratum sections 193, 194 and 195. The DCP incorporates the Cameron Offices (wings 3, 4 and 5 and the bridge) and land surrounding these wings to the north, south and west.

The Heritage Division would like to make the following preliminary comments. In addition, further clarity is requested on some matters. This will be useful to inform future comment.

**Heritage Values**

As you are aware, the Cameron Offices Wings 3, 4 and 5 and Bridge are listed on the Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL ID 105410) and on the Register of the National Estate (RNE ID 101084). The office complex is significant among other things as a bold, uncommon example in Australia of a major office building project designed in the late 20th century Brutalist Style. A copy of the CHL statement of significance and values are attached for your information. The values relate to the following criteria B (Rarity), D (Characteristic values), F (Technical achievement) and H (Significant people). The heritage values are expressed in a variety of ways, for example in the off form concrete structural structures and associated spaces, in the building's design, its streetscape setting, the office spaces, courtyards, bridge and the fabric and finishes.

Due to demolition of the other buildings in the vicinity, wings 3, 4 and 5 are now exposed to view. It is possible to appreciate most elevations and light is able to reach the offices, courtyards and associated spaces. Key questions are how have the changes to the surrounding environment impacted on the existing values and how best are the remaining wings retained and interpreted. Any proposal for redevelopment abutting these boundaries could have a range of impacts on the existing remnant offices, both visually and functionally. This could have consequent impact on the heritage values.

**Conservation Management Plan (CMP)**

Given the recent changes to the surrounding environment, there is an urgency for the owner/manager of the land (The Department of Finance and Deregulation) to prepare a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for the remnant offices in accordance with their obligations under the EPBC Act. In particular, policies will need to consider the streetscape (views to the buildings from public areas and adjacent sites, to satisfy criteria (b), (d), and (f) for which the site is listed). To protect these values limits may need to be set for bulk, high and scale of adjacent buildings. The analysis should inform the management of the site, for example to explain what uses of the site are acceptable, how what is left of the office complex is best retained and interpreted etc. This in turn should inform the nature of redevelopment on the adjoining land and any necessary provisions in the DCP (use, setbacks etc). Where appropriate, the CMP should draw on information of relevance from past CMPs.

**Update the DCP**

The DCP needs to reflect the fact that:

- o Other parts of the Cameron Offices have since been demolished ie delete clauses about 'may be retained' where building have since been demolished.

- o The DCP references the Territory Plan (2002) policies. Any new development applications or policy proposals after 31 March 2008 will need to be in accordance with the Territory Plan 2008. Refer [www.actpla.act.gov.au](http://www.actpla.act.gov.au). How does the 2008 version differ (if at all) from the 2002 version and what are the implications (if any) for the DCP?

### **Preamble of DCP**

This should clarify:

- o The Cameron office buildings wings 3, 4 and 5 and stratum sections 193, 194 and 195 (the Bridge) must be retained.
- o That some of the sites referred to in the DCP have already been developed. The ABS offices have been constructed on block x and car parks provided for on blocks y and z. If possible, it would be useful to explain whether the car parks are temporary or permanent features or are there known proposals for redevelopment? Does the likely redevelopment in the short term realistically only relate to B10, B20 and part of B11 on S44?

### **DCP Objectives**

- o At clause 2.1 about Plan Objectives: Suggest could include a heritage objective. For example to provide for the retention of the Cameron Offices (Wings x, y etc) and allow for redevelopment of adjoining blocks while not adversely impacting on the heritage values of the place.

### **Purpose Clause relating to Wings 3, 4 and 5**

At clause 3.1 ii reconsider whether "*To use the premises for any uses included in the Territory Plan B2B 2.1 Schedule 1 Precinct b except car parking*" is appropriate. The offices spaces are part of the heritage value of the place. The continued use of the building for offices would reflect the past use and hopefully ensure that the internal open plan layout is not compromised. Uses that could require internal reconfiguration of space/external changes could be problematic as they could impact on the heritage values. It is recommended that this clause needs to ensure office is the majority use of the floor space. Could add, other uses that are compatible with the heritage values may be considered where in accordance with clause/schedule x, y of the Territory Plan with the exception of uses x, y, z (ie delete all uses that would obviously be incompatible).

### **Subdivision**

See comments about CMP/analysis in paragraph 3 above.

It is unclear how the subdivision plan has been derived. It will be important to ensure that the surrounding development does not compromise the future use of Wings 3, 4 and 5 for offices (and use of courtyard spaces) and protects its heritage values. It is unclear how much space has been provided between the sides of Wings 3, 4 and 5 and the proposed subdivision boundary.

### **8 Heritage, Environment and Moral Rights**

See comments about CMP/analysis in paragraph 3 above.

8.1 After "The heritage significance" insert 'and values'.

Reiterate that Cameron Offices buildings Wings 3, 4, 5 and stratum sections 193, 194, 195 need to be retained. Then differentiate between the need to retain these wings versus providing for impact assessment for redevelopment on the remainder of the blocks covered by the DCP.

8.2 Qualify that any demolition proposal would relate to buildings on blocks other than Wings 3, 4 and 5 and the bridge (as they need to be retained).

### **Matters relating to height, urban design, development etc**

See comments about CMP/analysis in paragraph 3 above.



Please could you explain which applicable controls in the Territory Plan 2008 would apply. Also, where are the provisions relating to gross floor area and set back in the DCP? How does the proposed maximum height in the DCP (AHD 613.7 metres) relate to the height of the Cameron offices wings 3, 4 and 5 and how will it impact on the heritage values (if at all)?

Regards  
Margaret  
Margaret Hammond  
Historic Heritage Management Section  
Heritage Division  
Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts  
Ph: (02) 6274 2596  
Fax: (02) 6274 2095  
GPO Box 787, CANBERRA ACT 2601

-----  
If you have received this transmission in error please notify us immediately by return e-mail and delete all copies. If this e-mail or any attachments have been sent to you in error, that error does not constitute waiver of any confidentiality, privilege or copyright in respect of information in the e-mail or attachments.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.  
-----

## PAUL COHEN

---

**From:** Deshmukh, Karishma [Karishma.Deshmukh@finance.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Monday, 26 May 2008 4:40 PM  
**To:** cambdion@netspeed.com.au  
**Cc:** Roughton, Fraser; Doyle, Julie  
**Subject:** FW: CAMERON OFFICES SECTIONS 44 AND 49 BELCONNEN PRECONSULTATION DCP [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hello Paul

Please find attached the draft DCP for the above sites with Property Branch's comments/amendments in track changes mode. Please feel free to contact me if you have any queries.

For your information, Julie Doyle is on leave (returning 26 June 2008) and Fraser Roughton is acting in Julie's role for this period.

Regards

Karishma Deshmukh  
Project Officer | Property Branch (Monday, Tuesday, Friday)  
Legal Officer | Legal Services Branch (Wednesday, Thursday)  
Department of Finance and Deregulation  
T 02 6215 2494 | F 02 6267 7666

---

**From:** PAUL COHEN [mailto:cambdion@netspeed.com.au]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 21 May 2008 9:44 AM  
**To:** Doyle, Julie  
**Subject:** CAMERON OFFICES SECTIONS 44 AND 49 BELCONNEN PRECONSULTATION DCP

Good Morning Julie

I have been briefed by NCA to carry out the pre-consultation on a Development Control Plan for Sections 44 and 49 Belconnen.

The DCP is an amendment of an existing DCP.

I enclose a copy of the draft DCP for your information and I would be grateful for any comment you might have.

I have been given a tight time frame to report back to NCA and would be grateful for an early response.

Kind regards

Paul Cohen  
Campbell Dion Pty Ltd  
Certified Practicing Planner

62883719

0438883719

2/06/2008

---

Finance Australian Business Number (ABN): 61 970 632 495  
Finance Web Site: [www.finance.gov.au](http://www.finance.gov.au)

IMPORTANT:

This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain confidential or legal information.  
If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately by telephone on 61-2-6244-6244.  
If responding to this email, please send to the appropriate person using the suffix .gov.au.

---

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN

### BELCONNEN, SECTIONS 44 AND 49 (Cameron Offices)

#### DCP No. 171/08/0003

#### 1. Preamble

1.1 This Development Control Plan (DCP) relates to the subject site in Belconnen known as:

- (a) Blocks 7, 10, 11, 19 and 20 of Section 44;
- (b) Blocks 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Section 49; and
- (c) Stratum Sections 193, 194, 195.

1.2 This land is located within the Belconnen Town Centre and ~~from 198X to 200X for over 20 years~~ accommodated the Cameron Offices occupied by the Commonwealth Government. Redevelopment of the subject site for offices, residential and/or other uses ~~may~~ should have a significant positive impact on the function and structure of the Town Centre with a view to revitalising the Belconnen Town Centre.

1.3 The purpose of this DCP and DCP Drawing is to provide planning and design guidance for ~~the preparation of redevelopment proposals for of the subject site and retention of the remaining significant heritage buildings on the subject site~~ within the framework of the National Capital Plan and Territory Plan.

#### 2. Plan Objectives

2.1 The DCP for the subject site adopts the objectives contained in the Territory Plan namely to:

- (a) provide the main focus for the district population for shopping, community and cultural facilities, entertainment and recreation;
- (b) provide opportunities for business investment and employment while facilitating the decentralisation of employment from the Central National Area;
- (c) encourage a mix of land uses, including residential uses, which contribute to an active and diverse character;
- (d) provide an urban structure which is simple, legible and flexible;
- (e) maintain and enhance environmental amenity and encourage a standard of urban design consistent with the function of the centre; and
- (f) encourage activities particularly at street frontage level which contribute to pedestrian activity and social interaction.

**Comment [d1]:** Make these site-specific where possible, and consistent with the Territory Plan and National Capital Plan.

3. Land Use

~~3.1~~ Indication of overall land use for the precinct? Insert opening sentence's.

~~3.1.2~~ Land is to be developed as follows:

(a) **Section 49 - Blocks 5 and 6**

(i) ABS Building.

(ii) Purpose clause:

"To use the Premises for the purpose of offices in association with carparking and any purposes ancillary thereto."

(b) **Section 49 - Block 7**

(i) Cameron Offices Wings 1 and 2 are to be redeveloped as a car park.

(ii) Purpose clause:

"To use the Premises as a car park."

(c) **Section 49 - Block 8, Stratum Sections 193, 194 and 195 and Section 44 Blocks 7 and 19**

(i) Cameron Offices Wings 3, 4 and 5 and Stratum Sections 193, 194 and 195 are to be retained.

(ii) Purpose clause:

"To use the Premises for any of the uses included in Territory Plan B2B 2.1 Schedule 1 Precinct b except car parking."

(d) **Section 44 - Block 20**

(i) Cameron Offices Wings 6, 7, 8 and 9 may be retained or redeveloped subject to compliance with clauses 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3.

(ii) Purpose clause:

"To use the Premises for any or all of those uses included in the Territory Plan B2B as permissible in a town centre precinct 'b' or the equivalent C2 Business Zone"

(e) **Section 44 - Block 10**

(i) This land is to be redeveloped.

(ii) Purpose clause:

**Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

**Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

**Comment [d2]:** Please check that this is accurate. We did not have the map to cross-reference this.

**Comment [d3]:** These references appear to be incorrect.

"To use the Premises for any or all of those uses included in the Territory Plan in a town centre precinct 'd' or the equivalent C2 Business Zone."

(f) **Section 44 – Block 11**

(i) This land is to be redeveloped.

(ii) Purpose clause:

"To use the Premises for any or all of those uses included in the Territory Plan as permissible in a town centre precinct 'd' or the equivalent C2 Business Zone.

4. **Car Parking**

4.1 Car parking for the new ABS office development (on Blocks 5 and 6 Section 49) shall be provided at a rate of 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area (GFA), as shown in the Lend Lease Consortium Master Plan (dated October 1999). The parking for the development should be located within Blocks 5, 6 and 7 of Section 49 Belconnen. Consideration may be given to locating a small number of the total car parking within the verge of Benjamin Way directly accessible from the street if requested by the Territory.

**Comment [d4]:** Confirm this is correct.

**Comment [d5]:** Can this document be attached to the DCP?

**Comment [d6]:** Can this be done? Presumably all car parking needs to be on the site.

4.2 Car parking for development proposed on the balance of the site [excluding Blocks 5, 6 and 7 of Section 49 Belconnen] covered by this DCP shall be in accordance with the ACT Government standards.

5. **Land Subdivision**

5.1 Subdivision of land within Sections 44 and 49 should generally be in accordance with the Indicative Plan of Subdivision shown on the DCP Drawing 171/07/0001..

6. **Building Height**

6.1 The maximum building height on Sections 44 and 49 is AHD 613.7 metres excluding rooftop plant.

**Comment [d7]:** Please indicate how many stories this would equate to.

7. **Urban Design**

7.1 Building design is to be of a high architectural quality both in terms of form and visual appreciation. Building materials and finishes are to reflect the importance of the locations of these Sections in the context of the Town Centre.

7.2 Active land use activities along Benjamin Way, College Street, Chandler Street and Cameron Avenue street level frontages are encouraged in order to contribute to social interaction and liveliness within the Town Centre.

7.3 Where a block or section adjoining Benjamin Way is to contain non-residential land uses, active land use activities are mandatory along the site's Benjamin Way frontage in recognition of its role as the main entrance to the Belconnen Town Centre.

- 7.4 Residential land uses fronting Benjamin Way and other surrounding streets shall provide open space with semi-transparent fencing and pedestrian access to encourage:
- (a) high-quality landscaping and maintenance;
  - (b) public safety; and
  - (c) activity on the street.
8. **Heritage, Environment and Moral Rights Obligations**
- 8.1 The heritage significance of those parts of the Cameron Offices entered in the Commonwealth Heritage List or any other applicable statutory heritage listing is to be recognised by the Lessee and reflected in any redevelopment of the site.
- 8.2 It is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure that all obligations under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* and the *Copyright Amendment (Moral Rights) Act 2000* (or subsequent legislation) are met. As part of the consideration of any demolition or development proposal the NCA will require advice and evidence from the proponent that any obligations under the above legislation have been met.
- 8.3 A work method statement and heritage impact statement prepared by a heritage consultant must be provided to the NCA and to the Department of the Environment and Heritage for any demolition or major redevelopment works and must include advice on mitigation measures to protect existing heritage values.
- 8.4 Any adverse environmental impacts on adjacent properties from on-site developments are to be identified by the Lessee in accordance with the relevant legislation (Commonwealth and Territory).
- 8.5 The Lessee is required to prepare an Environmental Management Plan and have it approved in writing by the Territory before commencing any site works.
- 8.6 The Lessee is required to prepare a Construction and Demolition Recycling Plan and have it approved in writing by the Territory before commencement of site works.
9. **Environmental Protection Measures**
- 9.1 Environmental protection measures should be adopted as appropriate, to minimise any possible adverse impacts of new development or redevelopment on the physical environment, in terms of air quality, noise, waste water run-off, dust, steam and smoke.
- 9.2 Stormwater run-off from the site is required to meet the requirements and specifications of the Territory.
- ~~8.7 The Lessee is required to prepare an Environmental Management Plan and have it approved in writing by the Territory before commencing any site works.~~
- ~~8.8 The Lessee is required to prepare a Construction and Demolition Recycling Plan and have it approved in writing by the Territory before commencement of site works.~~

**Formatted:** Bullets and  
Numbering



**10. Mechanical Plant**

- 10.1 Outside mechanical equipment such as air conditioning units, heat pumps and the like are to be integrated into the overall design of the building, screened from public view, and located in such a way as to minimise nuisance to adjacent lessees.

**11. Pedestrian Access**

- 11.1 A north-south spine is to be provided through Sections 44 and 49 linking Condell Street, running off College St, with the Belconnen Bus Interchange. Provision is to be made to connect the spine through to the Swanson Plaza, and other activities on Section 54, in the event that the Interchange is removed at a future time.
- 11.2 The spine is to be a feature within the development, with good lighting, paving, landscaping and activities which will make it attractive in order to encourage its safe use at all times.
- 11.3 The pedestrian spine will comprise an easement included in the leases for all affected Blocks in Section 44 and 49 with provisions made in the leases to ensure free public access is maintained through that area at all times.

**12. Vehicular Access**

- 12.1 Section 49 may be accessed from Cameron Avenue and Chandler Street, .
- 12.2 Ceremonial access and limited short-stay visitor parking off Benjamin Way may be provided to Section 49 provided that there is no vehicle access to basement or rear parking areas.
- 12.3 Section 44 may have two access points from Benjamin Way. Access is also permitted from Cameron Avenue, Chandler Street and College Street, .

**13. Service Areas**

- 13.1 Provision is to be made for the storage and removal of waste material and general services areas in accordance with plans prepared by the Lessee and approved in writing by the Territory. All areas are to be suitably screened from public view.

**14. External Lighting**

- 14.1 All public access areas on the sites shall be illuminated and kept illuminated by the Lessee at its own expense and to the satisfaction of the Territory Government.

**15. Landscaping**

- 15.1 Landscaping must be carried out in accordance with a Landscape Master Plan prepared by the Lessee and be consistent with relevant element of the Town Centre Precinct Code of the Territory Plan .

**16. Signs**

- 16.1 All signs and graphics are to be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Territory Plan.

17. **Land Uses and Development**

- 17.1 Any land uses on the site will be developed in accordance with the relevant objectives and controls of the Territory Plan current at the date of commencement of the "Holding Lease" for the sites and the provisions relating to maximum building height, gross floor area and setback as set out in this DCP.

**Comment [d8]:** What is the date of commencement?

**Comment: [d9]:** These matters are not set out in this DCP.

## PAUL COHEN

---

**From:** Doris.Gerwien@immi.gov.au  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 May 2008 3:03 PM  
**To:** cambdion@netspeed.com.au  
**Cc:** Con.O'Rourke@immi.gov.au; Evan.Thomas@immi.gov.au  
**Subject:** Draft Development Control Plan Sections 44 and 49 Belconnen [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi Paul

Thank you for meeting with us on Tuesday to discuss the draft Development Control Plan.

I confirm that we do not see any adverse impacts on our tenancy arising from the new development.

Many thanks

Doris Gerwien  
Assistant Director  
Property Leasing and Reporting Section  
Client Services Division  
Department of Immigration and Citizenship  
Ph: +61 2 6264 3810  
Fax: + 61 2 6264 4135  
Mobile: 0412 068 629

Important Notice: If you have received this email by mistake, please advise the sender and delete the message and attachments immediately. This email, including attachments, may contain confidential, sensitive, legally privileged and/or copyright information. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. DIAC respects your privacy and has obligations under the Privacy Act 1988. The official departmental privacy policy can be viewed on the department's website at [www.immi.gov.au](http://www.immi.gov.au)

See: <http://www.immi.gov.au/functional/privacy.htm>

**PAUL COHEN**

---

**From:** David Parken [David.Parken@raia.com.au]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 3 June 2008 9:26 AM  
**To:** PAUL COHEN  
**Cc:** Sophie Clement; David Flannery  
**Subject:** RE: CAMERON DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN

Paul,

I have attached some comments received from two ACT Chapter members for your information and consideration. Time has been too short for a full formal RAIA submission and I had an Executive meeting on Friday and was interstate yesterday. I also appreciate that we will have an opportunity to comment during the public consultation process.

The RAIA are bitterly disappointed with the demolition of Cameron Offices and the treatment our submission to the Federal Government regarding its historical value to the community. I will be writing separately to the Commonwealth and NCA on that matter. However we will move forward but some of our members are not impressed with what has occurred on the site.

Regards  
David

David Parken LFRAIA, Hon AIA, Hon FNZIA  
Chief Executive Officer  
The Royal Australian Institute of Architects  
7 National Circuit  
BARTON ACT 2600  
Ph: 02 6121 2000 Fax: 02 6121 2001  
david.parken@raia.com.au  
[www.architecture.com.au](http://www.architecture.com.au)



2008 Venice Architecture Biennale  
[www.architecture.com.au/](http://www.architecture.com.au/)

---

**From:** PAUL COHEN [mailto:cambdion@netspeed.com.au]  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 May 2008 12:52 PM  
**To:** ceo@raia.com.au  
**Subject:** CAMERON DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN

Good Afternoon David

I need to finalise the pre-consultation exercise on the DCP.

I would be grateful if I could have any comment you might have by Monday morning at the latest.

The pre consultation exercise is to get comment on the proposed draft for public consultation. You have indicated areas of concern of some of your committees and there will be opportunity for full expression of RAIA views when the DCP is released formally.

Kind regards

Paul Cohen

3/06/2008

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN SECTIONS 44 and 49 BELCONNEN - PRE  
CONSULTATION Pre-consultation program with nominated stakeholders prior to the release  
of the draft DCP for Sections 44 and 49 Belconnen (Cameron offices site) for public  
consultation

ACT Chapter – comments sought from selected members

ERIC MARTIN

General comments

It is extremely disappointing that this has eventuated and that the relevant authorities permitted the building to be demolished at a great loss of our Heritage and at a great increase in energy consumption, especially when the embodied energy of the existing building is taken into account.

My preference would be to restrict the new building to the footprint and height of the original building then at least it would retain some urban context as per the original design and also pay some respect to the original design.

Particular comments on the DCP


1. 3.1 d (i) the words be retained are now nonsense as they do not exist.
2. 6.1 the height must be the max of the existing buildings/original buildings but I am not sure what the actual RL is.
3. 7.2 There needs to be a broader consideration of any development for the adjacent streets before you can consider just one side of a road. This DCP needs to be put into a context of the whole town centre and there is no evidence of that in the information provided.
4. 8.1 There is some heritage significance of what remains although substantially diminished. I understand that this will change to Territory land after the development is completed. If this is so then the potential requirements of the ACT Heritage Act needs to be written into the DCP.
5. 8.2.2 DEH reference needs to be corrected to DEWHA.
6. 8.2.3 There needs to be a stronger statement now on to what extent development can occur and not adversely affect the significance such as heights, closeness to the building etc.

SHEILA HUGHES

Comments

The issue of the treatment of the remaining portion of the Cameron Office is I think something we should address if it is seen as still having significance in its truncated form. It's not just the retention of the building as much as the structure of the area that could become the context for the remnant that may be the issue.

In broader planning / urban design terms there is no plan or controlling sections attached so the form of the land uses proposed is hard to assess. A key comment would be that any DCP by the NCA should not act in isolation from a broader master plan for the area. Also Benjamin Way is a major street and the DCP should very carefully set out controls for residential interfaces at street levels that will not produce suburban transparent fences. The whole issue of residential interfaces with streetscapes is poorly handled at Territory level a so thoughtful review of urban design guidelines that set a precedent for how more densely developed areas might handle this in contrast to suburban density areas is long overdue and the NCA should use this opportunity.



National Capital Authority  
GPO Box 373  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Telephone 02 6271 2888  
Facsimile 02 6273 4427  
Email [natcap@natcap.gov.au](mailto:natcap@natcap.gov.au)

[www.nationalcapital.gov.au](http://www.nationalcapital.gov.au)